

CHANGING SCENES:

ETHNOGRAPHIC EXPLORATIONS OF MEANING, ADULT LEARNING,  
AND COMMUNITY THEATRE

A Thesis

Submitted to the College Of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Continuing Education

in the

Department of Communications, Continuing,

and Vocational Education

by

M. Madeleine Butschler

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

1990

(The author claims copyright. Use shall not be made  
of the material contained herein without proper acknow-  
ledgment, as indicated on the following page.)

102000634320

The author has agreed that the Library, University of Saskatchewan, may make this thesis freely available for inspection. Moreover, the author has agreed that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised the thesis work recorded therein or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which the thesis work was done. It is understood that due recognition will be given to the author of this thesis and to the University of Saskatchewan in any use of the material in this thesis. Copying or publication or any other use of the thesis for financial gain without approval by the University of Saskatchewan and the author's written permission is prohibited.

Requests for permission to copy or to make any other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of Communications, Continuing, and  
Vocational Education  
University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon, Canada

## ABSTRACT

The study began as ethnographic explorations with members of a rural theatre group creating a play about the community's history. Through six months of participant observation, focus on recording what participants learned about theatre has been recast into a framework with meaning, change, and experience of change as central. Theories of modernity were linked to participants' context of pervasive change.

The study came to ask what we mean by change and how that influences our actions and responses to learning as both "learners" and "adult educators". Four areas of discovery emerged which both raised and responded to aspects of this complex question.

Two areas of discovery focus on change concerning constructions of adult educators, transition in: 1) Methodological works reflecting adult educators' changing constructions of adult education; 2) Data analysis process including forms of representation. "Paradigmatic transition" is proposed as a framework to interpret present gaps and epistemological inconsistency in methodology and methods of research.

In response to methods inconsistent with methodology, data analysis process has been reconceptualized as a synthesis of: relevant social theory and methodology; and constructions emerging from experience with data analysis and creation of representational form.

The other two areas of discovery focus on change related to learning theory. Based on fieldwork, the study provides interpretation of one set of participants'/learners': 3) Social processes related to constructions of meaning, change, and learning; 4) Theatre experience with paradigm creation as part of their social process.

The literature review identifies recent transition both in social change and in learning theories. The study proposes that, with a focus on process of change, meaning and culture may provide a nexus between these theories. Suggestions for reconstruction of learning process theory are offered through a theoretical synthesis. A set of working assumptions from data analysis process provides a series of links focusing on meaning and culture, social process and change, connected with learning process theory. A summary of these links follows.

The working assumptions include processual definitions of meaning (individuals' experience of relationship) and "cultural-meaning" (meaning which members of a group come to have a sense of holding in common). In a processual definition, "learning" is linked with "meaning": A process of changing meaning within an individual.

Since meaning is socially created and maintained (in epistemology adopted), study of social processes must be pursued to interpret individuals' meanings. Change, as both process and experience, is embedded in a larger social framework. Social dynamics related to individuals' meanings include: social creation and maintenance of meaning, loss of meaning, and social response to loss of meaning.

Individuals exposed to possible learning situations as change may experience a "tension in certainty" in which change may be viewed by "the potential learner" as: 1) Exploration, movement towards meaning; or 2) Disruption, movement away from meaning. The study proposes an epistemology of change as part of experience of learning. A processual definition of experiencing change is offered: Change is the word we use at the moment of awareness and thereafter when we recognize

something as having altered in relation to ourselves. Assumptions about qualities associated with experiencing change are also provided.

A bridge is offered between epistemology of change and social process: How individuals anchor meaning in their social interactions. Two anchors in "social entities" emerged in the study: "group entity" and "social structure". In dynamics of individuals' interactions, their meaning of anchors may emerge and shift subtly or abruptly.

Concerning the fourth area of discovery, two descriptions of participants' theatre experience are provided: 1) A narrative of fieldwork experience; and 2) The Mobile-framework, a model-description of participants' theatre process which details participants' theatre process considered from the set of working assumptions. It includes participants' interactions interpreted in terms of "paradigmatic actions" and aims towards reflecting dynamics of participants' interactions in creating and responding to changing meanings.

Theatre process is considered in light of theory of modernity, particularly attending to secularization, individuation, abstraction. Theatre processes as paradigm simultaneously foster and offer individuals a response to modern conditions of plurality and change.

The final chapter's reflections are couched in terms of three orientations towards adult education: 1) "Paradigm-watchers"; 2) Those concerned with specific theory content; and 3) Those concerned with specifics of daily practice. The study challenges adult educators of all orientations to make explicit our vantage points and to "follow through" on implications related to learning when placing meaning and change at epistemological centre. Reflections range from implications

for contemplated change in organizations, among researchers, and among those engaged in interactions with "groups of learners". Finally, the study advocates seeking out how learners culturally interpret the word "learning" as part of research efforts directed towards interpreting individuals' experience of learning.

The study's aforementioned set of working assumptions and Mobile-framework are incorporated into a six part document which also includes a Preface linking the study to adult education works, and a substantial Bibliography divided into five sections reflecting the study's multidisciplinary nature.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With the inductive, multi-disciplinary approach inherent in the thesis work there was much landscape and many guides, some for brief distances, others for the entire series of explorations. Given the contributions of so many, it is impossible to acknowledge everyone.

To all those involved in the work, I wish to express my heart-felt appreciation for your encouragement and your belief in the search for new trails. I also wish to express my gratitude to a few who assisted in exploration of specific terrain.

The late Professor Kathleen Whale was among those who guided my first steps of wonder into the fieldwork. Her insightful questions nurtured a sense of the multidisciplinary nature of ethnographic work. Her influence endured long after her direct involvement in the thesis.

Professor Michael Collins, thesis co-adviser, was also among the first to actively encourage me in pursuing this thesis topic. His advice and support to me both when I first entered into the Department's program and when the study was developed have made the research possible. Both he and Professor Adrian Blunt, as committee member, guided vital efforts to locate and link the study to diverse constructions of adult education. Special thanks to Professor Blunt for undertakings in editing and for asking the hard questions.

Professor John Thompson, thesis co-adviser, acted intermittently as guide, then anchor, with keen sensitivity throughout the tensions in certainty of this research. I am profoundly grateful to him for the many ways he contributed to fieldwork, data analysis process, and construction of representational form, bringing to these processes a

special gift of reconsidering vantage point when stumbling blocks appeared on the immediate horizon.

For his assistance in another landscape of thesis exploration, I am indebted to Mr. Skip Kutz. He gave invaluable editorial direction in the subtleties of musical metaphor for the "Mobile-framework".

Shifting landscape once more, I wish to acknowledge those with whom I sojourned in the field. Although I cannot name them for reasons of confidentiality, this is intended to convey my gratitude and appreciation to the director, who suggested my involvement in the theatre project, and each of the participants for their courage and their willingness to engage in the study in the face of so much ambiguity. Their creativity and their humour continue to furnish for me warm and bright memories.

For their enduring support, I am most grateful to friends and family and especially to my husband Stephen Ellis for his assistance in so many capacities throughout the study. The work would not have been possible without his computer wizardry, or without his wonderful care and his patience given the uncertainties of an open-ended process.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the University of Saskatchewan and the support received from St. Thomas More College during the writing of the thesis work.

In loving memory of my mother,

Nettie Butschler

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>PAGE</u>
	ABSTRACT	i
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
	PREFACE	x
<u>PART I</u>	<u>CHANGING ACT: ACTING CHANGE</u>	1
CHAPTER ONE	THE FIRST STAGE: Entering The Field	8
CHAPTER TWO	STAGE DIRECTIONS: Review Of Methodological Resources Related To The Fieldwork Stage	29
CHAPTER THREE	STAGE PLAY: Narrative Of Experience In The Field	63
CHAPTER FOUR	STAGE CUES: Review Of Literature Related To Data Analysis Of The Fieldwork Stage	135
<u>PART II</u>	<u>CHANGING PARTS: PARTINGS CHANGE</u>	179
CHAPTER FIVE	BACK STAGE: Ontological And Epistemological Foundations: Elements From Which The Framework Evolved	186
CHAPTER SIX	STAGE LIGHTING: A Working Set Of Assumptions About Meaning And Change In Social Interactions Reflected In The Mobile-Framework	299
CHAPTER SEVEN	STAGE LEFT, STAGE WRITE: Conceptual Outline of The Mobile-framework	368

<u>PART III</u>	<u>CHANGING PIECES: PIECING CHANGE</u>	434
CHAPTER EIGHT	STAGE PRODUCTION: The Mobile-framework Presented	437
	A. GENERAL CONTEXT: The Main Bar	438
	B. SUSTAINED UNCERTAINTY: The First Act-Play	496
	C. ANCHORED ANOMIE: The Second Act-Play	592
	D. PLAY ACTING: The Third Act-Play	715
	E. CONTINGENCY CONTROL: The Fourth Act-Play	921
	F. PLAYED OUT — THE PART IS OVER: The Fifth Act-Play	1039
 <u>PART IV</u>	 <u>CHANGING STAGE: STAGING CHANGE</u>	 1189
CHAPTER NINE	REFLECTIVE STAGE: Studied Reflections	1191
 <u>PART V</u>	 <u>RESEARCHING CHANGE: CHANGING RESEARCH</u>	 1318
BIBLIOGRAPHY	STAGE WINGS: Five Areas Of Literature Surveyed In The Study	1319
 <u>PART VI</u>	 <u>MIRRORING CHANGE: CHANGING MIRRORS</u>	 1337
APPENDICES	STAGE APRON: Artifacts and Instruments	1338
	SECTION ONE: Collection Of Artifacts	1339
	SECTION TWO: Instruments Created for Research	1353
	SECTION THREE Draft Documents For Data Analysis	1362

## PREFACE

### CHANGING SCENE: SEEN CHANGING

Yesteryear, we knew the world was flat, yesterday we discovered that the world was round. Today some think of it as a series of communication lines and networks. Yesteryear, we worked and lived in the same place with the same people, today many of us move from one job to another. Yesteryear our families were large, today they are smaller.

Our Western cultural world is emerging as an experience of change: a crucible of our response to and our creation of shifts. This experience of refocusing, of change as pervasive, has been expressed in many works from the popular, Future Shock, (Toffler, 1970) to the formal theoretical, "Toward A Critique Of Modernity" (Berger, 1977).

Change is "the all" around us. This is the modern context which we bring as learners and it is the context in which we act as adult educators. Foundational to our entire collection of purposes as adult educators is an intention to foster specific change. We are prompters of transition through learning process and through community development. In a flood of change we hope to effect a precise effort to change.

In our efforts to bring intended change, how have we, as adult educators, taken into account and responded to commonly held experiences of pervasive, unintended change? This "Preface" begins with that crucial question. The thesis continues to address aspects

of it and shifts concurrently to a second question. What alternative ways can we use to explore modern experience of change to promote cohesive discussion and reflection in adult education practices?

There are four major areas of discovery emerging out of this study. The more specific question of what we mean by change and how that influences our responses to learning processes both as learners and adult educators has been key to all four areas. I have chosen intentionally not to provide a succinct definition of "learning". That is the substance of this study and a basis for reflection in the final Chapter. I emphasize the importance of keeping both "learners" and adult educators in the picture, because our relations are interactive. However, in terms of the areas of discovery the focus shifts from one to the other.

Two areas of discovery focus on part of that question: what we mean by change and how that influences our actions and responses to learning as "learners". This was studied through empirical research, an ethnography. The major body of the thesis work is a participant observation study with a group of individuals in an informal setting who experienced tremendous change while learning about "theatre". They did so through developing a group, creating and then presenting a play about the history of "their" community.

The first area of discovery, a major focus for analysis, became project participants' social processes related to meaning, change and learning. I came to analyze how group members variously experienced rapid changes, how they interacted to create and respond to changes, and eventually how this shaped their learning. As part of a larger

endeavor to bring macro and micro spheres of theory together [Woods, 1988, p.97], the thesis offers a response to the struggle between attempting to focus on both individual and "group" concurrently (Chapter Five). In doing so it also advances a working assumption about relationship between meaning and culture, shifting emphasis to culture as "process" rather than object or product (Chapter Six).

As a second area of discovery, the work has also been concerned with how theatre experiences may influence individuals' meanings of change. Thus a major focus for analysis was the general effect of these individuals' emerging "paradigm" of theatre on their experience of meaning and change and thereby their learning. Study of "theatre" as a tool in adult education thus became a sub-study of social process and meaning. Acting and performing were important, but only within a larger sphere of group members' meaning and process. This recognition substantially re-directed my research for theoretical resources.

Theoretical work was sought to provide explication of the fieldwork experience. No single theoretical work located provided sufficient explication. In fact, given the focus on both individuals and "group", it was difficult to locate the work in terms of historical divisions in research. This difficulty shaped one of the main theses emerging from this study concerning adult education research. That is, "meaning" and "culture" as focal points are an important meeting place for learning theory and social change theories.

Both social change theory and learning theory are concerned with processes of change. Links between learning process and social change

have been emerging in adult education (Ruddock, 1967). They have been surfacing more frequently in a variety of forms in recent years (Blunt, 1988; Gooderham, 1987; Jarvis, 1987; Mezirow, 1981; Nieborg & Vos, 1983). The thesis seeks to further these efforts to link the two, by exploring how our meanings of change affect us in our interactions as learners. The thesis also works at the problem of bringing together "macro" and "micro" spheres through exploring this meeting place.

Ethnographic work, as part of qualitative research is intended to generate theory (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Since no theoretical work upon which to base data analysis was located, a synthesized theoretical framework has been generated from the data analysis. (See Chapter Five and Six.) The thesis offers this synthesis to adult educators as an alternative, as part of a narrow range of extant theories on social process related to meaning, change and learning.

Concerning the third and fourth areas of discovery, the orientation shifted to some extent from learners. It shifted towards adult educators, contemplating: what we mean by change and how that influences our responses to learning processes as adult educators. This question was considered mainly in terms of methodology.

When "meaning" and "change" began to emerge as focal points in the study, I reconsidered methodological resources on ethnography for renewed direction. I came to look to these methodological resources as one indication of how adult educators attempted to study meaning and change while observing individuals' learning processes. I discovered that despite growing popularity of both ethnography as a

form of research (Goodson & Walker, 1988) and theatre as a tool (Kidd, 1984; Minister, 1982; Radin, 1985) in adult education there are a number of gaps in the literature.

The third area of discovery took the form of a primary focus in research. I sought methodological materials sensitive to both data analysis and forms of representation which would focus on individuals' meanings changing through their interactions. Such resource materials were not located during the study. This shaped the thesis document in two ways. First, this precipitated a bulk of reflections on data analysis process. Second, a representational form to reflect emerging change, the "Mobile-framework" was specially designed in Chapter Eight. (The word "mobile", as in mobile sculpture, is used to convey a paradoxical quality of form. A mobile exists in a state of "suspension", yet its parts are able to move in relation to each other.) The thesis thereby offers other researchers an alternative model of representation.

I have documented my emerging process as thoroughly as possible throughout the thesis culminating in the "Mobile-framework". This was done to respond to a vacuum in the literature. Resource materials describing in detail processes for data analysis are only beginning to surface in the literature (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Miles & Huberman, 1986). Even so, neither guide materials nor ethnographic works tend to describe how the researcher's meaning "as learner" is changing over the course of the study.

This study endeavors to make a contribution to development of methodological resource material through offering one such data base.

The study (although extensive as a result of this painstaking attention to changing meaning and process in the research) may also provide novices with concrete examples of changes a researcher may experience during such a study.

Finally, as a fourth area of discovery, the thesis also focuses on methodology as reflecting change in adult education. I did not locate materials which would provide a comprehensive theory of method for this particular study. I discovered instead an array of social and research theories, and methods. As researchers we are faced with choosing among theories and methods which have competing claims and shifting influence on adult educators. The thesis reflects on implications this has for researchers and practitioners in adult education.

These, then, were the four major areas of discovery in the study. The remaining portion of this "Preface" sets the stage for the thesis. It does so by providing context for the study and elaborating upon the thesis framework. To provide insight into all four "previewed" areas of discovery, I step back into the larger context of adult education milieu in which the study took place. I return to the first question raised. In our efforts to bring intended change, how have we, as adult educators, taken into account and responded to commonly held experiences of pervasive, unintended change?

Our responses to experiences of unintended change as adult educators have been diverse. It is beyond the scope of the thesis to find a framework in which all might be expressed and understood. However, this thesis posits that there is a striking pattern running

through the diversity of our responses which until recently has predominated in adult education literature.

We have tended to respond to pervasive change in terms of perceived "content" of change. People are losing their jobs, we retrain them for other jobs. People are experiencing different stages in their life, we set up programs to meet those changing needs (Havighurst, 1972). Our responses have been dominated by a structural orientation (Ruddock, 1972), either aiming to assist the individual in changing to meet "societal needs", or aiming to change social structure (Lovett, Clarke, Kilmurray, 1983; Rubenson, 1989).

The thesis argues that our focused responses to the "content" of change eclipse another important potential response. Our attempts to respond to content of change in structural terms carry with them unexplored assumptions about what is meant by change. We have not fully reflected upon how people experience multitudes of changes and further how people act in relation to their sense of change.

Why should adult educators be concerned with modern, commonly held experience of pervasive change in relation to learning? The thesis postulates that this is an important "cultural" experience individuals are likely to bring with them to learning processes in Western social settings (Finger, 1989). This sense of pervasive change provides context for individuals' meaning associated with learning.

How does this affect learning processes? In some instances, learning processes may set off a response to change through the

learning as overwhelming. This may be an unintended effect of adult educators' mediation. If this occurs for learners, do we recognize their response as more than one of general resistance? Do we have responses to theirs consistent with our educational intent?

These questions concerning how learning processes may be affected by individuals' meanings in change emerged from pressing needs for explication of fieldwork experiences. As previously described, I was a participant observer among individuals creating a play about the history of a community. Most of those who became involved had little experience with formal theatre presentations and no previous experience whatsoever with writing a play. Over time "change" emerged as thematic. Initially, the size of group changed at every meeting; group members' ideas of process for writing and staging the presentation changed; even their senses of the community changed during the project; their ideas of theatre certainly changed.

One of the dominant focuses of the thesis was to develop an explication for how group members' meanings of change shaped their interactions. (At times group members were open to exploration and learning. At other times they were most concerned about avoiding a state of being overwhelmed.) The thesis studies their interactions. It posits that as "learners" their meanings of change and their reaction in light of their meanings were a significant element affecting their willingness "to learn about theatre" defined at this point in terms of taking direction from the "director".

The study attempted to work towards an epistemology of change for the purposes of explicating this particular experience. Towards this

end, the thesis contains a series of working assumptions (Chapter Five and Six). It sets out a framework to explicate individuals' meanings of change. It also posits various social responses they had to meanings of change, for example, interactions which may have provided them with a sense of certainty in the face of constant change.

The thesis has focused on learning associated with meaning held by individuals but with a further focus on implications of meaning prompting social action (thereby creating new meaning). In this way the thesis strives to enhance efforts to link learning theory with theories of social process. As part of this framework I have introduced a working definition of culture from a process orientation.

In adult education literature there has been a surge of interest in "culture" as a way of considering social process and change (Freire, 1985; Roberts, 1982). Generally, however, in doing so, often the idea of "culture" has not been reconsidered for epistemological consistency. Crucial to the thesis work is a concern with epistemological consistency which includes seeking a non-reifying sense of "culture". To contribute to discourse in this area, the thesis offers a brief consideration and critique of what we mean by culture (Chapter Five and Six). It proposes a working definition of "cultural-meaning" from a processual starting point.

In terms of an overview of process, based upon the fieldwork the thesis posits that we experience a "tension in certainty" in which change may be viewed by "the learner" as exploration, movement away from meaning or towards meaning. A recent article, by Peter Jarvis, "Meaningful and Meaningless Experience: Towards an Analysis of

Learning From Life" (1987) has great relevance. Starting from a different orientation, with more emphasis on the perspective of the individual learner, Jarvis describes a similar process. Continuing on in this direction, the thesis also explores how constant, unintended change as a part of modern Western context influences our meaning of change, our tension in certainty.

Based on the fieldwork, the thesis posits that those vulnerable to a modern context of change are more likely to experience change as moving away from meaning in a tension in certainty. In that instance learning as intensions to change may suddenly become overwhelming to a "learner". (This is linked with theory concerning modernity and "anomie" in Chapters Five and Six.)

Finally, in terms of this overview of the thesis' working assumptions, the thesis suggests that as individuals in our society we hold in common an experience of change. The meaning of this experience of change guides our actions both as individuals and in the role of adult educators. Change is the word we use at the moment of awareness and thereafter when we recognize something as having moved in relation to ourselves.

Viewed in this way, change does not seep or swell. It bursts; it is abrupt. Fieldwork indicates that this quality of abruptness may be associated with either a shift towards or away from meaning. If this is the case, then there are implications for research and adult education practice.

For example, when we assume these qualities in change in terms of research, this leads us to think of "change" as identifiable and most

probably measurable. This also leads us into a subtle shift away from thinking of change as process to thinking of change in object-like fashion. It becomes acceptable to represent change in such a fashion. In these terms "making change" shifts from current (in a stream) to currency.

In terms of engaging the learner in learning processes, these qualities related to how we may experience change are also most important. Returning to the fieldwork for a moment, I observed that this quality of abruptness when related to "theatre" as an educative tool was related to challenge, to creativity, and was highly valued.

In mainstream adult education literature, although I found many references to change in modern life, I found no exploration of how we experience change -- the qualities we associate with change. Fieldwork and data analysis raised more questions about how people experience change than I have provided "working responses". However, for paradigm building purposes, the thesis advances several generalizations. The thesis reaches towards an epistemology of change to further adult educators' understanding of this important aspect of our learning processes.

In addition to change being the modern context for "learners in the world out there", we as adult educators are beginning to experience shifts "internal to the world of adult education". We are experiencing change in terms of how we think about adult education. (Realization that this was important to the research is expressed in the third and fourth areas of discovery concerning methodology.)

For instance, there are beginnings of shifts in the theories influencing research. One such shift, apropos to this study, is in the area of "learning theory". Learning theories influencing North American adult educators have long been rooted in psychology, focusing on behaviour of individuals (Collins, 1987, chap.1) and more recently on individuals' internal cognitive patterns (Merriam, 1987, p.189).

This narrowed focus on change in the individual has a counter-part in terms of social change. Social change has most frequently carried with it a "structural" perspective -- social, political analysis devoted to changing institutional bases (Cervero, 1988). Learning theory rooted in psychology, and social change theories rooted in schools of political and sociological thought found no meeting ground until recently. However, some have begun to find some link between the two. Mezirow's "perspective transformation" (Mezirow, 1981; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988) and Freire's "codification" process related to conscientization exemplify this (Merriam, 1988). Two shifts in theoretical work indicate potential meeting places.

First, concerning learning theory there is renewed interest in focusing on learning in terms of meaning (Jarvis, 1987; Mezirow, 1981). There has also been a shift in researchers' voiced interest in studying meaning in terms of social interactions. The recent surge of interest in ethnographic studies (Sherman & Webb, 1988), culture (Collard & Law, 1989; Freire, 1985; Willis, 1985) and phenomenology (Collins, 1984 & 1987, Preface & chap. 1; Spiegelberg, 1984; Stanage, 1987, Part I & II) indicate movement away from a predominant focus on

structure in social change theories. In addition to this shift towards studying meanings, social process has become of interest, once more expressed in terms of ethnographic work (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), cultural studies (Collard & Law, 1989;) and critical theory (Collins, 1984; Gibbons, 1986; Mezirow, 1981).

The thesis research suggests that "meaning" as focal point is a nexus for learning theory and social change theories. Meaning is created within the individual, held by the individual but individuals create meaning through social interaction (Blumer, 1969; Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Ruddock, 1972). What is missing from the works mentioned thus far is individuals' meanings being affected by modern context of change. The thesis brings that context to the fore with respect to learning theory.

There is a second major way in which this context of modern change emerged in the thesis work. I have spoken of adult educators' experiencing change in an internal world of adult education citing shifts in learning theory as example. Changes "in adult education" are pervasive as in other aspects of our lives. A description parallel to the opening paragraph of this "Preface" suits adult education as well.

The "we" of adult education have also experienced change in contemporary society. Yesteryear we were alone, yesterday we colleagueally created conferences, today the institutional context of our employment often frames the context. Changes, however, go well beyond structural ones that shape our meaning (Podeschi, 1989).

Yesteryear we were without model, yesterday we had the model for practice, today we are faced with a multitude of choices. Yesterday we taught and they learned. Today we may have learned that some may teach and they may learn. Yesteryear there was no "we of adult education", yesterday "we" became large and today, Babel-like, we often pursue separate ways.

I have discovered a sense of the magnitude of change in adult education, once more, through urgent search for explication in the study. As noted earlier, when I began to look to theoretical materials and to methodology I discovered tremendous transition. (Since details of discovery are outlined in the thesis I will refrain from repetition herein.)

Returning to learning theory as example, Merriam (1988) not only documents diverse theories as others have done (Kidd, 1973; Knowles, 1984), she recognizes the air of disarray and confusion, the struggle of choice left to adult educators. Merriam begins to address uncertainty associated with such a diverse set of theories. She locates the theories in relationship to each other through a matrix.

Her work is one which draws attention to our transition from theories which tended to dominate (although we have always been "eclectic") to dissatisfaction and uncertainty in the face of choice. Rumblings about division between theory and practice (Jennings, 1985; Podeschi, 1989; Woods, 1988), shifting interest from quantitative to qualitative methodology (Griffith, 1979), shifts in content of learning theory, all suggest considerable change in terms of how we think about the world and our interactions as adult educators.

What then are our experiences of these many changes in adult education? What meaning do we derive of change related to adult education? Finally, do we respond to our meanings of change with any particular processes?

Returning to the thesis work, as a researcher, I experienced a sense of parallel between what some of the theatre group members apparently experience in terms of certainty and change and what adult educators may experience in those terms. I looked to a theory which had provided explication for some of the theatre group members' interactions in response to change. This was Kuhn's The Structure Of Scientific Revolution (1970). From within that work, "paradigm" as a key concept provided an explication for social processes among scientists.

Some may argue that with the many different areas of adult education we have never had a single paradigm upon which to rely. Some argue that we have had two (Lovett et. al, 1983); others are suggesting third paradigms emerging in various forms (Collard & Law, 1989; Jennings, 1985; Stanage, 1987, Preface). I do not wish to stir such a historical debate within this document.

If we have had a paradigm, it has not been so explicit or commonly held as those held by many scientists over the years. Nonetheless, we have begun to acknowledge in the last several decades, there has been a dominant and at the same time subtle influence on North American adult education practices of a combined

behaviouristically oriented psychology (Brookfield 1989; Collins, 1987, chap. 1; Merriam, 1987) and a structurally oriented sociology (Collard & Law, 1989; Ruddock, 1972).

The subtlety of their influence has surfaced in several critiques related to adult education research. One such exposed assumption is that we have consistently assumed in various areas of adult education that learners (professionals, community members) are homogeneous in "their" perspectives (Cervero, 1988 p. 33, Ruddock, 1967, p.78). A second critique is that research in adult education does not pay sufficient attention to process and change (Goodson & Walker, 1988) among "learners". As researchers who are learning (Podeschi, 1989), do we pay sufficient attention to our own process of change?

I have relied upon Kuhn's (1970) notions of paradigm creation and "crisis" of "anomalies" to make sense of my own attempts to locate the thesis work within changing adult education. If applied to adult education, his theory suggests that we are in a state of transition. Others apparently agree, for they are proposing possible paradigms (Jennings, 1985; Stanage, 1987; Willis, 1985). If we as adult educators are in transition with no solid paradigm in which to frame our work, what does this mean for the researcher?

We have been invited to "explore", to look to "theory generation" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) towards new paradigm creation. One author refers to grounded theory research as striving "to be paradigm transcending" (Hutchinson, 1988, p. 123). The thesis endeavors to be innovative as ethnographers are encouraged to be in theory generation (Goetz & LeCompte 1984). It attempts to make a

contribution towards responding to dissonance arising out of conflicting theories and in some instances lack of theory.

What is most interesting is that through his concept of "normal science", Kuhn has most ably provided us with how "we will look" when we are relying on a paradigm (Kuhn, 1970, p.10). He does not, however, suggest in detail how to make our way through transition periods. The book was not intended for this purpose being descriptive, not prescriptive.

Returning once more to modern context of constant change, exploration and theory generation take place amidst a swamp of change where nothing may be taken for granted. For instance, I made a discovery in the thesis work which steered me through much confusion. I came to recognize that the very social theory one relied upon to guide methodology might be inconsistent with "new" theory generated out of the work! (This is described more fully within the main body of the thesis). It raised a primary concern which has shaped the writing of the thesis.

A major focus for the research was coming to understand change in group members' meanings and social processes. In terms of methodology (as the fourth area of discovery) this translated into a similar concern with reflecting on my own changing meanings and process as researcher in representing the experience. As noted earlier, throughout the body of the thesis I have purposefully attempted to indicate key changes which emerged for me and became explicit in the process of working on the study.

Some of those important changes arose out of my coming to recognize inconsistency in theories upon which I had come to rely. The thesis, therefore, reaches towards reflecting epistemological consistency and to articulate thoroughly that process of discovery as much as possible. Given our apparent transition in adult education research, these were elements I sorely missed in research relying explicitly and tacitly on a tumult of theories and methods. Consistent with paradigmatic transition, I have attempted purposefully to take very little for granted. Reflection on process is as much a theme as any other in this thesis.

A second source directs my painstaking efforts at reflection throughout this work. In generating theory there are intriguing challenges arising out of the hermeneutical circle, other than troubling links to "old" methodology. Once one begins to think from a different paradigm, writing from "over there" can pose problems. For instance, trying to make oneself understood from "over there" may be a particularly difficult task. In addition, "staying over there" while endeavoring to speak to two different paradigms may result in slipping back and losing a new perspective.

As adult educators acting in any role, we will face more and more of these concerns related to theory transition. Given rapid change in our epistemological understandings as well as organizational changes we have already been attempting to communicate across paradigms. Podeschi (1989) raises important concerns about research caught in a conflict of transition through cultural and organizational changes, in adult education.

The intentional, multidisciplinary and cross-cultural nature of our work (Willis, 1985) escalates this problem-challenge for us. My ongoing attention to process in the midst of personally experienced, conceptual change is intended to make a contribution to work in this area by way of providing something concrete to push against -- "data" for critique of how to describe such change.

This attention to reflection on process and change in the study has shaped the structure of the thesis. For instance, I came to recognize a substantial shift in orientation between activities associated with fieldwork and my orientation when data analysis was my sole focus. (I do not intend to imply thereby that I did not do data analysis during my fieldwork. This is further explained in the "Introductions" to Parts One and Two.)

Upon discovering this shift in orientation, I separated the two into Parts One and Two. I came to create Parts Three and Four through a similar process of emerging distinctions. The various Parts of the thesis are as follows:

Part One: The four chapters of Part One describe the researcher's experience with the theatre project from the orientation of being in the field. The chapters are framed in terms of questions and ideas directly out of the field experience which guided data analysis and library research mainly of that time. The chapters alternate with the first and third providing narrative description of how the study commenced, entry into the field, questions arising out of this experience, and observations of processes in which group members and the director engaged while creating and presenting the play. The

second and fourth chapters constitute literature reviews guided by the questions arising from the fieldwork experience. The final search through the last of the areas of literature concluded March 1990, although articles which have been brought to my attention since have been included in the study.

Part Two: This Part contains three chapters. They are all written as part of an intensive data analysis process completed after the fieldwork experience. The opening chapter returns to methodology in terms of this stage of the process. It also provides review of the data analysis process, including a synthesis of social theory related to data analysis. The Chapter which follows it provides a set of theoretical assumptions emerging from data analysis process. The last chapter of this Part builds on the other two. It provides a conceptual outline of the "model" specifically designed to represent the data analysis.

Part Three: There is a single chapter in this Part. It is the model from data analysis referred to as the "Mobile-framework". There are six pieces in this "Mobile-Framework". The first piece is "General Context". The other five pieces, the "Five Act-Plays" represent five stages in the theatre project. The "Mobile-framework was carefully crafted as a special form of representation emerging from data analysis. It aims towards reflecting the dynamics of group members' interactions in creating and responding to changing meanings. Through it, I have attempted where possible to reinforce group members' non-homogeneity as well as representing experiences of change as emerging.

Part Four: This consists of a single chapter which consolidates reflections from the study particularly as they relate to adult education.

Part Five: Part Five is a Bibliography divided into five sections to reflect the multidisciplinary nature of the study.

Part Six: This is the Appendices. It mainly consists of artifacts from the fieldwork.

In summary, this study brings to the fore the need to reflect on an epistemology of change, to interpret how we experience change. Every piece of adult education literature deals with change directly or indirectly. Most pieces provide us with a method of how to effect change, two contrasting examples being program planning for job retraining, and Freire's "codification" process (Freire, 1985, p.52). Substantially fewer works attempt to go beyond a method to describe theoretical reference to epistemology of how people experience change in meaning (learning). -- How we experience change and how we respond to "change" is not generally addressed in the most adult education literature.

The thesis espouses the view that we must reflect on how people's experiences and responses to pervasive change influence all aspects of adult education. Otherwise, we will ignore one of the most striking elements of modern context. Ironically, if we do not, we will also ignore one of the few elements expressed commonly by all adult educators, our wide-spread experience of change (Darkerwald & Merriam 1982; Kidd, 1973; Knowles, 1980; Verner, 1964).

## REFERENCES

- Berger, P. (1977). Toward a critique of modernity. In P. Berger (Ed.), Facing up to modernity, (pp.70-80). New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. Garden City, New York: Penguin Books.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism, perspective and method. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Blunt, A. (1988). Education, learning and development: evolving concepts. Convergence, 21(1), 37-54.
- Brookfield, S. (1989). Learning and mind: A response to Selman. The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 3(1), 64-69.
- Cervero, R. (1988). Effective continuing education for professionals. London: Jossey-Bass.
- Collard, S. & Law, M. (1989). Cultural studies: An evolving research paradigm? Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 79-84).
- Collard, S. & Law, M. (1989). The limits of perspective transformation: A critique of mezirow's theory. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(2), 99-107.
- Collins, M. (1984). Phenomenological perspectives: some implications. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 179-189). Florida: Krieger.
- Collins, M. (1987). Competence in adult education, A new perspective. New York: University Press of America.
- Darkenwald, G. & Merriam, S. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. New York: Harper & Row.
- Finger, M. (1989). The subject of modern adult education. Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 133-138.)
- Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education, culture, power and liberation. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gibbons, R. (1986). Critical theory and education. Kent, U.K.: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Gooderham, P. (1987). Reference group theory and adult education. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(3), 140-151.
- Goodson, I. & Walker, R. (1988). Putting life into educational research. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.
- Griffith, W. (1979). Adult education research -- emerging developments. Studies In Adult Education, 11(2), 125-144.
- Havighurst, R. (1972). Developmental tasks and education (3rd. ed.). New York: D. McKay.
- Hewage, L. & Radcliffe, D. (1977). Experience of Sri Lanka, The relevance of culture in adult education for development. Convergence, 10(2), 63-74.
- Hutchinson, S. (1988). Education and grounded theory. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.
- Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: towards an analysis of learning from life. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(3), 164-172.
- Jennings, L. (1985). Paradigmatic choices in adult education: From the empirical to the critical. Australian Journal of Adult Education, 25(2), 3-7.
- Kidd, J. R. (1973). How adults learn (rev.ed.). New York: Association Press.
- Kidd, R. (1984). Popular theatre and nonformal education in the third world: five strands of experience. International Review of Education, 30, 265-288.
- Knowles, M. (1980). Modern practice of adult education (rev. ed.). Chicago: Follett.
- Knowles, M. (1984). The adult learner: A neglected species (3rd. ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Lovett, T., Clarke C. & Kilmurray, A. (1983). Adult education and community action. London: Croom Helm.
- Merriam, S. (1987). Adult learning and theory building: A review. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(4), 187-198.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Finding your way through the maze: A guide to the literature on adult learning. Lifelong Learning, 11(6), 4-7.
- Mezirow, J. (1978). Perspective transformation. Adult Education, 28(2), 100-110.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. Adult Education Quarterly, 32(1), 3-24.
- Miles, M. and Huberman, A. (1986). Qualitative data analysis, A sourcebook of new methods. London: Sage Publications.
- Minister, K. (1982). Elder theatre: Positive image of aging and forum for intergenerational communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 120).
- Nieborg, S. & Vos, K. (1983). Learning in community work. Community Development Journal, 18(1), 33-41.
- Podeschi, R. (1989). Cultural dimensions of the research/practice relationship. Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 242-247).
- Radin, B. (1985). Dramatic techniques in ESL instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed. 256 174).
- Roberts, H. (1982). Culture and adult education, A study of Alberta and Quebec. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press.
- Rubenson, K. (1989). The sociology of adult education. In S. Merriam & P. Cunningham (Eds.) Handbook of adult and continuing education, (pp. 51-69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ruddock, R. (1967). Social factors in adult learning. Adult Education, 40(2), 74-81.
- Ruddock, R. (1972). Sociological perspectives on adult education. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Sherman, R. & Webb, R. (1988). Qualitative research in education: A focus. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 2-21). London: The Falmer Press.

- Spiegelberg, H. (1984). Putting ourselves into the place of others: toward a phenomenology of imaginary self transposal. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 171-177). Florida: Krieger.
- Stanage, S. (1987). Adult education and phenomenological research. Florida: Krieger.
- Toffler, A. (1970). Future Shock. New York: Random House.
- Verner, C. (1964). Adult Education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Wildemeersch, D. & Leirman, W. (1988). The facilitation of the life-world transformation. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(1), 19-30.
- Willis, P. (1985). From praxis to theory and back. Australian Journal Of Adult Education, 25(3), 27-32.
- Woods, P. (1988). Educational ethnography in Britain. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 90-109). London: The Falmer Press.

**PART ONE**

**CHANGING ACT: ACTING CHANGE**

## PART ONE

### CHANGING ACT: ACTING CHANGE

#### INTRODUCTION

This thesis houses two modes of representing my experience with the theatre project. The four chapters in this Part, combined, comprise the first mode. Together, these chapters convey the theatre project from the researcher's initial vantage point, that being experience while in the field. The second mode of representing my experience with the theatre project is a model, the "Mobile-framework". This model emerged from an extended period of data analysis which occurred after the fieldwork. Consisting of Chapters Five, Six, and Seven, Part Two contains a description of data analysis leading to creation of the Mobile-framework. The Mobile-framework comprises Part Three.

These two distinct representational forms evolved from a methodological concern described in the Preface. Launched from the four areas of discovery, the Preface presses for more thorough reflection and documentation of research process. This concern with reflection and documentation is particularly strong in relation to change which emerges during research.

When I began to reflect on how to represent the theatre project experience, based on the fieldwork, I assumed it would take a chronological form. However, while engaged in data analysis I focused primarily on reconstruction of themes and abstracting both elements of concern to project participants and relevant to adult education.

Although chronology was still important, chronological form no longer provided exclusive criteria for representation.

In addition, through data analysis I began to recognize my own changing understanding of "events" associated with the theatre project. "Chronology from what vantage point -- whose and when?" -- became a most significant question. This question prompted reflection on distinctions between my experience and focus during fieldwork, and this latter stage with data analysis as concentrated focus<sup>1</sup>. Although there was great overlap, I became aware of some differences in my orientation during the two periods.

For instance, when in the field, I was frequently aware of tensions in growing relationships among group members. I gradually became aware of constant change through recognizing a continual need to respond to change (even as participant observer). The intensity which this set of individuals brought to the theatre project, their focus in theatre on physical movement, emotional expression, my own developing sense of concerns participants had, all of these elements created a tone in my tasks and a general sense of the experience.

By the simple matter of the immediacy of my involvement with group members, I associated fieldwork with an "intimate" quality. This quality was not linked in the same way with the data analysis process which followed. Uncertainty and change which had pervaded periods of the theatre project were gone during data analysis. My interpretations and reconstructions of the experience continued to

change. Yet, the uncertainty associated, for example, with the "final outcome", the presentation of the play, the audience response to it, this had ceased.

Replacing a highly interactive, social process, with a lengthy and mainly cognitive process, data analysis has been associated with attempts to create an "abstraction" from data. I have been focused on creation of a model. To symbolize this difference in tasks and reflective orientation between fieldwork and concentrated data analysis, I refer throughout the thesis to "the intimate" and "the abstract". These two words are intended to convey thematic distinctions of orientation described herein<sup>2</sup>.

Prior to commencing with the first representation of the theatre project, it is important to emphasize the benefit of providing the two different forms of representation. One form is not more precise than the other. Neither perspective alone yields a complete sense of the experience. Recognition of change in the researcher in this manner is important because of the contextual clues made available by the representations when laid side by side. As the view from one eye cannot provide depth perception, so it is with either presentation alone. The two together provide a more complete rendering. Simultaneously both provide content and context for the other.

On a more specific note, there is a matter of choosing form to express difference in experience and task. Writing style and format for each representational form has been carefully chosen. In the four chapters of this Part I have purposely cultivated a narrative style to reflect an "intimate", immediate quality. I have also relied on

questions arising during that period to frame much of the material and to indicate what library searches were pursued in response to fieldwork questions.

The chapters of this Part are organized in rough adherence to a chronology of questions. Chapter One describes entry into the field and the methodological questions that arose therefrom. In response to those questions, Chapter Two outlines the review of adult education literature on methodology and methods. Chapter Three completes the narrative summary of experience in the field and describes additional questions concerning theoretical resources. Chapter Four presents a review of several areas of literature including theatre and adult education, as well as resources on social theory. The review brings this Part to a close.

Beyond differences in format and style, there is another distinction in content between the two representations. Consistent with the hermeneutical circle, these chapters on the fieldwork experience reflect the beginning of data analysis. The second form, the model, derives from the final stages of data analysis. Content in these chapters will not entirely mesh with the "Mobile-framework".

For instance, Chapter One of this Part opens with an emphasis on theatre which might suggest that theatre is central to the thesis. When I entered the field I assumed that theatre would be the focal point of the work. However, emphasis on theatre as central changed through further data analysis, shifting to meaning and change related to learning. (I came to think of "theatre" as part of a larger process of social construction.)

An additional example of a difference lies in epistemological changes. These four chapters reflect my early struggles with distinguishing between a structural focus and a processual focus. For instance, in Chapter Two I describe criteria upon which I relied for choosing methodology and method in the study. One of the criteria refers to considering the nature of "the phenomenon" to be studied. As Chapter Five and Six reveal, I would no longer use those words since that construction tends to "reify" or objectify.

I have noted a transition in my statements of objectives. Chapter One describes one progression associated with the fieldwork. Chapter Five outlines an emerging objective related to the focused data analysis period. The statement of objectives contained in Chapter One, however, does not reflect the "future" developments, the interpretations reflected in the Preface or later work. It reflects objectives developed out of my initial understanding of what I was about to embark upon, tacit struggles with epistemology, assumed focal points and all.

I have not edited out such differences, despite editorial drives for consistency. These historical inconsistencies are "precisely" the point. They are an important record of emerging changes in the researcher's perspective. They indicate what questions and concerns impelled the study. As such, they illuminate turning points in the research. Part of the "singular" perspective these four chapters are intended to bring, then, is one of historical conceptual context.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Given that I had studied a set of individuals engaged in a project which came to a close, I could not return to the field for continued observational work. I did interview project participants after the theatre production. However, continued interviewing would have been problematic. Several participants were going to new theatre projects and all were taking on other activities which might have considerable impact upon their perspective of this particular project. Hence, after completing the second set of interviews, I did not return to the field.

<sup>2</sup>Sherman and Webb acknowledge a troubling tension between "abstraction" and what they refer to as a contextual quality crucial to qualitative research. [Sherman, R. & Webb, R. (1988). Qualitative research in education: A focus. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and Methods, (pp. 2-21). London: The Falmer Press.] Linking "intimate" with "contextual" attempts to locate the context within the researcher as a reminder of interpretive epistemology.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE FIRST STAGE: Entering The Field

<sup>1</sup>Whither wilt thou lead me? Speak. I'll go no further.  
Hamlet, I, v. line 1

<sup>2</sup>That's why I feel inadequate. I'm not from around here!  
Ann) J-11-47

### INTRODUCTION

The word "theatre" may conjure up immense acts of imagination. For some, "it" thrives in the costume clotted operatic gesture. For others, "theatre" may consist of minute acts of meaning -- the twice intended pause.

I can take any empty space and call it a bare stage. A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged.  
(Brook, 1972, p. 11)

Many in the theatre emphasize its quality of entertainment as essential (Brockett, 1984), while others maintain that "its" strength lies in its special abilities to evoke meaning (States, 1985). This prism of thought concerning theatre has found form in therapeutic (Moreno, 1977), in political (Lambert, 1982) and in religious (Millett & Bentley, 1935) frameworks. Theatre has been likened by social theorists to everything from "serious play" (Turner, 1982), to reality and reality to it (Lyman & Scott, 1975).

The diversity of these forms and applications strikes a parallel diversity in adult education. Perhaps, it is this eclectic commonality which has recently provided so many opportunities for joint endeavors between theatre and adult education. Concepts from

theatre have been applied in multi-varied adult education settings from adult basic education classes (Radin, 1985), to therapy (Ginn, 1974), to community development (Aruha, 1984). One element in particular seems consistent across this variation. It is the bright, warm intensity of enthusiasm in adult educators' reports of theatre. Materials on the subject give rave reviews to the use of theatre and prompt more study of combined adult education and theatre enterprises.

This thesis is about the study of one such endeavor. It is about one experience with "serious play". To bring further insight into such study, it is also about the intimate and the abstract elements of that experience. More specifically, it is about a group of people who used their present to locate and at the same time to create another group's past for purposes of future "present-ation", linking the two forever. It is also about one person of the group and not of the group trying to capture their moonbeam with her jar.

I was privileged to become a participant observer of a project with a rural theatre group during their process (over a six month period) of constructing and presenting a play about the history of that community. The preceding paragraph, with paper-plotted paradoxes, suggests several strands of that experience from which this document is woven.

To begin with, there was the interaction of theatre group members as a basis for my experience. Second, over time there is my jar -- my filtering framework which creates my interpretation of the group members' interactions. Third, the expression of my interpretations from this experience takes particular shape by the form of this

document. The objectives of the study have acted shuttle-like to weave these threads of experience together.

#### STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

From these objectives, data collection and data analysis must take shape. The shape ought to reflect the connectedness of the intimate (the essence of the experience) and the abstractions (my reflections and generalizations) of the experience. Sensitivity to this interconnectedness is, therefore, important in the creation of a set of objectives. In fact, it is at this point that the intimate may be ignored and the abstract thereby set adrift. To keep the piece between the two, before I state formal objectives I must emphasize some important aspects of circumstance.

I began this work with general interests which shaped my objectives. I viewed the chance to work with a theatre group as a wonderful personal opportunity in relation to my studies in adult education for two reasons:

- The occasion would provide an opportunity to observe the use of theatre as a tool for learning.
- The occasion would furnish me as well with the opportunity to participate in and observe members of a community group engaged in a process of learning. Historically, much of adult education resource material has focused on the individual learner.

Having described my initial interests/objectives in entering the field, I must also emphasize that my objectives changed during the

fieldwork period. They changed as I learned from my experiences and as my tasks changed even in the act of writing this Part of the thesis.

The objectives as formulated for this document have been crafted out of my developing understanding of both ethnographic research frameworks and adult education frameworks. Derived from these contexts, the first objective for this thesis is:

- a) To develop a rich description of a group of individuals engaged in doing theatre with adult education as one of their purposes.

The rich description inevitably reflects my focus (as participant observer) related to participants' perceptions and constructs of the process in which they were engaged through their theatre project.

Hence the second objective is:

- b) To relate the rich description to literature concerned with relationships between theatre and adult education.

The remaining contents of this chapter form the beginning of this rich or thick description. I have provided a particularly detailed description of how I entered the field. My first impressions of those participating in the theatre project at that time, and the setting, the countryside, the town and the theatre, itself are portrayed in detail as context for description of the project.

Chapter Two outlines library research concerning method and methodology. Chapter Three is comprised of a general description of that which I observed in project participants' interaction and their articulated meanings of the experience. The Chapter also contains a description of those participants not described in Chapter One.

Chapter Four summarizes my search for theories which would offer explication for questions arising out of efforts to understand how and what meaning participants were making out of the experience. The literature I surveyed to provide explication for observations made in the field is reviewed.

Throughout these four descriptive chapters are threaded questions evoked through the fieldwork. These questions were chosen from the many which accumulated in "Reflective Notes" taken during the fieldwork. The questions listed therein came from a number of different sources. They were raised throughout the experience by participants in their interactions, by my reflections in observing them, and also by resource people. (Details of field methods including a description of contents of my Reflective Notes are presented in Chapter Two.)

The questions most repeatedly raised were ones which stiffened my resolve to act in any one direction as a researcher. These questions, then, have been included in each chapter to provide a sense of how both intimate and abstract aspects of my experience prompted me to further action.

Relying upon these series of questions serves to detract from illusions of a wholly linear research process. Activities of participants in the theatre project did not take such a form; neither could my activities as a novice participant observer take such a form.

## DESCRIPTION OF ENTERING THE FIELD

There was a "first question" which precipitated my participation in the theatre project. That first question was "What shall I choose as a thesis topic?" This question was emitted synchronously with the flashing green rhythm of a photocopier machine one May day of 1985. It formed part of a fragmented conversation following photocopy etiquette. The question had history; I had asked it frequently before. This time, however, the perfunctory and the polite provided opportunity.

The person waiting for the photocopier, was and is a professional playwright, named Cameron. He is a tall man, in mid-thirties, who smiles and laughs gently. He may also be most forceful and dynamic. He conveys an air of intensity in loafers.

To return to happenstance, over the intermittent stretches and flashes of the photocopier, Cameron recalled a project with which he hoped to be involved in June 1985. He stated that a rural community theatre group located in the town of "Goetheim" had applied for funding to develop a play about the history of their community. The theatre group had asked him in, he said, to facilitate as writer-director the process of creating the play. He described the group as having "tremendous initiative and incredible energy". He exuded such enthusiasm about the project I found myself interested in becoming involved regardless of whether it satisfied the thesis quest.

When describing the project, Cameron suggested that I might be welcomed by the group to observe the process and record it. He

undertook to discuss the possibility of my involvement with the group. Shortly thereafter I was invited to a theatre makeup workshop they were having on the evening of June 3rd 1985. I was to drive out to the community, about an hour and a quarter's drive to attend the workshop. While there I was to put my request directly to "group members", participants in the project.

On June 3rd, 1985 I placed myself into the car, mentally checked off the "necessaries", started the car and drove towards the dramatic. Map in hand, I realized at the outskirts of the city that I had already become part of a line of vehicles leaving Saskatoon on a rural runway. The early evening light pleasant and passive seemed softly at odds with my sense of anticipation. After all, what an adventure to be off to a new place, meeting new people, challenged with a relatively abrupt request for acceptance and all through thrills of the theatre. As I reached the top of the next long hill I observed hints of clouds ahead.

I was particularly struck by two observations as I was driving to Goetheim that first evening on the highway. It was a road through truly rolling, lush green (for the prairies) hills. The rolling quality of the road frequently resulted in an inability to pass other cars for one could not see great distances. This meant holding one's place, often at a slow, dignified pace in spite of the fact that there might be nothing on the other side of the road for miles. Second, even if one became bored in one's place, the next valley view disclosed wonderful water sights of ducks and other fowl swimming and diving. These were both lovely and prosperous fields floating by.

When I first entered Goetheim I was reminded strangely of tree rings. On the outer edge were the newly developed town layers, a government building, a motel with a large restaurant and bar, a shopping mall with a distinctly German name, the Dairy Queen and a convenience store. After I had passed these at a slowed pace, nearer to the centre of town were a series of schools, churches, and the courthouse, big and brick. At the core, a single set of stoplights marked the main street. It was perpendicular to the "through road".

The main street, too, was staunch and sturdy, built in brick. The town hall, library, newspaper office, museum, and firehall lined the mainstreet interspersed with banks, jewelry stores and restaurants. (On a walking tour of the town a few weeks later my initial impressions of order, cleanliness and prosperity were confirmed anew.)

I located the school wherein the workshop was to be held by observing Cameron's truck parked near to a door. I located Cameron immediately as he was in his truck reading. He advised me that the school door was locked and one of the members of the theatre was reportedly out in search of keys. The sky had clouded over. It began to drizzle.

Eventually a key was located and several of us entered the school through metal crash doors of brown (ubiquitous in Saskatchewan schools). I followed the group down a corridor to the right in darkness. This corridor came to an abrupt end with another set of doors to the right. We entered a huge room which was transformed into a theatre when sufficient lighting etched out ascending scores of

seats. At the very back of the theatre, box-like, was the light and sound control room.

I turned to see a large stage to the left. Curiously, this stage was level with the floor. Its floorboards were painted black. Huge curtains of gold framed the stage. Black metal rows of lights hung like strangely suspended farm seeding equipment. I had the impression from Cameron's comments that the theatre was remarkably sophisticated for one to be supported by a small rural community.

The main focus of the evening was the makeup workshop. Cameron had arranged to bring a professional actor from Saskatoon to do a demonstration. There were about ten of us. Introductions were brief and blurred. I noticed the nominal. The "group" appeared to range in age between sixteen and forty. Some people were dressed in blue jeans, some in comely casuals. Women made up the majority of this group.

I was eventually offered the opportunity to speak to those present about the possibility of being involved in the "heritage play", theatre project. Judging from the questions people asked, they appeared to have little advance notice of me. Conscious of a late start to the workshop I spoke briefly. I described myself as a graduate student of the Continuing Education program with the University of Saskatchewan. I stated that I was very much interested by their project. As well, I indicated that I would like to become involved through observing and also participating in their process of developing a play.

I said that I was particularly interested in what they would be learning as a part of this process. I emphasized, however, that I could not describe at this particular point what focus this would take as it would depend on the shape of the project. Finally, I suggested that I did not require a response that very evening.

A response did come from Eileen, a tall brown-haired woman who always seemed to speak with considerable energy, and with carefully chosen words. Eileen, in her early forties, was born in the Goetheim area. She suggested that the question of my involvement be taken up at the next meeting, later in June. She explained that some of the group were not at this particular workshop. Eileen suggested that the group would then contact me with their decision. I replied that I would look forward to hearing from them.

That business done, we proceeded to go behind the curtains to crowd into the women's bathroom/dressingroom. The room was oblong, lined with mirrors and tables. It was brightly lit in contrast to the dark reaches of the theatre. People took up positions for the demonstration, leaning on tables, sinks and up against cubicles.

A fair-haired actor from Saskatoon began the workshop, informally demonstrating a series of faces ranging in age from youthful to elderly. He was a lithe fellow with loose, swinging arms and strong hands. The actor was bowed slightly at the chest. As he plied his makeup he spoke only occasionally and briefly then; Cameron supplemented with commentary.

Anna, one of the theatre group asked about the names and numbers of the makeup used. Often the numbers were large ones suggesting a

vast selection with subtle gradations. Some of the names had a mysterious, exotic sound such as, "Crimson Lake" (bright red) or "Carmen" (deep purple). After Anna had asked about the names of the makeup (sometimes asking merely for affirmation) she wondered to another member about the theatre group's stock of makeup.

Anna has very long brown hair frequently framing large hoop earrings and a friendly face. She is in her early thirties. Her sentences are often punctuated with a little laugh. She makes frequent jokes about her varying levels of anxiety in relation to performing. Yet, on this occasion she was using theatre terms that seemed absent from others' expressions.

When the question was raised concerning the theatre group's stock of makeup, there was a side discussion about what the group did have and where to order additional supplies. There were few questions during the workshop, a half-dozen in all. Conversation was limited as well. Cameron suggested returning to the theatre to observe the actor as aged. He stated that body language and lighting were as important as makeup.

With that we trooped out, back through the swinging bathroom door, and across the stage to the theatre seats. We spread out among the ascending rows of seats. People sat, some alone, a few in two's and three's. The lights were changed to focus on one corner of the stage where the actor stood. The lithe body now bent further, the face caved-in and trembled. One minute he seemed an odd fellow with strange markings on his face, the next minute, the lines and shapes melded to mean age.

There were several exclamations from group members — "Wow", "I don't believe it". One or two leaned over, whispering to each other, Anna among them. His metamorphosis was most convincing. Cameron emphasized the dramatic change with questions such as "Did you see what he did with his shoulders? With his face? With his hand movements?" Some nodded, some shifted about trying out their own alternated positions, others were motionless, apparently transfixed. The workshop came to a close shortly after this testimonial, with Cameron suggesting a "regrouping at the bar".

The bar chosen was part of the motel on the "outer ring" of town. It was a huge room with a high ceiling. Red naugahyde chairs and booths were crowded throughout the floor area. Most of them were empty. The room was divided with a third of it being raised a few feet above the larger portion. A wood railing separated the two areas. A pool table was planted off to the right side of the raised area. On one of the walls in the larger space an immense screen had been affixed to the wall. Rock videos flashed and flipped across it. Below the screen was a small open space with wood tiling. The "dance floor" was empty with no one sitting near it.

About eight of the people from the workshop came to the bar. They were crammed into a booth near the entrance. I was the last to arrive. When I located the group some were laughing while others were talking excitedly. They were the largest group in the bar. The lower part of the bar was virtually empty.

I remained there with the group for about an hour. During that time people joked and talked mainly as a group. The conversation

shifted several times. One of the major topics centred around a summer play several group members were beginning to work on for a children's organization. The problem of constructing a mask for one of the characters was the topic of discussion for several people. One among the group working on this production is a pleasant, round-faced man named Jim. He is jovial and positively spoken. Jim is in his mid-twenties. Lenore, with blonde sculpted haired and emphatically tanned seemed also to be involved in that production. She is in her early forties and is native to Goetheim.

Cameron suggested that those working on that play (four or five in all) come in to Saskatoon. A professional theatre troupe of which Cameron was a member happened to be putting on a play which he suggested might give them ideas concerning the mask and the staging of the play. During this discussion I became aware of the fact that the "theatre club" was newly formed. Some, but not all of the participants in this project, had been involved with the only production the club had presented, a few months before. (Five were involved at the time in a relatively small project which had prompted this discussion.)

Virtually all those participating in this project had extremely limited experience with theatre presentation and no experience with writing a play. The participants described their inexperience and the challenge ahead with tones of bravado when asked directly about it. I remember being in awe of these people's initiative and being warmed by their excitement and humor.

Conversation included comments on other, diverse subjects from the videos' appearing on the screen (appreciation of, a singer, Cyndi Lauper's staging techniques) to Cameron's comments of encouragement to the group. He spoke several times of his excitement about working with them to create the play. Responses from group members ranged from toasted self-encouragement to smiling apprehension.<sup>3</sup> I was one of the first to leave in order to drive home about 12:30 A.M.

My next involvement with any of the group was with Eileen. She telephoned a few weeks after the workshop to say cheerily that "the group would be happy to have me involved". She then talked of being in Saskatoon and meeting with Cameron. I invited her to come to my home to see him. The meeting occurred on July 5th in my little livingroom.

Over coffee Cameron and Eileen seemed to chat as much as meet. Discussion of Goetheim's current events flowed into discussion of the town's history in supporting community events, which then flowed into discussion of the concerns among group members about the project and then back to reflections about the town. Cameron's personal connections to the town were even contained in this flow. He mentioned that some of his relatives had farmed in the area.

At one point Eileen described the population of Goetheim as being static. By way of illustration she stated that "out of a graduating class of twenty-three that year, only two people had moved away". This led to a reference about the community not generally supporting new initiatives until they were proven successful. A bit of dark humor may illustrate described concerns about community participation.

Eileen stated jokingly that the group was not worrying about the dates for the play as, "Nobody comes anyway, so it doesn't matter what night they don't come anyway!" I later recognized this as a distinctive flavor in group members' humor. I discovered later that many people had attended the last (and first production) put on by the theatre club. Eileen's comments may have reflected indirectly apprehension about getting people to participate in putting on a production.

Eileen also spoke of concerns group members had. She appeared to me to be concerned, herself, although she did not clearly express personal concern:

- I don't have a lot of concern with people coming to see it -- yet... Eil) J-5.
- Too bad more people didn't come out to the meeting. Eil) J-5. Loretta could do far better than I could. We've lost a few... That's okay. Eil) J-5.

When Eileen made the latter statement Cameron asked "Who's quit?"

Eileen listed three people who had left Goetheim or were not available during the summer. She then listed several people who were "solid". She estimated that about fourteen were left. "Nobody thinks that's enough" she said. Cameron, however, described that as a core group and said, "There will probably be further attrition. Ten is lots."

Eileen emphasized there were a number of people "who were of help to" her. When Cameron suggested another meeting soon, Eileen responded with, "They want you to come" and later reiterated, "I think they'll feel better with you there." (Cameron had not been able to attend the meeting between the makeup workshop and this informal meeting.)

Eileen described the group as repeating a certain pattern:

They're very good at the meetings and then they fall apart on their own yet. That's what's happening. I think they have enough information stored up. Everyone seems to think they need to be reading... Eil) J-5.

She then outlined some of the work done in glowing terms: "Jim and Joyce have amazing songs." "Joyce read the whole Wheat Pool history. Jim did a whole skit on the Wheat Pool about holding a Wheat Pool meeting with planted questions from the audience." "Anna suggested a dream sequence."

When I asked how the members went about gathering information, Cameron and Eileen gave me a brief history. To summarize their history: Members of the group had applied for and received limited provincial funding for the "Heritage Play". The two people who had applied for funding were no longer involved with the project, one having moved away, the other being away on a trip. The original emphasis on the historical religious ties of the community (the town is predominantly German Catholic) had died out and was replaced with a list of subjects on a number of different subjects. (I obtained a copy of this list and the application form some time later. Both are included in the Appendices.)

Given the tenor of the discussion, I began to have a number of questions. What was Eileen's relationship to group members? Did she have a formalized role? What relationship did Cameron have to group members? Had his role been formalized? What perceptions would members

of the group have of me given that I had been introduced by Cameron, came from Saskatoon, and might seem a professional of some sort as a graduate student. — What expectations might they have of me?

None of these questions were clearly answered that day, although Eileen did answer the question of her role in this way:

- Jessie said [a member I had not spoken to yet and who was the president of the club] we need someone to produce it. I asked Jo as she was instrumental in getting the funding [Jo was the woman away on a trip]... I don't know if they need a producer per se, or an authority figure... When they get scared someone to call, "I'll call Eileen". Eil) J-5.

This discussion led back into an indirect discussion about what the play would look like. Eileen stated that in the application certain "promises had been made". For example, the form made reference to a certain length and format. Cameron addressed that, "It's not your problem. People don't make a show by length." Eileen's response seemed indirect:

- Skits if that's what it looks like... Whatever it comes out to that's what its going to be... A lot of them want to have structure. Eil) J-5-Fieldnotes.
- Joyce and Jim are just fine with no structure... All of them have it in them if they only knew. Eil) J-5-Fieldnotes.

Eileen also described inviting specific people to join this project. She spoke warmly of a youth named Jay "who had won a provincial award." He's self-confident... Knows how to pause, how to wait."

Eileen's fourteen year old daughter, Debbie arrived and Cameron left soon thereafter. Debbie is tall with bright blue eyes and a round pink face. Over the following months I grew to appreciate her teenage candor. She asked how things went. Eileen responded that

Cameron would like a meeting every week. She responded with, "Yeah it will give the group a feeling of something being done."

By the end of this "meeting" I was left with a number of observations. Eileen knew a tremendous amount about the community. During the discussions she had referred to "the old established families and named a few. She had made reference to the "family newspaper" and the quality of the surrounding farmland (her grandfather homesteaded in the area). When Eileen offered to take me on a tour of the town in the weeks following I quickly and gratefully accepted.

In addition, immediately prior to leaving she described the first and only production the group had staged. Her description was full of fascinating details. She told of a snowstorm seizing the town and area prior to the second evening performance, causing some to be snowbound. In excited, skin-of-your-teeth adventure tones, she told of "losing the director (who had a small part in the play), losing the lighting "crew", and losing the high school band (who were not allowed to come out because of the weather). The band members were to sell the tickets and bring baking for sale.

The biggest problem in all of this, according to Eileen, was "getting inside"! A huge drift had to be shovelled out and a key located. "It went really well -- once we were inside!" Despite the losses, someone was found to do the director's part, someone else came in to do the lighting. He had had to be directed by headphones from

backstage. Then they had begun to wonder whether anyone would come. In fact, the audience did manage to come and gave them a standing ovation in the end.

As Eileen described this I had an image of the prairie pioneer spirit dirty, ragged, and strong suddenly given full theatrical, exaggerated makeup and shouting, "The show must go on. The show must go on." On the heels of her animated description, Eileen spoke of "heading out for home".

Prior to leaving, Eileen advised me of a meeting to be held at Jim's and Joyce's home on July 11th. In reflecting on the afternoon's eventful discussion, I discovered that I was thinking in bilateral research terms. I began thinking that I had started in the middle. There is a show that has gone on, a show going on, and this show that will go on. Questions about understanding the past context for the group members had been raised for me. As well, I had begun to consider a series of questions about the roles of people. As I write this now, I have a clearer image of being on a timeline see-saw or perhaps, more accurately a saw-see-we'll see.

So many questions had been raised that the larger question of how to organize my research became altogether pressing. Basic questions such as: What is my purpose? What do I do? How do I explain my role to group members? Does my role change over time? — How much should I participate in group activities? Should I only observe? What methods of recording should I use? Having begun to do research in the area of methodology, these questions made the search compelling.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>For flourish and reflection, I have hung each chapter by a "line" from Hamlet. Hamlet's presence graced my thesis proposal. He lingers here supplanting his father in the haunt. I have been bemused by "his ghost" while conceptualizing this thesis; he among others has been a resource person. In true theatrical tradition, dialogue has created this thesis despite its monologue form. His speeches are intended to remind the reader of the social nature of a thesis.

Beyond the more general inspiration, I have come to consider his situation as having some limited parallel to those I have observed in the theatre project. I understand his character as one experiencing a cultural anomaly, a breaking point. He has gone away from his society to university to focus on philosophical studies, questions of meaning. His perspective is thus changed; he returns to a society changed and not changed. He is expected to act but has no final confidence in the meaning he makes.

And thus the native hue of resolution  
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,  
And enterprises of great pitch and moment  
With this regard their currents turn awry  
And lose the name of action... Hamlet, III, i, 84-88

His actions are those of one who is reaching to find ways to obtain certainty so that he may act. His reflections are of one whose anchors in the profound are utterly shaken.

<sup>2</sup>In the name of dialogue and social experience I have also quoted participants in the theatre project. A resource person suggested this to ground the context within the experience of project participants. The quotations chosen are statements they made during the process of creating and presenting the play. I have selected these on the basis that they reflect group members' most commonly expressed feeling at a particular stage in the project. They do not always match "Hamlet's". As any conversation may reveal, there are some contrasts and some expressions of the same experience described in markedly different manners. The quotations, in some instances, simply reflect two major themes in a chapter.

<sup>3</sup>My notes of these exchanges are scant. Since I had not received consent to do the study it was not appropriate to tape or take notes of the proceedings.

## REFERENCES

- Aruha, T. (1984). Awareness and involvement through popular theatre -- the igyura experience. Adult Education And Development, 23, 121-127.
- Brockett, O. G. (1984). The essential theatre (3rd ed.). New York: CBS College Publishing.
- Brook, P. (1972). The empty space. New York: Penguin Books.
- Ginn, R. M. (1974). Psychodrama, a theatre for our time. Group Psychotherapy And Psychodrama, 27, (1-4), 123-146.
- Lambert, P. (1982). Popular theatre: One road to self-determined development action. Community Development Journal, 17, (3), 242-249.
- Lyman, S. & Scott, M. (1975). The drama of social reality. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Millett, F. & Bentley, G. (1935). The art of the drama. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Moreno, J. L. (1977) Psychodrama, Volume 1 (rev. ed.). New York: Beacon House.
- Radin, B. (1985). Dramatic techniques in ESL instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 174).
- States, B. (1987). Great reckonings in little rooms, On the phenomenology of theatre. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Turner, V. (1982). From ritual to theatre, The human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

## CHAPTER TWO

### STAGE DIRECTIONS:

#### Review Of Methodological Resources Related To The Fieldwork Stage

Suit the action to the word, the word to the action,  
With this special observance, that you o'er step not  
The Modesty of Nature  
- Hamlet, III, II, line 16.

This is a time for stretching. We have a slight argument about  
how to set this up. Ann) J-11-59.

### INTRODUCTION

This Chapter describes how through research and reflection the field questions concluding the last Chapter were addressed. Consistent with a rough chronology, my early considerations of "contextual dimensions" concerning the research are presented. These initial considerations were relied upon as a basis for strategy in beginning a search of methodological literature.<sup>1</sup> Description of the initial "contextual dimension" is followed by an overview of four focal points emerging from the library search.

The remainder of the Chapter discloses findings in the literature concerning the four focal points. These are directly related to the study and implications in terms of research design. In this way the literature review is closely linked with reflections from initial fieldwork data analysis.

The questions raised at the end of the first chapter are extremely broad. "What is my purpose? — More basically: "What should I do?" As with other aspects of the theatre members' project my role was defined over time. Yet, in considering the context, there were

initial limits. I had not been asked in to do surveys, or to set up a laboratory to conduct tests.

My jar or filter for doing the research had several predetermining dimensions. One contextual dimension was created by at least one person involved in the project. Cameron's initial suggestion concerning my involvement assumed I would observe and perhaps participate to some extent in the project. "What is my purpose and what should I do" were to be shaped by those limits.

A second contextual dimension was formed by my focus as researcher, that focus being on adult education. I began with an explicit assumption that participants of this project were learning through a social process, for example, about the history of the community, about themselves and about theatre. Yet, could any of this research be related to extant research in adult education? To answer these pressing questions arising out of the immediate experience of the fieldwork I turned to library research and consulted resource people.

My first research strategy was simple and direct, I would search for like projects. That is, projects "like" this one in two senses: a) People engaged in similar projects (creating a play in a rural community) and b) people being studied in a similar manner from a participant observer role.

While I did discover a considerable number of descriptions about theatre groups in adult education materials, many were of a very different nature from the study at hand. They were different both in the constitution of groups involved and in the objectives of their

projects. (Discoveries of other theatre projects will be more thoroughly described in Chapter Four.) Of those resource materials concerning theatre projects located, the forms of the studies did not suggest an adult educator entering a group as a participant observer. This presented a strong argument for proceeding since the study might then offer new insights.

Given pressing "how to" questions about my role as researcher, I initially felt more urgent need to focus on others' experience with participant observation methods than I did to search for similar theatre projects. This quest for more refined methods led to more abstract aspects of methods, a study of philosophic frameworks as related to methods, that is methodology. The importance of methodology was also raised by the second dimension of context: "Could any of this research be related to existing research in adult education?"

While reading resource materials to answer those questions, I became quite fascinated with the concept of research methodology for another reason altogether. I came to understand how significant ontological and epistemological underpinnings are in developing research approaches in any form of adult education. For example, adult educators have been especially concerned with epistemological assumptions in adult education research as they relate to a particular conceptualization of learning and knowledge (Lindeman, 1926; Freire, 1973; Ruddock, 1971).

One final point before launching into the study's discoveries concerning methodology and methods. Research in this area continued

long after the fruits of my fieldwork had been harvested. Focus in reading the resource materials has shifted, however, as my tasks and my concerns have shifted. Four different, major focal points emerged through research of methodology and methods:

- a) Ontological and epistemological underpinnings of participant observation and ethnographic research. This was research I surveyed to locate descriptions of various methodologies linked with philosophic foundations.
- b) Data collection: Descriptions of fieldwork methods were sought to respond to immediate questions such as how to enter the field, how to record, how to act. (This became part of "my filter, my jar through which I have endeavored to capture the experience.)
- c) Data analysis: This was a search for descriptions of data analysis methods. At the outset the search was concerned with the following questions: What is data, what steps does one use to analyze data, when does one begin, how is data analysis integrated with data collection during fieldwork? (This became part of my filter system or jar as well.)
- d) Representational form for the research: This focal point for research emerged most recently out of the search for criteria in determining the final form this document should take. (Most of the work concerning representational form occurred some time after I left the field. I have reserved my descriptions of that work for Part Two.)

These focal points overlapped, downright bled and sweated into each other during my work on this thesis. They have been seemingly

separated in the tidiness of reconstruction. I have attempted to balance herein some sense of the actual experience with some framework, a cohesive order. The description of discoveries related to each will follow the same pattern as the four headings. This pattern roughly reflects a chronology of shifting tasks and concerns.

#### ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF THE RESEARCH

While searching for references to similar projects, I began to read a series of books suggested by resource people concerned with methodology and methods (Denzin, 1970; Glaser & Strauss 1967; Lofland, 1971; Spradley, 1980). As well, over time I consulted a series of references related specifically to methodological issues concerning education (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte 1984; Wilson, 1977; Wolcott, 1985).

These resource materials exposed a huge and oftentimes heated debate between methodological concepts of qualitative and quantitative research. In fact, in the literature, paradigmatic lines have been drawn by some between a "quantitative - rationalistic" approach to inquiry and a "qualitative - naturalistic" approach based on ontological and epistemological axioms (Guba & Lincoln, 1982).

The quantitative-rationalistic approach to inquiry is described as being derived from an "experimental" framework (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.45). Associated with this experimental framework is a laboratory "approach". Research need not take place in the setting

and if it does the researcher plans to control certain conditions — "variables". Generally the expected outcome of the research is affirmation or rejection of a specific hypothesis being tested.

In contrast, the qualitative-naturalistic approach to research includes several attributes. Qualitative research is concerned with the meanings people have, how people make sense out of events. In order to understand people's perspectives, qualitative researchers observe people's action in the natural setting for that action. The expected outcome of the research is a description which includes an analysis of the meaning people are making out of their actions.

(Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 27-30).

There are several positions taken concerning the possible existence of the two "alleged" paradigms. Some staunchly advocate that the qualitative framework engulfs quantitative research (Ratcliffe, 1983, p. 147). Others are adamant about paradigmatic lines being recognized as between the two approaches (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). Still others suggest that, rather than developing a set of dichotomized paradigms, a set of assumptive modes should be applied which would provide a continuum from which guidelines for research may be chosen (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). Even if it is possible to avoid the dichotomized-paradigm debate about where the lines are drawn and how one paradigm relates to the other, it is still important to reflect upon the assumptions or biases implicit within the potential focus of a study.

## DISCOVERIES RELATED TO THE STUDY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

This research served to raise issues about the consistency of method with purpose. As described earlier, considering the form of my entry into the group and my own interests, some form of participant observation was ostensibly the optimal option. However, the library research prompted me to reconsider my assumptions and to clarify certain aspects of the research, most particularly the objectives. Bearing this in mind I constructed three reference points from the resource materials to be used as a guide for reconsidering both the research methodology and methods.

These reference points acted as a checklist to ensure that my own ontological and epistemological beliefs, the nature of the fieldwork and possible relationships to the field of adult education be considered as interrelated criteria in choosing a methodology. The three reference points used:

- a) The researcher's own ontological and epistemological beliefs (Goetz & LeCompte 1984, p. 34).
- b) The nature of the "phenomenon" being researched (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 34).
- c) The purpose of the research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967, p. vii).

It is most important to recognize the interdependence of the three reference points. For instance "a", the researcher's own ontological and epistemological beliefs will be reflected in "b", how the researcher perceives "the phenomenon" being researched. The perceived

nature of the phenomenon will then have a bearing on "c", the purpose of the research. As each one is interdependent with the other two, each will shape the other.

a) The Researcher's Own Ontological And Epistemological Beliefs

Several weeks after entering the field, (by the fourth meeting I attended) I realized that there was a distinction between my perspective on the process and the perspectives of the writer-director and individual members of the group. I spoke in terms of learning, they spoke in terms of tasks and to some extent in theatre terms. This realization shaped what was to eventually become the preface to the second stated objective of the proposed thesis:

The rich description inevitably reflects my focus (as participant observer) related to participants' perceptions and constructs of the process in which they are engaged through their theatre project.

The orientation of focusing upon the participants' perceptions indicates an important ontological assumption. It suggests a belief that there are "multiple realities" (Guba & Lincoln, 1982, p.237). This ontological assumption is associated with a qualitative paradigm and more specifically with a phenomenological framework within a qualitative paradigm (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

In addition, the desire to study a "community group" within its setting indicated my belief in understanding phenomena in context, -researching in a holistic manner. These epistemological assumptions are also consistent with choosing a qualitative paradigm for the study (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 3).

b) The Nature Of The "Phenomenon" Being Researched

I had already addressed this issue, but I reconsidered it to understand it in relation to "the other reference points". From the outset it was the intent of the study to focus upon the process in which participants were to engage and to describe that process. This suggests an intention to observe an event which the researcher has not attempted to control. Once more this is consistent with a qualitative approach to research: "Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products. How do people negotiate meaning?" (Bogdan & Biklen 1982, p. 28)

c) The Purpose Of The Research

Researchers are advised frequently to begin their research with a well formulated question. I had many questions ranging from "What is the relationship between theatre and adult education?" to simply, "What are these people doing?" I wrestled with formulating a single question for some time. Resolution of that struggle was finally found by instead reflecting on how to formulate a set of objectives consistent with ontological and epistemological underpinnings.

Particularly during the library search for theoretical works, two distinct purposes for the research became evident. In essence the two were: to produce a description of a process and then, to locate that description within a theoretical framework. (These two purposes were eventually framed in the present form of the stated objectives.) This part has been divided to respect the differences in the form of the two purposes.

## 1) Development Of The Description

From the beginning the major purpose of the fieldwork and hence the thesis has been to record the activities of this set of individuals and therefrom to develop a description. The phrase "developing a rich description" does not imply a focus upon a "systematic counting or enumeration" of "previously defined units of analysis that is the limited form of 'description' ordinarily associated with a quantitative orientation" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p.6). In contrast, qualitative research is intimately bound with description. "The data collected is in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers." (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 18)

## 2) Locating The Description In Theory

The eventual search for theatre and adult education resource materials demonstrated the limited number of theoretical materials available. Of those located, most were of a descriptive nature, but not from an ethnographic framework. The descriptions were generally written from the authors' perspectives (Davis, 1983; Hummelen & Wildcat, 1984). The authors had either not taken or did not have the opportunity to devote their work to studying thoroughly the perspective of participants. They had not continued on to theorize about the significance of the participants' perceptions.

As reflected in the literature located, analyses and theory development in this area are in their infancy. This suggests a need to develop or generate theory. Glaser and Strauss (1967) have emphasized an inductive, generative approach to development of theory

in Discovery Of Grounded Theory. This approach to the place of theory in research is associated with a qualitative approach to inquiry.

Relying on these reference points as criteria, the researcher's own belief system, and the nature and purpose of the research meshed well with a qualitative approach to all aspects of the research. Once this was affirmed the more specific consideration of a research design was addressed.

Within the qualitative paradigm, there are diverse theoretical frameworks guiding research design. Literature in the area revealed that participant observation is more a method or even a role than an entire methodological framework. In choosing one of these, many of the same factors which were considered in relation to the use of a qualitative approach suggested a specific research design. Specifically, the researcher's focus on group members' activities in their natural setting suggested an ethnographic framework (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984).

Even within the ethnographic framework, however, there are "dueling schools". A consistent element within ethnography is the ethnographer's avid interest in the social structure of a group studied within its own context (Sanday, 1979). The concept of "culture" is key to an ethnographic study (Wolcott, 1985). Yet, therein lies a source of disharmony among ethnographers: a definition of "culture" (Geertz, 1973; Sanday, 1979). Without exploring the definitional gamut of "culture" herein, I will simply describe my choice and my criteria for the choice.

The criteria are very much those I used in choosing a methodological framework. While attempting to contemplate group members' interactions I had begun to be sensitive to diverse perceptions of individuals within the group (including my own orientations). This became linked to a search for the "meaning" members of the group derived from the experience. Given my orientation as a researcher, a more interpretive definition of culture was therefore more consistent with the nature and purpose of this study. Geertz proffers such an orientation in his definition of culture:

Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning. (1973, p. 5)

Finally, it is important to note the connection of phenomenology to the research framework. This research might be said to rely on a phenomenological framework (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Spiegelberg, 1975, Part 1, & 1984) to the extent that the research became oriented to a recognition of multiple realities and became specifically oriented to how group members were making meaning of the experience.

Methods of bracketing were not attempted (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 38; Holmes, 1976, p. 156). I did consider my role and how I might be perceived by group members in our interactions. These considerations were noted in my "Reflections" notes. I did not believe that it was possible, however, to step entirely outside the boundaries of my own context. This study, therefore, should not be referred to as ethnoscientific or ethnomethodological.

## DATA COLLECTION

Concerning the first focal point, "Ontological and Epistemological Underpinnings Of The Research", criteria brought to bear upon the question of clarifying my methodological framework have been conveyed. This focal point, "Data Collection" and the third, "Data Analysis", link methodology to description of the methods eventually chosen.

The definition of what constitutes "data" must be resolved in determining methods of data collection:

"Ethnographers consider data to be potentially verifiable information obtained from the environment" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 107).

This suggests that "information" is a larger category, encompassing "data". Information may be anything and everything in a "site". Data is defined as that information which is relevant to the research. As the questions of this study and its purposes were redefined, thus the "content" of data for the purposes of this study also emerged.

## DISCOVERIES RELATED TO THE STUDY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

In refining a research design for data collection, various methods associated with ethnography were considered. Resource materials consulted (Agar, 1980; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984; Spradley, 1980) suggested four commonly used forms of data collection: "observation, interviewing, research designed instruments and content analysis of human artifacts" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 107).

While reading these resources I was already thoroughly in the throes of being a participant observer. My fieldwork energies were concentrated on "collecting data" — attempting to "see" significance and to gather "it" in. Through contemplating the use of data collection devices beyond participant observation, I came to recognize and consider several interrelated factors affecting the research.

The stated purpose of the research: Developing a rich description is very broad in range. However, the notion of "rich" suggests detail.

The brevity of access: The theatre project was to take approximately five months from the first meeting with the group. As this was specifically a study of participants engaged in a specific project, there were important time constraints on the research.

Resources available for both the fieldwork and library research: As a graduate student my means were modest. I was unable to "live on location". With a few exceptions, this meant travelling to and from the site, about an hour and a quarter's drive one way. Any form of data collection in addition to attending the group's meetings would have to be shaped around those forays.

The context of the site: The numbers of people involved, the form of their invitation, their apparent expectations and resources, were all crucial considerations. The latter were emphatically significant both in terms of trust and ethical considerations. It is also important to note that some of this information was unavailable for much of the project. For example, the size of the group was undetermined during most of the project. It ranged from approximately eight people to an eventual seventeen. One person made a truly dramatic entrance, to the

group. She was asked to play an important role ten days prior to the first performance.

Based upon these considerations three methods of data collection were chosen: a) participant observation, b) interviewing, and c) collection and content analysis of human artifacts.

a) Participant Observation

As a participant observer I attended all group meetings, both formal and informal social occasions of which I was aware. (Chapter Eight outlines in more detail social arrangements and resulting questions in terms of the research.) I also attended all three performances of the production.

In addition to taperecording the meetings, I tried my hand at copious, but subtle notetaking of my observations during meetings<sup>2</sup>. The quick content of my notes included who came to the meeting, my sense of the general mood, pre-meeting exchanges and questions or observations about incidents which struck me as unusual.

Upon returning home I wrote down as well, my reflections about these fieldwork experiences. These reflective notes also included a set of notes describing connections I made between these experiences and resource materials from library research.

b) Interviews

At the time the study began, group members were holding meetings infrequently. I rapidly realized it would be difficult to develop

rapport with each group member by simply attending meetings. In addition, wishing to confine my impact as much as possible I consciously restrained myself from making many contributions at meetings. This meant, however, that my interaction with many group members was limited. More concentrated contact would resolve this difficulty to some extent. I also wished to make certain that I was not identified exclusively with "the gatekeepers" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p.58) or "stranger-handlers" (Agar, 1980, p. 85).

Of those forms of data collection described, spending time with individuals through interviews appeared to fit with other factors such as their resources and my resources. I began by informally asking one or two members who had been particularly encouraging to me to participate in an interview. As I started meeting with more people, the process became more formalized. Interestingly, some individuals appeared to think of our exchange as a very formal interview.

For example, they appeared to expect me to ask questions and to guide the discussion. Though none of the participants clearly stated this, I had the general impression that each of them expected me "to start". They appeared to wait for me to "provide" the questions and in this way to guide the discussion.

I did have a few specific questions on demographics, and how people became involved a) with the theatre club and b) with this particular "heritage" project. I hoped to have a "conversation" more than risk prompting through bringing my own framework in the questions. I certainly did have conversations with group members on other informal occasions. I believe this may have resulted from my

using the word "interview" when initially asking to meet with group members who had had limited prior contact with me.

In my ongoing efforts to consider the impact my presence might have on group members, I also considered possible effects of the interviews. Again, there are no data in the form of statements from group members to confirm any of my entries on this subject in "Reflective Notes".

However, I did consider for some time the possibility that my interviews took on a "group identifying" significance. It was difficult initially, to determine who was in the group and who was not. Since I was only interviewing "participants in the project", when I interviewed someone this may have reinforced their status as a group member. I also reflected on whether my presence as a person taking their endeavors seriously enough to study them was a way of affirming the importance of their work at a time when there was tremendous uncertainty.

My sense from these reflections was that I did have some impact for at least a few participants in terms of raising the significance of the project and in creating a sense of group. How much of an impact and how many participants may have experienced this effect was impossible to ascertain without causing additional impact.

These first interviews took place from August 27, 1985 to October 8, 1985 during which time I met with all those who were directly involved with the production. At the beginning of each of the interviews, I indicated that what was said in the interview would be treated as confidential. If I wished to quote from any of the

material I would ask permission before doing so. This tended to affirm a formal quality about our interview interactions.

I had begun to do some data analysis prior to the completion of the interviews. In these interviews, many of the individuals were so focused on the final outcome of the project that I began to contemplate the possibility of interviewing a second time after the completion of the production. Since the final outcome was key to many, through a second set of interviews I thought I might gain a sense of how they felt about the project's outcome.

I was troubled by a further factor which seemed to suggest the need for a second set of interviews. With the first set of interviews, I met with individuals over a prolonged period of time. Some simply did not join the group until close to the performance dates. When people joined the project I was faced with allowing more time to elapse as they needed time to develop their own sense of the group and their role in the project.

An essential aspect of the research was concerned with individuals' perceptions of the process in which they were engaged. During the project, the membership of the group changed, tasks changed, roles changed frequently within a short span of time. Therefore, I assumed that the timing of any one interview could make a considerable difference to the content of that interview. I pondered more than once the question of how much comparison would be appropriate between interviews. Although this situation could not be

rectified given the context, I first consulted with resource people and then determined to suggest a second set of interviews after the final performance.

The second set of interviews were spaced over a timeframe of November 22, 1985 to December 2, 1985 thus extending my involvement with group members to approximately a six month period. I assumed there would be few events during this time which would drastically alter perceptions as between individuals concerning the project. Hoping to gain insight into each individual's meanings of project events, again, I hoped to have unstructured interviews. In preparation, I developed a list of those things for which I would listen. (See the Appendices, Section Two for this list.)

Each set of interviews was taperecorded with the permission of the individual. I also made some notes primarily in the form of reflections after the interviews. Transcriptions were made of the first set of interviews. These provided data for analysis in the creation of themes. These themes then provided a basis for further observations both as a participant observer and as a basis for the second set of interviews. I have transcribed the second set of interviews and have used them as well in further data analysis. (See Appendices, Section Three for relevant documentation.)

Prior to shifting to other forms of data collection it is most important to note what arrangements were made with respect to confidentiality. When I entered the field I advised participants that I would seek their permission before quoting them. I also stated in the interviews that any statements they made would be made in

confidence. No one would have access to tapes from interviews without prior permission from the individual being interviewed. This was not true of most of the meeting tapes. People within the group had access to the meeting tapes. In fact Cam relied on a number of these tapes of participants improvisations as a basis for his work on the script. No one from the group took advantage of the opportunity to listen to the tapes.

Data analysis and writing the representation required considerable time. Since a number of participants were leaving the area prior to completion of the thesis document, I returned to Goetheim in the summer of 1989 to meet with each person separately. At that time virtually all participants indicated that they were not concerned about being quoted. Three people stated that they preferred a "code name" for some of their remarks made in the interviews. One person indicated a preference for not having the name of the town known. Ethically and practically-speaking, this also meant that any documents which might definitely link the project with the town, (this included copies of the script) could not form part of the thesis document.

Thus, the names of individuals and the town have been fabricated. A few details which might have identified the locale have been changed as well. These precautions concerning confidentiality may be observed in the next segment, concerning what artifacts form parts of the Appendices.

c) Collection Of Human Artifacts

To trace more mundane sources of "the moonbeam" I cast my jar about to catch the more concrete. My collection of artifacts commenced with my growing interest in discovering more about the setting, the community. The same factors which shaped limited access to the group members also applied to access to the townspeople. Limited resources and brevity of access were particularly significant. Given these factors, simply developing a method to obtain representation reflective of a community of over five thousand would have been difficult.

I was interested in obtaining data about the community to have more of my own sense of the general social structure of the community and to consider how its structure might have an impact upon group members. More specifically, I was interested in developing a sense of how members of the community were responding to the new theatre club in town.

Collection of artifacts, while a limited solution, provided some data (primarily demographics) about townspeople generally and a limited sense of their response to the theatre club. Two opportunities arose to experience townspeople's response to the theatre club and the production. The first opportunity was not actually in the form of collecting artifacts. I was able to listen to and engage in a few discussions with members of the audience at a tea held after each performance. Second, there was an article in the local newspaper prior to the performances.

Collection of artifacts was not limited to data about the community itself. Documents falling within three conceptual areas were collected:

Artifacts in relation to the community:

- Newspaper clippings relevant to the project\*
- Town history documents including information about ethnicity\*

Artifacts in relation to the theatre club's organization:

- The organization's constitution\*
- The minutes of the club's annual meeting\*
- The funding application for the project
- Description of department heads for production and responsibilities

Artifacts in relation to the play:

- Copies of drafts of the script as developed\*
- The program from the performances\*
- Schedules of workshops and rehearsals
- A list of subjects to be covered in the performance

\* Asterisks identify artifacts which, unfortunately, could not be included in the Appendices. To do so would be to breach the confidentiality originally promised participants concerning the setting of the research.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

This is the third and the last of the focal points for research described in this Chapter. As my filter for the experience became more consciously structured through the research and reflections described it has come to resemble a jar made of crystal with its own

set of intricacies. The early focus on data collection materials in the literature began to shift towards a concern with a method of data analysis.

Resource materials made reference to various forms of data analysis (Agar, 1980; Denzin, 1970; Spradley, 1980). Some descriptions of the process of data analysis were decidedly vague (Agar, 1980; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). Others pressed for precision (Spradley, 1980). The latter tended to be language centred.

In developing a research design, I first proposed to rely on a constant comparison form of analysis, using categories and properties as conceptual building blocks. The proposal to use categories and properties as both method of analysis and final form of presentation was made, however, with strong reservations.

#### DISCOVERIES RELATED TO THE STUDY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Three concerns arose repeatedly during a search for categories in the data. The first two concerns are epistemological in nature.

##### a) Epistemological Concerns

First, much of the literature located during the fieldwork which relied on categories and properties as a bases for analyses assumes a language-centred epistemology (Spradley, 1979 & 1980.) Relying on language so heavily as a source of data implies that this is the only way we come to know the world of others. At this point I had observed an orientation in participants' theatre activities towards physical and emotional elements. Language formed only part of the participants' social repertoire. Much of the process the participants

had experienced was learning to express themselves, their emotions, through physical terms. (I happened to have observed this about the time I was contemplating use of possible methods to develop categories from the data.)

Second, some authors, Spradley (1979; 1980) in particular, press for precision vis-a-vis structuring categories and properties. This call for precision may prompt positivist-like epistemological assumptions.

#### b) Concerns With Contexts and Purpose Of Studies

A third concern relates to contexts and resulting purposes for ethnographic study. Through resource material I became familiar with a common context in which ethnographic work is done, that of an identified "culture". A common purpose, for these types of anthropological and sociological studies is to describe the "culture" of an identified group of people (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 3). One of the assumptions in studying "a culture" is that for the most part, one is studying aspects of the culture which are relatively static, such as shared meanings among group members (Liebow, 1967; Spradley, 1979 & 1980).

These studies may certainly acknowledge change but the emphasis is placed upon trying to piece together a picture of the culture at a certain point in time. Although that was an underlying concern for this research, there were also factors which militated against analysis with that as the single point of emphasis.

### The Access Factor:

As a researcher unable to live in the community, I could not return and observe the group at daily routine patterns. This limitation, however, may have had minor significance given the circumstances of the project participants.

Most members of the group did not have the same place of employment. Nor did they all come together to socialize on a regular basis outside of group meetings and social occasions associated with the project. In fact, there was a striking revelation generated through demographic analysis and from my observational notes. I came to recognize that this "group" of people had very diverse backgrounds (age, religious affiliations, and general interests). They had few things in common initially beyond the theatre project. This has been considered in more detail in the next Chapter and again in Parts Two and Three which concentrate on data analysis process.

### The Focus Of The Research As A Factor:

A most significant factor is that my research was focused on a process of change among group members. This is not an aspect which is ordinarily associated with first studying a "culture". There were constant changes during participants' process many of which have previously been described. This is a cumulative summary:

- Group size changed several times.
- Most of the participants in the theatre project were newly acquainted with each other. Their perceptions of each other changed during the project.

- The project participants were neophytes in staging a performance. Being involved in writing a play and staging it, the perceptions of the group members' concept of theatre changed considerably during the project.
- The skill development of group members generally changed.
- The group's understanding of the town history as the subject matter of the play changed during the process.
- The group's perception (including the writer-director) about the process by which the script would be developed changed during the project.

(Documentation of these changes in the form of "slices" of data is provided in Chapter Eight, the "Mobile-Framework".) It is more than apparent from this description that this was no static structure being studied.

An important distinction lies between the context of anthropologically oriented studies in which this data analysis method is frequently used and the context of this fieldwork. Such a strong emphasis on change in this project distinguishes it from a study of "cultures" which, even if they are in a state of flux, have a history of association which may be relied on for comparative purposes. The "group" in this instance was not a group but a set of individuals still very much struggling to act like a group.

To return to the question of looking to language as a reflection of a static culture, the context of this study would not be appropriate for a number of reasons. With so many changes happening, participants' use of language and concepts underlying the language was

changing rapidly throughout the project. However, through reflection on these issues related to language, the study of participants' use of words (as one of several focuses) took on new significance. In addition to more vaguely voiced concerns regarding changes in physical and emotional aspects of individuals' interactions, I was attempting to observe language among participants as changing. I became more alert to individuals use of new terms, and use of old terms in new ways. In this way, study of language used by participants came to affirm "change" as an emerging, dominant theme.

A focus on change as a significant dimension of process being studied, did have repercussions concerning methods used to analyze data. Materials which provided detailed methods of data analysis wherein change had emerged as a dominant focus of the study were not located. Despite the difficulties of methods, there is a value, however, in studying a set of individuals experiencing so much change.

Much of the change group members experienced was arguably connected to learning. For instance, they learned about themselves, about aspects of organizing and administering a theatre group and about one process by which to create and stage a play. Change of this nature linked as it may be with learning is surely a most important subject for research in adult education. This third concern related to use of "categories and properties" as a method of data analysis proved most fruitful as a way to reflect upon conflicts in content of data analysis with methods proposed for data analysis. In this way, the third concern with context and purpose of study is also an epistemological concern.

Based on all three of these concerns I chose not to rely on that form in data analysis when nearing the end of the fieldwork. One last point demands attention prior to describing the method of data analysis selected.

The phrase data analysis sounds formal; it conveys a notion of an isolated, discrete event. This is not so. My reflections noted down throughout the entire field experience were consideration of data and therefore were data analysis in a broad sense. I brought one set of reflections with me from one meeting to the next for purposes of observation, often explicitly, sometimes tacitly. One might argue that this was indeed a form of trying out one's analysis. Agar describes wonderfully the interactive nature of data collection and data analysis:

In ethnography ... you learn something ("collect some data"), then you try to make sense out of it ("analysis"), then you go back and see if the interpretation makes sense in light of new experience ("more analysis"), and so on. The process is dialectic, not linear. (Agar, 1980, p.9)

This was the process of data analysis upon which I came to rely during fieldwork.

Only in recent years has qualitative research become a more widely accepted approach to research in education (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In addition, the specific use of a phenomenological framework and ethnographic methods may be considered relatively innovative in adult education research (Charnley, 1984; Collins, 1984; Taylor, 1974). It is not surprising, then, that the form of data analysis selected might not be regarded as conventional.

"Conventions" are at a youthful stage in development. As previously described, while grappling with the question of whether to use categories as a data analysis method, I actually was engaged in some form of data analysis. My "Observation" notes and my "Reflective Notes" were used as bases to consider what I was observing. I then returned to the meetings to "check out" those observations and reflections. Gradually, when certain observations or reflections resurfaced I began to pay special heed to them. Eventually I referred to these as "themes".

This informal process of theme gathering became much more structured with analysis of the first set of interviews. When I searched for themes from the first set of interviews I also returned to my "Observations" and "Reflections" notes as complementary framework. On completion of this process I had a rather long list of themes, about forty-five in all! A "constant comparison" form of analysis was used to combine and edit redundant concepts. These themes provided a basis for several aspects of the research thereafter.

The data from the second set of interviews served the same purpose as the first set in relation to data analysis. I relied upon that data when refining the themes to reflect group members' perceptions of the experience. In reference to additional library research, the themes guided the search for already extant theories which might make sense of the experience now shaped for me by the data analysis. Finally, theories, from the library research, which manifestly had application to themes discovered, also reshaped the

themes in some limited senses. The theories have been used to search for additional data wherein there was apparently a gap.

A final note on processual relationship between library research and fieldwork research. While writing this Chapter it became more difficult for me to separate contribution from library research and from the fieldwork than may be apparent from the writing herein. The two were so very much interrelated in terms of research, decisions and actions. Throughout the course of the library search several areas of research emerged (outlined in Chapter Five). The questions arising from the fieldwork guided in the main, the focus of the library research.

What has been learned from one form of the research has shaped or guided the other form. For example, the library research for materials on methodology and methods for participant observation guided decisions about the form of the fieldwork. First the library research affirmed the appropriateness of the initial choice to research in the role of participant observer. The library research then provided guidance for the types of data collection used. From the data collection observations were made concerning recurrent themes. These themes further guided the library research in terms of new areas of research particularly concerning theoretical constructs.

This concludes the overview of the study's three focal points for the research related to methodology and methods, "Ontological and Epistemological Underpinnings Of The Research", "Data Collection", and "Data Analysis". (A fourth focal point, "Representational Form For The Research", is considered in Chapter Five, Six, Seven and Eight.)

The overview of methodological work covers the period during which I entered the field until I concluded the fieldwork through the second set of interviews. To ease a complex chronology, references to some methodological materials consulted after this period have been included. Reconstructive analysis of process during the fieldwork also took place soon after I withdrew from the field.

Methodology related to data analysis during the period which followed the fieldwork, emerged through a difference in accumulated chronology and focus. That description, with some overlap, unfolds in Chapter Five which is dedicated to a second stage wherein data analysis was central. This Chapter has described and reached beyond some of the methodological answers I sought arising out of fieldwork experience.

To continue with description of that experience, the next Chapter is introduced with a question repeated frequently during my experience with the project. This question went hand in hand with making sense out of what group members had done and how they experienced their interactions. — What will they do next?

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>It must be remembered that despite prior references in the Preface to "ethnography", I had entered the field so swiftly to respond to opportunity, that I did not bring with me a research design. The study has been completed mainly from an inductive approach.

<sup>2</sup>My attempts to be inconspicuous in notetaking, did not arise out of an issue of trust with group members. Rather, I hoped to limit my impact on participants' interactions as much as possible.

<sup>3</sup>Study of language used by participants, in addition to affirming a dominant theme of change also suggested sub-groupings within the set of individuals participating in the theatre project. For instance, there were those familiar with theatre terms and those who were quick studies. There were those who were neither.

## REFERENCES

- Agar, M. H. (1980). The professional stranger. New York: Academic Press.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Charnley, A.H. (1984). Research and research documentation in adult education 1974-1984: a personal view. Studies In The Education Of Adults, 16, 58-69.
- Collins, M. (1984). Phenomenological perspectives: Some implications. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 179-189). Florida: Krieger.
- Davis, B. W. (1983). Drama -- a tool for nutrition education with older adults. Journal of Nutrition Education, 15(4), 138.
- Denzin, N.K. (1970). (Ch. 1). The research act, A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Seabury Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures, selected essays. New York: Basic Books.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.
- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological biases of naturalistic inquiry. Educational Communications and Technology, 30(4), 233-252.
- Holmes, J. (1976). Thoughts on research methodology. Studies In Adult Education, 8(2), 149-163.
- Hummelen, R. & Wildcat, D. (1984). Popular theatre in the arctic. Adult Education And Development, 23, 79-87.
- Lindeman, E. (1926). The meaning of adult education. Montreal: Harvest House.
- Liebow, E. (1967). Tally's corner. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Lofland, J. (1971). Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Johnson, J. M. (1975). Doing field research. New York: The Free Press.

Ratcliffe, J. (1983) Notions of validity in qualitative research methodology. Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 5(2), 147-167.

Ruddock, R. (1971). The sociology of adult education: A plea for humanism. Studies In Adult Education, 3, 15-27.

Sanday, P.R. (1979). The ethnographic paradigm(s). In J. Van Masnen (Ed.), Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 527-538.

Spiegelberg, H. (1975). Doing phenomenology, essays on and in phenomenology. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Spiegelberg, H. (1984). Putting ourselves into the place of others: toward a phenomenology of imaginary self transposal. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 171-177). Florida: Krieger.

Spradley, J.P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J.P. (1980). Participant observation. New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Taylor, W. (1974). The nature of community work. Community Development Journal, 9, 104-107.

Watkins, B. (1981). Drama as a learning medium. Washington D.C.: National Education Association.

Wilson, S. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 47(1), 245-265.

Wolcott, H.F. (1985). On ethnographic intent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(3), 187-203.

## CHAPTER THREE

### STAGE PLAY:

#### Narrative Of Experience In The Field

The nature of the theatre club...it's almost a disposable community. The difference here is that a community group has a core... Because of this it has a different vitality...  
Cam) J-11-61. [Paraphrased]

Good my lord, will you see the players well bestowed?  
Do you hear? Let them be well used, for they are  
The abstract and brief chronicles of the time. After  
Your death you were better have a bad epitaph than their  
Ill report while you live.  
Hamlet, II, ii, line 540.

### INTRODUCTION

Behind the question, "What will they do next?" is a research context crammed with a series of questions. How have they made sense and what sense have they made out of what has happened? How will they act based on what sense they have made? (Being focused on participants' process, these are questions of the first two areas of discovery.) How do I make sense of how they make (made) sense of their interactions? (Being focused on my process as researcher, this is a question of the third and fourth areas of discovery.)

A narrative of the fieldwork experience begun in Chapter One is continued in this Chapter. This narrative provides an answer to the question of "what they did next". It does so through my eyes as a novice fieldworker. Providing a description of "what they did next" offers partial fulfillment of the thesis' first object, "to develop a

rich description of a group of individuals engaged in doing theatre with adult education as one of their purposes". This narrative comes in extremely compressed form.

The primary purpose of rich description contained in this Chapter is to convey an impression of fieldwork experience which would have some commonality with participants of a theatre project experiencing this process "for the first time". This impression is intended to provide context for the second mode of presentation, the "Mobile-framework", which is a more detailed analysis of participants' interactions.

I had limited opportunity to sort out "pieces of detail" until there was time for concentrated data analysis after I left the field. The description, then, is not rich in all the detail of participants' interactions so much as it is rich in impression of this experience while the experience unfolded.

Given these purposes and provisos the narrative includes several elements. The main element is a "brief" chronology of participants' interactions -- those which seemed most significant as I observed them at the time. Participants who were not described in Chapter One are introduced within this chronology consistent with the timeframe in which I met them. Finally, in keeping with the narrative style, the chronology is infused with a cathetic sense of the experience, mine and my impression of "theirs" is expressed throughout the chronology.

Chapter Two concluded and this one began with the same question, "What will they do next?" This question embraced every aspect of the

first few weeks of research. It continued to be key until the end of the project.

Accepting the benefits of second thoughts and third thoughts, I believe this question was linked to my own sense of surprise in participants' interactions, of sudden turns and of swift changes of momentum in project participants' interactions. Particularly in the first half dozen meetings, if I could have responded at all with predictions about what they would do next, the question would have commanded less attention.

Some of my surprise is attributable to tacit expectations I had begun to develop through literature collected on theatre process. (That literature review is mainly outlined in Chapter Four.) My expectations at this point derived from two areas of theatre and education literature. One set described relatively specific procedures for collectively creating theatre (Bolton, 1979; Heathcote, 1984). These discussed the process primarily from the context of teachers in the school system working with children.

I had also been introduced to "popular theatre" through journal publications (Kidd & Selman, 1979) and through attending workshops at the Canadian Popular Theatre Alliance's Festival in June of 1985. Although people have created a variety of popular theatre forms, a common element is a political critique of community issues. I thought that the individuals involved in the theatre project might bring some of these elements into their process.

Based on my "Reflective Notes", I appear to have expected to learn the process for writing and presenting a play, combined with

possible aspects of critique. These elements were part of the process I observed, but not in the way I assumed they would be.

#### FIRST MEETING

The first meeting after participants agreed to the study was held at Jim's and Joyce's acreage on July 11th. Jim and Joyce are married. Their rented acreage is situated about ten miles down the highway from Goetheim. It is approximately two miles off the highway on a gravel road which leads to a dirt one.

As I rode the ruts towards their small farmhouse, I saw a long table with several people seated around it. The table claimed much of the space between the house and a nearby barn. A striking, white steepled church stood across a reach of green ground. It formed a backdrop to the scene. Farmland stretched in all directions beyond this cluster of buildings and trees.

On closer view of the seated group, I noticed several people I did not recall or had only vague recollections of meeting. Joyce greeted me at the car door. She was followed by some of her coterie of constant companions, two dogs in this instance. Joyce is a veterinarian, who is also a storyteller wrapped in prankster smiles and grins. She is in her mid-twenties, brown-haired with glasses, bright and organized.

When I sat down at the table, a half-dozen people were chatting in pairs. Across the bottle of wine, food, assorted papers and books on the table, there were two more unfamiliar faces. I eventually discovered that the young man, sandy-haired and regular featured is

named Lyle. He is in his early twenties, gregarious, and apparently impulsive, speaking sometimes in bursts. Lyle is one of the few in the group who is "from Goetheim". In business, his family has lived there for at least two generations.

Allie, seated beside Lyle, is a dark-haired young woman. Allie is fine-boned and lovely, intermittently smiling and serious. Like Debbie she is in high school but she is completing high school in the next year. When I first observed her on that evening, she was laughing uproariously in response to a comment Lyle had made.

Anna and Lenore arrived as individual discussions were winding down. Although there was no formality, the meeting appeared to begin by discussion taking place among all present rather than among pairs. No one spoke of a specific agenda. Participants started with sharing research findings and Cam taking notes. However, this topic did not remain at the fore. Discussion shifted from research done and specific "facts" about Goetheim, to comments about limited attendance at this meeting, to suggestions about props and costumes, to the form of presentation, to concerns about obtaining the funds granted. During most of the meeting there seemed to be no discernible theme to participants' discussion.

Participants' conversation wound about, in, and through two hours. I have chosen a segment of paraphrased dialogue<sup>1</sup> which exemplifies the shifts and turns in most of the evening's conversations. Cam occasionally interposed with statements about what

was important in response to descriptions of research and suggested ideas for the presentation. This example begins with one of his interjections.

"You must provide a dramatic context, a dramatic turn. There must be a focus for tension," he declared. This was followed after a moment by a statement from Eileen about format. "We don't just want to have skits." Throughout this meeting and the next participants used "skits" sometimes and "play" at other times to refer to the presentation. Individuals did not tend to use the same words consistently, since they had not yet made a decision about format. Cam responded, "We have to have a specific character doing something specific at a specific time at a specific place".

After a brief pause Joyce returned to researched historical content, "People moved back in with their parents". When no one else continued that line of contribution, Jim returned to process, "Are we open for new ideas? Let's get brainstorming!" This was followed soon after by a comment from Anna, "I need direction. I'm bad for that. Give me a script any time." Although this sample does not include administrative topics which were also introduced, it does convey what I experienced on that first evening as a series of non sequiturs.

In the second hour of the meeting Cam spoke more frequently with directive questions about the research. "What elements of that stir up the excitement? All the conflicts... — Men fighting each other who could have been friends." His questions became more frequent and his tone seemed slightly louder, more insistent. Thereafter, for about twenty minutes, various participants' contributions focused

mainly on what they knew of Gotheim from research or being part of the community.

They responded rapidly in excited voices. A common image of the community began to emerge, one of pride and privacy. These comments illustrate participants' attributions: "The family name was important," one person exclaimed. Another contributed, "You didn't find out things directly because of pride. I heard when people asked my mom." The German Catholic heritage of the community was also described, "Faith got them through".

On the edges of this discussion, before many other topics had crept into the conversation, Cam asked some to research and reflect on certain topics, "Now if you were doing your job 50 years ago -- what would you be doing? Don't think about just the technical things... Lenore, can you think about isolation? Lyle, you're interested in the catalogue. How did they base their commerce? how did they order coal? Eileen this is a very personal one. How did people deal with death?"

After Cam gave these "assignments", some reacted with concern. Lenore and Anna expressed concerns most frequently and clearly. Lenore exclaimed, "I don't like this part because I feel inadequate". Cam relid immediately, "That's really ironic because you're a wonderful contributor. (She had spoken several times about Gotheim as one who had lived there most of her life.) Anna broke in with, "That's why I feel inadequate. I'm not from around here. There must be some other way to get this stuff out."

A few minutes after that exchange, one of Anna's comments seemed to sum up the process of the meeting, "This is a time for stretching... We have a slight argument about how to set this up." As the meeting drew to a close, participants resolved to re-involve one of the two women who drafted the original grant application. She had ceased to participate in the project apparently over a disagreement about a strong religious direction research was taking. The meeting ended with a further discussion concerning the need to obtain the heritage funding granted.

I came away from this meeting with a sense that participants did not have the same perspective on many aspects of the project. Some seemed excited about writing the "play" or "skits". Others preferred to have a script given to them. Through his comments, Cam indicated as writer-director that he had a process in mind. Yet, his processual suggestions were followed-interrupted by participants introducing a completely different topic to the conversation.

I observed that participants had differing priorities. In their discussion, administrative matters were juxtaposed with ideas for the presentation's content. Discussion content demonstrated differing senses of the history of Goetheim, some very personally derived, some formally researched, while others suggested that they had no connection. Differences were not directly addressed or negotiated.

I have had the impression, however, that through discussion participants were beginning to build in common an image of the community which fit with their contemporary experience. When speaking of the history of the town and area there was some excitement.

However, a few had spoken in frustrated tones about the community's lack of responsiveness. One particular remark was intriguing. During discussion about the history of the community, one participant had said half jokingly that nothing had happened because "the Church wouldn't let it happen". Others from the area had nodded, however, taking the comment quite seriously.

All individuals present appeared to be involved with the struggle in locating a course of action. While they were so engaged they appeared to run through a spectrum of emotions, being excited and challenged some of the time, being apprehensive at others. Based on what participants had expressed, intensity and shades of emotions varied with each person.

When contemplating participants' interactions I was struck by the limited experience group members had with theatre and even with the community's history, on one hand. On the other, they were willing to pursue what may have seemed well beyond the realms of possibility to others with more theatre experience. A theme vaguely hovered, but not in terms of chaotic content of the meeting or the detailed detours.

Rather, the theme lay in a tension expressed through a rhythm in participants' excited, intense responses followed by disjointed discussion and expression of uncertainty. This tension imbuing participants' interactions was articulated by Anna, when she spoke more specifically of "improvisation". "Improvisation... This kind of thing scares me, but it also intrigues me." Interestingly, at this meeting Anna was the only person to mention the word which is usually used to describe a process of extemporizing.

After the July 11th meeting, there were to be twenty-five more meetings which included three presentations of the "play". These meetings and presentations averaged three and a half hours in length. One of them, a workshop, lasted about twelve hours.

Although the description of this first meeting is considerably compressed, it offers more detail than descriptions of the remaining meetings and interviews. I chose to do this because the July 11th meeting was particularly significant. It was comparable to the experience of entering the field, for I was attending now as a participant and observer. This was my first opportunity to take notes of group members' interactions during the meeting. Impressions I formulated that day were a benchmark for what followed. At this meeting I began to have some sense of many of the individuals participating and qualities of their interactions. It set the context.

This was no "classical textbook" example of theatre process with step by step precision. Tensions and negotiations in participants' interactions to arrive at a "concrete" process were most significant elements of that process. However, these were at best only indirectly addressed in the prescriptive formats provided in adult education materials. Surrounded with a sense of ambiguity, it was some time before I thought of this "messy inexactitude" as the special quality of this lifeworld experience to which I was privy. Nonetheless I began to record changes, surprises, ambiguity and even one element of tension, participants' excitement and anxiety associated with theatre.

## A SLOW FLURRY OF MEETINGS

The first few meetings were separated by substantial time periods. For instance, the next two meetings were spaced about ten days apart with the third being two weeks later. For me, the time between slipped by swiftly while I collected literature, read and reflected. Although lengthy, the meetings went by in a flurry. There were so many changes, so many new things to observe and consider during them.

Concerning the next three meetings locations changed and numbers of those attending changed with each of these meetings. While attending them I met another participant, Jessie. She was the first president of the theatre club, continuing in that office throughout this "heritage" project. Although she questioned me more thoroughly about the study at the outset than any other participant, she became a key supporter of the research.

Jessie has blonde, wavy hair and is emphatic. She is forthright and banteringly boisterous, with a winsome smile. Jessie is popular. She was well respected by virtually all participants in the project.

The July 22nd meeting was held at Lenore's cabin. There was a confusion over location and Cam did not come. This meeting was the most poorly attended, about six in all being there. At the beginning of the meeting participants shifted again from one topic to another without resolving associated questions and concerns. One topic which did capture considerable attention was the issue of obtaining the funding. They volleyed about ideas for alternative forms of funding including a lottery for a quilt. One participant expressed ambiguity

about whether to proceed to discuss the theatre presentation in Cam's absence.

Eventually, they did discuss an idea on which Eileen had worked based on Cam's statements about tension being an essential element of theatre. She suggested a scene with a family saying "Grace" when it suddenly starts to rain during a dry spell. This conversation sparked further enthusiastic and warm discussion among participants' about their youthful experiences with rural life. I had the sense that participants had not shared such memories as a group before this.

As the meeting continued, participants began to speak of the "play" as more broadly based, a play that could be about virtually any rural community. During this discussion as well, a few more statements about life in Goetheim were made. I began to have a sense that many participants were not from Goetheim and were frustrated with the community. I determined to explore that possible theme in future. Although some administrative decisions were concretely made, discussion about the theatre presentation ended by ebbing.

The meeting of August 1st was scheduled for Anna's home, out on the deck in her backyard. It was at this meeting that I first became acquainted with Loretta. She was one of the participants seated on the deck when I arrived.

Loretta has an oval face framed with light brown hair. In her early forties, she is quiet, but staunch. Though heavy-set, Loretta's hands are quite nimble. She has several hobbies including theatre.

Other participants involved in the project said they valued her presence because they viewed her as representing some of the values of the community.

Among other contributions she made to the project, Loretta was considered a kind of barometer. Some looked to her to provide an indication of how the community would respond to the play. I gathered this through a series of comments made over time. These comments also alerted me to some participants' strong feelings of difference and distance from the community. Loretta was also viewed, I believe, as an important sign that the community was becoming involved. However, this was not explicitly expressed.

This meeting began much as the others had, with shifts and disjointed responses. A participant asked this time about an agenda. None of the participants responded with one. Jessie indicated that was not her role in this project.

After about half an hour of participants' circling discussion, Cam indicated he would like to do a theatre exercise, but the surroundings were not right. After another few moments he stated that we would try the exercise which he referred to as "physicalization".

Cam began by creating pairs of all the participants. He whispered the name of a location to each pair and said mysteriously, "Now be there". Then, despite stated trepidations, nervous laughs, each pair got up and attempted to physically "be" in the location Cam had whispered to them. The actor's minimal physical movement "in reaction" to the location's environment was supposed to be sufficiently expressive to convey that location to the audience. The

audience in this instance was other paired participants. (I formed part of a pair as there was an odd number of people at the meeting.)

As audience members, participants found that they were able to state the location in most instances -- being in a field, being in a hockey rink. Amidst participants excited talk, Cam spoke quite eloquently, quite profoundly about what he believed was possible in theatre. "It's just like you're standing there looking out and suddenly you're on the prairie. Why? That's, the power we have."

He encouraged them to have confidence in themselves, affirming some comments from earlier meetings, made by Anna, Lenore and Eileen that this was the issue. It was at this point that participants responded with what seemed to be an abrupt change after the impetus of the exercise. Several expressed an urgent need "to see it be something". Some wanted to know what "it" was going to look like on the stage.

Cam indicated they needed a framework, thematic idea. Hesitantly, Eileen's story of the family saying "Grace" was described. Cam suggested using it as a framework by creating scenes out of the words of "Grace". This discussion revealed confusion over process among participants. Some thought that research and skits developed from it would be used. His surprised response indicated that Cam had not known of the amount of work done by participants previously. Others appeared to assume Cam was directing the process and that he did not wish to have participants think in those terms yet. (Many of the conversations occurring at meetings are detailed, replete with quotations, in Chapter Eight, the Mobile-framework.)

Cam's idea of breaking up "Grace" into scenes seemed to be accepted. Participants leapt in rapidly making a series of suggestions about possible scenes. Then discussion was halted by questions of what this would mean in terms of scene changes. Cam described using a minimal set, using mime and using lighting to divide the stage into various "locations". Most participants did not appear to understand him at first. Several asked questions. Cam, speaking in the context of other such productions as the Farm Show and Paper Wheat, referred to people miming and even forming part of the set. There were jokes about playing part of a saw.

Those asking questions indicated eventually that they were actually relieved at not having to spend time creating props. Anna said that they now at least had something concrete. Near the end of the meeting Cam gave them each an assignment, to create a "frieze", a picture using other actors to mime the "snapshot" from the research done. (I do not believe that the word "frieze" was explained or discussed.)

The formal part of the meeting ended on an interesting note. Anna described a pattern of always feeling satisfied and happy at the end of meetings but becoming anxious between. When the meeting broke up, participants partook of a birthday cake made by Lenore for Anna.

The next two meetings, however, brought more shifts and changes in process. Again, not all of the same people attended. Location shifted back to the theatre for the August 14th meeting. Cam was not able to attend this meeting and participants did not work on "friezes". Participants began by asking me not to give the tape of

the meeting or to discuss it with Cam prior to the next meeting. I agreed and complied with their request.

Instead of working on the friezes , several of the participants initiated a discussion about the form of theatre Cam had proposed. They began by acknowledging a dramatic shift in their own attitude after the last meeting. The main concern described in the discussion was that the community would find this kind of theatre disappointing. The audience would expect props and sets.

Some participants had the distinct impression that they might have to act as a prop, a tree, or saw. In their discussion they began to construct distinctions in kinds of theatre. "Experimental theatre" was attributed to what they thought had been proposed at the last meeting. A second concern was also mentioned. At least one group member thought that project participants were too novice for the calibre of acting required to work without props.

In light of this desire to reject the format of creating scenes based on the words of "Grace", and minimalist sets, it was suggested that they go around the circle and write down what each participant would like to see in the play. This was done. It was interesting to note that many focused on dramatic tension. Drawing on the audience's emotions was a consistent element in each participant's response. I could begin to see that some of Cam's "teachings" on his conception of theatre interspersed in conversations were being absorbed by participants. I came to observe the contrast between the first discussion I had heard wherein participants' main focus had been on "historical facts" gathered, for example, dates, events.

In this meeting participants also began to consider time required for certain tasks. Despite ambiguity about what would be required without knowing about the form and content of the presentation, one participant suddenly indicated that she did not have the time to act and to do administrative tasks. She offered to focus on an administrative task such as promotion. Other participants responded quickly with an undertone of urgency, refusing to allow her to do this. Eileen, the producer indicated she would take responsibility for all administrative tasks so that time at meetings would not be taken up with these tasks any longer.

Toward the end of this meeting, Joyce acknowledged a previous sense of no progress when she wondered whether they had again little to show for their efforts. Another person supported that view. However, two other participants indicated that they had a list of things they all wanted in the play. They had also determined who would be acting.

The meeting ended on a particularly dramatic note. When there were questions about what an improvisation was from those who had not participated in the "physicalization" exercise, several participants spontaneously went over to the stage. They promptly improvised a very funny scene. As audience members participants laughed and clapped at the end.

Statements from at least one of the participants indicated that she could not describe how to improvise, but she could do it!

I was taken aback by this event since those who suddenly decided to do the improvisation were among those who had begun the meeting expressing a strong concern about performing in this manner.

The meeting of August 30th was another most significant one. This time location had not shifted. All the meetings hereafter were to take place in the theatre. Those attending the last meeting also attended this meeting. Prior to the meeting beginning, Cam and Jim were shifting the stagelights. They seemed to work on creating the effect of dividing up the stage to which Cam had alluded in Anna's home when discussing the format for the presentation.

Cam began by asking whether participants had worked on friezes at the prior meeting. Slowly, and with apparent reluctance some participants began to tell him what they had done instead. They began to describe their discussion. As producer, Eileen appeared to be expected to describe "the group's" concerns and proposed change of plans. However, as she was doing this, suddenly she also indicated that she no longer thought that way. She stated that after doing the improvisation at the end of the last meeting, and after watching the stagelights being changed she thought that it was a matter of lacking confidence and they could do "it".

Out of confusion, other participants spoke of concerns beyond confidence. Jessie stated that they had also expressed at the previous meeting more concern about the audience being dissatisfied. She said, "But we want to give more to the audience than standing on

stage. Cam responded with comments which supported his view of "theatre". He replied, "I don't' think you can give more. I mean that's all there is. What can you do...Produce artifacts, things?"

Their ensuing discussion about participants' concerns and "theatre" was most significant for me. I began to see that there was no consistent notion of what "theatre" was among this set of individuals. Yet, everyone (including the participant observer) had assumed there was this entity called "theatre", which we were doing. That was what was held in common, this assumption that they all had the same concept of theatre but had varying technical skills.

Through describing tension as part of dramatic content for the play, Cam had begun to affect participants' understanding of the purpose of theatre . However, only a few participants expressed their thoughts about theatre as Cam did with the same sense of profound possibilities. (These observations eventually contributed to working on identifying subgroups of people within the larger group.)

During this discussion a number of "negotiations" took place. Cam clarified his role. He said that he was there to assist them in the process of creating their own scenes; the stories would come from them. At this point Jim spoke in frustrated tones about beginning to work on writing the play and then people quitting to wait for Cam to "do it". I began to see a pattern in earlier comments indicating a dissension among participants about their own role and Cam's.

Cam also indicated that they should not confuse what he was asking them to do for the sake of building up confidence with the

actual performance. They would not be acting as inanimate objects. This was something they might do among themselves, but not for an audience. Participants eventually agree that they would work with limited sets. They then reiterated their urgent need for something concrete in terms of the presentation. Cam suggested an all-day workshop to be held as soon as possible. It was set for the following weekend, August 24th.

The all day workshop was another key turning point in participants' process. The workshop was held in the theatre. All those who had participated in meetings in the past came as a core set of individuals. This resulted in a larger attendance than at previous meetings. Including Cam and myself, fourteen people came to the morning portion of the workshop. There were three new people. One of the three did not return to the afternoon session, nor did this person participate in other aspects of the project.

I did meet two other individuals at the workshop who would continue to participate in the project. One youth, Jay, had been mentioned by Eileen in earlier meetings. There had been a concerted effort to involve more men in the project.

Jay is in his late teens. He has dark brown hair, on a head that is in constant motion. Jay is multi-talented, with musical abilities and aspirations in stand-up comedy. He personifies undaunted eagerness. He began the day quite quietly; by the end of it he had begun to show signs of boundless energy.

Cam began the workshop formally, by asking participants to be seated in a circle of chairs on the stage. It was here I noticed a

second new person, Al. Later, during the workshop I discovered that he was working with Jim and Cam on rearranging the stagelights. He was to be the main part of the light and sound crew.

Al comes with a baseball cap and gold rimmed glasses. He is in his early twenties. Al has a slow smile and a swift sense of humor. He is a patient, blonde-haired technician working quietly and expertly in the background.

The workshop format was created by Cam. He directed all of the activities and participants acted readily upon his instructions. There was no sign of dissension about his role throughout the day. Participants appeared to be happy with being given a structured set of tasks.

Cam started the morning with a "story circle". He began the story with a single line, "I woke up this morning and my car wouldn't start...". Then he asked a person sitting beside him to repeat his line and to add a line to the story. The third person was to repeat the first two lines and add a third and so on around the circle. One or two participants joked about concerns, but all were able to complete the exercise. There was a great deal of laughter as the story took several abrupt turns. I had not observed participants joke and laugh so much as a group before.

Cam followed this exercise with a series of other exercises in which people were broken into groups and worked creatively as a small group. For example, he asked each group to find an object, to think of ten uses for the object other than obvious ones, and then to demonstrate or mime those uses. After this exercise Cam suggested a

lunch break. He requested that participants bring a historical or antique object from home which had some personal significance to them.

The afternoon session began with people sitting back in the circle in virtually the same seats. Each person described his or her object (some brought two) and often added why the object was of sentimental value. The objects were passed around and observations were made about them or stories linked with them. I observed during this exercise that participants were most attentive and respectful with one another. Again, I had a sense of impetus and rhythm about their interactions.

At the end of this exercise, Cam divided everyone into smaller groups once more, with three people to a group. He asked participants to bring their object with them to the group. Then he instructed each group to build a story located in the past which would include the three articles. He added that the story should have a connection to the present.

At the time, some of these individuals working in groups seemed to me to magically create storylines. One person would simply begin by suggesting who he or she would be. Another person might begin by simply acting as he or she thought "the character" would act.

The set of individuals I chose to observe struggled to find a plotline. They also expressed some confusion about whether they had to decide everything beforehand or whether they would improvise an entire scene. When Cam came along they asked him a series of

questions. He appeared to assist them by asking concrete questions and suggestions. For example, at one point he suggested that they could all be in a train station waiting for the train.

Within about half an hour each small group "improvised" their scene. I was surprised at how structured at least two of these scenes were. One was a scene of a grandmother and granddaughter discussing Goetheim and whether there was "anything there" for the granddaughter. This scene contained scenes of the past, the grandmother's reminiscences. Another scene took place in a hospital where a wife and friend were attempting to help a patient who had suffered a stroke, regain his memory of the past.

I observed one set of participants, Jessie, Joyce and Jay creating a scene. This scene did not come together at first as the others had. The scene grew from having three people in it to four when Eileen joined the group. By evening, the scene took place in a train station with only Jessie and Jay in it. It was entirely set in the past, during the First World War.

Cam commented positively on aspects of each of the scenes when the small groups improvised them the first time. He described one as having excellent characterizations, for instance. Each group then received instructions about what to "work on", including additional scenes to build onto the one created. It was by then midafternoon.

As the scenes were repeated through the course of the afternoon, occasionally "actors" would stop abruptly. When they would not know how to proceed, Cam and participants in the audience would make suggestions. Participants also laughed and applauded each time a

scene was performed. I experienced a sense of cohesion and excitement that had not been manifest at other meetings.

The day turned to evening and a new scene was begun based on research that had been done concerning nursing. This scene was "purely" improvised without reliance on creating a story from objects. The two participants simply began with the idea that they were nurses with certain roles, and they began to speak about their lives through conversation. This scene, like the others went through repeat performances for changes and embellishment.

I was unable to see a pattern in Cam's directions to the participants. He did seem to be asking concrete questions such as "Where are you?" and "Is it cold out?" He also stated on more than one occasion that he was trying to elicit dramatic tension. The rapid change in participants' willingness and confidence to improvise, their collective creativity, the change in energy and enthusiasm and the constant change of content in the scenes, were the core of my observations.

After witnessing such a drastic change with no explicit discussion of process, I began to have a sense of this emerging process as having the profound quality which Cam brought to his notion of "theatre". About this time I began to read Social Construction of Reality, (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). I thought about the process Cam was using to have them "construct" a reality amongst themselves on stage.

Thinking in those terms, I also began to think of Cam and the participants beginning with different, individual concepts of theatre.

Through this process, it seemed that they had started to find whatever commonality they had in the concept and to build on to it by engaging in these interactions. These reflections eventually led to considering the project from a larger perspective of social process in which "theatre" was to be understood.

At the end of the workshop Cam provided participants with an assignment for the following meeting as a basis for developing additional scenes. He asked them to choose an article in the Goetheim Journal from the early part of this century. Each person was to choose his or her article with a view to developing a scene based on it. The person choosing the journal piece would then narrate the article as a preface to the scene. Cam indicated that he wished to have everyone literally create and direct a scene.

Following this workshop, shifts and turns of participants' interactions in creating the play did not appear to be so abrupt. The series of meetings which came after the workshop had a similar format. The location was fixed and a sense of a core working group grew in part from people playing particular parts. I began to see some repeating patterns in their interactions. The next lengthy series of meetings, are further condensed into brief descriptions containing only those details which stood out at the time I experienced this process.

#### MEETINGS CONSOLIDATING CREATIVITY

On August 30th the meeting began, again quite formally with participants sitting in a circle on the stage. Cam asked participants

to read the article they were asked to bring to the meeting. Some brought copies from articles taken from a 1915 edition of the local newspaper. Eileen had suggested that it was an important year for the town and area. Some brought advertisements from the same year. Jay brought an idea for a scene that he had worked out based on a melodramatic style of writing popular at the time. The evening was to be spent improvising scenes based on some aspect of the newspaper pieces.

Scenes were developed in much the same way as they had been at the workshop. Two or three people volunteered to improvise a particular scene. They would then determine a setting or begin with characters suggested to them by the article. Several scenes were created in this way, one about telephone operators, another about purchasing one of the first cars, and eventually one about a women's hockey team.

I was struck for the first time that improvisations were literally trying out what might happen in a particular situation with two or more characters while both those elements were emerging. Cam referred to this as "organically working through" a situation. He would often gently or emphatically encourage people to "try it" and "see what happens" while they were improvising.

During this process various confusions arose. For example, Cam mentioned putting a script together. Prior discussions among participants indicated confusion about whether there would be a script coming out of this process. A second source of confusion was related to content. One participant expressed some question about whether

there would be more reflection of the German Catholic heritage of the community. Cam indicated that this aspect of the culture would come through references such as christenings and weddings and words that people used.

The participants' concern also raised the question of whether additional improvisations would be added or whether that part of the process was beginning to come to a close. Cam and Eileen impressed upon those present that they were still in search of ideas. However, no indication was given about when this would cease. At the end of the evening there seemed a general sense of satisfaction amongst participants. Cam thanked them for the evening.

Cam came to stay in Goetheim the following week. To take advantage of his presence participants met three nights in a row, September 5th, 6th, and 7th. On the first of the three evenings, Cam began with asking participants to sit in a circle, as was becoming the pattern. This circle on stage included everyone from those acting to the "sound and lighting crew", to the producer.

Cam started with the story circle as a warm up. This time, he began the story as though he was living sometime in the past, "I woke up this morning and my horse was lame". Group members enthusiastically responded to the circle laughing, but also attempting to be successful in completing the circle.

On that particular evening, however, there was a distinct change. Scripts were handed out. After the story circle group members read their parts aloud from scripts which Cam had developed based on the improvisations. He had listened to the tapes I had made of the

workshop and the meeting which followed. Using his computer he had drafted up scenes based on participants' interactions.

Some participants indicated surprise at the scripts. They had not realized that discussions about historical objects and then improvisations would lead directly to the script. (Several participants marvelled about this transition later in both informal discussions and the interviews with me.) Cam indicated that he had made some changes, some transitions, but that the words were mostly theirs.

Some scenes were still being improvised before "the group" for the first time on that evening. I observed that participants tended not to volunteer so easily to play additional roles, for each person had at least two or three scenes in which they had a role by this time. In addition, despite administrative tasks slipping to the background in the last two meetings, people began to express certain needs.

Lenore indicated to Eileen that she would do some work on costumes. Eileen asked the group to come up with a title for the play since she needed one for advertisements. Group members had been energetic and enthusiastic most of the evening. Group members' high spirits prevailed and they proceeded to shout out joke titles, such as "Gone With The Canola Seed", and "Goetheim With Everything". This went on for about half an hour with some people laughing until they had tears in their eyes. No title was chosen by all. Yet, everyone seemed to leave on a happy note.

In contrast to the excitement and enthusiasm of the evening, the next day there were discussions concerning "problems" with a group member. Participants had contacted Eileen as producer to complain about Lyle's continually disruptive behaviour. Apparently some members had spoken with him about actions he had taken which were viewed as insulting to a particular member when titles were being thrown about. He had not attended most of the workshop, nor many of the meetings. After discussion with at least four others, Eileen, as the producer decided to ask him to leave the project.

The next session, September 6th, began with a photo session. All the actors and Cam as director were to have their pictures taken. These were then printed in programs to be handed out when the play was to be presented. It seemed curious to me that the producer and technical crew, who were spending as much time on the production as many of the actors, were not to be recognized in the same way. (This is consistent with other theatre programs I have seen.)

Group members were quiet during the photography session. After the photographer departed, Cam asked everyone to sit in a circle on stage. He described very briefly the need to work closely and intensely as a group. He stated quietly, on behalf of Eileen, that the producer had asked Lyle to leave because his behaviour had been disruptive.

"How do you tell somebody that a whole bunch of people don't want him around, because he was causing an undefinable kind of trouble?" He emphasized that many people had made a heavy commitment to the project. Cam added that he had observed the tension produced when

Lyle did come. I observed at least two members whose faces express some surprise at what Cam was saying.

After the meeting I considered what this might mean to group members who had barely begun to establish a working relationship. There was no long established code of behaviour and "penalties" for behaviour. Cam had sensitively described this difficulty.

Cam asked Eileen whether she wished to say anything. She affirmed what Cam had said and Jessie then spoke quietly. (It was inaudible on the tape.) Cam also asked whether anyone wished to question or address the situation. Participants were silent. The circle was soon dispersed so that actors could run through their scenes. In contrast to the night before, it was quiet in the theatre as the scenes were being acted out. After the meeting several people met at the bar.

About this time, I had completed interviews with several participants to obtain more information about their background, how they were making meaning out of their interactions, and what they were learning. I also determined that this was a way of developing a relationship with all of the participants since my role did not allow me to interact much in the activities now that they were acting. When I asked individuals in interviews what they had been learning, most had not been able to reply with concrete answers. Some did not appear to think of what they were doing as learning. Others said they could do "it" but not necessarily describe "it".

I was most interested, then, to hear their discussion when I went with some group members to the bar as was the frequent custom, after

the meetings. This was apparently where many of their reflections about the day, both humorous and serious took place. It was also the place where they began to discuss administrative concerns no longer being considered at the meetings. For example, concern was raised about promotional materials and whether to hire someone.

Their earlier concerns about the content and format for the Goetheim audience surfaced and were addressed here as well. Lenore indicated that she had "changed her opinion a lot of times on a lot of things" through the process. Anna commiserated and indicated she was having a similar experience.

Some of those present also discussed and reflected in small groups on the editing process, both in terms of acting and editing the script. I was present when Anna and Lenore were discussing what it meant for them when Cam would press them in a scene to further improvisation, "Keep on going. Go ahead with it." Anna expressed this as searching for the "essence" of the experience. When I asked how they knew what "essence" was, both replied in the same vein. "What hits you in your guts... What causes you to react...What you get bumps from." Anna added that she did not think people on stage were intellectualizing the process. Cam interjected that they did not have time, so that was his role.

As well, it was here that group members spoke of the effect of not being told beforehand that the improvisations would form the basis for the play. They expressed appreciation for the process. Several commented on how relaxed they were in the improvisations since they thought of them as one more preparation exercise. (Cam had long since

advised me of his purpose in doing it this way.) Anna described the process as "agreeable manipulation".

During this conversation Cam returned to his original premise, that the workshop process had allowed participants to experience "being there in the past" to realize what the situation would be like. He described two important elements occurring in part of the workshop. The first he referred to as a "concretization of experiences". The exercise was sharing personal, historical objects and touching them and thinking about how they felt, how they might be used. He also thought that it was most important to have that experience in common amongst group members. Having said this he wondered whether that explained group members' reactions to Lyle, for Lyle had not participated in that exercise or most of the others during the all day workshop.

In terms of other comments about "the situation" with Lyle, those present spoke mainly about one concern. Two participants thought that he might stir up resentment and anger in the community, being from Goetheim. People indicated that there had been some trouble in the last play with having him learn lines and attempting to be the centre of attention. However, in interviews I had with group members which took place after this incident at least two individuals were disturbed with the event in terms of the process. They stated that they felt he should have been given a "second chance" having been confronted with his behaviour.

Listening to the range of topics and reflection which took place at the bar, I observed a tremendous amount of learning occurring among

group members. I recognized the value of time spent in this manner. Some, however, were excluded from this process because of the location and time.

Some were too young to enter a bar and some could not attend for other commitments. This type of discussion had occurred at least in part during meetings before the sessions were dedicated to acting and working on the script. These discussions appeared to be treated as informal socializing and therefore not valued in terms of being recorded or directly relied upon for future situations.

On the third evening, September 7th, they continued to edit and add new pieces to scenes. Cam had predicted to me on a prior occasion that when participants received a script, they would suddenly read instead of act. I had begun to notice this in the last meeting, but in this meeting it was particularly evident. Actors were stiff and read carefully even those places which were virtually lifted from the individual's original improvisation. It had apparently taken on an entirely new form for them and in so doing, they found themselves in a different relationship with the ideas which they had created.

With such a change in their interactions, Cam spent some of the evening reminding them of their original feelings. As he put it on another occasion, "The work is going to be in getting the life back into it." . On that evening Cam stressed that they could change the lines to make them feel more comfortable. On occasion if actors were stumbling over a line, he would ask them whether they felt like they "would say that line". On other occasions the actor would indicate that he or she "would not say that line".

I found this particularly fascinating for it seemed to carry the strongest criteria for editing. Given the process of developing the scenes, much of the actor's personality was often bound up with the character. This was particularly true of the scenes which had begun with the objects they had brought from home. I was not always certain when they said something like "I would not say this", who the "I" was. Certainly if the actor did not feel comfortable saying the line, regardless of whether it was consistent with the character, they would stumble. I noted with interest that when people were improvising they often used the person's name for the character as well. Hence, if Debbie was playing a woman on the telephone she would be referred to as Debbie in the script and in the play. (This was changed much later in the process.)

This criteria of "I would not say that", was also applied in altered form to actions. About this time Cam began to focus more on positioning actors' actions on the stage through improvisations. For example, a most dramatic scene between a man and woman meeting in a train station, had evolved most slowly and painfully. Jessie was playing the role of the woman and Jay, the man. They had developed a friendship through the process of playing these roles.

Cam wished to increase the tension in one part of the scene. He suggested that Jay virtually stride over to Jessie and stand angrily with one foot planted up on the seat beside her. Jay tried the action and then indicated that he did not feel comfortable with it. Cam encouraged him to do it several times to get the feel of the action. When Jay stated in the midst of a struggle with himself that "he

wouldn't do that", Cam stepped onto the stage and tried it himself. Based on this experience, he modified the action a little and suggested that Jay try that.

This pattern spread to one actor's response to another's actions. For example, in one scene Lenore said to Joyce, "I don't think you'd come and sit this close to me".

Particularly through the work done on this scene between Jessie and Jay, "the Train Station Scene", I also came to observe a theme in Cam's direction which I had not noticed before this. He spoke of "subtext" quite frequently in conjunction with avoiding "talking" about things. Subtext was related to the idea that characters would refer only indirectly to what they wanted to say, hence the dramatic tension. So, for example, they might be fighting about a potato, but what they were really fighting about was whether the marriage was failing. "Talking about it" meant one described oneself fighting as opposed to acting the action so that the audience could draw that conclusion.

Cam appeared to be most concerned with developing subtext in the dramatic scenes, more than the humorous ones. Most of the scenes in development were of a humorous vein. This was fascinating for I had a sense that the actors valued more highly the dramatic scenes and those who could do them since they were a more rare phenomenon.

On September 9th, a meeting was held which Cam could not attend. When I arrived at the meeting one of the first people I saw was new to

the group. Eileen indicated that she had invited another young man to join us. She introduced him to me before the meeting started.

Arthur is eighteen and is in the process of completing high school. He has curly hair and is tall. My sense of him is that he is eager to be involved and accepted. He tells a great many jokes whenever he attends meetings.

The meeting was begun formally with everyone seated in a circle on stage. The story circle was suggested. However, it was started twice owing to some dissatisfaction with the storyline, whereupon Jim asked "Why does it work when Cam's here?" His question lingered with respect to a group sense of direction for other activities.

After the story circle one participant exclaimed, "We did it. How dumb. We don't know what to do after this." Although each scene was supposed to be "run through" and Eileen stated this, group members did not organize themselves to do so. Two or three scenes were acted, but much of the time was spent "fooling around" as one participant described the evening.

Jim, Jay, and Arthur attempted a "new" improvisation based on an article from the newspaper about "hobos". They jostled each other, made rude comments and used many anachronisms. Through the hubbub of the three, some of the women began to make suggestions from the audience, but they simply laughed after a moment or two. This embryonic scene was never repeated.

After their improvisation the men continued to feign wrestling, improvising in the aisles, creating sound effects. Group members

laughed and satirized themselves. They had begun to do some of these things at earlier meetings in the background. This pattern continued in later meetings. I was constantly amazed by their energy and that of all participants generally when they were "doing theatre".

There was some discussion among some of the women, Anna, Lenore, and Eileen about a "Christmas concert" scene but that discussion died out as well. The evening came to a vague ending. I had the sense of mixed reactions to the evening, participants enjoying a sense of "silliness" and yet feeling guilty about not working.

When Cam returned on September 13th he was advised playfully that group members had been "having fun", and as a result had not accomplished a great deal during the last meeting. The circle had become the established way to begin the meeting. At the outset of the meeting, as I sat down I observed another new face. Eileen had encouraged another man, Bill, to participate in the theatre project.

Bill is a moustached basketball player. He has brown wavy hair and is in his mid twenties. Bill is astute with a keen sense of how to create camaraderie. He is a creator of rituals and he is a storyteller.

Cam produced a revised script for this meeting. This script was substantially changed from the last. It had two Acts. Cam had cast one set of scenes as the framework for the entire play. The scenes were those of Anna and Allie which consisted of a discussion between a grandmother and granddaughter about the value of living in Goetheim. All the actors read the script intensively to see what had happened to their parts. Several participants responded with delight concerning

Cam's rewriting and editing. There was the occasional sound of appreciative laughter as people read the script.

About this time I had begun to think that there would be few changes in the process at this point. Despite experiencing so many changes, I found myself looking to settle into "a" rhythm to learn more about such rhythm. However, I was immediately startled out of both this assumption and another.

When people had had a chance to review the new script, Cam announced that Bill would replace Jay in the train station scene. He indicated that there were other places where Jay would "shine in the play". I had interviewed Jay that afternoon and he had not known at that time of the replacement, as I had not.

This changed and thereby called attention to an assumption I had held tacitly. One could lose a part one had "written". It was my impression that Bill was chosen to replace Jay because he was older, about Jessie's age and considerably taller than her. Related to power issues between the two characters, the tension in the scene would be intensified. The criterion behind the choice seemed to be "the good of the play". I added that to my developing sense of "theatre" being constructed through this experience.

I also speculated on how others made meaning of this, for no one said anything about this at the time. As well, during the evening Cam indicated that there would be no new improvisations done to add to the scenes on which they were working.

While attending this meeting I began to pay special attention to participants learning how to take theatre instructions, or directions.

I had gradually become most interested in "theatre" language Cam was using and which I came to realize participants had not necessarily known before hearing the words from him. Most did not ask about words. They appeared to "improvise", guessing at what Cam meant or waiting for further explanation.

Cam often came down to the stage and demonstrated something if the person was hesitant. He also used alternate words. Most seemed to have come to know "stage right" from "stage left" and what "masking yourself", and "upstaging yourself" meant. Cam also talked about having a sense of rhythm for knowing how long to hold a pause during this period. All of these ideas were thus attached or imbedded in acts of creating the presentation.

The train station scene began to take up considerable time at this point. Cam had Jessie and Bill redo the scene trying various changes in words and actions. He indicated that the tension was still not quite right and suggested that they work on the scene between meetings. Jessie appeared to be much more passive in the scene with Bill. Cam asked Jay to stay and provide Bill with pointers, assisting with direction in the scene.

A few group members met at the bar only briefly after the session. Bill, who had been relatively quiet when not acting, asked whether the community might be offended by anything in the play. This had been raised in past meetings in a number of different ways.

— Was there a sufficiency of props? Should they use names of actual

people who existed in the community? -- Jokes about the feminist flavor of the play with the women's hockey scene and the number of women's scenes.

On this occasion, several members leapt to defend the play. One member suggested that it was already "watered down" because of those concerns. Others did not seem to feel quite that strongly. That series of interactions reinforced my sense of group members' concern and experience as being outsiders to the community. Tension on the topic was not far beneath the surface. Towards the end of the evening I also heard rising concern from one or two members about not having a beginning or an ending to the play yet.

When I returned home I reflected on what must have seemed like an "innocent question" to Bill. I had included demographic questions in my interviews with participants. Although I had only begun the interviews the results thus far demonstrated that many people in the group were not from Goetheim and had only been in the community for a brief period of time. Most were not Catholic, practicing or nonpracticing.

In discussions about the community in the first few weeks of meetings, participants had indicated in informal discussions that there was nothing to do in Goetheim unless one was a sports fan. These comments were followed by ones expressing general feelings of being out of place not being Catholic. One participant said in an informal discussion prior to a meeting that she felt people assumed you were Catholic and when they discovered you were not, ignored you.

I also began to reflect upon the evening in terms of subgroups within the larger group. I had begun to develop a clearer sense of subgroups when beginning to have interviews with participants. Although the evening meeting and discussions at the bar had not been particularly unusual, I had noticed again that despite commonality emerging from this joint experience there were different orientations underlying participants' actions. I began to think in terms of four orientations people expressed related to their decision to participate in the project.

These initial four subgroups included: a) "socially motivated" people (those wanting to enjoy the sense of group), b) "serious" people (those who regarded theatre in a similarly profound sense as Cam held theatre; those who carried a sense of professionalism to their acting and who were regarded as "serious" by others), c) "pranksters" (those people who in the interviews somehow associated theatre with pranks, with mischievousness), d) organizers (those people who seemed most concerned with building a group for the long term, developing structure and working on a relationship with the community. I continued to carry this focus on subgroupings into meetings thereafter to "test out" this data analysis.

I met Jo at the meeting on September 16th. Eileen began the meeting by announcing that only cast people were to sit on the stage, thereby changing the circle ritual. She also announced that Jo would be stage manager. There seemed to be no precise set of activities which were attached to the stage manager's role. At first Jo seemed to do anything that was required. When we spoke in the interview that

was how she described her initial experience as well. It was some time before she constructed her own sense of the role.

Jo has short brown, angularly clipped hair and fascinating, abstract fashion accessories. She has a large laugh. She is industrious, receptive and modest, having a large variety of hobbies. Jo is considered one of the long time residents of Goetheim. It was later that I discovered she was one of the women who drafted the original grant application with the emphasis on the German Catholic heritage. She had been away on a lengthy trip.

Cam asked to have a "rehearsal schedule" set up. Eileen and Jo went off to set one up beginning with September 18th. (See the Appendices for copies of the schedules circulated.) Although one or two scenes were modified even at dress rehearsal, many were now being rehearsed more than improvised. Some might argue that after the first improvisation, any elements repeated have shifted to a more traditional form of acting. The appearance of the scripts emphasized this transition.

The evening's work was focused on repetition of scenes primarily. However, Cam began to build the beginning of the play. He had created a scene with two men putting up a telegraph pole for a place called "Goetheim". Jay and Bill volunteered for this scene. A second part of this scene had two aboriginal women coming on stage looking at the strange pole and deciding to leave. (This was a reference to early realizations and questions about "why there are no native people in

Goetheim".) Allie, who has Cree parentage, and Jessie, who lived near a reserve in Southern Saskatchewan said the lines with Cree accents. They seemed to stumble with them.

Following this scene Cam asked group members to form a human train on stage. He positioned people to form an angled front and a compartment for the "engineer". He instructed the group to begin a rhythm of sounds to recreate the sound of a train. Then he asked some to move their arms to create the illusion of wheels moving.

After this he indicated that he wanted the entire "train" to move across the stage. His instructions were given amidst a chorus of laughter, groans, and people poking each other. At least one participant, Jessie, indicated that she felt awkward doing this. Cam encouraged them to try it several times. At the last, he asked Jay to announce "Next stop — Goetheim station!" as though the train were pulling into Goetheim.

In addition to "the train" being developed on that evening, several of the women produced a poem to be used for the opening of the play. They referred to it as a "feminist poem" written by "us women". Much of it was about aspects of women's life during the period. Cam replied, "There are feminist tinges to the whole play". Some of the women began to laugh. "I wonder why? Who did that?" Jessie grinned and the laughter grew louder.

Cam also produced another modified script on that evening. People were beginning to express confusion over scripts. Eileen also

stated that she seemed to need to have extra copies because people forgot them, or took others. This was certainly an additional cost factor in the process.

The entire script was gone through quickly. Group members' responses to this new script was not generally as exuberant as they had been. When some of the actors were running through the extant scenes they discovered new lines. Some did not appear to understand the intent of the lines this time. Lenore indicated that she "could not read his [Cam's] writing", which was in printed form. Cam responded by saying, "It's your stuff!"

One new scene in the script was rehearsed in several meetings after this one, before Anna and Allie indicated that they now "got the joke". Even one of the actors with some improvisational experience confided after this to another actor that he "had got that down" and hoped "they wouldn't change it" or he would be "screwed". Script changes were apparently shifting to become associated with something requiring adjustment.

In one instance, Lenore, reading for Joyce who was working that night, stopped in the middle of reading the lines. The character in the scene was describing the most embarrassing thing which had happened to her as a nurse. The lines were actually derived from an incident that Jessie had related to several people in the bar the week before.

The awkward experience had occurred to Jessie when she had worked as a nurses aid in the past. Cam had heard it and had added it to the

script. Lenore began to laugh in a surprised manner as she recommenced saying the lines. Group members present in the audience seemed to laugh in a conspiratorial tone when hearing her. I had the sense that at least some group members experienced this as roving into "taboo" territory. Jessie indicated that she was surprised and embarrassed, thinking that this conversation was not part of improvisational work and therefore was "off-limits".

At the next meeting, September 18th, scenes were scheduled for certain times. The entire group did not attend together. Group members did not sit and watch scenes waiting for their turn. Nor was there a small but constant hubbub of conversation in the background. The theatre was much quieter. On that evening Cam also produced a new script which included the train and the telephone pole as well as the poem.

I had the distinct impression that another transition had occurred during the last few meetings. The manner of this meeting clearly had a different quality of "rehearsal" with only those in the particular scene active. Props had begun to appear and the lighting had begun to match the scenes to some extent. Cam was clearly directing. He would tell people to change their position because they were covering up their voices by the way they stood. He was much more directive in terms of instructions to move or change lines. As well, he was giving lighting directions and indicating sound cues. I had the distinct impression that he was experiencing time pressures and had had to change strategies. There were a little over three weeks remaining before the first performance on October 10th.

There were more questions about the new content. Joyce was able to attend that evening. While doing the scene as revised, she read the new lines describing her character's most embarrassing situation. Joyce did seem embarrassed. She indicated that "she would not say that", which had been criteria for change in the past. However, Cam stated that he thought she would have had fun saying it. He impressed upon her that it was the character saying it. Joyce then read the lines.

Group members seemed to have little energy that evening. As Cam had predicted to me prior to handing the scripts out, the spontaneity which flooded the original work would have to be recovered. Cam spent much of the evening sparking actors' involvement in the scene. He frequently encouraged them to "be with it", "to take time", "come out with more feelings.

Work on the train station scene between Bill and Jessie brought the evening to a close. As the rehearsal was ending Jessie asked what to do "between times". She had assumed that memorizing lines was what one did when engaged in traditional theatre. Cam indicated that she and Bill ought to work on the scene together. Given the new scheduling very few people were left in the theatre. There were no arrangements to go to the bar after the meeting.

The next meeting was held on September 23rd. Cam was unable to attend. I came in about five minutes late to discover people standing in a circle on the stage. I rushed to have my taperecording equipment ready. However, a group member asked me to stop for a moment. As the meeting unfolded it became apparent that everyone had been called to

review the play. Some had raised concerns about parts of the play. They advised me as in the past incident, to tape the session but to wait to give the tape or speak to Cam about the event. They wished to speak with him beforehand. I assured them that I would respect their wishes.

The cast then proceeded to go through the play scene by scene. Apparently, with rehearsal scheduling and through absences some group members had not witnessed the entire play in its most current form. What I found most fascinating about this process was that they had not only learned how to do some improvisational work, but they had sufficient confidence and apparently concern to rely on their own criteria for decision-making in editing. It appeared that the criterion articulated most consistently was what they felt comfortable with doing as actors. They also quickly developed a process that evening so that those who wished to, might view the scene from an audience position.

The "human train" scene which had caused some discomfort had to be redone several times for various individuals to step out and see it. It was retained based on the final comment, "It doesn't look as pukey as it feels!" (This eventually became a fondly repeated joke associated with the theatre project.) However, Jessie and Allie determined that they did not feel comfortable doing the Cree accents looking at the pole. Two other scenes were modified on similar criteria. The "objectionable" lines for the nurse character which Joyce played were replaced. Several participants expressed concern with offending members of the community.

One other scene was changed concerning the Wheat Pool on the basis that it did not contain enough historical information. Joyce who had done the research had been unable to attend the meeting on the day the scene was first improvised. The scene had come to have an ironic twist with which the actors in the scene did not feel comfortable. Several felt that there was too much emphasis on a "catty" quality in the exchanges among characters. On that basis several lines were changed. Interestingly, those who were uncomfortable with their role were also those who were allowed to modify it in keeping with the original process.

By the end of the evening my surprise at this shift had changed to a sense of how much these people had learned. I was struck by how much they had absorbed from Cam both in terms of ability to improvise and now to edit. One might disagree with the quality of the editing in some instances, however, at least a few participants had begun to develop skills to do this.

I was also struck with how this had fit with Cam's original plan to have them begin to direct and develop some independence through doing the project. It reminded me of how several people had been able to spontaneously do an improvisation without being able to articulate what it was or to describe a process. I began to consider at this point both how much they had learned and also how much had gradually changed to accommodate for the incredible amount of time this process was requiring. (The first performance night of October 10th was now only a little over two weeks away.)

In addition, I came to recognize that not all those present participated in decision-making in the same way. What had occurred fit with the work that I had been doing in trying to understand whether there were "subgroupings" within the group. However, there was an element which most group members seemed to have come to hold in common on this evening so close to the performance. That was, a consistent sense that when they thought of theatre at this point, they had come to experience their actions as viewed by this community as audience. This lay in contrast with Cam's expressed view of theatre from the absolute perspective that if they felt something as actors, the audience would, too.

After this meeting, there was considerable tension in all remaining meetings. This tension was observable in subtle ways. There was no circle, no opportunity to discuss what had happened as there had been in the first instance, on August 18th. I discovered later that Eileen had not had an opportunity to speak with Cam about the meeting the week before. He had heard about it from another member.

On September 25th group members went through their scenes with Cam voicing where changes were made and asking for reasons. Cam indicated problem "lines" and problem "areas". He asked actors to change them or to leave them out. He also appeared to explain more frequently the content of subtext in various scenes to the actors. For example, to evoke another tone from Anna as grandmother reacting to Allie's line about wanting to do more than live in Goetheim, he asked her what she thought the line meant. When Anna indicated that

she did not know, he said in her character's voice, "So you're better than me is what you're saying".

In this meeting and the next four, September 27th, 28th, 30th, and October 4th, Cam began to ask actors to refrain from using any scripts. At the end of that time he would not allow anyone to have a script on stage. Some were clearly better at learning lines than others.

Despite the tension, there was something very like magic in watching these last few days. It was literally a web of adjustment. If something did not "read", that is, it stuck out or was awkward, Cam would modify it. This might be the lighting, it might be a line, it might be an actor's position or action in relation to another actor. When the modification was made, the whole thing would be viewed again and he would then deal with repercussions of the modification in the same manner.

Now that the line was changed, perhaps, the actor's positioning was wrong. Like the actors, I could not always see "the problem", but when Cam had changed it, the scene flowed more smoothly, or I experienced the actors' interactions more intensely. Participants responded variously to his direction. Usually they simply followed his instructions. Occasionally, however, there would be a question.

During this period, there was one last major shift. On the evening of September 30th, it became apparent that Eileen was making efforts to contact Allie. Her character was established as a main

one. She was supposed to be on stage with Anna's for the entire play. Their discussion was the framework from which all other scenes were introduced.

Allie had been unable to attend at least one other meeting I began to recall, as Eileen returned to say that she had not known about this meeting and was baby-sitting. Apparently, Allie had stated that she could not come. She could not simply leave her post. Cam decided quickly that this was an emergency and that she would have to be replaced. There were only ten more days before the first performance and the scenes had to be rehearsed that night for since substantial revisions had been made days ago and had not been tried. Eileen went to call someone else.

A few minutes after receiving Eileen's request to come, Helen arrived and began quietly to learn the script. Cam addressed group members and asked them to be patient with Helen because she was new to the process. He spoke very gently and softly to Helen and Anna for a few minutes. Then they began to do the first scene after the opening telephone and train scene.

Helen is slight, with brown shoulder length hair. She is in her mid-twenties, bright, and always artfully dressed with a quiet intensity. Her strongest interest is in music, both performing and writing it.

Helen read from a copy of the script while Anna attempted to do the scene without a script. Otherwise, that evening the same pattern, slightly jarred was used in going through various scenes of the play.

By October 4th some tensions seemed to have eased in exchange for others. Immediately after the tension became apparent in the September 25th meeting, the men of the group had desisted from "playing" during breaks and in the background while rehearsals were in progress. They had stopped wrestling, "swordfighting", and creating new strange sound effects over the microphone in breaks. These antics resurfaced about October 4th. Their antics were viewed variously by group members, some amused, others distracted. For the first time people also gathered at the bar after the meeting.

However, during the October 4th meeting there were a few tensions. There was still no ending for the play. A few were concerned about this. Cam stated that his intention was to "set the script" that night. There were a number of brief improvisations done to fill in gaps. Helen and Jay completed one as part of a long-distance telephone scene. Anna and Helen also attempted to improvise an ending for their last scene. However, they were unable to resolve the scene that night. As well, Cam had rewritten a scene based on the first improvisation created. This scene was performed for the first time. Group members responded quite positively to the scene.

In relation to "setting the script" Cam also stated that he had been using the actor's name for the character she or he had been playing. He understood that some did not wish to use their name for the character. Group members then quickly made decisions about what

to name the characters they had been playing. Despite all of the changes, I had a sense that group members were experiencing a feeling of challenge again, rather than expressing an overwhelmed feeling.

This sense was further affirmed in many participants' interactions at the bar. Many of the members came. They laughed and joked interspersed with some serious discussion. Bill borrowed my taperecorder and improvised a scene as a radio announcer for Goetheim. He interviewed each of the members, some of whom were much more receptive than others. Then he "took the show on the road" and interviewed a fellow sitting by himself in the bar.<sup>2</sup>

A few group members considered the suggestion that Cam introduce the play. Someone had proposed that he describe the process used to create the play to the audience. Then cast members would do fresh improvisations for the audience to exemplify the process. Upon hearing this, Jessie suggested that Jay should go out and do them. (I believe this was a compliment to Jay who was regarded by many as having a talent for improvisation.) She exclaimed that "they were hard work!" The idea was eventually abandoned.

Before everyone parted company that night Cam matter-of-factly stated that the next week would be demanding. Three dress rehearsals were scheduled for October 7th, 8th and 9th. These would be followed by the three performance nights. When I heard the schedule this time, I had a sudden sense of urgency. On the way home I reflected on what group members might be experiencing.

## DRESS REHEARSALS AND PERFORMANCES

Eileen and I spoke October 6th, the day before the first dress rehearsal. Her voice was energetic. She punctuated her sentences with laughter as she had in the first meetings of the project. She exclaimed, "It's the general consensus. We've done it. But we don't know what we've done. Everyone's phoning each other asking, "What have we got? Will anyone like it?" They seemed most concerned about whether "anyone would laugh".

When I asked how long this had been happening she said it had started about ten days before. She continued on to say that nobody knew anymore and that it was "the same with the other one". I assumed she meant the first formal production the theatre club had presented. Her excited tension prepared me a little for the first dress rehearsal.

I had long since begun to understand that there was a "phoning tree". Participants made many references to phoning someone to discuss something. As I could not attend "those informal" meetings I listened eagerly to how members used the phone to construct part of their experience with the project.

Held on October 7th, the first dress rehearsal was of the Second Act. There was confusion about starting time. Given their inexperience with theatre traditions in general, many members did not understand that a "7 o'clock call" meant being in full costume and makeup at 7 o'clock. Some arrived at that time instead.

I discovered a technical research problem as group members were trying to remember what they had learned in the makeup workshop

several months ago. There had been other occasions when group members divided into smaller groups leaving me with a decision about what to try to observe and what to taperecord. These occasions had not been prolonged. However, for the next six "meetings", group members would be interacting in several different locales. They were moving behind stage and on stage.

While they had interacted on stage and in the main theatre I had had some chance of observing much of the activity. Now, however, in addition to being on stage and backstage behind the curtains, they were also spending considerable time in the dressingrooms. In particular, the women were using their own dressingroom, the men were across the hall in theirs.

Quickly I decided that since the men came into the women's dressingroom to put their makeup on and to receive instructions, I would leave the taperecorder there, running at all times. I was assisting the actors preparing for performance until the rehearsal or performance began, so I could check on batteries and tapes. When the rehearsal or performance began I went out to the front, assisted when I could with odd jobs and took notes the remaining time.

That evening, Cam asked to run through the entire Act without stopping. The first dress rehearsal was quite chaotic. People were moving in costumes not worn before, learning to move in ways they had not. They were sorting out quick costume changes, adjusting to closing curtains, deciding anew from which side to enter. Timing pressed people. Prior to this, one scene did not have to mesh with another. There would be a pause between one scene being reworked and

a decision to stop so that the next one would begin. There had been warning.

Suddenly a presentation set in motion evaporated, was no longer a presentation, if anyone dropped the lines. Group members scrambled to keep pace to discover what lines from scenes before would offer cues for their entrance. Sound cues and light cues had to be matched precisely and then rematched when later changes were made. And there were changes made. Cam had given new lines to Ann and the ending had to be polished.

Through all of this group members shifted action. They began to try to anticipate everything in advance. I had not thought of theatre in such tight terms. As the rehearsal continued they seemed to become better at anticipating. One person had had to ask indirectly what "cue" meant -- "You mean when I come on?" The chord of performance stretched into longer pieces. This reminded me of people picking up and holding on to more and more things as they went along. Cam appeared to carry all of them.

Several participants expressed concern with the faltering, late start to the rehearsal. There was some vague disagreement about responsibility for all costumes. In addition, Loretta and Anna expressed concern with receiving new lines for their scenes. Otherwise, group members seemed to hold themselves in, to speak mainly about what would happen on stage and how they would respond. When they ran through the Act a second time, it was split into isolated pieces of repetition. The tension appeared to dissipate a little.

The second dress rehearsal seemed of a single thread, particularly in comparison to the first one. People knew when to arrive for a 7 o'clock call, how to begin their makeup, what to do with their hair or who would do it for them. Many appeared to have stretched their "anticipatory reach". There were no new lines. People took some time to move beyond the immediacy of the rehearsal to discuss pre-play arrangements. Their discussions revealed that Eileen had invited a local choir to sing German folksongs. As well, she had invited a soloist to sing songs from "pioneer days". She had done so to involve the community and to add to the length of the presentation. It had been established that the presentation was an hour in length. Several people had expressed a concern that the audience would find this too brief. These musical performers would present on Thursday and Friday evening.

The final day of dress rehearsal, though not as chaotic as the first, saw a reemergence of heightened tension in the women's dressingroom. From the men's dressingroom loud sounds erupted. They had been improvising and making jokes the day before. This seemed a "repeat" performance.

The entire play was performed with an "intermission". The intermission music was chosen at the time. The final touch was practicing "the cast bow" at the end of the performance to an empty theatre. This created an odd effect.

Then a few pieces, particularly the poem which had become a choral piece done by the entire cast, was practised several times.

Cam emphasized the rhythm to assist members in speaking as a single voice. People appeared to find this one of the most difficult aspects of the play to master. Jay and Jim were still improvising in the background as the rehearsal ceased.

On the evening of the first performance several of the women found themselves arriving between half an hour and an hour early. Jessie and Anna stated that they did not wish to be nervous at home. There were already a bundle of flowers in the women's dressingroom which Eileen had apparently ordered for the actors.

Jo, the stage manager, was there to "set up" as was the lighting and sound crew. Richard had joined that crew and there were several stagehands to close the curtains and shift a few props. I was there to observe the occasion from the start, to organize my taperecording equipment, assist with costumes and makeup, to establish a seat in the audience and to assist as a "second body" selling tickets at the door.

Talk about nervousness was thematic; it was the chorus in the conversation. Some entered the dressingroom saying they could not remember one line. Others were literally running through their lines. Some had been nervous all day but were calm once they got to the theatre; others had not become nervous until they got there. Jay traded theories with Helen and Anna about whether it was a good sign to be nervous before a performance or a bad sign. It was established early in the pre-performance hour who had family or friends in the audience that night.

As more and more of the actors arrived and the men came in to put on their makeup, the dressingroom filled like a pool, vibrating and

overflowing. Questions about the size of the audience were passed along with the "Crimson Lake" and the hairpins. Eileen came back with reports that the theatre was beginning to fill. Cam came in to the room dressed up for the occasion with general words of encouragement and some "munchies". They greeted him excitedly. He went away to find a seat.

I also left to sit with the person at the door to assist. When I started to leave the dressingroom, for a moment I almost forgot and went out through the stage area. Through the open door I saw Jo scurrying about backstage wearing earphones. These connected her to Al who commanded the lightboard in the box at the back of the theatre. They were talking about something in cultivated whispers. There were also two youths standing close to Jo at the time.

As I held the door I realized that the curtains were closed tightly. The stage had become ground associated entirely with the performance. No one was to tread on it but the performers. Instead, I went out the side of the women's dressingroom down a long corridor, turned left down another, followed by another and thus "circled" my way back to the brown crash doors.

There was a line up of people waiting to get into the theatre when I arrived at the doors. Suddenly there were several women handing out programs. Upon seeing them I began to realize how much work Eileen had been doing behind the scenes. People had appeared as needs and therefore tasks had emerged.

Many were senior citizens. I recalled that as part of the application for funding, the theatre club had offered a free

performance to senior citizens, the pioneers. When the crowd at the door thinned I went to check my taperecorder. When I reentered the dressingroom performers were anxiously lined up half out the backstage door. However, the choir and the soloist were to perform first. The actors had a long half hour to wait.

I left them pressed against each other leaning forward listening for sounds of "the beginning". I relocated my seat in semi-darkness. The presentation was beginning. About three-quarters of the seats in the theatre were filled. The first performers, the choir was comprised of senior citizens. They sang very simply, with terse introductions from the choirmaster. Polite applause followed their songs. The soloist also received polite applause. The curtain then closed briefly. When it opened, there was the telegraph pole scene and then the "human train" performing at "its" best. Some of those around me smiled and some laughed, pleasantly. They had begun.

I thought the performance went well, generally. The addition of an audience transformed the experience. The "pieces" I had observed in construction were now a presentation animated by thriving, amusing actors.

As I had acted in the role of prompter on the odd occasion, I noticed some changes in basic lines, but was not certain whether they were new ones. There were no gaps, but a few snags. One of the things not anticipated was the bodies and heads of the audience filling up the chairs. It was difficult to see Helen much of the time because she "sat at the feet of her grandmother", Anna, at the "bottom" of the stage.

Performers were exhilarated when I went to the dressingroom at intermission. There were jokes about the "rows and rows of glinting glasses" reflecting back on the actors -- this was after all seniors' night. Several actors described hearing whispers as those who could hear translated for those who were hard of hearing. At least one person said they could hear a second wave of laughter. They seemed genuinely pleased by the response they were receiving.

The rest of the performance flowed as smoothly as the first half. I noticed for the first time that most of the more serious storylines were in the second half. There was not as much laughter but the applause was about the same.

After the performance there was a party at Cam's hotel room. It was a small room. A few people did not come because they had relatives or friends who had come to stay the weekend and to see the play. People talked and joked in a larger group. They mentioned specific points where the audience had reacted positively. Bill said of the much questioned human train, "And didn't they love the train?" Others nodded and laughed. Cam indicated that he expected more response from the audience the next night because it "would be a younger crowd". They would at least respond to different things.

The evening of the second performance, there was a smaller audience. The theatre was about three fifths full. It seemed to me that this was the "best performance" with few snags. The actors came a little later on Friday night and seemed to repeat their lines to themselves or with others less often behind stage. They seemed to be articulating fewer suggestions and instructions to each other. There

were still questions about the size of audience and discussion about their responses.

During these three days I did not have the opportunity to listen to the taperecordings of actors' interactions in the dressingroom while the performance was on. These were, however, available for later data analysis.

The party which followed the Friday performance was a lively one. People appeared to be less focused on going over what had happened in that evening's performance. Instead, they sang satirical songs and popular songs which had been modified. Some spoke fondly of the first production the theatre club had done. Those who had participated in that production described for those who had not, the storm on the last performance night. They described the night of the storm as an adventure.

When Bill and Joyce were describing the challenge of finding someone to replace the lighting crew and finding someone to replace the actor who was missing, I found myself thrilling again to the story. This sensation was followed by a sense of a fine tension between feelings of adventure and being overwhelmed. I had come to experience this tension several times in the shifting process of the last several months.

When they did discuss the play it was Eileen who reflected on its technical qualities. Eileen said, "I think that because of Cam, probably we were so good. You know. Like we had all that technical detail and all that stuff down that a lot of people who regularly see plays and people who understand theatre really thought we were good.

Very good." She added that she thought they had "matured" as a group, when remembering how panicky they had been that there would be no sets. Her use of the past tense suggested "it" was already somehow over.

Joyce responded by saying that this is how they, at least she had thought about it [the play] in the beginning. "And then we were manipulated right back into doing it," she stated. Lenore agreed. Jim exclaimed that he thought "some of the actors had matured, too". People laughed at this. I was struck by a strong sense of these people becoming a group with a growing history in common.

The final performance braved a chilling head wind. A few people came early to repair their dishevelment and to stand in line for the performance. There was no repeat performance of a magic blizzard bringing people to the play. The audience was much smaller, somewhere between a quarter to a third of the theatre was filled. cavernous, the darkened theatre did not warm to the performance.

Though it was a small audience in comparison to the first two nights, they did respond to the performance, but the sound was thinner and seemed less convincing to the actors. When I went into the dressingroom at intermission, group members seemed passive. Some had begun to speak quietly of the cast party to be held at Jo's home after the performance. Some were putting away costumes from the first scene. Boisterous noises still came from the men's dressingroom. I returned to my seat.

There were a few patterns that I had begun to notice, both in terms of the actors and the audience. One participant had been teased

at the party the previous night for leaping in and taking others' lines if they hesitated at all. This had occurred two nights in a row. I could understand this sense of urgency about gaps given what had happened during dress rehearsals and the question of timing. I also noticed that some actors repeated the same lines each night, virtually word for word. On the other hand, there were at least two different scenes in which actors were still improvising words and phrases here and there. Cam had advised them that this was acceptable as long as they did not change words associated with lighting or sound cues.

Finally, I had also begun to observe one or two scenes which did not receive applause even when all other scenes did. One in particular was the Wheat Pool scene which had already undergone some editing for "cattiness". At the cast party after the performance this was observed with no further reflection at that time.

Unlike prior cast parties, group members brought spouses and relatives to this party. There were at least twenty-five people there. Debbie who had not been allowed to come to other cast parties did attend this one. Jay also came. For a short period the entire cast was there, although some technical crew members were missing. People broke into small groups. This had not occurred at any of the other parties. There seemed an air of formality to the party. I heard very little discussion about the performance.

Soon after the party began there was a presentation. Eileen asked everyone to sit in a circle. Cam was presented with a wrapped

gift and an improvisation. Jay and Jim acted out some of Cam's firm instructions, such as "Be there". They exaggerated movements that were recognizably ones Cam made in directing them. Cam broke into huge laughter. He clearly enjoyed the event. Then a story circle was organized.

I found this particularly interesting. Having participated in several I felt a significance about the exercise. I no longer thought of it as an exercise, but a way of sharing a creative act as a group. I believe that many group members thought of the story circle in those terms as well. However, none articulated this meaning.

I reflected later that Cam had only asked group members to do this twice. Yet, group members had done it twice now of their own accord. After the story circle was complete people gradually began to leave or to disperse into corners once more. It was my last sense of "the group". The party continued until the "weave hours" of the morning. I drove home to consider this experience.

#### INTERVIEWS

Before returning to Goetheim to complete a second set of individual interviews with group members, I reviewed the first set of interviews, my notes from the field and my "Reflective Notes". From this work I developed a checklist of things I wished to cover in questions. Once more I aimed towards an unstructured interview, a conversation.

I began to arrange interviews over the phone either from Saskatoon, or while I was in Goetheim on another interview.

Fortunately, I was able to meet with each of the group members. I met with most of them in the same location as the first interview which included restaurants and people's homes.

There were a few interesting patterns which were initially discernible. Many group members expressed anger with the lack of community response to the play. Examples cited included the "poor" attendance and the fact that the local newspaper had not even reviewed the play. They had heard from no seniors' organizations. Ironically these descriptions of the community's lack of response fit with group members' early discussions associated with research about the community. Several participants had stated that the community did not tend to support anything that was not well established.

There was another most interesting pattern. A few participants articulated that once a project was over, they stopped thinking about it and went on to the next one. There were others who did not articulate this but seemed to react in a similar manner by launching into speaking of new projects. There was a general reluctance to talk about the Heritage Project. There were few exceptions to this, two being Helen and Bill who had come into the project midway. In particular, Helen was still very much excited by the process and indicated her disappointment in not having an opportunity to perform in the play again.

One or two spoke of specific problems with the play. One person pointed to the lack of growth in the characters. On reflection she thought of it as a series of skits after all. She added that they had needed to hone their miming skills.

After doing one or two of the interviews I began to realize that there had been no formal process for reflection attached to the project. My attempts to ask vague questions or to strike up a conversation had not resulted in prompting group members to reflect in the interviews. I had also realized from my earlier interviews that group members did not think of what they had been doing as "learning". If I asked questions such as, "What did you learn?" I was greeted by blank stares or received limited responses.

Knowing that the interview was going to have some effect, I determined to mentally divide the interviews in half. I began with all the interviews as I had planned them, unstructured except for the demographic questions. Once the person being interviewed would begin to shift about or sit silently, I would then determine to ask them questions which would prompt them to reflect.

In the first set of interviews, towards the end of each interview, I asked "What have you been learning?" I had expected to receive answers, for example, referring to content of historical research gathered on the community or to specific theatre skills. As previously described, from many participants I had received blank stares. They seemed not to have made a connection between the word "learning" and what they were doing.

Although I have no clear statements from any of the participants to evince this idea, my sense of it was that they had come to associate learning with a formal, instructional framework. No one was

lecturing to them in a school room format. Therefore, they were not learning despite being in the throes of creating a play for the first time in their lives.

To avoid precipitating the blank stares of the first interviews I began to ask participants to reflect back on the process as they had experienced "it". I attempted to elicit their reflections in a number of different ways. By using their own words and asking them for more concrete detail about what they meant in some senses I was asking them to articulate "subtext".

In addition to this technique, I found one way of reframing the process which seemed the most effective and respectful. This technique came from remembrance of their revealing exchanges in apparently social situations -- phoning friends, chatting in the bar, discussing ideas before and after meetings.

Based on this experience, I suggested an improvisation setting of sorts. I asked them to "imagine bumping into a friend who inquires about what you have been doing". "What would you tell them." Then if this did not get at how the person made meaning of the process, I asked a more explicit question, "How would you describe the process to them?" I met with much richer responses through this line of inquiry.

Many indicated at first that they could improvise but not necessarily describe it. They were able to find some words to express "it" to a friend. This way I also avoided people responding to my presence during the process with comments such as, "You know what it was like", or simply assuming that I did know. Nonetheless, some responses were very brief.

A few participants began to also think about the interview process as an opportunity for reflection. One participant added when we were saying good-byes that he had enjoyed the opportunity to reflect about their process and wondered why "the group" did not have a way to do this formally within the group.

I thanked each individual at the end of each interview, feeling more and more reluctance to say good-bye to the next person. I had known for some time that the road home had become permanently connected to this set of individuals. They were going on to some new snow storm of adventure, to be overwhelmed on occasion. I was going home to analyze data and to "be there".

#### CONCLUSION

The Chapters of this Part were designed to illuminate "intimate" qualities associated with fieldwork. The narrative style generally and descriptions of Chapter One and this Chapter "recollect attempts to capture the moonbeam with the jar". Although theoretical works have not been cited in the Chapter, even this stage required abstract elements for creating "the jar to catch the moonbeam".

To answer questions emerging from field experience I made a search for others' descriptions of similar experiences. What role had other researchers assumed? Discoveries about how others have conceived of related methodology and method were disclosed in Chapter Two's review of methodological literature.

This Chapter set out to respond to the questions, "What will they [the participants] do next?" "How will they make sense of the

experience and how will I make sense of all of this?" The first two questions have been answered with description of how I made ongoing sense of the experiences while in the field. However, even these analytic efforts of the moment were influenced by how other researchers had conceived of related research. Chapter Four outlines these discoveries.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Despite testing it at home, I discovered that when I tried to use my taperecorder on site at this first meeting it would not work. Rather than become a distraction I put it to one side and took notes. I have labelled many statements from this meeting as "paraphrased", although most were copied quite accurately, I believe.

<sup>2</sup>When I interviewed those who had come into the process after the first scripts had been created they expressed disappointment with missing that part of the process. Bill and Helen both stated their fascination with the process. They appeared to reflect a sense that they had missed a "golden age" or something very like, although they did not use those words. They regarded themselves as not having improvised and yet both had done at least some original work, filling in pieces.

#### REFERENCES

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.

Bolton, G. (1979). Towards a theory of drama in education. Burnt Mill, Essex: Longman House.

Heathcote, D. (1984). Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama. London: Hutchinson.

Kidd, R & Selman, J. (1979). Popular theatre, social action and adult education. Learning, 1979 (summer), 15-17.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### STAGE CUES:

#### Review Of Literature Related To Data Analysis Of The Fieldwork Stage

What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba  
That he should weep for her?  
- Hamlet, II, ii, line 543.

You have to work through something in order to find it.  
Cam) S-6B-951.

### INTRODUCTION

To recreate a sense of the fieldwork stage of the study, the last three chapters and this fourth one, all of Part One, have been arranged to convey the interactive nature of fieldwork data analysis and library research. Chapter One described the opportune entry into the field accompanied with questions of methodology and method. Chapter Two chronicled a searched response to these questions in the form of a literature review of methodology and method. That Chapter concluded with fieldwork data analysis questions concerning how to interpret participants' ongoing interactions. Chapter Three, a condensed chronology continued the narrative of the field experiences. This Chapter returns to other areas of literature which were reviewed in response to questions from fieldwork data analysis.<sup>1</sup>

A single, broad question encompassed questions from data analysis. What resource material could assist in explicating "what they [participants] did next" and "how they made meaning of their interactions"? That question changed in research transit. The question sought a single theory to provide explication for

observations in the field. When no single theory provided adequate explication the question shifted to "What variety of explications or theories, were available to begin to construct how participants were making sense of their experiences?" This new form of the question guided the beginning of what became a search through multiple areas of literature.

The methodology required an inductive approach (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) to the research. Not only did a search of literature fail to locate one theory which could provide adequate explication for discoveries in data analysis, I did not locate a defined area of literature. Hence the reference to "multiple areas of literature". What follows is a description of delineation, a conceptual trek through a number of different literatures.

Discoveries from library research and data analysis from the field worked interactively to prompt and then define new areas of library research. For example, I began scouring the libraries for, and speaking to resource people about possible materials in relation to both methodology for participant observation and materials written about projects which might parallel the fieldwork experience. The two areas of research might have melded into one if descriptions of a parallel project or projects including a clear methodological description had been discovered. None, however, were located.

This supported a branching of efforts resulting in two distinct areas of research. The first branch became referred to as

"Methodology and Methods Resource Materials". The second branch which emerged from fieldwork questions concerning parallel projects became entitled "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials".

Prompted by fieldwork data analysis and discoveries from the first two areas of research, three other branches "grew": "Theatre Resource Materials", "Adult and Community Education Resource Materials", and "Social Theory Resource Materials". Reference to these five research areas are by formal title to link them with the Bibliography. The thesis' Bibliography has been compartmentalized to reflect these delimited areas of literature.

Chapter Two outlined findings in the research area of Methodology and Methods Resource Material. This Chapter furnishes an overview of the four remaining areas as a foundational construction for further focused data analysis.

The areas of library research are arranged with a view to respecting the chronological order of the research as much as possible. As previously indicated, this format is intended also to provide insight into an interactive decision-making process between fieldwork data analysis and library research. It is important, however, to recognize the conceptual artifice of a chronology in reviewing the library research accomplished. After fieldwork commenced several areas of literature emerged as described. At some points during the fieldwork all of these areas were researched concurrently. Yet for simplicity's sake the findings from each of the four remaining areas are outlined separately.

This review commences with the research area entitled "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials". As one of two branches initially identified for library research work, this area formed part of the starting place for research. The area of literature also proved to be a primary basis from which the other three areas of more specific research were determined. For example, research of "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials" revealed a need for more substantial social theories to explicate participants' process within which learning might then be explicated.

In the following reviews of these four areas of library research, an introductory section discloses context including purposes for research in that area. In addition it provides indication of the broad parameters of the search. An overview of discoveries made through the research follows the introductory sections. Discoveries from literature research are then linked to discoveries of the fieldwork in concluding sections for the four reviews.

## ADULT EDUCATION AND THEATRE RESOURCE MATERIALS

### INTRODUCTION

The thesis objectives outlined in Chapter One fitted with this "second" branch of research: b) To relate the rich description to literature concerned with possible relationships between theatre and adult education. However, in the urgencies of fieldwork experience, this objective was transmuted into a more interactive form.

In order to develop a "rich description", data analysis was required. A question arose from the beginnings of data analysis.

"What variety of explications or theories were available to begin to construct how participants were making sense of their experiences?"

To answer this question from data analysis literature was gathered which would describe how other researchers in adult education conceived of or analyzed their experiences in the field. A need to understand how other adult educators might construe this experience was heightened by revelation that most participants were not generally making sense of this experience in educative terms.

To discover how others linked theatre and adult education and to make sense of participants' perspectives, I looked to adult education literature related to theatre. A search provided affirmation of not one link but many between concepts of theatre and concepts of adult education. The search soon exposed a large area of generally related research.

As I surveyed existing resource materials none appeared to parallel the study in a way that I recognized. This realization produced another. Literature located was so thoroughly diverse that, without more in-depth comparison among the studies and writings, no criteria was available to clearly assess which elements might provide even partial explication for the ongoing study.

Based on this recognition I then developed a framework through comparing the literature. This was a lengthy procedure. An edited version of that procedure is reproduced in this section as a vital part of the thesis work. Imbedded in it are discoveries related directly to data analysis. This process also led to identification of other areas of research.

## DISCOVERIES THROUGH RESEARCH

Whether one thinks of theatre as a "dramatic" gesture or as acting out a role to illustrate an idea or event, the search affirmed that concepts of theatre have been closely connected with concepts of adult learning for many centuries. In fact, one might easily speculate that concepts associated with theatre and adult learning have been intimately connected since human beings developed consistent means of communication (Goffman, 1959; Perinbanayagam, 1981).

By beginning the search in adult education based literature related to theatre, a specific set of assumptions had been set off. I had chosen a perspective in contrast with most participants' particular perspective. I was to consider concepts of theatre as they have been applied and understood within contemporary concepts of adult education. Even if adult education literature has begun to recognize that adults have been learning on their own outside of formal institutional frameworks (Tough, 1979), by using that literature as a theoretical framework we still study adult activities through the "eyes" of modern-day adult education.

The formal concepts which shape our contemporary point of view include the definition of who is an adult, what learning is, and even how to do research to develop theories about these concepts in relation to concepts from other disciplines such as theatre.

Purposes in researching this area of adult education literature as they emerged were:

- To discover various contexts within which concepts of the theatre and dramatic technique<sup>2</sup> are being applied within adult education.
- To focus upon the nature and purposes of these various applications of theatre and dramatic technique within various contexts as described by extant adult education literature.

In other words, to provide context for my own experience in the field I intended to gather and reflect upon the experiences and conceptual frameworks of those who were working in similar areas.

Based on these purposes, references of two types were sought:

- a) Those references purporting to provide a theoretical framework or overview of any literature written about "theatre" or "drama" in relation to adult education.
- b) Those references purporting to chronicle projects combining aspects of adult education and theatre.

The findings from the research follow.

a) References Providing A Theoretical Framework Or Overview

No single reference which could provide an overview or theoretical framework containing the entire range of diverse projects and perspectives was uncovered in the exploration for descriptive references. Landy's Handbook of Educational Drama and Theatre (1982), drew nearest to satisfying the quest for an overview and a developed conceptual framework.

Landy's book, however, emphasized theatre in connection with children and it focused entirely upon projects in the Western World.

As neither of these points of emphasis were deemed required delimitations for this study's exploration, Landy's book was not used as a guiding theoretical framework. The absence of such an overview or theoretical work suggests a very significant gap in adult education literature.

Despite this gap in adult education, there were many works to be found on theatre and education. These were mainly written for teachers working within the school system (Kerslake, 1976). I have included a subsection in the Bibliography, "Education and Theatre Context References" to list those which were of particular interest to the study.

Several of the works consulted had combined theory about special qualities of theatre process with instruction on how to use theatre in the context of the classroom (Heathcote, 1984; Bolton 1979). Although these materials were written for educators working in an entirely different context from that of the study, they were of assistance in one particular area.

Their discussion of theory concerning theatre process provided initial aid in making some sense of participants' improvisational work done as a basis for creating a script. Heathcote's statement of purpose was particularly helpful in understanding Cam's directions to participants' in this process:

In this work, drama, what we are trying to do is to make ordinary experiences significant, and that's a hard thing to do. That is the excellence we strive for. To distort experience into significance means that we have to get children to pay attention, and they may not have the vocabulary for it. (1984, p. 24)

Heathcote's works referred to other elements which affirmed emerging themes in the study. Her focus on "distortion" for significance placed meaning creation at the forefront of purposes for theatre process. It suggested a special meaning, "beyond the everyday", associated with theatre. This sense of special meaning was to resonate later with a theme of "the profound" in participants' interactions related to theatre. She also stated that education and theatre are both processes of change (1984, p. 114). "Process" and "change" became focal points of the study. Heathcote's writings contributed with others to affirm these two themes as central to the work.

Both Bolton and Heathcote's writings are addressed to a specific audience, teachers within the school system. Their works are concentrated on improvisational aspects of theatre. Their discussion of theory is primarily limited to this process in the context of working with children. In contrast, fieldwork data analysis began to emphasize a larger social process beyond improvisational work.

First, this was not a classroom but a set of people coming together. They were not a "group". Second, when the project began there were many interactions prior to improvisation. Finally, they not only improvised but created a script. Their interactions changed through that process.

Data analysis indicated towards the end of the fieldwork that the study had "outgrown" the narrower intent of these works from education. However, through reflection on these works and others I came to recognize a need to consider works which had a broader focus

on social process within which concepts of theatre could be explicated.

Recently I located another author's work in this area which did refer to a more encompassing social theory. The author, Ken Robinson, has worked with Bolton and Heathcote. He created a collection of writings by those working primarily within the school system context (1980). His chapter in the book, "Drama, Theatre and Social Reality" has held great interest in terms of focused data analysis for this study. The work is brief, however, given the complex subject matter and the number of topics about which he is writing. This includes distinguishing between "drama" and "theatre". His chapter has functioned to supplement other works on social theory. I refer to it once more in Part Two.

In the search for theoretical resource materials a few of the materials located in the broader field of education discussed theory from that very different context. However, the search for theoretical writings and overviews within adult education related specifically to theatre proved unfruitful at this early point in the fieldwork stage.<sup>3</sup> While this search continued, I also sought another set of resource materials still within the context of adult education related to theatre.

b) References Describing Projects Which Combine Aspects Of Adult Education And Theatre

This search divulged a wealth of references. Several of the references suggested a long standing link between adult education and theatre (Kidd, 1984; Lovett, 1983, p. 5; Selman, 1976, p.31; Unesco,

1982, p. 42). Proliferation of pieces written about projects concerning theatre and adult education has occurred since the early 1960's.

This recent increase in publications with theatre and adult education as their subject matter demonstrates growing interest in use of theatre for adult education purposes. A survey of these publications indicated that relationships between adult education and theatre abound in a variety of forms. A general description of discoveries from the search has been included to portray diverse elements in resource materials located.

In a few instances materials were produced by agencies promoting the use of aspects of theatre (Canadian Popular Theatre Alliance, 1985; Unesco, 1982). A few of the other resource materials located included more abstract, theoretical orientations combined with a brief history of the use of aspects theatre (Hewage & Radcliffe, 1977; Kent & Carter, 1974; Kidd, 1984; Lambert, 1982).

The majority of more recent resource materials in this area may be characterized as brief descriptions of projects in which aspects of theatre were used for various purposes. Generally, the descriptions were from the author's perspective, that of an adult educator, psychologist or occasionally a theatre professional. In other words, they were not written from the perspective of the learners, clients, or audiences. The authors' role in most of the projects described in the references took the form of facilitator, or actor (Baird, 1972; Brookes, 1974; Pickering, 1957; Radin, 1985; Shank, 1977).

In virtually all of the references when an author/researcher referred to intended learners in a project they were described as if they were a group of homogeneous individuals. Distinctions among the members of the group, the roles they had in the group, differences in perception among those in the group were rarely explored, although there were a few exceptions to this generalization (Barndt, 1980; Chambulikazi 1989; Kidd, 1983). These works will be considered in Part Two which describes focused data analysis related to resource materials with an emphasis on theory development.

A comparison of the authors' perspectives revealed that the objectives for using theatre varied quite dramatically from one project to another.<sup>4</sup> To discover which projects might bear the closest resemblance to the study at hand, descriptions of projects were consulted to determine their a) purpose, b) apparent structure, c) the researcher's role in the project, and d) the researcher's/author's "frame of reference". By frame of reference I refer to an individual's perspective or orientation, which were in these instances, generally rooted in a particular school of thought within a profession or discipline. In other words this is the "context" from which the author wrote.

Some authors explicitly stated their context or frame of reference such as psychology (Moreno, 1977) or community education<sup>5</sup> (Kidd, 1983). In those cases wherein the author did not explicitly state a frame of reference, clues in the writing were relied upon such as:

- The terms the author used and how the terms were used. For example, in some of the references use of the terms "the patient" and "the therapist" suggest a framework from psychology as opposed to adult education.
- The described objectives of the project or work.
- The references cited.
- The journal or text in which the reference material was located.

In sifting through the resource materials located in the library search, it was discovered that there were four basic frames of reference from which authors were writing:

- Mass Education, Literacy Campaigns, and Adult Basic Education.
- Popular Theatre.
- Psycho-drama.
- Professional Actors Exploring Aspects of Theatre Related To Community Education.

Section Two of the Bibliography, "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials", consists of subdivisions to reflect these frames of reference.

The first two frames of reference reflected in authors' project descriptions are anchored in concepts from a broad adult education framework. Writings suggesting these two different frames bear very different ideologies concerning community education. These differences have been described as a "liberal" approach versus a "liberating" or "radical" approach (Brookfield, 1984, p. 67; Lovett, 1983, p. 4). Despite distinctions in ideologies those writing from these frames of reference still fall within a common, larger framework

of adult education in terms of focusing on work at the community level.

The third frame of reference, "Psycho-drama" has strong connections, developed over time to an adult education framework. Role-playing exemplifies a conceptual link between the two. Writers whose works suggested this frame of reference brought concepts rooted in psychology, to their theories and activities described. Common among these writers was a focus on working with the individual in a therapeutic form (Moreno, 1977).

Finally, the last frame of reference listed suggests a third major framework, "theatre" as a fine art. The focus for authors writing from this frame of reference is first on theatre. Education may be viewed from within that larger frame. It is the mirror image of adult educators studying elements of theatre as a tool for education.

There was a chief purpose in classifying and exploring the "frames of references" from which resource materials were written. This was to understand more about the nature of the differences among projects, at least in terms of how they were represented, as shaped by authors' frames of reference.

There were many differences observed between projects within distinct frames of references including differences in the roles of those involved, and differences in the concepts and language employed in association with the different projects. Understanding more about the different frames of reference led to other forms of library research, but it also led to new observation in the fieldwork.

Despite differences among frames of reference from which theatre was being used and described, there was one very broad theme consistent in all project descriptions. A theme in each project's objectives was to assist individuals (in some form) to understand more about themselves. It is all the more fascinating then, that despite this focus on assisting participants to understand more about aspects of themselves and their circumstances, what is apparently missing from literature is research focused upon recording perceptions of participants while they are engaged in one of these projects.

Of those resource materials which did describe effects experienced by participants, many of the descriptions, relied on traditional forms of behavioral evaluation in education (Tyler, 1949). These outlined peoples' behaviour and their responses to the theatre presentation (Bordes, 1982; Moreno, Clason & Borja, 1973).

This concludes a very brief and generalized accounting of the discoveries made through researching literature in the area. Having consulted resource material to understand how others conceive of links between adult education and theatre, the focus shifts now to fieldwork data analysis in relation to findings in literature reviewed.

The purpose of the research, apparent structure of the project, and the researcher's role and frame of reference were used to contemplate the study in light of library research findings. The study's key objective was to create a description of a process involving theatre, as was the case for most of the resource materials surveyed. However, many descriptions in the resource material were intended to be brief pieces to simply advise colleagues of an exciting

"new tool" (Moreno et al. 1973; Panday, 1986). The context in which the study took place contrasts with this.

The research began with an intent towards thorough study and reflection on one experience with people using theatre as a process. In terms of structure of the project the study also lay outside the spectrum of those described in the literature. On first blush, the structure of the project fit most closely with the last frame of reference, "Professional Actors Exploring Aspects of Theatre Related To Community Education". However, these were neither "professional actors" creating a play, with or without political overtones (Filewod, 1987). Related to other frames of reference -- these were not "students" learning about a particular subject through an educational play (Davis, 1983; Minister, 1982).

The theatre project was initiated by a community theatre club. Those partaking in the project were not professional actors. They had little experience with presenting theatre and many were not from the community. In creating and presenting a play about the history of the community, they were "the learners" upon which the study is focused.

In comparing the apparent purpose and structure of the project with other frames of reference, there was no perfect fit. A possible, uneasy fit with the fourth frame of reference was made more difficult by contemplation of the researcher's role and frame of reference.

Thus far, the purpose and structure of the project has been described in a manner consistent with my frame of reference and role as researcher interested in adult education. In Chapter Two many aspects of that frame of reference are reviewed through description of

ethnographic methodology and methods. Again, in contrast with other authors' frames of reference within adult education mine derived from a specific sociological and anthropological context. This shaped my role and the description created in the study.

As the thesis objectives state, the description of the project was not intended to be "brief", but rather "rich" in detail. Although the description was to be written from the author's perspective that perspective was to be mitigated by the methodological focus of the research.

#### The Methodologically Assigned Role Of The "Author"(Researcher)

The "author" of the research was not invited into the community in the capacity of an active adult educator in relation to the group. Nor did the author arrive as a director. I was accepted as a participant observer/researcher. Valuing the established role of participant observation researcher, I avoided facilitating any of the group members' sessions being particularly careful not to be the "expert" in the writer-director's absence.

#### The Methodological Focus Of The Research

While engaged in the fieldwork, I focused on the perceptions of the individuals. I endeavored to understand how the individuals as part of a group were making meaning of the process in which they were engaged. In creating a synthesis of individuals' perceptions, as researcher I was acting as a filter, de-emphasizing the dichotomy between learner and facilitator.

Shaped by the methodology, themes emerging from data analysis during the fieldwork emphasized the nature of the social process

amongst group members. Studying the nature of their social process and possible relationships to a learning process was very different from all other descriptions of projects. In focusing upon how group members' perceptions and actions contributed to that social process, the thesis reached beyond describing individual learners as a homogeneous group.

The context of the study offered a unique opportunity to explore both heterogeneity within a "group" and details of process within a community project. Search for parallel studies which might provide a cohesive explication for observations in the field was unsuccessful. However, there was a beneficial bi-product of the search.

An attempt to fit the project into one of the four frames of reference was abandoned for the moment. Through contrasting and comparing the study with other works, qualities which were unique to the study became illuminated. This led in the focused data analysis stage to strategies in terms of theory generation.

The next area of literature review emerged from one of the study's "unique" focuses, a desire to be sensitive to these participants' perspective or frames of reference which differed from my own focus on adult education.

## THEATRE CONCEPTS RESOURCE MATERIALS

### INTRODUCTION

Listening to the writer-director use theatre terms, "Stage left --"; watching group members try to intuit what those terms meant, "--No, stage left" and then begin to use them; experiencing an excited

stir when watching theatre rituals such as the lights being turned down and the curtain slowly ascending; all these field observations first spurred a search to discover more about the concept of "theatre" as viewed from the discipline of theatre.

A second source of impetus came from fieldwork data analysis. The longer I observed and participated in the project, the clearer it became that strong emphasis upon adult education concepts was specific to me as a researcher of adult education. The main emphasis for many group members was developing "theatre eyes and ears", particularly in the middle of the process of developing a script. That is, they were straining to become familiar with theatre vocabulary, theatre process, theatre thoughts. As a researcher then, I was prompted by this common development in group members' perceptions to discover more about a world they were drawing into their own.

A third source of impetus for seeking out background information on theatre resulted from the work on the four frames of reference. When commencing the search for resource materials on use of theatre in adult education, research was not delimited by way of determining definitions for adult education or theatre. Resources were discovered under many different reference systems including "Recreation". There was no carved out "area of literature" in indexing systems.

In doing research of a multidisciplinary nature delimiting has been one of the most difficult aspects of the research. To avoid overlooking a possible parallel project, as much material was gathered as was possible.

Despite the fact that many of the materials had a similar format, that of brief description of projects, there was incredible diversity in the authors' perspectives. For example, operating from an adult education framework in using concepts of significance to adult education, the role of the worker might be described in adult education terms as "facilitator", or as "teacher". Yet in other descriptions, the worker might be an "artistic director", or a "psychiatrist". The objectives were very different, therapeutic, educational, artistic. This precipitated creation of the classification system based on authors' "frame of reference" which was outlined in the previous section.

In some instances, following references from one monograph to another, research led into areas wherein the objectives of projects were almost entirely artistic objectives. Resource materials reflecting such a frame of reference were described in the previous section as "Professional Actors Exploring Aspects of Theatre Related To Community Education".

There were three major influences then to explore literature written from a theatre perspective: a general personal interest generated from the excitement of watching the play become a presentation, a need to have a sense of the place into which this theatre "group" was entering (and creating at the same time) and a need to understand and distinguish authors' frame of references in resource materials. All of these prompted a small excursion into the exclusive world of theatre.

The excursion was planned from the outset as being introductory in nature, a brief interlude. Avoiding the ubiquitous and wonderfully rich, but often huge debates created by differing schools of thought in any discipline, two introductory monographs were selected. One of the monographs was chosen because it was written in a traditional manner of some years ago (Millett and Bentley, 1935). To indicate how "traditional" concepts had changed, a more contemporary introduction written with university drama students in mind (Brockett, 1984) was selected as well.

To supplement these descriptive works, a book was obtained which was written by a "practitioner" (Brook, 1968) and which is held in high regard by many in the theatre profession (Brockett, 1984). I also selected other materials which addressed concerns of those working in professional theatre, and which distinguished between professional theatre and community theatre (Davies, 1967; Corrigan, 1984; Hampton, 1967; Kamarack, 1971). The latter materials provided a sense of how theatre might be viewed in several contexts.

#### DISCOVERIES THROUGH RESEARCH

Thus far the impetus for library research in the area of theatre and the choice of research materials have been described in some detail. Unlike the other four descriptions regarding areas of library research, however, a review of the content will not be provided herein. Because of the nature of the literature sought out, a review would constitute a litany of terms and definitions.

For the purposes of data analysis during fieldwork one most significant point emerged from these readings. No matter who defined "theatre", two elements were included. All expressed a profound aspiration -- theatre must strive to be "art". A second key element in the art is to entertain (Brockett, 1984, p. 8). This is a different starting point from that of adult educators.

There is an important purpose for describing objectives in researching theatre resource materials. It exposes a struggle arising out of a combination of data analysis during fieldwork and related discoveries in the literature. From this struggle emerged a recognition concerning the nature of the research work. This was a multidisciplinary study with all the attending benefits and issues related to such research.

With a few exceptions (Chambulikazi, 1989; Kidd, 1983; Russell, 1977; Selman, 1987) the resource materials reviewed in the first area of library research did not generally struggle with issues of differences in perspectives arising out of multidisciplinary work. As previously described differences in conceptual frameworks can lead to many differences in action. For researchers reading others' descriptions two examples are the creation of strikingly different assumptions about objectives and very different assumptions about roles (Russell, 1977).

Arguably, one might attribute such a significant gap in extant literature to a lack of resource materials providing an overview or criterion for reflection upon diverse projects. In future, brief project descriptions in adult education literature might also include,

as Russell (1977) and Selman have done (1987), reflective sections about issues which stem from multidisciplinary differences.

Issues arising out of multidisciplinary work are not confined in adult education to links with theatre. Adult educators often attempt work of an integrative nature with other disciplines. This attempt to integrate commonly takes the form of teaching the content of other disciplines, continuing professional education being one example (Cervero, 1988; Houle, 1980). As well, it may include attempts to integrate style of presentation, two examples being theatre or psychology through role-playing.

In addition, concepts from other disciplines are used as part of the adult education conceptual framework. For instance, aspects of learning theory such as the concept of "need" are largely derived from the psychology framework (Monette, 1977; Ruddock, 1971). Adult education may be understood as having several multidisciplinary aspects.

Struggle with the multidisciplinary nature of the work continued to erupt in various forms throughout data analysis. It resurfaces in the next section as part of an ongoing problem of delineation in the third area of literature review, "Adult And Community Education Resource Materials".

This draws to a close a review of two areas of library research. The resources located through these two areas were primary aids in fieldwork data analysis. Areas of library research next reviewed,

were created as part of a concurrent, continuing quest for theoretical frameworks which might then be applied to the stage of focused data analysis.

When these library researches were initiated to provide incipient context, analysis of data was incomplete. Consistent with the hermeneutical circle, library research for a theoretical framework was done with an air of tentativeness. That same air of tentativeness prevails in summaries of both the third and fourth areas of library research begun.

#### GENERAL ADULT AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION RESOURCE MATERIALS

##### INTRODUCTION

This was a third area of library research determined during later stages of the fieldwork. When research in the more specific area of "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials" failed to reveal a theoretical framework which provided adequate explication for data analysis, I returned to the larger reservoir of adult education literature. In doing so, however, I considered guides for delimiting within that larger area.

Two guides evolved. One came from reliance on themes which had by now begun to emerge from data analysis. Another resulted from a return to the "frames of reference" developed from findings in "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Materials". Findings from the latter process will be described first for continuity's sake. Prior to this, however, a cautionary note.

Discoveries described in this Chapter are those made through research occurring in close connection with the immediacy of fieldwork. As such they are "early discoveries" in a long process of discovery. By completion of the study, concepts "discovered" have been subject to substantial modification. For instance, a few resource materials upon which I came to rely did not exist when these initial "discoveries" were emerging from extant resources.

Some of these "discoveries" then, have long since been reconceptualized based on both further focused data analysis and those additional resource materials collected after completion of the fieldwork. However, descriptions of these early discoveries which took place in the context of a fieldwork focus have been included to indicate foundations for later developments in the research.

#### DISCOVERIES THROUGH RESEARCH

Findings from the first area of library research, Theatre and Adult Education, acted as one guide to searching for a narrowing of focus for research in adult education literature. As previously described, the initial search for combined adult education and theatre references disclosed an astonishing display of diversity. Project descriptions demonstrated many ways of combining aspects of theatre and adult education. None, however, ostensibly paralleled the study at hand. Nor did one in particular provide a cohesive theory or explication for fieldwork experience of this study.

To make some sense of this creative, conceptual chaos and to attempt to locate possible links with the study, I reflected on

authors' "frames of reference". This resulted in the four frames of references named in the "The Theatre and Adult Education Resource Material" section: a) Mass Education, Literacy Campaigns, and Adult Basic Education; b) Popular Theatre; c) Psycho-drama; and Theatre Groups Exploring Aspects of Theatre Which May Have Community Education Applications.

While engaged in this process the first time, I considered data from the fieldwork to discover what frames of reference might be found there. The task was complex. The author in each case was the single interpreter or filter system for all of those involved in each project. There was only one frame of reference articulated.<sup>6</sup> In relying on the author's description, his or her singular framework was used to determine the frame of reference for each project. This formed the basis for the critique concerning participants' perceptions treated as a homogeneity in evaluation of the projects.

In the instance of this study, as researcher it was my assumptions which have formed the frame of reference. However, based upon the methodology I attempted to reflect upon being a filter for the combined perceptions of all those involved in the project. One of the themes generated out of fieldwork data analysis was participants' differing perceptions of their experience.

For example, some participants had indicated a keen interest in theatre as art. These participants viewed themselves in a professional light of striving towards theatrical excellence. They tended to discuss the community in terms of audience, people attending the performance who must be impressed with the theatre production.

In contrast, a few participants tended to indicate concern in the project from an organizational and community development orientation. When discussing the community as audience, particularly at the start of the project, they expressed interest in making a contribution to the community. These comments indicated that they viewed people attending as members of the community who might learn more about their community through the play.

When I initially compared the study with the four frames of reference I considered briefly what I understood of participants' perspectives or orientations. Neither the structure of the project, nor participants' diverse orientations towards the purpose of the project combined to fit exclusively well within any of the frames of reference. However, when returning to the larger area of adult education, I did not look for a perfect fit. Instead I looked for cues or a signal which might assist in narrowing the research to an area within adult education literature.

Given that there were differences in perceptions of the group members, and given that the project had many different aspects, arguably it might be described as falling within each of the frames of reference. The "Psycho-drama" and the "Mass Education, Literacy Campaigns, and Adult Basic Education" frames of reference had extremely few links. The "Popular Theatre" and "Professional Actors Exploring Aspects of Theatre Related To Community Education" frames of reference fit the most neatly with the largest number of group members' perception of the project as well as my own orientation.

Psychodrama, rooted in a focus on the individual and the therapeutic was eliminated as were those areas of adult education focused on literacy and adult basic education. When surveyed, resources revealed a strong link between the final two frames of reference: Popular Theatre and Professional Actors Exploring Aspects of Theatre Related To Community Education. In some instances it was very difficult to distinguish between the two. One of these strong links is that focus was on the community and theatre was reflected upon as a social process.

Through this process of deduction cues suggested that community education was the best "uneasy" fit. I began to explore the area of community education for theoretical frameworks which could provide adequate explication for findings from fieldwork data analysis.

There were several dimensions in community education literature reviewed which recommended it as an area of research within the larger area of adult education. Literature identified with community education included a broad range of activities (Armstrong, 1977; Brookfield, 1984). With such a strong emphasis on "theatre perspective" the study required broad conceptual confines.

Community education literature has been searched twice. It was searched once among other areas of adult education for resource materials concerning theatre. The second search, de-emphasized theatre and focused upon more general theoretical works applicable to findings from the fieldwork. The remaining review of this area

outlines my efforts during the fieldwork stage to obtain an overview of community education literature as a prelude to locating theoretical frameworks within the area.

In this preliminary research I continued to consider themes from the fieldwork analysis. Several had emerged at the forefront. A focus on understanding a relationships between learning and social processes was most important. A particular aspect of this process was also emerging. I had observed an element in participants' interactions which came to be described as a tension between a desire to explore and a need for certainty.

Despite developing a sensitivity towards community education viewed from issues of "power" through reviewing "popular theatre" resource materials and Freire's work (1973, 1985), I found that this framework did not provide explication for a number of themes arising from data analysis. I set out with these findings as context for obtaining an overview of community education literature.

To begin with, there was an interesting knot within a tangle of terms. (In an earlier footnote I have referred to confusion concerning the terms community development and community education.) On occasion, "Adult education" is also used synonymously with community education (Kirkwood, 1980; Lovett, 1971). This suggests a confusion in the conceptual relationship between the two. Indeed, there were one or two references which raised the issue of their relationship (Jackson, 1970; Lovett, 1971). Others suggested an

ideological distinction between the two, adult education standing for a liberal form of education and community education for a more radical social action-oriented form of education (Jackson, 1970).

In this study, I have chosen to use the term community education as the most current and consistently used term for social activity oriented projects (Armstrong, 1977; Nieborg, 1983). I have also assumed that community education is a "subset" of adult education.

Several resource materials referred to difficulties with developing a common set of objectives for community education (Armstrong, 1977; Griffiths, 1974). Several problems were named as the root cause. A number of these were particularly troubling. One criticism of the field was that theory and practice are divorced (Kirkwood, 1980, p. 145; Champion, 1975, Sayer, 1986).

Interestingly, most of the solutions proposed development of a cohesive theoretical framework (Thomas and Harries-Jenkins, 1975; Northmore, 1986). However, more specific solutions suggested varied in content. Several called for more understanding of ontological premises (Champion, 1975, Sayer, 1986). One author suggested that focusing on ideology would assist in "closing the gap" between theory and practice (Sayer, 1986).

One of the strongest patterns in the literature was to call for more of a sociological framework of analysis (Kirkwood, 1980; Northmore, 1986, Ruddock, 1971):

... adult education, lacking institutional unity and a clearly formulated function, stands in particular need of a sociological analysis broad enough to relate to the social system as a whole, and to the needs and motives of the individual. (Ruddock, 1971, p. 20)

Ruddock, the author quoted above, in recalling a behavioral focus of sociology, cautioned against that focus and made a "plea" for the formulation of a "humanistic sociology" (p. 15). He suggested that adult education may have a hand in this new form of sociology which has as its conceptual "centre place" subjectivity: "intention, continuity, identity, integration, consciousness and experience".

Ruddock hinted at the possible application of the social construction of reality within adult education:

... there is little sense of the phenomenological nature of all social usages -- the extent to which, as Peter Berger argued, our society is what people are prepared to think it is, like the most solid-seeming bank, which is safe only so long as it is believed to be safe. (P.19-20)

Another author (Collins, 1984, p.179-189 & 1987, chap. 1;) focused more specifically on the phenomenological framework. "The phenomenological approach" is often described only in terms of a methodological starting point for research. However, in his works Collins has outlined a number of Husserl's key concepts such as "stock of knowledge", "life-world", and "multiple realities" with a view to exploring their implications for adult education. Included with the review of each concept he provided a section on possible implications of the concept to adult educators. For example, he suggested that the concept of the formation of stock of knowledge explains our uniqueness as individuals by considering "both the content and timing of our past experiences" (1984, p. 181).

In several other works perused there was a recognition of the significance of viewing the individual as a social being (Brookfield,

1984; Northmore, 1986). One author, Northmore, after emphasizing the need for more understanding of the social nature of community work also calls for more understanding of the neighborhood as a social system. She referred to the process of learning within the individual as "...a complex interaction between external factors of public roles and social networks, and internal psychological factors of attitudes and prejudices" (1986, p. 182).

One of the final critiques in Northmore's article was that "Community work has long emphasized its concern with 'process' goals and despite being seen by many community works as having an educational aspect, a theory of learning has been absent." (p. 185) The statement recognizes a focus on process and social elements and similarly recognizes an absence of learning theory which takes into account these pivotal elements of community work.

In combination with findings from other areas, Northmore's statement created a challenge for the research work. It affirmed a direction in which research had barely begun: that is, to seek out learning theories with a focus on social process in community education materials. Eventually I extended the search to the larger area of adult education. I did so because of two major factors.

One was the limited success at the time with locating materials on this particular part of the research. The second was that "the frame of reference" was not an entirely comfortable fit as a method of describing the "project". This area of research was in progress when fieldwork came to an end.

Although I continued to search for learning theory in connection with social process community education works and later in the larger domain of adult education, I began to place more emphasis on searches through resource materials outside of adult education. What started as "a little background research" associated more with methodological works emerged as a fourth area of research.

#### SOCIAL THEORY FRAMEWORKS RESOURCE MATERIALS

##### INTRODUCTION

This constitutes the final of the four areas of literature to be considered in this Chapter. It is not so much a literature review as a documentation of new direction and an intent to research. Two other aspects of the work conspired to bring about this fourth area of search. First, a series of themes were emerging from fieldwork data analysis. Second, as these emerged over time, I continued to sift through the areas of research as they became defined.

The search was for a theoretical framework which would provide adequate explication for themes which continued to emerge. However, no theoretical framework had been located in relation to all of the emerging themes. To facilitate an understanding of themes as they emerged on the "edge" of fieldwork and months beyond, I will recount those which were most frequently observed.

A key theme in these observations was the diversity of perceptions among participants. Demographic work had begun to indicate that many participants were not from the community despite the theatre project's historical bent. Data analysis of participants'

interactions had also begun to confirm diversity in background among participants. An additional part of the study was to ascertain whether there were subgroups through observing group members' interactions.

Virtually all of the themes were related to aspects of process amongst group members and their perceptions of process given their diverse perceptions. These themes illustrate a pattern in the analysis and reflections from the fieldwork. That is, fieldwork research would begin with focusing on perceptions of participants as articulated or also expressed in their interactions.

Through analysis and reflection the focus of the fieldwork often shifted to how perceptions and actions were influenced by group members when meeting with each other. For instance, participants' perceptions appeared to be influenced by individuals' assumptions about what the "group" would think or feel. Exemplifying this, one group member said, "If I do this they are going to think I'm nuts!" Although the group changed several times (often different people showed up at meetings), a concept of "the group" appeared to be a constant phenomenon, a reference point for each individual.

This process of changing and maintaining each other's perceptions guided the observations of another previously mentioned theme, learning as a social process. Recognition of a fourth theme, tension between a desire to explore and a need for certainty was bound up with recognition of the third theme.

A very large part of the fieldwork was devoted to observing the group creating a play through improvisations. When group members

began to use their own physical and emotional experiences (another theme) to construct a history of the town, it became apparent that they were literally constructing a reality for themselves and then later for the audience. The "reality" might be fiction, but it contained meaning for them that was "real".

#### DISCOVERIES THROUGH RESEARCH

A focus on social construction, "rampant", in the themes was consistent with the epistemological and ontological roots of the methodology. However, this particular sociological framework as acknowledged by those writing in adult and community education had not been a predominant "paradigm" of community education (Jarvis, 1985; Ruddock, 1972) when the fieldwork commenced.

Other than through liberatory education, historically rooted in a Marxist framework, sociology had been "neglected" as a possible framework in the majority of extant literature reviewed during the fieldwork. Brief references to phenomenology as linked specifically with adult education (Collins, 1984 & 1987, chap. 1; Spiegelberg, 1984) had barely begun to appear at the time.

Several works that had been suggested on the subject of social construction as they related to the methodology were consulted. The Social Construction Of Reality: A Treatise In The Sociology Of Knowledge by Berger and Luckmann (1966) was considered first. I then contemplated Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1970) and The Essential Tension (1977). The latter two books are Kuhn's reflections upon tradition and change in the scientific community.

When I first read these books, it was primarily in the context of background or related reading on methodology. While other areas of literature were pursued, I continued to return to these books as offering explication for data analysis that I did not find elsewhere. Eventually because of their unceasing "usefulness" in providing explication over challenges of time and tremendous change they became foundational to data analysis. This process encouraged me to step outside of the bounds of adult education literature to social theory. However, parallel to my search in "Theatre Resource Materials" my search was highly selective.<sup>7</sup>

Among those selected were Blumer's book, Symbolic Interactionism, Perspective And Method (1969); a critique of Kuhn's concept of paradigm by Masterman (1970); and background to several crucial concepts in Berger's and Luckmann's book such as "anomie" (Durkheim, 1964/1985). However, most of the library research related to social process and "social construction" occurred after the fieldwork was completed.

Beyond works related to social construction, I read works about "culture" (Geertz, 1973). After leaving the field I located resource material on "theatre" viewed from a sociological and anthropological framework (Lyman & Scott, 1975; States, 1987; Turner, 1982; Wilshire, 1982). These works were most important in their affirmation of meaning and later, the realization that meaning related to profundity is central to the study. However, to the extent that I had come to recognize that "theatre process" was only a part of group members' interactions, these works did not figure in the forefront.

"Interactions of theatre" came to be understood within a larger paradigm of "social construction".

These works are not reviewed in this Chapter because the key works are dealt with in some detail in Chapters Five and Six. Although Kuhn's books and Berger and Luckmann's were read during the fieldwork, they are imbedded most thoroughly in the focused data analysis process. These works have become associated with that highly analytical part of the thesis process and as such are located in Part Two.

Before leaving them entirely, it is important to recognize that Kuhn's work in particular affirmed a theme which had become extremely important as I was leaving the field. The book also greatly influenced how I contemplated the theme as "it" related to various aspects of the work. This theme was not described with the others at the beginning of this section because it emerged more recently as a theme foundational to the others. It is the theme of change.

This theme became most apparent after considering the process group members experienced in creating the play. Both the form of their interactions and assumptions about that process changed considerably over time. The themes of change, and group members' social process were clearly linked to their learning. Focused data analysis was to provide the opportunity to forge a framework to offer explication. Part Two describes this process in action.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Part One focuses on representing occurrences during fieldwork. Part Two and Three focus on data analysis work accomplished after I left the field. This division is difficult to make with respect to library research. Some lines of inquiry were begun during fieldwork and were pursued for a brief period thereafter. Where such was the case, rather than dislodging the line of discovery by placing the last portion in Part Two, the description is completed in this Chapter.

<sup>2</sup>Distinctions between the words "theatre" and "drama" are often unclear in related literature. Ken Robinson furnishes a lengthy description of a relationship between the two words (1980, p.148-150.) In essence he suggests "By 'drama' we generally mean situations in which there is some element of tension." According to the author we may use it to refer to "actual situations in real life" or "to mean a particular type of make believe". "Theatre" refers to both location and the activity, "a type of social encounter" which he states includes actors and an audience. However, in adult education literature, particularly in popular theatre writings, there may be no constant audience. Theatre workshops may be comprised exclusively of those who will act and create "their own play", for themselves, as a basis for analyzing their social experience.

When I first began the research I assumed the literature would be forthcoming with an appropriate definition. However, consistent with a "social construction" perspective there appears to be none. I have used the word "theatre" rather than "drama" to describe participants' interactions because that is the word they used consistently. Eventually I became more concerned with participants' tacit efforts to find a definition of theatre in common.

<sup>3</sup>In the overview of "Adult Education and Theatre Resource Material" I have indicated a general absence of theoretical framework. There are some exceptions to this generality. For instance, Moreno's work (1977) from a psychologicistic framework is considered to have substantial framework.

A second exception lies in more recent popular theatre writings linked with Freire's pedagogy. Among others, Kidd and Byram (1978, 1982) and Lambert (1982) have developed overviews of emerging varieties of popular theatre linked with Freire's process of conscientization. Chambulikazi (1989) has also begun to put the work within a "communications" frame of reference. Finally, both Chambulikazi and Hamilton (1987) have also begun to draw in the concept of change during the process.

These theories are not presented in detail at this point in the main body of the text because these latter works in popular theatre are more recently published and did not play a role in fieldwork data analysis. When I first began surveying the literature, popular theatre was beginning to emerge as a paradigm.

Since then those relying on a popular theatre process have become considerably more sophisticated in terms of involving members of the

community in their process. Kidd and Byram provide a critique in their article "Demystifying Pseudo-Freirian Development: The Case of Laedza Batanani" (1982) reflecting changing perspectives on the process.

Depending on the project, those facilitating the process may involve members of the community prior to performance (data collection), during the performance and after (discussion and action plans). The one critique I have made in the body of the text which I believe is still apropos in many popular theatre instances is that participants' perceptions of the process undergone have not been studied with a view to understanding heterogeneity in the experience.

Finally, I would emphasize that my comments concerning absence of theoretical framework are modified by approximations of the phrase "theoretical frameworks which provided adequate explication for findings from fieldwork data analysis. The project studied did not fit squarely within a popular theatre frame of reference, nor a framework rooted in psychology such as Moreno's. I do address possible links with Freirean approaches in Part Two, however, and therein make further reference to more recent popular theatre writings.

<sup>4</sup>The word "project" is being used very loosely to describe a broad spectrum of activities taking from a few days to several years.

<sup>5</sup>"Community education" and "community development" both appear in literature of this area. In some instances, they are distinguished by nuances of ideology. "Community education" was selected to avoid invoking debate associated with how use of the word "development" can be a superimposition of cultural values. However, this does not entirely avoid the problem since similar concerns may be raised with the word "education".

<sup>6</sup>Creating the four frames of reference was an act of reductionism. However, it was reductionism in keeping with the "data", the resource material under consideration. Reductionism had already been introduced through the format of most of the resource materials. Since many were intended as brief descriptions to introduce readers to a particular application of theatre in adult education, authors had been forced to write about experiences in a "reduced" manner.

<sup>7</sup> Constraints in terms of time and funding required this selectivity in an otherwise massive area of literature. This issue will be taken up in the final chapters of this thesis document.

## REFERENCES

- Armstrong, R. (1977). New directions for community education. Community Development Journal, 12(2), 75-84.
- Baird, B. (1972). Puppets and population. Literacy Discussion, 3(1), 105-109.
- Barndt, D. (1980). Education and social change: A photographic study of Peru. Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.
- Bolton, G. (1979). Towards a theory of drama in education. Burnt Mill, Essex: Longman House.
- Bordes, A. (1982). Utilization of folk media in the education of Haitian communities in family planning. Folk media and mass media in population communication. Paris: Unesco.
- Brook, P. (1972). The empty space. New York: Penguin Books.
- Brookes, C. (1974). "Useful theatre", in Sally's cove. This Magazine, 8(2), 3-7.
- Brookfield, S. (1984). Adult learners, adult education and the community. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism, perspective and method. Toronto: Prentice-Hall.
- Canadian Popular Theatre Alliance (1985). Report of the Canadian popular theatre alliance -- 1985. (Unpublished report).
- Chambulikazi, E. (1989, Jan-June). Theatre as a communication medium in community development. Innotech Journal, 31-42.
- Champion, A. (1975). Towards an ontology of adult education. Studies In Adult Education, 7, 16-33.
- Collins, M. (1984). Phenomenological perspectives: Some implications. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected Writings On Philosophy and Adult Education, (pp. 179-189). Florida: Krieger.
- Collins, M. (1987). Competence in adult education. New York: University Press Of America.
- Corrigan, R. (1984). The search for new endings: The theatre in search of a fix, part III. Theatre Journal, 36 (2), 153-163.

- Davies, R. (1967). There will be no "soft degrees". University Graduate, 13, 90-96.
- Davis, B. W. (1983). Drama -- a tool for nutrition education with older adults. Journal of Nutrition Education, 15(4), 138.
- Durkheim, E. (1985). Precontractual solidarity [1893]; Social rituals and sacred objects [1912]. In R. Collins (Ed.), Three sociological traditions, Selected readings, (pp. 161-186). [Reprinted from The Division of Labor In Society, 1965, New York: Free Press.]
- Filewod, A. (1987). Collective encounters: Documentary theatre in English Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education, culture, power and liberation. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures, selected essays. New York: Basic Books.
- George, V. (1984). Community theatre as a strategy in rural community development: The case of new market, Jamaica. Community Development Journal, 19(3), 142-150.
- Goetz, J. & LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.
- Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Hamilton, E. (1987). Popular theatre teaches skills and motivates Inuit young people of Canada's Arctic. Convergence, 20(2), 43-47.
- Hampton, C. (1967). Drama as a university discipline. Journal of Educational Thought, 1, 152-159.
- Heathcote, D. (1984). Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama. London: Hutchinson.
- Hewage, L. & Radcliffe, D. (1977). Experience of Sri Lanka, The relevance of culture in adult education for development. Convergence, 10(2), 63-74.
- Jarvis, P. (1985). The sociology of adult and continuing education. London: Croom Helm.
- Kamarack, E.D. (1971). Theatre in the community: A brief survey and appraisal. Arts In Society, 8 (3), 636-643.

- Kent, D. & Carter, C. (1974). The origin and development of psychodrama and its relationship to radical theatre. Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, 27 (1-4), 71-82.
- Kerslake, L. (1976). Using role playing in teaching the Thirty Years War, Perspectives, 11(2), 52-53.
- Kidd, R. (1983). From people's theatre for revolution to popular theatre for reconstruction: Diary of a Zimbabwean workshop. Hague:CESO (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 694).
- Kidd, R. (1984). Popular theatre and nonformal education in the third world: Five strands of experience. International Review of Education, 30, 265-288.
- Kidd, R & Byram, M. (1978). The performing arts and community education in Botswana, Community Development Journal, 13(3), 23-35.
- Kidd, R. & Byram, M (1982). Demystifying pseudo-Freirian Development: The case of Iaedza Batanani. Community Development Journal, 17(2), 91-105.
- Kirkwood, C. (1980). Adult education and the concept of community. Adult Education (U.K.), 53, 145-151.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1977). The essential tension. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Lambert, P. (1982). Popular theatre: One road to self-determined development action. Community Development Journal, 17, (3), 242-249.
- Landy, R. (1982). Handbook of educational drama and theatre. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Lovett, T., Clarke C. & Kilmurray, A. (1983). Adult education and community action. London: Croom Helm.
- Lyman, S. & Scott, M. (1975). The drama of social reality. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Masterman, M. (1970) The nature of a paradigm. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism And The Growth Of Knowledge, (pp. 59-89). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Millett, F. & Bentley, G. (1935). The art of the drama. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.

- Minister, K. (1982). Elder theatre: Positive image of aging and forum for intergenerational communication. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 120).
- Monette, M. (1977). The concept of educational need: An analysis of selected literature. Adult Education, 27(2), 116-127.
- Moreno, C., Clason, C. & Borja, A. (1973) Puppets and the theatre. Technical Note #12, Amherst: Center for International Education (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No. ED 172 206)
- Moreno, J. L. (1977). Psychodrama, Volume 1 (rev. ed.). New York: Beacon House, Inc.
- Northmore, S. (1986). A community development model of adult education. Community Development Journal, 21(3), 181-185.
- Panday, G. (1984). Why theatre? Adult Education And Development, 23, 119-120.
- Perinbanayagam, R. (1981). Dramas of structure, theory and performance in Northern Sri Lanka. Anthropological Quarterly, 54(1), 36-43.
- Pickering, A.K. (1957). Village drama in Ghana. Fundamental And Adult Education, Unesco, 9, 178-183.
- Radin, B. (1985). Dramatic techniques in ESL instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 174).
- Robinson, K. (1980). Drama, theatre and social reality. In K. Robinson, (Ed.), Exploring theatre and education. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Ruddock, R. (1971). The sociology of adult education: a plea for humanism. Studies In Adult Education, 3, 15-27.
- Ruddock, R. (1972). Sociological perspectives on adult education. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Russell, R. (1977) The fun bus: An experiment in nonformal education through the arts. Amherst: Center for International Education (ERIC Documents Reproduction Service No ED 142 453)
- Sayer, J. (1986). Ideology: the bridge between theory and practice. Community Development Journal, 21(4), 294-303.
- Schechner, R. (1985). Between theatre and anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Selman, G. R. (1976). Occasional papers in continuing education. Vancouver: Centre For Continuing Education, University of British Columbia.
- Selman, J. (1987). Three cultures, One issue. Canadian theatre Review, 53, 11-19.
- Shank, T. (1977). The welfare state. The Drama Review, 21 (1), 3-16.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1984). Putting ourselves into the place of others: Toward a phenomenology of imaginary self transposal. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected Writings On Philosophy and Adult Education, (pp. 171-177). Florida: Krieger.
- States, B. (1987). Great reckonings in little rooms, on the phenomenology of theatre. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Thomas, J. & Harries-Jenkins, G. (1975). Adult education and social change. Studies In Adult Education, 7, 1-15.
- Turner, V. (1982). From ritual to theatre, the human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.
- Tyler, R. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Wilshire, B. (1982). Role playing and identity, the limits of theatre as metaphor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Unesco (1982). Recommendations of experts meeting on integrated use of folk media and mass media in support of population/family planning programme. Folk Media And Mass Media In Population Communication. Paris: Unesco.
- Way, B. (1967). Development through drama. London: Longman Group Ltd.

**PART TWO**

**CHANGING PARTS: PARTINGS CHANGE**

## PART TWO

### CHANGING PARTS: PARTINGS CHANGE

#### INTRODUCTION

The Preface stated that discoveries emerging out of the study might be grouped into four basic areas, "four areas of discovery". The first two areas of discovery are focused on "learners". Concerned with understanding participants' social process related to concepts of theatre, change, and learning, these two areas are "the content" of data analysis. As descriptions of fieldwork experience, Chapters One and Three formed part of the terrain of the first two areas of discovery.

Chapter Two as a review of related methodology, and Chapter Four as a review of others' frames of reference, fashioned a conceptual lens for viewing that terrain. Given this function, the Chapters form part of the third and fourth areas of discovery. These areas of discovery emerged in the study from concerns related to adult educators and methodology.

Primary were concerns about: a) how we, as adult educators understand and study change related to interactions with learners and b) how, as researchers, we reflect and account for our own change in epistemology and institutional framework in the research. The Preface argued that as adult educators we tend not to study change in either respect. Chapter Four provided evidence of one source of these concerns related to study of change.

Despite growing diversity located in literature on adult education and theatre, there were no broad overviews or frameworks available to make sense of the conceptual pluralism. Clearly, changes had occurred over time. Adult educators were bringing different and changing semblances of thought and action to theatre related to education. A similar situation was unveiled in that Chapter with respect to more general community education writings. The Chapter described diverse solutions for creating a more broadly accepted theoretical framework. However, I found no hue and cry for an understanding of change as both an element in such a framework and a force acting upon maintenance of such a framework.

The thesis partially met the first challenge by creating and describing in Chapter Four a set of authors' frames of reference which might assist in distinguishing among a growing number of articles on theatre and adult education. However, a historical interpretation to offer explication for changes noted was beyond the scope of this thesis. A partial response to the second challenge, to understand changing frameworks in adult community education and learning theory, lies imbedded in the remainder of the thesis.

This study involved many changes over time. Being so pervasive an element, change demanded attention through reflection. Changes occurred in terms of the nature of participants' interactions. The first two areas of discovery were devoted to understanding these changes.

Changes also occurred with respect to the research. This became the "domain" of the third and fourth areas of discovery. As

researcher, my understanding of the nature of participants' interactions changed over time. I had access to data and an opportunity to analyze data in the concluding stage of the study which I simply did not have when entering the field. Yet when analyzing data I had to rely on those early observations in the field as well as the last. The hermeneutical circle continues to appear in many forms throughout the thesis work.

Still under the auspices of changes connected to the research, the study took place during a shift in research paradigm. In relying on a relatively "new" framework, in this case qualitative research, one is faced with both gaps in the literature and changing inflections of epistemology as surges of new discoveries are made.

Part One provided a description of fieldwork experience and library research associated with fieldwork. Part Two shifts to convey a process of focused data analysis replete with reflections on changing aspects of the work. In this vein, Chapter Five outlines discoveries in the study's third area of discovery. It discloses reflections on changes related to methodology and the research. Its review of materials on methodology and method includes materials published between completion of the fieldwork study and data analysis.

The review in Chapter Five also pursues the conceptual structure developed in Chapter Four, frames of references, linked this time to methodological writings. Based on a synthesis of discoveries from all areas of research, Chapter Five proposes a revised conception of what

constitutes methodological resources. It both suggests and models an integration of all theoretical materials and data analysis findings in terms of theory generation, as a methodological process.

Chapter Six is a consolidation of data analysis findings. The consolidation is comprised of a "set of working assumptions", a theoretical framework developed out of the synthesis of Chapter Five. The theoretical framework outlined in Chapters Five and Six interactively emerged from development of and also provided the basis for an analytical model, "the Mobile-framework" to represent experiences in the field. Following from conceptual groundwork laid in Chapters Five and Six, Chapter Seven describes in detail the structure of the Mobile-framework. Once more for the express purpose of documenting the researcher's changing understanding of data analysis, this Chapter records epistemological shifts. Part Three unveils the product sculpted from processual materials, the Mobile-framework.

Prior to commencing Chapter Five it is important to note that this processual description of focused data analysis was not created until almost the conclusion of that process. Preparation for data analysis (creation of transcriptions, administrative organization, gathering of theoretical materials) and data analysis process have occurred over a three year period. Between work referred to in Chapter Four and that outlined in Chapter Five, considerable time has elapsed. This lapse of time and a change of the researcher's orientation are expressed in a change of writing style.

As indicated in the Preface, the beginning of Part Two signals a transition from emphasis on "the intimate" towards "the abstract". The Chapters of Part One comprised a mode of representing experience in the field from the vantage point of being intimately in the throes of an intense, highly interactive social process.

Part Two consists of a second mode of representation. Combined, the three chapters of this Part transpose focus to representing a process of analyzing data from the experience in order to create an "abstraction". This division between Part One and Two signifies a way of recognizing change in the relationship of the researcher with the research, acknowledging different orientation points emerging during the thesis work: fieldwork and data analysis (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 168; Jorgenson, 1989, p. 107.)

The Introduction of Part One alluded to the importance of bringing both orientations or perspectives to this work. The two perspectives together are necessary for depth perception. Thus far, the two orientations have been distinguished by time and task. Distinctions in orientation may be more clearly expressed in terms of what experiences were associated with the time and the task.

When I contemplate the fieldwork (the moonbeam and my jar), the immediacy of contact with group members swells to the fore (Sherman & Webb, 1988, p. 10). When I contemplate the task of data analysis, questions related to abstractions flood forward (Sherman & Webb, 1988, p. 14). These attributes surface in the body of the work.

For example, in the first Part of the thesis I included not only observations of a personal note with respect to my involvement with

group members. I specifically attempted to reflect the non-linear intricacies of my inductions, my struggling (Jorgenson, 1989, p.8). The style of the first attempts to capture improvisational tones of that experience through gesture sketch sculpting.

In contrast, process from product has been separated into more discrete blocks in this Part and Part Three. For instance, I have located the main descriptions of my data analysis process in the Chapters of this Part. Purposefully included are references to a chronology of conceptualization. In describing data analysis process, Part Two records emerging concepts as part of the hermeneutical circle involved.

Part Three which then follows contains the sculpted product, the Mobile-framework. Within the Mobile-framework limited references are made to my changing orientations while creating the Mobile. The hermeneutical circle has been thereby compressed into a ring from which the Mobile may be suspended. First, then the surroundings from which the Mobile-framework is to be suspended.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### BACK STAGE

#### Ontological And Epistemological Foundations: Elements From Which The Framework Evolved

It' s on everybody's mind. "What are we going to end up with?"  
Eil) J-5.

Why then 'tis none to you, for there is nothing either good or bad  
But thinking makes it so. - Hamlet, II, ii, 246.

#### DESCRIPTION OF EMERGING METHODOLOGICAL PROCESSES

Chapter Two contained a summary of methodological literature located during fieldwork and shortly thereafter. The summary in that Chapter related research findings on qualitative research, ethnography and more specifically, participant observation.

The subject of methodology has been reintroduced in this Chapter because of two interrelated concerns from the third and fourth areas of discovery. A first concern stems from attempts to take into account emerging change in adult education research frameworks which occurred during the study. The second concern flows from changing focuses in research activities and a changing perspective in the researcher. In response to these two different concerns with change and the research, a single, encompassing purpose evolved.

That purpose was to capture any changes in the researcher's overall understanding of methodology as the work progressed. This included merging changes brought by more recent literature into the study's methodology. It also included identifying as researcher my own changing conceptions influencing the research process.

Following from this, I have distinguished my experience with process of data analysis during the fieldwork and that which I did while my energies were entirely devoted to data analysis. Thus relevancies of methodology and method altered from one stage of the research to another.

At the outset of fieldwork, determining a methodological approach was intrinsically connected to literature labelled methodological resource material. There was a future orientation to methodology in that context, one of planning in terms of research design. Gradually, as Chapter Two reveals when fieldwork shifted to emphasis on data analysis a parallel shift emerged concerning how I conceived of methodology.

#### OBJECTIVES REFINED

"Methodology" has become associated with a duality in process. The first is the doing, the collection of data, the analysis of data and the act of writing.<sup>1</sup> The second is reflection on that process oriented to past and present insights as well as future activity. It is the second aspect, reflection about the process, which constitutes this Chapter's emphasis in "methodology" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 190; Jorgenson, 1989, p. 26).

When contemplated in this sense, methodology came to include a reflexive consideration of all research and analysis of the study while the process is underway. In addition to acknowledgments of

change, response to changes were considered. Methodology ceased to be narrowly associated with carrying out data analysis by a prescribed method and then reporting the results.

This altered conceptualization of methodology has guided final stages of data analysis so far as to prompt emergence of a set of additional addenda, refinements to the stated objective in Chapter One. The double addendum is intended to reflect special considerations emerging from this stage of the research work:

- To attribute significance adequately to that which is studied and;
- To adequately represent significance attributed to that which is studied.<sup>2</sup>

Through use of the word "significance", the stated objective places meaning at the centre. Some may view discussion of meaning as primarily personal, not having value in terms of theory. ("I thought, I felt" — to be valued as descriptive narrative, at best.) One of the chief criticisms leveled at qualitative research is that its "outcome" is of a highly personal or idiosyncratic nature and that research of this type often offers little, generalizable, contribution to research (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 33; Woods, 1988, p. 95.)

However, the word "adequately" was chosen with care to modify the word "significance". Use of the word "adequately" refers back to a process, guided by reflection. As part of this process in discerning adequacy, priority lies with ensuring through reflection that the work is as ontologically and epistemologically consistent as possible.

This must, as a matter of course, include the researcher's perspective or values. The remaining Chapters are intended to exemplify this process.

I have previously disclosed a shift in understanding "methodology" as synonymous with exclusive reliance on resources labelled as methodology or method. In that shift I came to recognize several elements involved in data analysis process and in the process of creating a form to represent findings from data analysis. Each of these elements played a crucial role in methodological process. They contributed to emerging recognition of epistemological and ontological assumptions about method. These elements came from various areas of study and research.

There are four areas in which I have studied and worked, sometimes in an isolated fashion, at other times in an interactive manner. (These four areas of work are not to be confused with "areas of discovery". The areas of discovery emerged as thematic findings from the four areas of work.) Findings in one area guided work in others. Materials labelled in the literature as methodological resources comprised only one area of work. General theoretical resources (primarily social theoretical frameworks in this instance) formed a second. A third was the actual experience of having collected the data and begun ongoing data analysis. This brings the uniqueness of circumstance to the synthesis.

One related discovery emerged from the work. That is, the process of data analysis may be distinguished, although somewhat

arbitrarily, from a process of determining the most "adequate" mode of representing the results. A fourth area, then, is a sub-process of data analysis. This fourth area is populated with realizations or findings discovered through creating a representational form.

Prior to proceeding, it is most important to note that these four "areas of work" are highly interactive and interrelated. For example, distinguishing between "methodological works" and "general theoretical works" is extremely difficult in some instances. Cleanly severing data analysis from creating a representational form would be impossible. The classification is intended only as a conceptual tool to "find a way in" to a complex process. Otherwise, the very act of clumping everything under the title of "data analysis" other elements as identified in the "other three working areas" are repeatedly neglected within descriptions of data analysis process in current literature.

In summary, the objectives "to both attribute and represent significance adequately" are determined from criteria derived from a working synthesis of studied general social theory, methodological resources, and experiences of both fieldwork and data analysis.

Reflection on one's process as a researcher from a methodological viewpoint might best be described as a constant attempt to ascertain whether findings in these four areas match each other adequately. In other words they provide adequate explanations to questions emerging from the various areas of research (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 177 and Wilson, 1977, p. 255) and these explanations are epistemologically and ontologically consistent.

A complete description of my methodological process as reflected in data analysis would require inclusion of details concerning all four areas of work. It would also require imbedding each within the other to illustrate the work's interactive nature. While summaries are necessary given the massive accrual of work associated with the thesis, I have attempted to manifest wherever possible the interactive nature of the work.

"Review Of Methodological Resources For Data Analysis" begins as the first of the four brief summaries or reviews. This review of methodological resources draws on the general overview of Chapter Two. Resources are reviewed in terms of this stage of the work, data analysis and representation. The second is a "Review Of Key Concepts Arising From Data Analysis Process". It summarizes both data analysis process and findings therefrom. As the two are so closely linked, I have folded together description of data analysis process with "findings of data analysis" in a single review.

The third review is of general theoretical resource materials. It is referred to as a "Review Of Theoretical Foundations For The Mobile-framework". Most of the general theoretical materials upon which I relied for this work have been reviewed as well in Chapter Four. However, some additional materials were consulted based on questions arising from data analysis process and the work of creating the Mobile-framework. A synthesis of all those which emerged as most relevant in light of methodological resources and data analysis will be provided herein. (This is referred to as the "Social Theory Trail".)

The fourth is a "Review Of Key Discoveries From Creating A Representational Form" that being the Mobile-framework. This last review is tightly folded into a very brief summary. Most of my discoveries in this and general data analysis directed and redirected the gathering of and my reflections on theoretical resource materials. Much of this will have been described in the first three reviews.

#### REVIEW OF FOUR AREAS OF STUDY COMPRISING METHODOLOGICAL PROCESS IN DATA ANALYSIS

##### INTRODUCTION

These reviews are intended to reveal findings from data analysis within the context of process. Therefore, a detailed "list" of themes emerging from the study has not been provided at the outset of this Chapter. Emerging themes are outlined in each of the reviews, but as part of the description of process. Some overlap will be observed between the four reviews since findings were often prompted by more than one consideration or source.

The Chapters in Part One referred to a shift from categories to themes. They referred specifically to several themes. The same themes are not listed here as a starting point. As previously described, the Chapters of this Part continue the description of data analysis process. However, a substantial amount of time elapsed between the end of the work described in Chapter Four and the beginning of this Chapter. The themes of the fieldwork data analysis had been substantially reshaped well before this description was developed.

The themes as outlined through processual descriptions in Chapter Four become consolidated and reshaped. They emerge, framed by concepts of learning related to meaning and change in terms of social processes. Concepts of "theatre" shift to be understood within encompassing concepts of social processes. Tension in certainty continues as a theme also related to learning and social processes. Based on these themes the study eventually becomes concerned with theory generation directed towards considering possible "elements" in our social process, related to meaning, change, and thereby to learning. Exploration of social anchors related to meaning exemplify this direction of the study.

Each of the reviews then, provides both indication of process and findings or conceptual content arising from work in a particular area associated with data analysis.

#### REVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL RESOURCES FOR DATA ANALYSIS

Part One reviewed methodological resource material located during fieldwork and initial stages of data analysis. This section reviews methodological material from a later vantage point in terms of acquisitions of additional resource material and synthesis of findings from other areas of work.

Since becoming more familiar with methodological writings in the area, one of the first concerns with which I have wrestled (and one which supports dividing fieldwork experience from focused data analysis into two major parts) is the uneven development of methodological resource materials for qualitative research. In

comparison with writings on other aspects of methodology, data analysis processes have received far less attention generally. This emerged as a concern in the study's latter stage.

During the fieldwork stage I rapidly amassed resource materials mapping out various conceptualizations of qualitative methodology. At that time, the search for material was not limited to one stage of research, methods for fieldwork. Proposed research design included both approaches to fieldwork and a suggested approach to data analysis, that of creating categories and properties. While engaged in fieldwork I did not confine myself to conceptualizing a final form of presentation. When I considered it, I thought more in terms of creating a framework which would contain consistent steps in fieldwork and data analysis.

What I gleaned from reading all the methodological material gathered at that time related primarily to immediate fieldwork questions. It was a little like being in urgent need of a single set of concise lifeboat instructions and being confounded instead with a bulky consumer report charting various elements of performance for various lifeboats.

My change in orientation from fieldwork to focused data analysis was signaled by rereading related resource material. I have continued to collect resource material, for literature on qualitative research is burgeoning (Sherman & Webb, 1988). While reading and rereading the material with new immediacy for information on data analysis, I came upon several paucities in available literature.

For purposes of the study, the greatest gap lay in a lack of resource material providing criteria for selecting or creating a form to represent results of data analysis (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 34). A second gap also swiftly became apparent through this return engagement with methodological resource materials.

Materials proffered scant detail in descriptions of data analysis process (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 145; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 33-34). More specifically only a few, relatively more recent resource materials described methods of data analysis for generating theory (Miles & Huberman, 1986; Goetz & LeCompte, 1984). In descriptions of methods for data analysis which were available, few links were then made to theory of method. Finally descriptions of data analysis process did not suggest diverse methods for linking findings from theory generation to general theory available.

These two identified gaps in materials on data analysis process affected this stage of the work greatly. Responding to concerns which identified the gaps have required the lion's share of time allocated to "data analysis" in this study. For instance, sorting out confusion about how the term "data analysis" was being used from one resource to another demanded attention. The term "data analysis" covers considerable ground. It names both process and product (Agar, 1980, p. 1; Shimahara, 1988, p. 78). In terms of the four areas of discovery, this thesis has become about reflecting on the relationship between the two.

The particular gaps identified were observed because of concrete concerns brought from the study to readings of methodological

material. For example, given the multidisciplinary nature of the work it was difficult to locate methods to link theory generation of a cultural, social orientation (a common shape in ethnographic findings) to adult education learning theory traditionally focused on the individual. Findings from that work then had to be linked with theoretical frameworks associated with theatre. Methodological materials available offered no assistance on the specifics of this concern.

In addition, what emerged from fieldwork as a key theme, change, reemerged as a matter of urgency when forming part of a welter of unanswered concerns related to data analysis. Earlier methodological resource materials did not focus on change, but rather focused on culture as static. Finally, a simple comparison of content between methodological resources was confusing without historical bearings. There were ongoing changes occurring within that body of work which needed to be identified.

The third and fourth areas of discovery sprang from reflections on this bundle of concerns. Through reflection, I shifted away from a focus on content of methodological resources. In this process of reflection, the early work in the study on "frames of reference" has been connected to "paradigms" (Kuhn, 1970) through findings in research of theoretical works. Much of the remainder of this review of methodological resources shifts from content to a historical overview of paradigmatic development related to data analysis and methodology. In this manner several of the concrete concerns from data analysis were partially resolved.

First, developing a historical context for methodological resources reduced confusion arising from differences among resource materials. In addition, developing a sense of historical context assisted both in isolating the problem and then in forging links between findings of data analysis in a "cultural framework" to adult education learning theory generally focused on the "individual". Along the way other concrete concerns were also addressed.<sup>3</sup>

This historical review of methodological literature supplements that which was given in Chapter Two and the Preface. Chapter Two fleetingly referred to a relatively recent shift in frameworks by many researchers. Viewed from a Kuhnian perspective, the predominant paradigm, quantitative research, has begun to shift to another, qualitative research, (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). At present, not every researcher relies on research forms of a qualitative nature. However, what began as "epistemological fidgets" felt through several social sciences, escalated to "anomalie angst". Thereby, a dramatic paradigmatic change in preeminence has occurred (Wilson, 1977, p. 245).

When the shift in researchers' orientation began, two common critiques surfaced from those who were concerned about such a shift in research work. This shift is vulnerable to a critique of trendiness. Described in Chapter Two, a second common critique, arises from the question of how arbitrary is a conceptual division between quantitative and qualitative aspects of research. Do we de-nature research through such division (Sherman & Webb, 1988, p. 18)?

Concerns raised through these critiques are most important ones if as researchers we are to understand our paradigmatic processes. They must be taken into account when considering research direction. For example, with respect to issues concerning trendiness, it is most important to look to the benefits we derive from many researchers' highly concentrated study, shifting only periodically. Might this be a sped-up version of Kuhn's "normal science" (Sanday, 1979)?

Earlier literature on "qualitative" research speaks as much to sources of discontent and anomalies experienced with past "quantitative" research methods as they do about content of qualitative research. "The trend" of qualitative research offered some researchers opportunity for conceptual crystallization through contrast. They used this opportunity for contrast to assist in clarity of critique of past activity. "It" also provided opportunity for creative exploration, and perhaps, a new sensitivity to serendipity. In applying the "new" concept to everything, we delineate "its" boundaries and thereby begin to locate new fidgets. The process begins again.

While engaged in this process, "the trick" is not to throw away the critique of contrast (Sherman & Webb, 1988, p. 9). It is important not to structure the critique as a form of utter rejection dismissing all that has gone before (although some may argue that being "cut loose" may be necessary for exploration.)

In this light, a key question frames this reflection on methodology. What were researchers seeking in "qualitative" research

which they considered lacking in "quantitative" research"? This inquiry should aid in revealing the conditions to which using "qualitative research methods" are expected to respond. Concerns to which researchers expect to respond then shape their responses through the resulting form of their research.

From the outset, one of the most influential books in this area has been Glaser's and Strauss', The Discovery Of Grounded Theory (1967). The authors stated the problem primarily in terms of theory development. They suggested that few researchers were working on theory creation; most were attempting to verify theory already existing. Glaser and Strauss attributed this to methods of research. They proposed theory generation through a process identified with a "qualitative paradigm".

"Theory development", was one promise driving work associated with a developing "qualitative paradigm". Continued reliance on empirical studies as a form of research constituted an additional element associated with qualitative work. These two elements of common aim have many implications for research process. For example, they influence process in terms of location of research, and the role of the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

Related to theory generation, benefits of a more specific nature have been claimed for ethnographic work. Jorgenson, for example, suggests that participant observation as a method of ethnography is exceptionally useful for studying social processes and relationships about which little is known (1989 p. 12).

Again, as Kuhn predicts, emergence of a new paradigm has precipitated a flurry of excited, innovative work. Being "en route", some areas have been more thoroughly explored and represented than others. For example, there are various forms of qualitative research, some more heavily used than others. Ethnographic work, existing long before this debate crystallized and polarized, is now experiencing popularity among researchers (Woods, 1988, p. 90).

Prior to considering whether ethnographic work has responded to general claims and to concerns associated with quantitative research, brief consideration will be given to the role of social theory in research work. While aimed at generating social theory, as researcher, one's actions flow from assumptions of social theory as well. Making explicit those ontological and epistemological assumptions of social theory upon which method relies is the essence of methodology.

Social theory applied has significant implications in both fieldwork and data analysis. Researchers relying on differing ontological and epistemological assumptions regarding social life have diverse research purposes, different techniques, do research in different locations, represent data in different ways and even have had differing assumptions about how the end results may be used (Geertz, 1973; Sanday, 1979; Sherman & Webb, 1988, p. 5). Therefore, it is important to understand ontological and epistemological bases favored by researchers within a discipline at any one time. It provides context for researchers' purpose and process in the research. (This is their frame of reference.)

For those wishing to rely on ethnography as a "method" for research in education it must be remembered that ethnography was developed as a "methodology" in the context of a certain discipline, anthropology. As a discipline" anthropology includes development of ontological and epistemological underpinnings.

As is consistently the case with others, this discipline is rife with differing schools of thought (Sanday, 1979). Despite differences of thought on what the concept might mean, "culture" has been at the core of thought associated with ethnography (Agar, 1980, p. 23; Jorgenson, 1989, p. 107). Even with limited agreement on the concept, researchers bring and have brought a form of the concept with them to their research. In other words, they would be concerned with some form of social theory as related to culture.

One of the implications of this research is that as social theory changes, so must methodology change. One of the most fascinating aspects of research is that the work is interactive. Theoretical discoveries may lead to paradigmatic shifts across disciplines and occupational groups. These discoveries thereby also lead to changes in methodology. Ethnography stands as an example of this process.

Those working within other disciplines have come to rely on ethnographic methods. Thus the work has begun to take on a multidisciplinary nature in some instances (Agar, 1980, p. 12). This has had distinct repercussions particularly in terms of theory attached by researchers either tacitly or explicitly to ethnographic work.

For instance, in more recent years some sociologists have begun to assert the benefit of ethnographic research (Agar, 1980). Again, they commence with differing social theories resulting in differing assumptions about significance, and differing approaches to data analysis (Jorgenson, 1989; Jarvis, 1985, Ruddock, 1972, p. 38) As do anthropologists, sociologists bring a truly rich and vast background of social theory with them.

The wealth of thought described as sociology is so vast that conceptual overviews have been developed which include divisions to contrast various starting points within that discipline. Even such conceptual divisions achieve no consensus. For example, Collins (1985) refers to "three sociological traditions" in his book of that name. He delineates these three as the "Conflict", the "Durkheim", and the "Micro-Interaction" traditions (1985, p. vii).

In contrast, those attempting to construct an overview for adult education purposes have suggested somewhat different divisions. Cervero (1988) described a different three frameworks, "Structural-functionalist", "Conflict" and "Critical" theories. In the context of empirical research, Jarvis (1985) suggested two frameworks of focus, "Structure" and "Social Process".

As previously described, despite hard-fought differences among anthropologists, dominant inflection of the work is on culture. On the other hand, sociologists' more frequent orientation has been towards seeking knowledge about social structure (O'Dea, 1966;

Ruddock, 1972). Historically, this is a general distinction in starting places between the work of those associated with these disciplines.

Literature in ethnography is, however, becoming intermingled. For those wishing to understand extant ethnographic works, it is most important to consider as context whatever social theory influenced researchers at the time of their research. Those hoping to rely on ethnography as a methodology must make initial choices about social theory. Even so they will drag dilemmas with them through the work.<sup>4</sup>

Educational researchers plunging into ethnography land in a river with many historical currents. How have education researchers fared in entering into such eddies? For the most part, those of us beginning with an educational framework have decidedly brought currents with us.

Once more, it is important to reflect on our own paradigmatic processes as adult educators. What discontent had arisen out of earlier research work in education? To what were researchers of education responding when they first began to take up a qualitative orientation to research?

Haunting both education and adult education is a reputed disembodiment -- theory from practice and practice from theory.<sup>5</sup> Frequently, adult education work is structurally separated between these two concepts of the work (Elias & Merriam, 1980, p. 8). Given this complaint, the Glaser and Strauss book (1967) on theory

generation through fieldwork (grounded theory) has particular appeal. Ethnography, with such emphasis on field research has captured some of this appeal (Woods, 1988, p. 97).

In an attempt to respond to need for theory and practice to come together, education researchers have come to consider "grounded theory". Qualitative research to generate theory from practice has surged forward. However, the context for researchers is the theories upon which tacitly and explicitly they have relied historically. This theoretical "sedimentation" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) provides paradigmatic background and shape to emerging questions. This includes concerns about theory and practice as divided areas of activity.

Interest in qualitative research arises from sources beyond the theory and practice rift. Another paradigmatic shift has been emerging. Both behaviorism and structural-functionalism have been roundly critiqued (Cervero, 1988; O'Dea, 1966). Since historically these have been influential in adult education, for many adult educators, these critiques have brought social and philosophic theory once more to the fore. Emerging in adult education have been several interests in terms of social theory.

One general interest is to relate sociological thought to adult education (Jarvis, 1985; Ruddock, 1972). This work is beginning to take form (Jarvis, 1985). In terms of exploring particular schools of social thought, phenomenology has been of recent interest to adult educators (Collins, 1985; Spiegelberg, 1985) in research. Critical theory has also begun to hold interest for those in education

(Brookfield, 1989; Gibbons, 1986; Mezirow, 1981) and in various areas of adult education from professionalization (Cervero, 1988) to learning theories (Mezirow, 1981, 1988).

"Meaning" and "social context" have been theoretical focal points prior to the present (Kidd, 1973; Lindeman, 1926; Ruddock, 1972, p. 44). Interest in these concepts has resurged (Jorgenson, 1989; Mishler, 1979; Sherman & Webb, 1988). Through researchers' discussions and work, there is an ostensible paradigmatic shift away from structural-functionalist and behavioristic influence. Research in education, consistent with interest in "meaning" and social interaction, has found a link between concerns in separation of theory and practice and qualitative research.

In reflection of changing emphases in social theory, adult education researchers have gradually been pursuing diverse forms of qualitative research. Researchers' creative choices begin to reflect their ontological and epistemological assumptions. "Action research" is an example of this development (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). Interest in ethnographic work is another example (Sherman & Webb, 1988).

With respect to this overview, the metaphor of rushing water has been used for two distinct purposes. Moving water suggests a dynamic quality which captures an image of so many individuals interacting to produce paradigmatic effects. The metaphor also suggests the "rush" and "tumble" of this brief historical overview. It was intended to provide merely an approximation of context. The more pressing matter is what has come of cascading ethnographic work. What has surfaced?

## Critique In Ethnographic Literature

Does emerging ethnographic research respond to the concerns raised about quantitative research? Are there new concerns? Fortunately, the research is at a stage where researchers are ready to begin to comfortably accept and offer critique of qualitative research. Important, critical self-reflection has begun to emerge in the literature.

The most common critique relates closely to whether ethnographic work has responded to the promises driving researchers in search of a qualitative paradigm. Several authors acknowledge one common criticism of ethnographic work. Contemporary ethnographic work has been criticized for being descriptive only, not pressing more strongly towards theoretical analysis (Agar, 1980, p. 9; Woods, 1988, p. 95).

This critique strikes at the very heart of benefits claimed for qualitative research. It implies not only a lack of generated theory which is worrisome, but it also implies affirmation of a barrier between theory and practice. Some explain this as a necessary part of a process. It is argued that, over time, these descriptions provide sufficiency of data (saturation) so that theory may then begin to emerge (Woods, 1988, p. 94). While it may be a matter of compiling sufficient data through description, other critiques may offer up clues.

Additional critiques range from concerns with administrative processes to specific concerns with data analysis and social theory. For instance, Woods believes that the "snapshot problem", analysis limited by time constraints on researchers in data collection, is

connected to both. He suggests the problem is one of method, "one researcher doing one case study at a time " (1988, p. 102).

Coordination of studies is one of the proposed solutions.

Two other authors, Goodson and Walker (1988) address a different issue of time and ethnographic work. They express concern with "the basic assumption of timelessness which pervades many ethnographic accounts" (1988, p. 113). Goodson and Walker state that this implied quality is "misleading, for it suggests a simplification of the possibilities that underlie apparent formal similarities" (1988, p. 113). They attribute the problem to assumptions of social theory rather than issues of coordinated study.

"Timelessness" is not the only tacitly assumed quality in ethnographic work which trouble Goodson and Walker. Jointly, they speak forcefully of another surfacing theme in ethnographic work.

The preoccupation with the 'singer, not the song' needs to be seriously tested in ethnographic study. (Goodson & Walker, 1988, p. 111)

Their concern echoes with critiques of structural-functionalism and behaviorism. According to them, in pursuit of patterns, "the actions" become separated from the actor.

These latter concerns as expressed relate to problems of unexamined assumptions of social theory. These unexamined, "tacit assumptions" come from somewhere. A description of additional concern related to social theory may provide context for some of those already described:

No doubt the problem of linking micro and macro levels of analysis, society and the individual, structure and process will continue to exercise the minds of sociologists for some time. (Woods, 1988, p. 97)

Woods refers therein to a whole set of tensions in social theory, reflected in diverse schools of thought, within sociology and anthropology.

When discovered, then, some "tacit assumptions" prove to be recognizable but unresolved paradigmatic polarities inherited from various schools of thought within disciplines. These might be avoided to some extent through constant reflection and consideration of other researchers' experience.<sup>6</sup>

Other ontological and epistemological assumptions we hold as researchers are simply uncharted. Impossible to avoid, some of these may be discovered through recognition of and identification with the source of dissonance. (I speak from the experience of attempting to apply theories to data analysis and being disturbed by some vague sense of conflict as previously described.)

Exploring additional "critiques" and concerns of ethnographers has elicited at least one possible response to the question of why much ethnographic work remains primarily descriptive. Problems and enigmas raised in social theory and as represented in diverse schools have not been avoided by researchers choosing to do ethnographic work. They have become part of the context for researchers' work.

There are considerable difficulties in choosing a social theory. Diversity of choice is not the only problem. Even if one does choose,

one may be faced with unresolved tensions related to the choice. Woods referred to a number of these in terms of linking "macro and micro"; "society and the individual"; "structure and process" (Woods, 1988, p. 97).

These unresolved tensions with respect to social theory may, in fact, crystallize into an axis for paradigmatic shift. Referring back to the brief historical overview, within the last decade in particular, researchers have expressed interest in and come to rely on "meaning" and "social context" as a starting point. Increased discussion of phenomenological and critical theory indicate such a transition for researchers. In adult education a shift from structure to process is apparently taking place (Jarvis, 1985). This shift may be linked with capacity for theory generation.

There is a possible explication for researchers' "limited" theory generation if we consider our context in terms of "paradigm flux". If being rigorous about reflection on social theory, one must attend to assumptions about the concept of "theory". For example, those beginning from a strongly interpretive epistemology would argue that "description" is all that can be derived from research experiences (Guba & Lincoln, 1982). If, consistent within an interpretive epistemology, theory is considered in very broad terms as assumptions on which we rely to interpret our experiences, researchers' descriptions have social theory richly imbedded in them.

I have assumed that the most common intention towards "theory generation" is a creation of more abstract statements. These abstract

statements may be written in a manner suggesting immutable insight, in this case, into social interaction.

Placed in the context of "paradigm" as heuristic device, these "theoretical statements" are compelling only so long as they adequately make sense of our social experience. In the following passages it is the latter sense of "theory" which is used. However, both of these senses of theory are expressed in this thesis. The image I have used to express the two is "the intimate and the abstract". The thesis has been divided to reflect this. Again, the notion of the concept "theory" has implications in debates related to theory generation and "theory disengaged from practice".

Current confusion concerning existing social theory is an impediment with respect to theory generation. This is a dilemma related to the interactive role of social theory in methodology.

In striving to generate new theory by which we may make sense of our experiences, as methodological guide we must rely on the very social theory which we are in the process of re-interpreting. I will use my own experience with data analysis to demonstrate how this paradox may impede and ultimately dissuade researchers from generating more abstract theoretical statements from their experience in the field. Once more, struggling to define this paradox has figured strongly in my methodological processes related to data analysis.

#### Concerns Arising Directly Out of Data Analysis Work

This review of methodological resource material commenced with an admission. I described a need to return to materials on methodology

for special guidance in data analysis and creation of a representational form. Yet a repeat performance with "new" additional resource materials did not quell certain rumblings. Data analysis continued, but only with considerable discomfiture. Much of the Mobile-framework was constructed with a noise level beyond pen scratchings, paper squashings and printer scoldings.

This is the place where I am forced finally to attend to details of a disconcerting drum. The place is one of preparation for describing my own process of data analysis in the context of what has gone before. The critiques located in the literature provided some clues to the "noise". Through them I have discovered two sources of conceptual disturbance. Both sources originate from the dilemma of hermeneutical circle in methodology. Although the two sources are interrelated, this begins with the one most directly connected to data analysis.

a) Processual Guidelines For Data Analysis

The historical overview related to methodology was framed in paradigmatic terms. That overview described a number of changing currents in the theoretical riverbed of ethnography. Among them was a shifting in education away from structural-functionalist influence which conceived of education from "its" institutional functions. (The concept of "teaching" has been researched generally from this framework). In addition, a shift away from behaviorist psychology was described ("learning" having been studied within this framework and within the institutional context).

Described as well was a reputed shift towards concern with meaning and social context. This was related to increased interest in phenomenology and critical theories. Has this shift consistently influenced all aspects of ethnographic work? Certainly many authors have begun their works suggesting the significance of these concepts.

Given an emphasis on theory generation, it is not unreasonable for ethnographers to focus entirely on social theory in terms of "the content" of fieldwork and data analysis. That is, locating their findings in social theory. However, as previously stated, social theory also has a place in the processual role of generating theory. Ontological and epistemological assumptions must act as guide in analytic process explicitly or implicitly.

Unfortunately, this is precisely where the gaps in the literature on ethnography in education still linger. This is not entirely surprising if a shift in paradigm is being experienced. Available literature has not caught up with experience. Miles and Huberman, while reaching further than most in this direction, readily admit that possible process for data analysis and theory creation is not well described (1984, p. 251).

More worrisome for a researcher are efforts to describe data analysis methods which are incongruent with the very social theory sought after in theory generation. Examples of the paradigmatic paradox in process are provided. Two particular examples were chosen from the literature because they derive from relatively recent work. However, as the critique concerning "singer not song" indicates, the problem has been emerging for some time and is pervasive in the work.

Consistent with espousing a paradigmatic shift, recent methodological resource materials often couch the purpose and benefits of ethnography in terms of meaning and social process:

In short then, the methodology of participant observation provides direct experiential and observation access to the insiders' world of meaning. (Jorgenson, 1989, p. 15)

This certainly emphasizes meaning and concern with social process as the point of study. How is this self-same reflection on social process turned towards data analysis process?

Ethnographers appear to have dealt with the critique of "timelessness" by recognition of process. The method for recognizing patterns of social process observed is to add "process" to the list of categories by which to analyze data:

Your reasons for collecting the information and making notes provides a basis for identifying and labeling these materials as a member of some class, type, or set as part of or related to a sequence, process, or pattern. (Jorgenson, 1989, p. 108)

A subtle shift creeps into the work at this point. "Process" conveyed in this manner contains a troubling, tacit assumption. That assumption appears more markedly in this clarification of data analysis method for codification of "process":

"Process" codes refer to coding words and phrases that facilitate categorizing sequences of events, changes over time, passages from one type or kind of status to another. In order to use a process code, the researcher must view a person, group, organization, or activity over time and perceive change occurring in a sequence of at least two parts. Typical process codes point to time periods, stages, phases, passages, steps, careers and chronology. (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 159)

These authors confirmed a widespread attempt to shift paradigm so that ethnographic research recognizes social process and change. The manner proposed, however, is problematic. Creating categories of

process out of data collected, steers the work away from meaning, back to a structural-functionalist set of assumptions. Insofar as writers use "group, organization or activity" without making reference to "meaning" in this section, they appear to have slipped towards the reification.

"Meaning" has manifestly disappeared in their brief descriptions (although it resurfaces in other codes). If we represent, for instance, the language of the group we instantly summon up qualities of the static and the monolithic. This undermines qualities of meaning which, being held by individuals is far more dynamic.

In excluding these dynamic qualities of meaning, new interpretation of social theory sought after is edited out in data analysis process. This is the source of dissonance I experienced at the time when I attempted to use categories as part of a method of data analysis. In terms of the study, group members began with disparate ideas and their meanings changed as rapidly. They were attempting to create a "group".

If the concept of social "process" adequately reflected our social experience, interviewing one member of the group about the language should be sufficient to capture the perspective of all. Once researchers remove the actors and their process of creation and constant change associated with that process, the work lies vulnerable to those problematic aspects of structural-functionalism. This position leads to assumptions about how we may study "culture".

A few methodological resources call for more reflection of ontological and epistemological assumptions. Wolcott, for example,

emphasizes the need for researchers to contemplate what they assume by "culture". If the focus of study on social interactions is social process related to meaning, there are some inherent assumptions about how we can understand these processes and the manner in which it is possible to represent "them".

If the form of our documentation suggests mapping out a homogeneous, static object, we thereby solicit problems associated with structural-functionalism and reification. Adding "process" to our list of categories merely creates a phenomenon out of "change". Relying on that procedure of data analysis a new dimension is added to reification. We are still trapped, thereby, in the strong current of structural-functionalism.

Efforts to shift our paradigm away from structure towards meaning and process as focal point have been only partially successful. Our objectives reflect our intent. However, they are not actualized in dominant guidelines for data analysis process. Rather, we have managed now to press meaning into the exclusive service of structure (Wilson, 1977, p. 254). We must continue our attempts to match social theory inherent in objectives with data analysis process.

One apparent way a few researchers have avoided this problem is to recognize meaning as located in the individual and then to confine themselves to categorizing a particular individual's meaning (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Campbell, 1988). If, however, we adhere to a social construction framework, meaning for individuals is constructed through social process. When researchers confine themselves entirely to research on one individual's perspective at a specific point, even if

the research acknowledges limitations of claim, the picture, while a highly important contribution, cannot readily convey social and dynamic qualities of individuals' creation and maintenance of meaning.

In the study, focusing on a particular individual was not a solution to dilemmas of data analysis arising from "process codification". I was attempting to analyze data concerning creation of "a group".

This leads directly to a second, source of perturbation in the work. It was connected to another nuance in the relationship between data analysis and social theory. I have used "theory location" since the phrase describes several elements of the experience.

#### b) Data Analysis and Theory Location

Throughout the study I have searched in adult education literature for that which would provide explication for experiences in the field. The research began with adult education and theatre, and adult education and qualitative research resource material ethnographies and participant observation material more particularly. Theoretical literature exclusively framed in these terms did not provide sufficient explication. Since there was some difficulty discovering material under the auspices of adult education I searched for applicable social theory in other disciplines. That process was outlined in Chapter Four.

In these final stages of data analysis, theory generation, and representation I have returned once more to face the questions, "Where

may this study be located in adult education theory? Does it fit within the present paradigm as represented in the literature?

Through reviewing ethnographic critiques and my steps in search of like ethnographic works in adult education, I have become aware of a pattern in "location" of a more concrete kind. According to several sources, the "boom" in ethnographic research within education is generally conducted within a formal organizational setting (Woods, 1988). In the instance of this study, group members did not articulate, however, an educational objective as primary, either for actors or audience.

In focusing so strongly on adults outside of formal adult education organizations, a question has arisen as to whether this ethnographic work fits within an emerging theoretical framework for adult education. Admittedly, I have found considerable difficulty fulfilling my second objective of relating description to adult education theory. (See Chapter One.)

In the next segment, the "theory trail", there are limited references to theoretical works exclusively rooted in adult education literature. Focus being on ethnographic work and finding none similar, I looked to social theory concerning social process. I continued to consult this source of theory in an effort to move beyond problematic guidelines for data analysis "process" in ethnographic reference material.

Clearly, in the study I was observing adults who were learning. Interactions through which they learned were most illuminating. Yet

there has been an ongoing struggle to both find a way to make sense of that experience and to represent the experience in terms of adult education. As a result of this struggle, the question has become turned inside out. Its new form: "Why are so many studies, particularly ethnographic ones in education confined to the formal educational, organizational structure?"<sup>7</sup>

Two interrelated considerations stem from this question. First one of the hallmarks of both qualitative and ethnographic research is that the researcher must go where the important events are occurring (Shimahara, 1988, p. 82). One does not construct a laboratory, one "goes on location". This is the key to thriving empirical qualities associated with qualitative research. Put in terms of adult education issues, this is an important element of the ethnographic work attractive to current attempts at linking theory and practice.

Social theory influences more than just lab versus "on site" choice of locations. The social theory as emerging suggests specific sites. When we come to do data analysis and look to link the work with others' research, recognition of links may be tied up with commonality of site.

The fact that educational ethnographers have tended to choose to study formal educational organizations is a strong indication that they are oriented to think of formal educational organizations as the only site to study not only "education" but "teaching and "learning". Even if that has not been researchers' general assumption, the strong

emphasis in the literature leads to that tacit assumption. This general pattern to adult education research is noted by Darkerwald and Merriam (1982, p. 152).

In pointing out patterns of research location I do not intend to diminish the importance of research in formal educational organizations. Those sites are most important. However, over the years, some adult educators have begun to recognize other significant sites of research related to people's learning process.

Among others, Tough contributed to what might well be described at the time as a paradigmatic shift in studying adults learning outside of those institutional frameworks (1971). (As he framed his work in terms of individuals conducting their own learning projects, the work did not have direct application to content of data analysis in this study.) Despite Tough's work being vulnerable to contemporary critique on methodological grounds work in the area was most important in terms of shattering pervasive assumptions that organizations were the only location in which learning was occurring among individuals.<sup>8</sup>

Darkerwald and Merriam (1982) illustrate another attempt to shift focus to "learning" as associated with organizations having a spectrum of objectives. According to their framework, at one end of the spectrum were those organizations which articulated having adult education as a primary organizational function, at the other were those in which adult educations were viewed as secondary and supportive of other prime functions of that agency (1982, p. 155). Although looking to categorize a formal institution's objectives in relation to adult education, Darkerwald and Merriam were concerned

Yet in terms of guidance within resource materials on methodology and methods, frequently there is an underlying set of subtle assumptions. Many of the works are dominated by the assumption that, what Kuhn would call "normal science" is required. These writings imply that work adding to an extant framework is appropriate.

Within the same set of materials there are opening statements pressing for innovation and theory generation whether this work may press against paradigmatic framework or not. The two sets of assumptions at once create a detail of dissonance consistent with paradigmatic transition. It is expressed in advantages and disadvantages of providing concrete guides which also attempt to standardize data analysis procedures. It is also expressed in relying on whatever can be taken for granted including choice of site. The difficulty lies in being within a paradigm shift in which we have been unable to articulate a relationship between reliance on "the old" and what is emerging.

Before moving on I will relate this to the earlier source of discomfort, rumblings of dissonance referred to previously. To understand more about this source of changing rhythm I will explore a link between the two.

The historical overview alluded to a strong influence of structural-functionalist thought. From within that framework, "education" has been thought of in terms of institutional function. Reflecting this orientation, "teaching" was studied in terms of function largely within the formal educational institution. "Learning" was studied from a behavioralist psychological framework.

Converted into structural-functionalist terms, individuals were observed within institutions for changes in their behaviour (Tyler, 1949).

I have described researchers prompting paradigm shifts in social theory of late. In virtually the same stroke I have questioned how emphatically we have made this shift. The example I provided thus far is the first cause for dissonance — a critique of modifications to data analysis process. I now offer a second indication that structural-functionalist thought influences us so profoundly still that we locate and expect others to locate their research within the formal institution. For this reason most of our research resources lean towards researching a relatively narrow band of social activity in which individuals learn.

Research concerning learning in the larger context of social interaction not only receives limited attention, but it may be vulnerable to inquiries as to whether it is "actually" adult education. Historical conceptual ties with structural-functionalism may offer an explication of this apparent holdover.<sup>10</sup> Ironically, as previously pointed out, this acts to discourage innovation and theory generation.

Despite a refocus on meaning, very generally speaking, ethnographic studies appear to follow one of two routes. The researcher focuses on individuals and tends to ignore "change" in terms of social interactions, hence the critique of timelessness. If the individual's meaning is reified, separated in the research from the individual's interactions, even meaning becomes static. On the

other hand, the researcher may focus on education as "process" within a formal educational organization. This allows the researcher to assume certain elements about that organization's "structure".

"Process" as described is thus turned into an object which takes on, ironically, a static quality of "its" own.

These are critiques of a paradigm fast changing as more researchers begin to take up various forms of qualitative research. This "either or " of the ethnographic research in education appears to reflect, again, several of the unresolved tensions of social theory mentioned earlier.

Insofar as individuals' meanings and their experience of change in social interactions both became dominant themes in study of their learning, I have attempted not to focus on "the individual" to the exclusion of "process". I have endeavored not to sever "process" from the actors.<sup>11</sup>

The study attempts to come to terms with each of the three unresolved tensions in social theory which Woods described. It also attempts to address critiques of ethnography related to "timelessness" and "ignoring issues of power" (Woods, 1988). The efforts to do this unfold in the remaining Chapters. This first of the four reviews, "Methodological Resources For Data Analysis", has included references to a few findings in data analysis. These have provided a springboard for the following review in which data analysis findings are the focal point.

## 2) REVIEW OF KEY CONCEPTS ARISING FROM DATA ANALYSIS PROCESS

Because interpretation is grounded in data, results are neither discarded nor discredited if the data fails to support an original hypothesis. Rather, the hypotheses themselves are modified to match the nonconforming data. (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 199)

As Goetz and LeCompte describe it, a major part of data analysis is composed of theorizing. This entails developing theories about the data and sifting through extant theories of methodology and social theory frameworks already developed. Theory generation arises out of attempts to match the two or create new explication. Given the all-inclusiveness of this process, it is important to reemphasize that in a broad sense, data analysis describes virtually all aspects of my process including library research.

Although methodological resources in this area did not satisfy all questions from ethnographic work, they provided framework in two ways. First, I attempted to adopt strategies suggested in methodological resource material. Some were most effective. However, even when suggestions concerning process did not appear to be adequate, they were something to press back against. The struggle in shifting towards theory generation is one example I described. Relying on both these forms of direction from resource material, the data analysis proceeded.

### Stages Of Data Analysis

Data analysis formally commenced with scrutinizing fieldnotes for patterns in observations. Initially, I expected to search for

patterns and if they could be confirmed through other observations, I expected to note then whether these patterns continued. Instead, as group members' interactions changed and as my familiarity with diverse areas of literature grew, more and more patterns emerged. More and more ways of thinking about group members and their interactions surfaced. Eventually, with well over one hundred tapes (most ninety minutes in length) from group members' meetings and interviews (including discussion with resource people) and with binders full of notes (reflections on reflections), it became clear how enormous was the task of determining that which was "significant" .

Based on direction from methodological materials (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Spradley, 1980) "categories" were used as an analytic structure for data analysis. Patterns observed became the data for constructing categories. The first set of categories to emerge came through discussion with resource people. Through group members' interactions and through interviews four sub-groupings emerged. These subgroup categories were based on four different meanings people ascribed to their involvement in this theatre project. These subgroupings are outlined in "General Context", a section of Part Three.

Despite categories functioning as a useful analytic tool in that instance, I found myself struggling to use categories in other instances. It was particularly difficult to express early intuitive senses of significance in data through this means and then to "checkup" on these senses.

"Themes" found a more comfortable fit as a way to think of the by now large collection of observations. Quantities of themes were "aggregated" based on fieldnotes and transcriptions of interview tapes. At the high point the list was comprised of over fifty themes. Consideration of these large numbers of themes divulged how extensively the experience was changing. A dramatic grasp-gasp moment revealed what had been disturbing about relying on "categories" for data analysis.

The concept leaned towards an attempt to document a static picture of a culture — or structure (Goodson & Walker, 1988, p. 113; Shimahara, 1988, p. 82). A static quality of life was antithetical to what had been observed in participants' interactions.

A participant observer, for instance, examines within the world of everyday life exactly when, where, how and to what extent theoretical ideas do or do not apply. In this way, concepts sensitizing scholars to the realities of human existence are listed, verified, refined, or rejected empirically. (Jorgenson, 1989, p. 113)

Based on discussion with resource people and relying on resource material I began to look to methods of data analysis which were less likely to lead to focus on structural aspects of group members' interactions.

When rejecting "categories" as a method of analysis, other ways were sought to work with the unwieldy list of themes. Relying on processes which Goetz and LeCompte describe as "analytic induction" (1984, p. 179) and "constant comparison" (1984, p. 182) the list of

themes was sorted. In some instances there was sufficient overlap to combine themes. Even with this pruning process well over half the themes remained.

I recall this as a "stuck point" in the thesis work. All of the items on the list of themes had some relevance. However, an attempt to develop a framework placing all of these themes at the centre would have made data analysis unmanageable. Such a framework would not have reflected significance in group members' sense of the experience.

Priorities were required.

Analysis at this point is focused on uncovering specific issues of study and/or refining the research problem.  
(Jorgenson, 1989, p. 107)

I was attempting to make that transition.

In an effort to make the transition two strategies were pursued. I returned to the data and thereby re-immersed myself in the experience as much as possible. I reread a number of theoretical works. Beginning with this activity the process became so highly interactive it is difficult to describe. I have chosen two "tangles", two conceptual lumps which, when sorted out, led to crystallization of paramount themes for which I had been searching.

First, a key epistemological issue surfaced through a variety of shapes in items on the theme list. The list included themes which would be significant for some participants, but not all. A few themes simply reflected differing relationships among group members, myself among them. As the list grew, significance seemed to change.

When contemplating my relationship to "the group" and how I would represent various starting points of significance, I had difficulty

finding a starting place which would adequately represent "the experience". One question encapsulated this quandary: If I wished to represent "group" members' meaning how would I do that? I could not document participants' each and every meaning. In addition to problems of tacit and explicit meaning (differences between externalization and internalization), I simply didn't have access to each person's meaning at every moment. Even if I had, the data would be overwhelming for researcher and eventually reader alike.

Finally, no matter what the compendium created, I was the filter system so they would still be my meanings. Given issues of practicality raised by my questions and limited theoretical response on how to adequately represent meanings of divergent "group members", another question emerged through reflection and discussion with resource people.

Were there times when cues from the data suggested group members did hold similar meanings? If so when? And would these provide through group members' meaning a priority framework for the themes? This set me on a course for reconsidering social theories in terms of describing process of change in meaning. It is very difficult to describe the details of the next period. There were so many conceptual knots.

The work shifted back and forth among the four areas of work. A few rather large lumps do stand out still. I will describe several by way of illustration of data analysis process.

Clarity about confusion among "culture", "meaning" and "structure" was absolutely fundamental to movement forward. I was

directed to Geertz' work (1973) in the area.<sup>12</sup> It is from this conceptual struggle that distinctions emerged between structure and culture referred to in the first review of methodology. Distinctions considered are more substantially outlined in Chapter Six.

Having come to terms with this issue, I discovered that a second issue pressed immediately forward in the thesis work. Related to "theatre", this one was manifested through several different concerns during data analysis. In fact I have continued to struggle throughout with the place of "theatre" in this work. While reading a few social theory books I launched into reading about "theatre" cast in a number of different lights.

First, as the literature review in Part One discloses I read about theatre as written by those in adult education. However, these authors did not present a uniform picture of a relationship between theatre and adult education (other than the extreme usefulness of using theatre). As well I soon observed differences in ontological and epistemological starting points among authors.

In response, literature created from "theatre as discipline" was used as a starting point (Brockett, 1984) on the basis that this would afford the study some balance in perspective. As well, this literature had become more significant as data analysis led to a recognition that this was the intended framework of "the group". For them, their project was not framed in terms of education, but theatre.

I acknowledge naivete in searching for a univocal framework in literature of theatre since so much pluralism was discovered

elsewhere. I also came to realize that even if theatre had been homogeneously conceptualized by "authorities" in the literature, their views were not held by group members who were relatively new at this. Their assumptions were not homogeneous among themselves, as social theory upon which I relied had already predicted.

Finally, I sought guidance from works whose authors began from a social theory framework about "theatre" (States, 1987; Turner, 1982; Wilshire, 1982). As the next section will detail, some of these works provided a way of thinking about group members' meanings and activities. However, group members' interactions particularly at the start when researching and "negotiating" what they would do, could not be described as "theatre" per se. At most their interactions led up to acting. Their actions emerged into theatre actions eventually.

However, if the project had ceased within the first four or five meetings, one would not describe what they had done as theatre. These concerns led me back to general social theory on processes as the larger framework in which "theatre" as a part of their processes would fit. This had eventual implications for modifications to representational form, the Mobile-framework.

In working through these lumps and other conceptual tangles I had narrowed down some of the themes. Although group members clearly had many activities and meanings associated with their project, common meaning focused on theatre activities. To edit the mass, data was sifted for acting activities. Administrative activities were explored, but less intensively.

I have used these "lumps" as examples of my process. They might be fitted into any of the reviews of the four work areas since the work was interactive. They are excerpted samples of data analysis, taken from a complex of such emerging processes.

They are provided here to indicate where the process of data analysis may be meshed with literature on method in methodology and where my work did not find a footing in current methodological resources. I now understand that this is part of the nature of the work. One author describes attempts at grounded theory as "heretical - paradigm transcendence" (Hutchinson, 1988).

My attempt to concretely match extant theories with what was emerging from data analysis may be described related to two techniques described by Goetz and LeCompte "theoretical consolidation" (1984, p. 198) and "theoretical application" (1984, p. 201).<sup>13</sup>

From these direct experiences and much struggling emerged a few "paramount" themes which pervade the thesis: Change, meaning, and learning related to social process and theatre. Linked to methodological materials, these themes functioned as guides for further data analysis:

Unlike concepts defined and measured in operational terms, sensitizing concepts serve to alert the user to the general character of the empirical world, by providing hints and suggestions illustrated by actual empirical cases. (Jorgenson, 1989 p. 112)

I relied on these sensitizing concepts or paramount themes as compasses for analysis. These themes prompted emergence of priority or focus on specific meanings and interactions. Given the interactive work with social theory I also began to reflect on ways to represent

change in process. Reliance on the word "emerging" derived from that analysis.

Interestingly this analytic work most often began to take concrete shape through creating the representational form. Bogdan and Biklen's description of "process code" (1982, p. 159) most closely resembles my return to categories and properties, but in modified form. This is addressed in more detail within the fourth review at the end of this Chapter.

Again, linking this description of process with those offered in methodological literature, Goetz and LeCompte (1984) provided the most helpful directions. Related to their spectrum of analytic devices for data analysis, I used constant comparison and analytic induction concerning interrelationship between analytic devices for data analysis (direct theorizing) and relating already constructed theories to data analysis.

A benefit to having begun work on "themes" surfaced eventually. The themes list served as "data" for what emerged as significant. Meaning, and change, were paramount themes which indicated a need to discover how to think about analysis in those terms. As I had not located any methodological resources which modeled data analysis in this fashion, I began to work on such a "process" and "product", a model to represent the experience framed in these themes.

In doing the latter I shifted into a new stage of data analysis. This new stage was a focus on searching for a representational form as a concrete way of coming to terms with this issue. During this process I came to rely once more on "categories", but this time

reconceptualized. I attempted to use the concept being sensitive to issues of reification. in efforts to represent data. This issue inspired various efforts which emerged through process of creating a representational form. (Chapter Seven refers to them.)

Those methodological pieces which emerged as matching inductions and deductions from my work in the three other areas have been reviewed herein. Since one area flows into the other this review is now followed by an overview of work related to other theoretical resources.

### 3) REVIEW OF THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS IN THE MOBILE-FRAMEWORK: CONTRIBUTIONS AND LIMITATIONS BY SOURCE

Chapter Four outlines initial forays into various areas of theoretical frameworks. After leaving the field, additional theoretical works were sought to assist in data analysis. Goetz and LeCompte describe this analytic process as follows:

It [application of theory as technique] involves a systematic search for studies or analytic frames that fit the data more abstractly or generally. (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 20)

The review contained in this section takes the form of a compilation of theoretical foundations for data analysis and theory generation. The first collection includes works from the "Social Theory Resource Materials" area of research. It is followed by a second compilation drawn from "Adult and Community Education Resource Materials".

## SOCIAL THEORY TRAIL

This theoretical compilation marks a trail which had far more turns and intersections. The use of the words "Contributions" and "Limitations" reflects a streamlined review of a "matching process". Sections headed "Contributions" outline aspects of those theories which matched or provided adequate explication for data analysis and were consistent with methodology. Many of the theories cited are rich with concepts. The trail is confined to an overview of only those concepts which are major and which have particular application to findings of data analysis.

"Limitations" sections review areas wherein a match did not adequately explicate all elements of data analysis. Limitations, for instance, resulted from authors writing with an emphasis different from that of this work or from internal inconsistencies in a theoretical framework. When limitations were uncovered and there were areas where there was no match, it was necessary to literally push on to new theories.

The theories are not reviewed in chronological order as discovered in their application to data analysis. They are laid out in an order which best illustrates where they dovetail to make sense of data and data analysis.

Within this review several references to data analysis which prompted searches for theoretical material are described. This is to provide indication of matching process. In this way "Contributions"

and "Limitations" sections structurally link data analysis with theoretical resource material. Data samples, however, do not appear within this review.

The primary focus of the "theory trail" is to illuminate the first and second areas of discovery "content" of data analysis. A major focus for analysis became group members' social processes related to meaning, change and learning. In coming to analyze how group members variously experienced rapid changes, how they interacted to create and respond to changes, and eventually how this shaped their learning, I looked to theoretical frameworks to suggest "elements of social interaction".<sup>14</sup>

Elements Of Social Interaction:  
From A View Of Social Structure

Initially, materials on "methodology" and "adult education and theatre" were surveyed for guidance in content of data analysis. Resource materials concerning theatre and adult education eventually provided some assistance with data analysis. However, at the first two meetings group members did not "act" or "perform". They were attempting to come to terms with how to create a play, much of this through discussion. They were learning through their discussion and this provided context for their "acting". During this process several shifts occurred in their interactions towards each other and their expressed senses of "their situation".

I came to understand that they were literally creating a group and a common framework of theatre as well as creating a specific play.

These individuals were engaged in a larger social process which would have to be understood in terms of conceptualizing "theatre" as a "sub-process" of their social construction.

Fieldwork research became focused on perceptions of individuals in the group as they articulated themselves or expressed themselves through actions. During fieldwork data analysis and reflection my focus often shifted to understand how individuals' perceptions and actions were influenced by group members when meeting with each other.

For example, their perceptions seemed to be influenced by individuals' assumptions about what the "group" would think or feel. One group member said, "If I do this they are going to think I'm nuts!" Although "the group" changed several times with different people attending from one meeting to the next, some vague concept of "the group" appeared to surface during the first few meetings. "Group" became a constant phenomenon for them, an eventual reference point for each individual.

This observation about group members' process of changing and maintaining each other's perceptions emerged as an important guide for observations. I also began to think of learning as a social process. Finally, I came to recognize a common experience among group members. They appeared to experience a tension between a desire to explore and a need for certainty. This was apparently bound up with their learning as a social process.

I commenced with reading as was previously suggested, the book, Social Construction Of Reality: A Treatise In The Sociology Of

Knowledge by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966). It proved valuable as a foundational framework for explicating group members' "non-theatre" interactions. Many of the words used to describe emerging "themes" in the data analysis are ones which derived from that book.

In a few instances, when group members were improvising based on encouragement from the director it almost seemed as though they were relying on that book to plumb creative depths. They were socially constructing a "reality" on stage.

a) Social Construction Of Reality, A Treatise In The Sociology Of Knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1966)

The trail commences with this work chiefly because it became the main theoretical structure upon which I relied. This is not an uncommon reference to ethnographic works. Several authors refer to this theoretical piece (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988) in combination with another reference, Kuhn's work (Hutchinson, 1988; Jorgenson, 1989). I relied on this work as my foundation for social processes. Over the course of data analysis I returned to the framework repeatedly for guidance.

Through data analysis and efforts to find representational form "meaning" and "change" emerged as primary in the study's theoretical work. However, as neither these, nor concepts of theatre were maintained consistently at the forefront of this theoretical piece, the foundation was constantly modified through application of other theoretical works. Guidance for modifications came through data analysis and efforts to find representational form.

Contributions:

The Social Construction Of Reality is a testimony to the human capacity for synthesis. Berger and Luckmann are masters of "plot" creation; they have melded the discourse of many minds into one massive monograph. The monograph's plot being so rich with subplots, the main thesis is the primary focus of this review.

To discover a way of representing elements of group members' activities related to change, theories describing elements of social interactions were sought. The theoretical framework developed in Berger and Luckmann's book provided the broad ontological and epistemological structure upon which I came to rely. It provided a starting point on which to build using data analysis as guidance for new theoretical direction. What follows are those aspects of the theoretical framework which continue to have application "despite" data and data analysis.

The main thesis of the book is ostensibly simple -- "Reality is socially constructed" (1966, p. 13). That is, through interactions with others we create frameworks of meanings which appear to us to have an immutable quality. In the authors' words reality has a quality of "being independent of our volition" (1966, p. 13). The meaning we constructed thereby acts back upon us.

The contents of these social realities are based upon a social stock of knowledge. Concepts of "knowledge" are intimately connected to concepts of reality in the sense that knowledge is defined by the authors "as the certainty that phenomena are real and that they possess certain characteristics" (1966, p. 13).

Social Construction Of Reality provides an explanation for significance of and impetus for creating and maintaining a social structure through the concept of "anomie". Since the book became foundational as a basis for theory generation in the study, quotations from the book are extensive.

"Anomie" is a concept which may most easily be explained as "rootlessness" or as an experience of shifting structure in which individuals' meaning has been eroded:

While the horror of aloneness is probably already given in the constitutional sociality of man, it manifests itself on the level of meaning in man's incapacity to sustain a meaningful existence in isolation from the nomic constructions of society. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 119)

The book's interest in social structure appears to be based squarely upon the notion that humans, as social beings seek to avoid meaninglessness which the authors assume must stem from anomic conditions. Thus the book focuses not only on a processual description of social construction, but is oriented towards a focus on social mechanisms for maintenance of a socially created structure.

According to Berger and Luckmann this social process may be linked to a concept of learning. As a primarily social process, learning takes place in the creation or construction of the reality (based upon development of social stock of knowledge), in the transmission of aspects of it (again through transmission of the social stock of knowledge) and even in the "curbing cues" given by some aspects of the maintenance machinery.

The authors have provided an array of concepts connected to process of creating a social reality and maintaining it. Many of

these concepts are also most surely connected to learning processes. They are accompanied by extremely brief descriptions. Those concepts which were considered to have some application to data analysis are described hereafter.

"Socialization" is a process which takes place within the individual. Berger and Luckmann describe socialization in this way:

We now not only understand each other's definitions of shared situations, we define them reciprocally. A nexus of motivations is established between us and extends into the us... We not only live in the same world, we participate in each other's being. (1966, p. 150)

The authors theorize that socialization is created through a dialectical process which they describe in terms of three concepts. In summary these three are: a) "Externalization", an individual's outward expressivity (p. 49); b) "Objectivations", manifestations of human expressivity, products of human activity (1966, p. 49); c) "Internalization", the process whereby "the objectivated social world is retrojected into the consciousness of the individual" (1966, p. 78-79). These descriptions have been "streamlined" for the purposes of this review.

If viewed as initial processes wherein individuals are able to form a society, these processes are a prelude to social construction of reality. These processes set up the condition wherein the nature of the social interaction is apprehended in a way that imbues the interaction with a "real" quality.

The authors also describe two separate educative processes of socialization, "primary and secondary socialization" (1966, p. 151).

For the most part, the processes are transmissions of the social stock of knowledge, although the authors draw attention to a major distinction between the two: "In primary socialization the individuals' first world is constructed" (1966, p. 155).

In their arrays of social processes, Berger and Luckmann describe another set of sub-process in social construction and maintenance of reality. They refer to these as "typification", "habitualization", and "institutionalization" (1966, p. 70-71). These three concepts describe how the human capacity for pattern creation is reflected first in conceptualization of the entities with whom interaction takes place (typification), second in the creation of patterns in the acts constituting the interaction (habitualization), and third in recognition by individuals of these patterns as reflected in their reciprocity of action (institutionalization).

According to the authors part of that which is constructed and accumulated is a "social stock of knowledge". Again, they offer a processual description related to the concept: "Within the semantic fields thus built up it is possible for both biographical and historical experience to be objectified, retained and accumulated (1966, p. 56). This stock of knowledge is "then transmitted from one generation to the next" (1966, p. 56).

There is one final processual description from the book which offered an understanding of data analysis both in terms of "content" and data analysis process. It was an important contribution to all

four areas of discovery. This is the concept of "reification".

Berger and Luckmann describe this as a process whereby consciousness of the act of social construction is lost:

... reification is the apprehension of the products of human activity as if they were something other than human products -- such as facts of nature, results of cosmic laws, or manifestations of divine will. (1966, p. 106)

The concepts and processes outlined from The Social Construction Of Reality had application to several of the themes from the data analysis. It was the primary thesis of the book which had most fundamental application to a major theme of the fieldwork. That is, learning defined and understood in terms of social process. The thesis of the book is focused upon the relationship between social process and the creation of knowledge.

Reflecting on learning theory from within that thesis has many implications. One of the implications is the ontological and epistemological starting point that humans can only be understood as social beings and that learning theory must reflect an understanding of the social process which shapes humans and their actions.

A key theme from data analysis was a tension in certainty. Participants were observed to express a desire for certainty through maintaining status quo on some occasions. This was contrasted on other occasions with a desire to seek out new meaning as a way of securing certainty.

The concept of anomie, a disruption of social structure associated with fears of rootlessness and a need for structure, might

certainly be linked to one manifestation of participants' need for certainty. As well, references to forms of pattern creation such as habituation refer to the benefits of patterns and structure: "Any action that is repeated frequently becomes cast into a pattern which can then be reproduced with an economy of effort" (p. 70-71). A need for certainty might at least partially be explained in these terms as well.

In the book "theatre" is referred to as a sub-universe, a different, less substantial form of reality. However, the authors make only fleeting references to theatre. While they also refer to concepts associated with theatre such as roles, there is limited discussion of the concept of theatre in the book.

#### Limitations:

Berger's and Luckmann's central focus in writing the book was to contribute to development of a sociology of knowledge. They were concerned with social process, but primarily in terms of social structure related to creation and maintenance of knowledge. Meaning, then, is only indirectly related to their theoretical framework. On the other hand, meaning emerges as central in this study. Social structure is eventually related to possible loss of meaning through anomie, but social structure is only one element related to individuals' meaning. The study's emerging focus then, bore only some areas of commonality with the book's.

Given its focus on social structure and maintenance of social structure, as a theoretical resource this book could not provide

explanations for data analysis suggesting certain experiences. For example, the nature of humankind as described in the book did not focus on desire for self-expression. Yet expressivity was a most significant theme for many group members. The authors did not clearly address relationships between expressivity and adaptivity.

This is also related to meaning in terms of a tension in certainty. As previously described, certainty was derived through two strikingly different sets of interactions. In some instances, participants looked to acquiring structure and maintenance of structure as a method of securing some certainty. However, on other occasions, they looked to minimal structure, to explore and create new meanings. Their intention to explore was generally associated with "formally" labelled theatre activities such as improvisation. However, this was not always the case.

In addition, since Berger and Luckmann are focused on epistemology in terms of knowledge rather than meaning, their concern is with cognitive aspects of human nature. An important theme from data analysis indicated that many group members began to connect special qualities of "theatre" with a focus on physical and emotional aspects of situations. Self-expression in physical, and emotional terms, as well as intellectual seemed a most significant part of what they were "learning" through improvisational processes.

Berger and Luckmann do not make many direct links between education and learning. Many of the processual descriptions have implications with respect to concepts of "learning" some of which have been indicated. It is not surprising then, that they say very little

directly which might suggest how a social learning process might be related to the emotional and physical aspects of humans. If anything their brief description of the physical nature of humans (p. 201-204) suggests a requirement to learn rather than the opportunity to rely on "animal instincts".

Still on the subject of meaning, in keeping with the book's concern with change in terms of anomie, a critique of modernity emerges in many of its passages, but only indirectly. It is a later book of Berger's, Facing Up To Modernity (1977) in which change in these terms is afforded more concentrated study. This book is not focused on how intentional change happens in particular. The emphasis is on maintenance of status quo. In the project group members were changing and they appeared to have different responses to change which "occurred to them".

There is one more aspect of meaning related to the study linked to many of the described themes for which explication was sought outside of the authors' theoretical framework. When observing group members' experiencing and creating change, I observed that there were occasions when they appeared to experience intense concern or intense pleasure. On other occasions their interactions did not suggest intense responses. Other than through the reference to anomie and a fear of rootlessness, the book did not proffer an explication for these varying degrees of intensity. I began to search elsewhere to add to the wealth of theoretical framework that the book had afforded.

Elements Of Social Interaction  
From A View Of Change As Part of Social Dynamic

b) The Sociology Of Religion (O'Dea, 1966)

This work provided explications concerning a number of areas raised through data analysis, not previously explained. In particular it offered a theoretical framework for the latter concerns arising out of work with theory in Social Construction Of Reality: a) How change happens; b) A clear indication of a relationship between expressivity and adaptivity and whether one may be an ontological starting point; and c) Distinctions between two spheres of meaning which may explicate differing intensities in group members' interactions.

Contributions:

Those aspects of this theoretical framework which assisted in providing answers to questions from data analysis were several. This theoretical framework relies on "expressivity" as an ontological and epistemological starting point for human essence and activity. In doing so it not only lends support for that concept, this starting point also opens the way for the beginnings of rethinking social structure in terms of expressivity and meaning. O'Dea also holds as a starting point delineation between spheres of human activity in terms of "the profane" and "the sacred".

These starting points have provided more context for an interpretation of the concept of "anomie". The author placed foremost for humans a need for meaning and, in social terms, a need for "culture". He asserts our social structure or organization must be driven by this in the long term.

This work, through a number of its references, underscores differences between the analytic distinction of culture, as social home of meanings, and structure, as social home of relationships, roles, elements of organization. The author's respectful critique of vulnerabilities in structural-functionalism thought has been relied on heavily in my critiques of methodology and other theoretical frameworks on social process.

O'Dea's description of "sacred" and "profane" spheres of meaning provides guidance in attributions of meaning. The sacred is less significant in the daily negotiation of life which is guided by "the profane". However, the sacred is a sense of the foundational, of anchor. When the anchor is severed or "rattled" the consequences are so profoundly felt that this change prompts people to respond and to create further change.

The work also provides a description of how at least one form of meaning change occurs in social context. The phrase "breaking points" (1966) describes those situations wherein old forms of meaning no longer make sense of an experience.

More specifically, this work provides a description of at least one response to change which causes anomie, "charisma" (1966, p. 23). Individuals' response signals a change in their meanings which is primarily related to "jarring" of the sacred sphere. The work also offers a description of tensions (dilemmas) in attempting to institutionalize the charismatic. One such tension occurs in the process of attempting to establish the sacred in a profane "organizational" framework (1966, p. 92).

### Limitations:

O'Dea's purpose diverged substantially from emerging fieldwork focus in a number of respects. His book has the intention of creating a sociology of religion to respond to certain limitations of prevalent structural-functionalist theory. Within this context the book offers up much more of a sense of the "creative", searching aspect of social life and a sense of how change in meaning occurs. It also offers description of social responses to change within social construction. However, there are still some concerns raised through data analysis which require further explication beyond that which is provided by the book.

He does not focus on issues of meaning in relation to power. This was not an initial focal point for the study either. However, issues of power related to change became of concern as data analysis continued. In addition, despite the description of expressivity as an ontological and epistemological starting point very little detail is provided. This is a key element commonly attributed to the concept "theatre". Group members' actions were eventually focused on expressivity through acting. Other resource materials were explored for further conceptual assistance with respect to this.

Through the author's described dilemma related to charisma and institutionalization we are given an example of tension connected to a relationship between individuals' profound meaning, social structure and change. The question arises: Are there additional examples of social interactions which illuminate relationships between meaning and other changing elements of social life?

O'Dea's work described some situations wherein individuals experience change of meaning. He begins to address change in modern context through reference to processes of "secularization" (1966, p. 80). This processual change attributed to modernity is of key concern for O'Dea. His primary focus is on implications for religion related to meaning and institutionalization. The study's focus on profound meaning seeks beyond the impact on "traditional" forms of institutionalization to discover what links there are to theatre as social construction associated with processes of secularization.

O'Dea's work certainly prompted consideration of relationships among meaning, culture and structure with a very different lens. His ideas propelled another line of inquiry.

#### Emerging Conceptual Distinctions Between "Culture" and "Structure"

I ran into a stumbling block for a period of time during data analysis with respect to meaning, culture, and structure. Two short pieces written by Clifford Geertz were suggested as offering possible aid to disentangle these interrelated concerns. His piece offered great assistance to me in what was largely a struggle taking place on an intuitive plane. The act of describing this "jumble" and elaborating the various elements of confusion removes it from that distant place.

Berger's and Luckmann's work offered explication for social process in terms of structure primarily. O'Dea's work had affirmed significance of meaning change in relation to structure, but had also related this to culture to some extent. Ethnographic work suggested

that the fieldwork was about "culture". Readings on "theatre" emphasized culture as well. Yet I had retained limited connections to changing meaning and concepts of culture. Nor was I clear on relationships among meaning, culture and structure related to change.

c) "Thick Description: Toward An Interpretive Theory Of Culture" in The Interpretation Of Cultures (Geertz, 1973)

Contribution:

This work was of great assistance in the third and fourth areas of discovery — seeking epistemological consistency in methodology. In this Chapter Geertz searches for an understanding of culture in processual terms:

Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning. (1973, p. 5)

This theoretical framework placed meaning at the centre of human existence. It reached beyond the statement to assert a notion of culture epistemologically consistent with that theoretical starting point.

Limitations:

The abstractions now had some consistency. I repeatedly reflected on Geertz' descriptive definition of culture. Despite this discovery in terms of the analytic, my fieldwork and data analysis still focused to a large extent on structural aspects of group members' interactions. I continued to seek "subgroupings" and categories related to "roles". This inconsistency between espoused

epistemology and orientation in data analysis might have continued had it not been for the pervasive change in group members' interactions.

To develop structure was part of a struggle for them. Particularly in the first half dozen meetings there were virtually no "routinizations" to observe. If in one meeting, Lenore, Eileen and Jessie came, well then in the next, Cam, Anna, and Jim came. If someone called the work "a play" one minute, it was referred to as "skits" the next, sometimes even by the same person. If they met at a cabin one meeting and discussed administrative concerns, the next meeting was at someone's home with "theatre" activities.

Meaning appeared to be attached to "something" beyond structure and yet based on many influences I appeared to still frame my data analysis in terms of seeking structural manifestations. The muddle of dissonance was ripe for distinction between culture and meaning. The work suggested which brought considerable relief to a conceptual snarl was a second work by Geertz.

d) "A Javanese Funeral" in The Interpretation Of Cultures  
(Geertz, 1973)

Contributions:

Geertz distinguishes in this work between "culture" and "social structure for analytic purposes. His distinction derives from an experience within a community in which social structure changed in such a way as to prevent the immediate burial of one of the children of the community.

The community contained groups from more than one religion. Despite differences, funereal rituals and meanings were held in

common, one of the meanings being associated with swift burial. When for political purposes, religious leaders from one group refused to perform the rites swiftly, a jarring of meaning took place well beyond adjustment to a change in structure.

From this experience, Geertz determines to distinguish analytically between culture and structure to clarify relationship to meaning:

Culture is the fabric of meaning in terms of which human beings interpret their experience and guide their action; social structure is the form that action takes, the actually existing network of social relations. Culture and social structure are then but different abstractions from the same phenomena. The one considers social action in respect to its meaning for those who carry it out, the other considers it in terms of its contribution to the function of some social system. (1973, p. 145)

The description of the Javenese funeral is virtually a case study of what O'Dea refers to as a breaking point. Given the detail, the author sets forth a strong sense of how social change of this kind can occur and the kind of response people may have.

Limitations:

One small concern raised by Geertz' analytic framework, as it describes "culture", suggests a vulnerability to a problem with reification Geertz had brilliantly resolved in the first Chapter described. Nonetheless, the contribution to the study was vital to data analysis work and has continued to hold a pivotal role in associated theory generation.

This article describes a set of individuals' experience with what O'Dea refers to as a "breaking point". It is a description of one

such experience. It is distinguishable from this study in that Geertz' is describing a community, a set of individuals with an established history and sense of culture in common.

Group members in the project were not interacting within that kind of context. They did not have a sense of common culture and they manifestly experienced multiple breaking points in their dynamic social interactions. Having read Geertz' piece I was still in search of descriptions in which a set of individuals were faced with not only one change of structure or cultural meaning but with change as a "cultural constant".

Elements Of Social Interaction:  
From A View Of Frameworks Focused On Change

Until this point on the trail references to social change have been most general. Through data analysis I came to realize that it was most important to also provide context for our contemporary experience of "change".

e) "Towards A Critique Of Modernity" in Facing Up To Modernity,  
(Berger, 1977)

Contribution:

This chapter in Berger's book provided a wonderful synopsis of processes associated with modern Western life. It provided context for what individuals coming to the project might bring with them.

The five processes Berger describes assist in explicating how "theatre" as "paradigm" might substitute in modern life for other processes of institutionalization linked with the profound sphere of meaning. The processual descriptions provided assistance in

understanding aspects of meaning and change in terms of tension in certainty. The five are listed with brief definitions as a brief overview of the reference.

"Abstraction" (1977, p. 72) gives an account of a process of change related to a form of meaning. The concept suggests a shift in the way we think and express ourselves. The shift asserted is from the concrete to the conceptual. Berger describes the concept in this manner:

"Specifically a quantifying and atomizing cognitive style, originally at home in the calculations of entrepreneurs, and engineers, has invaded other areas (from the theory of political ethics to the praxis of the bedroom) in which that style has produced severe discontents. (1977, p. 72)

"Individuation", is a second process of change described. Berger fashions this processual description: "Modernization has entailed a progressive separation of the individual from collective entities, and as a result has brought about a historically unprecedented counterposition of individual and society." (1977, p. 75).

The author is careful to articulate a relationship between processes of abstraction and individuation:

This individuation is, as it were, the other side of the coin of the aforementioned abstraction, and it relates to the latter in a paradoxical way. The external social structural causes are the same -- to wit, the weakening of the all-embracing, all-containing communities that used to sustain the individual in premodern societies. (1977, p. 75)

"Futurity" (1977 p. 73) as a description of process focuses once more on a changing orientation in how we experience social life. This shift in orientation is concerned with "a profound change in the temporal structure of human experience, in which the future becomes a

primary orientation for both imagination and activity" (Berger, 1977, p. 73). As Berger describes it, changing experience of time is expressed in terms of a "powerful shift in attention from past and present to the future" (1977, p. 73).

The author states that certain compelling assumptions have become associated with our changing focus on the future:

What is more, the temporality within which this future is conceived is of a very peculiar kind — it is precise, measurable, and at least in principle, subject to human control. In short it is time to be mastered. (1977 p. 74)

Berger continues to detail social response to time in these terms. He suggests that we become as engineers structuring "the most intimate aspects of our lives" (1977, p.74). His explanation of what this means for individuals in our society must clearly be considered for possible relationship to adult education: "Futurity means endless striving, restlessness, and a mounting incapacity for repose" (1977, p. 74).

"Liberation" (1977, p. 76) as the fourth described process of modernity appears to bear close relationship with futurity. The author describes this orientation in this manner: "...large areas of human life, previously considered to be dominated by fate, now come to be perceived as occasions for choice — by the individual, or by collectivities, or by both " (1977, p. 76).

This description was of specific interest in the study with respect to explication for a tension in certainty observed in the fieldwork. Berger's description of this process was crucial in coming to understand elements in the tension:

Today it is not so much that individuals become convinced of their capacity and right to choose new ways of life, but rather that tradition is weakened to the point where they must choose between alternatives whether they wish it or not... To be sure there is an exhilarating quality to this liberation. There is also the terror of chaos. (1977, p. 77)

This will be further explored in Chapter Six and in the Mobile-framework of Chapter Eight.

"Secularization (1977 p. 78), is the fifth process of modernity which Berger outlines. His statements contributed greatly to the first and second areas of discovery, to content of data analysis, and to developing an understanding of group members' meanings and interactions.

... modernity, at least thus far, has been antagonistic to the dimension of transcendence in the human condition. But secularization has meant a weakening of the plausibility of religious perception of reality among large numbers of people, especially as the world view of secularity, has come to be "established" by the intellectual elites and in the educational institutions of modern societies. (1977, p. 78)

As may be observed from the contents of the latter statement, Berger's description also contributed to the third and fourth areas of discovery. His explication can be related to adult educators and was confirmed by orientations in literature which made virtually no reference to profundity and meaning.

#### Limitations:

This conceptual outline of Berger's material was intended to provide a succinct overview of dilemmas created by the effect of our own contemporary social processes coming to be described as "modernity". Berger demonstrates in his writing how we create them and also how they act back upon us.

However, in this brief work Berger does not attempt to provide detailed analysis of our experiences and responses to the cumulative effects of "modernity" — an epistemology of change. This work has a different, less specific purpose than does the study. It does not explicate a close link with tension in certainty described from the fieldwork. Another work which had been consulted, provided substantial explication for this observed tension. Eventually I was able to closely link concepts from both works.

f) The Structure Of Scientific Revolutions (Kuhn, 1970)

I have viewed Kuhn's work as describing one "modern" response to a tension in certainty. This response is part of a process creating the five dilemmas of modernity as Berger describes them. It also appears to be a response to the effect of these dilemmas.

Contributions:

Thomas Kuhn wrote The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (1970) and The Essential Tension (1977) about his reflections upon tradition and change in the scientific community. The Structure Of Scientific Revolution in particular was written as a critique of the history of science being presented as "a process of accretion" (p. 3).

This book, supplemented by Essential Tension (1977) provides a description and a theoretical framework for an observed pattern of change and a response to change from a particular group of individuals. More specifically, the group of individuals is engaged

in "exploration". The efforts of people in this group are actually dedicated toward creating change in some sense. Kuhn's thesis of how they do that is most pertinent to revelations from data analysis.

The concept of a "paradigm" as a framework which provides sufficient reference or reminder to the sacred but links those references to rules and rituals which provide for "doing the profane" is a fascinating social construction. This may act as a conceptual model for other groups of individuals looking to absorb and effect change and at the same time stave off possible problems with respect to anomie for lengthy periods of time.

There are marked differences between scientists as a set of individuals interacting and people interacting in terms of theatre. One may, however, perceive a possible parallel between scientists and this theatre group. Both groups recognize themselves as specially identified groups formally focussed on a conscious task of constructing a reality. In the theatre group's case they might call it "fictional reality". In the scientists' case, they might modify that statement to creating an explanation or reconstruction of the reality.

A second parallel between the groups may be argued. Kuhn is drawing our attention to one particular group in our society which highly values exploration as a human attribute. At the same time, Kuhn postulates this exploration, a learning process if ever there was one, takes place within a framework which provides some certainty, that is a paradigm.

In its established usage a paradigm is an accepted model or pattern. (1970, p. 24)

This model or pattern provides a framework for acceptable or appropriate action. In this way a semblance of certainty is provided for action.

Although it is only hinted at in the themes described from the fieldwork, perceptions about the process in which the group was engaged did change. Kuhn addresses the issue of how a paradigm changes. He does not use the words "construction of reality". Nonetheless his description of change through crises of anomalies (1970, p. 6) parallels "breaking points". Kuhn's process of "paradigm" reveals a conceptual framework which allows individuals to negotiate their tensions of certainty. This group collectively explores and at the same time is not subjected to intense, ongoing anomie.

#### Limitations:

There were two striking limitations with respect to this work in terms of applying it to data analysis. First, there are different starting points between this group of individuals, scientists, and those associated with "theatre". Second, as Masterman (1970) points out, Kuhn has provided us with a wonderful, but vaguely defined concept of "paradigm".

In this book his definition of paradigm changes shape several times. Kuhn acknowledges this in Essential Tension (1977) and clarifies his intentions to some extent therein. However, one is left with some quality of vagueness associated with the concept.

I turn now in the trail to a dominant theme of data analysis. Although this comes near the last, I began searching for theoretical framework related to theatre very early in the research. The preceding frameworks illuminating various elements of social theory were necessary, however, to provide context for individuals' interactions referred to as "theatre". I first sought this through those acting within the "discipline and profession" of theatre.

Elements Of Social Interaction:  
From A View Of Frameworks Focused On Theatre

g) The Empty Space (Brook, 1968)

Brook has had extensive involvement in the "established" theatre, particularly as a director. His book is written to the theatre community as a critique of the directions he perceived the community taking.

Contributions:

I have been searching for a sense of the sacred as we might recognize it through "modern eyes" -- an evolving form associated with those who might turn to theatre as a paradigm for exploring meaning. One of the difficulties with such a search as Berger has indicated (1977, p. 78) is that in our modern context such a search might not be expressed in terms parallel to religious terminology by those involved in such a search.

Brook, a most influential British director, produced a book in response to his concern with the direction theatre groups were taking. The book The Empty Space dwells as much on what ought not to be done and what assumptions ought not to be made about theatre as what he

holds dear about theatre. Several elements in his book struck a chord with respect to data analysis. First, he states that actors must treat theatre as a process which is a constant search for meaning:

In a living theatre, we would each day approach the rehearsal putting yesterday's discoveries to the test, ready to believe that the true play has once again escaped us.  
(1968, p. 17)

A second important element in the book emerged. Brook speaks with such passion. This passion focused on a constant search for meaning suggests a profundity, a quest-like quality to theatre activity. There are, indeed, other resources which describe theatre in these terms (Schechner, 1985; Wilshire, 1982).

Limitations:

Although Brook describes theatre in paradigmatic terms, details of process and structure are somewhat limited. Since he wrote the book to decry "inappropriate" theatre and to prompt right-minded thinking by professionals in "the theatre", it was not intended to provide a larger social theory of theatre. Conceptualization of "theatre" as a paradigm with sacred and profane aspects of meaning in activities were largely inferred from tone and context. The search for theoretical frameworks offering explication continued.

h) From Ritual To Theatre, The Human Seriousness Of Play, (Turner, 1982)

This book is not written from a "theatre-as-discipline" perspective, but from that of an anthropologist. It was of great assistance in filling in gaps concerning "theatre" viewed from social theory perspective.

Contributions:

Turner's book is actually about the incipient focus of the study, a concept of "theatre" related to social construction. It seems most highly connected to the data analysis and yet because it did not provide as thorough an ontological and epistemological framework as social construction, I have used the book as one of the outer layers of my framework. Two main concepts are the book's basic contribution to the thesis' theoretical framework.

Turner distinguishes between an "earlier" function of theatre as ritual in *Gemeinschaft* societies which he refers to as liminal in essence and theatre in *Gesellschaft* societies which he refers to as liminoid (1982, p. 52-53). In the first instance, ritual is an institutionalized response to change. The prime example for a constant potential breaking point is the change experienced with children becoming adults. In creating a ritual which institutionalizes the change there is control.

According to Turner there are three phases to the ritual: a) a recognition of change reflected by separation through some ceremony; b) a middle phase wherein the individuals are in some senses undefinable, in limbo; and c) a third phase of redefinition of identity and status.

The middle phase is of particular interest because according to Turner this is a period during which exploration can occur. He states that results of this exploration may appear later in more controlled

forms within the social structure. Turner refers to the tone of activities in this phase as having a ludic or playful, nonpermanent quality (1982, p. 32).

Turner argues that modernity has changed all of this. In our Gesellschaft societies with their complexity regarding roles and identity, the power of the ritual is largely lost. He suggests that within this social context, "theatre" takes on a liminoid function. He asserts that theatre has less power in the sense that it is a fragment of a fragmented society. For example, not everyone would even experience a particular theatre production. He suggests that rather than acting as a conservatizing force to maintain a certain social structure, it is often used as a form of social critique or a tool for change. It nonetheless retains some of its ludic qualities.

The larger social process within which Turner seems to make sense of this liminoid function of theatre is what he refers to as "social drama" (1982, p. 61-87). The phases of this bears a remarkable resemblance to a slightly more detailed account of one form of a breaking point: a) a crisis is recognized; b) there are cultural attempts to understand this breach; c) there is formal determination of redress; and d) there is reinstatement or recognition of irremedial cleavage. Theatre in its liminoid form may play a role in first and second phases as described by Turner. A theatre production may contribute to recognition of crisis. Theatre productions may be one of the "cultural attempts" to provide a framework in which a breach can be interpreted and understood.

In terms of direct relationship to data analysis, I related Turner's description of "liminoid" as "serious play" (1982, p. 32) to one aspect of group members' tension in certainty. I was most interested in their willingness to explore in improvisation. His description provided assistance in coming to understand elements of the tension related to ways of periodically releasing people from maintaining all social structures.

Limitations:

This framework is specifically focused on "theatre". Turner offers thereby an orientation towards "expressivity" as a starting point. In this light he includes descriptions of "serious play" and "ludic" qualities. Despite the many interconnections with the study's work I had some residual concerns arising from findings from theoretical resources.

The notion of theatre as a social institution with a very specifically definable function suggests questioned aspects of structural-functionalism. Analysis of data suggests quite different ideas of theatre which when acted upon might result in very different "functions" or effects.

Although Turner's work made a most substantial contribution in terms of linking "concepts" of theatre as social construction to general social theory, I did consult several other works written with the intention of linking social theory with social constructions of "theatre".

Contributions From Two Related Works:

The first book to which I turned for additional guidance was States' book, Great Reckonings In Little Rooms, On The Phenomenology Of Theatre (1987). This book underlines connections between phenomenological thought and social construction of "theatre". In addition to affirmation of meaning as an epistemological starting point, States describes theatre process as one compelling change of meaning:

Things are first interesting because they are new; then (if they were not simply fads) because they fit into an order or help to create a new order; finally, they disappear into the order as one of the invisible building blocks out of which new images and eventually new paradigms are made. Above all, in the theatre, as in any art, there is always the need to defamiliarize all of the old familiarizations. (State, 1987 p. 43)

This is reminiscent of Brook's descriptions of engagement with theatre.

Most importantly States is describing a desire and need for intentional precipitation of "breaking points" in order to create meaning. This assists in explicating the "other side" of tension in certainty, participants' desire to explore.

A second resource was consulted. Role Playing And Identity, The Limits Of Theatre As Metaphor, by Wilshire (1982) assists in making connections among these elements of social life and change. He links theatre as social construction in modern context with process of secularization: "The desacrilization of theatre parallels in illuminating ways the desacrilization of society" (1982 p. 295).

Wilshire's book had general interest as well since he was concerned with the question of how individuals anchor themselves in

social life. However, his major focus was "identity" of individual related to anchoring. The study's focus was not on this process of anchoring.

In addition the trail of theoretical frameworks had thus far provided virtually no view of adult education in relation to these many considerations. Prior to creating a fork in the trail so that such a view can be obtained, there is one final work which may form a juncture.

Elements Of Social Interaction:  
From A View Of Frameworks Focused On Theatre And Education

- i) "Drama, Theatre, And Social Reality" in Exploring Theatre And Education, (Robinson, 1980)

Robinson compiled a series of materials on theatre and education. They were written by several authors "practicing" in the area, including Heathcote (1984). Many of the writings in Robinson's book were oriented towards teachers in the British school system. However, in the last chapter of his book, Robinson linked drama, theatre, and social reality.

Contributions:

Robinson's writings affirmed a number of findings from data analysis. He begins with the theoretical assumption that as humans we are continually in the process of negotiating meaning (1980, p. 158). For purposes of education, he emphasizes the significance of using theatre concepts because of the socially creative nature of the

process. The author describes theatre process as an opportunity to test or explore and even suggests a parallel process with science (1980, p. 163).

Finally, and most significantly in terms of the study, he focuses on social construction as encasing theatre process. He links social construction to social processes in the classroom (p. 165). In this vein, he speaks to the role of teachers. He suggests that more energy must be directed towards applying concepts of social reality to interactions among students which may influence their willingness to participate in theatre events:

The actions of a group in a drama session in role or out of it, are not just a response to what the teacher asks them to do. They are also responses to the expectations they have of each other. We do not simply drop our normal roles just because we are asked to act out another one. (Robinson, 1980, p. 165)

This application of epistemology to both constructions of theatre process and to encompassing social actions of participants was not discovered in any other work.

#### Limitations:

Although Robinson's work was located most recently it was highly valued in a corroborative role. A search for adult education materials apropos to emerging refined themes and theoretical findings was pursued and now forms part of this trail.

#### ADULT EDUCATION BRANCH OF THE TRAIL

This trail cuts a narrow swathe mainly through the third and fourth areas of library research reviewed in Chapter Four, "Social

Theory Resource Materials" and "Adult and Community Education Resource Materials". Exploration in each of those areas pressed on after fieldwork so that this trail winds through an extended plot. The first part of the theory trail provided a view of works concerned with social theory written by those outside the field of adult education. The setting changes now to recently surveyed ground in adult education as guided by findings in each of the four areas of discovery thus far.

For instance, with a view to comprehending relationships between the two, both ethnographic and adult education landscapes were scanned in the first review of this Chapter. A historical-paradigmatic lens afforded an interesting view of the two.

Shared ground (albeit shifting) between writings in ethnography and adult education appeared in two areas. First, adult educators seek to generate theory and to link this process with practice. Ethnography may provide such opportunities.

The second area constitutes one of shifting, common ground. At this point in paradigmatic work, what has emerged from both ethnographic writings and adult education writings is a keen interest in meaning and culture as focus for research (Jorgenson, 1989; Jarvis, 1987, Collard & Law, 1989a.)

The trail broadens here to explore adult education ground more thoroughly, this being the intended destination of the study. There is also a change in format. The trail does not wind from one specific theoretical work to another. Instead a return to consideration from paradigmatic lens will frame the view. First, there is a brief consideration of adult education theory related to social change.

Community education materials concerned with social change offered some foundation for an emerging theoretical framework directly related to the study.

#### Community Education Materials Related To Social Change

The review of Chapter Four described findings in literature gathered during the fieldwork. Few specific links were made to data analysis and to themes in the study. At that point in the study themes were barely beginning to emerge. Since that time themes have emerged and additional resources have become available. It was beyond the scope of this study, given the number of areas of literature reviewed, to sift through and catalogue all adult and community education materials which might have application to the study. The following brief review is intended to consider works which influenced the direction of data analysis.

Influential works took two forms. I considered works which provided indication of paradigms operating within adult and community education. (This formed a large part of the review in Chapter Four and the review on methodology at the beginning of this Chapter.) I also explored the content of specific works which ostensibly might offer explication for findings in data analysis.

#### a) Freire's Work And Popular Theatre:

Beginning with the latter, a selection of Freire's works were explored for application to the study. Two works in particular were

considered in light of data analysis, the first being, Education For Critical Consciousness (1973). The second was a more recent collection of Freire's writings, The Politics Of Education, Culture, Power And Liberation (1985).

Freire's works dwell within liberatory adult education. They form part of the foundational, theoretical work in that area. Given the ethnographic focus of the study, my objectives as a participant observer could not be those of a community education activist. Since the study was also most concerned with meanings of participants, and they did not express "liberatory" objectives, I was not a participant observer of a project relying on Freirean techniques.

The study had a different starting point from much of his work then, which is focused on issues of social power related to a particular process of "conscientization" (1973). Links between Freire's works and an emerging theoretical framework related to themes in the study have been important, but relatively few in number.

Contributions:

This study has become primarily concerned with experiences of meaning, culture, and learning related to change. Freire's "codification and decodification" processes (1985, p. 52-54) is a method to evoke a change in meaning for those oppressed in a society. Codification, or creating an objectification for purposes of analysis may certainly be linked with creation of a play. (More of this connection will be addressed with respect to popular theatre.) The process is intended as an educative tool to assist groups in developing a critique of those aspects of the culture which oppress

them. Freire is concerned with the concept of culture in relation to "a culture of silence (1985, p. 50), the effect of "hegemony" as a method of cultural ideological control.

There is some connection between the study and this aspect of Freire's work. In the first few meetings participants' efforts to develop a common sense of the community revealed a matter of interest. Many expressed a common sense of the community as being a homogeneous culture of which they were not a part.

Work on demographics confirmed that the majority of participants had not lived in the community for more than three years. (See the Appendices for demographics work completed.) Those participants who were from the community had all been away for various lengths of time from a few months to a few years and had expressed some disassociation from the perceived homogeneity. In particular, the strong religious element in the culture of the community and the limited number of other activities beyond sports troubled participants. Although one person spoke of potential discrimination on the basis of religion with respect to employment, there was no direct correlation between financial well-being and being a long term resident of the community.

Freire's focus on culture and hegemony, while raising important questions for adult educators, are focused on concerns with a different contextual emphasis. For participants, the issue was not one of class struggle in a more "traditional sense". The cultural implications were focused on these people having in common a sense of being strangers to the community in varying degrees of intensity.

An additional contextual difference between Freire's work and the study was the non-homogeneity of participants. The set of individuals involved in the project had very little in common initially other than their sense of limited relationship with the community.

Returning to Freire's framework, the manifest intention of the work is to outline social theory concerned with a specific educative process. Thus, for example, his account of "problematizing" (1985, p. 40) speaks to social dynamics only so far as he is prompting change in individuals' political perspective. He is describing an intention and a process to create dissonance so that those oppressed may develop analysis concerning their cultural oppression.

Insofar as learning came to be identified through data analysis with change of meaning through social interaction, Freire's work affirmed some of these conceptual links. "Problematizing" as an intentional disruption of commonly held meaning in culture may be linked with unintentional occurrences of such disruption observed in the study. (These became referred to as "breaking points" based on O'Dea's work described in a previous passage of the theory trail.)

Freire's work also served as a reminder to remain watchful for issues of power related to group members' interactions. Since neglect of issues of power is a forceful critique of ethnography, this was an important contribution. However, considering issues of power, external to "the group" and internal to "the group" was not adequate for explicating all aspects of group members' actions.

### Limitations:

Based on data analysis, issue of power was only one construction of meaning for a series of interactions and a series of meaning constructions among group members. The crux of the thesis is that participants' most urgent struggle was coming to terms with a sense of rootlessness and loss of meaning in contrast to an apparently homogeneous culture of the community. This urgency was tempered with bouts of excited exploration and creation of meaning.

They were doubly faced with a sense of rootlessness in light of diversity among "group" members with little or no experience in formal theatre activities. Creating meaning in common and a structure which would be meaningful while undergoing constant change in process, became the more pressing problem. Issues of power were almost a luxury in the face of "anomie". Thus Social Construction Of Reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) and other writings concerned with providing explication for details in dynamics became a starting point through which analysis of power is then most importantly linked. In addition, I had struggled with notions of "culture" as social process involving heterogeneous sets of individuals. However, Freire's notion of culture was vague on these points.

An additional contextual distinction between Freire's work and the study is one of "modernity". Ironically, as group members' described community life, those engaged in the community life were not strongly affected by forces of modernity as described by Berger (1977). According to participants' developing image of community life, processes of "individuation", "secularization", and "futuraity"

were absent and frowned upon by acts of maintaining religious and other social construction suggesting homogeneity.

Coming from elsewhere, group members were accustomed to individuation, secularization, and futurity. Being confronted with the difference and being "outside" was troubling for them. Beginning with that as the backdrop breaking point, their experiences of changes throughout the project were amplified. Social theory developed under the auspices of "Modernity" provided considerable assistance in offering an explication for data analysis. However, Freire does not appear to be faced with such issues at the forefront of his work.

Before moving away from content of specific theoretical writings towards works concerning paradigmatic shifts in community education, it is important to return briefly to recent writings on popular theatre. It is interesting to note that a few more works concerned with frames of reference (Barnet, 1987; Mastai, 1987; Selman, 1987), and social theory (Mastai, 1987) have been emerging. Several writers have made substantial contribution through reflection towards an emerging paradigm of popular theatre. Social theory enclosed in these writings is mainly connected to Freire's work. Contributions made to the study's developing framework and limitations in terms of differentiation with the study's focus on social processes are largely the same as those described of Freire's work.

Authors' descriptions suggest a growing sophistication with involving community members in more aspects of theatre process in a number of different ways (Chambulikazi, 1989; Malamah-Thomas, 1987). The writings also convey more sensitively community members varied

responses (Chambulikazi, 1989; Malamah-Thomas, 1987; Selman, 1987). Participants are no longer described as entirely homogeneous. In addition some are beginning to contemplate differences in role and objectives stemming from multidisciplinary differences (Selman, 1987).

In contrast to the study, however, writers' roles associated with theatre projects described in this literature apparently require commitment to description and analysis in terms of theatre process and its "successes" and limitations. Given this context, they do not have the opportunity to reflect in detail on nuances of participants' interactions, and experience of constant change as a modern context. Other than through Freire's work and some connection to "communication and development" models (Chambulikazi, 1989), social theory providing broader explication is still limited in these works.

This brings to a close an overview of more recent community education works which were explored for specific theoretical content and which ostensibly offered explication for some findings in data analysis. The trail now crosses into works which provided indication of changing paradigms, or creation of a paradigm for some (Willis, 1985) operating within community education.

#### b) Community Education Materials And Shifts In Paradigm

Both the Preface and Chapter Four's review of the area "Community and Adult Education Resource Materials" laid the foundation for this part of the theory trail. This review supplements those overviews. Literature reviewed in Chapter Four raised the question of whether there was a predominant paradigm which community educators construct

and maintain. This is a matter of some dispute (Thomas & Harries-Jenkins, 1975; Northmore, 1986).

In a developing sociology of adult education many authors take the position that there are two paradigms of practice in adult education based on differing assumptions of social theory. However, different names are used to describe the "two paradigms". Rubenson refers to "the consensus paradigm" and "the conflict" paradigm (1989, p. 53). Others distinguish between "liberal" and "liberatory" adult education (Lovett et al., 1983).

The liberal or consensus paradigm has been associated with a behavioristic (in terms of psychology) and structural-functionalist (in terms of sociology) framework. These frameworks are thought by many to have dominated adult educators work in prior decades (Charnley, 1984; Collard & Law, 1989b).

There is an apparently strong difference in objectives between those guided by the two paradigms. The consensus framework leads adult educators to focus on teaching individuals in order to meet social need or to assist the individual to cope in society. The conflict framework leads community development workers to work towards social change — change in the social structure.

There is a shift, however, in analysis of the relationship between these two paradigms. Some argue that the two have more in common than is first apparent, That is, they both have a "structural" perspective which leads adult educators to overlook certain aspects of

social life. For example, heterogeneity of those interacting in social situations is not taken into account in conflict theories related to adult education (Cervero, 1988).

Contributions:

What is of most interest for the purposes of this work is an apparent shift towards studying meanings of people in the form of phenomenology (Collins, 1984 1987, chap.1; Spiegelberg, 1984; Stanage, 1987, Part I & II). There has also been a surge of interest in culture related to social change (Collard & Law, 1989a; Freire, 1985; Podeschi, 1989; Roberts, 1982; Willis, 1985). Those concerned with constructing and maintaining a social change paradigm appear to be shifting away from a focus on structure and towards social process. This has already been described in terms of ethnographic work (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984), cultural studies (Collard & Law, 1989a) and also in terms of critical theory (Collins 1984; Gibbons, 1986; Jennings, 1985; Mezirow, 1981). Some suggest that these are signs of a third paradigm (Cervero, 1988; Collard & Law, 1989a; Jennings, 1985).

The writings described herein were specifically noted because of the study's focus. They may or may not herald a shift that appears in adult educators' practice, or such a shift may not be maintained. Many of these works in adult education based on social theory appeared in the literature after data analysis had occurred. However, these works provided some support for efforts to achieve the study's second objective, to locate the study within adult education literature. These works also assisted through supporting various working assumptions in the study.

### Limitations:

This may be too early a stage to raise concerns with efforts to change paradigmatic frameworks. However, given the focus of the study, two prime concerns have emerged with respect to direction of recent interests in meaning and culture related to social change. For the most part these concerns have previously been voiced with respect to liberatory work associated with a Freirean framework.

"Culture" may be studied in such a way as to draw the concept back into one of structure (Roberts, 1982, Willis, 1985). Lack of concern with heterogeneity of a set of individuals and an absence of focus on change in dynamics may lead back to studies which lie vulnerable to critiques lodged against structural-functionalism.

In particular, few references were located concerning "modernity" as the cultural context in which we experience change and learning. One of the few references to this most important explication of our current cultural experience focused on two authors' frameworks for learning theory (Finger, 1989).

### Learning Theory Materials And Shifts In Paradigm

Prior to linking these works with Finger's remarks on modernity and adult education, this part of the theory trail begins with learning theory in pursuit of establishing a paradigmatic sense of the work in this area. Writings reviewed will also be considered in terms of contributions offered for the study's emerging theoretical framework.

In the area of adult learning, one particular work proved to be seminal, Kidd's How Adults Learn (1973). This book brought together a wealth of diverse frameworks on the subject of learning available at the time of its publication. Kidd emphasizes a relationship between meaning and learning particularly in his concept of "being and becoming" (1973, p. 124). Although Kidd does refer to meaning and some social aspects of learning, much of the work is a review of psychological theory focused on the individual from behavioral and cognitive aspects of learning prevalent at the time of publication. This particular psychologicistic frame of reference predominated learning theory for many years, despite the availability of other theory (Merriam, 1988).

In the past then, learning theory has been closely tied with work maintaining the consensus, structural-functionalist framework. As recently as 1986, one writer called for development of learning theory which might offer assistance in the social setting of community education (Northmore, 1986).

There has been a proliferation of works in the area of adult learning and learning theory. Merriam (1988) acknowledges the growing diversity and has taken on the gigantic task of providing a framework to sort out the various works in relationship to each other. She deftly designed a matrix which may be used as a guide to distinguish elements among writings on adult learning (Merriam, 1988, p. 4). The matrix reveals a number of different "theories of adult learning"

relying on diverse epistemological starting points. In particular, "perspective transformation" and "conscientization" were of interest to the study given the orientation towards social aspects of learning.

In bringing changing epistemologies and ontologies to theory and practice, adult educators are also reconsidering links between community education concerned with social change and learning theory (Jennings, 1985; Jarvis, 1987). At one time it would have been very simple to determine whether an author was writing from within a community education framework or one focused on learning theory. Yet one of the difficulties in determining where to locate descriptions of articles was that one might assume without other cues that the author began from either frame reaching towards the other. That condition alone signals considerable change.

#### Contributions:

Contributions which writings in this area made to the study's developing theoretical framework were generally of a corroborative nature. The study was begun on the assumption that participants were learning in a community setting. The research was then set on an ethnographic course to study their meanings and social interactions. Thus, socially constructed meaning and learning were first tacitly and then through struggle, expressly linked from the outset of the study.

Most of the literature available at the time of the fieldwork did not offer such links. Mezirow's "perspective transformation" theory does locate meaning at the centre of learning. Speaking from the view

of paradigm creation, Mezirow's early efforts to link learning theory and social change were seminal. They offered a springboard for later observations which could change the conceptual framework altogether.

His work studies processes of change of meaning within the individual (1978; 1981) in the context of social interaction. The author's description of "disorienting dilemma" (1981, p. 7) as a spark for process of change is parallel to O'Dea's concept of "breaking point". Thereafter, however, much of Mezirow's work is focused on process of change through the individual's reflection.

Many of the concerns with the theory clearly articulated by Collard and Law (1989b) were ones which caused difficulty in finding a fit with the study. The theory's focus on the individual even in the midst of social interaction was problematic given the study's focus on all members of the group. Despite his more recent descriptions of links with Freire's and Habermas' works (1981), the orientation remains with what is happening within the individual.

Collard and Law (1989b) have raised questions about epistemological consistency in their efforts to bring these writings together. Having limited conversance with Habermas' large body of work and having found limited application of Freire's work to the study, I found that Mezirow's theoretical framework provided only partial confirmation for explication in data analysis. However, his work among others has made a contribution to another set of articles of interest to the study.

The first is an article by Peter Jarvis, "Meaningful And Meaningless Experience: Towards An Analysis Of Learning From Life"

(1987). This work was particularly significant in its confirmation of explication derived from the study. Not only is meaning epistemologically placed at the centre of human existence, but the author delves in more detail concerning social theory and explication for creation and loss of meaning. Jarvis's references to "alienation" and "anomie" (1987, p. 169) meshed with the study's data analysis and findings from other areas of library research. I have refrained from using the word "alienation" because of its strong connections to Marxist economic focus.

Jarvis does what many fail to do when concerned with construction and maintenance of meaning. He holds onto and explores changes occurring both within the individual and through social change which precipitate meaning changes in the individual. He also focuses at great length on how change of meaning may shift towards meaninglessness and the social implications of that condition.

A second work which came to be equally valued was based on a community education study. In "The Facilitation Of The Life-World Transformation", Wildemeersch and Leirman create a framework drawn from the overlap in a number of different theoretical resources including Habermas, Freire, Mezirow, and Merton (1988, p. 19-20). Even Berger and Luckmann receive "honourable mention" in this work.

Although this brief article does not detail methodology and method for the study, this was one of the works located in adult education which linked social theory generation directly with fieldwork. Analysis was focused on social process of a particular set of individuals as related to learning. In addition, focus was on

change of perceptions within the group. These were all foci of this study as well.

Wildemeersch and Leirman outline stages in "transformation of the life-world" (1988, p. 20-22) which are consistent with Freire's work and that of Mezirow's. Once more these were also parallel with "breaking points" considered in the study.

The authors build upon this explication of social process in change with theory generation from a field study. Three dimensions were developed for purposes of "educational facilitation of the life-world transformation". These included: a) "task-dimension", the structuring of contents of educative process; b) "relation-dimension", referring to interactions between educators and participants and among participants; c) "growth-dimension", or the "qualitative growth" of participants in transformation process (1988, p. 24).

A key contrast between this study and that described in the article was the focus on a project which brought a Freirean framework to the work. There were identified "adult educators" whose objectives were to rely on a Freirean process to produce community change. That was not the context of this study. Thus the three dimensions outlined have only partial explicative power for this work. One of the three dimensions, however, had considerable commonality with descriptions arising out of this study.

"The Relation Process" described several stages in a "process of adaptation of the participants and the educator". The authors asserted that, "Characteristics of this stage of the process are feelings of dependency and uncertainty" (1988, p. 26). A second stage

is described as being "characterized by divergence". This stage as described is very closely linked with the findings of the study. Recognition of resulting senses of anxiety produced by divergence, "unfamiliar meaning perspectives" was a focus for this study as well.

The authors, unfortunately, have limited space within the article to consider potential explication for these dynamics. They do refer briefly to the concept of "anomy" (1988, p. 22). However, they shift, then, to the role of the educator and describe a need for sensitivity concerning two potential responses from participants in this transitional stage.

What is of interest for purposes of the study is a brief description of a tension in responses from participants:

Diverse views and actions may block the willingness to learn because some may be too threatening. On the other hand, a certain amount of anxiety is necessary to explore new perspectives. (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988, p. 27)

Although there is a somewhat different inflection in that description, this is very similar to a constant theme of the study, referred to as a tension in certainty.

In addition to this description of tension related to learning, the authors are also linking such a tension to a specific source. An element of that source is recognition of divergency, which may be linked with a loss of meaning through group. Again, though the orientation is different this links with work in the study concerning meaning through anchoring in a sense of group. This, however, is not addressed in the article so much as the effect of disrupting "the self-evidence of the life-world" (1988, p. 20).

### Limitations:

All of the works described carry with them the struggle of moving beyond paradigmatic influences. They are all important works in adult education generally. To the extent that the study's context was so different from any of the works located, those works proffer limited assistance towards explications in data analysis.

For example, a consistent feature which distinguished the study from many of the works was focus on explicating dynamics of interactions among group members. Many works focused on meaning and change related to the individual in a social context. In addition, many of the works focused more on descriptions from an emphasis on "adaptive" qualities in the interaction when tension in certainty was considered (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988, p. 21). The study also sought explication of observances which might be described in terms of excitement related to creation of meaning, exploration. An emphasis on theatre brought this to the fore of data analysis.

The largest distinction between the study and adult education works located was a focus on change related to theory of modernity. While a few mention societal change as an important context for meaning and change through learning (Jarvis, 1987), this is a largely neglected consideration in these descriptions of social change and learning.

In fact, this might be of particular concern for the many who wish to rely on theory concerning life-world as self-evident. Wildemeersch and Leirman, indicate their acceptance of this theoretical concept from "phenomenological traditions" and from

Habermas' works (1988, p. 19). Based on these theoretical roots they carry into the research the assumption that, "Changes in the self-evident life-world do not occur frequently" (1988, p. 21). This leads to the further assumption in terms of liberatory work that in facilitating a process which creates such disruption for the purposes of analysis, there is only "one" disruption going on at a time. It does not take into account theories of modernity which suggest, for example, through individuation and pluralism that the self-evident quality of the lifeworld may be under constant siege.

This section was introduced through reference to Finger's work related to theories of modernity and adult education. A promise was made to link his work with others in adult education. Although this falls under "Limitations", his work is reviewed herein, because it is a critique concerning neglect of modernity in relation to theories of learning in adult education.

In his work, "The Subject Of Modern Adult Education", Finger (1989) reaches beyond assertions made in the Preface concerning change as a ubiquitous element in our social life. He speaks of education as an engine of modernity, as instrumental in maintaining the impetus in a "modernizing society" (1989, p. 133).

Concerned with the "crisis of modernity", he reflects upon Brookfield's model of "critical theory" and Jarvis' "adult learning in the social context", experiential learning (1989, 135-136.) One of the author's deepest concerns lies with learning theory which promotes more individuation:

... the more split and the more complex modern society becomes, the more complex modern society becomes, the more individuals, as sub-systems which are conscious of being different from other sub-systems, will develop. (1989, p. 138)

His critique has reaffirmed attributed significance to "modernity" in the study generally. I have also considered his remarks in reflective statements within the final Chapter of the study.

Before leaving theoretical references to "modernity", it is important to note in adult education writings the relative absence of attention to secularization as a description of a process intimately connected to meaning in modern life. During the fieldwork, while participating and observing group members creating meaning through various forms of improvisation, I experienced a profound quality about the experience. Although this quality was not directly addressed or articulated by group members, their interactions suggested an extraordinary meaning associated with the experience. Several works concerning theatre as social construction have reinforced this link with profundity of meaning (Brook, 1972; Wilshire, 1982).

Descriptions of social theory in adult education reviewed, even when placing meaning at the centre do not directly refer to profundity or changes in institutionalization linked with profundity. Secularization as a process is not considered in these works. In terms of education, there was a sole contemporary source for considering meaning in these terms, To Know As We Are Known, A Spirituality Of Education, by Palmer (1983).

Interestingly, earlier works in adult education such as Lindeman The Meaning Of Adult Education, (1926) and Kidd's references to meaning in terms of "Being and Becoming", (1973, p. 124) bring with them a reverential quality and in this manner connect a sense of learning with the profound. One might argue that distancing in recent years between meaning, learning and a sense of the profound in adult education works is a manifestation of secularization as Berger has described the process (1977).

### Reflection

One final note of reflection on this process of meshing theories. I retain unresolved murmurings concerning variation of epistemological and ontological bases as among these frameworks. Heaviest lies the concern with those frameworks which are apparently silent on these scores but which in fact inevitably have underlying assumptions about them.

This concludes the "Review of Theoretical Foundations In The Mobile-framework". The theory trail ceases in this Chapter, to be transformed in Chapter Six. The theory trail was the third area of work related to methodology of data analysis. This constituted a review of findings from theoretical works which both shaped data analysis and confirmed findings from data analysis.

The final review, the fourth area of work contributing to data analysis is discoveries emerging from efforts to find an adequate form which would represent the field experience framed in the analytic findings outlined throughout this Chapter and the next.

#### 4) REVIEW OF KEY DISCOVERIES FROM CREATING A REPRESENTATIONAL FORM:

A contemporary metaphor for someone in exciting circumstances is the image of a person trying to hitchhike on a free-way. That metaphor might have modified application to a participant observer doing fieldwork and data analysis. However, in that case, the hitchhiker has already been picked-up. This does not mean the participant observer has stopped being a hitchhiker or has ceased to experience all the complexities of being one. However, the kinetic relationships have changed.

Albeit a circuitous route, this was a way of introducing one of two key concepts which I used in shaping the Mobile-framework, the representation of my data analysis. (See Chapter Eight for the Mobile-framework.) Through struggles with a format for data analysis, distinctions between analogue and digital concepts have been crystallized. I particularly searched for a way of retaining some of my kinesthetic sense of the experience. The "mobile" image has been a guiding metaphor for this reason.

The phrase, "kinesthetic sense of the situation", relates to concerns about how we experience change and how to represent that experience. The phrase "emerging" provides a way of thinking about our experience of change. "Kinesthetic sense" also emphasizes physical and emotional qualities associated with change.

The sections in the Mobile-framework entitled "Emerging Tempo and Rhythm Of Activities" illustrate efforts to retain that dimension of the fieldwork experience. The titles of each "Part" (for example, "Changing Parts: Partings Change") were also intended to evoke a sense

of rhythm in change. In terms of the nature of movement, they illustrate how elements which existed may emerge with a different emphasis and meaning.

A second concept which influenced the final form of data analysis was expressivity. Much of group members' activities were oriented towards expressivity, particularly in the first five weeks for during that time group members were improvising. They were asked to express themselves through theatre while writing the play and acting in it. There was a very strong physical and emotional intensity to this work. Other than through describing a kinesthetic quality to the experience and other than through rare descriptions of physical examples, I have found virtually no ways to bring this quality to this written work.

An additional concept influencing the data analysis' final form might best be described as a recognition of process, theirs and mine. Initial data analysis suggested that group members' perspectives and their activities changed greatly during the project. What I mean by recognizing "process" is finding a way of representing elements in participants' activity related to change which would reify the least. This included finding a way to represent my own change over time.

I have repeated this focus on change and process despite my many previous references to it. This results from that discovery of change being singularly pervasive in implications for the work. Additional aspects of it demand further attention.

Originally, in developing the Mobile-framework, I determined to preserve within it, descriptions of process within its structure.

However, so many explanations and asides were generated and as the structure itself became more complex, it warranted a separate section. As precursor to it, a description of the Mobile-framework was thus created. This description outlines each section, its purpose, content and key aspects.

As work continued on the Mobile-framework, questions surfaced about the pieces of that framework. Ontological and epistemological consistency became concerns within each "piece" of the Mobile-framework. I eventually became more acutely aware of inconsistencies in terms of the pieces' relationship to each other. A prime example of this leapt out when work began on an outline of contents in the "Emerging Cultural-Meaning" section. Uncertainty erupted at one point about the structure as between each of the Five Act-Plays.

I had long recognized that the theory trail offered a limited overview of ontological and epistemological underpinnings for the Mobile-framework. This prompted work on definitions of "meaning" and "cultural-meaning" to fill some gaps in a conceptual map. However, using these as central to theory meant redirecting "the trail".

Findings from the four areas of work generated: a) a set of theoretical working assumptions, b) an outline of the Mobile-framework and c) the Mobile-framework. In that order the first two comprise the remaining Chapters in this Part. The third forms Part Three.

This Chapter oversaw integrative efforts in the four areas of my work and study related to data analysis. The next Chapter is based on the findings of all four areas. It is, however, most strongly linked to the "Social Theory Trail".

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>This view stems from methodology experienced through direction from resource material about methodology. It is more closely connected to method and research design than to a theory of method.

<sup>2</sup>The double addendum parallels those forms of objectives recommended in several works on ethnography. For example, Shimahara uses the phrase "the authentic representation of what is happening in a social situation" (1988, p. 86). For some this may be balanced with additional qualities in the writing: "The basic goal of ethnography is to create a vivid reconstruction of the phenomena studied (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 190).

<sup>3</sup>Although this historical piece is tied with thematic content to Chapter Two, it appears here for two purposes. First, it is an attempt to preserve some faithfulness to chronology of process. At least two of the sources described in this Chapter, those by Jorgenson (1989) and Sherman and Webb as editors (1988) were published after completion of the fieldwork. Second, true to a chronology of conceptualization, epistemological and ontological inconsistencies erupted in data analysis and representational work. In fieldwork they had maintained a relatively low background hum. Confusion was sufficient to warrant identifying and responding to these inconsistencies.

<sup>4</sup>In the next segment "education" and "adult education" for all intents and purposes are used interchangeably in relation to ethnography. This results from an apparent lack of distinction between the two in literature located. In addition, there is little available on this area which is exclusively within an adult education domain.

<sup>5</sup>"Disembodiment" is not intended to suggest that no form of theory is being generated. It simply means practitioners are not heavily relying upon much of formally published theory. This highly abstracted form of theory lies in contrast with theory as a set of assumptions, oftentimes tacit, but which guides individuals' daily actions. On the other hand, generally theoreticians have not devoted resources generally to connecting their work with practitioners' experiences and insights.

<sup>6</sup>Perhaps, we need a refurbished version of "paradigm" which adequately describes ongoing dynamics of shifting schisms.

<sup>7</sup>"Organization" and "institution" are often used interchangeably. I have attempted to distinguish between the two words. I have used "organization" to describe "entities" which we perceive exist; "institution" I have generally confined to use in terms of social process as Berger and Luckmann (1966) use the word.

<sup>8</sup> I discovered evidences of this "myth" among individuals in the project when I interviewed them about what they had learned.

<sup>9</sup> This framework is difficult to relate back to participants' perspective on the "function" of their "group", since, for most of the project individuals were attempting to come together as a group. As part of that process they were attempting to come to consensus about what "theatre" was and what their common objectives were.

<sup>10</sup> Ruddock suggested that for those looking in, sociologists do not have a dominant framework. He indicated, however, that "structure" has dominated when sociological study is related particularly to education (1972, p. 49).

<sup>11</sup> I now think in terms of meaning and change rather than solely in terms of "process" since "process" seems so vulnerable to reification.

<sup>12</sup> One way to observe heuristical division among concepts of culture, meaning and structure is to consider those incidents wherein people have been doing something for a very long time in a certain manner. Suddenly, something happens to change the context so that they cannot do it or have it done in the same manner as before.

Geertz described such a shift between people's meaning and their structure occurring when due to political actions a Javenese funeral was unable to proceed swiftly as had become the custom tied up with certain common meanings. Javenese villagers were left in a situation in which they must make sense of and act differently somehow. Geertz has described a social situation in which members of a community have suffered loss of meaning in ritual structure and eruptions of new meanings for individuals.

<sup>13</sup> Goetz and LeCompte's Chapter Six provided one of the few sources of assistance in terms of a description of the interactive process of "theorizing" (1984, p. 167) in data analysis.

The authors encourage an inductive process between theorizing in data analysis (including "speculation") and attempting to match results from this with existing theories. The two briefly describe several different methods for relating the two.

<sup>14</sup> These theories played an interactive role in the sense that they also assisted in originally shaping development of these themes.

<sup>15</sup> There are, as well, a very few references from the second area of library research "Adult Education and Theatre". However, because of their scant number these references merely augment comments concerning materials from the third and fourth areas of library research.

## REFERENCES

- Agar, M. (1980). The professional stranger. New York: Academic Press.
- Barnet, D. (1987). Out of the collectives. Canadian Theatre Review, 53, 5-6.
- Berger, P. (1977). Toward a critique of modernity. In P. Berger (Ed.), Facing Up To Modernity, (pp.70-80). New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.
- Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1982). Qualitative research for education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Brockett, O. G. (1984). The essential theatre (3rd ed.). New York: CBS College Publishing.
- Brook, P. (1972). The empty space. New York: Penguin Books.
- Campbell, J. (1988). Inside lives: The quality of biography. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 59-75). London: The Falmer Press.
- Chambulikazi, E. (1989). Theatre as a communication medium in community development. INNOTECH Journal, Jan-June, 1989.
- Cervero, R. (1988). Effective continuing education for professionals. London: Jossey-Bass.
- Charnley, A. (1984). Research and research documentation in adult education 1974-1984: a personal view. Studies In The Education Of Adults, 16, 58-69.
- Collard, S. & Law, M. (1989a). Cultural studies: An evolving research paradigm? Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 79-84).
- Collard, S. & Law, M. (1989b). The limits of perspective transformation: A critique of Mezirow's theory. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(2), 99-107.
- Collins, M. (1984). Phenomenological perspectives: Some implications. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 179-189). Florida: Krieger.
- Collins, M. (1987). Competence in adult education, A new perspective. New York: University Press of America.

- Collins, R. (1985). Three sociological traditions, Selected readings. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Darkenwald, G. & Merriam, S. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. New York: Harper & Row.
- Elias, J. & Merriam, S. (1980). Philosophical foundations of adult education. Florida: Krieger.
- Finger, M. (1989). The subject of modern adult education. Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 133-138.)
- Freire, P. (1973). Education for critical consciousness. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education, culture, power and liberation. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C Geertz, The interpretation of cultures, selected essays, (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Ritual and social change: A Javenese example. In C. Geertz, The interpretation of cultures, selected essays, (pp. 142-169.) New York: Basic Books.
- Gibbons, R. (1986). Critical theory and education. Kent, U.K.: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodson, I. & Walker, R. (1988). Putting life into educational research. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological biases of naturalistic inquiry. Educational Communications and Technology, 30(4), 233-252.
- Heathcote, D. (1984). Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama. London: Hutchinson.
- Hutchinson, S. (1988). Education and grounded theory. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.

- Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: Towards an analysis of learning from life. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(3), 164-172.
- Jennings, L. (1985). Paradigmatic choices in adult education: From the empirical to the critical. Australian Journal of Adult Education, 25(2), 3-7.
- Jorgenson, D. (1989). Participant observation, A methodology for human studies. London: Sage.
- Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (1988). The action research planner (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Kidd, J. R. (1973). How adults learn (rev.ed.). New York: Association Press.
- Knowles, M. (1984). The adult learner: A neglected species (3rd. ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1977). The essential tension. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lindeman, E. (1926). The meaning of adult education. Montreal: Harvest House.
- Lovett, T., Clarke C. & Kilmurray, A. (1983). Adult education and community action. London: Croom Helm.
- Masterman, M. (1970) The nature of a paradigm. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge, (pp. 59-89). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Malamah-Thomas, D. (1987). Community theatre with and by the people: The Sierra Leone experience. Convergence, 20(1), 59-68.
- Mastai, J. (1987). Now more than ever. Canadian Theatre Review, 53, 7-10.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Finding your way through the maze: A guide to the literature on adult learning. Lifelong Learning, 11(6), 4-7.
- Mezirow, J. (1978). Perspective transformation. Adult Education, 28(2), 100-110.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. Adult Education Quarterly, 32(1), 3-24.

- Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1986). Qualitative data analysis, A sourcebook of new methods. London: Sage Publications.
- Mishler, E.G. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? Harvard Educational Review, 49(1), 1-19.
- Northmore, S. (1986). A community development model of adult education. Community Development Journal, 21(3), 181-185.
- O'Dea, T. (1966). The sociology of religion. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Palmer, P. (1983). To know as we are known, A spirituality of education. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Podeschi, R. (1989). Cultural dimensions of the research/practice relationship. Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 242-247).
- Roberts, H. (1982). Culture and adult education, A study of Alberta and Quebec. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press.
- Robinson, K. (1980). Drama, theatre and social reality. In K. Robinson, (Ed.), Exploring theatre and education. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Rubenson, K. (1989). The sociology of adult education. In S. Merriam & P. Cunningham (Eds.) Handbook of adult and continuing education, (pp. 51-69). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ruddock, R. (1972). Sociological perspectives on adult education. Manchester: University of Manchester.
- Sanday, P. (1979). The ethnographic paradigm(s). In J. Van Masnen (Ed.), Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 527-538.
- Schechner, R. (1985). Between theatre and anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Selman, J. (1987). Three cultures, One issue. Canadian Theatre Review, 53, 11-19.
- Sherman, R. & Webb, R. (1988). Qualitative research in education: A focus. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 2-21). London: The Falmer Press.
- Shimahara, N. (1988) Anthroethnography: A methodological consideration. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 76-89). London: The Falmer Press.

Spiegelberg, H. (1984). Putting ourselves into the place of others: toward a phenomenology of imaginary self transposal. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected Writings On Philosophy and Adult Education, (pp. 171-177). Florida: Krieger.

Stanage, S. (1987). Adult education and phenomenological research. Florida: Krieger.

States, B. (1987). Great reckonings in little rooms, On the phenomenology of theatre. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Thomas, J. & Harries-Jenkins, G. (1975). Adult education and social change. Studies In Adult Education, 7, 1-15.

Tough, A. (1971). The adult's learning projects. Toronto: The Ontario Institute For Studies In Education.

Turner, V. (1982). From ritual to theatre, The human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Tyler, R. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wildemeersch, D. & Leirman, W. (1988). The facilitation of the life-world transformation. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(1), 19-30.

Willis, P. (1985). From praxis to theory and back. Australian Journal Of Adult Education, 25(3), 27-32.

Wilshire, B. (1982). Role playing and identity, The limits of theatre as metaphor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wilson, S. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 47, (1), 245-265.

Woods, P. (1988). Educational ethnography in Britain. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 90-109). London: The Falmer Press.

## CHAPTER SIX

### STAGE LIGHTING

#### A Working Set Of Assumptions About Meaning And Change In Social Interactions Reflected In The Mobile-Framework

A lot of them want to have structure. Eil) J-5-Fieldnotes

This was sometimes a paradox, but now the time gives it proof.  
- Hamlet, III, i, 114.

### INTRODUCTION

This Chapter is a culmination of findings from all four areas of discovery. The content of working assumptions laid out in this Chapter flows from the first two areas of discovery. These areas craved explication of social process in light of experiences of participants as "learners". The same working assumptions, being descriptions of general social process, may also apply to adult educators' processes.<sup>1</sup> In this way, they also hail from the third and fourth areas of discovery.

In addition, findings from the third and fourth areas of discovery concerned with methodological consistency also shaped the intent of the Chapter. As a "set of working assumptions" the statements herein are intended as a contribution to paradigm construction. I have relied upon a concept of "paradigm" adopted as a social heuristical device for navigating through ubiquitous negotiations of meaning.

Based upon Kuhn's descriptions, "paradigms" offer "temporary" conceptual refuges of certainty before periodically collapsing beneath

a wealth of anomalies. It is on this basis that the set of working assumptions is proffered. These assumptions purport to explicate this study's data analysis. Nonetheless they are couched in more general tones of theory generation as possible propositions for others seeking out explications.

Consistent with the interpretive epistemology espoused in the study as working assumptions, no claims of permanent explication are made. Language used to convey various "working assumptions" may not consistently reflect their tentative and emerging nature. Adhering to current structure and general usage of language it was not always possible to reflect those qualities without associated qualities of awkwardness and artificiality.

Construction on this Chapter began in the midst of work on the Mobile-framework (Chapter Eight). Prior to completing the Mobile a need to clarify epistemological and ontological concerns came to light. With an eye to ontological and epistemological consistency, clarification of concepts became a separate analytic task. Owing to the complexity of the task a separate description has also emerged in the form of this Chapter. As a result a theoretical framework was created from which to suspend the hermeneutical circle of the Mobile-framework.

Foundations for a theoretical framework were laid in Chapter Five through descriptions of findings from various areas of work associated with data analysis process. This Chapter is a consolidation of those findings into a single frame which also includes theory generated.

Theory generation is the promise of qualitative research and ethnography. Among others (Hutchinson, 1988), Goetz and LeCompte exhort researchers to reach beyond description and to plumb creative, inductive depths, "Assigning meaning requires bold action" (1984, p. 196). They urge "creative and divergent thinking styles" even unto speculation. They instruct the neophyte researcher in such exploration:

To transcend mere reporting of facts, generate substantive theories, and integrate their studies with macrocultural issues, ethnographers use consolidation and application of theory, interpretation based on metaphors and analogies, and synthesis of their results with those of other researchers. (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, p. 196).

The study has taken up their challenge, relying upon a combination of "consolidation" and application of theory" in a process of theory generation. Within this work, theory generation has been confined largely to "hole-fitting", filling in conceptual gaps between available theories. Yet in relying on "meaning" as an outer framework, this might better be described as "whole-fitting". A description of the process by which this Chapter was created may shed further light on this.<sup>2</sup>

While engaged in this process I came to recognize a pattern. Many works begin with an articulated emphasis on "meaning" as epistemological sticking place. Yet, they would then wander away from focus on "meaning" towards "structural" concerns. That pattern is indirectly reflected in this Chapter. Many of this Chapter's segments begin with reference to extant theories, but then strike out when "their" path diverges from themes in data analysis. Emerging emphasis

on change related to meaning has promoted such diverging paths. Divergences occur with sufficient frequency to require creating also, the larger framework into which the mosaic pieces of this theoretical framework fit.

This Chapter draws together scattered elements discovered on the "theory trail". Relying on experiences with data analysis and with creating a representational form, a set of working assumptions have been developed concerning change and social interactions. Although many of these have been described elsewhere in the study this is a consolidation, a set of working assumptions in suspended state for the Mobile-framework. Assumptions addressed include an understanding of how people come to have a sense of holding meaning in common and how they experience changes.

While drawing these elements together I discovered myself shifting focus from "individual" to "social interaction". One can begin with either. Invariably, one finds oneself loping between connected aspects of these two starting points. For example, one might say confidently that meaning always resides in the individual. Yet, how individuals develop a capacity for meaning and what influences particulars of an individual's meaning is rooted in the social, individuals interacting with others (Blumer, 1969, Berger & Luckmann, 1966). On the other hand, if one vehemently concentrates on "the social" as did many adherents to structural-functionalism, one loses a major part of the dynamic, the actors — generators of what is studied (Goodson & Walker, 1988, p. 111).

Searching out a centre in oscillation between these two starting points (Podeschi, 1989) I began to gather in the pieces. I proceeded to consolidate by wrapping the pieces around a conceptual sticking point, "cultural-meaning". Since there are several pieces wrapped around "it" they have been laid out under delimiting headings.<sup>3</sup>

ONTOLOGICAL AND EPISTEMOLOGICAL STARTING POINTS:  
WORKING DEFINITIONS OF "MEANING" AND "CULTURAL-MEANING"

The hyphenation "cultural-meaning" was chosen as a sticking point with care. This form signifies two interrelated considerations in data analysis. The first consideration was to recognize key ontological and epistemological assumptions: Meaning is pivotal in human existence; we are creatures of meaning. Understanding our relationship with meaning is, therefore, pivotal to any understanding of human interaction, including one concerned with change (O'Dea, 1966; Kidd, 1973; Lindeman, 1926; Palmer, 1983). "Meaning" is used in a broader sense than "cognition". I refer to a combined intellectual, emotional and physical sense.

There is a second consideration in choosing this particular hyphenation of cultural-meaning. The hyphenation was intended as a reminder of a complex conceptual relationship. This relationship lies between meaning as associated with an individual's framework and culture as an illusive, parallel concept related to composites or social experience. Many theoretical works acknowledge a relationship between meaning and culture but do not afford clear ideas about the nature of such a relationship (Wolcott, 1985).

The concepts of "meaning" and "culture" appear to have particular significance in this instance. Group members were concerned with meaning and culture as part of their expressive, "theatrical endeavors". Insofar as these working assumptions may make sense of the data, I have developed working definitions of the concepts.

#### MEANING

"Meaning" may be described in experiential terms: -- Individuals experience an immediate sense of relationship or connection. Awareness of this sense adds a second layer (sphere) of meaning, a "supra-meaning". (Mezirow's distinctions between "meaning schemes" and "meaning perspectives" appear to be based on a parallel element of awareness [1988, p. 224].)<sup>4</sup>

This immediate sense of relationship, whether accompanied by awareness or not, may have various qualities associated with it related to these two spheres. An individual may experience a sense of relationship with different intensities of significance from the profound to the prosaic (O'Dea, 1966).<sup>5</sup>

Very much related to an experienced quality of significance is an experienced quality of being "real". "Reality" as defined in Berger and Luckmann's book is "a quality appertaining to phenomena that we recognize as having a being independent of our own volition" (1966, p. 13). Many of our cues which suggest a "reality" are derived from others acting in a manner consistent with a specific assumption. Experiencing this "quality of real" affects one's actions in relationship to that which one senses as "real". The effect is to

allow one to take for granted that which is real. All need not be questioned and negotiated (Collins, 1984; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988).

The working definition described thus far emphasizes meaning in terms of "internalization" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). It focuses on process of meaning being experienced within. A second aspect of "meaning" is individuals expressing meaning through actions ("externalizations") including creation of objects ("objectivations"). Considered in this way, individuals are also expressive and creative in relation to meaning. These two aspects of humankind, however, may spark off an inner tension.

First, if we are creatures of meaning, making sense of the world so that one may act and understand others' actions suggests a desire for certainty, a "reality" which does not change (O'Dea, 1966; Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Yet a desire to be expressive, to experience meaning in an active, creative form leads to exploration of meaning (Brook, 1972; Robinson, 1980; States, 1987). Such a process may lead to change of meaning. This sets up a tension in individuals' supra-meaning which may best be explored through consideration of several individuals interacting. My working definition of cultural-meaning begins to focus on meaning in these terms.

#### CULTURAL-MEANING

This is meaning which members of a group come to have a sense of holding in common in some degree and which shapes their physical, emotional, and intellectual focus in ongoing interactions.

- Well it was when we were talking about what we are going to end up with... It's on everybody's mind. "What are we going to end up with?" And from all that everybody seems to be centred in one spot. Something ... just got that way.. Eil) A-1-235-36.

Having proffered a processual definition, a cautionary codicil is now in order. Referring to "cultural-meaning" as an abstract concept is as much a heuristic device or conceit as is "institution". All concepts are abstractions. However, these processual concepts are taken to extremes when used to describe a concept of process as if these interactions and interpretations of interactions were a concrete object. For instance, the word "institution" is frequently used as if referring to a corporeal entity with a life of "its" own apart from the interactions of individuals. -- "We will do a needs assessment for your institution." Our language reflects the same problem, that is, a tendency towards "reification".

In the instance of "cultural-meaning", the closest the concept may come to a description of social interaction is describing a web of individuals' various externalizations and internalizations (Geertz, 1973, p. 5). For some, this may produce objectivations (on a social scale) in the form of articulated "institutions". The meaning of these objectivations as social artifacts, however, is always experienced individually.

"Cultural-meaning" is created to describe both process and repercussions of meaning experienced as being commonly held (or not) by individuals. If we must reify, cultural-meaning might better be described as a when -- when people experience cultural-meaning this becomes a driving force of meaning for their actions.

Meaning is always experienced individually. As previously emphasized, however, interactions among individuals not only shape individuals' capacity for meaning but shape content of their meaning and their responses or their further actions. For example, having a sense of whether others hold "a" meaning in common or not influences how individuals experience and respond to situations.

For purposes of the study, there is a particular importance in focusing on social aspects of life. People create meanings through their interactions, the very significance of which is heightened because that creation is through social interaction (Robinson, 1980; Turner, 1982; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). Through meaning associated with social process objectivations may be created in "the form" of articulated abstractions. Expressed abstractions or concepts, may then influence all participating individuals and thereby "act back on" the creators.

My working definitions of "meaning" and "cultural-meaning" include process in terms of initial meaning creation and expression. They do not provide a set of working assumptions concerning processual elements of change in individuals' meanings through interactions in a "group". The remaining segment of this Chapter is dedicated to elaborating such a set of work assumptions.

#### WORKING ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL PROCESS RELATED TO MEANING CHANGE

To consider change of meaning one must focus on both aspects of the same process: creation and change of an individual's meaning

specifically, and individuals' meaning in social relationships. (I have reflected this pattern in the proffered definition of "meaning" followed by "cultural-meaning".) Change of meaning may occur for an individual through isolated internal action or through interactions with others (Mezirow, 1988, p. 224).

In terms of cultural-meaning, change occurs either through several individuals coming to have a sense of holding meaning in common (emerging meaning) or losing that sense.

#### 1) INDIVIDUALS COMING TO HAVE A SENSE OF HOLDING MEANING IN COMMON

Berger and Luckmann (1966) posed dialectical processes associated with individuals' ongoing creation of meaning (internalization, externalization and objectivation). Correlatively, they posed dialectical processes for individuals creating together, that is, social construction: habitualization, typification and institutionalization (1966, 65-109).

The latter are, however, processual descriptions of social construction with an engineer's eye for construction. It is an efficient step by step plan for building a relatively permanent structure. One then simply locates a set of maintenance tools, "universe maintenance mechanisms" according to Berger and Luckmann (1966, p. 122).

Although it did offer a foundational starting point, their description did not offer a complete explication of fieldwork experience. Berger and Luckmann were approaching a different set of questions which concerned developing a sociology of knowledge. They

were synthesizing a number of conflicting theories into a solid, cohesive framework. In contrast, the fieldwork was focused on details of nuance and on change as thematic. The authors' description appears to shift into a concentration on patterned social artifacts (institutions) remote from individuals constant negotiation of meaning through a complex, ongoing process of change.<sup>6</sup>

a) Emerging Meaning: Focus On Processes Specific To An Individual

To understand how individuals negotiate meaning and change through complex processes, I return to consider "internalization" and "externalization" as related to meaning and cultural-meaning. Since this is a tremendously complex process I have reluctantly followed Berger's and Luckmann's strategy in dividing dialectical processes into pieces. This began with separating "internalization and externalization" in the working definitions of meaning and cultural-meaning.

Dissection carries with it disadvantages. Considering a rich complexity of individuals negotiating meaning over time, it is virtually impossible to untangle emerging constructions to locate a "precise" starting point. I have started with a set of premisses which appear to adequately describe many interactions. However, even with these there are cautions, beyond turning cultural-meaning into an object.

For example, based on the set of working definitions outlined thus far, one might describe an interaction in these simple terms: An

individual has a meaning which he or she wishes to express and which he or she does through "externalization". This description, however, conveys several questionable assumptions.

First, therein lies a suggestion that internalization or coming to "have" a sense of meaning is a starting point for action. However, a person may react to something reflexively, without much immediate sense of meaning (Wilson, 1977, p. 252). Second, descriptions thus far may have suggested that internalization is a simple act of recognizing and holding a single, simple meaning. In expressing meaning an individual may express only a part of complex meaning experienced.

As well, one may respond to only one element of that which was expressed. For example, viewing meaning in a physical, emotional, and intellectual sense, one might express a response to emotional tone as opposed to content of another's statement. Third, one may experience meaning while acting. This is a key aspect of theatre as some conceptualize that process. Internalization and externalization are not discrete. It is our abstractions which make "them" so.

Finally, with respect to cautionary notes, in relying on the singular form of the noun I did not intend to suggest that meaning is a simple, single object first internalized and then expressed. The description following the working definition of meaning suggested that individuals' meanings may be multi-layered and vary in intensity of significance and in a sense of being "real". In addition, meaning must be understood not only in terms of internalization as a process, but also in terms of a dialectical moment of internalization, externalization and objectivation.

### Emerging Meaning: Focus On Interactions Among A Set Of Individuals

Thus far the focus has been on complexities in processes of ongoing meaning creation within an individual. Now, focus changes to consider working assumptions about ongoing interaction among a set of individuals. From observations in the field and from data analysis, I came to rely on the following assumption: Humankind has tended to lean towards attempting to come to have a sense of holding meanings in common. Individuals do not always do that for a myriad of reasons. For example, processes of modernity, particularly "individuation" affect this tendency (Berger, 1977; Finger, 1989).

However, given observations in the field, the study concentrates on those situations in which that is a general intent. Even when this becomes common intent for a "group" of individuals, there are many possible variations. Several variations regarding internalization will be described.

With any set of people involved in an interaction, each person may have a different experience. From one situation some may experience meanings similar in essence. Others may experience meaning but may not be aware of experiencing particular meaning. Still others may experience various intensities of similar elements of meaning. Some may experience a spectrum of meanings.

Individuals may experience entirely different meanings from others. Yet, they may respond in like manner for a variety of reasons. These reasons may include a desire to respond in the same way because their meaning has shifted. They may feel it most significant to respond in like manner. For there is a double

significance about group members' responding in like manner: -- The content of meaning expressed is important, but also a sense of "the profound" that comes through sharing experienced meaning, a sense derived from recognized similarity of response. This is where supra-meaning of "the profound" may be linked with a sense of "reality" and therein provide a sense of certainty.

In this last paragraph the descriptions shifted. The section began with a comparison of how meaning may be internalized differently among several individuals simultaneously. As a part of this comparison the significance of experiencing common "internalization" and expressing that commonality was raised.

The latter shifted away from internalization into externalization insofar as they may be separated. Externalization for an individual is the act of expressing an interpretation, a response to an internalization of meaning about others' actions. For those interacting, that same act is an indication, whether acknowledged or not, of whether the "expresser" is experiencing the same meaning as they are.

To those interacting, there may be many indications which lead them to a sense of meaning commonality among themselves. An example: if one member articulates a meaning and others articulate approximately the same meaning or act in a way consistent with that meaning, each might take this as holding meaning in common. A more "lyric" way of putting that is to suggest that group members' interactions indicate whether they are "in tune" with each other.<sup>7</sup>

Another indication of meaning commonality in an individual's "externalization" might arise out of conflict. If a member responds with potential surprise indicating ambiguity or disagreement, this externalization ends a sensation of that meaning being held unanimously.

However, it may also express what others are experiencing, if others have a similar sense of ambiguity. In that case this act eventually brings about a sense of meaning commonly held (Turner, 1982). It precipitates mild conflict in which ambiguity is followed by further crystallization of meaning for group members.

Process of clarification may also leave group members with a stronger sense of meaning commonality (Malamah-Thomas, 1987; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). (Throughout data analysis I have referred to this process of conflict in meaning as "breaking points". I will provide further detail in the Mobile-framework description about this working assumption.) Thus meaning commonality may be experienced as emerging through patterns continuously or abruptly changing.<sup>8</sup>

Descriptions thus far have proposed processes of meaning change related to both an individual's emerging meaning and individuals' emerging meaning in social relationship. The latter is intended to signify how individuals come to have a sense of holding meaning in common, cultural-meaning. Yet to be addressed, is supra-meaning in change of meaning.

Emerging meaning and emerging cultural-meaning may be content oriented for individuals. What happens, however, when emerging meaning, or loss of meaning held is experienced as changed?

2) REFLECTIONS ON MEANING OF "CHANGE" IN SOCIAL INTERACTION:  
AN EPISTEMOLOGY OF CHANGE

While the "Social Theory Trail" was under construction, a gaping canyon in literature was discovered en route. By travelling alongside it for a while and considering various theoretical terrains I discovered that this was a theoretical canyon of the concept of "change". As well as it could be observed, the distant bottom teemed thick and fast with undergrowth. It was overgrown with foliage of tacit assumptions carried into every day actions and into research.<sup>9</sup>

As part of the third and fourth areas of discovery an underlying objective of this study is to consider that which is taken for granted in this type of ethnographic work. A series of blunt questions have surfaced from library research.

What do "we" mean by the word "change"? How do we experience change? Do we have, in our modern, Western society, a commonly held sense of change? If so, is our experience reflected in the way we use the word? Does our experience of change have implications for the way we research change?

These are questions which flowed from fieldwork and from various areas of data analysis outlined in the previous Chapter. The study endeavors to answer at least some of these questions from the vantage point of this specific research experience.<sup>10</sup> However, as the study

adopts an epistemology allowing use of "paradigm" as heuristic device, for purposes of theory generation the framework has been described more generally.<sup>11</sup>

"Change", like "meaning", "culture", and "institution" is so often used without ontological and epistemological reference points. This does not mean, however, that tacit assumptions are not made, hence the foliage in the canyon. In this way, too, our concepts of "change" simultaneously act back on us and also shift.

For data analysis purposes, I have laboured to create a suspension bridge over the canyon in the theory trail. Materials for bridging were derived from field experience, data analysis and extrapolation of elements in social theory. Since I have located meaning at our centre, consistency implied the undergirding of such a bridge: an effort towards making more explicit an epistemology of change. I have been selecting from and working with express and tacit assumptions concerning change.

One approach to identifying tacit assumptions in an epistemology of "change" is to consider "change" in terms of experiencing meaning. Casting about for footings on which to build a bridge, Berger's and Luckmann's (1966) work was reconsidered. Although they do not dwell on meaning, they do build their conceptual tower on a cornerstone of "anomie".

The authors focus on meaning at least for the purposes of reflecting on the concept of "anomie". They link meaning and social structure through anomie:

On the level of meaning, the institutional order represents a shield against terror. To be anomic, therefore, means to be deprived of this shield and to be exposed, alone, to the onslaught of nightmare. While the horror of aloneness is probably already given in the constitutional sociality of man, it manifests itself on the level of meaning in man's incapacity to sustain a meaningful existence in isolation from the nomic constructions of society. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 119).

Berger and Luckmann then return, however, to concentrate their theoretical development on social structure and "its" maintenance through social processes.

On the theme of social structural maintenance, they address a relationship between meaning and change somewhat indirectly. They suggest that an element common to modern societies has tremendous impact on attempts to maintain a societal structure:

The pluralistic situation goes with conditions of rapid social change, indeed pluralism itself is an accelerating factor precisely because it helps to undermine the change-resistant efficacy of the traditional definitions of reality. Pluralism encourages both scepticism and innovation and is thus inherently subversive of the taken-for-granted reality of the traditional status quo. (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 143.)

Their description points to one major, "modern" cause for experience of change in meaning linked with the profound. This "modern" cause is simply competing choices of construction.

Being faced with competing meanings may be a relativizing experience for individuals. In terms of supra-meaning, an individual's sense of relationship with the profound is rapidly changed. It is interesting that the authors refer earlier in the text to the "horror" of anomic conditions, (1966, p. 119) and yet, in this quotation, such experience is described as a duality of "scepticism" and "innovation".<sup>12</sup>

O'Dea also speaks to issues of profound meaning related to social change:

First, man lives in conditions of uncertainty; events of crucial significance to his safety and welfare are beyond his provision. (1966, p. 5)

He describes three aspects of human experience which create conditions of uncertainty, "contingency", "powerlessness", and "scarcity" (1966, p. 5). Two of these aspects have particular significance in an epistemology of change. Through distinguishing between "contingency" and "powerlessness" O'Dea emphasizes two different meaning constructions.

The author identifies one meaning state as a sense of "powerlessness" or "impossibility context" which "refers to the fact that not everything men desire can be attained. A second meaning state, according to O'Dea is "contingency" or the "uncertainty context". How are these two related to plurality as a modern condition of life? Jarvis also distinguishes between these experiences in relation to meaning. He describes them as "alienating and anomic experiences" (1987, p. 169).

"Plurality" may bring "contingency" to the fore as an issue of meaning. "Powerlessness" either recedes or becomes meaningful in terms of issues of contingency. Our plurality may make us "prone to" experience meaning of change in terms of an "uncertainty context". Shifts towards meaninglessness may become pushed to the fore wherein one cannot make sufficient sense as a basis for action.<sup>13</sup>

### Experience Of Change

Berger and Luckmann's and then O'Dea's work were surveyed for elements of an epistemology of change. "Anomie" and "contingency" provide explication for group members' actions when they sought certainty through obtaining and holding on to anchors. (See "Get-Got Something" segment of the Mobile-framework, Chapter Eight.)

However, they do not provide explication for meaning and change related to group members' interactions when they begin to improvise (a form of acting). Group members' actions are manifestly directed towards striking out to seek "the uncertain", to explore very much as Brook (1972) and States (1987) describe such a process . (See "Go With It" segment of the Mobile-framework, Chapter Eight.) Wildemeersch and Leirman describe a similar experience in a non-theatre project (1988, p. 22).

O'Dea's description of "the charismatic" has relevance. However, his description of meaning in change related to emerging charisma is limited. The author is concerned predominantly with "dilemmas" created through changing relationships between people's meaning and institutionalized interactions created to address profound meaning. Before shifting focus to implications of institutionalization as related to changes of meaning, it is important to contemplate our experience of change: — What meaning we make of change and then how that leads to social responses.

The study posits, for paradigmatic purposes, that it is possible to make more explicit commonly held sense of experiences of change we

may have in our modern Western society. In essence I will offer up a description of emerging aspects of our "cultural-meaning" of change.

Contained in my descriptions of internalization (from data analysis) is an assumption that when we experience meaning, "it" generally crystallizes for us. We "see" new relationships in the moment. In this way we experience, "something(s)" as having moved in relation to ourselves.

However, in experiencing meaning through recognizing a new relationship we may have no sense of what that relationship means, other than that there is something new. In other words, these shifts or moves may result in an experience of shifting towards or away from meaning (Jarvis, 1987; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). If this adequately describes aspects in our experience of change, what qualities do we attribute to "change"?

Experience of shifting towards or away from meaning appears to have a consistent element, a quality associated with each. Our cognizance of a particular meaning often comes together all at once. It was not there before, only pieces. Suddenly, it is a whole. Although this is not always consistent, this experience of "meaning change" tends to orient us towards considering "change" as being of an abrupt quality. Since the moment of recognition is abrupt, that experience of abruptness is frequently attributed to "the content of the shifting meaning". "Boy, did she ever change her mind quickly!"

How intensely an individual experiences abruptness in change may be linked with two different experiences of meaning change. Relying

on data analysis, I suggest that there are at least two differing experiences of change based on associated meanings.<sup>14</sup>

Given our propensity to reify process in conceptualization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 106) we may also convert "change" into phenomenon. "The change" may "cause" us to experience meaning or meaninglessness. However, in these terms, "it" (the "external") creates implications for us internally. Individuals are more likely to have a sense of abruptness remain as the core of that experience. Action and meaning have come from outside.

In contrast, change may be experienced as abrupt but as a distinct shift towards meaning for action. For example, if individuals' first experience a loss of meaning and then act to locate meaning, their sensation of locating meaning may be abrupt. However, their sense of motion towards meaning will not necessarily have the same "external" imposition. Individuals, especially those "combining forces", experience movement towards meaning as momentous and fluid. Their experience of movement towards meaning presses their experience of abrupt beginnings and ends to the background.<sup>15</sup>

How does this relate to qualities included in the working definition of "meaning"? If a meaning is experienced intensely and as one of significance, "the change" will be experienced as "profound" and "real". Placed back into the context of social milieu, whether these qualities are present for an individual may be related to awareness of experiencing a meaning and then a sense that others have also come to hold similar meaning. "Cultural-meaning", through processual definition, is meant to create a shift in how change is

understood. That is, a shift from viewing change as phenomena (the first described experience of change) to considering change as emerging social experience (a shift towards the second, as balance).

If this last working assumption is adequate to explain two ways we experience change as individuals, there is a corollary. Given modern preeminence of "change" (Berger, 1977; Finger, 1989; Kidd, 1973), arguably, we experience and express a common sense of change implying certain attributes or qualities "in change" through our interactions. In this sense, as members of this society, we are speaking of change in terms of our present cultural-meaning. If we bring and maintain a commonly held meaning of change to "group settings" which carries a quality of abruptness, this also suggests a supra-meaning need to respond quickly. Whatever the specific content of response, our general response is one of movement towards meaning.

These working assumptions propose that in our society we need, both as individuals and as adult educators, a very different sense of change with respect to meaning and cultural-meaning. A more sensitive awareness of how our emerging cultural-meanings relate to "change" would prove to be of benefit.

The experience of change for some might be described as movement in relation to oneself. However, that description neglects the larger perspective that through social interaction we are all always moving. We might almost think of it in terms of being on the road to "it", but never "having it" (Brook, 1972; Robinson, 1980). For despite my

occasional use of the phrase "have or hold meaning", cultural-meaning is not capable of being possessed; only the sense of it is experienced within individuals (Jorgenson, 1989).

Cultural-meaning related to change might also be thought of as a chorus of notes and cues, with chords occasionally emerging and being sustained for some time. A sense of cultural-meaning occurs in a sea of exchange among individuals, emerging concourse-like, being negotiated, being refined and disappearing again as meaning for those individuals (Mezirow, 1978; Robinson, 1980). What is most noteworthy about that description is the fragility of arriving at and maintaining a sense of commonly held meaning (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 121).

As previously described, part of "modern" cultural-meaning of change is that our experience of change is escalating (Berger, 1977). A sense of commonly held meaning appears that much more fragile in light of plurality and changing environment. Yet, a working assumption foundational to others described is that humankind attempts to avoid a state of meaninglessness in social interactions (Jarvis, 1987; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988).

Based on Berger and Luckmann and O'Dea's work as disclosed I describe a further assumption. As a supra-meaning strategy, individuals search to locate anchors of meaningful certainty in social life. This is often done in a tacit fashion. The concept of "anchor", as I am adding it to the theoretical framework, is a social element created and relied on in response to experience of meaning change (Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

### 3) SUPRA-MEANING RESPONSES: ANCHORING

In response to a sea of potential change and utter loss of meaning in interactions, individuals anchor themselves in particular aspects of "the social". In this way they need not constantly attend to supra-meaning (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Durkheim, 1985; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). They can rely on a sense of "reality" and slip into at least some aspects of life being partially taken for granted. Based on data analysis, the study postulates that individuals' anchoring of profound meaning in certain aspects of social interaction has more than one "port".<sup>16</sup>

For example, individuals may anchor themselves in the identity of "a group". A set of individuals may commonly endow this experience of "group" with charismatic-like qualities.<sup>17</sup> If individuals develop a strong enough sense of commonality, they may begin to have a sense of being a "member of a group".

This implies that "a group" exists for people when "a group" becomes an entity for them to the extent that in their perception "it" has the power to interpret reality with legitimacy. For example, "The group would think I was crazy if I did that."<sup>18</sup>

In addition, when the individual develops a strong sense of relationship to a particular "group" even if interpretation of reality changes, or actions change over time, individuals may still anchor their sense of reality or consistency with "the group". As long as a sense of "the group" consistently exists, even though other things change, individuals' supra-meaning attached to existence of the group may provide a sense of consistency in the "profound" sphere. In that

instance, maintenance of a sense of group or entity may become highly significant for them.<sup>19</sup>

A second anchor in social interactions, for some, may lie in an emphasis on actions forming an entity rather than actors. Developing a patterned set of interactions associated with a patterned set of meanings also may provide an anchor in terms of supra-meaning. This is a crude description of institutions as "structure" (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Rituals, for example, may be most significant or promote an experience of profundity because of a sense of certainty generated through repetition of reciprocal action (Turner, 1982). Additional detail concerning assumptions about this anchor is included in the segment which follows.

Prior to leaving this segment, one final point must be made concerning "anchors". "Plurality" in modern times has been linked with motivation for seeking out anchors in social life. This was not intended, however, to suggest that "anchors" have not been a long standing social orientation for individuals. Our need of them is certainly clear at this juncture.<sup>20</sup>

"Anchors" have been described as a social response relied on by individuals in response to potential meaning change. Do anchors provide a permanent social solution or are there meaning changes associated with anchors? This question is explored in the next segment.

#### 4) EXPERIENCE OF CHANGE ASSOCIATED WITH ANCHORS: BREAKING POINTS

As stated previously, I have followed a general pattern in construction of this set of working assumptions. Beginning with processes specific to an individual the set of assumptions shifts to consider settings of social dynamic wherein individuals interact as group members. The working definitions at the outset reflect that sense moving from meaning to cultural-meaning. This segment follows the same path.

The section began with a consideration of "change" experienced by individuals as shift towards or away from meaning. "Anchors" were then posited as a social response to change. This segment returns once more to change in meaning with respect to anchors.

Some changes of meaning experienced by individuals may mesh with meaning they already hold through anchors. However, among situations in which they experience change of meaning occurring rapidly, some people experience disruption of commonly sensed meaning (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). They, thereby, experience disruption of their anchors. Disruption may be relatively minor requiring some adjustment in individuals' meaning. Individuals also may experience extreme disruption (Freire, 1985; Mezirow, 1981, 1988).

These experiences of meaning change are referred to in this set of working assumptions as "breaking points" in recognition of O'Dea's work in this area (1966). Others refer to them as "life crises " or "disorienting dilemmas" (Mezirow, 1988; Jennings, 1985).

Again, we experience "breaking points" as individuals, but how we come to have this experience is generally through interactions with others. Based on field observations, this study assumes that if we experience them "en masse", the supra-meaning implications are that much more demanding and urgent. People may be left with no sense of how to act or respond.<sup>21</sup> "Breaking points" are elaborated in relation to data analysis in Chapter Seven.

The study does not claim to have discovered through data analysis all the ways change in cultural-meaning becomes abruptly experienced for many group members. There is, however, one situation for which explication through data analysis was sought. This may be described most clearly by beginning with structure as a "second anchor" in social life.

Experience of cultural-meaning as defined is closely linked to experience of social structure as anchor. To divide these concepts is another instance of heuristic device in these working assumptions. It becomes useful to analytically distinguish between cultural-meaning and social structure, however, to make sense of certain situations.

For example, people can experience, through a series of interactions, a sense of "permanent structure". In essence this is what Berger and Luckmann refer to as "institutionalization" (1966, p. 65-109). It is meaning in action, which becomes reified in a series of abstract concepts associated with externalizations.

In other words, a certain set of individuals' meanings and actions take on a "real quality". They seem to have a meaning-life of

"their own". This offers one explanation for why a memory of social "structure" may take on a quality of anchor for individuals.

If conditions change to the extent that people's meanings change, the "structure" created to address their set of meanings may no longer address those "original" meanings. In some cases, however, "the structure" has taken on a meaning sense of being "real" and is therefore difficult to abandon (Freire, 1985). In that instance, people may experience conflict between their emerging meaning and with meaning they have established through their "structure" as anchor (Geertz, 1973).

Stemming from data analysis the study posits an additional working assumption. An important element of experiencing meaning commonality through anchors takes the form of a tension. This tension lies between individuals first anchoring meaning in certainty through developing structure, followed by a loss of meaning originally associated with that structure over time. Berger and Luckmann (1966) suggest we create "subuniverses", (1966, p. 102) and "universal maintenance mechanisms" (1966, p. 122) to deal in part with problems of meaning such as this.

O'Dea, (1966) describes precisely one of these situations in his work on "Dilemmas". The author outlines this as a problem of profound meaning disappearing for individuals and being replaced eventually with a focus on the prosaic aspects of ritual or administrative aspects of institutionalization.<sup>22</sup>

Shift in focus of meaning for individuals eventually cuts their anchor (Mezirow, 1981, 1988). Such a shift may happen in many ways if

one accepts the working assumption that "we are all moving always". Several adult educators working within a "liberatory framework" have focused on processes to create such breaking points (Chambulikazi, 1989; Kidd, 1983; Freire, 1985; Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). This particular description of a breaking point illuminates again a thematic tension between a need for certainty through present anchors and a need to explore through expression of meaning from which we derive new meaning again.

In this experience of breaking point, the supra-meaning sought through certainty of anchoring to a set structure is severed. It is severed when the structure becomes meaningless in other senses. In addition, when structure offers no sense of identity for individuals, those individuals will not be anchored through that structure (Berger & Luckmann, 1966).

At any rate, key to this experience of change is that at some point there is no certainty for individuals. Socially constructed anchors in specific "structure" or "group entity" are not then "permanent" (O'Dea, 1966). How do individuals respond to breaking points which irreparably sunder their anchor?

Those who no longer experience meaning through a structure may discover supra-meaning in moving away from the meaningless towards exploring. Relying on fieldwork I would suggest that one way individuals do this is to find meaning in action through expression of whatever meaning they do experience. This may be a common expression of experiencing fear.

In this way individuals may come to have again a sense of common meaning. This is one course of action through which tension between a desire to explore and to seek certainty may become resolved for a time. A fundamental working assumption is that individuals focus on moving away from meaninglessness to seeking the meaningful. In the exploration individuals have a sensation of intense experience together. Based on fieldwork I suggest that this is one means through which individuals begin to hold a sense of charisma in group.

The descriptions of two different experiences of change referred to earlier in "Experience Of Change" have been intentionally repeated. In this manner the study endeavors to provide additional context for these experiences related to anchors.

Herein I have outlined how individuals' experience of change is very much related to both an individual's meaning and individuals' meaning in social relationship through anchors. More specifically, the study has provided an example of when individuals experience a conflict between emerging meaning and meaning emerged in social anchor. I have described a possible cycle in loss of anchor and search for new anchor. However, this does not address a dimension of time.

When "anchors" were first introduced in the Chapter, it was in reference to "anomie" and more specifically "plurality", our modern experience of competing claims. No paradigmatic claims are made for the length of time "anchors" have been a "social response". Individuals may have relied upon such a meaning process since the dawn of humankind. The question in light of "modernity" is: Have

individuals been modifying them of late to suit a response to plurality and to unabated change of meaning?

The next segment considers a set of assumptions about our interactive response in creating conditions of modernity and responding to these conditions. These assumptions about individuals' "modern" responses will be considered as well in terms of how we may affect our own social anchors.

#### 5) RESPONSE TO "CHANGE" IN PRESENT SOCIAL INTERACTIONS RELATED TO SOCIAL ANCHORS

Individuals who eventually "became this group" did not come as tabulae rasae. When they began to create mutual meaning for the first time, they brought meaning with them. Their internalizations and externalizations of this experience were rooted in their past experiences, their context.

A theoretical framework about our modern experience of change has been described on the assumption that this may have been a general meaning context for group members. Many may have brought this context with them to the project. As individuals they would hold this mutual context in varying detail and intensity. This is addressed more specifically in Chapter Eight in descriptions of interactions among those observed through the study.

Within previous descriptions limited references have been made to current modern context. What follows is a broader set of working assumptions about general social context within which those living in the contemporary Western world interact. This will include

description not only of "modernity" as socially created. It will also include individuals' "modern" response to created conditions in terms of change related to anchors.

Many theorists subscribe to a construction of our present time as being unique in the history of human interaction. They have used the word "modernity" in reference to this construction. "Modernity" as a label indicates a set of working assumptions about our changing relationship with our social structure as reflected in present Western society (Mastai, 1987). Since there is a large body of work referring to the concept of "modernity", to simplify where possible, I have principally relied on references among works on the Social Theory Trail. As well, I will focus on those assumptions underlying "modernity" and relating to meaning which appear most directly related to concerns raised through data analysis.

Berger's work "Toward A Critique Of Modernity" (1977) creates a set of working assumptions about processual change described as "modernity". His work has been of assistance once more, because of Berger's agility in synthesis. In this piece, he has gathered together substantial content and reflection on theories about "modernity".

Berger has divided working assumptions about modernity into five processual changes. He describes them in terms of "dilemmas" because of what we evoke for ourselves through our social interactions which generate these five processes. A brief description of all five processes constituted part of the Theory Trail: "individuation", "abstraction", "futuraity", "liberation" and "secularization" (1977,

p. 70-80). All of these working assumptions have implications in terms of "meaning", "cultural-meaning", tensions in certainty, change and social anchors.

The first four processes, "individuation", "abstraction", "futuraity", and "liberation" manifest various shifts of meaning. The fifth, "secularization" is apparently an outcome of cumulative affects (meaning shifts) arising from the other processes. Secularization is a process of individuals' shifting supra-meaning, of profound attribution, reflected in changing anchors.

Each of the four processes described may arouse dual experiences of meaning change -- movement towards meaning and away from "it". For example, in "individuation" we may observe a process of moving towards a new meaning. In that process people begin to shift focus to the individual as centre and carrier of meaning. Most importantly, contained in this change of meaning, there is a shift away from "individual" defined in a social collective sense.

In a process of "abstraction" there is also movement towards new meaning. In "abstraction" an emphasis emerges on moving towards a particular form and focus of meaning. This emphasis leads to valuing meaning in terms of "the rational", or "rationalization" as process. These processes suggest movement towards meaning. Then, wherein lies a second experience of change, movement away from meaning?

Berger has described "abstraction" and "individuation" as synergistic in process:

Be this as it may, modernity, by simultaneously making institutions more abstract and the people in them more individuated, has enormously aggravated the threat of what sociologists call anomie. (1977, p. 75)

His description of anomic shifts associated with these two processes suggests a loss or weakening of anchors in social life. For instance, possible anchoring for individuals through structure is weakened by a sense of loss of connectedness to institutions. A second anchor, meaning through a charismatic experience of "group as entity", is highly problematic in the face of a focus on the individual through "individuation".

If these working assumptions are adequate explications of social dynamics in our society, weakening of anchors "aggravating a threat of anomie" would prompt individuals' experience of change as movement towards meaninglessness. They would evoke for individuals contingency as context and experience of change as abrupt and externally imposed. On the other hand, both "futuraity" and "liberation", as explicated suggest a strategic determination to experience change as moving towards the meaningful. An optimistic quality in such social action is implied.

Based on earlier suppositions, arguably, "liberation" and "futuraity", are shifting social responses to underlying senses of change experienced "as abrupt". This fits with a tacit, socially unexplained, taken for granted experience of change — the canyon foliage. Futuraity may be thought of as seeking meaning through

discovering a way of preventing change from occurring in the same historically abrupt, frightening, or frustrating, manner of past and present.

Futurity focuses away from the past and present towards the future. Emphasis in meaning is shifted to having the ability to plan and control change in future. Interestingly, this indicates an intended shift away from experience of change as abrupt and external, towards intended experience, towards meaning. However, it still raises the questions: "From what are we changing? To what are we changing?"

"Liberation" as Berger describes the concept indicates a specific focus for directed change. Change suggested in the working assumption of liberation emphasizes our expressive natures through change (1977). The processual concept of "liberation" carries with it an exploratory impetus. This may be understood as a social response to tension concerning the experience of loss of supra-meaning in current structure. It also supports intention to move from meaninglessness towards meaningfulness.

I intimated earlier that each of the four processes prompts two experiences of change. Descriptions of futurity and liberation have been concerned with intention to move towards meaningfulness. What are the implications of these two process? How "successful" have these social processes been in maintaining a course towards meaningfulness?

As was the case with "individuation" and "abstraction" both processes imply connections to meaning change related to anchors.

"Futurity" suggests no absolute commitment to present anchors of any kind. "Freedom of choice", when an absolute precept, implies no profound commitment to anchor either in current structure or particular groups. This is closely related to Finger's critique (1989) of attempts in adult education to realize a model of adult education based on critical theory.

There are fascinating meaning implications buried in these processes. If, however, one scrutinizes the definitions of the five processes (see Chapter Five), within these working assumptions there is no direct articulation of how we experience change at present. Most specific references to experiences of meaning and change within this segment have been supplementary, being rooted in data analysis process.

If these descriptions of processes are congruent with contemporary social interactions the effect of these processes is a rejection of various elements of what has gone before. If not a complete rejection, a neglect, a forgetting. Should this be so, we bring our own element of abruptness with change in modernity.

Although a set of individuals may act cohesively and intensely towards meaning, if they have turned their back on what has gone before, this is abrupt shifting. Implications of shifted moorings in social life manifestly escalate tension in placing two different experiences of change side by side demanding constant adjustment.

A sense of loss of anchors may not be initially experienced by individuals. Movement towards meaning may supplant temporarily a

sense of loss. In this manner a sense of abrupt loss may be deferred until the motion stops in breaking point experience. When describing implications of these four processes I emphasized movement both towards meaning and away in terms of loss of present anchors.

"Loss" suggests entire loss of meaning, anomie. However, a fifth process of modernity, "secularization" speaks to "modified" anchors (Berger, 1977, p. 78). The other four "change-meaning" processes influence the fifth. However, individuation and abstraction as shifts in meaning appear to have a particularly close connection to secularization. "Individuation" as a meaning shift moves from "individual" defined in terms of the social collective.

With "abstraction" as process, inflection of meaning shifts to "reason" or the rational. In this process, supra-meaning becomes fused with claims to "objective reality". This shift in valued meaning for individuals becomes manifest in social interactions. Emphasis in anchors swings away from "spirituality" to logical-abstract process". According to this, meaning in certainty would be achieved through scientific procedure, not through spiritual ministrations. The fifth dilemma, secularization begins to signal such change in profound meaning being created and acting back on us (O'Dea, 1966; Palmer, 1983; Turner, 1982, Wilshire, 1982).

This study turns now to explore more fully this double process related to our experiences of change. The segment which follows addresses changing anchors in relation to "profound" spheres of meaning.

6) THE PROFOUND AND PARADIGMS:  
CULTURAL-MEANING IN ACTION RELATED TO ANCHORS AND CHANGE

Thus far it has been posited that individuals in our society have commonly experienced a shift in meaning within both the profound sphere and meaning in the prosaic sphere of activity. Our anchors through social structure and a sense of group are emerging as modified. If this provides explication for current shifts in social processes at least one immediate question emerges. How do we anchor ourselves given this change?

The previous segment considered change in terms of how we experience shifts in our moorings. Through working descriptions it posited that within our society we have a tendency to experience change tacitly in at least two different ways. We tend to experience change as abrupt, as happening externally to ourselves, and as moving away from the meaningful. A second way has been described in which change may be experienced. We also may experience change with less quality of abruptness and as an internal as well as external dynamic force and as a part of that force we are impelled, moving towards the meaningful. The study has suggested as well that our responses to these two experiences of change are manifest in a tension we experience through our social interactions.<sup>23</sup>

Based on data analysis it is assumed that this profound tension is related to supra-meaning and certainty. Tension arises out of duality of meaning in action: a) meaning associated with consistency of action in terms of structure and group entity and b) a need for expressivity, meaning associated with exploration in action, a move

towards meaning. Four processes described, "abstraction", "individuation", "futuraity" and "liberation" contribute to heightening this tension as these processes in which we are engaged imply two strikingly different experiences or characterizations of "change".

An additional assumption is that these different characterizations of change lead to entirely different responses when experienced intensely. For example, if change is experienced as abrupt and a disruption of meaning by individuals, then one response is to locate certainty through maintaining that which one has by hanging on to extant anchors. However, if change is experienced as movement towards meaning, this implies a former state of meaninglessness or partial meaninglessness, however momentary. This further implies that old anchors no longer act as anchors of meaning. They become impediments, millstones as opposed to milestones.

Outlined previously were implications of meaning shifts when "they" affect anchors. This Chapter has endeavored to describe individuals' experience of change and their response to change as dialectical in terms of meaning creation and re-creation. It has linked this dialectical to the profound anchored in social experience.

An additional assumption emerging from the study is that both these responses to change contain a common element. This assumption is an extension of an earlier one that we lean towards holding meaning in common. These responses contain an aim for control of meaning. In a broad sense this translates into intent towards control over change.

To develop a sense of how we respond on a composite social scale to modern experience of escalating change, consideration will be given now to our emerging cultural-meaning of the profound.

Previous segments described "anchors of social life" in terms of "group entity" and "structure". It is assumed that these must be anchored into "certain" ground. That ground is supra-meaning of the profound. This is where for individuals, the source of change (and therefore of reality) and anchors meet. For a set of individuals, "group entity" will be charismatic because "the entity" is linked with a source of vitality -- God, or "a higher truth" in the form of rationality.

Structure arising from interactions of group members must be anchored in the same soil of the sacred. When attempting to locate both anchors and "profound" ground of group members, the nature of the clues may actually make the search interactive. Data about shapes of anchors may provide clues about where they are anchored. As well, where they are anchored may reflect on the shape of the anchor.

Based on findings in all areas of the study I have looked to the process "secularization" for indication of location and shape of our "modern" anchors in social life. Those who accept "secularization" as explication of change in our Western society, accept a description of a shift in shape and moorings of our anchors in social life. Examining the shapes and following the anchors for location in the profound provides us with a sense of the soil.

Key to processes of secularization is movement away from religion (Berger, 1977; O'Dea, 1966; Wilshire, 1982) towards experiencing

rational thought as being a profound source of meaning. This orientation is associated with "science" and it is this framework wherein I came to search for manifestations of contemporary anchors. What response does the scientific community have to this tension in certainty as meaning in constancy and meaning in exploration? Kuhn has provided an excellent description of how they do this. In his set of working assumptions the concept of "paradigm" is central.<sup>24</sup>

Kuhn's concept of paradigm might be understood as a "modern" response to "change". His theory of paradigm shift emanates from his need to create an adequate historical description of how scientists deal with change. Kuhn refutes the commonly held perspective of scientific work being purely one of incremental building on what is already there. He argues that scientists rely on frameworks, exemplars to guide their work. This he refers to as "normal science" (1970, p. 10).

He states, however, that periodically conceptual frameworks fall to pieces. According to Kuhn they do this when the framework no longer yields a cohesive explication for experiences. These conceptual frameworks are eventually replaced by others (1970, p. 10). Kuhn is describing a process of change and response to change within a "group" that is aimed at discovering an objective reality. He offers us "paradigms" as a processual linchpin.

Kuhn masterfully illuminates by doing the very thing he is describing. He is creating a paradigm which can explicate that which was historically anomalous. Kuhn does this through bringing a new meaning to interactions prompting change for scientists.

His definitions of "paradigm" in his first major book on the subject tend towards empirical descriptions of how paradigms are manifest in process. His descriptive definitions are rich but have a certain disadvantage. Masterman (1970) articulates a concern with the number of variations in Kuhn's definition of paradigm.<sup>25</sup>

Kuhn replies in an essay situated in a second book on this topic, The Essential Tension (1977). In this essay he acknowledges variations in definition of paradigm and collects them into two major groupings (1977, p. 293-319) which very roughly parallel the two anchors I have described as "group entity" (scientific community) and "structure" (commitments, exemplars of the scientific community). However, his notions of "group entity" and "structure", as anchors, reflect being reshaped by processes of change attributable to modernization.

For example, among Kuhn's various descriptions of paradigm one may find group or entity in the form of scientific community directing action. One may find "paradigm" also as structure in terms of exemplar or conceptual framework with sufficiency to provide broad explication and allow for prediction. In deference to modern experience of change, the framework must leave room and guidance for interstitial exploration.

#### Towards A Definition Of Paradigm Applicable To "Groups" Generally

As previously described, Kuhn tends toward empirical description of how paradigms "function" in process rather than providing a more

general definition. I have faced a similar situation with "cultural-meaning". The concept has been defined in epistemological and processual terms: "individuals coming to have sense of holding meaning in common". Yet it has also been useful to apply the label in my speculations about the product of process, what they held in common, as much as "it" can be described. The concept was created to describe composite effect of sensing common meaning.<sup>26</sup>

When definitions were required in this working set of assumptions, efforts have been specifically directed towards providing them in processual form for the sake of epistemological consistency. Ironically, in attempting to provide processual definitions there is a singular syntactical attraction to slip from process to product, "objectification" in Berger and Luckmann's terms (1966). "Paradigm" is subject to this fate. One of the most common ways of expressing "paradigm" is framework and specific contents of framework. The conceptual framework is, in a sense, the product or artifact of our social interaction which creates "it".

When paradigm is conceived as "framework", it places a very strong emphasis on structural elements. However, when we speak of creation of framework associated with breaking points, (Kuhn's "crisis of anomalies" 1970), or simply an experience of recognizing two different starting points for expressing and responding to "the same situation", then, fundamentally we are focusing on elements of meaning in actions associated with paradigms.

With this emphasis in paradigm, focus shifts to elements of cultural-meaning. In terms of cultural-meaning "paradigm" might be

expressed as group members' commonly sensed intention and momentum towards a framework of common meaning. In this light "paradigm" may be conceived also as a nexus of cultural-meaning, structure and "group entity".

One way of responding to problems in maintaining a processual definition is to couch statements in terms of meaning in action. Paradigm, described as "commonly sensed intention to create a framework" should include all that entails in terms of individuals' social interaction.

Since our social creations also act back on us (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Robinson, 1980), a processual definition should include how individuals' common intention may be effected and affected. Assumptions about "all that entails" must be based on one's epistemological and ontological premisses.

Given the premisses this document outlined, "all that entails" includes reliance on anchors, creation of a group entity, creation of a structure and response when group entity or structure is no longer meaningful. The latter suggests paradigms as a modern social response to tension between certainty in present anchors and exploration.<sup>27</sup>

#### Effect Of "Paradigm" As Social Construction

What Kuhn appears to be fascinated by is the social benefit of paradigm as "product". What has become significant for purposes of data analysis is understanding the effect for group members of having

a process of production. For these purposes it may be useful to relent and to focus on paradigm as artifact for purposes of describing how product has an impact on process.

"Paradigm as framework" closely parallels Berger and Luckmann's "universal maintenance" mechanisms (1966). When thought of as framework, the concept "paradigm" provides members of a group with sufficient explication and guidance to act so that questions of the profound are not constantly raised by patchwork creation of meaning. More particularly, some paradigms which individuals create and maintain through interactions appear to allow them to respond to change more comfortably than others with different paradigms.

As stated, some emerging paradigms may provide a more adequate social response to modern escalation of tension between certainty associated with constancy and certainty associated with exploration. Previously described were several influences prompting exploration, on a magnitude people have probably never experienced before -futuraity, liberation. In modern times how then do we deal with need of certainty? How do we explore and not overwhelm ourselves so that everything is not open to question?

For scientists "paradigms as framework" appear to provide relief in this tension. First, one may acquire from a paradigm a sense of community and identity by recognizing those who adhere to the same paradigm. Second, one has a process laid down for one, "the scientific method", which includes a higher purpose. That higher purpose is to search for the truth. As well, in "normal science" one has a sense of compartmentalization. One is not constantly looking at

the whole, the profound. Some of the lifeworld can continue in this way to be "self-evident" (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). A stock of knowledge can be maintained (Collins, 1984 & 1987, chap.1).

What appears to make exploration "safe" without attacking all of "reality" is the notion of experimentation. One can move conditionally towards meaning without letting go of "props". One may explore part without all being uprooted.

He suggests that normal science means working within the framework and supporting it as "reality". This "reality" is supported at least until the exploration begins to accrue a "critical mass" of meaning. At that point, conceptual structure relied on becomes meaningless. Kuhn refers to this as a crisis of anomalies (1970). Until this breaking point, however, experimentation is meaningful as exploration in the sense that Berger and Luckmann describe "subuniverse" (1966, p. 102-106).

Kuhn's work provided a thorough, concrete example of how a particular set of people dealt with this tension concerning certainty. It offered a foundation for reflections on the concept of theatre as providing a different solution to a similar set of problems.

#### Theatre As Paradigmatic "Sub-Universe"

The trail has gone clear past the canyon. Now, the land spreads out as the trail fades into landscape thick with underbrush. Where has this trail led? To another working assumption about location of meaning. — To theatre as "concept", an abstract objectivation of our society which may be used by individuals in paradigm-oriented

interactions. More particularly, individuals may come to rely on their paradigmatic construction of theatre to respond to modern dilemmas which weaken our previous anchors. There are a few markers or trail blazes which led to this location.

The significance of trail markings have emerged through two resources. First, in the form of library research many authors' "maps" of the terrain were consulted. In addition, recognition of some trail markers stems from familiarity with parts of the terrain through fieldwork and data analysis.

The first marker which attracted attention came through field observations. Group members came to resolve, at least for a time, tension between two approaches to obtaining a sense of certainty. A series of interactions which they eventually referred to as improvisational theatre found them exploring, being comfortable with expressing themselves in a manner which they could not do before. Second, their talk and actions, particularly at the beginning of the project tacitly assumed "theatre" as objectivation, as framework.

These two observations led to a particular reflection emerging from experienced resonance. This resonance was heard between what concept of theatre, as emerging through their constructions, offered to participants, and what Kuhn suggested "science" as paradigm offered scientists in terms of meaning in action. I began to consider group members' actions as paradigmatic responses to anomic conditions — changing meaning with no anchors as starting points for action.

Having described initial data analysis process meshed with theorizing, this segment now proceeds to lay out more clearly how

"theatre" as abstract concept may offer a paradigmatic construction as one response to modern social needs for modified anchors.<sup>28</sup>

As they have unfolded from the Social Theory Trail, more specific working assumptions will be provided concerning possible paradigmatic elements related to concepts of theatre. These include, the nature of the profound (attributions of meaning source), and the shape of modified anchors. "Meaning and change" as themes guided the sojourn before and continues to do so.

Linking "theatre" to the concept of paradigm draws dangerously nigh to implying that people hold a homogeneous meaning of "theatre". I concede a similar problem with science and paradigm.<sup>29</sup>

When I first entered the field I carried this unexamined assumption with me. For example, as I first began reviewing literature on theatre it was for explication of "the phenomenon" of "theatre". To some extent, this is reflected in the literature review of Part One. In the first days of fieldwork, I expected the literature to allow me to merely catch up with "the group" in understanding the theatre's nature and function.

Based on my present assumptions concerning meaning and social construction I no longer assume that people have a homogeneous view of theatre. I now view "the literature" as describing various assumptions about the concept of theatre which may represent and provide cues as a stock of knowledge. Individuals' meanings may then be derived and vary from this stock of knowledge (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Collins, 1984 & 1987, chap.1) for social construction.

Some of the various concepts of theatre in literature derive from writers' diverse disciplinary orientations. Some are sociologists and anthropologists concerned mainly with "theatre" in terms of structure or with culture (Lyman & Scott, 1975; Turner, 1982; Wilshire, 1982). Some merge disciplines such as anthropology and theatre (Schechner, 1985) while others are entirely concerned with questions of theatre as "discipline" (Brook, 1972).

Still others are concerned with theatre as a tool in education (Davis, 1983; Lambert, 1982; Landy, 1982). Even among those concerned with education and theatre there are some differences in objectives concerning theatre as between those working within the school system (Bolton, 1979; Heathcote, 1984) and those working in the larger community (Kidd & Byram, 1980; Malamah-Thomas, 1987).

Yet, among all these varied writings, stirs a common social cue. Virtually, all of those works located in this area of literature are written from a structural-functionalist perspective of theatre as thing. Whether describing theatre as a phenomenon, or framework, most authors look to describing the functions of theatre (Lyman & Scott, 1975; Turner, 1982). Some combine this (particularly in educational materials) with process (Heathcote, 1984; Robinson, 1980; Kidd, 1983).

The writings, then, generally leave cues or an impression that theatre offers a framework for action (Mastai, 1987). Some writers, particularly those writing from a theatre-as-discipline perspective, speak of theatre in paradigmatic overtones (Brook, 1972; Schechner,

1985) They focus on immediate experiences for actors which produce theatre. For them, theatre exists as paradigm as completely as "science" exists as paradigm for those of the scientific community.

What does this mean for recipients of such cues? Armed with even the impression of theatre as framework, those expecting to rely on "the framework" act in a manner consistent with a broad notion of paradigm. It is not surprising, then, that when I went into the field I thought of "theatre" in this way. Nor is it surprising that data analysis revealed that despite being inexperienced and (ironically) holding diverse views of theatre, individuals joining the project assumed that there was the theatre.

Drawing on theatre tacitly assumed as paradigm in terms of framework, I have sought out paradigmatic elements suggested in the literature. Returning to working assumptions about meaning and change related to paradigm, I have looked to observe whether authors indicate in common a profound sphere of meaning and "theatre". In available literature, the concept of theatre is most commonly connected to creation of meaning, exploration of significance (Heathcote, 1984; Mastai, 1987).

In contrast to science as paradigm, search for meaning in theatre is not based in rationality but expressivity. Experience of profundity is not entirely realized from confirming a higher truth or larger order. Epiphany springs from experiencing creation of meaning in the moment (Brook, 1972; Robinson, 1980).

Most authors indicate commonality concerning theatre as offering opportunity to explore meaning. However, they have differing focal

points concerning implications for such exploration of meaning, such as change. For example, much of the emphasis in Turner's work is on meaning and change related to an entire community as participating "audience".

Turner's concern is primarily societal; he is not focused immediately on actors or "the theatre people". I have relied heavily on his work because he focuses on theatre's effect in terms of tensions of certainty. For example, his analysis concerning theatre as having a rite of passage (1982, p. 24) function is concerned with how a society may provide opportunity to explore for those in transition (liminal status) without changing the entire society in the process.

The author considers ritual within tribal societies in terms of "ludic" elements. Turner postulates that ritual is a way of confining effects of meaning change in "play" to a period outside of the current social structure. This functions as a way of containing meaning change for individuals so that the entire society is only affected so far as staging the ritual.

In terms of meaning and change, according to Turner, "theatre's" function in modernity may contrast with theatre's function in tribal societies (1982, p. 52-55). Theatre as liminoid may actually disrupt and cause members of a society to question.<sup>30</sup>

Turner's work provided a basis for understanding theatre as potentially paradigmatic. However, focus in the study was mainly the actors observed through the fieldwork, actors as existing in a community. Other theoretical frameworks were sought out which might offer additional insight.<sup>31</sup>

Brook (1972) contemplates theatre as an effect of actors' experience. His writing draws near to explicating data analysis in the study concerning some participants' emerging meanings of theatre in terms of elements of the profound. Brook urges artists to consider theatre as a constant search for meaning. Not only does he locate meaning at the centre, but his intense tone connotes a sense of the profound. Expressivity is fundamental to theatre within his "paradigm".

Expressivity is so significant an element in his "theatre" that actors' expressivity acts back on theatre as paradigm requiring exploration of anchors. States, work supports this construction of theatre, describing the ongoing process of meaning creation as "defamiliarization" (1987, p. 43).<sup>32</sup> Brook casts meaning change entirely in terms of exploration. Certainty is only achieved through the search.

There are those who advocate theatre as a tool for renegotiating meaning. Dorothy Heathcote uses the word "distortion" to create significance (1985, p. 114). Gavin Bolton (1979) also writes about theatre as paradigmatic tool in education. In their works focus has completely shifted from audience as potential learner to those individuals acting, as learner.

Most writing about popular theatre (as parallel work in the community) also emphasizes expressive elements in theatre. As a label, "popular theatre" is attributed to a spectrum of activities from performances for community members to community members using acting to explore and discover aspects of their lives.

What then does a commonly held concept of theatre offer in terms of profound meaning for those both creating and seeking a response to change and meaning in modern society? The Social Theory Trail contains descriptions of theatre suggesting a process which may allow a certain relief from the tension in certainty for those interacting. The concept of "theatre" if relied on as a paradigm may offer assistance with the same tension in certainty as paradigms of scientists. However, there is paradigmatic difference in meaning as starting point between the two.

Constructed in this way, as a potential paradigm, the concept of "theatre" offers individuals a response to the tension of exploration and certainty through offering a "ludic" quality in action as described by Turner (Robinson, 1980.) Theatre as a cultural phenomenon still entails a search for meaning but allows those acting in such a search to experience this intense, expressive interaction as subuniverse. Exploration and change may become not a direct attack on the constancy of "reality" which may be returned to after theatrical interaction. Interestingly however, having explored, if group members did experience change of meaning, their "reality" would be indirectly affected. Despite an intent to "explore only", with change of meaning they could not "go back".

This Chapter has explored how theatre may be conceptualized so as to offer profound meaning in action as response to modern escalation in tension in certainty. An additional working assumption will now be added, a further detailing of elements of theatre as paradigm . Based most heavily on data analysis I suggest that for some depending upon

theatre may be a modern way of anchoring through paradigm in a modified combination of reliance on "group" and "structure".

#### Anchors In Theatre As Modern Paradigmatic Construction

Prior to contemplating how social anchors may be reshaped through individuals' paradigmatic construction of theatre, consideration will be given to shifts in meaning related to theatre as context for social interaction. Description of "abstraction" was included in working assumptions of process creating dilemmas in modern society. I referred to "paradigms" as an exemplification of that process. This connection is particularly clear when related to scientific endeavors. Based on meaning valued in terms of rationality and logic, abstraction takes the form of intellectual activity.

Abstraction, as part of secularization, is very much linked with theatre as process of change in meaning. However, in a paradigm wherein meaning is valued in terms of expressivity, or meaning creation in the moment, a link with "abstraction" may be less clear. The study posits that theatre is a process of interacting to create an abstraction of daily life, from "reality" (Mastai, 1987). This might be described as abstraction of act, or liberation of expressivity in modified form. It is certainly an attempt for individuals to contain and thereby control meaning change within certain conditions. Turner makes this point concerning theatre on a social structural-functional plane. Robinson's work (1980) as described in Chapter Five achieves an epistemological consistency by describing this process in terms of negotiating meaning (1980, p. 158).

### Group Entity

Based on experience in the field, the following supposition was created. If individuals construct their "theatre" in this sense of paradigm, the concept also offers them a different sense of community. A sense of group in this paradigm is highly individualistic. Individuation in role is most significant. Yet, if group members experience intense search for meaning, and the search is rooted for them in both emotional and physical aspects of performance, this may bring a strong sense of community to their interaction during performance period. Hence, as with paradigm related to science, paradigm as related to theatre offers modified anchors both in terms of group as "entity" and "structure".

In the instance of the fieldwork, group members did appear to have a sense of holding some meanings in common. For example, their actions conveyed a consistently sensed need to create a common framework for action. These actions directed towards creation of a framework were referred to as paradigmatic actions. There were, as well indications that they thought of "theatre" as providing opportunity for framework. Group members also appeared to have some sense of supra-meaning in common concerning theatre.

Participants appeared to have a sense of meaning about theatre as play, what Turner refers to as "ludic" and Berger and Luckmann refer to as "subuniverse" or stepping out of the real in the manner of dreams. They generally understood that acting as a part of theatre was to somehow step out of reality as daily experienced.

Cues to distinguish the act of acting emerged as most significant. Individuals were initially concerned about "props", lighting and costumes. Related to this was their meaning held in common concerning concept of "role". (Data upon which this analysis is founded may be located throughout the Mobile-framework's "Five Act-Plays").

Modified Structure:

In a further comparison with other elements of paradigm a few details of framework were ostensibly held in common by group members. Many details held in common were of a structure consistent with notions of "traditional" theatre: Virtually all members had a sense of performance for audience and most assumed the script as path for performance. Most knew the names of important "administrative positions", "the director" and "the producer". However, there was some confusion over these roles.

In this project, however, most of even these bare details held in common were disrupted. In early stages of the project improvisational theatre work was relied on to create the script. This experience of improvisation was inconsistent with concepts of structure and roles which some group members had begun to relate to "theatre".

On reflection, the concept of "theatre" does offer paradigm for some. However, each set of individuals will redefine what this means for themselves, through their interactions.

## WORKING ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT LEARNING RELATED TO MEANING AND CHANGE

A review of adult education literature revealed a growing convergence of theoretical work between adult learning theory and community education. A focus on meaning related to learning and a focus on cultural processes signals these bridging activities. This final segment avoids repetition of previous Chapters by moving beyond literature review into making explicit implied links between learning and the set of working assumptions outlined. Links will be described briefly as preparation for the Mobile-framework. Additional description of links made in the study will follow the Mobile-framework in Chapter Eight.

Although Jarvis' recent work on "meaningful and meaningless experience" (1987) was located in the final stages of data analysis, it has been of assistance in framing this segment. His conclusion articulates most important links between learning and social process:

From the above analysis it may be seen that an understanding of human experiences is vital in order to comprehend learning. However, the learning that results from and the meaning that is attributed to experience depends upon the interrelationship between a personal stock of knowledge and the socio-cultural-temporal milieu within which the experience occurs. (Jarvis, 1987, p. 171)

The working assumptions were gathered and in some instances created in aid of developing a more adequate understanding of meaning derived through social processes -- dynamics of shared meaning, including meaning creation, maintenance of meaning, and loss of meaning. All of these experiences as experiences of change must be understood in terms of our response to what we experience as change.

What the study has attempted to do in exploration of meaning and change is to add to existing sections of path to merge them into a paradigmatic framework. A few bridges were required including processual definitions of "meaning" and "cultural-meaning". The focus on an "epistemology of change" is intended to draw attention to change as an element of experience which has implications for all our actions — hence the outlines of anchors and references to spheres of the profound and prosaic. A concern with modernity provides a larger theoretical context in which this epistemology of change may be understood as a "cultural" or commonly held experience.

Finally, the work on theatre as a social construction of process is very much linked to modernity. Theatre as socially constructed paradigm offers a response to modernity, in terms of modified anchors of group entity and "structure".

These descriptions are offered as explication for observed dynamics in what Jarvis described as "socio-cultural-temporal milieu". In order to interpret how and what participants learned it was important to interpret what was meaningful and what was meaningless for them in the experience. Their responses to "learning" might then also be "meaningful" to me in my reflections in the context of adult education.

There were many occasions during the fieldwork in which participants' responses "as learners" took me by surprise. Developing an interpretation of their actions in terms of meaning related to change, and anchors has alerted me to learning in terms of social response. For example, their response to "learning" in the prosaic

sphere was far different from that which tacitly or explicitly disturbed their anchors. Disturbance of anchors might occur in different ways and at different times. Sometimes disturbance would be experienced immediately. Other times they did not apparently experience disturbance until after action had been taken. (This is noted in Chapter Eight in the Mobile-framework.) Further detail of the fieldwork is required to solidify "rumors" of links among learning, meaning and change. Chapter Eight, the representation model of field experience will provide these concrete examples.

Working assumptions included in this Chapter produced and were produced through development of the Mobile-framework of Chapter Eight. There are many assumptions made explicit in this Chapter, while others remain tacit. The Mobile's framework attempts to reflect these many assumptions. To facilitate correlation between these assumptions and the Mobile-framework, a description outlining the conceptual structure of the Mobile-framework forms the next Chapter.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Podeschi (1989) reminds adult educators that sociological concepts, including emerging interests in culture must be considered not only in terms of theoretical content such as learning theory. He challenges adult educators to reflect on cultural influences which shape the context in which adult educators act, including their own organizational contexts.

<sup>2</sup>This Chapter has been constructed to mirror data analysis process. Extant social theory was considered first to explicate discoveries and questions emanating from data analysis. If none were found, or if they provided only partial explanation I attempted to "fill in" the gaps through theorizing as described in the prior Chapter.

<sup>3</sup>This dissonance I initially experienced in data analysis correlates with a critique of ethnography. Ethnographers are reliant on social theory. Dilemmas inherent in contemporary social theory unavoidably influence ethnographic work. Through further data analysis, discussion and reflection the work attempts to find a way to keep both "sides" of individual-society, structural-process and even micro-macro tensions in "the dynamic picture" (Woods, 1988, p. 97). This framework of assumptions and their manifestation in the Mobile-framework is my attempt at this.

<sup>4</sup>I do not wish to intimate that hierarchy is a structural quality of "meaning". The prefix "supra" and the word "layer" imply such a structure. However, no better substitute was described. The form of our present language is such that it is easier to use it to describe that which is abrupt and discrete.

<sup>5</sup>O'Dea's framework, partly rooted in Emile Durkheim's work, relies on the words "sacred" and "profane". However, in the same way as Berger and Luckmann use "anomie", these words are too strongly linked with "structure" as a focal point rather than meaning. Therefore, I have substituted "profound" and "prosaic" for "sacred" and "profane" wherever possible.

<sup>6</sup>I do not wish to overstate this "case". The authors do recognize some ongoing changes in the individual. For example, their distinctions between primary and secondary socialization (1966, p. 157-158) indicate such changes. However, themes of the study require focus on the daily dynamic quality of social relations which must follow from the authors' description of "social construction".

<sup>7</sup>Acting in a "consistent" manner may require a mirror image form of reciprocity. You hold out bread. I do not likewise hold out bread, I take the bread you offered.

<sup>8</sup>This raises a point about the value of participant observation as a form of research. Acting as a partial outsider, the participant observer records among other things "surprises". In experiencing a different set of cultural-meaning assumptions from members of a group, arguably, the researcher is more sensitive to what appears to be the natural course of action to group members. For cultural-meanings are frequently held tacitly.

Frequently, actions no longer seem a matter of choice to group members. In this way "permanent", socially constructed meaning acts back upon "its" creators. When a participant observer is "surprised" it is important to note whether any group members also respond with surprise in which case this may be a breaking point for either specific individuals or of such proportion that group members' experience this as breaking point for "the group".

<sup>9</sup>This must surely have concern for adult education if for no other reason than that "learning" is related to change (Blunt, 1988; Kidd, 1973; Verner, 1964; Darkerwald & Merriam, 1982). As stated in the Preface, it is not that there is no literature in this area; it is rather that in the past it has been relegated to the bottom of the canyon. As referred to in the critique of ethnography (in Chapter Five), what literature has been created in the area is troubled by either focusing entirely on the individual or "macro" processes open to the vulnerabilities of structural-functionalism.

<sup>10</sup>These are efforts to address one of the described critiques of ethnography. For example, Goodson and Walker point out that many studies treat their data as though timeless (1988, p. 113).

<sup>11</sup>I rely on "paradigm" doubly. With respect to research, I use it concerning researchers' combined efforts aimed towards a common explication of social interaction. With respect to social theory, paradigms are also referred to as group members' social intent in action. For instance, I refer to theatre group members' paradigmatic actions in the Mobile-framework.

<sup>12</sup>This duality of scepticism and innovation suggests diverse meaning in change. It manifestly parallels findings in the study of tension regarding two distinct meanings related to searching for certainty: hanging onto meaning through extant anchors, and exploring for new anchors.

<sup>13</sup>I do not intend to suggest that experience as "contingency" and that of "powerlessness" are wholly discrete. However, in those instances, where one has a sense of how to act, even though one does not wish to act in such a manner, this would best be described as powerlessness. — This is not "contingency". It is distinct from experiencing no meaning whatsoever.

<sup>14</sup> Perhaps, related to this experience of abruptness, we also often think in terms of a single causal link. "Yesterday things were not this way and now they are because she did that!"

<sup>15</sup> My paradigmatic speculations herein derive primarily from experience in the field and related data analysis. I have provided considerable detail on this in the Mobile-framework under the auspices of "Paradigmatic Actions".

<sup>16</sup> At this point I have not directly reflected on "source" of anchors in terms of supra-meaning, for example, an omnipotent being. I will address supra-meaning in terms of attributed source of anchor later in this Chapter within the segment "The Profound and Paradigms".

<sup>17</sup> A more accurate word might be "entity". In this instance I am most interested in "group" as charismatic. However, the description provided might also apply to a leader or "personality" who somehow becomes associated with the profound in terms of meaning creation. Historically, this is more often associated with the word (O'Dea, 1966).

<sup>18</sup> I have also reflected on an individual's identity or sense of self in terms of another anchor. However, such consideration is beyond the boundaries of this study. Two works which may assist in further study of this possibility are "Religious Evolution", by Robert Bellah located in the American Sociological Review (1964, p. 358-374) and Identity And the Sacred: A Sketch For A New Social-Scientific Theory Of Religion by J.J. Mol (1977), New York : Free Press.

<sup>19</sup> Berger and Luckmann have an excellent conceptualization of what may occur when individuals, lepers, in their example, shift from viewing themselves and being viewed as isolated individuals to "a group" (1966, p. 186).] Given my thesis resource boundaries, I have not pursued a more detailed description of process based on theory. Future research aimed at locating theoretical resources should include Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities Of Religious Affirmation by Peter Berger (1979), New York: Doubleday Anchor.

<sup>20</sup> As an abstraction, this notion of "anchors" has been conceptualized within the context of modern thought. Emerging from this context, the paradigmatic claims are stronger, being rooted in our experience.

<sup>21</sup> This is not intended to suggest that all group members will always experience a breaking point in the same intensity, if at all. For those who do experience one, the implications are tremendous and must have an impact on other members.

<sup>22</sup> Herein lines a situational shift from meaning constructed in terms of contingency to issues of "power". When the "structure" loses "its" meaning and thereby "its" legitimacy for individuals in that society, those attempting to maintain that structure now must

superimpose. With superimposition, meaning for individuals shifts from issues of contingency to issues of power (Freire, 1985; Jarvis, 1987). O'Dea refers to these shifts of meaning related to structure as the "Symbolic Dilemma" (1966, p. 92) and "Dilemma of Administration" (1966, p. 93)

<sup>23</sup>There may be many manifestations of such tensions. Findings in data analysis have directed concentration on "a" particular manifestation of tension. This description of tension is offered as an explication consistent with experiences in the field particularly during the first three weeks of observation.

<sup>24</sup>I readily acknowledge a tautological element in considering scientists as a "group" to study who arise out of modern context. Some would argue that science related to technology did not arise out of modern context but were major elements in the creation of modernity. I would simply emphasize the complex set of interactions and relationships involved in creation of context.

<sup>25</sup>Kuhn has keen intuitive insight into the social life of this particular group of individuals, scientists. His insight is all the more keen since Kuhn's background as a natural scientist and a historian does not provide him with a conceptual reservoir for what is a sociological work. The problem of conceptual vocabulary surfaces in his attempts to arrive at a definition of paradigm which will further explicate details of relationships in social life.

<sup>26</sup>A "modern" twist as described in process of "abstraction" (Berger, 1977) is that through our present structural interactions we are more likely to produce more abstract, highly articulated objectifications. The concept of "paradigm", for better or worse, epitomizes such a process. This does not preclude some aspects of shared meaning in paradigms being tacit. It means the balance between tacit and explicit is shifting towards attempts to make more explicit in abstract form.

<sup>27</sup>Data analysis left me thirsting after a processual definition of paradigm. This need arose out of a single recognition from data analysis. It was clear through group members' interactions that they did not have a commonly held paradigm, although sometimes various individuals assumed they did. They were very much engaged, through both explicit and tacit means, however, in the process of searching for one.

<sup>28</sup>As support for the working set of assumptions, I have relied more heavily in this Chapter on a review of trail blazings derived from the literature rather than fieldwork and data analysis. The latter receives full representation in the next Chapter and Part Three.

<sup>29</sup>Whatever sense we have of "science", our sense is a social construction as well. However, given the "high profile" of science and scientific precepts, and acknowledging Kuhn's work, we are far more likely to have a common sense of science than theatre. This is made even more likely by the tremendous variety of form, substance, and purpose espoused in relation to acts labelled as "theatre". — For many hold that part of the purpose of theatre is to search for new forms of "itself" (Brook, 1972; Halprin, 1973). This lies in contrast to beliefs concerning a science which searches for a scientific method and reshapes "its" history to one of accretion in order to reflect the intent towards method.

<sup>30</sup>Turner has also used theatre as metaphor in terms of "social dramas". Theatre in this sense may be related to Kuhn's theory of paradigm which includes a processual framework, paradigm, the breaking down of that framework and response to that breaking down. He refers to "paradigm" in the context of this conceptual work (1982, p. 73). This also bears resemblance to O'Dea's description of breaking point situations.

<sup>31</sup>In many ways Turner's work on a set of assumptions about what he refers to as a "liminal" phase is of relevance to the data analysis work. For that describes experiences of those in transition. Turner does draw attention to the opportunity to explore in these circumstances the results of which may reappear in other more acceptable forms later (1982, p. 28).

<sup>32</sup>Since a constant search for meaning through expression is the most pressing aspect of commonly conceptualized "theatre" this requires exploration of form. For example, theatre experiences have included exploration of new relationships with "the audience". (Halprin, 1973).

## REFERENCES

- Berger, P. (1977). Toward a critique of modernity. In P. Berger (Ed.), Facing Up To Modernity, (pp.70-80). New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism, perspective and method. Toronto: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Blunt, A. (1988). Education, learning and development: evolving concepts. Convergence, 21(1), 37-54.
- Bolton, G. (1979). Towards a theory of drama in education. Burnt Mill, Essex: Longman House.
- Brook, P. (1972). The empty space. New York: Penguin Books.
- Chambulikazi, E. (1989, Jan.-June). Theatre as a communication medium in community development. INNOTECH Journal, 31-42.
- Collins, M. (1984). Phenomenological perspectives: Some implications. In S. Merriam (Ed.), Selected writings on philosophy and adult education, (pp. 179-189). Florida: Krieger.
- Collins, M. (1987). Competence in adult education, A new perspective. New York: University Press of America.
- Davis, B. W. (1983). Drama -- a tool for nutrition education with older adults. Journal of Nutrition Education, 15(4), 138.
- Darkenwald, G. & Merriam, S. (1982). Adult education: Foundations of practice. New York: Harper & Row.
- Durkheim, E. (1985). Precontractual solidarity [1893]; Social rituals and sacred objects [1912]. In R. Collins (Ed.), Three sociological traditions, Selected readings, (pp. 161-186). [Reprinted from The Division of Labor In Society, 1965, New York: Free Press.]
- Finger, M. (1989). The subject of modern adult education. Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 133-138.)
- Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education, culture, power and liberation. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures, selected essays. New York: Basic Books.

- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M.D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.
- Goodson, I. & Walker, R. (1988). Putting life into educational research. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative research in education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.
- Halprin, A. (1973). Community art as life process. The Drama Review, 17(3), 64-80.
- Heathcote, D. (1984). Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama. London: Hutchinson.
- Hutchinson, S. (1988). Education and grounded theory. In R. Sherman & R. Webb (Eds.), Qualitative Research in Education: Focus and methods, (pp. 123-140). London: The Falmer Press.
- Jarvis, P. (1985). The sociology of adult and continuing education. London: Croom Helm.
- Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: Towards an analysis of learning from life. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(3), 164-172.
- Jorgenson, D. (1989). Participant observation, A methodology for human studies. London: Sage.
- Kidd, J. R. (1973). How adults learn (rev.ed.). New York: Association Press.
- Kidd, R. (1983). From people's theatre for revolution to popular theatre for reconstruction: Diary of a Zimbabwean workshop. Hague: CESO (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 694).
- Kidd, R. (1984). Popular theatre and nonformal education in the third world: Five strands of experience. International Review of Education, 30, 265-288.
- Kidd, R., & Byram, M. (1978). The performing arts and community education in Botswana, Community Development Journal, 13(3), 23-35.
- Kidd, R., & Byram, M. (1980). Popular theatre: A technique for participatory research", Participatory Research Project, Working Paper No. 5, International Council, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 178 740).
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Kuhn, T. (1977). The essential tension. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Lambert, P. (1982). Popular theatre: One road to self-determined development action. Community Development Journal, 17, (3), 242-249.
- Landy, R. (1982). Handbook of educational drama and theatre. Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Lindeman, E. (1926). The meaning of adult education. Montreal: Harvest House.
- Lyman, S. & Scott, M. (1975). The drama of social reality. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Malamah-Thomas, D. (1987). Community theatre with and by the people: The Sierra Leone experience. Convergence, 20(1), 59-68.
- Mastai, J. (1987). Now more than ever. Canadian Theatre Review, 53, 7-10.
- Masterman, M. (1970). The nature of a paradigm. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge, (pp. 59-89). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mezirow, J. (1978). Perspective transformation. Adult Education, 28(2), 100-110.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. Adult Education Quarterly, 32(1), 3-24.
- Mezirow, J. (1988). Transformation theory. Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 223-227).
- O'Dea, T. (1966). The sociology of religion. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Palmer, P. (1983). To know as we are known, A spirituality of education. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Robinson, K. (1980). Drama, theatre and social reality. In K. Robinson, (Ed.), Exploring theatre and education, (pp. 141-175). London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Schechner, R. (1985). Between theatre and anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- States, B. (1987). Great reckonings in little rooms, On the phenomenology of theatre. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Turner, V. (1982). From ritual to theatre, The human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Verner, C. (1964). Adult education. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

Wildemeersch, D. & Leirman, W. (1988). The facilitation of the life-world transformation. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(1), 19-30.

Wilshire, B. (1982). Role playing and identity, the limits of theatre as metaphor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wilson, S. (1977). The use of ethnographic techniques in educational research. Review of Educational Research, 47, (1), 245-265.

Wolcott, H.F. (1985). On ethnographic intent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(3), 187-203.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### STAGE WRITE

#### A Conceptual Outline of The Mobile-framework

I'm ready to see it be something... Eil) A-1-247

Suit the action to the word, the word to the action,  
With this special observance, that you o'erstep not  
The modesty of nature. - Hamlet, III, ii, line 16.

### INTRODUCTION

This Chapter reviews the conceptual synthesis which emerged from the fourth area of work associated with data analysis: that is, work directed toward creating a representational form or framework.

The framework as originally conceived was intended to reflect two processes simultaneously. The preeminent focus was the social process in which theatre group members engaged. The second process was the conceptual development of the framework to present the first. The creator's fingerprints on the Mobile were not to be polished away. This attempt at synchronicity, however, clashed with attempts to provide sufficient detail for each. The Mobile-framework fast turned to footnote clutter and clatter. The two integral processes have been severed since with careful attention to preserving the fragile essence of "processual fingerprints".<sup>1</sup>

As previously described, development of a framework to represent group members' processes has been a lengthy, complex set of syntheses involving discoveries through resource materials on theory, methodology and data analysis. A description of the entire process would be both web-like and elephantine.

Through dialectical process I have looked to discover that which seems most significant about this experience. By providing a combined description of the framework's conceptual outline and an indication of how key concepts emerged, I offer criteria to interpret whether significance has been adequately attributed. This description then, sets the stage for the Mobile-framework representation of theatre group members' processes replete with data therefrom.

#### CONCEPTUAL OUTLINE OF THE MOBILE-FRAMEWORK

As previously described, the phrase "Mobile-framework" was selected purposely. "Mobile" is intended to convey several qualities about the representational form. Harkening back to the "intimate" and the "abstract", the Mobile-framework is clearly an abstraction created from a lengthy process of synthesis. As such, it is a "sculpted" abstraction.

As an art form, mobiles have a paradoxical quality. They exist in a "suspended state". Yet parts move in relation to other parts. This conceptual tension permeates every aspect of the study's work to develop an analytical representation of fieldwork.

The choice of "Mobile", then, constitutes a conceptual compromise. If it cannot capture "the moonbeam in the jar", the Mobile furthers attempts at least to reflect the moonbeam in the jar by retaining some kinesthetic and visual sense of the experience. The parts of the Mobile are solid, of a piece. However, as pieces of

representation they may move to portray new relationships with each other. Despite this apparent fluidity, they are attached by threads to a fixed point.

Finally, the notion of Mobile indirectly admits of compromise. The pieces are a statement by the sculptor that the representations created are the most significant elements to behold. They are the substance. But they exist in relationship with space. There are recognized gaps between the representational pieces.

Concerning the study's analytical representational form, there are six conceptual pieces or bars within the Mobile. The first bar, "General Context", is followed by a constellation of five smaller bars signifying events of the fieldwork. These are named collectively the "Five Act-Plays" and individually: a) "Sustained Uncertainty", b) "Anchored Anomie", c) "Play Acting", d) "Contingency Control", and e) "Played Out". The five Act-Plays comprise the main body of the data representation. They represent group members' interactions during periods of the project. These particular five were created from data analysis to represent distinct changes in group members' activities and focus.

The form of their suspension from the "General Context" may be rearranged depending on focus for reflection. For instance, they may be conceived as being side by side, attached to "General "Context".

#### G E N E R A L   C O N T E X T

SUSTAINED UNCERTAINTY	ANCHORED ANOMIE	PLAY ACTING	CONTINGENCY CONTROL	PLAYED OUT
--------------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------------	---------------

This is only one configuration. They may be considered in a linear fashion also with the first Act-Play only, attached to "General Context". The second would be suspended from the first and so on. It is the latter formation which unfolds in this outline of the Mobile-framework.

The nature of the first bar, "General Context" distinguishes it from the remaining five bars, the five Act-Plays. "It" offers background support to the other five bars which are descriptions of fieldwork experience. No matter what the configuration, The "General Context" piece forms the framework's main bar from which the Five Act-Plays suspend.

The five Act-Plays have all been fashioned with the same headings. However, owing to its distinctive nature, the overview of "General Context" has a special structure which will be outlined first. A structural outline of the Act-Plays will follow thereafter.

#### 1) GENERAL CONTEXT

To emphasize the internal structure of the Mobile-framework, an overview of the purpose, content and structure, as well as key concepts is provided.

##### The Purpose

This "main bar" of the Mobile-framework was created to divulge background for data analysis and thereby to limit arbitrariness of starting point into the field.

## Content and Structure

In the main, the "General Context" is comprised of "emerged" patterns. That is, relatively stable data in the sense that it is less vulnerable to change through acts of interpretation or through wholly new action suggesting other inflections.

In terms of structure, these are the main headings of the "General Context" section:

Introduction

EmergEd Patterns:

- Data Of A Generally Descriptive Nature
- Data Analysis Indicating Some "Starting Plays"

These headings are repeated replete with a description of content to "reproduce" Chapter Eight's format.

## Reproduced Outline Of General Context Segment:

### a) Introduction:

The "General Context" section begins with a descriptive, introductory section. This section acts as a guide, outlining intentions of this piece of the Mobile-framework.

### b) EmergEd Patterns:

Two subheadings frame discoveries from data analysis in this segment, "Data Of A Generally Descriptive Nature" and "Data Analysis Describing Some "Starting Plays". Distinctions between the two are clarified by the content within each segment.

- Data Of A Generally Descriptive Nature

Data outlined in this section are comprised of that which has been referred to as "emerged" data. Key "contextual elements" through data analysis were ascertained: a) "the community" in which the project occurred b) the "theatre club" as the organizational framework within which the project was initiated and c) individuals who came to interact as "a group" in the project. Descriptions of these elements in this segment of the Mobile-framework parallel the action of a camera zooming in from a macro to micro view.

Process in deducing these elements, however, was mirror image to this description. My involvement began with individuals coming together to consider themselves as a group. Some of these individuals spoke of the "theatre club". Investigations led to distinguishing between those involved with the theatre club and those involved in this project. Group members' continued reference to the community over a period of time suggested a most significant thematic relationship requiring further exploration.

The content includes a brief description of the town and area. Moving from the town to the theatre club the Mobile-framework presents a brief accounting of the club. This account includes description of the club's inception, projects undertaken and its current size. Description of group members involved with this project mainly takes a demographic form.

- Data Analysis Indicating Some "Starting Plays"

This segment is integrally connected to theories identified as assisting in data analysis. It bridges interpretations of past

elements with the project's present. Theories and data analysis of "emerged" data set the stage for making sense of those group members' interactions to which I was privy and which is framed in the remaining five parts.

### Emerging Key Concepts

Concepts emerged from all four areas of discovery which shaped the growing Mobile-framework. Those which most directly influenced creation and content of the Mobile are explicated under this heading, "Emerging Key Concepts" throughout this Chapter.

#### a) Concept of "Emerging" and "Emerged"

A pressing purpose for this outline was to proffer processual fingerprints. This section contains at least the more firmly planted fingerprints. When approaching the fieldwork, methodological resources were consulted for response to ontological and epistemological questions of research design.

Chapter Two described the series of inductions and deductions which led to choosing participant observation as a primary part of research design. However, in prior Chapters I have not alluded to more specific ramifications this choice has raised related to interpreting fieldwork experience in light of choosing a representational form.

Participant observation might best be described as a method. The method may manifest various schools of philosophic thought. It is the ontological and epistemological assumptions one has which steer actions as a participant observer in the field, evoke assumptions in

data analysis and influence the form of data representation. Early data analysis (and acknowledgment of my own long held values) suggested that "meaning" was a pervasive theme concerning group members' interactions.

To the extent that I was focused on understanding how group members understood the experience I was attempting to record their meaning. However, I did not take up the full methodological mantle of ethnomethodology. For example, I did not rigorously attempt to "bracket". Having determined to understand "their" meaning, I was faced with two other insistent quandaries.

First, locating and describing "their" meaning suggested that the work was devoted to creating a monolithic reality. This appeared to lead back toward a functionalist framework with associated vulnerabilities.

In shifting away from the methodological resources, the theoretical resource upon which I came to rely was Social Construction Of Reality (Berger & Luckmann, 1966). Although limited in its dealings with a concept of meaning, for purposes of data analysis, the strength lay in terms of describing individuals' interactions as creating a reality at most intersubjective.

Second, concerns were all heightened by the question of my relationship to the experience of interacting group members. If there is not some objective reality to be observed and related what is the nature of my reporting? According to this theoretical framework, if I attempted to describe the reality of a group I would be creating "a reification".

Unfortunately, the authors of Social Construction Of Reality, heuristic devices in hand, carve out a paradox. The authors fashion an epistemological snarl, for the book speaks in tones and terms of creating an objective framework for understanding interactions of creatures existing on an intersubjective basis.

A partial resolution to this substantial problem eventually evolved from an early observation. When scouring methodological materials for possible precedence, I was struck by a certain contrast. In studies read, authors aimed to outline that which was static in a community: the structure, the relationships, even the meaning.

However, when comparing these studies of "the" static with my fieldwork experiences, I recognized a significant distinction. In my fieldwork experience the singular constant was change — change in group size, change in meeting place, change in purpose of activities, and change in meaning and purpose. This observation resurfaced at sufficient intervals to become a major theme.

I struggled to recognize that theme and eventually did so in two respects. Foremost, I connected change with "meaning". Both in focused fieldwork and in data analysis I explored how "group members" perceived pervasive change. This work related to "meaning" and "change" is one among several cues which made social theory concerning anomie so relevant to fieldwork experience.

This theme of change came to the fore in a second manner. It is this second manner which pertains most directly to the problem described. As I cast about for ways of representing fieldwork experience, I recognized how significant a theme change was. Without

making a direct connection, I began to think in terms of representing group members' " process". By "process" I came to mean emphasis on how they experienced change through their interactions and responded to it. This line of reasoning evolved primarily from concentrated data analysis.

With this developing focus on process, confusion associated with theoretical readings concerning "the objective/subjective debate", while not entirely resolved, emitted a new emphasis. Both reflection on "meaning" as related to process and change and discussion with resource people on how to couch process in the framework produced the word "emerging".

Use of the word "emerging" settled several conceptual dust storms. "Emerging" while emphasizing transition was also compatible with intersubjectivity as an epistemological starting point —emerging as common amongst a group of individuals. However, as efforts at analyzing data became more focused on finding a way of expressing change of meaning, recording my own process of the experience and its affect became most significant.

In this way, I came to distinguish between what emerged for "them" (an orientation towards objectivations) and what was emerging for me (as interpreter — an intersubjective orientation) as a result of an "after the fact" prolonged, analytic process to which group members were not exposed. Hence this segment on "fingerprints" was developed.

"Emerging" is, then, a reminder that the study's descriptions of group members' process are attempts to refine paradigm in terms of an

intersubjective social tool. In this way, in addition to its other purposes, "emerging" also substitutes for repetition of "working assumptions".

This conceptual work concerning the word "emerging" precipitated substantial reconstruction of the "Five Act-Plays" portion of the framework. It also provided the basis for discovering a contrast. Contrasted were elements which I have come to assume change from elements which I have come to assume were less vulnerable to change of meaning from actions of any source, or "emerged" as I refer to it. These are meanings which group members would most likely continue to experience in common.

While I had contemplated developing an introductory section to the "Five Act-Plays, the inductive analysis concerning "emerging" solidified purpose, structure, and content in the form of "General Context". Chronologically, the "General Context" section "emerged" after I had developed a framework consisting of the "Five Act-Plays" but prior to each of the five being fully fleshed out.

This conceptual work on "emerging" and "emerged" as a way of bringing together epistemology of change and the representational form to reflect the epistemology influenced every aspect of the Mobile-framework. That influence may be clearly observed in both the "General Context" and the five "Act-Plays".

Having explored the purpose, content, and structure of the "General Context" piece of the Mobile-framework, description shifts to the "Act-Plays" of the Mobile-framework. Description of the five is consolidated into one generic description.

## 2) THE "FIVE ACT-PLAYS"

Following the "General Context" bar, a constellation of five smaller bars signify events of the fieldwork as viewed through data analysis. These I have named collectively the "Five Act-Plays", and individually:

### T H E F I V E A C T - P L A Y S

SUSTAINED	ANCHORED	PLAY	CONTINGENCY	PLAYED
UNCERTAINTY	ANOMIE	ACTING	CONTROL	OUT

These five Act-Plays comprise the main body of the data representation, the Mobile-framework. The five have been created to represent distinct changes in group members' activities and focus. Each of them presents data analysis and supporting data within the same structural lines. This structure contains six main headings:

- Emerging Context
- Emerging Patterns Of Process
- Emerging Structure
- Emerging Tempo And Rhythm Of Activities
- Emerging Cultural-Meaning
- Themes Directly Related To Adult Education As Constructed At Present

Each heading represents a lengthy process of reflection in terms of epistemological consistency. This process of reflection included consideration of how we understand our own social processes related to the nature of data analysis and additionally related to modes of representation. The repetition of the word "emerging" is intended as reverberation of this conceptual process.

In terms of creating the framework I have been at pains not only in choosing each heading but in considering relationships among them.

The internal logic of their relationship as it emerged unfolds throughout the following overview. The overview describes each section through a "Purpose", "Content and Structure", and "Key Concepts" format.

#### EMERGING CONTEXT

The "Emerging Context" section within each of the five Act-Plays follows the same format with minor variations.

##### The Purpose

Parallel to the "General Context" section, the purpose of the "Emerging Context" section is to act as a conceptual backdrop. The backdrop provided through the "Emerging Context" sections, however, is specific to a set period of time or "stage" in group members' interaction.

##### The Content and Structure

One of the most complex aspects of data analysis parallels the nuance of dressing. Reductionism may be compared with being under-dressed. Gawdy garb may be compared to an inundation of detail wherein nothing stands out as significant other than superfluousness. In the latter instance, the work may become descriptive rather than theoretical.

Negotiating a balance between the two became part of a self-monitoring process throughout data analysis. For example, there

was sufficient data to describe each meeting, rather than grouping several meetings as a stage or Act-Play. However, describing each meeting and providing a comparable framework for each one would have required diminishing the number of elements in the framework or risking loss of significance. The concept of "Emerging Context" offered a compromise. Certain specific details could be limited to creating a general impression. The set of details chosen for each Act-Play is described as follows.

In "Emerging Context" with each of the five Act-Plays, the data revealed may be described as "demographics of occasion". Data is represented under the auspices of four headings:

Time of Year (season and weather)  
Period of Time (over what period of time the meetings included in this stage took place.)  
Location (of meetings)  
Attendance (number of members)

#### Key Concepts

##### a) "Emerging Context":

The format distinguishes "Emerging Context" sections from the "General Context" based largely on a single element. Data under this heading derives from the period when I observed group members' interacting. This data is also less vulnerable to reinterpretation than data encased within later sections, although some group members may not have been privy to the data.

For example, some simply may have been absent from meetings, or may not have explicitly considered experiences in terms of patterns

observed by other participants. Therefore, not all group members would necessarily hold precisely the same interpretation of the context. However, within these strictures, the description should represent roughly a majority view.

#### EMERGING PATTERNS OF PROCESS

With "Emerging Patterns Of Process", representation shifts to data analysis directly describing group members' interactions and includes excerpts from their interactions.

#### The Purpose

The segments in the section were crafted to give the reader a sense of participants' diversity and of their activities as individuals. Particular emphasis has been placed on the idea that these are not the actions of "a group" but a set of individuals interacting.

This section was created as well to provide the reader with a strong kinesthetic sense and to contribute to a richer representation of change. For example, to get at the notion of "emerging", content in the section includes patterns which do not necessarily become part of group members' formal structure. They also include patterns that do become part of "their" formal structure but are lost to the "social construction" because of change or shift in "cultural-meaning" over time.

## The Content and Structure

These sections contain descriptions of emerging patterns of group members' social construction. This is the "primordial soup" of individuals' meaning and their interactions. The "soup" consists of patterns constantly emerging for different people, which eventually form the basis for "cultural-meaning" when sufficient members experience meaning commonality and express this in their actions. The "soup" of group members' interactions also forms a basis for emerging social structure. The patterns outlined in this section focus on both "form" of interaction and content.

Even "soup", having substance, must have some structure no matter how fluid. There are two foundational concepts which form a basis for headings that appear within this section in each of the Act-Plays:

Emerging Shapes Of Group Members' Interactions  
Shifting Shapes In Group Members' Interactions

Content and conceptual structure of "the primordial soup" are shaped by the ontological and epistemological assumptions described in Chapter Six. Those elements of primordial soup upon which I have focused are those within a process of shifting meaning for group members: If they come to sense meaning in common, how do they, and what happens when they do not or meaning falls apart on them?

As part of a process of data analysis I have sought out that which emerged from primordial soup in terms of group members' interactions. In particular, focus turned to observing group members' interactions which may have related to anchors and paradigms. This focus is reflected in concepts "key" to development of the section.

## Key Concepts

### a) "Primordial Soup":

Through data analysis process I have come to consider group members' initial interactions as a kind of primordial soup out of which meanings and structure commonly held and acted on by group members began to "evolve". Group members brought to their soup meanings and senses of structure as individuals, developed from other experiences. Some patterns in their interactions which first emerged did not continue as other patterns emerged and predominated. This suggests a special significance emerging from dynamics among these group members. (Breaking points have a way of doing this.)

The study endeavors to ensure representation of this primordial soup of experiencing through each section entitled "Emerging Patterns Of Process" for all the "Five Act-Plays". As meaning and structure become more commonly held, however, there is a reduction of soup-like quality. One might imagine my metaphorical Mobile-framing eventually taking the shape of an inverted infundibulum.

### b) "Emerging Shapes Of Group Members' Interactions":

Without qualification, the single most difficult work in creating this data analysis framework has been to maintain a sense of action, of process, of change as key elements of fieldwork experience with group members. In initial attempts at creating a framework for data analysis, data were presented through creating a typology of information exchanged and shared among group members. That framework

assumed most group members' interactions took a single form, discussion. This was not an accurate assumption even with respect to activities in the first stage, "Sustained Uncertainty".

When work began on the second Act-Play "Anchored Anomie", the problem crystallized immediately. During those meetings group members were improvising, which was not at all the same as their discussions. In coming to grips with that problem, I relied on findings from searches for relevant theoretical readings and discussions with resource people. The work in relation to theoretical readings and subsequent discussions entailed searching for consistency among applicable theories and filling in gaps through further data analysis. In this way, the work between data analysis and theoretical work has been interactive.

Through this process I have begun to recognize in group members' interactions, distinctions in shapes. In addition, at this point the study begins to represent the significance of experiencing shifts from one form of interaction to another as an important element of group members' interactions in a more focused manner.

The phrase "shapes of interactions" commands an important place in the title of this section. By "shapes of interactions" I am seeking to paradigmatically recognize significance in both the kinds of interactions among group members and distinctions in the nature of their interactions over time. As well, this phrase recognizes not only external elements of those interactions, but maintains some sensitivity to special links with internal elements as composites of shapes of interactions.

"An action" may be an isolated act. The word "interaction" conveys an element or elements of relationship between two or more actions. In terms of human interaction, Berger's and Luckmann's framework (1966) sheds light on elements of relationship in human interactions. According to their framework, human interaction includes processes of externalization (outward expression) and internalization (internal absorption and meaning creation) of those people interacting. It may also include objectivations (creation of objects).

The word, "interaction" suggests that internalizations and externalizations of those interacting would be reciprocally affected. Applying Berger and Luckmann's framework, when we refer to social interactions we are commonly referring to externalizations. It is most important, however, to remember that in coming to understand outward expressions, externalization processes are very much connected to meanings created through internalization.

When we refer to human interaction, generally, we speak of social interaction of which we have many forms. To convey a contrast among modes in which people interact, the word "shapes" has been carefully selected. The intention was to choose a word which could carry nuances arising out of the complex relationships in interactions. For example, despite having markedly different internalizations, people may use similar actions or externalizations to express internalizations.

For that matter one act may express more than one element of a person's internalization. The interaction may be reconstructed also

through internationalization into a set of interactions with entirely different directions. In the latter incident, a single action or interaction would form part of two distinct kinds of interactions.

One of my criteria for choosing "shape" is that the word has been associated with movement and with change in such expressions as "shape of the future". By using "shapes" in relation to interaction, it is my intention to represent the element of change to be as significant as others and thereby also to maintain a representational link between processes of externalization and internalization.

In attempting to distinguish between the nature of group members' interactions through considering differences in them, I have also opened the door to reification. I am casting interactions as objects with distinguishable attributes as reflected in my grammatical usage. Using "shapes" has not avoided the problem of reification entirely. However, to the extent that the word "shapes" suggests nuances of change, of movement through space and time, it will be of assistance. (It may also indicate condition.)

In addition consideration has been given to internalization and more particularly externalization in terms of not only a sense of the individual, but "the group". In my interactions with group members through internalizations, I might choose to externalize as a group member as opposed to as an individual. For example, as an individual I might smile in response to what others are doing and remain silent. As a group member I might determine that "group" means everyone must do what the others are doing and so I begin to bend over backwards and hop on one leg. The distinction is, arguably, most significant to

that experience in terms of a relationship between meaning and emerging cultural-meaning.

I must emphasize that in the process of analyzing data I have not assayed the data for all possible shapes of group members' interactions. Absent, for example, are references to group members' actions of physically building sets, creating circuits of lights and sounds. Given the volume of data available and given that there are many possible foci, to follow up all these threads would have made this work prohibitive. Those shapes which have been included in the Mobile-framework were thematic in the sense that group members' interactions most frequently took these shapes. In all, within this data analysis representation five different shapes of participants' interactions are elaborated.

There is a particularly odd quality about listing and describing these shapes as separate from the context of the social theories from which they derive and from the group members' interactions. It is the stuff that reification is made of. However, for the reader's ease, provided in this conceptual outline is a list and a description of these five shapes of interactions. The descriptions are introductory generalizations. There is overlap in both the form and content of some of these shapes. This may cause some confusion. Confusion arising out of these descriptions may be clarified through examination of examples of group members' interactions contained in the Mobile-framework following this Chapter.

In terms of the format, for each of the five "shapes of interactions" I have included both a description of outward form of

expression (externalization process) and my construction of internal meaning as related to cultural-meaning, as well as structure and group entity possible (internalization process). The descriptions are arranged roughly in descending order of complexity in both external expression and internal relationships.

- Discussion, Summary:

Drawing on the data, I would describe "discussion" as verbal interaction among group members with the broad purpose of exchanging or sharing information. As well, "discussion" at least suggests that all those engaged in discussion may contribute equally.

Group members did much of their constructing and reconstructing through discussion. They conversed amongst themselves about their thoughts, their feelings, what they had done, what they were doing, what they would do, what they wanted to do. Through discussion they made decisions about what had happened, they made decisions about future actions.

Group discussion content might be further characterized in terms of whether group members were focused on construction or awareness of and reflection on the process of construction. Virtually all group members were aware of discussion as a form of interaction which they used.<sup>2</sup>

- Interview, Summary:

Both sets of interviews with group members were instigated for the purpose of having discussion with participants on an individual basis. Our actions took the form of conversing. The interview interactions were discernibly different, however, from discussion amongst group members.

One of the key distinctions includes a difference in format from group meetings. As interviewer and interviewee, our roles were relatively clearly defined. Our conversational flow was purposefully one directional. In the main, I asked questions to elicit group members' perceptions of their activities. Through these means, I endeavored to facilitate reflection primarily about how they experienced the theatre project in which they were engaged. In the interview our activity had a more reconstructive than constructive orientation.

In this way the interviews did not occur between two group members. Through the content of my questions and in my demeanor, as much as possible, I shifted away from participant to observer. All group members were not able to make that distinction clearly, but many apparently could. Some relished the opportunity to step back and reflect. I promised group members that information given to me in the interviews would be confidential if they so required. In contrast to group meeting discussions, this added to some sense of private discourse.

The locations of the interviews also distinguished them from group meetings. I met with members individually in whatever setting

was most comfortable for them given our limited choices. This meant meeting in individuals' homes, or in restaurants with booths. Once more, virtually all group members were aware of interviews as a distinctive form of interaction.<sup>3</sup>

- Acting, Summary:

In contrast to "discussions" and "interviews", interactions of "acting" had an emphasis on physical action beyond verbal forms. While dialogue was very significant, actors also were required to express their meanings through movement, for instance.

In addition to this contrasting feature, other qualities associated with acting distinguished this shape from "discussion" and "interviews". I referred to definition of roles as an important element in the shape of interviews. With respect to "acting", assumption of role appeared to be key to the shape of "acting" interactions. It is the special meaning associated with the concept of role which made "role" primary.

Actions performed with the assumption of an acting role did not apparently retain the same quality of "real" as those of everyday actions. Therefore, "they" did not have the same significance. They were not attributed to the actor in the same manner as everyday actions would be. They carried, instead, a play-like or pretend quality. This quality is sometimes referred to as a "ludic" quality (Turner, 1982; Wilshire, 1982).

How much group members assumed a ludic quality about "acting" actions will emerge throughout this data analysis representation. For

example, actions performed while someone was acting might have a diminished quality of "real" or "significance" with respect to another actor with whom the first actor was interacting. However, "the quality of the acting" and the content of the play have significance and a real quality as a play for the audience. In this instance, it was clear that the audience's response had very real significance for the actors. In this way only certain aspects of the actions of acting were ludic (State, 1987).

Prior to focusing on other shapes of interaction, there is one final point worthy of note about "acting" as having a special quality for those acting. Turner (1982) speaks of the "ludic", Berger and Luckmann (1966) refer to theatre as a sub-universe of reality. No matter what the label given, a distinction being made between everyday action and "acting" necessitates a series of cues to suggest transition from one form of action to another.<sup>4</sup>

This brings to a close comments and descriptions of "acting" as a shape of interaction. The final two shapes of interaction, "paradigmatic actions" and "breaking point actions" have been placed strategically at the end, together. The phrase "shape of interaction" fits them least well because aspects of these interactions were not directly manifest either through a single action or articulation by group members. These interactions were virtually always combined with other shapes already described.

These two shapes of interactions have an important element in common with the previously described shape "acting". Data suggest

that some group members' interactions included an internalized sense of transcendence. That is, people indicated through various ways a sense of meaning beyond everyday life, "reality". With respect to acting, this transcendence or stepping outside of everyday reality was not consistently connected with a sense of certainty or the profound. In contrast, the following shapes of interactions were more consistently linked with seeking a sense of certainty or the profound.

- Paradigmatic Actions, Summary:

When we speak of paradigms based on Kuhn's work (1970, 1977), despite the shuffling definition, we generally assume some sort of framework created and maintained continually by members of a group to guide their directions. It is posited that in order to be viable, this paradigmatic framework must address group members' needs for a sense of the transcendent, the "sacred" (O'Dea, 1966) or the profound.

Such a framework also must address people's needs for a sense of how to act on a daily basis, within the "profane" sphere (O'Dea, 1966) or the prosaic in a manner consistent with the transcendent. The paradigmatic framework may also provide interpretations of actions so that consistency in individuals' actions is manifest.

For heuristic purposes, if one relies on a distinction between cultural-meaning and structure, a paradigm is the nexus between the two. A paradigm is the creation of structure in social action based on cultural-meaning for the purposes of interacting meaningfully.

This data analysis framework distinguishes between the analytic device, the concept of paradigm as a framework in the sense of object

(no matter how incorporeal), and people's interactions associated with paradigm creation and maintenance. Aspects of a paradigm as framework may be articulated wholly, or in part by group members. However, a paradigm may be manifest only in people's interactions as are "institutions". Individuals act in a manner consistent with a paradigm, thereby creating and maintaining the sense of "its" existence and they gather meaning both from the consistency of their own actions associated with a paradigm and the reciprocal or non-reciprocal interactions of others.

Through data analysis one pattern emerged in group members' interactions connected to creation and maintenance of a paradigm. Most of the data from which this pattern emerged were located in two sources. The data derived from discussion in which group members engaged and from acting.

The shape of group members' paradigmatic actions overlaps with the shape of their discussion and with their acting. However, the study posits that there are additional elements specific to the shape of their paradigmatic actions.

People may discuss or act for a variety of purposes. Through data analysis two elements have been associated with group members' paradigmatic interactions. The first is focus on creation and maintenance of commonly held meanings. The second is focus on process of creation and maintenance of meaning.

For purposes of comparison, since "role" was included as an element within descriptions of shapes of interactions such as

"interviews" and "acting", role is also considered in relation to group members' "paradigmatic actions". Role did not emerge as a key element in terms of requiring consistent, continuous, distinguishable actions associated with two particular individuals, as was the case with interviews. Thematically, a concept of role did not emerge with such potent force of meaning as to cause structure to be a most significant element of people's actions.

Data analysis provided in the Mobile-framework suggests that a concept of role was connected to group members' paradigmatic actions much more broadly, as a general, social obligation. Therefore, many members, if not all members of that group might assume a role. It was observed in the field, however, people who emerged as leaders were more likely to act from a sense of responsibility or meaning in action to maintain "the group" through maintenance of paradigm. Most group members might intuitively have recognized paradigmatic actions. It is unlikely, however, that they would describe these actions in terms of shape.

Despite being fraught with risks of reification, a visual image with respect to social construction of paradigms, may offer explanatory assistance. Social construction of paradigms might be thought of as helix-like, coiling around strands of interactions and of individuals' meanings. Shape of paradigmatic action might be most adequately described as strands connecting helix(es) to interwoven strands of individuals' meaning-in-action. (The Mobile-framework elaborates on this description in Chapter Eight.)<sup>5</sup>

- Breaking Point Actions, Summary:

Data analysis indicates that these last two shapes have some commonality. Much of that commonality lies in the complex nature of interactions I am attempting to represent through "them". It has been suggested that a paradigm as objectivation is not a shape of interaction, but is integrally related to such a series of interactions. In the same way, a breaking point is not a shape of interaction. However, "it" might be described rather as a locus for a shape of interaction.

Relying on O'Dea's work (1966) I would describe a breaking point as a person's or persons' experience of disruption of meaning (Jarvis, 1987; Mezirow, 1981, 1988) both prosaic and profound. Described in this manner a breaking point might be thought of as shapelessness rather than shape.<sup>6</sup>

This sense of disruption becomes the locus of special interactions. These special interactions may be thought of as people's interactions related to emergence of disruption as experienced and thereafter people's interactions related to their emerging responses to disruption of meaning.

As was the case with paradigmatic actions, breaking point actions are layered with other shapes of interactions. Arising from data analysis, I came to associate a quality of intensity and a focus on cultural-meaning with breaking point actions. I have distinguished between breaking point actions and paradigmatic actions by results of a series of group members' interactions.

In interactions directed towards paradigm creation and maintenance, group members were focused on contents of a possible framework. Prior to a breaking point experience, group members may have been focused in this manner. However, at and beyond a breaking point experience, making sense of a break came first. Then, construction starting from foundations again, was second (Wildemeersch & Leirman, 1988). (These stages related to breaking points are portrayed in the Mobile-framework of Chapter Eight.)

Within group members' interaction, roles were not clearly defined except in terms of a shared imperative role for all group members to relocate meaning. As with paradigmatic actions, group members emerging as leaders were more likely to assume responsibility for this course of action.<sup>7</sup>

Initially, one cue in particular suggested individuals' experiencing breaking points. On occasion, in mid conversation there would be a sudden shift in topics of discussion. In addition, as I came to hold a stronger sense of individuals' daily tone, a second set of cues surfaced. I have located most of what I referred to as breaking points by the remembered intensity in a particular situation.

Cues for intensity included striking tones of voice and distinction in group members' speed of actions. These might be faster or slower, louder or softer but they were distinguishable from the "average range". For these data I relied on my notes as participant observer, as well as a memory of the physical nature of incidents experienced in the field.

These incidents which have been labelled "breaking points", even now tend to be more intense than others still in terms of my memories of experience in the field. The sound as captured by the audiotapes has affirmed these memories of intensity.

c) "Foci In Group Members' Interactions: Theatre-Group/Group Theatre"

The following description exemplifies a conceptual struggle to shift from data analysis grounded in structural concepts to one searching for a way to convey meaning and process. Although lengthy, this segment demonstrates how many elements must be considered in such a struggle. The record of this inductive grappling illuminates processes of the third and fourth areas of discovery concerned with methodological consistency.

During fieldwork, through data analysis at the time I identified three major types of group activities. The three initially identified were labelled as: 1) "group glue" (the doing and saying of things which could assist group members in experiencing a sense of commonality and intimacy), 2) "theatre" activities (activities directly related to creating a play and staging it), and 3) "administration" activities (more indirectly related to staging a play with emphasis upon behind the scenes organizational structure). Distinction between the last two types emerged largely from group members' emphasis on the former, thereby distinguishing administrative activities through the de-valuation of "those" activities.

Through interaction between analysis of data and scrutiny for theory consistency I have modified this aspect of the data analysis

framework several times. While revising aspects of the framework I have begun to pinpoint several difficulties specific to characterizing data exclusively in terms of types of activities. This is integrally connected to reconceptualizing work resulting in "shapes of interactions".

The first "difficulty" arose in terms of group members' actions and meaning related to "theatre". To begin with, through extended study of data I observed that "theatre", for some group members, was not merely associated with specific tasks, but held a "higher" meaning for them. For some, "theatre" as a concept suggested a framework for creating profound experience. This data became connected with concepts of paradigms. That led to a reconsideration of "activities" in terms of "meaning-in-action".

Rather than continuing to label "types of activities", I began to think of the three as "foci for activities". By applying the word "foci" I attended to maintaining a direct link between group members and their actions. (Conveying a typology of group members' actions can create an impression of a separation of activities from actors.) Their foci for their activities was evoked through their meaning, hence these foci were their meaning-in-action.

Part of a second, emerging knot in the work has been a lack of distinguishing elements of meaning-in-action. Upon recognizing this absence of detail, additional consideration has elicited elements in meaning-in-action.

The study now posits that although these elements are inseparable, meaning-in-action includes both "what is it" and "how do

I act", given "what I decide it is". If meaning-in-action may be thought of in those terms, the word "activities" as suggestive of social "structure" becomes inadequate.

In response to these concerns, I have shifted emphasis away from primary focus on "activities" as a part of the framework at this point in data analysis. The phrase "foci in group members' interactions" is now used to suggest a double part of activity -- meaning as part of activity as well as external action.

In returning to a notion of meaning as related to actions, it is most important to take cognizance of "the profound and prosaic" related to meaning. This distinction is of assistance in reconceptualizing the original typology.

I experienced a third difficulty with the original "three types of activities". Even when I began to think in terms of three foci in group members' interactions, I could not find a conceptual consistency between "theatre" and "administration". Yet to distinguish the two appeared most important to group members. The second was ostensibly very much a part of the first.

When considering group members' meaning-in-action more closely and distinguishing between "what it is" and "how do I act in relation to it" and between profound and prosaic aspects of both of these, a relationship between theatre and administration began to emerge. I no longer think of them as three foci, but two. There are a number of considerations concerning this relationship.

Many of these considerations were described in Chapter Six related to "group entity" as anchors. Nonetheless, I have included

the description here as part of data analysis specifically associated with creation of a representational form.

As emphasized in the introductory paragraph, the intention, consistent with the third and fourth areas of discovery has been to illuminate questions and processes of methodology. Continuing with this processual example, I now describe attempts to link that conceptual work with elements in the theoretical framework of Chapter Six.

In considering the original three as two foci, my conception of them has also shifted to some extent. For instance, at this later stage in the data analysis I came to think of "group glue" in a broad sense of "group" (in a "communal" sense) related to two subsets of meaning.

First, there is "group" in a prosaic sense of day to day interactions, setting up social occasions, making jokes, relating recent experiences. Second, there is "group" in a more profound, tacit sense of anchor. That is, individuals considering "the group" as an entity with validity and legitimacy imbedding these qualities in constructing and reconstructing reality, linked with "culture", and identity.

Based on theoretical resources (Durkheim, 1985) and data analysis I have come to recognize the forceful significance of "group". This is the case particularly based on the second meaning of "group". That is, when an individual identifies a group as a "body" or entity which interprets and represents a certain reality.

In many instances, the notion of "group" may have a mediating function for individuals linked as it may be with identity. In this sense, shifting to experience a set of individuals as "a group" is very much related to manifestations of paradigm. Berger and Luckmann refer to the process of creating such a group as "successful socialization into another" social world. They refer to such a group entity as providing a "plausibility structure for counter-definitions of reality" (1966, p. 186).<sup>8</sup>

One of the most significant aspects of having a sense of group is that when a "group" exists as meaning for individuals, that meaning provides the context for structure to act back on individuals (Robinson, 1980). "If 'the group' does it, I must do it to be a member of the group."

This example indicates that individuals may experience this "acting back" in both profound and prosaic spheres. Consistent with that, themes arising out of group relationships may be further clustered in terms of relationships external to the theatre group (the community) and internal to the theatre group.

Since this data analysis work, the second foci has continued with the name of "theatre". Through data analysis two clusters of meaning have become associated with "theatre" — "theatre" in a more formal, conceptual, paradigmatic form (emphasizing the profound) and "theatre" as day to day activities (the prosaic sphere). "Administration" activities have now been included in "theatre of the prosaic". It is most important to distinguish between acting and administration as there was a strong sense for group members in delineating the two.

This second foci of "theatre", particularly focused on the prosaic, very roughly corresponds with elements of anchoring through social "structure".<sup>9</sup>

Throughout analysis of the data I have struggled long and hard to determine which of these foci predominated or was at the forefront for group members. In the final stages of creating this Mobile-framework my conception of these foci has altered yet again in several ways.

I now perceive my struggles with this problem as thematically commingled with my earlier struggles precipitating emergence of "shapes of interaction". The same concerns have demanded conceptualizations more sensitive to process and change as reflected in group members' meanings-in-action.

For example, concerns have been reshaped to emphasize a need to understand possible relationships in their foci. That is, whether one focus predominated throughout their interactions. At a particular point were participants developing a common orientation towards creation of "group"? Were they engaged in a process of creating a stronger paradigmatic framework regarding "theatre" at any particular time?

One of the most difficult aspects of trying to determine whether one focus might have been consistently at the forefront for participants is that the nature of the data associated with each is so different. Data from group members focused on aspects of theatre is abundant. They identified themselves as a theatre group. In that sense, both of the foci are at the forefront of group members' interactions.

However, there are also data from diverse sources, such as interviews and discussions, which indicated group members had several needs. In particular they had both a strong need to make sense of individuals' experience with the community and an intense need to search both for prosaic and transcendent meaning through connection with a "group's" meaning.

These needs were not always apparently linked to theatre for participants. In addition to data from discussions and interviews, there were data from the demographic research and data which suggested sudden shifts from one shape of interaction to another and from one content theme to another. Arguably, neither focus was constantly at the "forefront" for participants. They were not often articulated or even recognized by all group members, yet they easily emerge to the forefront given certain conditions.

Those "conditions" are posited in the data analysis representation. To symbolize this shifting preeminence I have added an extra hyphen between the words: "theatre—group".<sup>10</sup>

#### EMERGING PATTERNS OF STRUCTURE

The "Emerging Patterns Of Structure" comprises the third section of each Act Play, building from the first two sections "Emerging Context" and "Emerging Patterns Of Process".

#### The Purpose

This section both posits and represents a changing nature within certain patterns observed in group members' interaction. This

changing nature as posited indicates emergence of patterns in a more "permanently established form" such as articulated roles, or in Berger and Luckmann's terms, typification and habitualization shifting into institutionalization (Berger & Luckmann, 1966, p. 70-71).

### The Content and Structure

A glance at the organization of "Emerging Patterns Of Structure" would garner the following overview of major headings:

- Emerging Subgroups
- Emerging Roles
- Emerging Lexicon

My orientation in the study has become a sensitivity to meaning. Development of the concept "cultural-meaning" has emerged through data analysis process, including library research work. Acknowledging the emerged orientation toward "meaning" as central, the limited work done in the study with respect to structure is offered. It should be noted also that this section has been used throughout the five Act-Plays as a "residual category" and meshed miscellany with miscellany.

In developing these headings to represent data analysis findings, I came to reflect on how "structure" had been defined at the outset of data analysis prior to distinctions between cultural-meaning and structure being clarified. When relying on the concept originally, I tacitly used the word "structure" as "framework" rather than reciprocated interactions, in Berger and Luckmann's terms. For purposes of this section "structure" is primarily conceived in terms of conveying the concept of relationship between "the whole" and "parts" since it is based on the fieldwork data analysis.

Having recognized that original conceptualization, I have continued to use it explicitly in relation to more than one aspect of data analysis. Through data analysis three potential foci for structure as related to concepts of a whole and parts have emerged. While acting as a participant observer of this group I have contemplated structure in terms of a) "parts of the group" in the more traditional notions of an entity which may have subunits, b) "developing parts of patterned interaction", and c) "parts of language" or words group members began to use in special ways.

The first foci, "parts of the group", is basically data analysis concerning "subgroupings". This is portrayed in the subtitle "Emerging Subgroups". The second foci is related to process and, as that is a focal point in the research, I have tended to gravitate towards focus on structure of interactions. That is why a heavy reliance has been placed upon Berger and Luckmann's Social Construction of Reality (1966). That segment is entitled "Emerging Roles".

The segments on "emerging roles" remain separated from the third foci, structure of language, despite their mutual connection to "process". Consideration was given to placing group members' developing language directly under the auspices of "Emerging Cultural-Meaning". However, words as social artifacts are still very much related to structure while manifesting cultural-meaning. I have determined to include it in this segment on that basis, referring to language as "Emerging Lexicon".

## Key Concepts

### a) "Emerging Structure":

Data disclosed in "Emerging Patterns" was likened to a primordial soup of group members' interactions. I imposed an analytic structure by pouring the soup into various conceptual containers. In so doing, I began a process of identifying interactions which might provide key direction to understanding group members' emerging structure and emerging cultural-meaning.

Geertz' (1973) distinctions between culture (in terms of the study "cultural-meaning") and structure have been used as a heuristic device in creating this segment and in the creation of "Emerging Cultural-Meaning" which follows "Emerging Structure".

As they are most commonly conceptualized, "cultural-meaning" and "structure" are intrinsic to a whole conceptualization of social activity. Nonetheless, in studies one is often given primacy if not absolute emphasis. This dissection is ostensible even in disciplinary terms. For example, very broadly speaking, sociologists have been oriented more frequently to studies of social structure (O'Dea, 1966; Ruddock, 1972) and anthropologists to culture (Agar, 1980; Jorgenson, 1989). Since the study relies on readings from both, it endeavors to be sensitized to this distinction within the representational form, the Mobile-framework.

An exploration of ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying the study formed an earlier part of this text. Those descriptions announced cultural-meaning's place of primacy. However, I also suggested that structure as created through social interactions

may be an expression, a manifestation of cultural-meaning. People's interactions creating and maintaining a sense of certain structure (frequently described as roles) may also result in change to their meanings and thereby to cultural-meaning. The centre of a circle exists only with the circumstance of circumference.

As previously described, cultural-meaning has been described as meaning which members of a group come to sense they hold in common to varying degrees. In the main, I have contemplated "structure" as group members' interactions emerging from primordial soup patterns into solidification of a framework, interactions which shift in meaning from an incident to a pattern for group members. The pattern which emerges for them is imbued with qualities of permanency and reality through becoming a part of a larger whole (no matter how brief the conceptual-meaning-life of the whole is maintained by group members).

b) "Emerging Subgroups":

This text keeps an eye on emerging parts of "the whole". Process does not shape this material. It is intended more as a conceptual chart of current parts during a particular period of time. For example, the "General Context" provided an overview of demographics for all individuals participating in the theatre project for a period of time. "Emerging Subgroups" provides an indication of how demographics change as individuals become part of the group.

c) "Emerging Roles":

The data included in the segments "Emerging Roles" indicates patterns in group members' interactions which have become more formalized, more institutionalized. Placing reliance on Berger and Luckmann's concept of "roles" it is difficult to separate emerging patterns of process and emerging roles. They assume that creation of roles and maintenance of roles arise out of behavior which becomes patterned, "habitualization" (1966, p. 70) through internalized and externalized pattern construction.

Berger and Luckmann refer to like internalizations being held by two interactors as having "common goals" (1966, p. 74). The authors also identify combined externalizations as held in common by interactors indicating that a second element distinguishing "roles" is, "interlocking phases of performance". Much of this is the substance of that which is described as "Emerging Patterns of Process".

The purpose in making such a distinction in the study between emerging patterns of process and emerging roles is worthy of note. This set of participants were relatively new to each other. All were new to their activities since even the "steps" followed to write the script and present the play changed and were changed as group members continued working on this play. Much of group members' activity demonstrated through data was not initially "carved out" and then repeated. Nor was it associated with two individuals interacting as is suggested by Berger and Luckmann's conceptualization of the beginning stages of role. Rather the entire group was privy and

involved generally. To begin with then, many of their patterns also changed swiftly.

The "Emerging Patterns of Process" section serves to gather together less "formalized" patterns of group members' interactions which emerged through data analysis. Many of their interactions might be said to lead to the emergence of roles, hence the reference to patterns of process as primordial soup.

There exist many facets to role creation if role development is paradigmatically described as a stepping stone to institutionalization. To reflect this aspect of Berger and Luckmann's analytic framework in each of the five Act-Plays these segments begin with emerged patterns bearing the closest resemblance to "role creation or development".

Generally speaking, throughout this theatre project, those participating experienced uncertainty concerning roles, particularly during the first few meetings I attended. When group members did create roles, the roles created seemed to be formed sometimes through habituation in their activities, but more often through breaking points occurring.

I return to meaning-in-action to focus on aspects of group members' meaning connected to group members' interactions emerging as roles. In terms of meaning-in-action two foci "theatre" and "group", have been elaborated to explicate themes observed in data. These clusters of meaning orientation emerge particularly in relation to creating a structure for action roles.

Given group members' posited breaking point of needing "something" and discovering a way to create it, the predominant foci at this stage in terms of roles is "theatre": who does what in "theatre" to create and produce a play. "Group" is still an important aspect of even the substance of these role formations. However, the roles became defined in terms of group members discovering the need for accomplishing something and thereby identifying someone with power and responsibility to assist them in completing the identified activity. Thus the emphasis was on "theatre" in the phrase "theatre--group" during early periods of the theatre project. This influences the shape of these segments in terms of "role crystallizations".

c) "Emerging Lexicon":

All of the data spread throughout the Mobile-framework testifies to group members' expressiveness. I have indicated that group members commonly considered "theatre" as an opportunity for self-expression. Any lexicon aspiring to represent the wealth of their expression will be meagre. This is attributable to a number of considerations.

Initially, lexicon commonly held among participants becoming involved in the theatre project over a period of time was extremely limited. Many group members brought few "theatre" words with them. Second, group members frequently chose not to question when they did not understand words others were using. (I was advised of this in informal, unrecorded discussion by several group members.)

Third, their developing lexicon contained kinesthetic elements. Group members had a "lexicon of expressions". That is, their

communications consisted of gestures as well as words. An additional element in attempting to document lexicon was the incredible number of shifts in terms of activities from research to improvisation to traditional theatre, the number of breaking points and the number of people involved. Attempting to compile all forms of expression held by individuals and in addition, changing nuances of expressions already used would require massive resources.

A limited lexicon has been chosen to acknowledge existence of group members' emerging "vocabulary". More specifically I have chosen "words" signifying group members' experience of process and change particularly related to theatre.

These, then, are the major concepts which evolved through data analysis and which shaped the "Emerging Patterns Of Structure" section in each of the five Act-Plays. It was acknowledged previously that kinesthetic aspects of fieldwork experience, particularly with respect to "emerging lexicon" are largely absent from descriptions in each of these "Structure" sections. To balance a general absence of kinesthetic qualities in descriptions of fieldwork experience, a section for this singular purpose was developed.

#### EMERGING TEMPO AND RHYTHM OF ACTIVITIES

Unlike other sections, the "Emerging Tempo And Rhythm Of Activities" section is entirely comprised of a very brief description. No outline of headings is possible for there are none within this section.

### The Purpose

As previously described, the purpose of this section is to embellish and bring into focus the kinesthetic sense more indirectly suggested in other sections.

### The Content And Structure

Each of these sections within the five Act-Plays includes a brief metaphorical description of my interpretation of the impetus and "volume" of group members' activities. The description is chronologically structured to convey impressions of emerging changes or shifts within tempo or volume in participants' interactions during a particular period of the theatre project.

### Key Concepts

One key concept "orchestrates" the section.

#### a) "Emerging Tempo And Rhythm"

The phrase "emerging tempo and rhythm" was developed based on data analysis which indicated an element of impetus in group members' responses. An example of this is provided, as well as it can be established through evidence in a written form, in data listed within the description of the first paradigm "Go With It" (Chapter Eight). To enrich the description the "musical metaphor" is extended in these sections through use of musical vocabulary.<sup>11</sup>

The tempo and rhythm section aspires to prepare the way for the section which follows. "Emerging Patterns Of Cultural-Meaning" describes sources of impetus, meanings behind movement.

## EMERGING PATTERNS OF CULTURAL-MEANING

This section comes as climax to data analysis work on social theory. Each of these sections in the Act-Plays represents the culmination of work in the first two areas of discovery, directly linked with descriptions of fieldwork experience. This is reflected in the purpose.

### The Purpose

The section's purpose, as evolved is to synthesize all of the data analysis through focusing on a pivotal element in group members' interactions, their sense of meanings commonly held.

### The Content And Structure

Group members' "cultural-meanings" shift over time through both their interactions (giving rise to new meaning for individuals) and their changing context. It is the process of newly emerging cultural-meaning which has been documented in prior sections. In each of these sections in the Mobile-framework description provided is of cultural-meaning as emerged. The study postulates that this emergence of cultural-meaning occurs fully for individuals by the end of a "stage", sometimes prompting a new stage by "new cultural-meaning" requiring a response!

The section unfolds through two main headings:

Group Members' Emerging Chord Of Cultural-Meaning  
Group Members' Emerging Commonality Of Meaning

The first describes what cultural-meaning emerged as a predominant theme or "chord" through group members' emerging sense of resonance in their interactions during a particular period. These are interpretations of what has emerged for group members as a result of data analysis.

The title of each of the five Act-Plays describes group members' resonance or their "chord" for that particular period. An explication of the title for the period is offered under this heading within each of the five Act-Plays.

Contents under the final heading, "Group Members Emerging Commonality Of Meaning", returns to process of emergence. It differs from earlier sections describing process in that its singular focus is upon cultural-meaning. Description herein acts both as reminder of earlier stages and as conclusion to the more detailed tracings of "Emerging Patterns Of Process" and "Emerging Structure" in a particular stage in group members' interactions.

Creation of a working definition for "cultural-meaning" was based on a series of assumptions. These assumptions were arrived at through interactive analysis of data and theoretical works. Now the definition acts back to the extent that representational form must be consistent with assumptions woven into the definition. The following is a description which illuminates a struggle to do that. This struggle reveals various influences which shaped the eventual form and content of this section "Emerging Cultural-Meaning".

I have described cultural-meaning in processual terms: a set of individuals coming to have a sense of holding meaning in common. In

the Social Theory Trail (Chapter Five and the consolidation which followed Chapter Six) I developed a set of working assumptions to divulge more about possible social processes related both to achieving that sense of common meaning and suffering loss of that sense on occasion.

In exploring ontology and epistemology in process of change I have edged into content of meanings individuals hold which drives what they experience in terms of cultural-meaning. Dual experiences of change, response to that change, five processes related to modernity, (Berger, 1977) all of these explications also refer to individuals' meaning content.

In this representation, the Mobile-framework, I have attempted to document two processes. The first, recorded in each of the "Emerging cultural-meaning" sections of the Mobile-framework describes how these people came to have a sense of holding meaning in common and lost it periodically. The second was how to represent that process. However, in light of the significance of "theatre" and "education" as a part of the process, documentation also shifted into content of meaning.

Although it is not quite parallel to Kuhn's problem in "defining" paradigm there are some similarities. I was certainly piqued by a paradox of my own invention. That paradox pervades attempts at creating representational form. If I wander into specific content of meaning and attribute that content as cultural-meaning held by the group I have unleashed reification into the work. For instance, if I said the cultural-meaning of "the group" was to "express themselves", I had moved from suggesting that many have a sense of coming to hold

similar meaning to stating that each individual actually holds the same meaning. A fresh example of this problem was described in "Emerging Lexicons".

How then, could I represent content of individuals' meaning without springing the reification trap? Does one attempt to ascertain meanings both tacit and explicit from each individual interacting? Even if this were possible to do, it would utterly destroy representation of dynamic qualities of social interactions. Through this conceptual struggle, what I have come to represent of content is a compromise. This compromise was created through intuition initially, based upon experiencing group members' dynamics, reshaped periodically through ongoing analysis of theories and data.

This problem showed a thousand faces as I worked on the set of assumptions and created the Mobile-framework. I responded to some, but not all. Those for which I have a response are several as is the form of my responses.

First, one response arises out of the simple act of drawing attention to the problem of representing content of cultural-meaning. This has been accomplished not only by recognizing the problem, but by shaping the compound word "cultural-meaning". The definition for "cultural-meaning" was fashioned to avoid assiduously escalation of this problem as much as possible.

Second, to reflect heterogeneity of individuals' meaning, I have outlined elements of process in group members' interactions wherein individuals in the group clearly did not hold the same meanings. Third, I have used words such as "emerging" to act as a reminder of

our constant movement which was often experienced as abrupt change. Fourth and finally, I will proffer hereafter an explication of what is described as content under the auspices of "cultural-meaning".

Thus have I dealt with some concerns related to translating "cultural-meaning" as processual definition into representing a specific set of group interactions. With reification as insidious as it seems, what can be represented about meaning content in a particular situation?

A brief review of processual elements described in working assumptions which are related to "cultural-meaning" may afford assistance. I have repeatedly emphasized cultural-meaning as emerging (Robinson, 1980). Acting in the role of participant observer, "details" of meaning may be recognized because one or two members actually articulate their meaning, "Yes I always avoid asking about the project. She only gets nervous and that makes me nervous."

These "details", however, may not be details of meaning commonly sensed by most group members. They may also be fleeting, replaced by a meaning which submerges all others for a lengthy period. I have referred to these details as primordial soup. Stated this way "they" are the basis for what may emerge as an experience of cultural-meaning. These "details" may be implicitly significant and commonly sensed. However, as participant observer working out clear connections I have limited myself to those incidents of a more explicit nature.

Points at which many group members experienced coming to hold meaning commonly were more explicit. Either group members referred to

the experience or a strong sense of intensity through tone and speed of interactions indicated this kind of experience. Points at which group members experienced loss of meaning was another instance wherein individuals were more likely to express through words or action a common sense of that loss. Ironically, that constituted commonly held meaning as well. I have also looked to working assumptions about acquiring certainty, anchors in group entity and structure to consider any indication of commonly sensed holding meaning. These were all contemplated in content developed for these "Emerging Cultural-Meaning" sections.

Through data analysis process I have come to understand that there is much implicit which may be related to cultural-meaning. One example observed in the field was those things group members experienced as meaning in common and which became taken for granted. In an effort not to abandon this area entirely, beyond "primordial soup" representation, I recognize two interrelated methods I have intuited in data analysis process.

I have located some implicit aspects by searching for themes and "bumps". These two are interrelated because they are arguably derived from my tendency, my own efforts to hold meaning in common with group members. "Bumps" were surprises or breaking points I experienced (as partial outsider) in terms of meaning commonality. I brought with me my own set of working assumptions including an escalated desire to raise questions, not to take for granted and to search for significance.

There were incidents wherein group members did something which surprised me, but which other group members did not appear to greet with surprise. In some instances, they responded in like manner or as if the action was routine. There are many examples of this, some of the most striking concerned an early "pattern" of constantly switching topics in conversation. Another example from the field was group members leaving meetings feeling calm, then returning to the next meeting in a state of anxiety.

There were "abrupt bumps" and very gentle bumps elicited both in the field and in data analysis. These bumps were elicited through reflection on themes, actions and articulations of group members which emerged for me as more significant because of reiteration. I suspect that these emerged for me more obviously because of my purposeful, constant reflection given my role. I further suspect that some of these "themes" emerged for others in the group at different rates in terms of timing.

What has come to assist me in making sense of these bumps and themes has been to contemplate them in terms of the working assumptions developed interactively with the Social Theory Trail. For example, these themes and abrupt bumps often suggested the outline of an anchor or ground in which "it" was planted.

In summary, most of what I have attempted to represent of "cultural-meaning" through the Mobile-framework is limited to the explicit or the intense, suggesting change experienced as profound. Arguably, this is not untoward in terms of this theatre project since group members experienced enormous change over a relatively brief

period of time. They were able to take very little for granted and thus were faced with the profound.

### Key Concepts

#### a) "Emerging Chords":

Out of all group members' noted meanings, at certain points group members appear to have come to hold not only the essence of certain meanings, but a sense of predominant significance about those meanings. Continuing with the metaphor of movement in the form of music, prior sections have recorded an entire "Movement". These are what I refer to as "chords".<sup>12</sup>

The study posits that if group members also experienced a sense of urgency in common, this became a driving force for their interactions. Their interactions became reshaped and expressed through change in their structure.

This section looks to identify chords which resonated for group members. From this viewpoint, chord also refers to accord. Chord was chosen to highlight an essential element of cultural-meaning -- not a single note but several coming together to emerge as a single thematic sound. The impact of this thematic sound was change. I have relied on these thematic changes in cultural-meaning to demarcate "stages" in group members' interactions.

The title of each of these stages, then, is intended to reflect chords of cultural-meaning emerging as thematic during this set of

group members' interactions. It is combined with an indication as well of the predominating shape of group members' interactions, if there was one.

b) "Emerging Cultural-Meanings":

The "Emerging Cultural-Meaning" sections are intended as a culmination in data analysis inductively relying on the patterns to synthesize both articulated and unarticulated meaning commonly held, which oriented and directed group members in their interactions.

When I created this framework I had two criteria for determining the order of data analysis representation. I have attempted to arrange data based on a chronological flow. I have endeavored also to balance chronological order of data analysis with arranging data analysis according to thematic significance.

With respect to my criteria of thematic significance, in the outline of my theoretical assumptions I placed "meaning" at our epistemological and ontological epicentre. I described "cultural-meaning" as a "social parallel" to meaning held by individuals. Despite describing cultural-meaning as primary to group members taking action, I have relegated that segment of my data analysis to one of the final pieces in all five Act-Plays.

Arguably, however, material encased in one of the concluding pieces commands special status simply by being last. It can establish the essence from which echoes may then emanate. The end of one piece

becomes the beginning of another. In positioning cultural-meaning materials near the end of each segment, I have attempted to assign them a place of significance.

On the question of chronological consistency, I have found considerable complexity in determining "an order" for emergence of cultural-meaning in social interactions. As indicated earlier, when choosing a definition I took pains to describe cultural-meaning in terms of process: — Meaning which members of a group come to hold in common in varying degrees. That description suggests cultural-meaning is the culmination of a process of participants' interactions.

In locating cultural-meaning materials after "Emerging Patterns of Process" and "Emerging Structure" I have given expression to that order. The data analysis reflects my belief that people do come to hold in common meaning through a mutual experience. However, I have also suggested in this data analysis representation that cultural-meaning is a driving force for group members' actions.

This would place cultural-meaning prior to interactions. As I have suggested elsewhere, meaning for members may arise out of interactions guided by meaning already held in common and expressed through ongoing interactions of members. Cultural-meanings emerging for members of a group may prompt from them new interactions.

A relationship between cultural-meaning and interaction of group members was complex. This complexity is "flattened" if shaped to fit a representation based on chronology of outward events. A better reflection of this relationship might be described as a hermeneutical hall of mirrors. As interpreters of data the chronology we are better

equipped to describe is our own hermeneutical-heuristic detective trail. Insofar as we need the entire trail of process to interpret what has occurred, we also need to better break down the process into elements for heuristic purposes.

I have suggested that cultural-meaning is central to social interactions. I have suggested that cultural-meaning is the most difficult to locate. In my fieldwork, I believe the strongest sense I had of emerging cultural-meaning did not come through a specific verbalization, which was my primary source of data, but a kinesthetic sense of group members' interactions, how quickly they acted or reacted in a few instances.

Creating the term cultural-meaning and then describing such instances in group members' interactions is reminiscent of attempting to contain a moonbeam in a jar or to see the wind. First experiences of light or wind may be wrought through intuitive experience of significance, of what sense demands attention. Following the wind or light as "they" transmute is like unto following group members' cultural-meanings webbed in change. However, what is a Mobile without wind?

If I rely on chronology related to when cultural-meanings emerged for me, they were last. They emerged through a series of clues, themes of discussions, breaking points, emerging roles. Ultimately, then, the chronology on which I have relied is my own compressed hermeneutical circle.

Since cultural-meanings emerged for me as a culmination of understanding other elements of group members' interactions, I have

structured this section to reflect the other elements beginning first with primordial soup ("Emerging Patterns Of Process") and then noting that which became more permanently established in form and therefore more "real" in quality ("Emerging Structure").

During my efforts to sculpt this data analysis framework I have continued to reflect on conceptual definitions pivotal to the emerging framework. The concrete results of data analysis both in terms of the Mobile-framework's content and internal logic of structure can act as eruptions on definitional landscapes. No volcanic vehemence has shaken this definition of cultural-meaning. It has remained largely adequate as explication for new influences arising out of data analysis.

The definition of "cultural-meaning" intentionally contained reference to process in the phrase "come to hold" meaning. However, the work in both "Emerging Patterns Of Process" and "Emerging Structure" speaks to group members coming to hold and then coming to hold, again and again. To the extent that it conveys a static quality in what comes to be held, the definition falls short of explication. This segment exists precisely for the purpose of exploring what group members came to have a sense of holding in common and whether that changed in a constant process of negotiated meaning (Robinson, 1980).

The section which follows this contains the shards of my early attempt to compress the hermeneutical circle within the Mobile-framework, itself. Being a remnant it is intended to act as reminder of my paradigmatic orientation towards adult education when group members were engaged in this process.

THEMES DIRECTLY RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION  
AS CONSTRUCTED DURING THIS STAGE

The Purpose

This section reflects work associated in the third and fourth areas of discovery. The section's purpose was to further my objective to reflect "the researcher's" process. This material is intended to represent concretely change as related to analysis of data. In other sections I have referred to meaning emerging for me as researcher. Through brief descriptions of my emphasis in various stages I provide a clearer indication of how and when my orientation changed over time.

The second objective is to link this work more concretely to adult education. I do this in terms of considering my changing perspective on adult education which indicates how this perspective influenced and was influenced by data analyzed at the time.

Content and Structure

This piece concludes each of the five Act-Plays. These sections are the culmination of data analysis for each "Act-Play". They are divided by two headings:

Cultural-Meanings For Participant Observer  
Data Related To Adult Education Framework As Constructed  
During This Stage.

Data analysis included in these sections completes each representation through several means. For example, "Emerging Cultural-Meanings For Participant Observer" contains reflections of my changing role, and my changing understanding of field experiences as I related them to adult education during this period.

In the description provided within "Data Related To Adult Education Framework As Constructed During This Stage", a most important aspect of process is revealed. It outlines data related to one of my key concerns, the connection between group members' activities and adult education.

Despite possible redundancy inherent between this section and others, for purposes of reflecting on research processes the section is deemed significant. Observing at least to some extent my emerging view of adult education based on both growing experience in the field and with methodological and theoretical resources, it is useful to understand how my orientation toward adult education was changing. This certainly had implications for data analysis during each of these stages. An example of such implications follows related to my changing understanding of learning.

#### Key Concepts

There are two key concepts which remained central in the research. However, my understanding of those concepts has changed through the process of analysis. These were "learning" associated with my orientation towards adult education and "theatre" as group members' articulated focus.

##### a) "Learning":

Aside from methodological questions, this concept formed the basis for my initial questions. When I observed group members' processes, "learning" was what I initially considered in data analysis. Insofar as my experience with a concept of "learning" was

derived from more traditional frameworks of adult education, I began with tacit assumptions of a psychologically oriented framework (Merriam, 1988; Ruddock, 1967).

In this context "learning" was also associated with a more formal process focused on individual learners. Interestingly, group members' response to my questions about "their learning" reflected particularly the latter assumption about learning.

This focus changed over the course of the data analysis through emphasis on social interaction as context for "learning". (Chapter Nine will address my "final" reflections on a concept of learning for purposes of the study.) A second concept loomed up in terms of data analysis related to this area of processual reflection.

b) "Theatre":

My initial intentions were to observe this set of individuals "learning" about "theatre". Formulated in this way "theatre" is a singular paradigm towards which group members reach. However, I came to understand through readings and data analysis that there are many schools of thought with respect to this notion of "theatre". By the end of data analysis process I had come to think of theatre as a concept from which people draw different elements to construct their own emerging paradigm. The Mobile-framework reflects group members renegotiation of meaning attributed to "theatre".

This brings to a close contemplation of the purpose, content, structure and key concepts which grew out of work on the

Mobile-framework and development of the Chapters of this Part. The length of this description reflects the thoroughly interactive nature of data analysis and analysis in finding representation form. Part Three shifts from "talking about" to "action" through unfolding the second representational form of fieldwork experience. Now comes the compressed hermeneutical version, the Mobile-framework.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>I have not abandoned the idea of annotating combined processes in this sense, except when presenting on this scale.

<sup>2</sup>Data of group members' discussions were obtained primarily from recordings of formal meetings. Since group members did have informal discussion prior to and after meetings, data collected includes some of these interchanges as well. My access to group members' informal discussions on occasions other than meetings, however, was extremely limited.

<sup>3</sup>I have an abundance of data from group members' interactions in meetings. Since this is precisely what I was studying, I have relied on this as the primary source of data. The interview data has functioned to supplement data analysis from participants' interactions at meetings. Primarily, data from interviews affirmed individuals' orientations. For example, through the interviews demographic data gathered indicated various subgroupings among group members.

Interview data also supported analysis related to individuals' orientation toward the theatre project. In addition, interview data was consulted when I had difficulty making sense of interactions or group members appeared to experience diverse reactions. Finally, I have also relied on interview data to fill in "gaps" of data collection such as those occasions when I was not present. Examples of these gaps are the birth of the theatre club, the first meetings of the project, and discussions on the "telephone lines".

<sup>4</sup>One of the difficulties in relying on data when attempting to describe a concept of acting is that group members began the project with disparate experiences and meanings of "theatre" and "acting". In fact, there is an interesting paradox associated with this.

Both Cam, the director, and participants, themselves, acknowledged that most group members had extremely limited knowledge and skills of theatre. Yet, people used the word "theatre" in discussion without explanation, suggesting that they assumed those listening thought about theatre in the same way as they did, or even that they had a strong sense of what "theatre" is. More often the word "theatre" itself was implied rather than spoken.

All members did have a basic sense of "being somebody else" in a role. However, even this notion became blurred with improvisational theatre. Finally, with respect to the form of data, given that group members were learning about acting beyond dialogue, I have relied on my notes as participant observer for background data.

<sup>5</sup>I experienced varying levels of difficulty in locating data revealing group members' paradigmatic actions. Some of those engaged in these interactions were able to articulate a paradigm. Cam, for instance, was able to do this in relation to his concept of theatre. Wherein members could express a paradigm I found it possible to trace

through data to locate their actions which reflected following a course of action consistent with an expressed paradigm. In the main however, most members were concerned with discovering what immediate action to take. Ostensibly, if they held a paradigm of meaning in common it was not initially effective. Fragmented attempts to rely on a paradigm emerged as thematic of group members' interactions. This formed the basis of my data selection in that instance.

<sup>6</sup>This particular description was suggested by Dr. John Thompson in one of our frequent discussions during data analysis.

<sup>7</sup>Primarily, data sources of breaking points were located in the meeting tapes. Some data indicated group members experiencing breaking points during meetings. Data from other occasions indicated that some group members experienced breaking points outside of meetings. In many of those instances, reflection and confirmation of a breaking point occurred through group discussion in the next meeting. The experience of some group members recognizing a breaking point formed the content for discussion.

<sup>8</sup>I do not intend to suggest that all individuals engaged in the theatre project entered another social world. A few may never have experienced being a member, although they did experience "group" and also experienced having some commonality of meaning with those "in the group". Virtually all those involved had some other anchors which they did not abandon. However, the sense of a group entity existing did begin to flourish for many toward the middle and end of the project. Many of their interactions would not have been possible without that supra-meaning.

<sup>9</sup>The relationship between "anchors" described in Chapter Six and these foci as posited should be carefully considered prior to assuming a simple relationship. For example, elements of the prosaic in terms of "group" relationships, and "theatre" as emerging may be thought of as anchor in terms of structure. However, this analysis is pursued primarily through example of the Mobile-framework. Theory generation on that scale of detail was beyond the scope of this thesis.

<sup>10</sup>Diverse orientations among group members created a reservoir for shifting preeminence. Descriptions of subgroup orientations in the "General Context" section of Part Three will shed more light on this.

<sup>11</sup>I am not the first to foster such a metaphor. Turner (1982) makes reference to those who have used music as a metaphor in social interactions. In creating this metaphorical section I have gained one representational advantage, with the possible risk of evoking a disadvantage, namely, promoting a sense of reification.

<sup>12</sup>I considered referring to these as "cords" as well insofar as they bind community members together.

## REFERENCES

- Agar, M. (1980). The professional stranger. New York: Academic Press.
- Berger, P. (1977). Toward a critique of modernity. In P. Berger (Ed.), Facing up to modernity, (pp.70-80). New York: Basic Books.
- Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1966). The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge. New York: Penguin Books.
- Durkheim, E. (1985). Precontractual solidarity [1893]; Social rituals and sacred objects [1912]. In R. Collins (Ed.), Three sociological traditions, Selected readings, (pp. 161-186). [Reprinted from The Division of Labor In Society, 1965, New York: Free Press.]
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures, selected essays. New York: Basic Books.
- Jarvis, P. (1987). Meaningful and meaningless experience: Towards an analysis of learning from life. Adult Education Quarterly, 37(3), 164-172.
- Jorgenson, D. (1989). Participant observation, A methodology for human studies. London: Sage.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions, (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1977). The essential tension. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. (1988). Finding your way through the maze: A guide to the literature on adult learning. Lifelong Learning, 11(6), 4-7.
- Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. Adult Education Quarterly, 32(1), 3-24.
- Mezirow, J. (1988). Transformation theory. Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual Adult Education Research Conference, (pp. 223-227).
- O'Dea, T. (1966). The sociology of religion. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Robinson, K. (1980). Drama, theatre and social reality. In K. Robinson, (Ed.), Exploring theatre and education. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Ruddock, R. (1967). Social factors in adult learning. Adult Education, 40(2), 74-81.

Ruddock, R. (1972). Sociological perspectives on adult education. Manchester: University of Manchester.

States, B. (1987). Great reckonings in little rooms, On the phenomenology of theatre. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Turner, V. (1982). From ritual to theatre, The human seriousness of play. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications.

Wildemeersch, D. & Leirman, W. (1988). The facilitation of the life-world transformation. Adult Education Quarterly, 39(1), 19-30.

Wilshire, B. (1982). Role playing and identity, the limits of theatre as metaphor. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.