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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.
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CHANGING PIECES: PIECING CHANGE
PART THREE
CHANGING PIECES: PIECING CHANGE

INTRODUCTION

In Parts One and Two, in the tradition of Escher's artwork, I reconstructed both the room holding and represented by the Mobile-framework. The conceptual tools for creating the Mobile were identified in the two Parts. The substance from which its pieces were made have been identified therein as well. Finally, the "Description Of The Data Analysis Framework" in Chapter Seven provided a preparatory synopsis of the Mobile.

The work entailed in creating all of these preparatory descriptions has resulted in transmutation of moonbeam and jar into a Mobile. This Mobile-framework has been fashioned to catch and reflect the moonbeam through suspended, moving pieces, of the jar. What still remains then is the unveiling of metamorphosis in representational form, this Mobile, "A Play In Five Acts: An Act In Five Plays".

This second representational form contrasts with the first, the narrative on fieldwork experiences in Part One. Analysis in Part One was brief. Questions framed descriptions of experience in the field. Those questions shaped four areas of discovery guided by a predominant theme, change.

The representational form in Part One, then, only began to recognize change as an emerging theme from work in the field. The narrative of Part One cannot answer: it only begins to pose the question placed in the Preface: "What alternative ways can we use to
explore experiences of change to promote cohesive discussion and reflection in adult education practices?"

The Mobile-framework constitutes one such attempt to both explore experiences of change and to design a manner of representation sensitive to epistemological consistency. It may best be considered as offering an episode of exploration which also affords a form for crystallizing new questions, concerns and action in our endeavor to develop a working epistemology of change.

Returning briefly to the four areas of discovery, I was engaged in the first two areas through considering content of the Mobile-framework. Much of the framework is dedicated to developing a description and explication of participants' social processes related to meaning, change and learning. The second area of discovery concerned with how "theatre experiences" may influence individuals' meanings of change has also been explored in developing the Mobile-framework. In addition, the third and fourth areas of discovery are manifest in the methodological work which influenced the shape as well as the content of the Mobile framework.

Finally, then, the Mobile-framework constitutes an analytic representation of the fieldwork experience which frames those experiences in terms of an explication of meaning and change. The working assumptions concerning social process and change outlined in Chapter Six provide the conceptual building blocks — experience and meaning in change related to modernity, tension of certainty, spheres of meaning, meaning-in-action (paradigmatic action), and anchors in entity and structure.
CHAPTER EIGHT

STAGE PRODUCTION

The Mobile-framework Presented

Ay, or any show that you'll show him. Be not you ashamed to show, he'll not shame to tell you what it means.
- Hamlet, III, ii (Check spacing)

The closest I could come to explaining what the stages are is sort of how it was something and then it was something else and then it was something else and then it ended up being what it was. Eil) N-27-p.19.

THE MOBILE-FRAMWORK —

A PLAY IN FIVE ACTS: AN ACT IN FIVE PLAYS

The Mobile-framework and the six "conceptual bars" were described at length in Chapter Seven. A visual image was provided in that Chapter which suspended each of the five Act-Plays directly from "General Context". The arrangement in this Chapter follows a more chronological, linear approach along the lines of this image:

GENERAL CONTEXT

| ANCHORED ANOMIE
| SUSTAINED UNCERTAINTY
| PLAY ACTING
| CONTINGENCY CONTROL
| PLAYED OUT

With the unveiling of the Mobile-framework, the "General Context" is revealed first, then each of the five Act-Plays as various "stages" or transitions in group members' meanings and interactions.¹

437
A. GENERAL CONTEXT:

The Main Bar

Yes, but I or we who are not from here, what can we say? Ann) J-11-19.
You can have a lovely personal story, but if you can't relate it to space and time it won't have a meaning for the audience. Cam) A-1-173.

And enterprises of great pitch and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry
And lose the name of action. - Hamlet, III, i, 86-88.

INTRODUCTION

This "main bar" is the Mobile "context". Used in this way "context" is a synthesis of that which has already emerged. Context establishes a starting point as a basis to make sense of meaning that emerges for those interacting.

In recreating participants' contexts the study focuses on their main reference points linked with the theatre project. These include "the community" in which the project took place and the theatre club which "authorized" the theatre project. Descriptions of participants' reference points were developed from data analysis which posits certain common elements in their experience prior to the project's beginning.

Derived from data analyses, the study describes those coming to the project as experiencing anomic conditions. It posits that these individuals experienced anomic conditions specifically related to the community. The study suggests that participants brought these experiences as individuals to the theatre project.
When they began the theatre project, given obvious diversity among themselves and a general lack of experience with theatre projects, individuals also experienced anomic conditions related to the theatre project. The study further postulates that individuals' experiences with anomic conditions at the outset shaped their interactions throughout the theatre project.

Participants articulated their experience of anomic conditions with respect to the theatre project process eventually. However, their descriptions of experience with the community did not directly express experience in terms of anomie. This section, "General Context", begins with that which was expressed and may be confirmed through other means with respect to participants' reference points. It then shifts in the middle subsections beginning with "Data Indicating Relational Starting Points For Participants" towards interpretation of data which suggests individuals' tacit experiences of anomic conditions in their relationship with "the" community.

This section is also roughly divided into two segments, "Emerged Patterns" and "Emerged-Emerging Cultural-Meaning" on another basis of participants' context. The first segment, "Emerged Patterns" mainly describes patterns of meaning which participants brought with them as individuals at the outset of the theatre project. The second segment, "Emerged-Emerging Cultural-Meaning" indicates transition of participants' meanings as they began to interact in the project.

As no contact was possible prior to the theatre project's creation, and as the study began after the first two meetings, much of
this must be reconstructed from data "after the fact". Reconstruction was accomplished through data analysis of participants' discussion in meetings and through interviews. The section commences with a reconstruction focused on what individuals brought with them when they began to participate in the project.²

EMERGED PATTERNS

Data analysis has located the theme of "change" as a locus within group members' interactions. This segment shifts pace to describe data which are less vulnerable to meaning change through subsequent action or reinterpretation.

Narrative descriptions in Chapters One and Three complement the summary descriptions of context which follow. Those Chapters conveyed my impressions on entering the field as participant observer. This Chapter approaches a description of a period prior to commencement of the study with a focus on group members' meanings concerning context.

TWO CONTEXTUAL REFERENCE POINTS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Data analysis in the field began with the assumption that the structure of the theatre project constituted the major reference point for participants. However, within the first two meetings, their comments indicated that the majority of participants retained three contextual reference points which shaped their actions: a) a sense of "the" community;³ b) a sense of the theatre club; and c) a sense of this particular theatre project. The latter, a sense of the project and the people involved changed throughout work on the project.
The main body of the study addresses this third "reference point". As a prelude, however, descriptions of the community and the theatre club will be provided. These descriptions were developed mainly from group members' sense of the community and the theatre club. Other resource materials were consulted. These included theatre club artifacts, and resource material concerning both the history and current descriptions (at the time) available concerning the town.

To preface forthcoming descriptions a cautionary note is in order. Several participants working within this project had had limited contact with the theatre club. A few were not familiar with the theatre club's brief history. Not everyone had precisely the same sense of the town. Nonetheless, the descriptions which follow should portray a sense of how the majority of participants, as individuals, viewed context within which the project had been developed.

a) Description Of Approximate Size, Location And Ethnicity Of Community

Participants were engaged in researching the history of the town. However, the "current" community was the context in which they undertook their activities. During informal discussions, group members stated that the size of the town bordered on being sufficient for city status. Reference materials produced by organizations in the town confirmed that Goetheim's population was under ten thousand.

In their discussions, participants made reference to the importance of the surrounding farming community. They indicated that the area was a relatively prosperous one with no prior history of crop
failure. The appearance of the town, with paved streets and brick buildings supported their statements.

Group members also referred in their discussions to "the community" being predominantly German Catholic. The proposal to obtain funding for the play reflects this perception:

The Goetheim Theatre Community Players propose to research, write and present a dramatic production depicting the cultural history of the Goetheim area. The emphasis would be on the German Catholic origins of this community and area. [See Appendices, Section One.]

A search for affirmation of group members' assumption concerning the German Catholic culture of the community was conducted. It was discovered that Statistics Canada did not provide materials outlining the ethnicity of this limited population base. No other documents surveyed divulged information about this. "Physical evidence" in the community was considered. Although there were other churches, there was a higher ratio of Catholic organizations in the vicinity including a large separate school.

Group members' discussion and research concerning the play indicated that signs of German culture had been quelled during the First and Second World Wars.

- You still have a cousin there. People could attack you. So it was more or less keep your mouth shut and you'll stay out of trouble. I don't think there was trouble or dissension between groups. This man was simply saying not to make any. Eil) The people that I got, [interviewed] that lived here, the German people, I'm sure they thought of their families back in Germany that were being pulverized... Jes) [Eileen continuing] This man reminded everybody that we are guests of the government of Canada. Through the generosity of the Immigration Department. As guests we would not be saying anything. Eil) A-24-592.
- They no longer called it sauerkraut. Jes) There was an article in the paper. Eil) They called it pickled cabbage. Jes) And they
just sort of sat around here and didn't get involved at all. Just kept on farming. Jim) A-24-596.

It is not surprising, then, that materials from the town library made no direct reference to the community's links with German ethnicity.

There were, however, indirect signs of past and present-day German heritage through the town's name, and names of facilities. In addition, a German Club was in the process of forming to allow members of the community to explore their cultural roots. Lenore had joined the German Club and described learning about the German language and customs.

Group members' discussions and research on the history of the town soon stretched beyond considering the size of the town, the wealth of the farmland, and the German Catholic ethnicity as "historical fact". Insofar as participants added to these foundational ideas of the community considerably, and a sense of the community commonly emerged through their discussion, these descriptions unfold in the next segment and in the Act-Plays. In addition to acting within a context of present-day community some participants were also influenced by considering the project as a "second" production of the theatre club. In this manner, the theatre club existed as a second context for participants' interactions at the outset of the theatre project.

b) Description Of The Theatre Club — A Brief History

Within the first few meetings I attended some participants referred to the theatre club, the Goetheim Community Theatre Players,
through a variety of links. The most urgent reference was to encourage more people from the club to come out immediately and to offer support through doing a number of different tasks. Some members also alluded to the club's first major production and its apparent success.

Initially, the relationship between the theatre club and this theatre project was a source of confusion. Not all those participating in this project had been active in the club. For example, Jay, Arthur, and Loretta had not involved themselves in the theatre club prior to the beginning of this project. Others who had been quite active in the previous production were not involved in this theatre project.

- And we've got actors in the club who you've [Madeleine] never met. And the reason you've never met them is because they're actors. And they weren't acting in this production so they wouldn't do anything else either. And I would suspect that when we cast the next one in the spring, um, people -- the same thing will happen. N-p.17.

Despite the confusion, several participants appeared to link their experience with the first major production and a smaller production in progress (a one act play for a children's organization). They brought these expectations with them as initial context for this production.

- We were actually thinking of it as being a three act prod -- play. And that, that was just hung over from, uh, our first production because it was the only play we'd ever done. And we thought plays had to be on always stages with sets type of thing. Eli) N-27-p.19.
Context From The Club's Creation:

In the interviews, several participants indicated that experience with the club's first production afforded their chief experience with theatre aside from high school experiences. A very brief history of the club is included in this segment to indicate what context over half of those engaged in this project brought with them as club members.

The history of the theatre club at the time of the first set of interviews was a recent memory, apparently too recent for written record. During these interviews I gathered pieces of description from several who had been with the club from its inception. There were five who mainly contributed to this summary, Jo, Jim, Joyce, Anna, and Eileen.

Their accounts consistently had Jo launching the club through her efforts to organize the first meeting in the fall of 1984:

- So we called a meeting and about seventeen people showed up and that were interested... In the paper — we put a deal a week before in the paper. And I think the Goetheim Shopper comes out every two weeks. And in Goetheim, here, you normally advertise through the church bulletins. They're the best way. Jo) 0-6-p.3.

Descriptions from a married couple attending, Joyce and Jim offer slight variations, yet demonstrate similar experiences of the first meeting:

- Jo comes around at work saying she'd like to get this thing together. And she's got a couple of her friends interested and she's going to put an ad in the paper. And I said, "Yeah, okay, I'll be there". And so I showed up. It was at her basement and there was probably ten or twelve people there. And it looked like this thing was probably going to go. So they decided that they would put on a play. Jim) 0-1-p.6.

- The first meeting I walked into a basement full of strange people. There were a few people there and it was sort of
unexpected that they were there. — Cause I didn't know other people are interested in such things. Actually there's only three to four people from that first meeting still involved, [laughs]. There were quite a few people from out of town. 

Some referred to this meeting as confusing:

- It was a very confusing meeting. They were talking about financing and just everything but the kitchen sink. Al) O-4-p.9.

Joyce's description suggested some tension among those who attended the meeting. There was apparently some disagreement with how to proceed initially:

- Jo was trying to get things organized as far as structure of the club. I remember a few people were upset. "Why are you talking about this — We should just pick a play and go for it. "Why are you worrying about all these other things? Let's just make a play." S-28-p.2.

Anna's reflections on the event also alludes to this tension concerning organization:

- ...About sixteen people... Oh yeah. We had to choose a director that night because that was the only way we were going to get started on that. Ann) A-1-p.15.
- Well I knew we couldn't just do a play. Because I knew I wanted to act and I didn't particularly want to do too much of anything else. I knew that possibly other people would be doing other jobs. Ann) A-1-p.16.

The first major production was begun with no formal organization other than the choice of a director. The director chosen was a high school teacher who had participated in organizing the first meeting.

One of Neil Simon's first plays, a popular three act comedy was selected and auditions were scheduled. However, the issue of structure arose again.

- Okay, we finally decided after a while ... after a few people decided, "We do need an executive". And we finally decided, "We
do need something, a set up, a little bit administrative anyway"... Because you can't expect the director to do everything. Jo) 0-6-p.5.

- So there were a few other meetings called. And at that point Eileen wasn't working. Eileen and Jessie had just moved into town then and their husbands' family that summer or something like that. And they had a little more free time. They weren't working. Well, Jessie was working part-time. Jo) 0-6-p.5.

The executive generated a document soon after this production, "Department Heads for Production and Responsibilities". [See Appendices, Section Three.] When receiving a copy of this document I was advised that it had circulated in response to "concerns raised during the first production". No specifics were given in this informal conversation. Vague references were made to some consternation among participants of the first production related to clarifying roles.

Other than organizing one or two workshops on lighting and makeup (a description of the latter is provided in Chapter One) the history of the theatre club blurs in discussion with club members. It blends with memories of the club's first production for those who participated in it.

Context From The Club's First And Second Productions:

There is some difficulty in providing a description of what context the first production afforded participants since they did not refer to that experience in meetings generally. Since this reconstruction of their context is reliant on statements made later in my presence, this offers only a few impressions of various contexts participants derived. On two "social occasions", during Eileen's chat
with Cam at my home in July, and then during cast parties, references were made to "the adventure" of the first production. Description of the experience had an air of storyteller, of regaling an audience.

The story told consistently focused on the events of the last evening of the production. A snow storm had immobilized the countryside and they had "lost" the lighting person and the director who had a small part in the play. The theme emerging from the story was the initial chaos experienced which was followed by their concerted, unified efforts to present the play. The group's unified endeavor produced a standing ovation from the audience and a thrilling, happy ending to their story.

This leads to a second impression suggested in an interview with one of the participants of both productions:

- The way the group becomes so cohesive. Everybody who's not involved, they appear so out of it that it's hard to deal with somebody outside the group after awhile. To start with the rehearsals are a little awkward cause nobody knew one another. You'd hardly talk to them and it was just sort of strange. But as you went on you became that character more, you even talked to other people as if you were those characters. It's very strange. Something I hadn't done before I guess. Joy) S-23-p.4.

Discernible, again, in this description is an initial stage of uncertainty followed by intense certainty. (The possible nature of intense certainty through group cohesion will be considered in the next segment and throughout the five Act-Plays.) The experience of the first production may have suggested a similar pattern of process was the "norm" for theatrical productions. Cam was to hint at that on more than one occasion affirming this context:

- Well to me, it's coming together as well as one can expect or plan these things. Cam) S-6-01.
Prior to leaving this "montage" of participants' context related to a history of the theatre club, there are two interesting highlights. The first is linked to the play chosen for the first production. I have not named the play, for reasons related to confidentiality. However, it is most important to note that the context of the play dealt with children rebelling from their parents' "traditional, old ways". This theme, with a slightly different inflection, eventually dominated the "play" created through this project. Data analysis suggests these choices were linked with participants' experience of anomic conditions in relation to the community.

A second note worthy of mention is that a small production sponsored by the club was rarely acknowledged. This was the case despite the fact that five of those participating in the theatre project were dedicating time to this second production for a children's organization. Evincing this is a quotation from the president of the theatre club at the time. In this statement she refers to the theatre project as the second production, ignoring the smaller production completely.

- And I was worried. About hurting the club, if we — if the production was bad. I mean, this is the second production we've ever done. Eil) N-27-p.12.

The five participants of that second smaller production brought their experiences with them as context, but they did so largely as individuals. No formal discussions, no sharing of insights took place within meetings for this theatre project. In that sense, even the brief "history" of the club was apparently disjunctive, a set of
intense and isolated experiences even for those who shared each experience.

Context For The "Heritage" Theatre Project:

In terms of reconstructing events from which the theatre project emerged, a few participants referred to a funding proposal in the first meetings I attended. Ostensibly, the project was initiated by two of the original club members. In February, 1985 they requested permission from club members to apply for a provincial heritage grant to create a play about the history of the community.

Several participants indicated a similar response to the suggestion of applying for a grant. Their reconstruction of the events suggested that they were happy with the notion of participants showing such initiative and did not wish to discourage such motivation. However, apparently several club members did not consider thoroughly the contents of the application at the time it was proposed. They did not believe funding was a possibility. (See Appendices, Section One for a copy of what was on file with the Club as the original application for funding.)

- Oh that was at a meeting. It came up that there was a grant available for Heritage Plays and it sounded like it was the only one available in the Province. So we said, "Sure apply for it. We'll never get it..." There it was. It seemed like a lot. I frankly thought it was beyond us. But..." Joy) S-23-p.l.

When participants later spoke of "the success" of receiving the grant, their tones were the same as those they used to describe the performance during the snow storm. These were tones of adventure against the odds. However, intermixed with this tonal quality were
description of coming to terms with the implication of being faced with an ambitious undertaking. They were now faced with writing and presenting a play immediately after the club had barely finished putting on "its" first production.

- And like Anna said, "I never thought we'd get it or I wouldn't have voted for it". She said, "I just went along". She said, "I'd have argued a lot, -- but, I just... it just never occurred to me we'd even get it. So she paid little or no attention to their proposal. N-p.19.

This, approximates the "birth" of the theatre project. The study assumes that club members considered the theatre project "real" when they received official acknowledgment in the spring of 1985 that funding had been granted to the club. It was at that point that individuals, beyond the two originators of the grant application became concretely involved in shaping the theatre project through their interactions.

Prior to proceeding with data analysis describing participants' interactions which began to shape the theatre project, it is most important to emphasize a distinction between the first and second reference points. A brief description of the theatre project which focuses on when people became involved will assist in illuminating a distinction.

The theatre project began with creation of the funding application in February 1985. It ended for the most part with the final performance on October 12, 1985. (The study extended until December 5, 1985 with completion of the final "formal" interview.) Most of the activity associated with the theatre project took place during some thirty meetings, from late May 1985 until the three
October performances. Over this period of time sixteen group members participated intensively. (This number does not include Cam as an "outside" director, nor myself as outside participant. Neither stagehands who attended only the dress rehearsals and the final performance, nor ushers have been included in this number.)

During the project there were considerable comings, and goings. When the words "participants" or "group members" are used it must be remembered that this is to describe a "floating" set of people. For example, of those who were with the project from beginning to end virtually no one attended every single meeting.

In addition, those who participated did not all begin together.

- The people that we have in the play right now — a lot of them didn't come to the regular meetings we had this summer. It was like that before. It just didn't seem like there were many of us. Jim) 0-1- p.11.

Three began approximately half way through the project. The stage manager joined roughly two thirds of the way through. One actor was asked to participate within the final two weeks of the project. Two people who began with the project were no longer directly involved by the end.

As indicated previously, some had not been involved with the theatre club prior to this project. Several participants may never have had any direct contact with the original grant application and very little sense of the theatre club. Context of the theatre club for these people would have had an indirect influence on them at most, through their interactions with participants who had been influenced by context with the theatre club.
In contrast, the first reference point, "the community" was context for all participants no matter when and how they became part of the theatre project. Although some had limited involvement with the theatre club and the funding application, all participants brought with them among other experiences and meanings a sense of their relationship with the community, initial senses of relationships among themselves and to "theatre" generally.

DATA INDICATING RELATIONAL STARTING POINTS FOR PARTICIPANTS

Descriptions of participants' contexts concerning the community and the theatre club were general in the first segment. These descriptions did not entirely locate participants as individuals within "the picture". This segment is intended to convey starting points of meaning which participants held prior to meanings emerging from their theatre project interactions.

At the heart of the study is an endeavor to understand participants' sense of their relationship to "the community", to themselves as participants in the project and to "theatre". Their actions and changing responses in construction of this project bring these three elements of their meaning together. In particular this segment focuses on experiences and meanings of relationships which individuals brought with them to the first meetings of the project.

Once more, given the need to approach this as a reconstruction, there is admittedly some difficulty in separating out meanings they held before they began to focus specifically on the theatre project. This also includes, therefore, their initial actions related to the
project. Much of these data derives from both the first set of interviews with each of the group members and data from meetings of a "reconstructive" nature. Key to this reconstruction was demographic data collected.

**Demographic Data**

Primarily through the interviews, a series of demographic data was collected. Data included individuals' age, marital status, occupation, and ethnicity. More specifically concerned with possible relationships to the community, birthplaces were identified. Those not born in the town were asked how they came to the community, their occupation, their family. In addition, participants were encouraged to talk of their hobbies and activities, a very few of which connected them to other organizations in the town.

Conversations during interviews also included what interest and experience individuals had with theatre or drama. As a part of that discourse, individuals described how and whether they had become involved in the theatre club and then specifically with this Heritage Project. (See the Appendices, Section Three, "Casts Of Characters" for brief descriptions of individuals including listings of demographic data for each person.)

The demographic data indicated two distinct patterns concerning participants' ties with the community. The majority of participants were not from the community. That is, eleven of the sixteen core
participants came from other communities. In the "group" of five who had been born and raised in Goetheim four had left for a substantial period of time before returning.

Fourteen of the sixteen participants had also lived in at least two other places. The majority of participants had only moved to the community (or returned to it) within the last three years. (See Appendices, Section Three, "Casts Of Characters").

- Since I've been living back here I'm seeing it from different eyes. Eil) A-8-p.5.

Despite being among those who had lived longest in Goetheim, in the process of researching the play, one of the participants who had moved to Goetheim eight years before still expressed discomfort with her role in the project and a sense of distance from the community:


When asked, the majority of those interviewed did identify a religion either Catholic or United, but then declared that they were non-practicing or added such words as "United Church, I guess". Only one of those who participated throughout the entire project stated that she was Catholic and practicing her faith. Two other participants joining the project after the halfway mark were practicing their faith, one being with the Catholic church, the other with the United Church.

Participants then, were not "from the area", nor did many have the same cultural background as "the community". In fact, there was
tremendous diversity even among participants with differences in ethnicity, age, occupation, and educational, background. For example, there were two high school students, a veterinarian, a homemaker, a teacher in the public school system and a teacher's aide in the Catholic school system, a nurse and two agricultural engineers.

Other than two familial relationships and three people who knew each other from work, there were not many long term established relationships among these people. Joyce's description of the group which attended the meeting to initiate the club was an apt description as well of project participants:

- This was a whole completely different group of people with completely diverse backgrounds. Like you name it. They were there. Joy) S-23-p.4.

However, these were not for the most part the same group as Joyce reveals in her description of the club's first meeting:

- Actually there's only three to four people from that first meeting still involved, [laughs]. There were quite a few people from out of town. Joy) S-28-p.2.

This was at least in large part a new set of "different" people.

To determine whether, at the outset of the project individuals brought any points of commonality with them I reviewed demographic data they had offered. A survey of this data revealed that many participants listed a variety of interests during the interviews. They appeared to be highly active people with diverse sets of interests. However, in pursuit of these various hobbies participants indicated they had not previously crossed paths with each other.

- I probably wouldn't have met these people... I didn't know them at all. Ann) A-1-p.18.
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And with this drama business, ever since I started this, like there wasn't anybody, other than Della, that I knew before and I've made some really good friends since then that I would never probably meet in ordinary life — like what I was doing before.

The interview data also divulged that even past experience with "theatre" was not a common thread for participants. Many had little or no prior experience with any formal theatre beyond school experiences. Their inexperience with theatre was, if anything, an odd sort of common ground.

... [From this project I learned] quite a bit of theatre stuff as a matter of fact. Because I didn't know anything about it at all. Eel) N-27-p.14.

The overall objective? We're so young, I don't think we have one. Madeleine, we've only done one play. Eel) A-8-p.18.

We just don't have that expertise. Jim) A-18-540.

In consideration of data, a most striking form of "common ground" among participants emerged. Common ground among individuals joining the project arose specifically from being "transplants" to Goetheim. Through collection of demographic data and ongoing statements from participants, it became apparent that a majority of those who joined the project initially brought with them a sense of distinction between themselves as individuals and "the community".

Participants' Distinctions Between Themselves And The Community

Description of "the community" in the first segment was general, excluding participants' sense of relationship to "the" community from the picture. Based on data analysis, the Mobile-framework assumes that each participant came to the theatre project with a consistently held view of his or her relationship with "the community".
As described in the introductory segment, the study has come to rely on the assumption that at the outset of the project virtually all of the participants brought with them a sense of being outsiders to a conservative, homogeneous community and thereby they experienced anomic conditions. Given that the number and kinds of links with the community varied with each individual, participants held this meaning of their relationship to the community in differing intensities. This subsection explores in more detail data which led to assumptions about participants' sense of the community as individuals.

Despite coming together to create a play about the history of the community, most were not from the community. They were reminded strongly of this in the process of researching and creating the play:

- Yes, but I or we who are not from here, what can we say?

Although data upon which the study relies is from individuals already engaged in the process, the data suggests that these are impressions individuals had held for some time.

In addition to describing Goetheim as a wealthy farming community, participants attributed certain other conditions in the community to this wealth. Several participants suggested that children did not tend to leave the community as in other farming communities for there were sufficient funds to purchase additional farmlands or to set them up in town businesses.

Some participants accounted in this way for their perception of the town and area as a relatively homogeneous German Catholic
community. The study did not entertain resources to confirm this perception. Most significant for the purposes of the study was participants' sense of the homogeneity of the community and a sense of being outsiders to that homogeneity.

Based on data collected from informal discussions among participants they experienced this homogeneity as resulting in a limited tolerance for non-German Catholic people and change generally.

- I've never been more minoritized than in this town... This town scares me sometimes. S-6-1031.

Discussions concerning issues of intolerance took place on at least two separate occasions. Both of these occasions occurred within informal settings. Given this setting, data collected was limited.

One participant in particular spoke of job discrimination. She stated that she had found it difficult to obtain a job because she was not Catholic. The same participant referred to an experience with one set of neighbours. When first moving into the neighbourhood she described having a relatively friendly relationship with her neighbours. She then described one day when she had indicated in passing during an "over the backyard fence" chat with them that she was not Catholic and that was why she had not been attending their church. Thereafter, she stated they literally never spoke to her again.

- ... your neighbours won't talk to you? Because I'm not Catholic. Participant) Period? Mad) Period. Participant) S-6-1028.

(Additional data concerning these two discussions are provided in chronological fashion in remaining pieces of the Mobile-framework.)

Other participants while not providing such graphic incidents spoke
of feeling like outsiders, feeling awkward and ill at ease about their
to behavior, feeling restricted.

- I'm so glad you said that. You were a member of the Catholic
  church right? So we can just wait for you to say those things we

During these informal discussions participants suggested that the
community had little to offer them.

At formal meetings participants spoke several times of the few
activities available in the community. Many indicated that community
activities were limited mainly to a few organized sports:

- This town is really heavy on hockey and baseball. A-27-p.28.
- But it's, it's a real, um it's a real sports town. Like the
  sports facility is always used, whereas the theatre is often
  not... It's just nice to have something... a little cultural
  [laughing a little]. N-27-p.4.

In addition, some described frustration with limited community support
for new initiatives, for innovation, or simply any activities:

- It sounded like something the town needed and I wanted to see it
  get going. The only way to get it going was to get involved in
  it because no one else seemed to be. O-1-p.3.
- That's why I wanted to do the phoning thing. Boy, that's
  Goetheim for you. Someone coming from Saskatoon [participant
  observer] and you can't get four people from Goetheim.
  J-11-64.
- And the other part was that this town notoriously doesn't attend
  functions. [Pause] Now, I mean. A hundred and sixty or two
  hundred people do. Consistently. But that's about it. It
  doesn't really matter what "sport" you're talking about. They
  just don't attend. And uh, it's really hard to get over that,
  that sort of limit. O-1-p.3.
- Our first play was a success as far as Goetheim goes.
  A-27-p.28.
- There's not too much of that sort of thing in town. There's a
  few people, the people that are in the club now... that have
  wanted it for a long time, but, have just sort of finally gotten

These views of the community were held by many members of the
group prior to joining the project. As such, participants held these
views individually. It was not until later through expressing and
sharing this sense of the community that they held them in common
through articulation.

There are several indications in discussions after the outset
of the project that individuals had experienced the community as
repressive, disapproving of various forms of expressivity. This was
discussed in terms of the history of the area by the participants who
had been raised in the community:

- Did anything turn this town on its heels? Cam) I don't think the
town... The church wouldn't let it happen.
There was some laughter, some silence.] Participant) [Paraphrased
from participant observation notes.] J-11-32a.
- You didn't find out things directly because of pride. J-11-29.
- We all sensed something was happening... J-11-33.

A later discussion transposed this perception to modern day life
in the area.

- We were talking and joking, "What has ever happened in Goetheim?
Nothing. We wouldn't allow it to happen here." [The participant,
apparently forgetting the original statement substitutes "we" for
"the Church". There's a certain truth to that — a lot of truth
to that. And part of the reason, part of the way nothing is
allowed to happen here is just by, "Shut up. Don't you ever show
the closets, the skeletons." A-24-605.
- What was good about it? I guess maybe being away from Goetheim...
I wanted to meet new people... One of the fun things for me is
just exploring. S-13-p.5. [This person was reflecting on what was
good about going away to school for a year.]

Interestingly, indications of individuals' sense of "the
community's disapproval" had been expressed prior to the project
within theatre club activities in terms of past choices of plays:

- I was going to do a play about homosexuals in Catholic Goetheim
[laughing]. I mean, it wasn't a play about homosexuals. He just
happened to be gay.... Nothing happened with it. Umm. They
[pause] a few people, worried that I might even be serious. You
know, oh no. They just had fits. The whole group just had fits.
This meaning of community as audience was to shape drastically participants' interactions related to contents of the play as disclosed in the five Act-Plays.

**Interests Participants Expressed Related To Involvement In The Project**

In terms of what sense of relationship with the community, participants brought at the outset of the project, much of these data came from interviews. In particular this data emerged in participants' description of why they had become involved in the theatre club or this particular project.

- Because for isolation, the only other two worse places would be the Antartic or the Sahara. S-13-p.29.
- It's just experience and its just something for an outlet. Otherwise I would have nothing. You say "outlet", what do you mean by that? Mad) My energy, just -- whew ... Because when after I do that scene with Jessie, I'm exhausted every time, almost every time. It's the only thing I focus full energy on. Like I never focus full energy on work at home because after eight years it just loses its appeal. And even when I work at the restaurant I don't do that because I can't see reasons for it. S-13-p.32.
- There's not much of that sort of thing in town [cultural events]. There's a few people, the people that are in the club now... that have wanted it for a long time, but, have just sort of finally gotten it together. But there are those in the community that really want to, and really enjoy that sort of thing. And those that enjoy doing it too. N-27-p.4.

Emerging from data analysis it appears that individuals brought with them to the project at least two desires related to their sense of relationship with the community. The first articulated was a desire to express oneself through exploration. Most often this was described in terms of the opportunity to "be someone else" by acting in various roles.
While several participants used a similar expression, quotations which follow are from a single participant. This series, while lengthy, epitomizes a number of different elements and relationships expressed by others:

- I just like to perform in front of people. I like that aspect of it. I don't know if its really — if a guy likes to pretend he's someone else, but trying to fit yourself so that you're someone else. Something like that. Deep, eh? [Laughs]. A-1-p.3.
- You don't notice at the time. At the time you're doing it — you are someone else. — If you are really into it. You know when you're not and then its not good. But after you look at yourself and you can just feel it and you know that you've been someone else and that you've convinced people. S-13-p.3.
- ... My father's always someone else. Participant) What's attractive about being somebody else? Mad) Well, when you live in Goetheim, I guess... When you try... I don't know. — It's hard to explain what's attractive about being someone else. Hmm. It may come to me. I've never really realized — analyzed it before... I just can't get a handle on it. It's just more natural, spontaneous. Participant) S-13-p.28.

Even the participant's expression of the tacit nature of valuing the desire to "be someone else" and the struggle to answer in the interview reflects similar experience with other participants.

Based on consideration of data both from observing participants' later interactions, and from interviews with them I have come to assume that participants found it oddly enough, a form of self-expression to "be somebody else". It was viewed as an act of exploration. By doing so they would be afforded an opportunity to explore actions and meanings they would not otherwise risk exploring particularly given their sense of relationship with this community.

In addition to the opportunity to "be someone else", participants also indicated that they became initially involved with the club or
this project with the expectation of experiencing cohesiveness of a group. In other words, some individuals brought with them an expectation of finding a sense of community which the larger community did not offer them.

Those who brought this expectation with them appeared to do so having experienced this while involved in the first production of the club. Once more, because lengthy quotations indicate a number of elements involved, only two participants' descriptions are included.

- This was a whole completely different group of people with completely diverse backgrounds. Like you name it. They were there. And you got — then you found you had a lot in common with them and you had a lot of fun together. That part of it was probably the biggest thing I got out of it. The way the group becomes so cohesive. Everybody who's not involved, they appear so out of it that it's hard to deal with somebody outside the group after awhile. To start with the rehearsals are a little awkward cause nobody knew one another. You'd hardly talk to them and it was just sort of strange. But as you went on you became that character more, you even talked to other people as if you were those characters. It's very strange. Something I hadn't done before I guess. S-23-p.4.

- Well, you get to find out — even just rehearsing. You learn to know how far you trust them — or if you can trust them. Or how loyal they're going to be. Like, say, if anything would happen, if you would blow a line — would they jump right in to cover up for you or would they let you stand there and get embarrassed. And you can after being with them for a while you can kind of feel this out. And with this drama business, ever since I started this, like there wasn't anybody, other than Della, that I knew before and I've made some really good friends since then that I would never probably meet in ordinary life — like what I was doing before. S-6-p.10.

- And when it was over we were all so happy and thinking "God, now its over we don't have to worry for a long time. And then someone mentioned putting on a spring production and I thought, "Oh my God, there's no way!" Then we were told, "You don't have to be involved in every production, but dammit, there was no way they were going to put on a production without me. No matter how burnt out I was, I was still going to be there. S-6-p.13-14.

These two interests which participants expressed as bringing with them in their initial involvement with the project, the desire to "be
someone else" and a desire for intense experience with a cohesive group, suggested a desire to act. Many individuals expressed the belief that virtually all those attending wished to participate as actors. This was often suggested by participants through indirect means. For example, one participant, Anna expressed this belief by offering to take on other jobs because she had "had her shot". That is, she had already had a major role in the first production and ought to shoulder responsibility for less desirable tasks such as promotional work.

This assumption appears to have been a holdover for some from the first meeting of the club. At that meeting most of those present apparently indicated that they did wish to take on an acting role:

- Everybody wanted to act. But they said no one was going to drop out just because they don't happen to get a role [laughs] the first time around. Ann) A-1-p.16.

In spite of this assumption held by several participants, within a few meetings it became apparent that some did not wish to act in the production. In addition, even among those who wished to act, they did not appear to hold a common set of priorities in their actions. Knowing that few individuals brought extensive theatre experience with them at the beginning of the project, it was important to discover what meanings, what priorities they did bring initially to their actions.

Participants' Orientations In Activity

When I first entered the field, within a few meetings it became readily apparent that participants did not have a "static culture".
They did not all hold precisely the same sense of direction for the project. To understand what meaning they were making, I began to watch for "signs of subgroups". This was at a time when I was still focused on searching for "the structure" of "the group". Although many participants apparently did wish to act, this was difficult to express because there were no scripts. People were uncertain of how acting "roles" would be obtained.

When searching for subgroups, data analysis posed an alternate framework for considering what meanings individuals brought to the project in terms of two reference points, "community" and "theatre". Through participant observation and interviews emerged four "orientations" which participants brought initially to their interactions in the project. At least two of these are suggested in one participant's description of the club's first meeting:

- There was quite a wide variety in what people wanted to do. I guess a lot of people wanted to act but there was a lot of — people like Jo who had no desire to act whatsoever. And Al had no desire. But that was probably the motivation for a lot of people. Some people just want to see drama. (Joy) S-23-p.3.

Descriptions of the subgroups or four "orientations" developed from participant observation and interviews were based upon each individuals' presented view of self in relationship to the "group", the project, or contexts associated with theatre. Their orientation appears to shape at the very least individuals' ideas of purpose, and thereby their actions in relation to the theatre project.

Participants' four orientations emerging from fieldwork data analysis were as follows: a)Organizational Developers (including a
public relations — P.R. Person); b) Socially-Motivated Persons; c) Serious Actors; and d) Pranksters. As emerging from data analysis, descriptions of individuals' orientations when becoming involved in the theatre project have been summarized.

Organizational Developers:

Individuals who brought this orientation to their activities tended to associate "theatre" with several concepts including community, need, culture and fun. These individuals also apparently highly valued creativity while assuming they were not creatively "gifted".

They described activities in terms of community development and group development. Their awareness of learning appeared to emerge in this context. In contrast to other individuals, organizers appeared to be more independent learners seeking information from a wide variety of sources including written resource material. These individuals tended to recognize and explore assumptions more than other participants except those with "prankster" orientations. Those with this orientation also seemed to have a relatively high level of confidence.

- It sounded like something the town needed and I wanted to see it get going. The only way to get it going was to get involved in it because no one else seemed to be. 0-1-p.3.
- But I wasn't too keen on acting. But I tried anyway. And I was quite relieved when I didn't get the part. So I thought, "I'll work backstage. I'll learn how to make the theatre work." 0-1-p.7.
- A lot of people have told me I'm a good organizer and so efficient. I know what areas I'm good at and that's researching out or digging out or trying to find people or find songs or something like that. So I figured I'd be more beneficial there
than worrying about lines. They can get miserable for everybody else. S-28-p.6.
- I want the information and resources that other people have. I want to be able to share our experience and resources... But I want us to be involved in the whole drama, arts culture of Saskatchewan. A-27-p.28.
- Uh... there's a word for it. Somebody who's there to provide optimism and encouragement... When everybody else is getting down in the group and getting ready to give up, I'll just go over and sort of nudge them. And keep them interested and keep 'em going. Jim) O-1-p.25.

Although it is difficult to determine from the data, it would appear that those with this orientation tended to act with long term goals in mind. However, their long term commitment was not necessarily to this organization. Organizational developers seemed generally "less intense", more low-key than most of the individuals participating. They all had a strong sense of humor.

Within a set of individuals with similar orientations, there was one person whose orientation had an additionally strong concern with public relations or "P.R."

- What would you like to do for the — Mad) P.R. person. Recruiting officer... Uh, I'd like to do, a lot, a lot of, uh, organizing. Some workshops maybe. And get some, I, I'd really like to get a big workshop into St. Luke's some time. Some year. It's a perfect place for that kind of thing. I think I'd like to probably promote the whole concept of, of teaching a little bit... and that kind of thing where it could spread out into the community a little bit more. That kind of stuff I'd like to do. N-27-p.16.
- I'm a business person. I'd like to do the business with drama, not the acting.

This individual had as high a level of concern for administrative order as other organizational developers. However, this concern with administrative order was invaded occasionally by intense concern with a need for intimacy and high regard from other participants.
In contrast with other individuals' oriented towards organizational development, this individual was extremely intense.

- And keeping in mind I get so involved in this project, trying to keep in mind it's a hobby for some people... Nothing's a hobby for me. A job, or recreation, or a sport. I pursue it all with the same intensity. I'll give as much to the play as I'll give to John at my job on Monday. N-27-p.25.

One of this individual's prime concerns was to maintain appearances of good will within the group and between the group and the community. The individual appeared to excel at recognizing opportunities for the theatre club to make bridges with the community.

This individual's long term commitment was to community development. The person was highly committed in the short run to the theatre club. However, the participant was also extremely active in other organizations, so that the commitment to this one could abruptly end at the end of any project.

In early stages of the project this person was to have a major impact on participants' interactions, particularly as a morale booster. This effect waned when the script was created and after several revisions were made to it. This individual appeared to be searching for a "strong leadership style" in the context of a tense and shifting "collective".

Socially Motivated Persons:

Individuals whose statements suggested this as their primary orientation tended to associate theatre with a number of diverse concepts. However, most clearly they identify their presence with the theatre project as socially motivated. They expressed a desire to
have fun in meeting people while doing things together or being with people and being recognized. At least one person spoke in contrast with the organizational orientation.

- Well it just seemed over organized to me. I don't know. — I just don't like over-organized things. It gets to be you go to these meetings and people are arguing over something that's really minor... Bil) S-27-p.3.

Almost all individuals oriented in this fashion described themselves as taking on activities because of boredom or having limited connections with people. Theatre was simply one avenue of activity pursued. When providing both "social profile" and "group intimacy", theatre activity may have offered especially attractive opportunities for those socially motivated.

During the interviews it appeared that there were two slightly different affinities for those who acted from this orientation. For example, one person was primarily focused on "the social" in terms of an ability to entertain. This person had been used to a large city with a large network of friends. Acting provided this particular individual with a "high profile" to make connections quickly.

- I really don't know what it is... I like getting up on the stage and the applause and everything. But I think I said it before when I said it was a social thing. It was a good way to meet people. And it's really worked out good that way. S-27-p.4.
- I had more fun doing that and I met more people doing that. I lived there the year before, this was my second year there and I was in this plays and people were saying "well who is this person? ...And after that I just had people stopping me on the street and everything it was — whew! Yeah, it was fun. S-27-p.1. [The participant is describing a first experience with theatre in another small community.]

This individual cultivated a "raconteur" image, frequently telling stories to amuse people and to build morale within the group.
The stories were rich with dialogue and or had a monologue structure. Both the content of the stories and the manner in which the stories were told indicated a keen sense of ritual. In the interviews, the participant's learning style appeared to be that of an experiential, inductive approach — learning by doing. All participants indicated considerable tendency towards this as a learning style.

A second subgroup orientation emerged from interviews which consisted of several people. This set of individuals focused on "the social" in terms of "things to do". Part of the value system these individuals brought with them was "keeping busy" in a social, creative milieu. When asked in the interview about their hobbies, these individuals had very long lists.

- I had wanted to act and I had thought even of painting. I paint. Did I mention that? Well, I took a couple of painting classes and I always loved art. 0-4-p.8.

Individuals with this orientation appeared to be less intense about their concerns and their interactions in meetings generally. However, their statements in interviews suggested that they expressed considerably more concern privately than they expressed in "public", that is, discussions in large groups. Concerning their confidence, it seemed to depend on how much experience they had with the subject or the situation. When these individuals worked on things with which they had considerable experience they were independent. More frequently, however, at least in the instance of this project, they expressed a need for clear guidance, structure in which to learn.

Interestingly, both "sets" of individuals with a "social orientation" tended to devalue their own work by labelling it as a
hobby or craft. They did associate "theatre", however, with two levels: "entertainment" (a hobby) and high art. These individuals placed a high value on "art" and the special people associated with "art". There was some tension for these individuals as observed in their interactions. While experiencing a desire for social recognition, lack of confidence dissuaded them from aspiring to that which they highly valued being a "serious actor". Several became close friends during the project with "the serious actors".

**Serious Actors**

These were individuals who had slightly more experience with theatre, but who had reflected considerably on various forms of theatre activities. Very quickly they were also acknowledged and valued by other participants for their talent. Individuals expressing themselves in terms of this orientation associated theatre with culture and placed a high value on its existence in society. "Serious" individuals viewed themselves as extremely creative and valued others' creativity in any form.

- I love to act even if its a small part. S-13-p.23.
- The more characters I can play the more I guess I like it. You have to learn something with each new character you're trying to portray. S-13-p.7.
- I wanted to be an actress since I was nine or ten. Participant) What was important about it? Mad) I liked to be the centre of attention... I was pretty sure — I could see myself on stage accepting the Oscar. Participant) A-1-p.2.
- It's not easy to come up with ideas spontaneously but its also true that its not easy to lay yourself open in front of the rest of the group. I know that some of us have a harder time than others of us with that. For me, I found myself, remarkably
comfortable once I got into it, "being there", and being up and doing that kind of thing. N-28-p.1.
- It's my ability to create, I guess... that's what I'm showing to other people... That this is something special that I can be and not everybody can be. It sounds awful... It's just a, its just a personal little things. But when you say it out loud [laughs]. But I think that's a part of it anyway. N-28-p.3.

Of all other participants, individuals with this orientation appeared to have a belief system associated with theatre. Their various belief systems consistently bore a profound quality. This profound quality was frequently revealed through individuals' expressing their own aspirations concerning theatre:

- That and my philosophy is "If you have a chance at something — even if its a dream — just go for it, cause the way I figure it you got nothing to lose. S-13-p.3.
- I'm afraid they try and break it down into scientific methodical steps [drama schools] and I just don't... I hate that. I think my philosophy's a good one. Jay) S-13-p.26.

Their belief system related to theatre was manifested in their descriptions of having "heroes" or role models in theatre.

- A movie star didn't have... I wanted to be a "Bernhardt" [Sarah]. A-1-p.7.

It was also expressed in a focus on "craft of acting". Individuals with this orientation often referred to what "professional actors" would do. After the fact, these individuals were "keepers of theatrical mistakes". They would exhibit concentration on use of appropriate terms. They acknowledged a single desire to act rather than to do other tasks. Learning was decidedly filtered through these "intensive" lenses.

Even among those oriented towards the "serious" stage, there were differences in preferences. One participant, for example, was most
interested in more traditional constructions of theatre, theatre with a script and a director. Another aspired to be a stand-up comic and expressed preference for improvisational approaches to theatre activities.

These individuals seemed most oriented towards images — creating settings, people, and situations in rich detail. However, a keen sense of timing and a kinesthetic sense were also required for miming. Much of the interview time was spent in the subjunctive with individuals oriented in this manner. Creation of "fantasies" appeared to be a significant part of their social interactions. They had a tremendous ability to construct and reconstruct connections quickly. This was of great assistance to them both in improvisations and in determining new meanings for a situation:

- It makes sense. The producer produces. In a professional production you're not arguing for your opinion, any more than you're up there saying, "I think you're left arm should be..." A-14-431.

Prankster

There were fewer participants beginning to interact from this orientation. Nonetheless this orientation emerged as a strong one. Awareness of such an orientation emerged when I began to recognize a pattern in interviews.

When I asked about theatre these people responded repeatedly with stories of pranks or skits with critique in them. In other words, they were oriented towards satirical humour. Those who are described as pranksters associated theatre with culture. However, in heavy
competition with a "highly valued notion" of theatre as culture was theatre as "fun". That is, theatre as entertainment with a strong element of "devilry", pranks, mischievousness. Those who linked theatre with pranks did so through past connections with their family.

- I guess I am a little bit crazy... Wacky, crazy. You know what I mean — not half a brick short of a load. ... Full of the devil... I guess, my mother was always full of pranks. That kind of thing and I guess because I always admired my mother so much and felt she gave so much enjoyment to so many people that I would tend to want to copy her. Like she was the one who started making cardboard birthday cakes. She stitched up the shorts of the guest. S-6-p.7.

- I do remember my other sister being cast as a witch in one play. And she was disappointed in the part. So Mom was telling her how this could really make or break the play... The cackling and stuff had to be done very well. So she practiced all the time. She used to hide in the basement and practice her witch cackles and I used to be terrified [Laughing]. Joy) Practicing on you? Mad) Whomever. I was probably the most susceptible being the right age... S-23-p.1-2.

As previously indicated they also linked theatre with skits. These skits apparently were intended to have a punch-line with a critique:

- In the College they have a — their awards night. Annually each class puts on a skit. I don't know why at Awards Night. But everybody gets their scholarships and the rest of us get to do skits. And each class puts one on. And uh, I got stuck the first year organizing it for some reason. Cause nobody else would probably. And so it's probably something that's bugging you or something humorous is happening at the College or a series of little things... [Laughing] And every year from then on I got stuck with it... I guess I can tell people where to go and what classes.

- We mostly, uh, we were very sarcastic and hit below the belt a lot [Laughing].

- Just our subtle little hint about that item. I guess, everything that bugged us about what was going on in the college, I guess.

- People just got... a lot of times they were just strictly for humour, and uh an out — a way to let out some of your frustrations with things that were happening. A lot of the profs would come up and talk to you afterwards. "Yeah that was a good point you guys made about that." S-p.1-2.
These individuals valued "acceptable craziness" as a form of being special. Although this may have limited connection, "pranksters" came from large families (of over eight) and were among the younger children. They described their families as tending to promote the idea of being "busy" and the importance of "doing something". In this way they appeared to have a link with those of a "socially-motivated" orientation.

Individuals with a prankster orientation, when describing people or situations frequently demonstrated keen awareness of levels of power. The scope of their activities was aimed at a broader range than "serious" participants. They were interested and willing to do other tasks in addition to acting. These people consistently referred to seeking out intimacy of "dramatic" groups enjoying "seeing drama put on".

Conversations with pranksters often seemed to have a "conspiratorial" quality. Those who had a prankster orientation had some skill at critique and evaluation. This appeared to constitute a substantial amount of their social activity. Emphasis in a process of learning for individuals with this orientation appeared to be related to discovering "what was wrong" and then determining various methods of drawing attention to the problem "to fix it".

Related to these individuals' interest in critique was a tension. This tension lay between their association with the fun of a prank and the possibility of being "publicly" embarrassed themselves.
Reflections On The Implications Of Individuals' Orientations

One of the implications of each orientation is that they bring a focus to activities for individuals. Based on the theoretical framework developed in data analysis, this focus for individuals suggested a direction for action towards certainty and away from uncertainty. For those concerned with organization, action towards developing group structure in combination with developing sense of group appeared to provide some sense of certainty.

Those with orientations towards socializing expressed concern about certainty of all kinds. These individuals apparently attained some sense of certainty through action towards obtaining personal recognition and experiencing a sense of group.

Those with a "serious" orientation towards the idea of theatre apparently quested after a specific form of certainty. Their certainty came both from key criteria for their own sense of excellence in performance and from the immediacy of audience reaction — whoever was being defined as audience at a particular time.

Finally, pranksters expressed concerns of all kinds. For example, they appeared to be attuned to both inconsistencies in interactions and discontent among participants. Their orientation led them to seek certainty in several ways. These depended on the individual's sense of security or certainty concerning "the group" itself, and his or her place in it.

During the project there were also implications which resulted from differences of orientation among participants related to searches
for certainty. Before introducing examples of these differences, there is an important point. Development of "subgroup orientation" descriptions provided an analytical tool to understand different starting points for individuals. It was another method by which I strove to understand what individuals brought with them in terms of meanings and constructs which guided their initial actions.

Not everyone fitted within these descriptions. This is reflected by the number of "sub-subgroupings". Participants all carried elements of more than one orientation. For example, by the end of the theatre project there was indication that each participant had "always" nourished an element of "prankster" within themselves. Stories of individuals’ pranks prior to the project emerged from many quarters.

The orientations described, then, were intended to indicate initial proclivities in individuals' actions. One might derive benefit from this analytic tool when considering those situations where difference in orientation might cause some tension arising from individuals' first interactions in the project.

This is exemplified in the beginnings of the theatre club wherein some felt very strongly that an organizational structure ought to be developed. Others with a different focus for their activities felt quite the opposite:

- Here it was way more organized. You know they've got the constitution from P.A. Players and everything and really formed a group. I questioned whether they really needed to do that... Well it just seemed over-organized things. It gets to be you go these meetings and people are arguing over something that's really minor. S-27-p.3.
Jo was trying to get things organized as far as structure of the club. I remember a few people were upset. "Why are you talking about this — We should just pick a play and go for it. "Why are you worrying about all these other things? Let's just make a play." S-28-p.2.

Eventually this tension was to have a painful impact particularly on one individual with the "P.R." orientation:

- You're alone. [Pause] Like — actors have each other. There's always at least — you can always find at least one other person, back there in the dressing room to sound off with. In a group as small as ours, when you try to take the load off your actors, then you have to carry it all yourself because there is nobody else to do it, you know. And if you put the load on the actors... um, they [pause] feel like your putting the load on the actors, cause what they want to do is act. N-27-p.17.

Contemplation of tensions arising out of participants' initial interactions leads into the final segment of the "General Context" section. The first focus of this section was on a reconstruction of what context, meanings individuals brought with them to the beginning of the project. However, consideration of data has shifted with these last segments to individuals' first interactions both shaping their sense of "the project" and in response, reshaping the project.

EMERGED—EMERGING CULTURAL MEANING

This final segment of the "General Context" forms a cord to the first Act-Play. The segment twines together meanings individuals brought to the project with a reconstruction of their initial responses to working on the project. In particular, it focuses on their meanings and actions emerging immediately prior to and continuing to emerge when the study commenced.
The introductory passage of this section alluded to individuals' experience with anomic conditions. The intermediate segments have mapped out data which led the study to suggest that participants brought a sense of anomic conditions with them to the project. This segment continues to build on that description based on individuals' initial experience with the project.

Individuals, Community, And Experiences Of Anomie

The study has posited that individuals' experience of the community as homogeneous and conservative prompted their sense of anomic conditions. Anomie is generally associated with social upheaval. Berger and Luckmann (1966) refer more specifically to implications arising from drastic change in social structure. In this instance, however, the community was not perceived as changing. This warrants additional explication.

As indicated previously, eleven of the sixteen participants were not from Goetheim. Fourteen had lived in several other places. Participants, not recognizing this at first, in part because they did not know initially who would be in the group, indicated their emerging awareness in later interviews.

- I, I thought, it was interesting that most of the people that were involved in doing this thing, came from outside ...

Their surprise at the lack of diversity and the lack of willingness to support new initiatives suggest they had not experienced these conditions to the same extent elsewhere.

Through moving to Goetheim and interacting with "the community" according to their constructions, many of these individuals had been confronted with a relatively homogeneous community resistant to changes. This community was thriving in the midst of a more pluralistic landscape from which most participants had come. Moreover, as individuals they experienced being outsiders to the community.

Change, in this instance, was change experienced by participants in coming to a community which stood for them in contrast with their prior experience. In particular, for them the community did not offer opportunities for change cast in modern thoughts ("individuation" and "liberation") of self-expression (Berger, 1977, p.75-77). Resulting from experiencing conditions of anomie in their relationship with the community, individuals' sense of how to act, how to express themselves was jarred.

This was particularly difficult for those who highly valued creativity and opportunity to express oneself creatively:

- It ["getting lost in the role"] would mean feeling completely free. I could say or do anything that I thought was completely necessary to say or do to get my point across without being afraid that people wouldn't accept what I'm saying and doing. A-1-p.10.
- I would have wished in that little thing that I could have done it without feeling like I was acting while I was doing it. Participant) What would be the benefit of that? Mad) Because all of us feels a little unnatural all the time. Participant) A-p.13. [Participant is referring to a memory from a drama class taken before she moved to Goetheim.]
- What's "attractive about being somebody else"? Mad) Well, when you live in Goetheim, I guess... S-13-27.
- Yeah. Especially in Goetheim, like I say, if I want to do something I'm doing it and I don't really give a damn what anyone else thinks. That and my philosophy is "If you have a chance at something — even if it's a dream — just go for it, cause the way I figure it you got nothing to lose. S-13-31.

Experiencing conditions of anomie translated into individuals' sense of isolation and caused tension with their instincts to act creatively and spontaneously in social settings. Before shifting to individuals' experience when joining the project, an additional aspect of anomie indicated through data analysis must be noted. The previous segment began to address this aspect in terms of ethnicity.

In the process of gathering and analyzing demographic data a pattern emerged. Participants' description of their limited involvement in religious organizations fit within another processual description of modernity, a shift towards "secularization" (Berger, 1977; O'Dea, 1966). The majority of participants stated that they had no religious affiliation or were "non-practicing". However, in this community individuals experienced themselves as being faced with an omnipresent emphasis on religion, again, in contrast with their earlier experiences. The study postulates that not only did individuals experience being outsiders to the community, in this context it also set off for some concerns with profound spheres of meaning.

Those who were to participate in the theatre project brought these experiences of anomic conditions to their interactions. This sense of anomie swiftly became a point of common meaning among them. That is, a common sense of anomie in relation to the community emerged as "cultural-meaning" among early participants. Participants'
experience of anomic conditions related to the community emerging as cultural-meaning then shaped their ongoing interactions in a myriad of ways. This segment outlines some ways which emerged prior to commencement of the study. The five Act-Plays represent others emerging after the study began.

Participants' Emerging Cultural-Meaning Of Anomie

Based on working assumptions of social construction outlined in Chapter Six, data analysis proceeded on the basis that individuals were first attracted to the theatre project because they assumed certain elements about "theatre" and "theatre process". Relying on individually held notions of "theatre" and relying on past experience some participants brought with them from the club's first production, "the theatre project" apparently offered two opportunities to individuals.

At the outset the project offered some an apparent opportunity to explore self-expression in a traditionally acceptable fashion. They were taking part in a "cultural" event. As well, data in the prior segment provided indication that the project initially suggested to some a chance to participate in developing "a cohesive group" working together to present a play.

The study posits, then, that individuals brought a sense of anomic conditions in their relationship to the community. In addition, it posits that many individuals' initial involvement in the project was partially born out of various desires to respond to those experienced conditions of anomie. In believing that the theatre
project might respond to some of their concerns and needs, individuals were relying on certain assumptions concerning "theatre", and "theatre process". The question very soon became whether the theatre project would fit with their assumptions and meet their needs arising out of their experience of anomic conditions.

The Project And Anomic Conditions Experienced

The data suggest that in addition to experiencing anomic conditions in relation to a community which did not offer meaningful structure, those who first began with the project also experienced anomic conditions within the project. First, individuals who joined the project came from disparate backgrounds with differences in age, sex, employment, and diverse orientations (subgroups). Most participants, who had had little or no experience with "theatre" or the theatre club, would have found these to be anomic conditions in the more "traditional" sense of anomie. Social identity and structure were amorphous in the beginning. Change was their context.

Quoted previously, one participant who was involved in the club's first production recalled such experiences given similar conditions of interacting with other individuals of differing backgrounds:

- This was a whole completely different group of people with completely diverse backgrounds. Like you name it. They were there. Joy) S-28-p.4 - To start with the rehearsals are a little awkward cause nobody knew one another. You'd hardly talk to them and it was just sort of strange. Joy) S-28-p.4.

The same participant described how these feelings were replaced with ones of a sense of commonality when going through rehearsal process.
- It was really fun because it was a whole new group of people...
And you got — then you found you had a lot in common with them
and you had a lot of fun together. That part of it was probably
the biggest thing I got out of it. The way the group becomes so
cohesive. Everybody who's not involved, they appear so out of it
that it's hard to deal with somebody outside the group after.
S-23-p.4.

Her recollection suggested a willingness for temporary uncertainty in
exchange for the pleasure of developing into a closely knit group for
a period of time. (The title of the first Act-Play, "Sustained
Uncertainty", reflects this willingness to accept anomic conditions
temporarily.)

In the case of the project, it may have seemed like history
repeating itself, for this was relatively speaking a "whole new group"
once more:

- Actually there's only three to four people from that first
meeting still involved, [laughs]. There were quite a few people
from out of town.

When individuals began to participate then, they had certain
expectations about process. Some assumed a certainty of structure.
Others had come to expect "ongoing anomic" as a small part of a
process or structure. That is, initial uncertainty was expected to be
temporary, to pass relatively rapidly with expectations of eventual,
if equally temporary closeness.

However, both sets of individuals' assumptions were challenged
virtually immediately concerning possibilities of certainty. Not only
were there many different people involved with different backgrounds,
some were involved in the theatre club, some were not. The same group of people did not attend the first meetings. There was no permanent location for meetings.

The single most significant difference, however, between the first production and this Heritage Project was the need to begin with creating the play. In the first production, individuals sense of structure apparently emerged from "the rehearsal process". For at least one of those who participated in that first production, structure emerged for actors by relating to other cast members through the role.

In this sense, Joy described the rehearsal process as beginning with individuals feeling "awkward cause nobody knew one another" to becoming the characters and talking "to other people as if you were those characters". Despite this emerging structure for the actors during the first production, issues arose concerning the general roles of directors, actors, and producers. Some conflict prompted creation of a document outlining those roles. (See the Appendices, "Department Heads for Production and Responsibilities".)

Unlike those circumstances, there was no play around which to coalesce. In the document developed by club members, producers', directors', and actors' roles had been defined largely in terms of rehearsals as a meeting structure. In the circumstances of the project there were no rehearsals around which to structure meetings and no script with characters for roles to emerge among actors.

Conditions of anomie were also suggested then through the limited experience of participants with theatre presentations and particularly
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in the writing of a theatre production. In the first meetings individuals thus had difficulty in taking action. They were still acknowledging and expressing this difficulty in various ways in later meetings after the study had begun:

- Go ahead and do it. Assign a job. We don't need to sit around and mope and rehash and rehash. Just do it. Jes) A-14-430.
- I was tryin' to find something to grab onto. Joy) A-14-387.
- Yes, every time we get together we get deflected away from doing the play. Anything but doing the play. Joy) A-14-423.

There was no agreed process for creating the play and getting to a rehearsal stage. They had no immediate cues for how to begin except for the contents of the application made to obtain funding. However, even the contents of the application caused dissonance. Based on data analysis, participants' dissonance erupted into a "breaking point" (see Chapter Seven for a description of the concept of "breaking point"). In later interviews several participants described their early meetings as ones of growing crisis:

- Yeah, there was a lot of work going into it, but nothing coming out of it. I was getting pretty discouraged. And I was off for most of that time working and I didn't really know what was happening. And I'd come home and nothing had happened. And I'd been gone for two weeks and this thing's still sitting there. I was almost to the point where I was wondering if this thing was going to go at all. I didn't want to give up on it. I don't think I was to that point. I certainly had my doubts. Jim) O-1-p.24.

Their response to this breaking point had several implications.

**Breaking Point Crystallization:**

**Emerging Cultural-Meaning In Response To Grant Application**

Data collected suggest that prior to commencement of the study, participants' interactions through the theatre project precipitated in a "breaking point". From this breaking point a sense of meaning in
common apparently emerged for participants. Although this breaking point and group members' meanings emerged in part prior to the study, their "breaking point" has been reconstructed based on participants' struggle with some of the outcomes when the study began.

As described in the previous section, two members of the newly emerging theatre club asked the other club members whether they should apply for heritage funding to create a play about the community. In the flush of success from the first play, they were encouraged to proceed. On more than one occasion, expostulating after the fact, several participants indicated to me that they had not expected to receive the grant.

- And like Anna said, "I never thought we'd get it or I wouldn't have voted for it". She said, "I just went along". She said, "I'd have argued a lot, -- but, I just... it just never occurred to me we'd even get it. So she paid little or no attention to their proposal. N-27-p.19.

When club members received notice that funding had been granted, at that point individuals began to focus on the contents of the application. Perusal of the document disclosed an emphasis on Catholic as well as German traditions of the community.

The Goetheim Theatre Community Players propose to research, write and present a dramatic production depicting the cultural history of the Goetheim area. The emphasis would be on the German Catholic origins of this community and area.

The production would take the form of a series of Vignettes (scenes) predominantly humorous in nature and based on anecdotes culled from the Seniors and long term residents of this area. Such Vignettes could include "the inside story" on the escapades of former students, not to mention priests and nuns of St. Mary's Academy and St. Luke's College.

[Excerpted. See Appendices, Section One for a copy of the entire application as filed with the theatre club.]
When the funding was received, the two who had made the application began to collect the research. It was not entirely clear to those members who were interviewed whether the two expected to also write the play, for one of the two was a writer. After doing some research, but prior to creation of a script, one person, the writer, relocated for employment's sake and the second person went away on a holiday. Under those circumstances some of the club members became more directly involved in determining what to do.

The matter of being inexperienced and therefore uncertain of how to proceed was of concern to those involved with the project at the time. However, based on data, the breaking point seems to have centred on the issue of the religious focus given the play. Prior to the two withdrawing for other reasons, this issue had already been raised with them apparently:

- ...Their original letter and information and stuff, that they brought to the club. And, and their first couple interviews proved this too. It was very religious. They were very heavily into, um the aspect of talking to the priests and nuns. And uh, really working more of a history of St Luke's. A heritage of St. Luke's than the town of Goetheim. And [pause] we were, that was the direction that, that it had sort of started in... If we had left them just go along, we would have ended up with a religious play. Eel) N-27-p.19.

Those participating at the time disagreed with the direction of content and it was not clarified initially whether a writer should be hired.

- After — then when we got the grant [pause] the idea of what the play was going to be was again different. Eel) N-27-p.19.
At the first meeting I attended this experience with changing direction was still being addressed in the context of the disagreement:

- I think the thing is going in a different direction. I think it's like Cam said, if she'd stuck it out she'd see the Catholic [content]. J-11-22.
- They had certain ideas and wouldn't listen to anyone else. J-11-52.

Members expressed concern over the disagreement and hoped to involve the person still living in the community on return from her holidays. This eventually did occur.

This incident was manifestly significant on at least two counts. While data gathered are limited, and "after the fact", it would seem that participants experienced a reaction to the suggested focus of the play because many of them were not from the community, did not have German Catholic roots and did not describe themselves as being religious. Interestingly, the concern with having to do "a religious play" was never explicated. It appeared to be a given that a "religious play" was inappropriate or distasteful, despite their own statements reflecting that the community was a religious one.

Eventually there were references in the play to giving a Bible to someone, "baptisms" and a special annual Catholic event, but references were relatively scant.

The study posits that a unified response among the other participants in the form of strong disagreement with doing a religious play gave rise to a sense of commonality even if in the negative. This may have partially opened the door for group members to begin to express a sense of distance in their relationship with "the
community". In other words, members began to acknowledge, at least one distinction between themselves as "a group" and "the community".

However, even indirect acknowledgments of this distinction were few in number in the first formal meetings. One of the clearest and most direct of a limited number of such references by participants at this stage has been previously quoted. The individual's statement has particularly significant because her comment indicated both a sense of difference and timidity to remark on such difference.

- I'm so glad you said that. You were a member of the Catholic church right? So we can just wait for you to say those things we think. J-22-106.

In addition to their experience of breaking point providing opportunity to develop a sense of commonality in one area, the incident may have also resulted in creating factions. Instead, in light of participants' expressed concerns for the two people who had worked on the application, the incident would later become significant because it provided an opportunity for group members to express a commitment and concern for the well being of members with whom they might have a disagreement at one point. (Begun in prior meetings this effect emerged in later meetings described in the first Act-Play, "Sustained Uncertainty").

After the initial disagreement a research list was developed. A few participants happened to discuss the project with Cam as a professional writer/director resource person. He suggested they "write it themselves" with his assistance. This suggestion might have been thought of as "middle ground" by some group members. In data collected later, there was also indication of confusion and
disagreement at the time whether to invite someone from outside of the group to write or direct the creation of the play.

Interestingly, this meant that few members initially seemed entirely certain of Cam's role, even those who had consulted with him and who wanted his involvement. It is on this basis that Cam entered the scene. In the meantime participants began to research and discuss possible form and content for the play. They were in the throes of that process when the study began. As part of the Mobile-framework the first Act-Play was sculpted to represent their early movements.
Although this is a lengthy chapter in relation to some of the others, I did not wish to dismantle the Mobile-framework.

The entire Mobile-framework is a reconstruction. The distinction in this instance is that the study had commenced, I was attending meetings during the period referred to as the five Act-Plays. In contrast much of the substance of the "General Context" deals with participants' meanings prior to the study's inception.

An epistemology based on "social construction" and concerned with process ought not to treat "community" as a homogeneous reification. Yet, the study relies on that phrase in this section. This phrase is used to the extent that it expresses participants' experience and meanings. In their discussions, many referred to "the community" or "Goetheim" in those terms.

Data from meetings form the core, while data from interviews provided background and specific highlights.

An example of this awareness of power emerged from an interesting pattern in data from an interview with the person who described the series of skits she helped to create and organize as a student over a four year period. In the first year skit, she stated that they created caricatures of other first year students. However, in the following two years their satire turned to "clients". Finally, in the fourth year when these students were virtually through the program, several elements of their skit were critiques aimed at situations with faculty members:

- People just got... a lot of times they were just strictly for humour, and uh an out — a way to let out some of your frustrations with things that were happening. A lot of the profs would come up and talk to you afterwards. "Yeah that was a good point you guys made about that." S-p.1-2.

Some of the participants moved to Goetheim from other small town communities which may have been as "homogeneous". However, when living in the community in which they were born and raised they would not have been outsiders in the same sense as they were when moving to Goetheim. These participants would be confronted with an issue of pluralism, but with different nuances from those who were from larger centres.

I have relied heavily on "Joyce's" descriptions of the first production in this section because of several factors. She was one of three people who were involved intensively in that first production and who began to work on this project at the outset. There is, therefore, a limited pool of data. In addition, each of the three involved brought different orientations to their observations of events and were involved in different tasks.
One of the other two involved in the first production was engaged in a different stage, becoming active later in lighting and sound, and building sets. The third person, given her orientation towards "theatre" focused in interviews on contrasting a "traditional approach" (the first production) with an "improvisational approach" to theatre (the project), rather than constructing meaning concerning a sense of "group development".
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B. SUSTAINED UNCERTAINTY:

The First Act-Play

Yeah, there's been no firm decision. But all this time as our thoughts have been pulling out together it... It's that. Jes) A-14-294. I think all of us feel the same thing. I haven't been into this kind of thing before, so.. if we hang together...

A-14-329.

And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?

- Hamlet, III, i lines 81-82.

INTRODUCTION

With the first Act-Play comes a discernible change in writing style. This Act-Play and the next one, "Anchored Anomie", functioned as "the drawingboard" for data analysis after the fieldwork experience concluded. Work on the Mobile-framework began with these two "pieces".

As other pieces or Act-Plays were developed through data analysis, data from participants' later interactions were then studied more intensively. Occasionally, during this data analysis process patterns emerged which had not been readily apparent in earlier "stages". When patterns appeared to emerge within later periods of participants' interaction, this meant returning to these first two pieces of the Mobile as a check to see if the "pattern" was consistent with data from these earlier periods.

If the newly recognized pattern was consistent with data of an earlier period then these first two Act-Plays also had to be rearranged to ensure that groundwork had been laid for additional
nuances or what was to "emerge" as observable in participants' later interactions. Through this process the first two Act-Plays represent layers and layers of changing data analysis.

One of the most difficult elements in developing the Mobile-framework came from complexities of chronology in terms of what emerged for whom and when. In terms of "evidence" for postulations from data analysis, the study has relied on statements mainly from participants. In some instances participants have been quoted because they have articulated what they experience as emerging. However, frequently, participants did not articulate their experience of process. The second manner of using quotations is as illustration of participants' interactions which had suggested "the pattern" in data analysis.

In terms of participants' articulating what they experienced as emerging, it was discovered in working on the "pieces" for the Mobile-framework, that they often did so several meetings after their experience. The quotation at the beginning of this Act-Play provides one such example. Those were statements made by participants during the "next stage". I have endeavored to limit confusion by quoting data mainly from a particular stage to represent that chronology.

Within later stages this becomes less and less a problem. The hermeneutical circle in terms of writing and representing the work became a less pressing problem as the two chronologies come together and the "last bits" of data were collected. At the conclusion of the fieldwork all of the data were available from which to refine interpretations, for both participants and for me as researcher.
This layering of interpretations was also influenced by reflections on epistemology and implications for writing style. Some of the early "telegraphic" style used in initial data analysis remains and is thereby represented in the Act-Plays. The "Emerging Context" sections with their brief headings and small parcels of data illustrate the format first used in data analysis. In addition, the language, for the most part, is not as tentative as that used, for example, in Chapter Six.

This introductory section is intended as a reminder that the work in these pieces of the Mobile-framework is a series of working assumptions, consistent with the epistemology. However, such phrases have not been added into the work because it would burden an already complex, "rich" description.

EMERGING CONTEXT

TIME OF YEAR

We were in deep summer, heavy with heat. Evenings passed for bearable out of doors.

PERIOD OF TIME

This is data from participants' interactions during three meetings after the study began. These meetings were held over a period of approximately three weeks July 11 - August 1, 1985.)
LOCATION

When I began attending meetings, our location varied from meeting to meeting. One element appeared to be consistent about the locations. All the locations seemed to have a "special", social quality about them. For example, after the study began the first meeting was an open air session at an acreage. Refreshments in the form of wine and food were proffered.

The next meeting was held at a member's cabin. Soft evening light poured through a sliding door framing trees and lake. Motorboats hummed and sputtered out our backdrop. Our third meeting took place in the backyard on the deck of a participant's home. As it was that individual's birthday, another participant made a cake to celebrate the occasion.

These meetings had at least in part a "social occasion" air about them. Participants also made references to earlier gatherings with wine and cheese and fun.

ATTENDANCE

The numbers and faces varied substantially with a general decline in numbers, during the first three meetings.

- We're down to a relatively small core group. Eil) J-22-83.
- But if there's only going to be six of us and we have to write the play, produce the play and act... J-22-85.

Cam was not present at the second one of these meetings. He was expected, but there was confusion about our location.
EMERGING PATTERNS OF PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

"Change" was the dominant theme emerging out of data analysis throughout the theatre project. In an effort to represent subtleties of change in participants' interactions and meaning over time "Emerging Patterns Of Process" was created. "Patterns Of Process" have been described as "primordial soup" of participants' meaning and interactions.

Their individual meanings, sense of cultural-meanings and structure from other experiences comprised "the soup". However, theirs was a dynamic soup. Ever emerging were participants' sense of structure, patterns which for a period became socially solidified, and their sense of "cultural-meaning", a sense of meanings held in common at that time.

In selecting which portions of their soup to ladle out in these "Emerging Patterns Of Process" I have looked to "the active ingredients". Based on ontological and epistemological premises the study concentrated on those ingredients which document a process of participants' experience with shifting meanings. Their search for certainty in social anchors, their experience of uncertainty or ambiguity and their response to "it" are the primary focus of "Emerging Patterns Of Process" segments.

Participants' meanings and sense of certainty were in a constant state of flux throughout this theatre project. In "this stage" the scene opens on participants attempting to find common meaning, although this is not their articulated goal. They had various ways of
doing this explicitly and tacitly. Their main focus was creating and presenting a "play" about the history of the town. Though they did not spend time at this point deciding what "theatre was", theatre formed part of the backdrop.³

AN EMERGING SHAPE IN PARTICIPANTS' INTERACTIONS, THEIR DISCUSSIONS

"Shapes" of participants' actions forms a conceptual framework for unfolding process of change. Rather than repeatedly offering an explication for the study's particular use of the word "shapes" in each of the five Act-Plays, an explication has been located in Chapter Seven's "Description Of The Mobile-framework" as a "key concept". This segment details a shape in participants' interactions which first emerged, their discussions.

a) Locating Common Ground

As the "General Context" Section discloses, the history of the theatre club did not begin with the Heritage Project and the study commenced after group members began to work on this specific project. Some members of the group had met on at least two or three occasions, depending upon how formally one defines "meeting". Participants had done some "research" prior to the commencement of the study.

A list of topics for research was created by Eileen. (A copy of this list is included in the Appendices, Section One.) Some participants had read material or interviewed people concerning topics chosen. For example, Jessie researched the topic of war/veterans; Joyce read and reflected on the history of the Wheat Pool; Loretta
interviewed a woman who had been among the first trainees of the hospital on the subject of health care/ nursing.

During the first two meetings I attended group members spent their time trading experiences, disagreeing and agreeing with each other about their direction. In the middle of the third meeting a transition occurred. Cam suggested an acting exercise. Group members engaged in the exercise and then turned back to discussion of their experience and how this experience connected with what they might do next.

In these first meetings, discussion constituted a predominant shape of group members' interactions. The substance of their discussions was of import to shifts in shapes of their interaction. What interested and concerned group members was as important in terms of coming to sense common meaning as the shape of their interactions.

**Emerging Themes In Participants' Discussion:**

During these meetings several patterns began to emerge within group members' discussions. For example, their discussions included descriptions of discoveries made from research done by group members; discussion about personal experiences in the community; updates on obtaining funding; concerns and comments made in an effort to make decisions about certain situations. Group members very much relied on discussion to share and exchange their thoughts and feelings. (To contain title lengths in this segment, description has been limited to use of the work "exchange" alone as descriptor of their social process.)
I sifted through the data to arrive first at four and then, very recently, at a fifth theme in their discussions. In listing the five themes they have been organized as much as possible in order of "their first appearance" — or when they were first observed. However, many comments from group members were rich in meaning content and there is overlap in themes. As they emerged for the study, the five themes of group members' sharing and exchanging are:

1) Exchanging Experiences Concerning Research For The Project
2) Exchanging Ideas About The Shape And Content Of The Play
3) Exchanging Concerns Of An Administrative Nature
4) Exchanging Ideas About Group Identity, And Personal Information
5) Exchanging Ideas Of Process

Despite problems associated with monotony, "Exchanging" bears repeating for each theme. In arranging group members' statements in this way they have been removed from "their" immediate context. The word chosen for repetition was intended to emphatically reinforce group members' interactions as context.

Patterns described as themes of "exchange" or "sharing" were prevalent in group discussions which occurred in the first few meetings I attended. The main part of meetings consisted of large group discussions. During these discussions participants made reference to other discussions they were having informally with other participants outside of formal meetings. Their comments suggested intense reconstructions of reality were taking place in discussions outside the meetings.

- Jessie and I were talking about some ideas this afternoon [regarding funding options] Eil) J-22-91.
- Eileen was mentioning something about the last meeting you had talked about, uh, raffling something... Jes) J-22-92.
- Cam said an idea can be great but it must go somewhere. So I did come up with an idea. Jessie and I talked about it. Eil) J-22-105.
- Eileen and I were talking about that the other day. To look back — for a woman... That just seems like extreme hardship. Jes) J-22-150.

Although participants clearly discussed and reflected on their interactions outside of meetings, the meetings were the main forum for group interactions.

1) Exchanging Experiences With Respect To Research For The Project

Since they were creating as well as staging a play about the community's history, participants had to obtain information about "the history" relatively early in their process. Part of group discussion included sharing information about forms of research for the project and resources consulted:

- Yes, but I or we who are not from here, what can we say? There has to be another method of getting this stuff out. Ann) J-11-19.

In sharing these concerns, participants were also sharing varying perceptions of what research is legitimate. They also shared through their discussions research "facts" about the community:

- The Minnesota connection... They mailed the passport back and forth across the border. [Paraphrasing] Len) J-11-26.
- 1915, the first year the town sent someone to war... The best crop they ever had... It's the year they built the water tower... Eil) A-1-199.
A distinction between kinds of "information" emerged out of participants' discussions. Over time they became more focused on a combination of cultural and psychologically oriented "information". For example, discussions turned to the community's German Catholic heritage, and given that heritage, the impact of being German in Canada during the two World Wars. Cam specifically promoted discussions of this kind:

- The personal history is the best. The things that are important to you... the things on the list will be a by-product. Cam) J-11-35.

Thereafter, participants' discussions related to the community shifted to a more "personal" plane:

- Didn't find out things directly because of pride. I'd hear when people asked my mom. J-11-29.
- Family name was important. Competitive... Liked to show-off. They'd live in the basement and keep the upstairs for company. You build your house even if you don't have money and their empty. J-11-32.
- [Eileen told a story about a man who committed suicide being proclaimed crazy so he could be buried in consecrated ground.] I couldn't figure out why it seemed like such a big favor to be buried... Eil) J-22-120.
- I had to go to Father Gerhardt before our marriage for instruction...I was embarrassed...What a thing to talk about. J-22-121.
- My dad's only 82... But otherwise there's not that many old people. And that's what's really hard to face. There's nobody left. Nobody to talk to. J-22-141.
- That's why I wanted to do the phoning thing. Boy, that's Goetheim for you. Someone coming from Saskatoon and can't get four people from Goetheim. J-11-64.

A fascinating discussion took place among four participants in these meetings about the experience about life in the past. Two of the participants, Jessie, in particular, spoke of reaching a "block" in the research. She indicated that she had found it most difficult
to reach beyond thinking of earlier pioneer life as hard. The two participants who suggested that life was not any harder then were both older than most of the other participants and were thought of as "coming from Goetheim":

- We think of it as extreme hardship. But that was their life. Jes) They didn't know any different. Len) It's hard to keep in perspective, looking back. Jes) J-22-151.
- For me to get over that block of "it was tough, it was hard, it was horrible", it's the hardest thing I have... Jes) A-1-186.
- One of my favorite tapes was, of a boy in a Grade 4 Schillerdorf school project. Interviewed his grandmother - question - memories of hard times. [Paraphrased] They don't have any. Jes) That's funny because I have notes from the first time we talked. "People tend to recall the tragedies of their lives". [Laugh] Came up with that at the first meeting. Joy) J-22-153.
- I don't know, when we were growing up, we had no power, or didn't have bathrooms. We didn't have any of that. As far as I'm concerned it was no harder than now. Lor) I was experiencing the same problem as Jessie at Jim's and Joyce's. Ann) ... They had time. We have society pulling us in so many different directions. Horses stopped for the night. Len and Lor.) A-1-187-89.

There is one important note concerning the latter series of discussions and learning. Eileen, the producer reflected on this "block" some participants expressed experiencing and proposed a solution for purposes of working on the play:

- For those people who are having a block, I've really tried my best to get the local newspaper to give me the 1915 paper. Go in and read those twelve issues... Just do that and you'll be able to move back a lot easier. You feel that much closer to what happened. It's like reading a newspaper same as you read your local newspaper to get the news. Eil) A-1-198.

Data analysis suggested that these discussions assisted participants in developing a consensus about the community past and present. As "researchers", they clearly came to their relationship with the community in a different role. Developing this consensus about the community assisted them to begin to locate an anchor through
beginning to develop a common sense of the community and thereby also to develop a sense of group. It assisted participants in distinguishing themselves jointly from that "culture" and in beginning to develop a sense of identity apart from the community as "researchers" analyzing research.

2) **Exchanging Ideas About The Form And Content Of The Play**

Participants' comments and questions about specifics concerning "the play" were sprinkled throughout discussions at meetings. Comments they made and questions they raised most frequently have been gathered together in the following "subthemes" related to theatre.

- **Form Of The Theatrical Event:**
  - No, see. He [Cam] doesn't want us to think of this as little skits because it's not going to be skits. Len) It may well be little skits. Cam) A-1-195.
  - We don't just want to have skits. Eil) J-11-2.
  - If we begin the play, the whatever... Cam) Let's go with "the play". Eil) A-1-241.

- **Timeframe For Contents Of Play:**
  - No, I've always pictured that this would be acted out over fifty or a hundred years Jim) J-22-114.
  - Jim said, "You're not going to go through every year?" I said, "In fact, I was thinking of one day." Eil) A-1-.68-245.

- **Search For A Focus As A Way Of Determining Content:**
  - Yeah, I think the colorful characters are important. Eil) J-11-18.
  - What about the telephone on line? We have some o-o-o-ld telephone equipment. Len) J-11-15.

These subthemes, particularly the question of content and form of the play predominated as a topic of discussion in the first meetings.
3) **Exchanging Concerns Of An Administrative Nature**

In the first three meetings after the study began, discussions frequently drifted toward concerns of an administrative nature. The word "drifted" has been used, because administrative concerns generally emerged at the forefront mainly when people were uncertain of what to do next.

- There's so much more than just the presentation. Sponsorship... I never knew I had to beg. I found it wasn't so bad. There are all these different aspects... Len) J-11-56.
- That's okay. We'll do alright on the play. We'll be fine. But if there's only going to be six of us, and we have to write the play, produce the play and act... which of us is going to have time to write programs and uh, make time to write programs and uh, make posters? So we need money to get stuff now. And if we're doing period costumes, and we're going to have to, we can find one or two people who could sew for us... But we have to get that material. All of the things that cost money also save time. Ell) J-22-89.

These first three themes of exchange and sharing as outlined indicate participants' more specific, focus on prosaic aspects of "theatre". The following two themes of exchange and sharing in participants' discussions are more general and arguably subsume the first three. These latter two are very much related to social anchors through group entity and structure.

4) **Exchanging Ideas About Group Identity, And Personal Information**

Participants' references to prior meetings suggested a common viewpoint that they had met previously for the purpose of exploring ideas together. References suggested participants laughing, having lots of fun, but not settling on anything. (Socializing may have been
a strategy to encourage people's involvement.) Some aspects of this social orientation could be seen in the first three meetings after the study commenced. This sense of meetings as social event, however, seemed to take on an ever diminished form.

These early meetings provided the first participants, about ten in all, with a basis for learning about each other. This led to at least a few of the first participants developing meaning commonality for working together, a beginning sense of group as entity. Through exchanges concerning research done and discussions of personal experiences, participants began to develop a common sense of the community. This was most probably their first instance of commonly held meaning. Arguably, participants' sense of "the group" first developed in this way.

When I commenced attending meetings, participants were beginning to share their ideas about "the group" and personal experiences about themselves. However, this was still a relatively rare part of discussions in relation to other topics at this stage. During these first meetings personal feelings and experiences were generally linked with discussion on research or their activities together as a group:

- What an adventuresome group. [Response to participants deciding to go on with or without funding.] Jes) J-22-97.
- I'm so glad you said that. You were a member of the Catholic church right? So we can just wait for you to say those things we think. Jes) J-22-106.
- [During the second meeting participants regaled each other with stories of their small second production which was a performance for a children's group. After the performance the children invited the cast to participate in performances which shifted into pranks:] And we ended up being the suckers every time. They made suckers out of each one of us. Len) J-22-137... It was nice. It was good for us and good for them. Len) J-22-142.
My dad's only 82... But otherwise there's not that many old people. And that's what's really hard to face. Len) There's nobody left. Nobody to talk to. Jes) J-22-145.

Anybody who has got the stories and the knowledge you have, has got to be old. Jes) It really depends on where you fit into your family. — If your family is older too. Cause I'm one of the youngest in a family that stretches out 25 years. Len) J-22-148.

-Cam's notions of a theatre group:] - 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]

Interestingly, at the second meeting when only half a dozen attended, this was when participants began to discuss research about the community shifting into more personal terms:

- Well, I go out to the homes and they make comments about... They go, "Oh, you're not Catholic!" Participant) It's the same with me in the Catholic school. They just assume that I'm Catholic. And when I have to say, "I have no idea what you're talking about", or I can't take communion or whatever... They're not — like they just assume... Participant) J-22-116-17.

There was only one other instance during a relatively formal occasion in which participants spoke with other participants about such experiences with community members. In that case, it was not a formal meeting but during discussion after a meeting later in the project.

5) Exchanging Ideas of Process

A final, most important theme emerging in participants' initial discussions was concern with process — method and criteria for action related to theatre. "How we do this? Is the way we are doing this right?" Those attending frequently expressed this theme in terms of personal discomfort or a question about how or whether to do something:
- This a time for stretching... We have a slight argument about how to set this up. Ann) J-11-59.
- Should we be looking into, uh, any other business type things now? Searching for prices for programs? Um... What you mentioned, in another month? Jess) J-22-102.
- Like I don't enjoy digging through old information and that kind of thing. I'd just as soon... Like if someone would give me an idea of what to do and the information to work with, I could probably get something out of it. Len) S-6-p.14.

This theme of exchange and sharing has been fastened on specifically at the last. Virtually all data indicate that from the beginning of the project participants were interested in and concerned with the process of creating the play. Yet most of their concern was expressed indirectly in the "doing" of the process, through activities related to the first three themes. It is virtually at the end of this stage that participants' actions indicated personal discomfort as this thematic concern emerging as uppermost.

b) Participants' Emerging Experience Of Ambiguity

In addition to providing opportunities for acts of sharing and exchange, participants' discussions also brought forth questions and concerns throughout this period. Gradually as more concerns emerged and fewer were resolved, a common sense of urgency developed for participants.

What follows is a list of ambiguities which "emerged" through date analysis. It is unlikely that any of the participants had such a precise list clearly outlined in their heads. They were nonetheless greeted by all of these ambiguities through their ongoing discussions. Data analysis indicated, however, that participants began to
experience these ambiguities as a form of overload and as a shift
towards meaninglessness.

- Who's in the group?

  The task of developing a sense of group without knowing who that
includes would be, from the outset, a difficult one:

  - I told everyone that this was an important meeting. Ann) J-11-9.
  - Nobody will not tell you they won't come. Ann) J-11-63.
  - We're down to a relatively small core group. Eil) J-22-83.
  - Jay is joining us next week. Eil) A-1-169.
  - Will it naturally happen that the cast will be picked? I'm
    worried about members coming in at the last minute. Eil) Set an
    arbitrary date. September or a week before. Cam) I'd like the

- Who's making decisions? How are decisions being made?
  (Should we have an "expert"?)

  Ambiguity for individuals concerning decision-making arose out of
a quiet conflict among participants. Data from meetings and
interviews at a later stage suggested that at least two participants
with an organizational orientation wished to have only "group members"
create and present the production. These participants experienced
having to rely on an "expert" director as an issue of power.

  In contrast, other participants expressed a sense of uncertainty
on how to proceed. On occasion some participants linked this sense of
uncertainty with deep felt need for expert guidance. For these
participants issues of power were not experienced with respect to
having a director from "outside" the club.

  - We may not be able to use all the ones we had sort of planned on.
    Lor) Doesn't matter. We hadn't really planned on anything. So...
    Cam) Well we did before you got here. Lor) Oh. Cam) We didn't
    plan. Eil) ...Running into such deadends. Ann) Although that
wasn't such a bad idea to start with... it was a wash... I'm glad you're here Cam because I enjoy — Ann) [She is interrupted by Eileen.] Okay where are we? Eil) A-1-274. [Paraphrased]

These different starting points were an important, if frequently tacit, element in participants' ongoing interactions. The following passage evinces such undercurrents in their interactions.

- So what's happening Cam? Eil) J-11-34.
- What's on the agenda? Ann] [Silence] It's not my ball game. Jes) Does anyone have an agenda? Ann) A-1-166. [This was followed by a conversation about needing more men in the project.] Jim can play very many parts. A-1-167. [After another apparently stilted pause, Cam began to state his "agenda" for the meeting.] What I want to touch on tonight... I haven't figured out a way to do it... If we were in a theatre setting or more controlled setting, we could actually move around and do some things. Because what I wanted... Cam) J-11-174.

In terms of meetings, it was participants who spoke of lack of direction and lack of confidence who expressed themselves most frequently and clearly:

- I don't like this part because I feel inadequate. Len) That's really ironic because you're a wonderful contributor. Cam) J-11-46.

- Who's supposed to be doing what?

Given ambiguities listed with respect to identity of "the group" and roles in terms of decision-making, it is not surprising that other roles had not been established initially by participants:

- Are you taking this all down Joy? Could you do it for sure, so I don't have to do it Jes). J-22-100.
[This was a reference to finding out about obtaining a red river cart for the stage set.]
Very much associated with establishing roles, the following set of questions emerged as interconnected for participants and also as most urgent.

- **How do we do this? — Where do we start?**
  - So what's happening Cam? Eil) J-11-34.
  - The problem of tying it all in together... Jes) J-11-110.
  - The whole idea of writing something for the stage stumps me. Ann) J-11-38.

- **What form will this take?**
  - We don't just want to have skits. Eil) J-11-2.
  - Plays — now what are we... How are these going to be arranged? Like five plays, short, — ten? Iyl) It's going to be one I think. Eil) Yeah, there's been no firm decision. But all this time our thoughts have been pulling out together it... It's that. Jes) A-14-294.

- **What content will the presentation have?**
  - How specifically does Goetheim... Like as long as there's references specifically stuck in, this could be fairly universal. — Well except for the German-Catholic... Joy) J-22-157.
  - Well I think it should be just rural Saskatchewan. Like I mean. It has to be German Catholic. Len) J-22-158.
  - You know we could probably make it in such a way that they would say, "Hey, wow this is Goetheim and then you could go over to Biggar and they'd say... Jim) J-22-159
  - Jessie isn't here but she feels really strongly that we stick to a certain time period. Eil) J-11-16.
  - No, I've always pictured that this would be acted out over fifty or a hundred years Jim) J-22-114.

- **What kind of sets do we need?**
  - We can focus our energy on doing it rather than building things. Cam) Yeah (several) I was worried about that. Eil) A-1-257.

- **Where do we meet? (When do we gain access to the theatre?)**
  - One more thing Jessie. About the theatre, do we have a key... we need access. Cause I'd like to get in there for audio equipment sometime. Jim) J-22-125.
  - Do they have anything in the fall that we have to work around? Joy) No They have nothing on. The school's is in November so
we're safe where we are. I don't know where else we would investigate. Jes) J-22-126.
- ...If we were in a theatre setting — a more controlled setting we could actually move around. Cam) A-1-173.

- What about funding?
- She's having trouble getting the money. Len) J-11-48.

As these questions raised through discussion became cumulatively unresolved, participants responded shifting shapes in their interactions.

SHifting shapes in response to ambiguity, participants' emerging paradigmatic actions

The study posits that participants' "paradigmatic actions" were more than acts of discussion. Their efforts at paradigm creation carried with them assumptions of the profound and thereby contained strong emotional elements for participants. Yet most of the content of their discussions was focused on activities with primarily "prosaic" concerns.

Participants' interactions related to paradigm creation or maintenance were coiled through and around discussions. Some of their interactions which might be described as blending with paradigmatic actions have been outlined previously. These were their interactions which engendered a sense of group entity and processual structure.

Patterns of what the study refers to as participants' paradigmatic actions were barely beginning to emerge in the first few meetings. Nonetheless, in this respect one observation was swiftly made in the field. Participants had at least two highly distinct
approaches toward creation of mutually held paradigm. A key difference between their two different responses lay within individuals' assumptions about what constituted certainty. Prior to elucidation of each of their paradigmatic actions, an image describing relationship between them may provide context.

With respect to participants' direct response to heightened ambiguity, closer examination of data suggested an arrangement of tension between their paradigmatic actions. These might be thought of as paradigms — participants' two different, but related responses to uncertainty, meaninglessness. As a heuristic device the study refers to their interactions in the image of a double helix-like relationship. The segment begins with a description of "one strand", participants' "go with it" response, followed by description of a second strand of paradigmatic actions, participants' "get something concrete".

a) Participants' "Go With It" Response

What the study refers to as participants' "Go With It" response is manifestly related to what people working in theatre call "improvisational theatre" — a willingness to explore with few restrictions. The popular concept of brainstorming contains many of the same elements. The study has not used either "brainstorming" or "improvisation" to identify participants' paradigmatic actions. At the project's outset many participants did not have a clear understanding of the word "improvisation". They did not use the word "brainstorming" commonly.
The phrase "go with it" was used later in the project in terms of direction or encouragement.

- Go with it. Cam) A-24-677.
- I'm going this way. Ann) That's fine you have to go with the flow. Play with it. Play it back and forth. Cam) A-24-688.
- He'll take a line and go with it. Bill) S-27-p.11.

Although Cam used the phrase first during a formal meeting, "Go with it!" in directing an improvisation, participants' statements indicated using phrases with a similar tonal quality such as "We said, 'Go for it'." prior to Cam's use of the phrase. The notion of "play with it", often linked with the phrase "go with it" was an important part of that phrase which was not necessarily conveyed by "go for it".

When it was eventually used the phrase appeared to capture participants' sense of what they had been and would continue to be "about" in their ongoing paradigmatic response. For example, if someone suggested an idea, participants explored the idea through contributions made in "a flurry". The following quotation represents a brief example of such "go with it" activity during this stage.

- The problem of tying it all in together... Like Eileen said, using the family, whatever issue you're dealing with, you'll be involved with the family. Jes) The son could go off to war. You could bring in the Wheat Pool scene Joy). The father could be a doctor. Jes) This would all take place, I presume within a space of about 10, 15 years. Jim) There we go, we have the whole play right there. Jes) J-22-107-13.

In addition to swiftness of responses, a creative quality to contribution became important in participants' go with it paradigmatic actions. Contributions from participants might simply mean adding a thought or feeling. They also took the form of expressing the idea through a character which in turn suggested a
situation. For example, participants' humor began to reflect this through "a running joke" style.

The following sample of paradigmatic actions must come in the form of "paraphrasing". From fieldnotes, this sample reconstructs a discussion of which there is no tape recording. Early in the first meeting I attended Cam began to facilitate group discussion:

- What elements of that stir up excitement? Cam) War displays sadness and victory - happiness [unknown source]. They were fighting each other. Joy) You had to report. Evil) They took all your guns. Joy) Did anything turn this town on its heels? Cam) I don't think the town... The church wouldn't let it happen. Participant). [There was some laughter, some silence.]
- What were the up times for them? Cam) [The tempo was dying out. Jessie began to pass a book around in response to Cam's question. Soon after there was silence. The silence was finally broken.] "I told everyone that this was an important meeting" Ann). [More silence suggested a lost sense of direction.] Cam says, "You just keep talking, it's boring, but I'm taking notes. J-11-10.

During the fieldwork, patterns referred to as participants' paradigmatic actions were not as evident in these first meetings as later ones. Data analysis suggests that participants' various efforts toward creating a common framework of meaning in action became more concerted over time.

Despite a limited amount of direct evidence concerning participants' paradigmatic actions, data indicated "stirrings" of this activity. To provide a more detailed accounting of participants' interactions which might be referred to as "go with it", a description of emerging elements in participants' responses was developed.

**Emerging Elements In Participants' Responses:**

Several of those participants taking on a leadership role appeared to have a sense of this approach in common. The study posits
that "certainty" for people engaged in "go with it" responses became identified with having a sense of being "placed" in a challenging position.

The entire project took on this quality when some participants recalled the start of the project with the phrase, "We never thought we'd get the money!" The laughs and grins associated with descriptions of being surprised into a massive project were very like those accompanying descriptions of the club's last production.

Descriptions of the snow storm and the accompanying loss of lighting person and director/actor were always quicksilver-filigreed with smiles and nods, with words suggesting a sense of "adventure". This epitomizes what the phrase "go with it", attempts to capture, an act of consciously leaping in to "see where we end up". This may be viewed paradoxically, as an active form of passivity cast as it may be from the notion of responding to challenges.

Risks or failure might be framed in those terms. Hence "go with it" might be interpreted as taking action but mainly in the form of response, albeit creatively, to whatever "gets thrown at you". In that sense, "makeshift" can be understood as wonderful, the grace of creative reaction.

- "Present a dramatic production depicting the cultural history of the Goetheim area." Jes) Pretty broad. Joy) Oh yeah we can wing that. Jim) J-22-161. [This was one of two occasions when a few of the participants referred to part of the grant application.]

There was apparently a very special element to this "creative reaction". Participants' actions were attempts to move towards meaning away from the meaningless. A common purpose for participants
emerged in this response: to make connections, as many as possible and as creatively as possible.

Swiftness in response and spontaneity of interactions were important elements to participants' sense of these paradigmatic actions. From the speed of individual responses a general momentum gathered. With impetus at the forefront participants allowed themselves to cover a vast amount of ground. They were able to explore a great deal in a relatively uninhibited fashion "creatively". Critique often followed, but some time after this process.

Although critique was not part of their "go with it" responses, some creative content was more valued by participants than other content. As Cam described it, those most highly valued tended to be reactions which had a "turn". That is, they were reactions wherein meaning was changed "dramatically".

- You must provide a dramatic context, a dramatic turn. There must be a focus for tension. Cam) J-11-1.

Meaning was "turned" so quickly in these "go with it" responses that both senses of meaning could be experienced simultaneously, at least the sense of change could be. This may be observed in opening lines which were proposed initially for a scene in the play:

- "Jesus Christ, -- Hell Mary it's raining"...and a lot of excitement, kids running around. Eil) J-22-107.

In this example of a "turn" Eileen suggested an idea for a scene in which a family is sitting down to a meal. The father begins to say "Grace" with the words, "Jesus Christ", but as he is about to say "Hail Mary", the next words in the prayer, he notices that it is beginning to rain.
The words come out instead "Hell Mary," his wife's name also being Mary apparently. In continuing on to say it is raining the context has been entirely changed. This is one of the few examples of a "turn" acknowledged explicitly through discussion:

- At Lenore's, when I was talking about the farm setting? And like when I said it's raining outside... Eil) Yeah, it brings a whole different meaning to things. Cam) A-1-183.

Experience of meaning creation and change in meaning such as this carried with it a special sense of certainty — profound experience in meaning creation. An additional element, more difficult to replicate in written form is the intensity of these kinds of interactions. Some participants appeared to value most highly the intensity of the experience.

There were some areas wherein participants experienced a sense of "success" through use of this emerging paradigmatic response. In terms of socializing, individuals acting in this manner brought a sense of fun, of "partying" to interactions. It was also of assistance with respect to some activities such as funding. In these instances this approach generated excitement and a variety of options.

However, use of these paradigmatic actions do not appear to have been experienced as "successful" for participants in their initial endeavors to produce something concrete in the form of a script or presentation. Despite richness of content created in their "go with it" responses, participants did not establish through those responses a structure for more prosaic, ongoing activity.

- I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it. But when I stopped to think about it afterwards...Ann) A-14-306.
- For some reason we thought that was good until we thought about it after. Eil) A-14-303.

This makes some sense in that momentum, as previously described appeared to become a singular focus in participants' "go with it" interactions. From that perspective content was tremendously significant. However, it was primarily significant as fuel for locomotion. A breaking point was eventually reached.

As described previously through the image of a double helix, some data indicated that participants were relying on two distinct paradigmatic responses. Data indicating participants' reliance on distinct paradigmatic actions also suggested a tension between these two responses. The two sets of paradigmatic actions are best observed in relationship with "each other".

b) Participants' "Get-Got Something Concrete" Response

Participants' "Go With It" responses might be described as "certainty through force of movement". In contrast, participants' "Get-Got Something Concrete" response may be more aptly described as stemming from a desire for "hold it in your hands" certainty.

Participants expressed a need for certainty in these terms on several occasions. The following data represents one of their first expressions in a formal meeting:

- I'm ready to see it [their work] be something. Eil) A-1-247.

When they chose to articulate the need for "concrete" direction emphatically they were nigh to breaking point.
In later meetings after this "stage", participants began to use the word "concrete" related to these concerns and their paradigmatic actions as the following statement indicates:

- We need something concrete, we're getting anxious. Jes) A-18-505.

With this paradigmatic response, certainty appears to be linked for participants to "the concrete" in two forms: a) a construction process anchored in physical objects and b) an aim towards rapidly constructing a physical presence with some quality of "permanency" a "finished product" or something to show for the time spent. This would be distinguishable from "physical", in the sense of movement. It would be "physical" then, in the sense of static object, for instance a script. Hence participants were frequently focused on artifacts of all kinds, "sets", "programs", "posters", and "costumes". 5

During the first few meetings discussion of fund-raising was another concrete set of actions for participants. It was also an area in which participants were clearly the decision-makers internal to the project. In fact, they spent two thirds of one meeting Cam did not attend discussing strategies on both fund-raising and gaining access to the theatre and its technical equipment.

- We talked about, for example having a program. Um, having a keepsake program. We'll need money to do that. Jes) J-22-82.
- One more thing Jessie. About the theatre, do we have a key... we need access. Cause I'd like to get in there for audio equipment sometime. Jim) J-22-125.
- ... Not just the theatre but the sound booth and the control room. Jim) J-22-127.
- Do they have anything in the fall that we have to work around? Joy) [An extended silence which Jessie breaks.] No they have nothing on. Jes) J-22-130.

Participants did continue on to discuss a potential beginning scene for the play briefly and then drifted into personal "historical" memories. However, this was how they began the meeting and then proceeded to spend considerable time in discussion. Their discussion was a less urgent form of "get something concrete" response for participants.

Emerging Elements In Participants' Response:

This response was a mirror image with participants' "go with it" responses wherein they attempted to build momentum. Based on data analysis from fieldnotes, intensity for participants appears to have been strongest at the beginning of their "get-got something concrete" responses. If they were able to experience satisfaction with obtaining something concrete their intensity diminished. However, participants' intensity continued to build, if no "results" or products were obtained.

When responding with this paradigmatic action, intensity was not experienced by participants as desirable or enjoyable. At least to begin with, angst appears to have played a greater role for participants in "get something concrete" responses. This was in contrast to the excitement and thrill of "go with it" which frequently had a game-like quality associated with these interactions of participants.
As with participants' "go with it" response this paradigmatic response appeared to result in participants experiencing some success in certain areas of activity. For example, these paradigmatic responses frequently brought administrative activities and "concerns" to the fore. A sense of urgency was also generated in participants' interactions of this ilk, which then prompted commitment-making by individuals.

There were areas of activity in which participants' get something concrete response did not appear to have the desired effect for participants. For instance, these paradigmatic responses did not generate more energy in their actors. Tasks of a creative kind were not often "successfully" tackled through participants' paradigmatic actions in this manner.

c) Tension Between The Two Helixes

Having described both strands of their double helix, the study endeavors to represent a dynamic relation between two of the participants' responses as observed. In terms of emerging patterns of relationship between participants' paradigmatic actions, it might best be described as a shifting between "going with it" and gravitating to "something concrete" or "get-got something concrete" for the group.

A few participants were particularly vulnerable to experiencing a tension between paradigmatic responses. The following quotations were statements made by the same participant. The first quotation "foreshadows" a tension:
- Improvisation... This kind of thing scares me but it also intrigues me." Ann) J-11-55.

The following quotations were statements made by the same participant during one of their "go with it" responses:


Although derived from a later meeting, the following quotation indicates the excitement associated with the original experience. Concurrently, this statement illuminates a shift which in this instance took place for the participant in reflections after the meeting:

- I still think that. I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it and still get all excited about it afterwards. Ann) A-14-307. [Later meeting]

Through a study of this "shifting" element in participants' interactions, several pattern changes emerged concerning participants' shifting interactions. This study of data concerning participants "shifting" between paradigmatic actions yielded three distinct "layers" of patterns.

**Participants' Shifting Patterns Internal To Meetings:**

If one "carved out" a slice of data from the middle of any one meeting, one might discover participants shifting paradigmatic actions with some regularity in their attempts to locate and rely on a single paradigm. The sample given earlier and partially repeated here provides data of such incidence:

- What elements of that stir up excitement? Cam) War displays sadness and victory - happiness [unknown source]. They were fighting each other. Joy) You had to report. Eil) They took all
your guns. Joy) Did anything turn this town on its heels? Cam) I don't think the town... The church wouldn't let it happen. [Unknown source.] [There was some laughter, some silence.]

- What were the up times for them? Cam) [The tempo was dying out. Jessie began to pass a book around in response to Cam's question. Soon after there was silence. The silence was finally broken.] "I told everyone that this was an important meeting" Ann). [More silence suggested a lost sense of direction.] Cam says, "You just keep talking, it's boring, but I'm taking notes. J-11-10.

Beginning with a "go with it" response, participants shifted to get something concrete within a few short minutes.

Patterns Unfolding For Entire Meetings:

Comparisons between one entire meeting and another suggested an overall pattern to these earlier meetings. This pattern appeared to be crystallizing for participants about the time the study began. It was described outside of taped meetings by one member, Anna, who experienced it, perhaps, more profoundly than most other participants. Anna described her experience, "This always happens. At the end of the meeting I always feel better, like we've done something. But then between times I feel like we haven't accomplished anything."
[Paraphrased.]

In brief, then data analysis indicates that at the start of each meeting many participants came with a sense of concern, looking for some sign of progress, a "get-got something concrete" response. As they began to discuss and pin down some things they would also begin to feel comfortable enough to explore ideas or "go with it". The energy from doing the latter would leave them excited. The meeting would end on an "up note".

Participants would then go home and over a period of time realize they had not entirely addressed their need for something concrete.
They would come to the next meeting concerned again. The quotation below, although coming from a meeting a little later in the process describes this pattern:

- I got so excited and then when I got home I thought, "My god that's a stupid idea". Jes) A-14-300. [This seems to have occurred more for women who took on a leadership role in group activities than it did for the men.]

Patterns Describing Changes In Meetings Over Time:

Although there are data indicating that the above two patterns might be observed in ongoing interactions among participants, there are also indications that the frequency of their shifts changed over time. Again, data analysis throughout the entire field experience suggested participants' shift between "going with it" and searching for "something concrete" became more and more abbreviated until at certain times they were left with dwelling on whatever could be discussed concretely. In effect, this narrowed participants' range of activities. As participant observer I experienced this initially as a shifting around from topic to topic followed by silences.

The emphasis on relying on one paradigm or the other with more regularity and intensity as an element of these interactions changed over time. This eventually lead to a breaking point wherein participants were experiencing urgency in finding "something concrete".

A sampling of some of their starts has been gathered. Many of those which follow had a "go with it" quality, but were preempted along the way.
Original Research:

Despite sharing some ideas amongst themselves about their research, participants did not appear to have focused in a concentrated fashion on sharing what each learned through the research. The research had been divided among them from a list developed by Eileen based on early group meetings. Cam seemed to have known about the list and some of the research.

Instead of prompting them to "report" their findings, Cam advised the group to think about research in this way:

- The personal history is the best. The things that are important to you... The things on the list will be a byproduct. (Cam) J-11-35.

Rather than relying directly on participants' discussions of research that had already occurred, he suggested new areas of research with new dimensions associated with the research:


Then, at the next meeting Cam indicated they would not discuss the new areas:

- All I wanted was to really put people in touch with elements of themselves. I don't want to have people blurt that out now. Not important now. It will be important later because it will be part of a bigger thing. (Cam) A-1-193.

At following meetings Cam attended there was confusion between the two sets of research begun. A few participants privately expressed frustration that this research work "had gone no where".

Even when I was researching I just felt, "What's the use?" This isn't going to be used. Which it didn't. (Allie) S-16-p.3.
The research done by participants was to be used eventually, but in an indirect manner, as backdrop to improvisation. A few participants would recognize this at a later point in the process. In the meantime, the interpretation that their prior work was not being used, prevailed for participants in the first three meetings of the study.

- **Skits:**

In addition to speaking of research information, participants periodically referred to ideas for skits in various stages of creation. Some participants had begun to work on skits. However, when Cam began to attend meetings their earlier work does not appear to have been acknowledged directly. Cam only became aware of this through the meetings.

- Has everybody got their little bitties all figured out? Lor) No. this is what we're not doing. We're not doing that. Len) Why aren't we? Lor) For a number of reasons... Cam) — No, see. He [Cam] doesn't want us to think of this as little skits because it's not going to be skits. Len) It may well be little skits. Cam) A-1-195.
- We may not be able to use all the ones we had sort of planned on. Lor) Doesn't matter. We hadn't really planned on anything. So... Cam) Well we did before you got here. Lor) Oh. Cam) We didn't plan. Eil) ...Running into such deadends. Ann) Although that wasn't such a bad idea to start with...it was a wash... I'm glad you're here Cam because I enjoy ... Ann) Okay where are we? Eil) A-1-.88-274.

- **Exploration Of Ideas At Meetings When The Study Began:**

An incident in which participants engaged in "go with it" paradigmatic action has been selected to exemplify a series of changes which occurred over several meetings. As well, this selection provides context for the passage which was included in initial descriptions of "go with it" responses.
At one of the early meetings Cam was unable to attend, toward the end of the meeting those attending briefly began to explore an idea for the "play" contributed by Eileen. With encouragement from others, she described the scenario of a family in a time of drought sitting down to a meal. According to Eileen's idea the opening lines are spoken by the father of the family. He begins to say the first words of "Grace", but suddenly breaks off:

- "Jesus Christ, — Hell Mary it's raining"...and a lot of excitement, kids running around. Eil) J-22-107.
  You would say the whole thing. You never stop in the middle of a prayer. Ien) It doesn't work if you don't stop. Eil) The problem of tying it all in together... Like Eileen said, using the family, whatever issue you're dealing with, you'll be involved with the family. Jes) The son could go off to war. You could bring in the Wheat Pool scene Joy). The father could be a doctor. Jes) This would all take place, I presume within a space of about 10, 15 years. Jim) There we go, we have the whole play right there. Jes) J-22-107-113.

This idea was raised apparently between meetings amongst some participants:

- I've replayed this in my head over and over. Ann) Were you there that night? Eil) No, no, no. But you've told me about it.
  Ann) A-1-238.

However, at the next meeting the originator of the idea was reticent to describe it in deference to Cam's plans:

- Eileen have you ever told Cam that first scene you thought up one day? Jes) [Laughs and then there is silence.] We're not supposed to be doing skits. Eil) It's so good. I want you to tell. Jes) Well it was when we were talking about what are we going to end up with... Eil) A-1-233.

Eileen described the idea of beginning the play with preparations for a meal starting with "Grace". The idea was picked up and modified
in "go with it" fashion as described. Cam began modifying her idea to suggest the scene form the entire framework of the play in a specific manner.

- The whole thing transports to another place and something else happens. So it comes back to the table again. Cam) A-1-244.

Despite acceptance of Cam's suggestion and contributions made to it by participants, at the meeting which followed the idea as modified was rejected during two meetings which followed.

- For some reason we thought that was good until we thought about it after. Eil) A-14-.23-303. I still think that. I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it and still get all excited about it. But when I stopped to think about it afterwards... Ann) A-14-305-06.

It was never pursued again after this discussion.

This incident has been selected to exemplify tension between participants' two paradigmatic actions. In this instance, neither set of paradigmatic actions provided apparent satisfaction for participants. Shifting from one to the other left participants with more ambiguity. These early paradigmatic actions were not linked with explicit, commonly accepted criteria to evaluate what they created through the responses.

Participants' interactions thereafter led them to a crucial turning point ushering in new meanings for them. This turning point will be addressed as part of a question concerning participants' paradigmatic actions as response to their ambiguity. Generally, how did participants' paradigmatic actions affect their ambiguity? Although this segment has addressed that question through scattered references a more focused reflection follows.
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d) Participants' Ambiguity And Paradigmatic Actions

Ambiguities were previously listed in the form of questions participants expressed experiencing through their discussions. During this stage, in a few instances as participants experienced some ambiguity, they stopped experiencing other forms of ambiguity or appeared to experience them less intensely.

Participants' concerns with ambiguity changed over time through various means. For example, some of their ambiguities would be displaced by others taking precedence for participants. Questions concerning content and form of the play eventually emerged as uppermost for them.

The study has posited that participants' paradigmatic actions changed participants' concerns with ambiguity over time. This study has proposed that their paradigmatic actions were both generated as a response to and had an impact on their experiences of ambiguity. What follows is consideration of incidents wherein participants experienced reduced ambiguities related to their paradigmatic actions. Incidents wherein participants experienced escalated ambiguity are explored thereafter.

1) Reduction Of Participants' Experienced Ambiguities

Although participants' paradigmatic actions were not the only means by which their ambiguities were reduced or suspended, it is most important to emphasize that their paradigmatic actions did reduce to some extent participants' concern with respect to ambiguity. For example, during these actions, regardless of the "results", for a
period of time participants experienced certainty through the sense of being engaged in common action. Specific to one of their responses momentum associated with "go with it" gave them some sense of common direction for some time.

As part of their paradigmatic actions, participants strove to create a paradigm or framework for actions of both a prosaic and a profound nature. Through discussion, participants' individually held paradigms did shift toward each other. Some of their commonly experienced angst about ambiguity was thereby resolved.

There were several different patterns of interactions by the end of which participants no longer appeared to experience ambiguity in the same manner as they had previously expressed. On the basis of the apparent effect of these interactions, they are referred to as "Slip Shifts".

Participants' Paradigmatic Actions and "Slip Shifts":

"Slip shifts" were very subtle changes in participants' meaning over time. The study traced their changes in meaning mainly through participants' constant references to ambiguities — hence the lengthy "list" of their questions in a previous segment. When returning to such a list if participants' experience of ambiguity had changed, then consideration of how their meaning had changed was necessary to interpret such slip shifts. An important example of a "slip shift" in participants' experience with ambiguity is provided.
- **Ambiguity Experienced:**

  Several participants expressed uncertainty about how to contribute to research and writing of the play not being from Goetheim.

  - Yes, but I or we who are not from here, what can we say? There has to be another method of getting this stuff out. Ann) J-11-19.

As demonstrated through demographic data most participants were not from the community. (See Appendices, Section Three for compilation of demographic data.) As described in Chapter Five, based on a lengthy process of data analysis the study posits that participants' concerns related to creating the play were linked to their larger sense of anomic conditions related to their experience of the community. This would provide explication for the intensity with which participants expressed their concerns.

Herein lies a possible irony. Given the project's focus on the history of the community, the very place where those experiencing unconnectedness to the community sought release from concern with identity and behaviour may have served as a constant reminder of that unconnectedness.

- **Shift:**

  This aspect of participants' ambiguity was dealt with in an indirect way. When Cam gave research assignments, he did not specify the Goetheim community. It was possible to take his topics and apply them generally from one community to another:

  - Now if you were doing your job fifty years ago — what would you be doing? ... Don't think about just technical implications. Cam) J-11-39.
- The personal history is the best. The things that are important to you... The things on the list will be a by-product. Cam) J-11-35.

Thus people who had formerly felt they could not contribute because they were not from the area did research through speaking to their parents and reflected on their own experiences:

- When I got into talking to my mother about my little project... one of her recollections was going to school in the morning. Ann) A-1-185.

As a result of this process, a shift in understanding theatre and the process of creating it was manifest in a "go with it" conversation participants had about the possible content of the play. The conversation took place near the end of the second meeting of this period, the meeting which Cam was unable to attend:

- How specifically does Goetheim... like as long as there's references specifically stuck in, this could be fairly universal. — Well except for the German-Catholic... Joy) J-22-157.
- Well I think it should be just rural Saskatchewan. Like I mean... — Has to be German Catholic. Len) J-22-158.
- You know we could probably make it in such a way that they would say, "Hey, wow this is Goetheim and then you could go over to Biggar and they'd say... Jim) J-22-159
- Actually, you could - if there weren't too many of those references. With a little research you could go on tour and change those references. Joy) J-22-160.

Although there was still some confusion about content for "the play", such "go with it" discussion indicated that participants had distinctly shifted in their perception about theatre. Yet they had not directly recognized this themselves at the time, hence use of the word
"slip" in the study. This shift was also to have implications in terms of participants beginning to bring to bear their own historical context as a framework for making sense of this community.

The study then suggests that participants' paradigmatic actions did assist them in reducing some of their ambiguity and associated anxiety. It also suggests, however, that participants' paradigmatic actions were insufficient to respond to a growing sense of anxiety.

2) Escalating Ambiguity

Part of earlier difficulty for participants seems to have arisen out of literally experiencing no gestalt as a group. Everything became equally important. While a few participants experienced some things as more important, others did not. Related to the four different orientations, in the first meetings there was some disagreement about when they had "something concrete" or not. A sufficient number of participants turning to Cam for guidance meant, at least for those participants, initially abandoning early "go with it" and "get-got something concrete" efforts. Neither sets of participants' paradigmatic actions had been entirely effective.

For some participants, as an expert in theatre, Cam represented having an anchor in certainty about theatre process apart from their paradigmatic actions. Interestingly, however, even Cam's process at the beginning brought more ambiguity with it in relation to their paradigmatic actions.

When Cam became involved with the theatre project he attempted to provide a framework through describing important elements of
"theatre". He did this through asking participants questions to stimulate certain ways of thinking about research material and by giving them assignments to be done between meetings. These assignments, for the most part were not completed by participants during this stage. Through these assignments he had wished to have the group discuss, explore and exchange, this time with him among them, so that he could be part of that process.

The samplings already described comprise several bits of work that never seemed to lead to a sense of completion for participants. They moved instead into more research, reflection, and discussion. Cam explained that he gave those assignments to participants to make them respond and to make them think about the past in a more immediate way.

Patterns of discussion in which participants were able to share and exchange ideas and feelings about their experience, continued throughout this "stage". As observed in the field five dominant themes reflected in their discussions have been illuminated. However, some of the themes appeared less frequently as participants began to acknowledge less frequently these initial patterns.

As they began to acknowledge more and more a sense of urgency for concreteness, this came to displace all other themes. It was the fifth theme, "process" which emerged as dominant. Participants seemed to retain correlativey less and less remembrance of what they had accomplished.
SHIFTING SHAPE, PARTICIPANTS' BREAKING POINT ACTIONS

Included in Chapter Seven's introduction to "Shapes Of Interactions" were descriptions of "five shapes" developed from data analysis. Two of these shapes of interaction, "paradigmatic actions" and "breaking point actions", were linked together as participants' responses to ambiguity. They were connected through both participants' internalizations and externalizations.

One example of participants' paradigmatic actions wherein they were able to internalize a shift of meaning from Cam's paradigm of theatre was provided in "Slip Shift". Through internalizing an aspect of Cam's theatre participants' individual frameworks of theatre were modified commonly. This shift in meaning apparently reduced some of their ambiguity and associated anxiety during one of participants' go with it responses through externalization.

In contrast to "slip shifts", there were interactions in which participants appeared to experience ambiguity so intensely that they could not proceed without a striking shift in their interactions. I observed participants experiencing several of these "breaking points" throughout the fieldwork.

Participants' Series of Breaking Point Actions, The Beginning

In the interviews which came much later, well after these meetings, and from "the other side of their sense of crisis" participants spoke of their escalating concerns during this period.

- We were really quite lost by then. Participant) O-1-p.22.
- I take it from what happened, because we sort of stagnated for two solid months -- July and August -- nothing just happened out
of all of that... It was really good when we finally got together and did that thing, that one Saturday with Cam. Until that point we were pretty lost. Participant 0-1-23.

One such "breaking point" emerged for participants when their paradigmatic actions did not provide them with relief from ambiguity, but rather escalated their ambiguity. This experienced breaking point created such a dramatic shift in participants' meanings and interactions that the study refers to participants' responding series of breaking point actions as the end of a stage, this Act-Play and the beginning of another.

During this stage, participants' paradigmatic actions appeared to set off more ambiguity eventually than they resolved. As indicated, tension experienced between shifting from one paradigm to another more and more frequently did not alleviate, but raised participants' sense of uncertainty and change. Particularly by the third meeting during the study, they were experiencing heightened concern about "making progress". Ambiguity of process was moving to the forefront as a concern for many.

Through observations of participants' "breaking point actions" I came to hold a strong sense of clustered interactions. To locate these clusters in data analysis I found it of most assistance to search for their experienced breaking point — a shift in tone and intensity of interaction. In the Mobile-framework this "eye of the sturm" is referred to as "Breaking Point Clarity".

In addition to describing breaking point clarity, as a consistent process in data analysis, I have back-treaded from the breaking point
to discover interactions evidencing participants' dissonance. To the extent that they chose to articulate a source for their dissonance, these anomalies have been described under "Indications of Discomfort". Participants' "Response to Breaking Point Clarity" have been recorded as well.

Relying on data analysis, the study suggests that most participants' experienced a series of escalating breaking points towards the end of this stage. The following data reflects their sense of being overwhelmed, of breaking point.

a) Breaking Point Clarity — What are we doing? Who decides?

There were no specific words from participants articulating a breaking point. Through data analysis outlined in Chapters' Five and Six, the abstract concept came to be applied to describe those occasions when participants were struggling profoundly with jarring of meaning. The first few minutes of the third meeting after the study began, suggested a gradual grinding to a halt — a sense of lost direction for participants.


The issue of who would make decisions about direction seemed to emerge first as a problem of meaning in action.

b) Indications of Discomfort

Most participants came to have, in varying degrees of intensity, a consistent sense of spending time on the project, but "getting
nowhere". They came to have a common concern directed towards having some sense of progress. Participants appeared to most strongly link "progress" with making a decision about what they would do, but most importantly with some permanence associated with the decision. They expressed this very specifically in terms of the "stage-product":

- Well it was when we were talking about what are we 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 to be that way — things that are going to happen on the stage. Eil) A-1-235-36.

Prior to expressing this deeper concern with direction, participants had to consider more than whether and how to express their concerns. The first element of breaking point was "With whom ought they to express their concerns?"

There were disagreements about the "situation" or what was stopping them from making progress. Some participants felt they needed an expert to assist them. For example, some felt strongly that they were unable to write a play. They did not know where or how to make a start:

- Writers just write for themselves. I prefer to mimic as create. The whole idea of writing something for stage stumps me. Ann) J-11-38.

Other participants did not think that an expert was necessarily needed. However, as the shifts between "going with it" and searching for "the concrete" did not appear to work, their interactions reflected less and less of an attempt to act decisively. The quotation provided concerning responsibility for agenda indicated
increasing struggle in terms of the question of leadership and
direction. This in turn led to a sense of floundering for all
participants.

c) Participants' Response To Breaking Point Clarity

There were two shifts in interactions. The first response came
from Cam who proposed suddenly that the group engage in a theatre
workshop-like activity. The second shift came from some participants.
The changed response from participants was a unified "submission to
his direction" at that time. Even those participants who felt they
did not need an expert from outside the group threw themselves into
the activity he suggested. A sense of group swelled through their "go
with it" response to Cam's activity.

Cam's words during the July 11th meeting suggest a strong sense
of direction for group activities which was hampered by both an
inability to devote more time to the project and a problem of
inadequate facilities:

- I wish I had a room with more space. I'd like to move around.
  Cam) J-11-44.

At the beginning of the August 1st meeting he described his sense of
direction for the theatre process:

- One of the things I would like to have been able to do and will
do eventually is to do a series of exercises to make us
experience the same place at the same time. And there will be
qualitatively given shifts and nuances just by suggestion... But
if you relate those to the stories, they take on meaning. When
they take on a meaning, when time and place take on meaning, uh,
well then you've really got something. Those will be the raw
material from which we make up our show. Cam) A-178-80.
However, the problem of facilities still appeared to have posed a problem for him at the beginning of the third meeting:

- So uh, I'm not exactly sure what... we can do just sitting here. Cam) A-1-181.

It was not until well over half an hour later when participants were clearly floundering, running off on tangents, shifting paradigmatic responses, that he determined to begin regardless of the circumstances:

- [Silence followed by Lenore speaking to Anna's child who was present.] It's a goose berry. Want to eat it? Sour isn't it? Len) A-1-200.
- [Cam then stood up] - Okay, let's... I'm going to get people up to do some things. Just to give you an idea of what I'm talking about... Get this out of the way... (chair).. A little walk way, five steps... A-1-.25-201.

Cam's instructions on that evening suggest he was "improvising" the activities, himself, given the surroundings:

- I'm going to give you, uh, everybody a place. And uh, by walking across the room and without speaking, I want the rest of us to know what the place is. What... only I don't want you to demonstrate it. I don't want you to talk. It'll be purely by being there. Cam) A-1-203.
- By observing what's around you... With actions? Ann) Not necessarily with actions. I mean if I say.. Well you'll see. Cam) A-1-205.
- You work together. [Cam decided to create pairs.] Go talk. Cam) We can talk? [Unknown source.] Cam) A-1-207.
- The exercise is just to walk into a place and be there. And we have to figure out where you are. Cam) A-1-208.

The general structure for the activity included dividing the group into pairs. Cam whispered the name of a place and time to each pair.

We were then to "act out" being in that other place and time which Cam had whispered to them. The remaining participants were to guess at the location the pairs were conveying.
Scenes conveyed by participants included:

- Standing in the middle of a field viewing a crop.
- Being in a creamery.
- Being in an ice hockey arena.
- Being in a dance hall before the dance.

Sampling of participants' responses were:

- That was just a good guess because I've never seen a hockey game go this slow. Len A-1-211 - How did you guess? Cam) Well they stood, one here --walked around-- then she said "cold" --[gesture with arms shivering]. Deb) A-1-211.
- We didn't rehearse a big scene. Len) What are they out looking at crops? They're looking at something. Be there. Come on. They're not getting much season across. Cam) A-1-213.
- You guys didn't mime that much. [Cam is referring to the re-created creamery scene in which Anna was "moving" cream containers around to suggest location.] I wonder whether an audience from New York would have got it? Cam) I've never been in a creamery. It was the only thing I could think of to do. Ann) A-1-216.

Cam concluded the event with a series of intense statements about theatre. From his tone and manner I inferred at the time that he was speaking from a sense of the profound. In listening to the tapes my sense of his concern with profundity was heightened.

- It's like you're just standing there lookin' out and suddenly you're on the prairie. Why? That's, that's the power we have. Don't ever sell yourself short. Cause it's there. A-1-217. [He declared this most emphatically.]
- That's what presence is. A person has the ability to just walk onto a stage and just communicate their thoughts. Cam) A-1-224.
- If we were to work on this scene and it is worth working on, I would ask you to do it in half. Carry the same emotional energy but half the physicalization of that... Cam) A-1-231.
- I'm anxious to get going...as I imagine you all are. There's a really good energy level here tonight. It'll be nice to start working on little bits. See what happens. Cam) A-1-234.

Cam's response to participants' breaking point, apparently partially satisfied participants' need for concreteness. They had an opportunity to "act" rather than to discuss. Second, relying on
detailed data analysis the study posits that there was an implicit decision by all participants' to accept Cam's authority temporarily.

The study additionally proposes that these two reductions of ambiguity afforded participants sufficient energy and sense of unanimity to pursue with Cam a much more substantial element of urgency. In this manner the first set of breaking point actions led to a second set of breaking point actions.

Prior to these breaking point actions some participants had been caught by a contradiction. Cam had been telling them what great group trust they had. They expressed feeling anything but brave. For confidence sake, they needed his compliments as an "expert". Yet, generally they did not wish to do that for which he was complementing them, take the risks he was suggesting. For example, they did not wish to spend more time exploring. They longed for "something concrete" in the form of a play.

**Breaking Point Actions Pursued**

After the physicalization exercise which Cam proposed, group members sat down to discuss plans. At that point some group members confronted Cam directly with their concerns about having no sense of progress.

a) **Breaking Point Clarity**

Although others had hinted indirectly at their concerns, Eileen finally expressed them in a single sentence followed by a half apology:
- I'm ready to see it be something Cam. Eil) Ummmm.
Jes & Len) Gettin' worried about the deadline I guess.

Although these words were spoken at the third meeting in a relatively quiet way, once they were finally spoken formally by someone "official", the producer, it seemed easier for participants to recognize the depth of their concern.

b) Indications Of Discomfort

Prior to Eileen's reluctant declaration there had been some indication of breaking point in participants' "floundering" about at the beginning of the third meeting. When all participants willingly engaged in Cam's physicalization exercise, there was a partial resolution of ambiguity associated with the breaking point. This partial resolution occurred in terms of clarification of organizational structure. As previously posited there was an implicit decision by all participants to opt for one form of certainty, recognition of Cam's legitimacy not only as an "expert" on theatre but as a leader of this group at this point. This signaled the beginning, wherein participants' generally accepted Cam as "theatre process decision-maker".

However, the cultural-meaning side of their breaking point remained to some extent. Participants, having dealt with the first part of their breaking point were now able to focus exclusively on their bouts of anxiety about certainty in the sense of a search for concrete progress:
- Well it was when we were talking about — What are we 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... just got to be that way: Things that are going to happen on the stage. Eil) A-1-235-37.

c) Response

When Eileen described her concern Cam shifted first by listening and then responding to Eileen's description of a sense of urgency for "something concrete". With support and encouragement from other participants, Eileen described her idea of the family saying "Grace" to Cam as a concrete start.

As earlier outlined, Cam responded to her idea by modifying the suggestion. He did so through proposing that the prayer act as a springboard for scenes. Taking up his idea, participants began to contribute:

- If we begin the play, the whatever... with, with the preparations for a meal we could introduce the basic characters. Cam) We're going to have a dad? Oh yeah, Jim. Len) Mass, benediction. It's the uh. It could be any number of things. [Group members come in improvising lines.] "Go get carrots. Ann) No, I don't want to." Jes). The whole thing transports to another place and something else happens. So it comes back to the table again. Cam) A-1-243-44.

Through this process a sense of concreteness was obtained by some participants:


Not only was a possible structure for the play created within minutes, but a concrete activity associated with creating scenes was outlined:

- Write down "Grace" and then write down place, every jump off point. Cam) All the places you can stop. Eil) A-1-266.
However, in discussions concerning staging the creation new
ambiguities arose:

- You actually change the physical scene? Jes) You don't actually
  have to have the meal. Jes) Oh no. All the stuff would obviously
  have to be mimed. Cam) Just a minute... Barns burning down. how

Cam explained that a combination of miming and using certain lighting
conditions would be used. None of the participants (including the
most experienced) had assumed this from the discussion up to this
point:

- So you, you're talking about a minimal set. Ann) Oh absolutely. I
don't think you can do this story with elaborate sets. Cam)
  A-1-254.

Most group members who spoke at the meeting responded positively
at first to Cam's description:

- Do it all with little boxes and black curtains. Okay, okay. Jes.
- I find that extremely exciting. Really, extremely exciting. Ann)
  We can focus our energy on doing it rather than building things.
  Cam) Yeah. [Several members say that.] I was worried about
  that. Eil) A-1-257.
- It's such an exciting prospect from the point of acting. From
  the old, you portray what Neil Simon says you portray, to doing a
  much broader, more complicated thing than we were doing out
  there. But that's a good indication of it. Ann) And if you can
  get over your giggles. Allie) After you've done it twenty-five
times you'll get over them. Len) A-1-260.

This suggests a "go with it" rhythm from group members in response to
Cam's suggestion.

Participants' Renewed Experience Of Ambiguity:

Despite participants' initial "go with it" response to Cam's
suggestions for the play's framework, they shifted to asking questions
almost immediately:
- So this family is going to sit there through the whole play. Lor) No. No. [Several members of the group try to respond.] It's ensemble. Cam) The family will do all the acting. Eil) Absolutely. Cam) A-1-262.
- Where's the family going to go? Lor) People will be coming on and off. Where's the family going to go? They're going to get up and leave the table. Some of them will become parts of whatever action takes place. They'll all become different characters. They may become things, animals, buildings. Cam) A-1-264-65.

Cam was quite candid in distinguishing for participants what he had envisioned and what would have to be worked out in future. Cam was quite comfortable with some elements of ambiguity. He seemed to assume some things would need to be worked out through the creativity of the process: "We won't worry about that just yet." Cam) A-1-261.

When Cam suggested that, as actors, they might not only mime actions but become inanimate objects there was little or no response from group members.
- Some of them will become parts of whatever action takes place. They'll all become different characters. They may become things, animals, buildings. — I don't know. We'll see where we go from here. Cam) A-1-265.

By the time Cam said, "We'll see where we go" the "go with it" rhythm had clearly dissipated, shifted to questions and then to silence.

Questions of clarification were asked by participants and the meeting ended soon after. This did not bring to a close entirely this series of breaking points and group members' breaking point interactions. The discussion concerning staging the production carried the seeds of more experienced ambiguity.

However, this stage was referred to as "Sustained Uncertainty" because participants appeared to be willing to live with their
ambiguity and thereby sustain their own uncertainty up until this point. Participants initial attempts to articulate their concerns marked a transition point.

Prior to proceeding with "Emerging Structures", it is most important to describe Cam's paradigmatic actions in contrast to those of group members. This explication of data has been reserved for the end of the segment in order to refrain from bringing to the Mobile-framework too many pieces too quickly. However, Cam's paradigm of theatre cannot be neglected long because his paradigm became more and more important to participants' interactions based on his heightened involvement in decision-making about the process of creating the play.

CAM'S PRIMARY PARADIGM FOR THIS PERIOD: THEATRE AND PROCESS (In Contrast To Group Members)

Although he did not express it explicitly, Cam appears to have believed that "theatre" can have transcendent qualities. That is, it can transcend the "everyday". In speaking with group members' he divided the lines in terms of good and bad theatre.

- ...if you relate those to the stories, they take on meaning. When they take on a meaning, when time and place take on meaning, uh, well, then you've really got something. Those will be the raw material from which we make up our show. A-1-176-81.

"Good" theatre appears to have profound dimensions for him in the sense that it transcends everyday life when meaning is discovered through acting.
- It's like you're just standing there lookin' out and suddenly you're on the prairie. Why? That's, that's the power we have. Don't ever sell yourself short. Cause it's there. [Says this emphatically.] A-1-38-217.
- That's what presence is. A person has the ability to just walk onto a stage and just communicate their thoughts. Cam) A-1-224.

Cam's paradigmatic actions had a very large element of "go with it". Ostensibly, he was able to rely on his prior experience with theatre in having a sense of "ritual chaos":

- Well to me, it's coming together as well as one can expect or plan these things. Cam) S-6.1. [This comes from a later interview - September 6th.]
- We won't worry about that just yet. I doubt that there will be anything. I'm sure it will just be plain light. I'm not sure, but... Cam) A-1-261.

Although some participants carried a parallel sense with them as Joyce's statements indicated, not all participants did. Even those who expected chaos at the outset became restless to be through it.

There are a number of ways of going about creating meaning according to Cam, but it is done primarily through a process for actors which must be rooted in their own reality. If they as actors experienced something, the audience would experience that as well. In addition, however, the dramatic "turn" is the most exciting, an element of spontaneity or surprise through twist.

Cam did not use the words sacred or profane or profound and prosaic with respect to theatre. However, his tone carried with it a quality of reverence. Cam seemed to be quite comfortable with a degree of uncertainty. He appeared to have developed a sense of how to "work" gestalt. For him, "go with it" was apparently part of a larger process. In the case of the theatre project he wished to have
the group "go with it" in terms of research. However, ideally they were supposed to have a clear, concrete orientation of what to look for as substance for theatre in research:

- What elements of that stir up the excitement? All the conflicts... Men fighting each other who could have been friends. Cam) J-11-7.
- The personal history is the best. The things that are important to you. Cam) J-11-135.
- You just keep talking. It's boring, but I'm taking notes. Cam) J-11-10.

As expressed in private with me on later occasions, he wanted to have the group explore as much as possible, to expressly search until "the most meaningful" could be exposed. Then for him it was a matter of editing out "the rest". He continued to pursue his idea of his role in these terms more aggressively as time went on. He thought of this as a necessary step in the process of creating a "play".

Cam advised me prior to one of the first meetings I attended that he was working on two "arms" with the group. I must paraphrase this as there was no tape recording of the discussion available. He said that group members were doing two things at once: writing and acting. Cam believed he had to do work with the group to develop skills in both areas. A hint of this two prong approach lies in this statement made to the group:

- ...Last time... We made certain links. As from, uh, a personal perspective as to where stories come from. They come from inside. I gave everybody something that I hoped they would mull over and think of different ways of relating... We'll get to that later. That's the most important element. The second most important is space — and time... You can have a lovely personal story, but, if you can't relate it to space and time it won't have a meaning for the audience. Cam) A-1-173.
Cam's certainty appears to have been anchored in having sufficient experience with theatre and writing. He had developed a strong sense of meaning and purpose in theatre process which he continued to build into a sophisticated, developmental structure for creative use of "go with it" actions. In his developmental structure or process Cam appeared to expect to link spontaneous elements aroused through "go with it responses" and shape them into "something concrete" to satisfy those responses. Unknowns were closely connected for him with benefits of spontaneity, serendipity.

Bringing with him an intentional element of the unknown, Cam's sense of process included guiding group members to think about things in certain ways which he thought would be productive.

- All I wanted was to really put people in touch with elements of themselves. I don't want to have to have people blurt out that stuff now. It's not important now. It will be important later because it will be part of a bigger thing. Cam) A-1-192.
- That was just part of the process. That's why once I did it there wasn't any point in doing it again. Cam) S-6-.01.

Cam began by attempting to develop group members' skills and at the same time get at content for the play in a process oriented way which would result in bringing on a group sense of "gestalt".

Observations in the field suggest that Cam's meaning framework was not "emerging" for him, so much as his framework has even now been emerging for me. This is difficult to determine because one of Cam's great skills as a writer is his ability to synthesize and create frameworks swiftly.

My questions as an interviewer and his interactions with group members may have pressed him to articulate and thereby create or
modify his framework for this experience. Data analysis also suggested that the process of creating as an individual was very clear to Cam. A study of what change had occurred for him throughout the theatre project indicated that what he had learned more about during later stages was how to engage a group in this process. That is where his framework appears to have shifted.

In this stage "group members" paradigm has been distinguished from that of "Cam's". Cam was not a member of the group and the study has not treated him as such. He did not consider himself as a participant, nor did participants think of him in this way. Cam's perceptions, his goals and more particularly ongoing negotiation of his role placed him in a very different position from group members.

Even Cam's paradigmatic action was not held in common with group members. Their paradigmatic actions disclose two shapes entwined with ongoing tension, while he appeared to have molded his paradigmatic actions into a single relatively cohesive strand. However, elements of participants' paradigmatic actions, particularly "go with it" responses were similar to Cam's and occasionally struck a common chord during this time.

In this stage, group members were less engaged with activities of a theatre orientation than they were with discussion and dealing with ambiguities they were experiencing. Their paradigmatic sense of theatre was driven by their cultural-meaning of a specific audience. Good and bad theatre was defined for the moment as a projection of the community as audience response to form of the play.
Group members' cultural-meaning, by the end of what the study refers to as this stage, was focused on concreteness. Note Eileen's response to Cam's statement with respect to relating time and space to meaning:

- Um, when you're talking about exploring a space and time, are you talking about — we're going to pin down a particular time? Jes) A-1-182.

However, even at this point group members experienced some shifting between the two paradigms. This allowed them to participate in the "physicalization workshop" before having the second breaking point:

- Improvisation...This kind of thing scares me but it also intrigues me. Ann) J-11-55.
- This is a time for stretching... We have a slight argument about how to set this up. Ann) J-11-59.

Group members were able to use "go with it" in the physicalization exercise. They were able to reciprocate on occasion. However, at this stage they did not hold in common a structure among themselves or with Cam.

EMERGING STRUCTURE

INTRODUCTION

Of all the pieces which comprise the Mobile-framework the "Emerging Structure" pieces are the least "fluid". The study's focus on processual change is de-emphasized in these segments concerning structure and participants' interactions. As a substitute these are studies in relationships as parts to whole.

A note is necessary as a prelude to this section as it concerns elements important to providing an overview of participants' emerging
structure. Significantly, "the group" changed in size and composition every meeting within the first month. In terms of developing a sense of subgroups and participants laying down a set of accepted processes, all of these shifted with group composition changes. This section attempts to make note of this aspect of change.

EMERGING SUBGROUPS

To be consistent with the introduction, in this segment emphasis concerning data is on structure of "the group" as parts of the whole. The "whole" in a sense was the community. The theatre club was located within the community. However, the club was larger than the theatre project both in terms of the set of people who became involved in this production and in terms of intended duration.

Continuing with locating parts in the whole, the "group" involved with the theatre project may be divided up into subgroups on various bases. In the "General Context" section data indicated distinctions between members of the group and the community. This segment revisits some of the same data to flesh out parts of that structural analysis. The data serves as a reminder, reestablishing participants' structural starting points. This provides a basis for understanding changes emerging in their relationships during later "stages" in this theatre project.

a) Theatre Club Structure

Although the project was created in the name of the theatre club, the club was distinguishable in a number of ways from "this
production". In terms of participants, there were some people participating in the production that had not been active in the club; others who had been active in the club did not become actively involved in this production. The latter was indeed a source of surprise to some members of the group who made several efforts to involve all club members in the writing of and acting in the play and then later in "backstage" work.

For individuals, commitment to the theatre club was of a long term. The theatre project was to be one of many productions. Focus of meetings were different from those of the project, requiring roles and tasks of which only a few resembled the theatre project's main activities. In contrast with participants' activities in the theatre project, the primary function of the theatre club was administrative.

b) "Demographics Of Those In The Group"

Although demographics did not change drastically as new participants joined the project throughout the first three stages, there were, nonetheless, some changes. This segment endeavors to record those changes.

Familial Relationships:

Of the ten participants actively involved six were married. Four had at least one child. Generally, however, only one family member participated in the project. There was one husband and wife who both took part, and one mother and daughter who both worked in the project.
Gender Groupings:

Women decidedly outnumbered the men at its inception and throughout the project. Depending on the meeting date, the number of women attending varied from four to eight. At most, with adding in Cam (as director he was not included in the ten participants) there were three men in attendance.


This was regarded as a serious difficulty particularly in terms of actors for male roles. One of the three, Lyle missed two of the three meetings at the start of the study and had not participated in earlier meetings.

Age and Occupation:

The project began and concluded with individuals representing a broad range of ages from fifteen to forty-two. There were two high school students, two women working at home and several people working in various occupations including a veterinarian, a teaching assistant, and an engineer of agriculture.

Subgroup Orientation To Theatre:

The "General Context" section of the Mobile-framework outlined four different orientations to the project which participants brought with them at the outset. Participants' four orientations emerging
from fieldwork data analysis were as follows: a) Organizational Developers (including a P.R. Person); b) Socially-Motivated Persons; c) Serious Actors; and d) Pranksters.

Of those actively involved in the project during these first meetings three were oriented towards organizational development, three were socially motivated in orientation, two were "serious" and two were "prankster" in orientation.

EMERGING ROLES

This segment's emphasis on emerging theatre roles is consistent with participants' express concern with "things that are going to happen on the stage" (Eil) A-1-235-36.

a) Emerging Theatre Roles

As previously described a group member and I specifically discussed the question of roles. The group member stated that members of the first production experienced considerable consternation with the question of roles. As a result, after that first production a member of the theatre club had researched and had eventually provided "job descriptions" for roles. (See Appendices, Section One.)

During meetings of this production no explicit reference was made to these "job descriptions". This does not, however, preclude the possibility that some group members discussed them outside of the formal meetings. However, unless these descriptions of roles were
specifically discussed, not all group members would be conversant with them since some in this group had not been in the first production and were not members of the theatre club.

Even had these job descriptions been provided for participants of the project, group members were embarking with Cam on uncharted waters. They were writing as well as presenting a play. The role descriptions did not cover these activities. Finally on this note, if group members had wished to rely on these descriptions it would have required requesting Cam "the expert" in professional theatre to impose this description on his own behavior.

What follows is an outline based on data analysis of how and when theatre roles emerged for participants during the project. The roles have been depicted in such a way as to emphasize process.

1) First Emergence — Producer + Group

Participants occasionally referred to Eileen as "the producer". She advised me that she had been named in that role by group members present after official notice of funding had been received. Her initial construction of this role appeared to be focused on obtaining funding, arranging meeting times based on group members' schedules, locating male participants, morale boosting, and developing a list of areas for research.

From observations in the field, it appeared that she did much of the "running around" between meetings while group members discussed
and often made administrative decisions during the first few meetings. This was relatively consistent with what Eileen had described as participants' perspective of her role:

- Jessie said 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 they need someone to call, "I'll call Eileen". Eil) J-5.

Eileen also chose to be actively involved in creating the play. She participated as a researcher-actor at first.

Participants' interactions during this stage of the project resulted in research activities and activities of an administrative nature being accomplished or at least being identified. In the main, during the first three meetings after the study commenced, those attending the meetings discussed whatever issues came up in the course of discussion, no matter what their nature. Sometimes a decision was reached. However, often no decision was made for want of additional information or response from other participants.

- Should we be looking into uh, any other business type things now. Searching for prices for programs, um... What you mentioned, in another month. Jes) J-22-102.

These arrangements, these cooperative decision-making endeavors were accepted at first, though participants thought of them as unusual. Eventually it was explained to me that from the inception of the theatre club, most club members wished to act and did not want to take on other roles. The same claims were made in reference to participants in the project:

- There was quite a variety in what people wanted to do. I guess a lot of people wanted to act... But that was probably the motivation [wanting to act] for a lot people. S-23-p.3.
- Everybody wants to act. And they don't want to feel that it may be their term to do something else besides. N-27-p.15.

However, this constructed division between "acting" and all other roles which had developed from the first production, did not hold up at this point. For instance, it "emerged" that in order to act in the play one had to be involved initially in the research and "writing" as this was the manner in which parts were created.

2) Second Emergence — Director + Producer/Group

Cam came with a process to create the play. His conceptualization of the first few steps did not change over time. What did change was his efforts to guide the group through those steps. Cam attempted to establish a process through a series of actions. He gradually became more assertive about his role through discussion arising out of the breaking points.

Cam made several kinds of overtures to the group within the first few meetings of the project. He did have a certain kind of legitimacy, to all he was an expert. The "Emerging Patterns Of Process" section describes early tensions among participants concerning the need for an "outside expert".

- Oh yeah we can wing that. Jim) J-22-161.
- I don't like this part because I feel inadequate. Len) That's really ironic because you're a wonderful contributor. Cam) J-11-45-46.
- Writers just write for themselves. I prefer to mimic as create. The whole idea of writing something for stage stumps me. Anna) J-11-38.
Cam's sense of process and suggestions were "not well heard" at first. As previously described, meetings tended to skip about until group members experienced a series of breaking points. Data analysis indicated that the subject was changed occasionally when group members did not understand or did not like his direction because of power issues or content.

Role Crystallization:

One of the first crystallizations for the director's role given the initial task of writing as well as presenting the play arose out of a few statements Cam interspersed among participants' discussion:

- You just keep talking. It's boring, but I'm taking notes.
- The personal history is the best. the things that are important to you... the things on the list will be a by-product. Cam) J-11-35. [List of areas for research, created by Eil.]
- Now if you were doing your job fifty years ago - what would you be doing?... Don't think about just technical implications...
  Cam) J-11-39.

With the commencement of the physicalization exercise, Cam's role began to play a much larger part in group members' interactions.

3) Third Emergence:
   Group As Researcher-Actors + Director + Producer/Group

At this juncture of research and "writing" those with "emerging" legitimacy were researchers in two senses: a) Community/researcher, these were participants from the community who remember stories and b) Resource/researcher, these were participants who had read or interviewed community members and had developed analysis based upon "facts".
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- Anybody who has got the stories and the knowledge you have, has got to be old. Jes) J-22-148.
- I don't like this part because I feel inadequate. Len) J-11-45.

4) Role Crystallizations To The End Of This Stage:

Roles which crystallized through group members' interactions during these first few meetings would be modified in later meetings in their ongoing interactions. To assist in quick scanning for purposes of comparison, a summary form of role crystallizations has been created. During this stage the following role crystallizations occurred: Producer-Researchers-Actors/Director/Participant-Observer

b) Emerging Leadership, Friendships, "Distance"

Through participants' interactions roles and relationships began to emerge other than those directly associated with creating the play. Among group members, some of these roles had a more established, static element to them.6

"Emerging Patterns Of Process" described participants' issues concerning the need for an outside expert. Despite this issue, there was some residual legitimacy for "group leaders". Reflected in "Emerging Theatre Roles", their areas of legitimate activity included raising question about process, focusing on "administrative activities", and particularly during breaking point experiences expressing commonly felt sensibilities for the group.
Alright, the feeling I'm getting [from the group] is that we...
[sums up for the group a strategy with respect to funding].

- So what's happening Cam? Eil) J-11-34.
- But, uh, could we also benefit from raising some money along side... Is $3,200 going to be enough? Jim) J-22-98.
- Are you taking this all down Joy? Could you do it for sure, so I don't have to do it? Jes) J-22-100.

People who had lived in the area and who had many stories about the place also experienced a sense of legitimacy when the group discussed possible contents of the play. During such discussions, others who had researched through reading or resource people also provided direction in "their area".

In reference to friendships, participants did not acknowledge being friends with other participants at the project's outset. They did not articulate such relationships during meetings, although Eileen, the producer of this production and the secretary treasurer of the club and Jessie, the president of the club, appeared to have developed a supportive relationship. Two or three other participants seemed to be developing friendships as well. Lines of communication between meetings, who phoned whom about what, indicated emerged or emerging friendships beyond intended accomplishment of administrative tasks:

- Jessie and I were talking about some ideas this afternoon [regarding funding options] Eil) J-22-91.

No strong sense of "distance" or dislike among participants was initially apparent. The two youngest participants of the group, two teenagers in high school, said very little in the larger group. When they did, other members tended to pay less heed to their statements.
Interestingly, the two did not develop a friendship as a result of this "condition".

This barely constitutes an overview of participants' emerging relationships. However, it should be emphasized that participants' activities did not tend to lie in a direction focused on developing structured relationships.

Some participants, organizational developers and socially-motivated orientations, were oriented toward developing a sense of group. Even so, at the outset of the project this was not the direct focus but rather an indirect focus of participants' interactions. Their primary concern as expressed was with the concrete task of creating a play. Other things such as relationships would flow from this activity. This was reflected to some extent in participants' emerging lexicon.

EMERGING LEXICON

Participants "words" and data selected to depict participants' emerging lexicon represent a meager portion of rich expression exposed through group members' interactions. They were selected through data analysis on the basis that they emerged as words through which group members expressed their experience of process and of change.

"Play":

In the first meetings, participants did not use the word "play" consistently in association with the presentation they were
endeavoring to create. Used as a noun, the word "play" appeared to imply for group members a "sophisticated" structure to which they might aspire. Data analysis suggested that some participants had very strong notions of a gradation of theatre within a continuum such as — "amateur to professional theatre". One participant spoke of "experimental theatre" in a later meeting. Many aspired to "professional" standards, but what these would be they did not well define. Participants' apparent ambiguity about "what is theatre" led eventually to participants' next commonly expressed breaking point.

"Play" Used As A Noun:

- We don't just want to have skits. Eil) J-11-2.
- If we begin the play, the whatever.. Cam) Let's go with "the play". Eil) A-1-.65-241.
- Eileen have you ever told Cam that first scene you thought up one day? Jes) Laughing. Silence. We're not supposed to be doing skits. Eil) A-1-.60-234.
- No, see. He [Cam] doesn't want us to think of this as little skits because it's not going to be skits. Len) It may well be little skits. Cam) A-1-195.

"Fun":

This word did not seem to have singular significance for participants at this stage. It was not a word frequently used or one used with particular intensity. However, data analysis indicated that the word did emerge as quite significant for some participants in later stages. To provide a sense of how group members used the word differently over time data has been presented in this first stage:

- It was nice. It was good for us and good for them. Len) Yeah. It was fun. Joy) [This was a reference to the theatre club's second, smaller, production for a children's group.] J-22-143.
"Block":

Some group members began to use the word "block". For them, it seemed to mean stuck, or not going anywhere, with some emphasis on discovering the source of their block:

- For me to get over that block of — it was tough, it was hard, it was horrible — it's the hardest thing I have. Jes) A-1-186.
- I was experiencing that same problem, Jessie, at Jim's and Joyce's. Ann) A-1-188.
- For those people who are having a block, I've really tried my best to get the Journal to give me the 1915 paper... Go in and read those 12 issues... Eil) A-1-196.

"Go With It" and "Something Concrete":

Group members' emerging structure reflected as much ripping apart and reconstructing as general acts of construction during this time. Two other concepts for which words were beginning to emerge from participants' interactions and which were closely associated with their sense of process and change have been described previously. These were phrases linked to participants' paradigmatic actions, "go with it" and "get something concrete". These have been detailed within "Emerging Patterns Of Process" and therefore are not repeated in this segment.

"Be There":

During the physicalization exercise, Cam began to use a phrase "be there" as direction. Most participants developed an understanding of the phrase and came to use it at least in terms of describing how they were supposed to transport themselves in acting:

- It's not easy to come up with ideas spontaneously but its also true that its not easy to lay yourself open in front of the rest of the group. I know that some of us have a harder time than
others of us with that. For me, I found myself, remarkably comfortable once I got into it, "being there", and being up and doing that kind of thing. Ann) A-1-p.1.

Through these words group members expressed experience of process. However, presented as they are, they do not depict a vital quality, a kinesthetic sense of that experience. Although the next section cannot recreate that sense directly it frames description in terms of movement through music.

EMERGING TEMPO AND RHYTHM OF ACTIVITIES

Participants' interactions in the three meetings which began the study might each be described as conveying a slight variation in tempo. Particularly the middle meeting which Cam did not attend sustained quite a different movement. However, generally there were some emerging patterns.

Each meeting began slowly, as in a largo tempo, while individuals tacitly established what was happening or had happened from the last meeting to the present one. The meeting then gathered overall momentum, a crescendo emerging as some sense of direction would crystallize for participants. The meeting would end with a flourish as participants went away "feeling better". However, the very next meeting would begin again, uncertainly, this time, allegro.

- They're very good at the meetings and then they fall apart on their own yet. That's what's happening. Eil) J-5.

A middle movement of group members "running with" an idea then moving to a more concrete point, might be characterized, however, as more tumultuous, vivace — a what about this, what about that rhythm.
Their interactions were not swift enough, nor precise enough to describe the rhythm and tempo as staccato, but something very like it.

Whenever group members began to do "theatre exercises" the tempo quickened and their volume increased discernibly.

- I'm anxious to get going... as I imagine you all are. There's a really good energy level here tonight. It'll be nice to start working on little bits. See what happens. Cam) A-1-233.

Although the tempo and rhythm appeared to be exclusively related to participants' actions, this assumption would result in substantial oversight. As described previously a sense of momentum was linked, for example, with participants' paradigmatic actions. More specifically, their "go with it" responses had a distinctly kinesthetic sense. It may be this experience to which Cam referred in the last quotation.

Tempo and rhythm, then appear to be more directly related to participants' meanings-in-action. To understand their various meanings in action, additional understanding of what meanings participants came to hold in common is needed.

The next section will offer an explication of how group members' "paradigms" and "paradigmatic actions" emerged from their cultural-meaning. As the detailed description of data analysis in Chapter Five suggests, "cultural-meaning" emerged for participants through their interactions. Much of what follows is a synthesis of what has gone before in the other sections but with data analysis oriented towards understanding emerging commonality of meaning for group members.
EMERGING CULTURAL-MEANINGS

INTRODUCTION

The entire Mobile-framework is suspended from the interactive data analysis process outlined in Chapter Five. Drawn from that process of data analysis, the working set of theoretical assumptions framed in Chapter Six became the conceptual tools for sculpting the pieces of the Mobile-framework. With this section in particular, their influence is manifest in references to meaning commonality and anchors.

The first account, "Group Members' Emerging Chord Of Cultural-Meaning" carries a brief but significant description. It is a description of what emerged as a pervasive theme of meaning for participants in the process of becoming group members during this period. The second heading "Group Members' Emerging Commonality Of Meaning" contains elements of process or how this striking "chord" emerged for group members.

GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING CHORD OF CULTURAL-MEANING

By referring to these first meetings of the project as a stage entitled "Sustained Uncertainty", the study attempts to recount a series of group members' meanings within their interactions over time. These interactions may be described as "exploring", or searching. However, in group members' eyes, these interactions did not concretely lead to creating a presentation or a "play". — Hence the reference to group members sustaining themselves in a state of "uncertainty".
Admittedly, participants were not always entirely in a state of uncertainty during this stage. However, this sense of their experience eventually emerged at the forefront and became group members' reconstruction of the period. As previously indicated, several participants' reconstruction of this period was to emerge in later interviews in terms of a sense of crisis.

- I was ready to quit just before we started those improv... Participant) S-16-p.14.
- I was almost to the point where I was wondering if this thing was going to go at all. I didn't want to give up on it. I don't think I was to that point. I certainly had my doubts. Participant) O-1-p.24.

Their emerging, commonly held construction of sustained uncertainty fueled "breaking point actions". In other words, group members' meaning shifted by the third meeting to a commonly sensed urgency for something concrete. Their breaking point interactions then shifted toward what is referred to as their next stage of common meaning "Anchored Anomie".

GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING COMMONALITY OF MEANING

To portray process of group members' emerging commonality of meaning two smaller pieces have been sculpted. The first is "Starting Point Of Commonality". Based on acute experience in the field from these early meetings, I have specifically refrained from including "group members" within this subtitle.

Group members were not always members of a group. They came together as individuals hoisting with them their own peculiar
ingredients for primordial soup. Individuals' actions were based on meanings, including those of structure, brought with them from previous biographical circumstance.

To begin to fathom each ingredient of meaning each individual brought with him or her to make up primordial soup is beyond the scope of this work. However, those elements which have emerged as active ingredients in changing the flavor of participants' soup have been traced back through a frieze-dried process.

The "General Context" section provided much of this stock. Data of individuals' meanings from these first few meetings and interviews provided the remainder. In "Starting Point Of Commonality", the study is concerned primarily with two sets of meanings. Of all those elements of meaning participants carried with them into the project, first the study specifically focused on those elements of meaning which individuals would eventually come to sense as holding in common. A second set of meanings held commonly, but not experienced initially as being held commonly, were individuals' meanings arising out of early encounters in this project.

Once individuals began to interact, their "primordial soup" frothed and foamed with their interactions. Individuals' meanings on which the study focused within their interactions included relationship between individual and community, and individual and "group". They included meanings about theatre. In keeping with ontological and epistemological assumptions about how individuals socially make meaning the study focused on meaning in terms of anchors, "group entity" and "structure".
A third set of meanings are also described in this segment. These were derived from individuals beginning to develop a sense of meanings in common through their attempts to act in concert, their paradigmatic and breaking point actions. However, this latter description comes under the second heading of "Emerging Commonality Of Cultural-Meaning Through Interactions". First then, meanings individuals held prior to and at the beginning of their involvement with the project.

a) Individuals' Starting Point Of Commonality
   (Meanings They Brought To The Project As Individuals)

   There was considerable diversity within the first set of meanings individuals brought to their primordial soup. Diversity among group members generally was exposed through demographic data including individuals' background and their orientations in the "General Context". Despite their diversity these individuals also had common ground, experienced as individually held. Their common ground was expressed over time through interactions during the project.

1) Individuals' First Set Of Meanings

   As described in the "General Context" section, many of those involved in the project were not long term residents of the community. They had come from other communities. Virtually all remaining participants who had been born in the community had gone away for a period. Upon returning these participants had found it difficult to be reassimilated into the community.
Participants experienced "the community" as strongly religious and remarkably homogeneous, described as a German Catholic culture. Virtually none of the individuals in the project described themselves as "religious" and more particularly practicing Catholics.

Many directly and indirectly expressed finding themselves on the outside of the community. These individuals found that in community life there were a limited number of activities available, and there was a limited willingness among townspeople to accept and support new activities.

Individuals came to the project each with their own particular set of biographical meanings. Their meanings described thus far were among those meanings which individuals held prior to their involvement with the theatre project. What is "special" about these meanings of individuals is that these were individuals' meanings which would prove to be common ground as they interacted with each other. An example of the significance of common ground located among diverse meanings is provided herein.

At the outset of the study, in the interviews, individuals' actions often suggested intensity in expression. When asked what interested them about theatre there were several responses. This was the basis for descriptions of the subgroups in "General Context". Some said, "I want to be somebody else". Through data analysis this was eventually interpreted in terms of participants enunciating a desire to express themselves through roles not confined by day to day life in the community.
Some individuals linked theatre with pranks — expressing humor and sometimes varying degrees of a social statement. Others who draw on past experience spoke of the closeness of the theatre group at the end of a production and the social recognition of being in a production. Still others were concerned with how to organize people's actions so that they could perform as a theatre group.

Although one might categorize individuals' meaning of theatre into diverse groupings, virtually all expressed some sense of the first meaning, a desire to express oneself through different roles. One of the chief complaints particularly with those first ten people is that most preferred to act. Very few wanted to do administrative work.

The study's explication through all forms of data analysis lies in the proposed concept of "cultural-meaning". These individuals experienced anomic conditions in this community. They did not find meaning in community members' interactions and they also experienced being excluded from many community members' interactions. Their participation in community life was therefore limited and in being so "tenuous" they experienced restriction in terms of how they might express themselves.

Particularly since the community had a strong religious base, most of these individuals were confronted with community members' involvement with the profound. This may have prompted some of these individuals to experience a loss of meaning in the profound or pressure to address the profound sphere of their lives. This connection was never, however, directly addressed in formal meetings.
As most of these individuals had not maintained connections with churches their "paradigmatic actions" did not lead them there. (See the Appendices, Section Three for details on demographics.) "Theatre" as a place to express oneself differently but in a historically and culturally accepted form of structure was appealing for this reason for some individuals. That meaning of theatre was one element most participants commonly brought with them to the project. Experience of "theatre" as offering a "mediating framework" between self expression and the community, developed as participants continued to have more theatre experience and continued to work with the others involved in the project.

In summary, these individuals found themselves surrounded by a community which confronted some of them with questions of profound meaning given the strong religious roots of the community. Questions of the profound and the prosaic being evoked, the problem took particular shape in two ways for individuals: a) in the experience of not being allowed to be expressive and affirm their own meanings in this way, b) a sense of social loss in terms of meaning reciprocity. That is, individuals experienced being deprived of intense response from others which could affirm their own reality through meaning in action. Many came to this project experiencing anomic conditions. Beginning from various orientations they were looking for the possibility of meaning in working on the theatre project.

Despite holding various meanings of theatre, individuals coming initially to the project did have a common understanding of playing a
role which would provide an opportunity for expression. Individuals also commonly brought to the project an intention of theatre as providing a structural framework. However, details of structure, how to conduct oneself, and what to do, ideas about those things were not held in common.

These are the ingredients participants initially brought as individuals and which comprised their primordial soup. New ingredients emerged, arising out of their interactions.

2) **Individuals' Second Set Of Meanings**  
(Participants First Experience and Meanings Of The Project)

When individuals began attending meetings some brought experience of the club's first theatre production. Many did not. In this sense there were two sets of common ground among group members.

Those who did bring with them experience of the first production, brought assumptions with them from that experience. A few, for example, assumed that one started out in chaos but that "everything would come together" at the last minute. For those, initial chaos came then as no surprise.

There appears to have been some meanings about their first experiences with the project clearly held by each individual in some degree. Once more, however, they did not necessarily recognize that these meanings were being commonly held. Five meanings held by individuals and gathered from data as outlined in earlier sections is provided.

One of the first was a recognition among individuals of how diverse were those involved in the project. A second was the
apparently more concrete element of "task". Each individual's priority for action in the project was to create and produce a presentation about the history of the town. Third was the sense of mutual inexperience. All participants had a sense as individuals that each of them were inexperienced in theatre. They expressed both excitement and fear particularly in terms of researching and writing such a presentation given their inexperience.

Fourth, each individual quickly became aware of the possible use of an "expert" in theatre, Cam. Fifth, very much related to the fourth, individuals apparently assumed a reified notion of theatre, that there exists a single ascertainable form of theatre. They did not, however, hold a consistent sense of what that would be like. Finally, individuals also had a sense of changing faces at the first meetings. It was difficult to "get to know" others when different people attended. Many did not know each other at all.

These were some of the meanings individuals held commonly. It was through interactions they began to actually experience holding them in common.

b) Emerging Commonality Of Cultural-Meaning Through Interactions:

In "Emerging Patterns of Process" a process was outlined wherein individuals came to have a sense of holding in common some meanings through their interactions. As these individuals interacted they not only came to have a sense of holding meaning in common they thereby
created experiences in common. In this way, together, they began to create anchors for their meanings. This is their third set of meanings as posited in the previous segment.

Relying on the working set of theoretical assumptions outlined in Chapter Six, the study posits that participants faced at least one serious difficulty at the outset of the project. One of their chief difficulties lay in being able to interact with sufficient certainty to create anchors and to create sufficient paradigm in common needed for certainty of action.

Developing a sense of "group entity" was a key example of this. Initially, individuals struggled with not having a sense of group, given the diversity of those involved in the project and the changing faces at meetings. Endeavoring to develop a sense of what action to take was a second key example. Participants were inexperienced in terms of interacting with each other as individuals generally. However, they were also inexperienced with "theatre" process or a sense of structure, particularly with creating a play.

The following is only a summary of those meanings emerging as commonly held by participants. As indicated in the working assumptions of Chapter Six, it would be impossible to "list" all common meaning. The meaning focused on in this study is what has been identified as "cultural-meaning" which emerges at the forefront for participants and is thus compelling.

This summary explicitly construes experiences of this stage in terms of the set of working assumptions brought to bear on members'
interactions through data analysis process. One additional working assumption must be added to those of Chapter Six.

In order to interact for any length of time "approaches" or paradigmatic action must "succeed" for participants in being anchored within a commonly held paradigm, however, "young and in development". Two anchors have been described based on data analysis, a sense of "structure" and a sense of "group entity". Thereafter if change is to be experienced relatively "safely" only one anchor can be "loosened" at a time. The remaining portion of this traces development and then shifts of anchors.

Individuals came to the project with assumptions and a desire for anchors given their experience of "the" community. They assumed that there was the theatre which would offer a single structure, and a process for their activity. They also expected to be a group. If there was a single proper process, they soon discovered that no one knew it among the individuals participating from the town. They did not find in the beginning that their diverse notions of "theatre" provided a paradigm for action.

They also experienced considerable diversity among themselves. Those attending changed from meeting to meeting. All of this suggested no initial anchor through group entity. Data analysis suggested that this would have been cause for escalated anxiety in some. Based on this situation the question is how were they able to socially construct enough ground to move, to act?

Analysis of data indicates that, in an effort to do something, group members had at least two different responses to trying to
interact with limited anchors. They relied more heavily on one response than the other at first. They would "go with an idea", then "go with another".

An embryonic sense of group entity did begin to form for some when sufficient people resisted the original idea of having the play focus on a history of the town from a religious perspective. (From this breaking point began to emerge a common sense of meaning in response to the community for group members.) Those participating had also begun to do research about the history of the place. Their discussions (including those who had been raised there) further led them to a sense of the community, affirming and explaining their experiences as individuals in the community. In this fragile way, participants began to have a sense of group at least in relation to community. This provided the beginnings of an anchor through group entity.

They also experienced some commonality in terms of being novices at a theatre process. However, how to handle learning about and doing theatre was where individuals did not agree. This lay as a potential jeopardy for loss of a sense of "group entity". They could make no decision because group members had not developed cultural-meaning and "structure" through "group entity" which would provide criteria, or a person or persons with legitimacy from within the group, to make "theatre" decisions.

Concerning structure as anchor, some group members may have relied upon Cam's presence to reinforce the idea of a single
processual paradigm for theatre. Some looked to discover it from him. Cam's statements might have been experienced as containing double messages. When he spoke of "good" theatre, he spoke in absolute terms. However, in describing the process of creation, he suggested that part of that process meant changing and responding to the experience.

In an apparent effort to maintain the fragile sense of group entity as anchor, and with a growing sense that their paradigmatic approaches had not been effectual, even those who did not wish to rely on an expert accepted Cam's direction. When they acceded to Cam's authority to direct their process, some structural anchor was created. Someone could make some decisions. This provided the beginnings of anchors in both "group entity" and "structure" despite potential conflict in meaning between these anchors group members were forming.

Group members then responded "successfully" to Cam's direction in the physicalization exercise. That is, they were able to act, and also able to respond as audience with accurate guesses about what each was acting out. This also added to a sense of group entity, for those attending had now experienced jointly an intense theatre experience.

Given the strengthening of "group entity" as anchor, individuals finally confronted the weakness of their second anchor, meaningful structure. They began to publicly express a common sense of anxiety about structure. They were able to express a breaking point from a "Get-got something" stance. Group members indicated urgent feelings about a need for something concrete — a script, an idea of what they would do on stage.
Cam responded in "Go with it" fashion. Relying on a group member's idea he began to toy with ideas for a framework. Group members participated in that process indicating comfort more with the notion of having a concrete idea than with excitement over content of that idea as modified. This strengthened participants' anchor in structure to some extent. However, different meanings held by group members concerning theatre as paradigm continued to "buzz in the background". In being as concrete as possible, group members began to ask more detailed questions about how the play as suggested would be presented. Discussion ensued concerning limited props, the use of mime and lighting for such a production. The meeting came to a close with that.

Participants were in transition during and after this meeting. Their cultural-meaning emerged and was expressed. They spoke of a common sense of being in a state of uncertainty and a strong rejection of continuing in that state. With the close of the meeting, group members had shifted based on breaking point actions. They now had "something concrete" a roughed out idea of a framework for a play which they had worked on together. Among these shifts was a stronger sense of group entity and now some sense of structure. The next meeting would bring additional changes in meaning, but anchors established now would need to be shifted as opposed to completely constructed. They would now be "anchored in anomie".

Before continuing with exploration of participants' emerging meanings, those of the "participant-observer's" must
be briefly considered. The section following this one strives to secure a sense of my "hermeneutical chronology" in that role. It represents how reflections on group members' actions have been reorganized over time.

THEMES DIRECTLY RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION AS CONSTRUCTED AT PRESENT

This section consists of two major segments, "Cultural-Meanings For Participant-Observer" and "Data Related To Adult Education Framework As Constructed During This Stage". The first provides context in that it is a descriptive summary of influences or meanings which were brought to bear on data analysis in any one stage. The second segment then affords samples of data which reflected the orientation I held towards the concept of "learning" as researcher during this stage.

CULTURAL-MEANINGS FOR PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER

In retrospect, I observe that my activities during these meetings revolved about three main points of emphasis: a) accruing direct experiences in "the field" and b) searching through the assistance of sources to i) understand my role as "participant-observer" (methodology) and ii) locate existing theory which would make sense of what I had begun to experience in the field.

With respect to the first, my direct experiences in the field, included several predominant themes. As a "participant-observer" I was sweating out the getting of my see-legs. It was impossible not to experience admiration for this group of people engaged in a huge,
creative task with little experience amongst them. As a novice also commencing a massive task, I felt a common bond with participants.

In spite of having admiration for group members and a sense of common bond with them, I experienced concern about being accepted and trusted by group members. Very much connected to that concern was my concern with ethical issues about what one did with information given in trust. Their excitement and fear of failure was contagious.

I experienced a group blur effect during this period although most people were "becoming individuals" for me by the end of the second meeting. The fluctuating numbers of those attending meetings was of assistance to me — ironically. The fewer people at a meeting, the easier it was for me to begin to develop a relationship with them. I suspect that this was also the case for group members. However, in light of their concern about sufficient people to do the work, this would be at best a blessing "in disgust".

Concerning the second and third emphases related to searching with the assistance of resources, a main point of emphasis was to search first for methodology — how one should act as a "participant-observer". This line of inquiry included determining the most appropriate methods of recording field experiences.

Through resources on methodology I became aware that there were certain repercussion of entering the field rapidly. I would be faced with a largely inductive process. I had not "got beforehand" a cogent, formal theory as a platform for comparison with experiences in the field.
When considering theoretical frameworks at this point, it was assumed that a theoretical framework from adult education literature would be most appropriate. I began with the view that what these individuals were doing was related to adult education. In introducing myself to them, I expressed my interest in their activities as having a focus on their learning.

In summary, my sense of adult education literature at this point indicated a choice between two very different frameworks. One framework, with the largest following would lead me to focus on the individual from a largely psychological perspective. A second framework was associated with various forms of community development with a strong emphasis on political issues.

During this first stage I had only begun understanding distinctions between these frameworks. I had not resolved which framework would make sense of the experience. I did speak and think in general terms of learning as this appeared to be consistent with the questions and statements group members directed towards me as a person doing a thesis in education. As a result of this initial momentum, "learning" became an ongoing element in my data analysis and is reflected as such in the next segment.

Given the absolute need to change orientations as through data analysis one becomes more conversant with participants and their possible meanings, there are special implications for gathering data in early field experience. Despite an onerous demand in terms of
time, one of the benefits of taperecording and "copious" note-taking, in this instance was that there was data "to go back to" in reconstruction as new inflections of meaning emerged.

DATA RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION FRAMEWORK AS CONSTRUCTED DURING THIS STAGE

Initially, I was focused on observing indications of whatever groups members might be "learning" through this experience. Early data analysis at this stage of the fieldwork indicated that some group members were absorbing Cam's instruction as well as reflecting on the experience. Samples of individuals "learning" in a traditionally behavioural sense of learning were gathered. Some of the samples collected were as follows.

a) Concepts Related To Construction Of A Play
   - Cam said an idea can be great but it must go somewhere. So I did come up with an idea. Jessie and I talked about it.
   Eil) J-22-105.

b) Concepts Related To Acting
   - It definitely is more comfortable if you can physicalize, as opposed to whatever term it is you use for feeling it and trying to get it across. Ann) A-1-229.

   Based on early notions of a search for data related to adult education, data were chosen specifically which conveyed participants' interactions portraying teaching in terms of transmission of information.

c) Concepts Related To The Staging Of A Play
   - You actually change the physical scene? Jes) You don't actually have to have a meal. Len) Oh, no. All the stuff will have to be mimed. Cam) A-1-250.
- You can do it either way. You can do it... I'd rather do it under one set of lights. but you certainly could do it with two sets of lights. One spotlight... Now I'm eating. Now I'm saying grace. Now I'm looking at the barn. It just takes a step and a movement. You can be there. Cam) A-1-253.

During this stage the first few interviews took place. Once more, although beginning to change at this point, data analysis focused on "learning" as change in the individual in terms of knowledge, attitude or action. These were key considerations in sifting through data. The following sample is indicative of what was of prime interest in this first stage.

d) Learning Related To Change/Process

- When you have the script all memorized certainly there's the fear of forgetting... the next line was put there by somebody else. All you have to do is remember it. But that stuff on stage... especially in that one little scene we were doing there, trying to pull more and more out of it. I was having a good time with it beforehand. I was going crazy in the teacher's lounge there when we were talking about it. "How will I keep that straight in my mind?" I thought, "That's not necessarily what this is about. He doesn't necessarily want us to say the same line each time just yet. Ann) A-1-p.1.

The samples provided in this segment were chosen to illustrate what starting point of meaning "the participant-observer" brought to the study. Throughout the long process ahead, the remainder of the project, participants' interactions were to change, resource material and resource people were to be consulted. This starting point of meaning was to change rapidly. As the participants experienced change so did the participant-observer. To discover this dynamic of change, participants' next Act-Play, "Anchored Anomie" must be considered.
It is not always clear in this representational form whose "inductions" are being described. It is my assumption that the "emerging" patterns described herein were emerging at least intuitively for participants. In this way I may explain their responses. Some participants appear to have been acutely aware of many of the patterns described, but not all of them. As author of this presentation of events they have "emerged to me" through observation and data analysis.

A pattern emerged in data analysis concerning when participants acknowledged patterns they saw. On occasion this would occur at a breaking point. On other occasions, one participants might describe a pattern after something had changed. (I suspect that it would be safer to describe a pattern after it became less threatening.) In other words, the timing of participants' recognizing and expressing patterns of their experience has implications for all data analysis. There may be many implications. The one addressed in the text at this point is focused on descriptive quotations coming from another stage in many instances, therefore being reconstructive.

As previously described, the prior section "General Context", was intended to reconstruct two meetings held before the study began. Much of the data recorded in that section came from participants' statements during the first meetings I did attend. Some of the data used as "reconstruction" material in the prior section will be repeated in this section for a different purpose. It provides a more complete perspective of what occurred during these meetings and hence forms part of this "chronology".

After the study began, Lenore was the single participant to allude to a need for direct reference to German Catholic heritage in the play. At this time, she was the only participant who had been born and raised in the community and who was practicing her faith.

Searching for "the concrete" may be described also as an early form of "contingency control" as explicated in the fourth Act-Play of this Mobile-framework.

"Roles" have received the same treatment in the study as "relationships". For the purposes of the study little is gained in distinguishing between the two concepts insofar as "relationships" also suggests common goals and interlocked actions.
C. ANCHORED ANOMIE:

The Second Act-Play

... As I perchance hereafter shall think meet
To put an antic disposition on.
- *Hamlet*, I, v, line 171

You just have to let your imagination go further. Jes)

INTRODUCTION

During "this stage" group members' activities changed in two ways observed through data analysis. They changed in relation to their activities of the first stage, and they also changed throughout this period.

While there was a theme of common meaning running through group members' interactions in these meetings, there was also contrast between group members' shapes of interactions during the meetings. This section reflects these changes by separating in "this stage" the first two meetings, referred to as "Breaking Point Meetings", from a third meeting referred to as an "All-day Acting Workshop".

EMERGING CONTEXT

TIME OF YEAR

We continued into late summer with its changing inclinations, mainly hot, but sometimes surprisingly cool to the touch.
PERIOD OF TIME

Three meetings were included through data analysis in this stage. Participants held the three in the last three weeks of August, the fourteenth, eighteenth, and twenty-fourth.

LOCATION

The location of participants' meetings during this period markedly changed. Meetings in the first stage "meandered", one meeting being held in one location, the next in another. However, beginning with this series of meetings participants met in one location consistently, that being the theatre in Goetheim. The theatre was situated in the public school.

In addition to their interactions at formally called meetings, group members also referred to intense reconstruction and construction occurring outside of meeting. In some instances individuals went home and reflected.

- I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it. But when I stopped to think about it afterwards... Ann) A-14-306.
- For some reason we thought that was good until we thought about it after. E11) A-14-303.

Some of the reconstruction and construction continued as well through discussions taking place outside the more formal meetings. As they had during the "first stage", these informal discussions occurred mainly in group members' homes, often in telephone conversations.

- Anna and I talked for about an hour on the phone that night. E11) A-14-383.
In terms of the "all-day acting workshop", activities for the group as a whole took place in the theatre within the school. Small group members' activities on that day mainly occurred elsewhere in the school facility housing the theatre. For example, group members went off in small groups of three and four to collaborate in the proprroom across the hallway from the theatre, and in various schoolrooms connected by brightly lit corridors. They even "worked" in the corridors during this event.

ATTENDANCE

The August fourteenth meeting was relatively well attended by those who had been participating regularly. At the second meeting, on August eighteenth, the numbers declined. There were no "new faces" at either of these meetings.

In contrast, the all-day workshop brought the largest turn out of people. All those who had attended prior meetings participated in at least part of the workshop. There were three new faces. The two "new" men who attended eventually joined the group, Jay and Al. A woman also attended for the first time participated in the morning sessions but did not return for the afternoon activities. In the meetings which followed the workshop a "core" group of people began to emerge.
EMERGING PATTERNS OF PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

The August fourteenth meeting emerged as one during which many group members recognized a major shift. There were apparent shifts in both the kinds of ambiguities with which group members commonly struggled and the shapes of their interactions or the manner in which they struggled.

Criteria for suggesting that this meeting emerged as an occasion of marked change included: a) The August fourteenth meeting was the first meeting to be held in the theatre. Location became a constant. Not only was it constant, the theatre provided the ambience for their acting. b) During these three meetings group members' activities reflected intense concentration on coming to grips with what "theatre" meant to them. Most significantly, this took place in the narrower context of what they were prepared to do to put on a play for this community. Their activities expressed two primary shapes, intense discussion of what group members wanted, followed by group members actually beginning to act in the form of improvisations. c) It was at the August fourteenth meeting that, for the first time, some group members intentionally created an "improvisation" without aid of Cam.

The first few weeks during which people met and discussed this theatre project were in many ways the most significant in terms of data analysis. The experiences people had and the decisions they made — whether to become involved with the project, what the project meant to them initially, what concerns they experienced, who should do certain things and how they should be done, set the tone and the tack
for group members' ongoing interactions. It was during these early efforts when people were attempting to come to hold in common a sense of direction, a paradigm, that they were more likely to experience abrupt changes and meaninglessness. This meaninglessness for many participants was expressed in "Sustained Uncertainty" in terms of a list representing an accretion of ambiguities group members experienced.

To provide a clear idea of when and how shifts in group members' interactions emerged, the weeks of their activities have been divided into five stages, five Act-Plays, as noted in the introduction to the Mobile-framework. Where the lines have been drawn between these "five stages" to create the pieces of the Mobile-framework depends on points of emphasis and is arguably quite arbitrary despite extensive data analysis. The line drawn between "Sustained Uncertainty" and this stage, was particularly difficult to draw.

EMERGED PATTERNS, GROUP MEMBERS' AMBIGUITY AND ANOMALIES

All the questions listed in "Sustained Uncertainty" which group members faced as sources of ambiguity were significant for the content of each question. Some were disturbingly fundamental questions. These questions were also significant in terms of the sheer volume of questions group members were asking through various means.

Placed together these questions signaled an amazing accretion of ambiguity for group members. Nonetheless, between the beginning of
meetings in the first stage and the first meeting of this stage, August fourteenth, there was a decline in at least the sources of ambiguity for participants.

Some group members' questions, if not wholly answered, were discussed. A course of action was suggested by Cam during the last meeting of the first stage. Ostensibly the number of issues they experienced had been reduced and a concrete plan of action had been suggested.

As the "Cultural-Meaning" section states, data analysis suggested that group members experienced some shift away from feelings of being overwhelmed as expressed through a desire for "the concrete" during the latter part of the first stage and the first part of this stage. Their concern with general ambiguity shifted from the forefront to a large background hum. "It" was nonetheless poised for the forefront. Still steeped in ambiguity angst, group members' responded positively to Cam's concrete proposal.

EMERGING SHAPES, AUGUST FOURTEENTH MEETING, GROUP MEMBERS' BREAKING POINT ACTIONS ANEW

There were two meetings which the study describes as "Breaking Point Meetings". At the first such meeting, on August fourteenth, Cam was unable to be present. He attended the second meeting on August eighteenth.

The fact of a concrete plan being suggested had several implications. This meant it was actually possible to have a concrete plan -- something about which group members had begun to question as
Anna's comment on August first had suggested: "Grace. Got something shaping up at least." (Ann, A-1-266.)

The implications of having something concrete, however, was that assumptions might be confronted. Despite offering some certainty, "something to grab on to" the concrete must be meaningful. If "the concrete" ran counter to most group members' meanings, the concrete would not offer acceptable bases for their action. Its concrete quality would have limited benefit. That is what occurred for at least some of the group members.

Their angst of facing old ambiguities was insufficient to stave off angst raised by the concrete proposal. Rather than taking up the framework Cam had suggested for the play and rather than working on "friezes" as he had requested, some of the group members began this meeting with breaking point actions.

They began with clarifying their thoughts on theatre in terms of what they were prepared to do and what they were not prepared to do for this project. At the first meeting "of this stage" group members did this amongst themselves. Cam was not present at the time. At the second meeting when Cam attended several participants discussed their concerns with him.

Reduction Of Group Members' Ambiguities and Anomalies Through Breaking Point Actions

All members of a group do not necessarily experience a breaking point at the same moment. Some may not experience any disruption of meaning whatsoever. In this instance, group members did not experience a breaking point when together. Several group members
apparently experienced a breaking point after the August first meeting. This was the meeting wherein many of the group had participated in a "physicalization exercise" and then after the exercise had discussions concerning a format for the play.

For those experiencing a breaking point after that meeting, their experience was a prolonged one. They were faced with waiting to respond formally to their breaking point experience until the next meeting on August fourteenth. Then these group members were faced with describing this to Cam at yet another meeting on August eighteenth. It was not until that meeting that a clear change in direction would be determined with him.

Participants' breaking point actions in Cam's absence are particularly interesting because through them surfaced a very clear sense of what some group members would not do. They were to strike up the next meeting with their concerns.

a) Breaking Point Clarity

- We cannot get up there without props. We need a set. It has to look like a house. A-18-480.

Some group members' discomfiture with "the concrete" came from details of Cam's proposal for the play structure. He had indicated at the end of the prior meeting that there would be limited use of props and sets:

- They [actors in a scene] may become parts of... Some of them will become parts of whatever action takes place. They'll all become different characters. They may become things, animals, buildings. -- I don't know. Cam) A-1-264.
Group members at the August first meeting gathered from this and other statements that there would be a minimum of props and sets. They might be required to portray inanimate objects in the play.

b) Indications of Discomfort

There was an element of abruptness both in terms of group members' shift in meaning and their accounts of the experience. At the meeting where the proposed structure for the play emerged based on Cam's suggestions, some indicated strong support at that time:

- I find that extremely exciting. Really, extremely exciting. Ann) It's easier to do in a way. Lor) We can focus our energy on doing it rather than building things. Eil) Yeah. Cam) I was worried about that. Eil) A-1-257.

Strikingly, despite these statements of support, many indications of discomfort were reported as having been experienced soon after the formal fourteenth one group member began:

- I want to start with last week's meeting. I really liked the improv we did at the beginning and then near the end there when we were talking about using the Grace... I got so excited and then when I got home I thought, "My god that's a stupid idea". A-14-300.
- Yeah, you can't do that in Goethein, at least not yet. Participant) Yeah, if we were more experienced or in a different community, I'd... A-14-301.
- For some reason we thought that was good until we thought about it after. [She laughs] You can't do that, that's stupid. Participant) It was like changing the scene right then and there. Participant) It was like no sets, and just... A-14-304.
- I still think that. I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it and still get all excited about it afterwards. It was respect for the Goethein audience in a Heritage Project in which we are responsible for $3200 of money. It's not us taking a bathe if we want to put on some experimental theatre. A-14-307.
- I think we generally feel the same way about that. So now... A-14-314.
Notably, not everyone participated fully in this discussion. Of the three most vehement speakers, these three had tended in past meetings to take a leadership role in most decision-making. Not all of those attending this meeting had been at the August first meeting where the physicalization exercise was followed by discussion of possible structure for the play. Nonetheless emerging construction at this meeting was supported either directly or through passivity by both those attending this meeting.

c) Response. Paradigmatic Actions

Very much in the manner of "get something concrete" paradigmatic action, the producer facilitated group members listing what they did wish to have in "the play". She finally articulated concern, the need to take action and their process. As there was no protestation from other group members her articulation ostensibly crystallized their process.

- I think we generally feel the same way about that. So now before Cam comes back on Sunday and we have to tell him we don't want to be combines, I think it's much better to tell Cam what we want to be. A-14-314.

One of the interesting features of this occasion was that Eileen suggested a process whereby everyone might express themselves. Although she was suggesting a simple process, this had not been done before by project members during the study. The process of using a circle shifted from story contribution to formal format for discussion.
- So let's talk about it. We'll go right around the circle. Pay no attention to what you think somebody else might be thinking or caring about. You tell me what you visualize our end production as sort of being. What kind of a play can we put on for the people of Goetheim that we can enjoy doing, that we can get done and I think we'll all come up with basically the same answers. But let's each add our own and make a list of what we expect to see in the play. Eil) A-14-314-17.

Each group member present at this meeting proceeded to contribute to the discussion about possible format and content for the play. When this process began a group member pulled out a pen and paper. She began to write down informally what members wanted as they went around the circle.

The entire conversation has not been reconstructed within this segment. However, group members' comments have been clustered into thematic areas. The first cluster reflects their "revised" sense of content. These were recorded relatively informally.

- In the beginning I was really thinking characterization and women's role. But I got off on a tangent... that people who have read the Best Of Goetheim or people that have lived there then will recognize... A recognizable short journal...a journal of a specific period of time. Human drama people recorded. Ann) A-14-319.
- I think we have to stir up the memories that they're looking for. A lot of feelings stirring in the audience. Mixed emotions. I'd like to see it be a really emotional play. Back in those times families were close, there was a lot of laughter. Lyl) A-14-324.
- That's what we want to impart to the audience is the excitement of what happened there. And in that particular year, Stern's crop came in at 52 bushels to the acre, 100 acres planted. Eil) A-14-340.
- I think we really have to get the people and the emotional.. like the sadness. But also, like the happiness too. Because people now sort of think, "Wow, could they ever smile?" Like they didn't have T.V. or an electric can-opener or whatever. And they just think it would be so hard for them to live. Deb) A-14-345.
- I think we should introduce as much humor ... I think all of us feel the same thing. I haven't been into this kind of thing before, so... if we hang together... lor) A-14-329.
- That'll come soon enough. You'll say "That stinks." [Laughter and an emphatic voice.] Or like me, get right into it and then go home and went... What the hell did I just do? Eil) A-14-330.
- I really agree on that point about togetherness, I wouldn't want the whole play just being this one family... I know its difficult to do but I'm — still in thoughts of doing more than one year. I like the idea of little Johnny in school and going off to war. I don't want to get hung-up on props. Have to have some... But I don't think we should sell our audience short. We should leave a lot to the imagination. Jes) A-14-333.
- Because of the heritage idea, I want, or I'd like to see quite a bit of interesting history factor. I think probably for the younger people getting an idea that it was exciting and a lot of interesting things happened here... Cause reading the history there was a lot of really exciting things happen. And like Jessie I'd like to see it extend more than one year. I haven't had a chance to get the Journal. Joy) A-14-357.

It is interesting to note that there is an apparent shift in participants' consideration of the play's content. First, their statements reflect some commonality at this point. Second, that commonality is consistent with Cam's statements about theatre being focused on personal history and dramatic qualities, not only "facts".

One member raised questions about using "real" names.

- Will the community be offended if real names are used? Iy) If you are going to refer to a teacher you can refer to a real teacher or priest. Don't get hung-up about it." Eil) A-14-342.

Then two group members shifted to a discussion about reading the Journal as a resource for research:

- Anna, tell first about how you felt when you went through the Journal that day. Nobody else read it yet. Eil) I started out with the sewage systems kind of thing and got bored with it right away. I got quickly bored with pages two and three, war propaganda... Once you got back down to the personal columns, and some of the stuff happening around it was just tremendous. I said to Eileen on the phone, "I think it ought to be required of everybody that's involved in this even to spend twenty minutes, half an hour. Read one issue, skim headlines. Invaluable not only for news event but characterization. Ann) A-14-369.
Anna and I talked for about an hour on the phone that night. I read completely different and entirely different things. I never saw what she found. She didn't see what I found. Everybody brings their own. [Ann breaks in] what your notion is when I walked in there. Like I was obviously interested in finding the "pink pills for pale people". A-14-383.

As that discussion died out two group members expressed ongoing concern with not accomplishing something permanent through this particular task. They were beginning to evoke again the experiences of anomic conditions through these comments:

- No, I mean so far I mean still after all our, our discussions... [Joy says, "Nothing"] and things, we still don't have anything. Ann) A-14-387.

Others responded emphatically to this implied shift towards meaninglessness:

- Yes we do. We have a page and a half of what we want in there. Jes) Lyle, get up there and drive a team of oxen for us. We have to have something. Eil) I'll be an ox... I was trying to find something to grab onto. Joy) Yeah and a tree [Eileen says this as Joy is completing her last sentence.] On Sunday we will give all this to Cam. See how he wants to work into it. Eil) A-14-387.

When Eileen referred indirectly to the future, and to creating the play as a process this prompted a swift shift to a second set of breaking point actions among group members.

Renewed Ambiguity, A Second Wave Of Breaking Point Actions

Having begun to have something concrete "something to grab onto", in the form of a process for discussion, a strategy to respond to Cam from "the group", participants had strengthened both anchors to some extent. Having done this, other questions, those of detail could be raised more safely.

604
a) **Breaking Point Clarity**

- Until we know if we have these other people, we're counting on Buddha in the air right now. Ann) A-14-398.

The question of more detail raised at this point related to a number of uncertainties. The question was one which concerned in particular, roles, tasks, and time. A group member precipitated the question in part as an offer.

b) **Indications of Discomfort:**

Group members' breaking point actions took shape in more discussion at this point. Their discussions centred on frustration over lapsing time with so much more to do. There was a major turning point, however, as one person with tremendous legitimacy in terms of acting abilities suggested that she would withdraw from an acting role and take over an administrative role.

- Because I, what I was going to say was if there's lots of people that want to perform and I'm very concerned about the amount of time, commitment of time to putting this thing together and the work that has to be done, otherwise, -- Eileen's various lists, that I would take on the job of advertising and promotions and would step away from, if we've got a good group of performers. Ann) I disagree with that. Eil) Well I had my shot at it last time and if there's enough people who want... Ann) A-14-390.

- That's awfully gracious of you, but... Jes) No, I'm not being gracious. What I'm being is -- I sat down with my husband and my kids and said, I am going to commit myself to 3 nights a week at this. I don't know about all the other work that has to be done. Everyone has to pitch in. It's going to have to be split up. Ann) A-14-394.

c) **Group Members' Responses**

There were several responses. First, group members described assumptions about other resources.
- People that belong to the club but haven't been coming, I am positive they're still wanting to do work. Jes) I'm hoping so. That's why I said to Eileen on the phone today, I will... Can we write a list of people tonight who might have expressed an interest? Otherwise I'll take on a job for my own. Until we know if we have these other people, we're counting on Buddha in the air right now. Ann) Our annual meeting is September 6th. The members can do the leg work. Jes) A-14-396.

On the heels of this discussion, the producer determined to obtain commitments from those present in terms of acting. In doing so she relied on Anna's estimate of time requirements, three nights a week. The producer began to go around the circle again, this time to ask if people could commit to three nights a week. She also asked who wanted to be on stage. During this process there was an acknowledgment that "a couple of people" were not there.

- ...But in this situation it isn't going to work that way. If I commit myself to Monday, Wednesday, Friday I'm not going to commit myself to something else. I can't. Ann) Can you commit to 3 nights? Eil) I will do it. Ann) Joy, what about you? Eil) A-14-401.
- That's eight people on stage -- nine people on stage. Eil) Do you know how many people that is to direct? What a job. Ann) A-14-456.

After it was established in this fashion which members would be "acting", as producer, Eileen undertook to assume all administrative functions.

- What I sort of have to decide to do is, you people who want to be on the stage, I'm going to just have to find a way to take all those concerns away from you. I'll hire somebody, I'll scratch people off the street. [Her voice is very quiet.] Yes, every time we get together we get deflected away from doing the play. Anything but doing the play. Joy) A-14-422.

Group members' focus turned then to amplifying both the producer's role and their own in administrative activities:
- Like I said when it comes down to the crunch, like "Anna, for Christ sake I got 500 tickets here and they all got to go to five different stores. Can you please take them?" And that's all. Ann) A-14-427.
- You certainly don't want me taking up three hours of your time to decide whether the old people should sit in the yellow seats or the orange seats. You don't have the time. Eil) A-428.
- The producer, most of the things are written down. You can follow them and asing them. If you disagree say, "Hey folks, I don't like the idea of children's matinee. What do you think? Yes, yes, no". Go ahead and do it. Assign a job. We don't need to sit around and moe and rehash and rehash. Just do it. Jes) A-14-430.
- It makes sense. The producer produces. In a professional production you're not arguing for your opinion, any more than you're up there saying, "I think you're left arm should be..." Ann) A-14-431.
- I'll have to force you — I can force you into not using that excuse. I'm not hearing a damn thing out of anyone of you except plays. Eil) That eases my mind tremendously, really. Ann) A-14-425.

Once group members had a sense of establishing these roles more clearly, they turned again to some discussion about matters related to the process of creating the play. This discussion was very much from the perspective of acting:

- I think it would be fun. Like I'd like to do several characters and just change, like a bunch of little parts. Joy) A-14-437.
- I really disagree with that. I can't help it. I don't want part of the play to be somebody sitting out in the audience saying, "Oh, look that man is a woman." Ann) A-14-439.

A specific theme began to emerge with respect to process:

- And things are going to change. Joy) Changes, yeah. Ann) But we are going to have a script. Lor) No. [Several voices] A-14-446.
- We will definitely not be following a script? Lor) We don't have a scriptwriter. We don't have time to write a script. We're going to be up there doing it. Ann) A-14-448.
- You do it and everybody sets it down — take notes of everything you say and do. And then after we'll write a script. Jes) Yeah. No. Ann) A-14-449.
Confusion arising out of this discussion prompted the beginning sense of another breaking point. The producer suggested doing an improvisation as an example of what the process would be like.

GROUP MEMBERS' SHIFTING SHAPE, ACTING AUGUST FOURTEENTH MEETING

Spontaneously, the producer prompted group members to participate in an "improvisation":

- Jessie will get up there and somehow go ahead. Eil) I'm a man by the way. [Jessie states this as she moves towards the stage. Group members laugh.] A-14-449.

Anna and Eileen also rose to participate. They huddled together briefly (no more than three minutes) while the rest of the group watched intently from the audience seats. As the improvisation unfolded for me, Anna "became" a mother working in one room. She was making motions which I interpreted as baking. Eileen, as a disembodied voice called out to Anna as her mother. She indicated that she was sick through a number of cues. She coughed prolifically. Her voice conveyed that of a fretting child.

Child: M-o-o-o-m, do I have to stay in bed? [Cough, cough, cough.] Eil)
Mother: Yes, you've got a cold and a fever. Just try and get some sleep. Ann)
Child: [Pause] Mom? Eil)
Mother: What now? Ann)
Child: Can I have a glass of water. Eil) A-14-450.
[As group members were laughing and talking, it was difficult to discern all the words spoken. This is a paraphrased approximation of the dialogue.]

Eventually Jessie "knocked" and Anna let her in, continuing to "bake". Jessie established her character through references to selling things. Anna offered her coffee and they attempted to talk
about what Anna would like to buy. Eileen began to interrupt, coughing considerably. Jessie commented on Eileen's illness and suggested she was trying to remember some remedy she might sell her. She'd read the advertisement for it but could not recall the precise wording.

Travelling
Salesperson: Something about pink pills or pink people?

Eileen's interruptions became more insistent eventually. Anna was caught between trying to be polite and converse with Jessie, bake and keep track of Eileen's condition. The improvisation came to a "crisis" when Eileen declared loudly that she was going to "fro-up, Mom". Anna, rushing around with her "bowl" began to look for something and yells,

Mother: Use the pail! Ann)
Child: I don't have it. Eil) Mother: Oh, where is that pail?
[Anna running around]
Ann)

Jessie then burst out with what became the punch-line at that moment. (She referred to an advertisement in a 1915 newspaper which had amused group members earlier):

Travelling
Salesperson: That's it, "Pale"!
Mother: Where? Where? [assuming Jessie had observed the pail]. Ann)
Travelling
Salesperson: "Pink Pills For Pale People!" Jes)

[Ann stopped. She stared at Jessie with the sound of Eileen throwing up in the background. There is a sense of the curtain drawing closed soon after their sudden halt in sound and movement. The "actors" start laughing.] A-14-452.
Group members as audience began laughing more and clapping loudly. The producer immediately began to relate this process to group members:

- Now that's what's going to happen. That's how you do it. Eil) Yeah, that's how you do it. Jes) That's how it's going to work. Cam will get us started. So now does everybody feel better? Can we make this work? Eil) A-14-453.

Elated with their first efforts of an "improv", those who had acted in this "improv" began to comment excitedly about their experiences:

- I said to her would you just cough a bit please. [Jes laughing] I'm a ham. Eil) She gets up there and is puking all over the place. Jes) When we do stuff like that "Use the pail", you wouldn't never have thought of that earlier. It just happened. Speaking of pale... A-14-455.
- That was fun. Ann) Okay, well that makes me feel better. Joy) We do this every meeting. I come here full of concerns. By the end of the time I'm saying, "Oh, I'm so excited." [Laughing] Ann) A-14-456.

After this, group members chatted about several things including recounting some "stories" of the August first meeting. The August fourteenth meeting essentially ended with those group members who had initially voiced concerns about the process, creating an improvisation. Their exuberant remarks indicated that they experienced doing the improvisation as confidence building. It is not so clear whether those in the audience experienced a boost in confidence.

- So now does everybody feel better? — Can we make this work? Eil) You, three can. I'm not so sure I can. Lor) A-14-453.
SHIFTING SHAPES, AUGUST EIGHTEENTH MEETING
GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING BREAKING POINT ACTIONS WITH CAM,

As unclear as group members' collective meaning was after experiencing the improvisation, superimposed upon their earlier discussion, they were faced with addressing Cam. They had not followed his request to spend that meeting creating the "tableaux".

a) **Breaking Point Clarity**

- You're just really bare naked up there without anything, a room. It is lack of confidence. One person alone in the middle of that space...Eil) A-18-504.

In spite of some confusion among group members arising out of the improvisation experience, there was still a commonly held, fundamental concern which emerged through their breaking point actions.

b) **Indications of Discomfort**

The meeting was slow to start. Cam began it with an informal question:

- So what happened the other day? Cam) We talked. Eil) Did you do the friezes? Cam) [He had asked group members to each work on a frieze from the meeting before.] No. Eil) You didn't. How come? Cam) We just never got that far. I don't know how come. Eil) A-18-471.

At this point there was another abrupt transition. The producer found herself in the uncomfortable position of attempting to represent a construction of meaning from the discussion of last meeting. She had been one of several to foster that construction at the time. However, she had since experienced another shift in meaning.
Although experiencing such a shift, she began with a description of what had happened between the meeting Cam had attended and the one had not.

- Everybody left feeling okay. Everybody got home to a person and said, "We cannot do that. We cannot get up there without props. We need a set. It has to look like a house." Eil) A-18-480.
- "Nobody in the audience is going to recognize us pretending that this is a house", everybody panicked. And we really felt strongly about that and I think most people still do. But after Jessie, Anna and I got up and did that little skit. We did that and we didn't have any props and now when I'm watching the lights [Cam had been working on lighting]... So I think we have to get something started and start doing some work. Everybody wanted sets. Everybody wanted props. Eil) Oh, I really disagree. They felt that the audience, couldn't get it. Jes) The audience, okay, you're right. Correct me whenever I say anything confusing. Eil) A-18-486.
- I just think you're just lacking in confidence in yourself. And uh, anything you believe you can do, the audience will believe. There is just no question in my mind. If you create a situation, they'll believe it. It doesn't matter how you -- how real or how specific your props are... In a production like this where we're trying to tell a history, too many props... I mean you can't. It's impossible. it would just be an endless lineup of props and sets. A garish headache. Cam) A-18-487.
- That's not to say there won't be props, things, artifacts. ...As a matter of fact that was going to be my next thing for the next time we meet, some artifact, something from the past. Props differ from sets. Moods, places you create with lighting, you create with your mind. Cam) A-18-492.

In this way, the conversation subtly shifted concerning a more general discussion of theatre. Based on that slip shift, a second shift occurred.

c) Group Members' Responses

Individuals' construction of meaning for "concrete" (something to hang on to literally) began to slip away from being identified with "props" and "sets". Group members began to express their meaning of "concrete" in terms of action, acquiring experience.
- You know what we have to do is create one of those places and look at it and see what we've got. Because one of the things somebody said was, "Make real rooms" and that was the kind of the thing that everybody was concerned about. And people were concerned for the audience. Eii) The audience will accept anything if they come with an open mind. It didn't take us seconds, milliseconds to catch on to what was going on. [Cam is referring to the physicalization exercise.] A-18-495.

- But we want to give more to the audience than standing on stage. Jes) I don't think you can give more. I mean, that's all there is. What can you do? Cam) Artifacts, things... People said we shouldn't be something. The trees... We had a big joke about trees. That no one wanted to be things. We wanted things to be there and... We don't want abstract improving to that degree. Not like someone mentioned real rooms... as we talked further, but not to the extreme that people are going to be trees. Jes) A-18-496.

Cam then began to address their more specific concerns, attempting to quell their anxiety about what they would do for an audience. He did this through a number of different means. One of the distinctions Cam made at this point was a distinction between activities external to the group and those internal to the group.

- Couple of things. Let's not confuse "a)" what I am asking you to do for the sake of gaining some confidence in yourself and your bodies and, uh, just you know, realize the potential of what we want to do. You know, if you're going to be a saw, among ourselves, that's fine, among ourselves. It's a joke, fun. But it does also trigger the possibility "If I can do that, I can do other things with my body and create another image of this physical presence that I have, other than what I am. Because that's what you have to do as an actor. If you can't do that, then we have a real uphill struggle. No matter how many rooms and buildings and real saws and trees you drag on to a stage, it's not going to do you a damn bit of good. Cam) A-18-497.

Although such delineations may have been tacitly expressed through group members' actions, none had explicitly articulated structure associated with group members' interactions in this fashion.

- Yeah I think people realized that. That wasn't what they were saying. But like I started to say, "We needed something concrete. We're getting anxious. The thing at Anna's was magnificent and we realized the goodness of it and how useful it is, but the fear is if we don't do something now, we're not going
to get anything done... As we talked we were saying we need those exercises but we have to start doing something. So it went right to the other extreme of the concreteness. Jes) You're just really bare naked up there without anything, a room. It is lack of confidence. One person all alone in the middle of that space, right now just there can can in fact hold all those factors... We've seen it. We know it, we know it can be done. But I don't think any of us want to... I think may be if we did it... Eil) Yes exactly... Jes) we'd feel differently about it. Let's do it. Get up there. Eil) Exactly. Like last week. Jes) Do it. Get up there and do something. It's so hard for us to grasp. The things you say, we know they're valid. But to actually see ourselves doing them... Eil) A-18-504.

Thus far, these statements reflected a return to, a repetition of the earlier experienced breaking point. However, now group members' statements carried a forcefulness, indicating that for some at least they were escaping from compressed intensity.

Several shifts occurred in terms of focus during the discussion recounted thus far. One group member began their discussion, expressing to Cam a group concern with not feeling sufficiently confident to go without props. Expressed in this form group members spoke as a set of individual actors, personally concerned about being out on the stage alone. A second member reframed her statements to indicate group members' concern was with the audience, not themselves. That is, they were concerned with whether the audience, implying the community, would understand the play.

In the ensuing discussion Cam propounded his belief that the audience would understand if group members believed in what they were doing. His meaning shifted "responsibility" in theatre away from the community back to actors. Given this shift group members returned to their requirement for something concrete, this time in terms of activities rather than a script.
At that point, one of those described as being in the subgroup oriented towards organizational development voiced her concern not as an actor but in organizational terms. In this way she returned the issue directly back to the community, while not specifically mentioning the audience.

- My god are we actually going to be able to open this play, Friday? We want that so badly. Eil) We feel like we're on thin ice. We screw up and we've lost the support of the community. We've played this thing up and... This is probably not true but we feel that way. Eil) I feel like Anna, the worry-wort of the group. Jes) "Oh I feel so much better now. I really needed to come to this meeting tonight." [Eileen imitating Anna.] A-18-530.

Despite this shift, focus of discussion remained squarely on developing a concrete process so that group members fears would be assuaged. In an effort to do that, group members began to describe their process, what had "worked for them" and from which experiences they drew their meanings of need:

- And what we did, we took something concrete, writing in a newspaper article "Pink Pills for Pale People"... advertising. And so what we did was, Eileen, Anna and I went up there. It was the same type of thing we did at Anna's and then took a scene off of that. But we had to have something concrete to start. Jes) A-18-515.

Upon hearing an interpretation of their processes and meanings of need, Cam described to group members his process:

- In the back of my mind I've been working with the notion, I thought there was consensus about the meal and how that might work as a framework with which to string it together. But everybody has a story. They are going to want to tell and it's going to be at the cooperation of everybody else that they're going to be able to tell that little story... The "thing", the whatever that is done -the pill thing might be one of the sketches. It sounds like a good one. I would like to have worked from the friezes to concretize those. Do it from those. Going from the abstract to the concrete rather than the concrete to the abstract. You can do it either way. Because I wasn't there it was difficult to imagine what I had in mind. Cam) Yeah,
that was the difficulty for me I had no idea what you wanted. Jes) A-18-518.

He followed this with a description of his role and attempts to relate that to both his paradigm of theatre and some group members' experience with theatre:

- My job is to string all of those stories into some kind of cohesive shape. We may not see that shape till latter stages. This is not unusual for any theatrical endeavor including the one you guys were involved with the first time. Cam) A-18-527.

He attempted to assure the members that what they were going through was simply part of the process, that they were still engaged in a process, not adrift:

- We're looking for a nail to hang it on... We have to let it slosh around. It's frustrating. It's the only thing... I seem so blase about it because it's constant. That's just the way it is. To be anxious about it doesn't help. What I'm saying is you have started to write it. Cam) A-18-534.

At this point a group member expressed frustration with the process in terms of control over decision-making. This was the first and one of the few times that group members expressed at a formal meeting a breaking point internal to the group — frustration with depending on an expert:

- See we got all these ideas together and did some things on our own. And all of a sudden somebody just decided, "Okay. Let's sit back and see what Cam is going to do. That was it. We stopped. Now should we or shouldn't we be doing that. If we want Cam to do it, let's do it. But we had said from the outset we wanted to write this ourselves. Jim) A-18-535.

Cam responded to why he thought the group had not continued on that course of action. His response was consistent with his earlier statements concerning the issue of their taking action:
- And nobody here has the confidence to say, "Well I know how to do it and how to do it right." That's right. We just don't have that kind of... [Eileen interrupts, saying, "Experience"...]

Cam returned to refining a description of his role through more

description of process:

- What I'm here for is when we have time and collectively a sense of time and place, then, we can just let the story go. We should have certain things in common. Where we all know that the story, the setting, place mask, characterization for a particular moment. Then when we take you out of that moment and you all have something to work with, the group will "do things" spontaneously. Cam) A-18-542. [This last line is a paraphrase in part. As there were multiple sounds on the tape the words marked with quotation marks are approximations as there were multiple sounds on the tape.]

He indicated several times he expected that soon group members would be able to work on parts of the production on their own.

- What I really wish was to have some way of having you guys doing something constructive and useful with me not being here. Cam) After a while we can, but until we get some sort of established story line. Eil) Maybe so, but it's our story, so. Jim) A-18-532.

Cam began to strategize about how to hasten "the" process:

- We need a long session to work on a storyline. I can write a story. But it's not my story and that's not what I'm here for. Cam) A-18-526.

One of the chief outcomes of this discussion between group members and Cam was to determine a starting point for more in depth theatre work. They eventually agreed upon the urgency of having a workshop to begin to work on the play. Thus they established something concrete. It was determined that the workshop would be a day in all and they determined the date, August twenty-fourth. It was to be their next meeting.
SHIFTING SHAPE IN GROUP MEMBERS' ACTIONS, ACTING
AN ALL DAY ACTING WORKSHOP (August Twenty-Fourth)

When people first entered the theatre on the morning of the
workshop they gravitated towards the first few rows of seats, sitting
in small groups. As with all meetings, some group members engaged in
informal, small group discussion prior to and after the more formal
interactions marking the main meeting.

The meeting was formally begun with a call to sit in a circle on
the stage. It offered the only space large enough in which to do
this. (That pattern continued throughout the first few meeting of the
next stage "Play Acting".) While there was special focus on activities
conducted on the stage it could not be described as the focal point
for all group members' activities.

Cam began the workshop welcoming people. In the activities which
followed participants were required to do "exercises". These were
game-like activities which shifted toward group members literally
improvising and then acting in scenes as the day wore on. Activities
had both a physical and emotional orientation in their focus.

During most of the day the group was divided into smaller groups
to participate in events. The day was characterized by tremendous
activity and energy from participants. When a small group was
performing, the remaining group members often participated as an
audience.

Thus far through the Mobile-framework I have recreated my
interpretation of group members' experience concerning both their
differences in assumptions and their commonly experienced meaning. To support this interpretation the Mobile-frame has drawn from my observational notes of their interactions. However, it has drawn most heavily upon participants' words during their interactions.

In the instance of the day long acting workshop, there was considerable shift in the form of data. Most of the verbal data came from two sources. The two were, Cam's direction to group members and group members' words in doing the exercises.

When the background hubbub was discernible or emerged at the forefront, for example, when group members responded to Cam with questions or statements, I have presented data. However, this data is considerably diminished in the third meeting of this stage.

Group members' appeared to hold a common expectation that Cam would "give the workshop", that he would structure the events of the day. His words comprise much of the data, then, most clearly indicating the direction of activities. Cam assigned tasks. Even if they were not always clearly understood there were few questions when he assigned them. There was little or no discussion in the large group about his instructions.

In contrast to weeks of meeting and discussing, group members were engaged in activities of a far more physically oriented, expressive nature. They were generally eager to leap into the activity first. They asked questions of Cam if they could not determine something once they had started.
Processual Outline Of Workshop Activities

The day may be described in terms of a series of activities through which Cam guided those attending.

a) "Story Circle" Exercise

After introducing himself and welcoming everyone, Cam started the morning with an exercise. While he had everyone sitting on the stage in a circle he began:

- I'm going to start a sentence, a story. Everybody will add to it. First repeat what I said. Cam) A-24-04.

Group members had been laughing and joking among themselves in response to Cam's instructions. When Cam gestured which way around the circle the story would go, Jessie realized that she would be near the end. In fact the more difficult position was to be the last person. The person concluding the story circle had to recall and repeat the entire "collective story" before he or she could add her final line:

- You're starting? Want to trade places? [She said this laughing to someone a few seats down.] Jes) This is not focused. In other words, it doesn't have to have a meaning. It's just a concentration exercise. Cam) It has to make sense. Jes) Does it have to make sense? Eil) A-24-561.

Cam began without responding to Eileen:

- I got up this morning and my car wouldn't start. Cam) I got up this morning and my car wouldn't start because I ran out of gasoline. Joy)

I got up this morning and my car wouldn't start because I ran out of gasoline. So I walked over to the service station with a pail. Len) [Much laughter at the possible link with the "pink pills" improvisation.] Gas can? Whatever... Len) No. "Pail." Do it. Joy) Speaking of pails, sickly boys and girls. What you need is Dr. William's pink pills for pail people. Ann) A-24-04.
[There is more laughter, louder and longer illustrating appreciation of a "running joke".]

Group members responded to each participant's contributions with appreciative laughter. When some stumbled, forgetting part of the story, group members also laughed and then provided hints. Cam expressed surprise at how well group members were able to remember the story. He immediately began a second exercise.

b) "Objects" Exercise

With this exercise, the group was broken into smaller groups. Cam provided a numbering scheme which resulted in group members being unable to choose small group with friends.

- Number off into groups. Find an object — three in a group...
Cam gave them no criteria for selecting an object other than size.

Group members scattered to scour the school. As they began the activity, group members became quite boisterous. When two groups returned, there was some rivalry between them as each group displayed their object:

As Cam looked over the objects he commented on one group's object which was a huge, ornate trophy with a cup on a wooden and metal pedestal.
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When each group had returned with their object Cam gave them a few minutes for the second part of the exercise:

- The next part of the assignment is to find ten uses, other than what it was intended for... Go into the group to decide. Cam) A-24-565.
- Without using words, I want you to take your things and without words, either in groups of two or three take turns defining what your thing is. Cam) A-24-567.

Members of the small groups then were asked to demonstrate ten uses for the object. One or more people in each small group mimed one of the uses. "Audience" members shouted out various ideas as each of the uses was mimed. As soon as someone identified the use, actions would quickly shift to the next one. Their ordered tumultuousness took very little time.

The study provides by way of a sample, a few instances of group members representations. The group with the trophy immediately turned "it" into a garbage can then scrambled to show it as a paper weight. One group had chosen a broom. They speedily removed the handle and used it as a shoehorn. Yet another group used a garbage can as a stool and then as a mobile.

Strikingly, this exercise required a clamour of collective creativity. Group members had to form a group for decision-making purposes. Group members also had to think quickly about how to act so that their "audience" (other group members) would understand the use of the object. There was a tremendous amount of physical movement, some most swiftly and subtly done by group members. This was a form of mime and as such required getting used to using physical movement to convey meaning.
Generally, everyone was in high spirits. Group members, shouted and laughed while attempting to guess each group's representation of the ten uses of an object. They laughed both in response to what small group members did to portray the object's use and they laughed at "wrong" suggestions coming from among themselves. Their responses became more and more raucous. When one group member could not remember or think of a tenth use, Cam asked, "Can others help him?" A group member responded amidst laughter: "I don't think so." Joy) A-24-569.

After this Cam asked group members to return to the circle. They did so sitting in precisely the same spots they had before. Cam asked them to take an early lunch break (half an hour only) so that they could go home to fetch an object:

- Come back with some thing that has some kind of sentimental value to you, That is old. Something you keep around the house, not because you need it or use it but you just can't throw it away... I want it to have some emotional value to you some how. This next step is going to be a long process and it's going to involve both the things we just finished doing. Only in terms of our story. Okay. Cam) A-24-571-72.

c) Lunch Break

The lunch was very brief. Many participants went home for lunch. However, some stayed or came back after purchasing lunch. During this time they had an opportunity to chat about apparently unrelated things, for example, gypsies, attending powwows and washing carrots in a washing machine. (One person was eating carrots.)

Not all returned to the afternoon session. One woman who had not attended earlier meetings did not come back. Another member did not
return for several hours: "Lyle's not here but he may be very late."

Eil) A-24-575.

d) "Object Of Personal Past" Exercise

Cam began the session after lunch with the group in a circle seated in virtually the same positions. His instructions this time were:

- Take your thing, whatever it is and just talk about it a bit. And then what we'll do is the same kind of a circle thing. I want you to pass it around so that everybody can get a look and a feel. And also tell what it reminds them of. So everybody will probably have a different, quite a different, uh, impression of this thing. Cam) A-24-576-577.

Cam advised me after this workshop that his purpose for including the exercise was part of a larger process to help group members make links between personal and past in the group.

One at a time group members brought forth their objects and described them. Some made reference to why they valued the objects, others did not. In an unrecorded discussion Cam indicated to me that he was aware of those who had not described why they valued their object. He stated that he did not wish to press people to do more than they would feel comfortable with doing. An interesting pattern developed wherein several group members brought two objects, the first being a "real" antique, the second being "old" in the sense of the person having had and valued the object since his or her youth.

As each participant finished the description, the object was passed around the circle. Others then commented on how they
experienced the object, some in tactile terms, others in terms of what they observed about the object. Group members' spoke more slowly, sometimes with hesitancy, but with keen interest and respect. Cam barely facilitated, group members’ following his structure, directed themselves in discussion.

This was a lengthy process. Two samples of data related to two members' objects were chosen to exemplify their process.3

1) Anna’s Object

Anna gently stroked a silver-colored purse made of chain while beginning to speak of its importance to her:

- My gramma was a packrat. She gave to me this purse. Her first beau gave it to her. Saving up, he bought it for her. Then he went off to war and died... Has unfinished sense about it. Ann) A-24-578.

She then passed the purse around. People also stroked it, looked at how it was made, observed that it required mending. About half way around the circle it came to Joyce. While looking at it closely she discovered a date of manufacture "1918" and commented that this would not have given the boy much time to go to war. Anna frowned and then smiled after a few seconds:

- My grandmother was also, from other sources many years later, quite a party girl. But of course as my grandmother she was nothing but one of the suffragette founders of the CCF...

A brief discussion ensued about the nature of memories. It was suggested that "people tend to remember what they want to recollect". Joyce added to this analysis:
- When people tell stories you remember, they actually embellish to make it a better story. It sounds so much better that you don't want to disagree with it. [She laughs.] It was not nearly so much fun when it happened. Joy) A-24-583.

2) Joyce's Objects

Joyce began with a book on veterinary medicine published in 1906. She described the book as including recipes for treating animal's symptoms:


The book was passed around, people flipping through pages, smelling its mustiness, talking among themselves, pointing at pictures. Joyce began to describe a second object while the book was in the process of being passed around:

- This is my favorite. I rescued this from thirteen nieces and nephews. Anyway that's my sentimental thing. I used to sleep with it. Participant) A-24-588.

"It" was an old plush toy dog which turned out to have a music box. Joyce announced the name of the song "How Much Is That Doggie In The Window". Eileen then described a similar toy that she had as a child:

- I had a pink pig that played "Edelweiss". [Group members laugh.] Eil) A-24-589.

After this for some time discussion occurred to the strains of "How Much Is That Doggie In The Window". As people passed the dog amongst each other, some wound it up.

Other examples of objects people brought included: a high school jacket with the person's nickname on it; a round aluminum jewelry box that played "Jingle Bells" (this eventually became part of the play); animal skins (one member's grandfather had owned a mink ranch,
another's was a trapper). Many people brought things from their childhood and many were gifts from grandparents. This also eventually became a theme in the play:

- And then I felt real sad because everybody else had personal things and that wasn't personal cause I wasn't born [when it was made]. So I had to go home and get a personal thing, a butterknife my grandmother gave me. Jes) So the importance of this is that your grandmother gave it to you? Mad) Hmm. [Nodding] Jes) A-24-599.

During this series of discussions a theme arose with respect to the community. Group members came back several times to the question of what happened to the community during the war:

- ...You still have a cousin there. People could attack you. So it was more or less keep your mouth shut and you'll stay out of trouble. I don't think there was trouble or dissension between groups. This man was simply saying not to make any. Eil) The people that I got, [interviewed] that lived here, the German people, I'm sure they thought of their families back in Germany that were being pulverized... Jes) [Eileen continuing] This man reminded everybody that we are guests of the Government of Canada. Through the generosity of the Immigration Department. As guests we would not be saying anything. Eil) A-24-592.

- They no longer called it sauerkraut. Jes) There was an article in the paper. Eil) They called it pickled cabbage. Jes) And they just sort of sat around here and didn't get involved at all. Just kept on farming. Jim) A-24-596.

One person read a 1915 newspaper article which listed a number of items which "the boys should take with them over there". The list included a blanket, long underwear and a Bible. Following the latter comment several members speculated about the question of who was allowed to go over to fight the war. On the theme of the community dealing with crises in certain ways, one person returned to a comment made by a group member at the July eleventh meeting:

- We were talking and joking, "What has ever happened in Goetheim? Nothing. We wouldn't allow it to happen here." [The individual has actually modified the original conversation slightly. The
original reference was to the church.] There's a certain truth to that — a lot of truth to that. And part of the reason, part of the way nothing is allowed to happen here is just by, "Shut up. Don't you ever show the closets, the skeletons". A-24-605.

Soon after this discussion, all the participants had described their objects. Cam then began an exercise which led to improvisations.

e) "Creating A Story With Objects"

Through his instructions, Cam conveyed a strong sense of purpose for the next exercise, but less certainty about specifics of process:

- Take your things in your groups and uh, what I want ultimately and I'm not quite sure how to step this... We're going to do this quite quickly. Build a character that relates to the objects. Create a character who relates to these articles. If you don't want to use the article you have switch with someone. Don't worry about characters... I want the articles to tell the story. All three have to be involved in the same story.

Cam's instructions raised questions among some groups. Others appeared to have no difficulty.

Providing detailed description of the remaining workshop hours would require transition from mobile to macrame for hereafter group members worked together much of the time in small groups creating concurrently.

Three small groups created storylines pushing their way through to improvisations. Each of their processes became rich with diversity and reflection. Eventually, Cam rearranged these groups slightly and a fourth group began an improvisation with a complex set of interactions.

When each group had created a storyline, then each group continued to modify that storyline repeatedly. When Cam was not
working with a small group those individuals would either be audience (each group watched each other the first time) or they would be sent off to work on an aspect of their improvisation.

The confines of the "paper" medium still demand a linear form. The number of strands must be reduced. Being unable to trace all that was emerging I have compromised with criteria. Those ingredients, artifacts, of primordial soup that remain after being boiled down are those connected to my interpretation of their cultural-meaning, what group members came to experience commonly.

The strategy is to describe very briefly the substance of three groups' initial improvisations. Insofar as I was able to observe one group through their behind scenes discussions in a more concentrated fashion, a window on their process is provided.

Participants of this third small group took longer than others to establish a flowing improvisation. Their comments revealed considerable reflection on process given the reaching and stumbling they experienced. I will also describe aspects of process, but will rely on the one group not as an example of the others so much as an extrapolation. First, a synopsis of the three improvisations.

1) Group Number One: "Patients Personified"

Improvisation of this scene did not flow entirely smoothly for this set of small group members. Their comments while standing on the stage express an uncertainty arising out of inexperience. Literally, they did not know how to start having never done this before:
- Should we have our artifacts? Jim) Should we... Eil) Whatever you need to do. Cam) ... Should we just take off? Eil) We're going to act? Jim) Mr. MacCrae? [Eileen begins the improvisation].
Eil) A-24-620.

The scene begins with a nurse tending a patient trying to get his attention. His wife is sitting close by. The patient is not responding. He has apparently had a stroke. "His wife" is anxious about being able to communicate with him. The nurse calms her indicating that he will come around gradually.

A friend, "Joe" from his past comes to visit the patient. Joe tries to communicate with him. The patient remembers the friend's name and mutters something about this friend owing him money. The friend explains to the wife that in fact the patient, her husband, owes him money from a time when he gambled his wages away and didn't wish to tell his wife.

According to Joe, the husband "covered up" by claiming that Joe owed him the money and never paid him. He has been telling the story so long he believes it. (This appears to incorporate the theme of a difference between memory and actual occurrences discussed in the "object" exercise.) After a few interactions, prior to Joe appearing, however, one of the actors breaks out of the improvisation.

- I'm really lost Eileen on how you want me to bring this in. Len) I don't want you to do anything. You just do it. Eil) I'm really lost right now on what we're planning... Len) A-24-621.

Cam then strode up to her to give her suggestions. He spoke to her quietly, directly. His words were not recorded for this reason, although I was able to obtain samples of these "intimate interchanges" at other times. Despite Cam's whispered suggestions this
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participant's role in these early improvisations tended to be one of response rather than initiation.

Cam's response to the improvisation when they stopped was one of enthusiasm:

- Super characterizations! You got that part of it out. Going with that kind of dialogue. It's very real. Cam) A-24-630.

He then launched into ruminations concerning what a script would look like if they did create one.

- If we ever do have a script, it will be phrased for most people like, "And so and so talks about such and such. And it'll have an outline of points that are covered. You'll do what you just did. Interject little bits of things as they occur to you. And uh, it makes it sound much more spontaneous, more real. Cam) A-24-633.

The Outcome Of This Improvisation In Relation To The Play:

The first time group members "improvised" this scene, in spite of a few bumps there was a substantial storyline. Cam's excited comments added to expectations that there was a bright future for this scene. However, when the group was sent off to work on additional detail, upon their return the scene did not appear to have changed much. Problems experienced in this first improvisation resurfaced each time the scene was done.

The scene did appear in the first script several meetings later. However, those involved did not express enthusiasm about the scene. Shortly thereafter, Eileen indicated that she would not be acting in the play at all. When faced with replacing her, group members decided to abandon the scene. 4
2) Group Number Two: "Birthday Blues"

As it unfolded, this scene was of a grandchild visiting her grandmother. The grandchild is upset by the fact of her twenty-first birthday. She feels as though life is passing her by in Goetheim. The grandmother gives her a present. The gift is a round aluminum jewelry box which plays "Jingle Bells". She expresses surprise at receiving an "old" gift. The grandmother then begins to tell her of its significance.

"Gramma" explains that her husband who is dead now bought it for her many years ago for her birthday. Her brief description of receiving the jewelry box is quite romantic. However, we then see a "flashback" of the actual situation.

The husband has been "out with the guys" and has forgotten to get her anything until after the fact. He comes upon a native woman and negotiates the price, paying very little for it. We "return" to the grandmother who recounts that it was "mass produced" -- a new thing which made it very special at the time. The granddaughter accepts "the treasure".

In addition to "getting at" differences in meaning between the younger and older generations, the story illustrates the difference between what "really happened" and her memory based on what she knows of the incident. However, the granddaughter experiences the profundity of "gramma's" experience "right here in Goetheim". Through this experience the granddaughter begins to have a different sense of the past and the community.
Throughout their improvisation these actors created their lines fluidly. Their interactions suggested a personal comfort with the medium. It would have been difficult for me to distinguish their performance with one which had a script. No long silences broke the illusion of story. The audience clapped, laughed, and repeated the last parts of lines throughout this improvisation. Interestingly the woman who played the grandmother commented after:


A discussion about why there have been no native people in the area in modern times ensued. Part of the discussion also included Cam's "directorial" comments. He advised the actors on a point of writing more than acting:

- All of what happened here you talked about rather than having it happen. All the bits of information we laughed at, it was because it was, you know, [Cam gestured with his hand to the side of his mouth as though doing an "aside" on stage] "Information point! — Get it audience?" "Would you like to hear the story" — instead of organically working out how it happened. That's when the story is really happening in those transitions, those awkward pieces. Let's go. [Cam was addressing the next group, group number three.] Not ready? Cam) A-24-643.

Cam was to refer to this tendency to blurt out "information" rather than to have it flow through interaction many times in future. For example, in the synopsis I have used the words "grandmother, granddaughter, and husband". In some instances they may not use those words immediately. One may gather from their manner, the tension in what they do and say, the nature of the relationship.
The Outcome Of This Improvisation In Relation To The Play:

This scene was worked on and developed until they created a number of scenes linked through the grandmother's and granddaughter's discussion. Cam eventually used the first part of their scene as the opening of the play. He used these two characters' conversations as its outer framework.

3) Group Number Three: "The Train Station Scene"

This scene took the longest to evolve. As indicated, this description includes some of their "behind scenes" struggle. Small group members began with Cam's instructions to create a storyline from three objects they had brought with them:

- We've got such a perfect match here. [Jay is referring to three objects, a plush toy dog, a butter knife and mink furs.] Think about war. He can't choose [I believe this is a reference to what to take from the list for "boys going over there"] He kills himself out of frustration! [Pause, a second inspiration] "Don't take this to war!" Okay. We got our story. Jay) A-24-615. [He paused again for a moment and then continues on.] No I don't think that's going to work. Jay) You can't see it working? Jes) We get in everything. Joy) Yes, but its not saying anything. Jay) Hey, there was no rules ... Jes) A-24-617.
- We were wondering if the story has to be sane. Director, does it have to be sane? Jes) No. It has to make historical sense. [Cam stated that and left immediately.] You improv it on the stage. Joy) [I believe she meant "We don't have to work out the details now"] I'm having trouble with this. Jes) Maybe we should work a few more details out here. Jay) Yeah. Joy) A-24-618.

Group members began focusing on the part of the scene located in the past. They placed themselves in a railway station through further creative exploring. During this process Cam observed them and indicated that there was no conflict in the scene. He then suggested a tension in terms of setting:
You're uh. There's been a real blizzard and you're all caught in it. You're all essentially... three strangers caught... in a strange station... I want you to set yourself this time and place — 1915 in a train station during a storm. But I want you to relate that time and place and artifacts to today. Cam) A-24-626.

Jessie was the first to respond to his suggestion. She began in a voice intentionally shaky to indicate age:


About this time in their process, small group "number one" stopped for the day as Lenore had to leave. Cam suggested members from that group join others. Eileen became one of the characters in the railroad station and thereby part of this group's process. When asked what her character would be she responded:

- Some are waiting to get on, some are waiting to get off. I'll go with the last. Eil) A-24-637.

Through further creative discussion each of the four took on a character. Eileen was a "run", Joyce was a "doctor", Jay a "trapper", and Jessie a "young woman". They discussed a rough outline of what they would improvise, but realized that they were unclear about how to bring the scene to a close:

- We'll have to wing the rest of it. But that's okay... We have to have a good stopping point. Jay) Just end. "That's it! We're finished". [Laughing, Jessie, said this as though speaking to the "audience" out there.] We can go back to the present. But there should be some reason, else why you remembered us. Joy) Otherwise there's no significance... We need something significant to tie it all together. Why would she remember all those years, these people? We don't have a story. We can wing it. Jay) A-24-648.
When group members got up to improvise what they had done thus far, they exchanged a few words, but then began to repeat what the last person had said. Silence indicated that they had no strong sense of direction upon which to act.

Cam suggested that group members then begin to think in terms of conflict among the characters:

- Are you a heathen? Like would you say something like "God, I wish this snow would stop?" Cam) Oh certainly. [Joy was a "doctor" at this point.] And you would say, "God has chosen to have it snow". [Jessie said this "for" Eileen whose character was a nun.] Whatever. You would take in a different way, then she would mean it. Cam) A-24-651.

Relying on the nun character for disapproval, group members toyed with variations:

- I could be a German Catholic and him not. I could be a girlfriend. [Joy] If she was a Catholic girl and you knew her and who she was waiting for, you'd be totally shocked that she was... Joy) Exactly, this is the big confession. This could be really interesting. Cam) It's intricate. [Joy] Hmmm., but it's very much steeped in the... getting involved in the sentiment of the time. Cam) A-24-653.

Through a series of "run throughs", group members' story evolved through decisions actors made and suggestions made by Cam and other group members. Cam frequently used a strategy to assist those improvising. He would ask more concrete questions. Through this strategy the nun and doctor (Eileen and Joyce) were edited out in part by their own response to partaking in the scene:

- Freeze. Stand up to front. Tell who you are, what you're doing, what's going on, what date it is, why you're here. Then you do the same... Then we'll see what happens. In character. Cam) The more we do it the harder it is for me to imagine that any woman would be here. Eil) [This is followed by a discussion of how liberated nuns were.] A-24-704.
- The situation doesn't seem to be going anywhere... Cam) Out the door in the garbage can. Joy)... What could this be going to? Cam) A-24-664.

With the focus on the remaining characters, the young woman and man, they retained what had been developed in terms of possible storyline and refined "the conflict". Cam made two suggestions, he suggested that the young trapper was not taking the train to sell furs elsewhere, but to leave town because he could not go to war. He was escaping the community and his culture. Cam also suggested a change in the character's relationship:

- It just occurred to me that you're an ex-boyfriend. So there are all those kinds of sparks. You know. All the questions have a lot more meaning than meets the eye. And all that polite conversation at the beginning is just that, polite conversation. All she has to say is "flannel underwear". That becomes a very, very personal moment for you. Cam) A-24-723.

As the story eventually came to unfold the young woman meets the young man in the railroad station. Through their initial "polite conversation" it is established that he is catching the train and she is meeting the train to give a Bible to one of the troops going over. As their conversation progresses their purposes for being there become more apparent.

In the climax of the scene the woman accuses the young man of running away from his German heritage. He then accuses her of the same by arranging to marry "someone with a Scottish name". The scene ends with the man catching the train, returning to her a memento suggesting the end of a possible relationship between them.
The Outcome Of This Improvisation In Relation To The Play:

The theme of how young people of German ancestry living in Canada experienced the war grew into and remained a key element in the scene. The scene was edited down to two characters and a second scene was improvised wherein the same two characters met many years later. Eventually, these scenes were acknowledged by group members to have been a pivotal piece in the play. It was notably, one the most dramatic scenes and as such balanced the levity of the majority of other scenes.

While this scene emerged over the length of the day, other small groups had been improvising and modifying their scenes as well. (Technically speaking, a scene can be improvised only once. After that one is repeating even if modifying.) All the scenes were modified several times over the remainder of the day. This process was a relatively simple one.

The actors would begin based on earlier improvisations, doing approximately what they had done before, unless they had worked on changes. When doing the scene for Cam if they stumbled or came to a full fledged halt, they had to work through or around their impediment. Occasionally, Cam stopped them to suggest changes.

f) Supper Break And Evening "Shifting"

The supper break merged with the work people were doing. In a sense of group members followed a shift-work format. As one small
group would be "re-working" their improvisation on stage, generally in front of Cam, others would have gone to do some work on their own and then return to be audience and await their turn to act.

During this shift-work a "new" small group began a fourth improvisation, "Nurses Two". This improvisation did not develop directly from the "objects exercise". Its source was the research work which had been done in the form of an interview with one of the first nurses of the area.

In addition, second scenes built on a first scene were begun from all three original scenes. "Process of creation" changed with one small group to the next. Their interactions may be summarized in terms which follow.

The "objects exercise" generated themes. Group members used these themes in addition to their own unique set of objects to create a semblance of a storyline for a scene. An element generated through storyline creation was characters. Initially, in their improvisations group members identified only an aspect of character. They determined relationship between one another, familial or occupational, examples being grandmother, granddaughter, nurse, patient. They used that as a springboard to begin to interact to "discover" more about their situation. As group members developed more and more a sense of character they acted as they came to assume that character would act. These interactions generated more ideas. Their spontaneous interactions "revealed to them" both more about their character and "the situation", these two being interactive.
Initially, when group members got up to improvise a scene Cam did not interrupt them. They would simply go until they stopped. Some ceased at a point where there was a conclusion to the storyline. Some stopped when no one could find anything more to say.

As described previously, Cam responded with a number of different strategies to either prompt actors into picking up the improvisational threads or to "improve" on a scene generally. One apparent technique he used was to explore characters in yet more detail to develop the story:

- Stop... right now... Don't speak your feelings unless she drags them out of you. You're speaking your feelings. Cam) That's what grammas are for. Allie) No. Grammas drag those feelings out of you. Cam) I usually went and said, "Gramma, help! All) But if you've established like you have that you're not going to talk, then you can't talk. And if she's the one that establishes she's bright and cheery, let her. Cam) A-24-659.

Cam's technique to prompt group members to act or to change their actions was comprised of making various aspects of what they were doing more concrete for them. For example, he might do this with reflecting and asking them to reflect on the theme or climax of the story. His intervention with group members acting in the train station scene exemplified use of this technique. His series of directive questions were described previously. This recreation will provide additional context.

The group of four were sitting on stage as though in a train station. They were struggling with who should say what. They were silent and then they began to laugh. Following their laughter Jay made sound effects, the wind howling about the door. One person finally spoke:
[Long silence.] - Why are you waiting? Cam) Just who are you waiting for? Jay) [I believe this was meant as a joke. On occasion Jay gently lampooned people. I believe he was picking up on Cam's technique of asking concrete questions.] This Bible is for James. Eil) Where is this scene going? This other scene was a love story about growing old and it went somewhere. This is a dramatic scene. The situation doesn't seem to be going anywhere. Cam) Out the door in the garbage can. Joy)...
What could this be going to? Cam) A-24-664.

As an additional technique to prompt actors when their improvisation was ebbing, Cam also asked them to consider concretely any conflict between characters. When the storyline and the characters were apparently settled, his directive questions turned to concreteness in terms of nuance, that is feelings or motivations behind certain actions in which the actor was already engaged.

- Why have you come to see your grandmother? Cam) Hmm. All) Well, why? Is mom around? what is it? You have to know that for yourself. You know, just so that you have a sense of reality. Wherever you can get the most reality from your own self. And I don't mean by that you should tell your whole like story, but the kind of thing that makes the most sense to you, uh, go with it. Cam) A-24-675.

- Your playing in a friggin' tournament. You left her at home. You're feeling guilty. [Cam said this to actor playing the role of the husband buying the aluminum jewel box.] A-24-660.

Up to this point descriptions in this segment have centred in the main on Cam's actions and those of "the actors". Group members also contributed to interactions as audience members. At first, their actions were more consistent with "traditional" audience actions. They sat and listened, clapped at "the end" of an improvisation. They laughed at both intended jokes and unintended ones. As the day rolled by, group members became more vocal responding with suggestions, repeating jokes and once in a while responding with jokes.
- What did you come here for? Maybe, you could have just popped out. Cam) While she was out? Jay) The way she was sitting looking distraught made me think she was on the front steps and gramma came home from the walk. Eil) ... Gramma's second home. You don't knock. All) All that's... it's just a suggestion. A conscious image with which you can work, somehow, someway. I don't mean for you to actually get up and do it. Cam) A-24-684.

At first Cam did not discourage their interactions. He laughed with them. At the time I had the sense of group collaboration, that all were engaged in writing this play and "making "it" theirs.

Almost at the end of the meeting there was a minor shift in defining what behaviour was appropriate. The incident came during work on the hard-won train station scene. Jessie muddled her words. Some group members laughed as they had done in other instances. At that point Jessie broke out of character by turning to the audience and saying:

- You guys know what I'm trying to say. Give me some help. Jes) Okay you guys let's have a little bit of respect. This is tough enough...Cam) A-24-727.

For some time group members were much more quiet in their responses as audience.

In addition to improvising and responding as audience, group members clearly spent part of the day reflecting on the process. They did this in small, informal groups. Many of their reflections were not recorded. However, a few examples were documented, particularly those which were raised with Cam.

- How do you get a hold of the problem? We were just talking about — how there, there's two people talking. So you know when person A has stopped person B has to talk. Here we're either having nothing or two people are talking, cause you have no idea... Joy) You'll work it out. Don't worry about that for
now. For God's sake this is not, we're not working for production level yet. Don't worry about it. It will become obvious as it progresses who has what to say. Cam) A-24-694.

g) Wrap-up

When group members' shift-work stopped about nine-thirty at night, Cam made a series of reflective references to what had happened and what he expected would happen in the next few weeks. His comments included statements about what was further required to complete the play. He also spoke of a process to initiate additional improvisational efforts.

- This is not what we live and die for. What we live and die for is being who we are and what we are. And that's much more important. That comes out in major scenes. I think the major theme is, uh, love and life and death, whatever you want to say about Goetheim. They really say something, they say quite a lot. And those we can strengthen up and build on. Cam) A-24-758.
- I think what would definitely work as a kind of binder twine is, uh, a kind of narration, thing, who might be a journalist from 1915, reads snippits. Cam) And what would the narrator be doing? I don't understand what you're saying. Jes) A-24-756. [Cam provided very briefly examples such as reading the article about the list of things to "take over there" as a preface to the scene she had been working on.]
- May I give you an assignment? It's a very concrete assignment. Everybody here is going to narrate one thing. We'll either illustrate it or think of how to dramatically portray it. [The last half of this sentence is paraphrased.] Cam) A-24-767.

Included in Cam's reflection on what had to be completed to create the play was an assessment of what they had accomplished that day:

- You guys are amazingly close to performance level on some stuff. Cam) A-24-760.

Moving from contemplating the creation of additional content, Cam referred to structure in terms of administering activities. This included more traditional theatre rehearsals with a script.
- Very, very quickly we'll break this down into scenes. There's no point in calling people for every rehearsal when they're not needed in the scene. Cam) A-24-765.

In this sense it would have been more in tune with most participants' experience of theatre. However, as described at this point, the format and content of the script would barely resemble what many group members would have experienced as a script.

- ...For the primary purpose of literally banging out a very needed tidy script. You know something that will actually exist between pages script. By that time this should pretty much be ready. Soon, the seventh we can have a general idea of the shape of play. Two weeks from today, three weeks before we open, we're talking like an hour show, so we're in pretty good shape. Cam) A-24-770.

Some, in particular, the producer registered surprise at the length. Apparently at least a few of the group members had assumed it would be longer. Cam indicated that there would be considerable work to create the hour. Cam ended the day on a happy, respectful note:

- Thank-you very, very much for today. It was, uh, rewarding. I feel really good about it. Cam) It was exhausting but rewarding. Jes) Yeah. Jim) We done good, again. Jes) A-24-773.

LOCATING COMMON GROUND AND AMBIGUITY

In the first Act-Play, the section "Emerging Patterns Of Process" began with the heading "Locating Common Ground". That segment was concerned less with a chronology of when precisely people said or did something than it was concerned with themes of meaning in group members' discussions. Chronology was provided in terms of representing shifts in shapes of group members' interactions. Themes
in participants' discussions were followed with descriptions of members' paradigmatic and breaking point actions in that section of the first Act-Play.

In contrast, this stage began with the sound of rushing rapids — a series of group members' experienced breaking points during the first two meetings. That description was followed by descriptions of shifting shapes in group members' interactions to acting during the all-day workshop.

The selected form of representation for this segment has been based on the nature of group members' interactions. When in one set of interactions group members' meaning were drastically affected by a series of changing shapes in their interactions, chronology became crucial.

Linear insistence as a quality has been both of assistance to and a limitation of chronology. A chronology tends to rely on specific attribution of significance. One usually follows specific events to "their" conclusion. As such, chronology may be prone to a narrow causality. Relying solely on a chronological format of representation has become troubling since I have come to understand change as group members' shifting and emerging meanings not always held commonly.

Lest the previous outlines have dieted away the richness of group members' interactions, this segment returns briefly to the same three meetings. It now reviews thematic elements in group members' discussions through which were coiled group members' acting, paradigmatic actions, and breaking point actions.
Group Members' Discussion And Exchanges

This segment strives to present herein those meanings which group members came to hold in common through discussion. Differing assumptions group members carried and which were exposed through their discussion are also described. This represents an overview. Since data has been quoted more extensively in other segments, quotations have been limited to one or two as samples in each area.

a) Sharing Information About Prior Meetings

The August fourteenth and eighteenth meeting were two of a few instances wherein group members began a meeting with an "update" of past meetings. The update came in the form of responses to questions from members who had been absent from past meetings:

- Cause I missed the last two meetings I have no idea. Lyl) A-14-294. 
- So what happened the other day? Cam) We talked. Eil) A-18-471.

On other occasions, group members appeared to obtain information of this type through informal discussion or they simply tried to reconstruct what had happened based on references and changes in direction at the meeting they were currently attending.

b) Exchanging Concerns Of An Administrative Nature

In terms of administratively oriented concerns, one particular matter seemed to resurface several times. Group members appeared to have more than one perspective on the question of who else would become involved in the project.
- So maybe she's still coming then. I didn't get a chance to make all those phone calls, but I still will. Eileen suggested to go through and call the membership. Divvy out two pages each. Jes) A-14-289.

- I went and cornered Helen today. And uh, "Do you want to be involved at all in this production or not. Tell me yes or no, now. After September one if I have a task will you do it?" "Yes I will!" Ann) A-14-290.

- This production, she's too late. [Some background noise suggesting people shifting. I interpreted this at the time as a reaction of surprise from some group members.] If she hasn't been in on the groundwork or what not — I can't see people coming in at the end of September and saying, "Sure you got the play ready I'll act in it. It isn't going to happen that way. Participant) A-14-292.

- Until we know if we have these other people, we're counting on Buddha in the air, right now. Ann) A-14-398.

This arose again, this time related to advertising the all-day workshop:

- Jessie, who should I phone? Eil) Everybody that's on that list. Jes) Did I say something wrong? Jes) No. Jim just assumed and Jim feels and I never thought of it... That I should be phoning everybody in the club. Eil) Sure. And I think you should also be sticking an ad in the paper. Cam)... If you get them out and get them interested and you make them have a good time, they'll stick around. Jim) A-18-558.

I observed a distinct shift in group members' approaches to administratively oriented activities between the meetings I've described as the first and second stage. In the second stage, by the third meeting these kinds of discussions and related activities were a part of the formal meetings far less frequently. They were still discussed at the beginning of meetings and sometimes at the end, but generally, there was less discussion of them. This may have been due, in large part, to the described breaking point mainly prompted by one group member during the August fourteenth meeting.
c) Exchanging Information With Respect To Research

In the meetings of the first stage, a pattern emerged of participants' sharing research through discussion. That pattern of sharing information uncovered through research continued to emerge through this stage. Specific to these first two stages was the additional element of discussing "the researcher's" reaction to the information.

During these meetings there was a distinct change. When group members' shared information it was no longer with an intentional focus to discuss. Through the breaking point meetings and the all-day workshop group members' focus had shifted to acting and to determining process. However, almost as though by ritual, because this had been a prior focus, group members respected and shared in "going off" the topic in this manner.

These "deviations" from the topic were not lengthy. Their discussion would soon return to the original focus. Shifts of this nature came less abruptly in group members' meetings of this stage than such shifts had come, particularly in the final meeting of the first stage.

As described previously, an additional shift during this period also appeared in the nature of information shared. Information from some was much more in the vein suggested by Cam, indicating group members' "learning". It was less oriented to quantitative kinds of facts and more towards "human drama" even when numbers or dates were involved:
- One thing that struck me was how many children died of pneumonia... I don't necessarily mean really historical facts. I started to write those down and then got away from it... Human drama people recorded. Ann) A-14-322.
- The younger people can try to imagine what it was like... Leaving it up to them. -- What I want there is for him to physically leap up from table hugging and kissin'... And in that particular year, Stern's crop came in at fifty-two bushels to the acre, one hundred acres planted. He made a fortune! Eil) A-14-341.

d) Exchanging Ideas About Group Identity, and Personal Information

During the first stage, as previously indicated, participants began to share with others information of a personal nature. Discussions during which they shared information of a more personal nature tended to take place when participants were in smaller groups, at the beginning or end of meetings in their meetings of the first stage. Occasionally, during a formal meeting, when group members were in the full throes of shifting between "paradigms" and seemed to have come to a halt, a discussion of this type would be started by a "casual" remark.

Throughout this second stage group members continued to engage in these kinds of discussions before and after meetings. In the course of the formal, large group meetings, however, this personal sharing began to take the form of a brief remark, or a "tease" between, for example, one participant and another. However, during this stage group members' references to personal matters were still relatively rare. Those who did make these kinds of remarks tended to also lead discussion and make suggestions, generally.

One example of this was Anna's story of Jim moving her chair away by accident during the August first meeting at her house. Apparently,
he had not known that it was "her chair". Moreover, he had not known that she was about to sit down in it. Jim moved the chair. Anna did not look before she sat down and consequently fell in the space where the chair had been. This is how she described the incident:

- I went down like a load of bricks. I threw him a glance that would've creamed anyone of lesser stature. Then it occurred to me. Ann) [I inferred from this that she meant she had come to realize that Jim had not done this on purpose.] First I looked at Anna and thought, "Oh no". Then I looked at Jim and went "Oh no". Cause he looked like he was about to cry. Jes) [Group members laugh.] And after she had gunned him off for a little while everyone was reasonably okay. Then it was funny. E1) A-14-462.

A second example of these more personal references emerging between members in these meetings, comes in the form of a "tease" from one participant to another:

- We do this every meeting. I come here full of concerns, by the end of the time I'm saying, I'm so excited." Participant) [A second participant interrupts.] "Let's go to the bar." [The second participant intends to finish the first participant's original statement, completing the phrase, "by the end of the time I'm saying...".] That's what you do usually, really. A-14-457.

In addition to these brief windows of "the personal" during meetings, Cam structured one of the theatre exercises so that participants would formally share more about themselves.

Cam included in the all-day workshop an exercise previous described concerning "objects of the past". He asked group members to bring a historical object to the afternoon session of the workshop. They were to describe the object and why it was meaningful for them. In this manner he placed at least partial emphasis on sharing personal experience.
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This exercise succeeded in providing group members with the most focused opportunity during the project to share stories and descriptions of their own connections to the past. They proceeded to take advantage of this opportunity. Many of their statements during the exercise have been recorded in a prior segment describing the exercise.

- And then I felt real sad because everybody else had personal things and that wasn't personal cause I wasn't born. So I had to go home and get a personal thing. This butterknife that my grandmother gave me. A-24-598.

Following Jessie's statements, Allie produced a fox fur. She caressed the fur all the while she was explaining how she had come by it. Her grandfather was a trapper. She had discovered the fox dying in a trap. So she had shot it to put it out of its misery.

- I shot it. I skinned it. But I can't bear to cut it up because it might hurt it. [Allie refers to cutting up the fur to use the pieces for trim, or mitts. She speaks of this as an odd contradiction of which she is aware.] Allie) A-24-610. [Paraphrased.]

On the day of the workshop, I also observed in some instances, changes in relationships. For example, Jessie did not know Jay before the beginning of the workshop. However, they worked together all afternoon and evening to develop the train station scene. Toward the end of supper break, Jessie "teased" Jay:

- Nuggets. I saw you eating them that nuggets. Jes) I asked people if someone wanted them. Jay) Didn't ask me. Jes) Why didn't you force yourself to say, "Hey give me some". Jay) Well, cause I didn't know you then and I was trying to be polite, but next time, oh... Jes) A-24-669-70.
She has indicated in this statement that the relationship has changed in half a day. By the end of the day they were referring to each other by their characters' names.

- That's not true John. Jes) [She is speaking to Jay, using his character's name.] Okay Sue. Jay) [He now refers to Jessie by her character's name.]
A-24-768.

e) Exchanging Ideas About The Shape and Specific Content Of The Play

The first Act-Play suggested that a pattern emerged in group members' frequent discussions of the shape and content of "the play". In the first two meetings of this stage group members continued to discuss possible shape and content of "the play". There was, however, a discernible shift emerging in group members' interactions comprising these meetings.

The suggested content appeared to move more closely to Cam's descriptions of theatre as "needing a focus for tension" and being concerned with "personal history" and meaning. The data provided with respect to shifts in research content substantiates this change. When asked specifically about content of the play, many group members emphasized similar elements:

- I think we have to stir up the memories that they're looking for. Get a lot of feelings stirring in the audience... a lot of mixed emotions. I'd like to see it be a really emotional play. Lyl
A-14-323.
- It's a big important thing cause he just broke his fifteen acres and he's going to get his homestead. That's what we want to impart to the audience, the excitement of what's happened there. Eil) A-14-340.
- I think we really have to get the people and the emotional... Like the sadness. But, also, like the happiness too. Deb) A-14-345.
In addition to a shift in the group members' ideas about content, there was a shift in the form of discussion. Group members were much more methodical about discovering what each member wished to have as content and focus for the play.

With respect to the shape of the play, there was also a shift to the extent that group members appeared to have reached more of a consensus that Cam would have a large part in formulating the play's shape.

- On Sunday we give all of this to Cam. See how he wants to work into it. Ann) A-14-389.

This meant that the shape of the presentation was not an element much discussed during this set of formal meetings.

f) Exchanging Ideas of Process

Group members' experience with "process" during this stage primarily came in two "shapes" as previously described, through their breaking point actions and their acting. To avoid reiterating that data, this segment emphasizes a few "loose" ends in group members' interchanges concerning their process. Consideration of their "loose ends" is intended to convey assumptions group members raised which were only partially clarified through their interactions.

For example, in terms of administration, although the producer stated that she would take over all administrative tasks and decision-making, few details were provided at the time. Given apparent ambiguity group members were experiencing about this unique process in which they were engaged, this amounted to a loose end. One
person suggested that Eileen might consult the "document on roles and responsibilities of a producer" (see Appendices, Section One). She also suggested that if something was not clear in that document, Eileen could bring it back to the group. However, this process of "bringing back to the group" was never clarified formally.

Another "loose end" arose out of an emerging question concerning different modes of acting. During this period, many group members indicated reluctance to act before an audience as either objects, or without props.

In response, Cam raised distinctions between activities internal to the group as part of their developmental process, and activities external to the group, those performed for an audience. However, details of what would be acted and what would not, other than acting as an object, was not thoroughly discussed. This left group members with varying levels of anxiety.

One additional "loose end" which arose from discussions in these meetings must be noted. Responses to whether there would be a script or not "fluctuated" during this stage, lending an air of uncertainty to process.

In summary, group members' breaking point actions resulted in confrontation concerning their most immediate concerns related to several issues. In these instances, urgency promoted group members' attempts at quick resolution. There was one main disadvantage to seeking swift resolution. Such response led to extremely limited
exploration concerning what were various key elements in group members' concerns. Shades of variation in group members' assumptions were to be discovered through later breaking points.

**Group Members' Emerging And Reemerging Ambiguities**

Group members' most pressing ambiguities were described in breaking point shapes. Some of those which emerged through less intense means have been described in the prior segment "Locating Common Ground And Ambiguities". For purposes of comparison between stages, a list has been provided of the large number of areas about which group members expressed a sense of ambiguity in the first meetings I attended.

- Who's in the group?  
- Who's making decisions?  
- Should we have an expert?  
- Who's supposed to be doing what?  
- How do we do this?  
- Where do we start?  
- What form will this take?  
- What content?  
- What timeframe are we using?  
- What kind of sets do we need?  
- Where do we meet?  
- What about funding?

This list is a cumulative one based on concerns expressed by group members prior to and including the August first meeting up until "the breaking point".

Based on data analysis, a list of group members' ambiguities was generated for this period. If such a list had existed for group members, it might have looked like this at the end of their interactions of this stage:

- Who's in the group?

  This was still very much at the forefront of discussion, although a few other concerns appeared to take precedence over it. During the
first two meetings this issue surfaced in terms of discussions concerning administrative roles and more particularly, in terms of concerns about sufficient people to do the work required for this presentation. It also surfaced in terms of whom to contact for the workshop.

With the all-day workshop, group members appeared to experience some closure on who would be in "the group". Although eventually more people would become involved in the project, and some would "leave", group members seemed to have begun to develop a sense of a "core" or working group.

This may have resulted primarily from two particular events. First, they may have developed this sense from the meeting in which they had made commitments to act, while Eileen took on administrative tasks. In addition, the concrete experience of watching each other take on roles during the all-day workshop may have also given them a sense of group.

- Who's making decisions?

This question became very much linked with "what form will the play take?" and "who's doing what?" In this sense, the number of questions was being reduced.

- Should we have an expert?

This initially formed a pointed subquestion of "who's making decisions". As indicated in "Sustained Uncertainty" at this point group members had implicitly accepted Cam in the role of expert. That
larger question faded, but more specific questions about his role still hovered. These included questions about his control in
decision-making apart from making expert suggestions.
- Who's supposed to be doing what?

This question seems to have fallen into the background during the
first breaking point, to emerge as a second breaking point regarding
group members' limited time commitments.
- How do we do this?

This question was de-emphasized in group members' interactions
some senses by implicitly accepting Cam in the role of director. In
some ways the question was very much alive, but "folded into" other
concerns implying an overall reduction of ambiguity. This question
reemerged during group members' improvisational work.
- Where do we start?

A start had been made, even if it is not one with which all group
members were happy. This concern was also "reduced" by being shifted
into or folded over into other extant ambiguities.
- What form will this take?

During the first series of breaking points this question was very
much at the forefront for group members, squeezing out most other
ambiguities. This provided a limited kind of certainty, arguably.
- What content?

This was also at the forefront of group members' concerns during
the first breaking point of August fourteenth. However, by the middle
of the first meeting in this "stage" there appeared to be sufficient
consensus that some of their sense of ambiguity had passed as a result
of Cam's mini-lectures about what constituted theatre. This ambiguity reemerged, folded into group members' questions concerning how to improvise.

- What timeframe are we using?

  This appeared to be combined with a general concern for group members in terms of "acting".

- What kind of sets do we need?

  During group members' initial breaking point this was front and centre of their expressed concerns. However, this also became folded in with other ambiguities concerning improvisational process.

- Where do we meet?

  This was no longer ambiguous. The theatre was booked. This question no longer existed on their common list of ambiguity.

- What about funding?

  This ostensibly stopped being a concern at this point. Group members did not raise the subject again at another formal meeting. Their list was shorter by this question as well.

  Although very few additional concerns were raised by group members during this time, one person raised two specific questions:

- When and how often was the group expected to meet in future? How much of a time commitment would be required?

- How many will be acting in the play?

  These questions were raised early in this stage in the context of considering various roles and time commitment. The questions received a concrete response from the producer and did not resurface for several meetings. Prior to concluding the "Emerging Patterns Of
Process" section, there is one more important reference to group members' shifting shapes.

EMERGING PATTERNS RELATED TO AMBIGUITY AND PARADIGMATIC ACTIONS

In the first stage, group members' constant shifting in search of an approach to create a play suggested through data analysis the double helix metaphor. In the first Act-Play, participants' paradigmatic actions were described as related to a dual set of their responses. The section suggested that strong tension existed between "the helixes" or paradigmatic responses implicit in members' shifts.

In contrast, group members' activities during these August meetings could no longer be characterized as constantly shifting. An abrupt quality associated with their shifting in terms of both content of concern and approach to dealing with particular concerns suddenly ceased.

Tension Between The Two Helixes

A decrease in group members' shifts back and forth from a "get something concrete" approach to a "go with it" approach suggested a substantial change. New patterns emerged through data.

During these meetings group members continued to use these two different approaches. One member articulated her experience of the two approaches. She also expressed her experience of a tension between the two. She did so in an attempt to describe a breaking point to Cam:
- The thing at Anna's was magnificent and we realized the goodness of it and how useful it is, but the fear is if we don't do something now, we're not going to get anything done... As we talked we were saying we need those exercises but we have to start doing something. So it went right to the other extreme of the concreteness. Jes) You're just really bare naked up there without anything, a room. It is lack of confidence.

Eil) A-18-504.

Despite this description of experienced tension between the two approaches group members appeared to experience less tension between them during the three meetings. They appeared to use them for more sustained periods of time and for discrete purposes. The following are overviews of emerging patterns regarding these meetings. Helixes seem to have provided what was needed when sought after during this stage.

- Pattern Internal To Meetings:

Data analysis indicates that group members only shifted abruptly once between "go with it" and "concrete" approaches. During the August fourteenth meeting virtually all group members' actions were directed towards obtaining "concrete" criteria through a round table discussion. Individuals described their expectations regarding the play and its content.

Suddenly, however, in the last portion of the meeting several group members decided to "go with it". To portray an improvisational process to other group members, three members got up and improvised a scene based on an 1915 newspaper advertisement, "Pink Pills For Pale People".

During the August eighteenth meeting members had "concrete" discussion with Cam raising concerns about role clarification, and
content clarification. In contrast the August twenty-fourth meeting group members decidedly used a "go with it" approach in the all day acting workshop.

- **Pattern Unfolding For Entire Meeting:**

  Except for the August fourteenth meeting, with whatever approach group members began, that was the approach with which they ended their meeting.

- **Patterns Describing Changes In Meetings Over Time:**

  The most striking pattern in terms of changes from one meeting to the next is rooted in group members between meetings reconstruction. Their struggle with internalization of meanings between meetings, resulting in informal discussion and dissonance is particularly manifest in their breaking point meetings.

  Despite these changes of meaning for group members from the end of one meeting to the beginning of the next, with respect to their paradigmatic responses, group members appeared to be maintaining both strands of the helix and they seemed to be using these responses to better advantage. Absence of abrupt shifting from one response to the other suggested more of a sense of meshing their two responses rather than tension arising from having "alternative" responses.

  In the first stage, data analysis posited that there was a discernible problem for group members in attempting to use both helixes. In this second stage, by the nature of concerns and questions raised by group members, any problems they were having in terms of tension between when to use one of their responses were diminished.
As their tension between helix-responses diminished, an associated tension diminished as well. Based on data analysis, the study posits that this associated tension was linked with problems of ambiguity related to fundamental premises about "theatre". As participants began to come to terms with ambiguities in their individually held paradigms of "theatre", as they began to develop a paradigm in common, their paradigmatic responses became more consistent. For example, improvisation provided a meaning-in-action home for their "go with it" approach.

Developing a more commonly held paradigm of theatre was to continue to compel group members as a tacit task until the project concluded. Another perspective on this development may be observed in "Emerging Structure".

EMERGING STRUCTURE

This section continues to define "structure" as parts of the whole. However, the equivalent section in "Sustained Uncertainty" dealt primarily with participants' starting points. In this second Act-Play, their sense of structure is indicated in terms of change emerging for group members through their ongoing interactions. In that sense, this section represents more fluidity than the parallel section in the first Act-Play, "Sustained Uncertainty".
EMERGING SUBGROUPS

During the first two sets of meetings group members raised one question through many different questions: Who was in the group? This question had many implications, a few of which may be perceived through the study's efforts to record changes to "the group". — Who would join the group, and who would no longer be in the group at the close of the project affected changes in the parts of the whole.

a) Theatre Club Structure

This was the last period of time when group members looked to the theatre club as yielding up more researchers and actors. Some continued, however, to think of the club as a reservoir for administrative, back stage assistance.

- Our annual meeting is September 6th. Members can do the leg work. Ann) A-14-398.

b) Internal and External Structure

During this stage group members began to develop a much stronger sense of group entity as described in "Emerging Patterns Of Process". Meaning arising from this had implications for many participants in terms of structure.

Some group members began to develop a sense of actions appropriate within the group and group actions appropriate for presentation to the external, the community as audience.

- We feel like we're on thin ice. We screw up and we've lost the support of the community. We've played this thing up and... This probably not true but we feel that way. Eil) I feel like Anna,
the worry-wort of the group. Jes) "Oh I feel so much better now. I really needed to come to this meeting tonight." [Eileen imitating Anna.] Eil) A-18-530.

Somewhat ironically, Cam was one of the first to express at a formal meeting after the study began a distinction between "internal" and "external" structure related to the group. This is ironic because one of the few manifestations of participants' first sense of internal and external structure may be observed in their concern with Cam as an "outside" director. He was, however, from outside the community in their early demarcations.

Participants' own sense of internal and external structure developing toward the end of this stage was evident in terms of emerging process for creating the play. Emerging roles, an emerging lexicon and particularly in breaking point expressions, group members appeared to begin to make this structural distinction. However, these distinctions were not articulated by many group members until they had experienced other changes.

At the workshop it was assumed that improvisations were not for "performance", not to be done for the community. They could play and explore with the condition that these actions were internal to the group. In this sense a "ludic" quality was linked for some with actions being "internal" to the group.

c) Demographics Of Those In "The Group"

As individuals joined the group demographics changed. This segment notes some of these changes.
Familial Relationships:

The majority of members comprising the group prior to the workshop were married and almost half had children. However, the two who became part of the group during the workshop were both single. This altered the balance by doubling the number of single people involved with the project at that time.

Gender Groupings:

The workshop brought two more men to "the group". One, however, would eventually work on lighting and sound. Despite their presence, there was still a difference in balance with four men, five including Cam (three acting). The group included nine women, ten including the participant observer (eight acting).

Balance between the number of men and women was significant not only in terms of interactions among them. The number of men available to act affected theatrical content undertaken by the group:

- In January of that year the Goetheim Amateur Dramatic Society made its debut. I, at one point was getting — I thought, "Why don't we just chuck this whole heritage play, get a copy of the one they did in 1915 and put that thing on. Except there were five men in that."


Generally, group members experienced this as a sufficiently serious problem to provoke discussion about women playing men's roles.

Occupation And Age

The two men who became members of the group during the workshop were less than twenty-four. This shifted the average age from early thirties to late twenties. The addition of the two added to diversity of occupation among group members, one now being a university student. However, the second participant had the same work place as a long term group member. Both worked with agricultural implements.

Subgroup Orientation To The Theatre—Group:

One of the joining members viewed himself as a "serious actor" in terms of theatre. This brought a slight shift. There was now more balance between subgroups with differing orientations to the theatre—group. Given the breaking point meetings and the theatre workshop, however, members of these subgroups began to draw together in their orientation.

Data analysis of the first few meetings has posited in the first Act-Play that group members view of the community as audience was initially relatively homogeneous. This began to change as they struggled with the dominant question of their second breaking point meeting. That is, whether the source of their "difficulty" in wishing to abstain from theatre without props was attributable to a sense of "them", their commonly developing view of the community as un receptive to the new, or "us" in the form of group members lacking confidence. This issue was never utterly resolved. The fifth Act-Play indicates that group members were still struggling with this in interviews after the project concluded.
During this time, group members began to recognize other subgroup orientation with the group. At least two group members experienced and felt sufficiently comfortable to openly recognize differences in their perceptual starting points:

- See, when Eileen and I were talking about... she found all the axe murderers she could. I wasn't looking for that stuff. So I got, "Pale? Sickly?". "Pink Pills For Pale People." Ann) A-14-366.
- You know, I think you can tell more about people by what they all come back with from reading the Journal. Joy) A-14-367.
- Anna and I talked for about an hour on the phone that night. I read completely different and entirely different things. I never saw what she found. She didn't see what I found. Everybody brings their own... Eil) what your notion is when I walked in there. Like I was obviously interested in finding the "Pink Pills For Pale People". Ann) A-14-373.

These differences in starting point may have been related to subgroup orientation to theatre—group. Data studied, however, did not particularly support such an interpretation. For example, the difference in research starting points may be based in part on these two members' different interpretations of Cam's statements concerning the content of theatre.

EMERGING ROLES

"Theatre" continued to be at the forefront of participants' interests and concerns during this set of meetings. This segment reflects their interest and concern.
a) Emerging Theatre Roles

In this stage new roles did not emerge so much as group members refined through their discussion those roles which had been established to some extent in group members' prior interactions. This process of refinement took place throughout all meetings of this stage. Each role was redefined either explicitly or tacitly in group members' interactions during this time.

Since group members' roles were interactive, sometimes several were refined concurrently through one discussion. A chronological description is not quite possible for this reason. This begins with the two roles about which group members expressed most urgent concern.

1) Emerging Refinements Of Director's Role

Cam's role was discussed both directly and indirectly in group members' conversations. Group members discussed his role indirectly in terms of whether he had authority to require them to act, for example, as a tree. The issue of whose role it was to decide on format and content was at issue. This issue resurfaced throughout the project. The role shifted from one meeting to the next in this period. During the first "breaking point meeting" group members appeared to have thought of Cam as a technical expert — almost as an editor.

- On Sunday we give all of this to Cam. See how he wants to work into it. Ann) A-14-389.

At this point group members' discussions of Cam's role frequently took the form of questions:
- Is Cam going to be at every rehearsal? Lyl) A-14-405.
- Not nearly so difficult. Eil) Unless there's something we can

During the second breaking point meeting group members discussed
with Cam their concerns about what he was asking them to do. The list
they had compiled (on August fourteenth) of "content and shape" for
the play was never presented. Eventually, group members impressed
upon Cam the need to act, to do something concrete.

- I can write a story. But it's not my story and that's not
what... My job is to string all of those stories into some kind
of cohesive shape. We may not see that shape till the latter
stages. This is not unusual for any theatrical endeavor,
including the one you guys were involved with the first time.
Cam) A-18-527.

Through this statement Cam was apparently endeavoring to delineate his
role and "theirs", and to indicate a symbiotic quality to their
relationships. This was consistent with how the producer Eileen had
described his role in the first breaking point meeting.

Group members did not respond directly to his description of
roles. Instead, they expressed a sense of urgency, however, in doing
something:

- My god are we actually going to be able to open this play,
Friday? We want that so badly. Eil) We feel like we're on thin
ice. We screw up and we've lost the support of the community.
We've played this thing up and... This probably not true but we

Their sense of urgency led Cam to do an all day workshop wherein
he took a highly "directive role" in structuring the event.

- It's just a concentration exercise. (Circle game) Number off into
groups. Find an object - three in a group... Bigger than a bread
box... The next part of the assignment is to find ten uses,
other than what it was intended for... Go into the group to
Group members made no protests concerning his directive role on that day.

Cam's role emerged, through the breaking point meetings and the all-day workshop, as having several functions. He gave direction to shape group members' dramatic experiences by providing a number of exercises leading to improvisational work. In this sense he was a facilitator or animator. He thus assisted them in creating their foundational theatrical work. He then edited-directed, made suggestions, prompted them to build on their foundations.

In addition to his acts of overt direction, for some, his role was simply to act as charismatic anchor, substituting for group entity to some extent:

- I need your confidence — it rubs off on me. I'm okay again. I can see that happening. But as soon as you're gone, Cam so is that. Ann) A-18-524.

Her meaning in a subgroup sense (Anna has been described as a "serious actor") was not that of all other group members, however. There were still some "rumblings" concerning a need to be independent in "the process". Those with more of an organizational orientation spoke in those terms:

- We don't see the long term. Where are we going to get to in the end? That's exactly where we started from last time. Jes) A-18-524.

This seems to have implied a compromise for her at this point. She appeared to indicate a willingness to submit to Cam's process, if they would be provided with an idea of the direction it would take them.

During the discussion on August eighteenth one of the organizational people finally made brief reference to a historical
tension among group members concerning Cam's role:

- What I'm saying is you have started to write it. Cam) See we got all these ideas together and did some things on our own. And all of a sudden somebody just decided, "Okay. Let's sit back and see what Cam is going to do. That was it. We stopped. Now should we or shouldn't we be doing that. If we want Cam to do it, let's do it. But we had said from the outset we wanted to write this ourselves. Jim) A-18-535.

This series of statements suggested that group members, themselves, were responsible for not acting with more independence. Relying on Jim's statement, Cam then refocused the question:

- You're right. -- The question is more politic. The question is, "How do we make, what we want to write work?" And part of the hesitancy of why you haven't done it is, what you were talking about earlier, is the confidence of, "We want to make sure it's done right. And nobody here has the confidence to say, "Well I know how to do it and how to do it right. Cam) A-18-538.

Jim's response was most interesting:

- That's right. We just don't have that kind of... [Eileen interrupts Jim saying "Experience."] ... expertise. We need that crutch. Jim) A-18-541.

Although agreeing with Cam, Jim referred to a tension concerning roles represented through his negative use of the word "crutch".

This tension among group members concerning Cam's role was described in the first breaking point of the first stage. Their tension related to the director's role remained "backstage" much of the time. The all-day acting workshop was an example of this.

Throughout the project, however, the role of director was shaped by when group members' tension concerning that role was subdued and when their tension erupted. Even when Cam was attempting to alleviate group members' anxiety, he was in danger of being perceived by some as stepping beyond the role's jurisdiction. Yet, others indicated that
was precisely what they needed. Since group members did not hold in common a set of values related to the role of director, and more particularly, having Cam in that role, the director's role could not be clearly defined for them in terms of their cultural-meaning.

2) Emerging Refinements Of Producer's Role

Interestingly, the producer's role was not the issue which sparked discussion related to her role. A question arose as a breaking point for at least one group member in terms of how many other people they might rely on for backstage work. She indicated in this way that group members were still doing both administrative and research acting roles.

The group member offered to take on a specific administrative job while indicating that she did not have time to do both. In order to allay her fears and to make certain that there would be sufficient researchers and actors, the producer Eileen responded:

- What I sort of have to decide to do is, you people who want to be on the stage, I'm going to just have to find a way to take all those concerns away from you. I'll hire somebody, I'll scratch people off the street. [Her voice is very quiet.] Yes, every time we get together we get deflected away from doing the play. Anything but doing the play. Joy) A-14-422.
- It makes sense. The producer produces. In a professional production you're not arguing for your opinion, anymore than you're up there saying "I think you're left arm should be..." Ann) A-14-432.

Thus viewed, the producer was "relieving" other group members from the time required to both make "administrative decisions" and to do the chores associated with backstage work. However, from one member there was an indication that she assumed a role and process had
been established for "producer" in a written record. (See Appendices, Section One.) There was also an indication in her words that she did not expect to be entirely removed from all decision-making process:

- The producer, most of the things are written down. You can follow them and assign them. If you disagree say, "Hey folks, I don't like the idea of children's matinee. What do you think? Yes, yes, no". Go ahead and do it. Assign a job. We don't need to sit around and mope and rehash and rehash. Just do it. Jes) A-14-430.

It was tremendously difficult to define any role without a clearer sense of what process would be used. The role of producer as written down was based on a particular paradigm of theatre which did not address needs arising out of this stage of the project.

One task which Eileen incorporated into her role as producer was to represent the group as a liaison with Cam. Eileen also attempted to ameliorate group members' anxieties. One instance exemplifying her attempts to do so may be observed in her suggestion to attempt an improvisation so that group members would see "the" process.

- Now that's what's going to happen. That's how you do it. Eil) Yeah, that's how you do it. Jes) That's how it's going to work. Cam will get us started. So now does everybody feel better? Can we make this work? Eil) A-14-453.

Despite agreeing directly or passively to have Eileen make administrative decisions on her own, group members were to experience confusion on this point in future.

3) Emerging Refinements Of Actors-Researchers Role
(Emerging As Separate From Administrative, Back-stage Work)

As the producer's role became refined it was separated, at least conceptually, from researchers' and actors' roles. It took several
more steps, however, to distinguish the producer's role from the actors-researchers' roles. The first step took the form of determining who would act.

Described in a previous segment, Eileen as producer asked each person present at the August fourteenth meeting whether they would act. Asking group members in that manner, to some extent she intimated that this was the preferred course. At the time her own daughter was the only one of the group, other than Eileen, to indicate she would not act in the production:

- Debbie are you going to be on stage? Eil) No. [Deb whispers this.] A-14-411.

By creating a list of people who would act, Eileen acquired some formal commitment from group members and thereby something concrete had been established. In addition, this process virtually drew an either or line; two subgroups had been created, "producing" or acting. Debbie's position as the only one not fitting into either category, was simply undefined at that point.

Labelling roles was one action. Determining details or nuances of their interaction required considerably more. For purposes of this segment there was one particularly significant implication of this stated division of roles. That is, actors-researchers would have to modify the focus of their interactions since little distinction had been made among any roles thus far in the project.

Their roles had been defined until this time through their interactions as "members of the project". As members of the project
they had both assumed a sense of responsibility for all tasks and been involved in discussions and decision-making processes for virtually all aspects of the project.

For example, although they made the decision as actors-researchers not to be involved in administrative tasks during the first breaking point meeting, they continued to "slip into" considering such tasks and discussing process related to them.

- This all has to be brought up then at the general meeting. Ann) Actually, I imagine it's something I decide if it came down to that. Eil) A-14-418. ["This" referred to whether there would be special performances of the play for specific audiences such as school children.]

During this stage, in addition to identifying who would take on certain roles, process as part of role was also discussed. A theme for group members in this discussion was whether a script would be created. From one meeting to the next there were shifts concerning whether there would be a script:

- When we're writing it and putting it into our own language anyway. It's not going to be as difficult to learn your lines. Joy) A-14-444.
- And things are going to change. Joy) Changes, yeah. Ann) But we are going to have a script. Lor) No. [Several voices] A-14-446.
- We will definitely not be following a script? Lor) We don't have a scriptwriter. We don't have time to write a script. We're going to be up there doing it. Ann) A-14-448

A "role" associated with responding to ambiguity in process was articulated with the suggestion that the role was "spreading" to others:

- I feel like Anna, the worry-wort of the group. Jes) "Oh I feel so much better now. I really needed to come to this meeting tonight." [Eileen imitating Anna.] A-18-530.)
Arguably, this "worry-wort" role might be linked with a group member's role generally. However, this aspect has been linked with "emerging" roles of actors specifically, given the need for actors to throw themselves into the theatre process, while acting. Uncertainty about theatre process would be most manifest for them in terms of the public nature of their "acting" interactions.

This aspect of actors' role emerged in a modified form in terms of "contingency control" within a later stage of their theatre process. At that time the link between actor and this aspect of role became much clearer. (See the fourth Act-Play, "Contingency Control", for additional explication.)

Theatre process throughout this stage gradually emerged more forcefully at the forefront as an orientation for activities. As needs crystallized through acting process, those needs drove administrative activities.

- Are we only going to be on for an hour? Eil. Minimum. There's a whole lot of production work that has to go into the rest of this. Thank-you very, very much for today. It was, uh, rewarding. I feel really good about it. Exhausting but rewarding. Jes) Yeah. Jim) We done good again. Jes) A-24-774.

The "Pink Pills" improvisation and group members' improvisations during the all-day workshop crystallized group members' experience of "anchored anomie". All group members at the workshop eventually participated in the exercises leading to improvisations. This included those who had indicated they would not be acting. Although all of them did not develop a highly structured sense of their "role" in improvisation, they had begun to develop a sense of process.
The segment, "Locating Common Ground And Ambiguity" described the process whereby group members were asked in at least one of the workshop exercises to share personal or intimate feelings. During improvisations, they were also asked to search for their own emotional response to "the situation".

- All she has to say is, "Flannel underwear". That becomes a very personal moment for you... [Cam is directing Jay in the improvisation of the train station scene with Jessie.] Cam] A-24-722.
- But what is she doing? She's hooking up with a Scottish guy so she can wind up with a Scottish name. And that's her way of running away. So bang you get her for that. [Cam] A-24-726.

Apparently, part of the role of acting which emerged from "actors" interactions at this time was to attain a "formal closeness". While acting they were to intensively explore and share meaning. However, when improvisations ceased, most actors initially walked away not expecting to maintain the intensity of relationship.

In this way, actors were not expected to make long term commitment to specific relationships developed through their acting interactions, although a few apparently did. This will be further explored in the next segment.

4) Role Crystallizations To The End Of This Stage

For purposes of comparison with other stages the same form of summary has been used as that of "Sustained Uncertainty". Through group members' interactions during this set of meetings, the following role crystallizations occurred during this stage:
Producer-(Sole-administrator)-Researcher-Actor-Audience/Researchers
Actors-Audience-Worry-Worts/Animator-Director/Participant-Observer.
In analyzing data in this area, what struck me anew about "roles" is how subtle and detailed roles may be.

b) Emerging Leadership. Friendships. "Distance"

Leadership in the formal meetings shifted, depending upon who was in attendance. Distinct from earlier meetings, Cam generally directed the agenda for meetings during this stage. In his absence, particularly at the first breaking point meeting direction shifted from Eileen to Jessie to Alma.

- Assign a job. We don't need to sit around and mope and rehash and rehash. Just do it. Jes) No, I think that's why as producer I should just be taking that over. Eil) A-14-430. - That's his job. Don't worry about it. The ideas are all the same things we talked about tonight. A-14-443.

During this time, legitimacy among group members appeared to shift slightly, away from those who had "expertise" with research, to those who excelled at improvisational theatre (improvs). Those who displayed some knowledge of process or who articulated detailed analysis were given appreciative attention by other members as well. Particularly at the workshop there were two ways of receiving attention.

First, participants received attention through other group members showing signs of appreciation as audience in reaction to an improvisation. Generally, group members were quite encouraging with each other, clapping and laughing for everyone. However, the frequency and intensity of their response varied.

Second, group members also made suggestions occasionally when those doing the improvisation were stuck. Not all made these
suggestions. Of those making suggestions, some received more rapt attention to their suggestions than others. For example, group members with a "serious actor" orientation tended to be supported in this manner by other members giving their suggestions due consideration.

An additional sign of legitimacy was associated with ambiguity in theatre process. Those with legitimacy were generally those with sufficient confidence to question and to clarify at least some of that which was ambiguous.

- I think what would definitely work as a kind of binder twine is, uh, a kind of narration, thing, who might be a journalist from 1915, reads snippits. Cam) And what would the narrator be doing? I don't understand what you're saying. Jes) A-24-756.

Thus in addition to "serious actors" obtaining recognition from other group members, during this stage, people still tended to pay heed to those with an organizational orientation. This included Eileen, as producer. As well, Jessie appeared to have legitimacy, in part attributable to her position as president of the theatre club and in part attributable to her persistent questioning of process.

- That's how it's going to work. Cam will get us started. So now does everybody feel better? Can we make this work?Eil) You three can. I'm not so sure I can. Lor) A-14-453.
- Yeah, Jim is good at it. (She was referring to his ability to improvise. Eil) A-24-622.

Another factor which indirectly influenced group members' "legitimacy" and "leadership" was the meeting format. For example, at the all-day acting workshop group members broke into small groups to work on an improvisation. In smaller groups there were more
opportunities to lead. Through this process more members had an
opportunity to participate in leadership.

- You're not supposed to tell me that because I'm into my story.
  [Anna broke out of improv dialogue to instruct younger actor. The
  audience laughed.] No. She should do that. She's absolutely
  right. Keep going. Cam) I don't want to get married. Allie)
  That's exactly — what she's doing is right. Cam) Okay. I'm
  going this way. Ann) That's fine. You have to go with the flow.

In addition to mild shifts in leadership and legitimacy, group
members also experienced some shifts in their relationships. At least
two sets of individuals had begun to develop friendships with other
members prior to the project or at its inception. However, most
members had not developed friendships within the group.

References to friendships began to emerge within this stage in
more abundance. One cue was group members' references to phone chats.
A second cue which suggested a developing sense of relationship was
one member representing another member's interest in that member's

In effect, the all-day acting workshop restructured group
members' opportunity for interaction. It created an abrupt shift.
People who were unfamiliar with each other were thrown together to
work intensely.

- Did we lose Allie? You're in the wrong group. Jes) [Jessie
talking about Joy] I am not. Joy) You're not with me. Jes) She
was, too. Mad) Wow! Cam) A-24-624.
money you mean? Jes) To get money. Joy) Oh, I work. In this part
Although group members did not articulate such sentiment data analysis suggests that intimacy may have been easier to experience and express for some in a smaller group.

A few began to form friendships out of their shared experiences that day. They began to find common ground through the intensity of working together. One such example was previously proffered in a prior section.

- Nuggets. I saw you eating them thar nuggets. Jes) I asked people if someone wanted them. Jay) Why didn't you force yourself, "Hey give me some!" Jay) Well, cause I didn't know you then and I was trying to be polite, but next time, oh...

With respect to difficulties among members, once more, at this stage data analysis did not reveal strong "distancing" interactions among group members. In terms of where people sat and with whom they sat prior to meetings, there were no strong patterns. The younger two women continued to be quite quiet relative to the other members.

In this segment, emerging roles have been described in terms of theatre process primarily. With description of friendships and "distances" in group members' relationships, the focus has moved to "group" in the theatre—group tension. In addition to relationships, group members' interactions suggested an emerging pattern of activity gravitating toward developing a sense of group.

c) Ritual Of Humour

In this stage group members' earlier "go with it" responses emerged and crystallized into what the study came to refer to as a
"ritual of humor". It would appear that group members were able to find application for "go with it" responses in terms of developing a sense of group process. In this stage they began to use go with it humor to both acknowledge their crystallized experience of anxiety and to alleviate those feelings.

One form of ritual humour observed through data analysis was their "running joke". This phrase describes those occasions when group members interspersed what became thematic jokes throughout a discussion. An example of a "running joke" has been selected from the first breaking point meeting.

Near the beginning of that first meeting, group members began to make a series of jokes about acting as objects despite their very strong concern with having to do such a thing. "Iyle, be a whispering pine." Eil) A-14-333. Within ten minutes group members referred again to acting as a tree.


About fifteen minutes after the first series of jokes about being certain objects, group members began again:

- I'll be an ox... I was tryin' to find something to grab onto. Joy) Yeah and a tree [Eileen says this as Joy is completing her last sentence.] A-14-387.

Group members' ritual of humour generally reflected a satirical quality:

- I'll think about it tomorrow. Fiddle-dee-dee. Joy) A-14-362. [This reference to Gone With The Wind is a suggested ending for the play. It may be as well a reference to group members' process and progress with work on the play.]
d) Emerging Lexicon

The list of words used with more frequency and consistency by group members continued to grow during this period. Again, the following is primarily a sampling of the words group members were using related to theatre process. Words previously noted in the first Act-Play, such as "play", which group members continued to use in a similar fashion have not been repeated in this segment.

"Fun":

Group members' appeared to associate the word "fun" with excitement during this series of meetings. Their use of "fun" in these terms was manifestly linked with a "go with it" approach, with exploration. In this vein, some appeared to correlate experiencing fun with a sense of personal accomplishment.

- That was fun. Okay, well that makes me feel better. Joy) We do this every meeting. I come here full of concerns. By the end of the time I'm saying, "Oh, I'm so excited". Ann) [She laughs.] A-14-456.

During this stage group members began to develop a collective sense of "group entity". One of the cues which suggested this was an emerging definition of how one acted "internally", within the group and what the group did "externally" within the community, for the audience. The distinction was emphatically linked with "fun":

- But not for this heritage thing. Jes) Yeah I had fun. And the exercises he wanted us to work on afterwards and stuff. I don't mind in that kind of situation being a table, or combine. I don't think in this situation we could carry it off. Ann) A-14-311.
- You know, if you're going to be a saw, among ourselves, that's fine among ourselves. It's a joke, fun. But it does also trigger the possibility "If I can do that, I can do other things with my body and create another image of this physical presence that I have, other than what I am. Cam) A-18-497.
Interestingly, although group members' use of "fun" carries with it a ludic sense, their description was framed more in the personal than in a collective sense. The previous quotations as well as the one which follows suggest the sense of the individual rather than the collective.

- I think it could be fun, like to do several characters. And just change, like a bunch of little parts. Joy) A-14-437.

Division between action related to a sense of internal and external structure also suggested a "dismissive" quality about fun. Although they might "aspire" to fun individually as related to self-expression, the collective goal was to engage the audience. Paradigmatic striving associated with the goal of theatre to engage the audience precluded "self-absorption" of that apparent kind.

- Well people tell stories you remember, they actually embellish it to make it a better story. It sounds so much better that you don't want to disagree with it. It was not nearly so much fun when it happened. Joy) A-24-583.

Group members appeared to "shift" in and out of expressing fun as a predominant goal. This seemed to be related to their struggle with developing an "internal" and "external" sense of structure.

"Work":

Group members' use of the word "work" in this stage suggested that they were beginning to link the word with describing the effectiveness of a theatrical piece. Group members appeared to have adopted this from Cam although some of the "serious" individuals may have used it initially as well, when not in my presence.

Work was not used at this time in the sense of contrast with playing.

"Blocks":

Group members did not use the word block in this set of three meetings. Those situations wherein group members eventually began to use the word "block" in the next stage, were simply indicated at this point by redirection. That is, they would try something else or in the case of improvisations break down into silence.

- Yes, every time we get together we get deflected away from doing the play. Anything but doing the play (laugh) Joy A-14-423.

"Concrete":

Group members' use of the word concrete changed over time. Initially they used it in terms of having a script, a product, something to show for the time gone by. At this point they seemed to be using it less in terms of a concrete object and more in terms of a sense of action. One member described a spectrum of "concreteness":

- The thing at Anna's was magnificent and we realized the goodness of it and how useful it is, but the fear is if we don't do something now, we're not going to get anything done... As we talked we were saying we need those exercises but we have to start doing something. So it went right to the other extreme of the concreteness. Jes) You're just really bare naked up there without anything, a room. It is lack of confidence. Eil) A-18-504.

- Let's do it. Get up there. Eil) Exactly. Like last week. Jes) do it. Get up there and do something. It's so hard for us to grasp. The things you say, we know they're valid. But to actually see ourselves doing them... Eil) A-18-506.

"Rules":

Not all group members used this word during the project. However, a few spoke directly of rules during this and the next stage.
Use of the word provided indication that some group members were thinking in terms of structure. (This statement was made by someone I identified as oriented towards "group" in "theatre—group":

- We get in everything. Joy) Yes, but its not saying anything. Jay) Hey, there was no rules ... Jes) A-24-617.

"Theatre":

In the first Act-Play, group members began to use words suggesting that they had a sense of different types of theatre. They appeared to have some gradation "skits" being in one part of the spectrum and "plays" being in another. Additional details of some group members' spectrums were revealed during these meetings:

"Experimental Theatre":

- It's not us taking a bathe if we want to put on some experimental theatre. Ann) Experimental theatre is a great word. It would be marvelous to do. I'd be excited to do it too. But not for this heritage thing. Jes) A-14-307-08.

"Exercise":

Group members also began to use the word "exercise" to distinguish between different activities in theatre:

- As we talked we were saying we need those exercises but we have to start doing something. Jes) A-18-507.

"Wing It":

Several group members had begun to use the phrase, "Wing it" in these first sets of meetings. Based on data analysis the phrase appeared to be a parallel "early" expression for "improvise".

The phrase was used throughout the stages more by the men than the women. They used it on occasion in the vein of a quiet rallying
cry to respond to situations they constructed as "go with it". "We
don't have a story. We can wing it." Jay) A-24-648. No reference has
been located in the data to Cam's use of that phrase with group
members.

"Performance Level":

During this stage, Cam used this expression; group members did
not:

- You guys are amazingly close to performance level on some stuff.
  Cam) A-24-766

The phrase was included to provide indication that group members were
exposed to more than one "spectrum" of theatre through interactions
among themselves and Cam. The study assumes that this exposure led to
additional shifts in developing a commonly held paradigmatic framework
of "theatre".

This brings to a close the "Emerging Structure" section of the
second Act-Play. To reemphasize tremendous movement and change in
group members' interactions of this period, the "Emerging Tempo and
Rhythm Of Activities" provides another sense of this experience.

EMERGING TEMPO AND RHYTHM OF ACTIVITIES

This stage might be described as a "three piece suite"
correlative with the three meetings. The first piece began with
string instruments, a trio, with a pensive theme. The theme was taken
up through slipping into many little themes with no firm final form,
but nonetheless gathering momentum. This piece concluded with a sudden
burst of exuberant, improvised jazz in contrast with the earlier
themes. The theme in this instance was the instrumentation. The same trio which began the piece, ended the piece.

The second piece began ever so diminutively, hesitantly, with violins responding to cello. Themes from the first piece were repeated becoming clearer and more emphatic as they grew in volume. The tempo accelerated bringing the piece to a close with full, rich orchestration.

The final piece in the suite commenced with a quick staccatoed 3/4 time. The piece reflected the exuberance of the earlier theme evoked by the jazz trio. The opening segment of this final piece suggested a shift, shift, shift, sensation — a fast paced, and "light" quality. A second segment suggested a more sedate pace using recapitulated themes to build and draw to a strong close.

EMERGING CULTURAL-MEANING

In relation to other pieces suspended in the Mobile-framework, those fashioned for this Act-Play should inspire a little larger, a little more resonant, a little brighter emanation. From pooled reflections in the first two meetings to rippling waves in their exercises and improvisations this time became a watershed experience for group members. "Anchored anomie" floats at the centre of the Mobile-framework.

GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING CHORD OF CULTURAL-MEANING

Unlike other Act-Plays, the title "Anchored Anomie" alludes more strongly to one specific shape of group members' actions among others
which occurred during this time. It refers to their experience of improvisational work including the games and exercises which led up to improvisations. The breaking point meetings have been included in this stage because group members' struggling discussions of theatre set the stage for their improvisations. Their perspective at these meetings also provides a striking contrast to their acting.

"Anchored anomie" is intended to describe a series of group members' interactions wherein they were given a few rules, asked to be creative, and "set off" to act in whatever manner they chose within those relatively scant rules. Placed in high contrast with their earlier response to anomic conditions, group members appeared to have experienced a considerable shift in meaning. Their excitement and humour suffused their exchanges, supplanting their earlier fear and anxiety related to anomie.

Many group members expressed exhilaration in this opportunity despite a number of uncertain elements involved. It is striking that their anomic questions such as "Where is this leading?" did not resurface during this time. Neither did they express tremendous nervousness about making up a story and acting it out. Occasionally someone asked questions in response to Cam's brief instructions. Some members expressed momentary uncertainty. But for the most part group members "launched" into action as they could not before.

(Improvisation might be described as "intentional anomie".)
GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING COMMONALITY OF MEANING

In the parallel section of "Sustained Uncertainty" two sets of meanings were described which group members contributed to their primordial soup. The first set were elements of meaning which they had experienced prior to joining the project. A second set of group members meanings were those which they had experienced as individuals in the first meetings.

At the outset, the section indicated that those elements of meaning on which the study concentrated were those meanings group members eventually came to experience as holding in common. These two sets merge into one in this section as a reminder of group members meanings which had emerged prior to this stage.

a) Group Members' Starting Point Of Commonality

A growing meaning of "group entity" in the sense of differences from the community, had begun to emerge for group members in meetings of the first stage. Differences in religious emphasis and willingness to explore and to change were two major distinctions between the community and themselves which group members came to express in the first meetings of the study.

Despite a growing sense of group entity in terms of contrasting the community to themselves, a sense of structure to produce a play eluded them. To respond to a need for anchoring group members came to accept, to some extent, Cam's direction as an expert in theatre.

More specifically they looked for proof of effective action in structure, something concrete in terms of what would happen on the
stage. Cam responded with a suggestion for a concrete framework for the play. He proposed to modify a group member's idea and use "Grace" as that framework.

Group members accepted this suggestion initially as response to their immediate needs. However, this resolution of structural uncertainty did not come to terms with their differing assumptions about theatre in relation to the community. This was to surge forth again in this stage at the very first meeting.

b) Emerging Commonality of Cultural-Meaning Through Interactions

Group members' cultural-meaning as expressed from the first breaking point meeting "to the all-day workshop" indicates incredible transformation. This segment aims to record various changes with the additional intent of explication.

Given group members' general concern with anomic conditions, and intrinsically related to that, given group members' concern with how they could express themselves in the community, the question is: How did they shift from the position of being unwilling to do "experimental theatre" to doing improvisation within the space of three meetings?

Group members concluded one meeting (August first) leaving the impression that they had accepted Cam's direction. They also indicated through several interactions that they were satisfied with his response to their concern for concreteness, the proposed framework for the play. When they met on August fourteenth, however, several expressed experiencing extreme concern with his proposal. They spoke
of realizing between meetings that Cam's suggestion concerning the format for performance would not be accepted by the community.

Group members' statements indicated that their "cultural-meaning" in terms of urgency for something concrete had been redirected by their "growing cultural-meaning" related to the nature of this community. Through research and discussion they had grown to have a commonly held sense of the community as being uninterested in risk-taking, in change. As it has emerged for me through data analysis, many members had looked to "the theatre" as a historically acceptable place and therefore safe place to express oneself in the community. However, what was being proposed was not "historically acceptable" in group members' eyes. Theatre meant having props and sets not being the props and sets.

In accepting Cam as an expert of "the" theatre, certain assumptions were made about his paradigm. However, his suggested course of action crystallized distinctions between whatever commonality was contained in group members' assumptions and his in reference to theatre. These distinctions were sufficiently troubling to some so that they resisted.

When Cam was not in attendance during the discussion of August fourteenth, group members engaged in the process of clarifying their assumptions as a group, thereby, further developing a cultural-meaning of theatre among themselves. Their meaning was entirely framed in terms of: a) What will the audience accept and like? b) What are we prepared to do? One group member framed criteria for structural action in this way:
- ...What kind of a play can we put on for the people of Goetheim that we can enjoy doing, that we can get done and I think we'll all come up with basically the same answers. But let's each add our own and make a list of what we expect to see in the play.

Eil) A-14-314-17.

Data from their discussion during that meeting indicates that while group members were concerned with the implications of Cam's suggestion about props and sets, they had begun to make some shift towards his paradigm of theatre. They conveyed this with respect to one particular element. When asked what they thought should be in the play, most emphasized a need for props and sets. However, on the heels of that, about eighty per cent of those attending stated a corresponding need for the play to evoke the audiences' emotions.

At the end of the process, two group members began to return to cultural-meaning as urgency for something concrete. Others stated emphatically that their process had resulted in something concrete:

- No, I mean so far I mean still after all our, our discussions... [Joy says, "Nothing"] and things we still don't have anything. Ann) Yes we do. We have a page and a 1/2 of what we want in there. Jes) Lyle, get up there and drive a team of oxen for us. We have to have something. Eil) I'll be an ox... I was tryin' to find something to grab onto. Joy) Yeah and a tree [Eileen says this as Joy is completing her last sentence.]

A-14-387.

A plan of action, to give their consolidated views to Cam was articulated. As an expert he could then create a process based on their common sense of direction concerning content and format.

One group member expressed urgency on an additional score. She described concern with process in terms of tasks and time commitments required by those tasks. Emerging out of that discussion group members came to hold a common assumption that, excepting Eileen as
producer, they could "let go" of worrying about and doing most of the administrative tasks.

Cultural-meaning until this point in the meeting had been "congealed" through their discussion as a group. In response to some ambiguity of detail in process, group members who had been most articulate spontaneously did an improvisation on "Pink Pills". A statement from one group member in the audience suggested that this experience with improvisation did not create homogeneous meanings for all group members attending. Her remark indicates that this experience served to suggest a distinction among group members:

- That's how it's going to work. Cam will get us started. So now does everybody feel better? Can we make this work? Eil) You three can. I'm not so sure I can. Lor) A-14-453.

The latter statement also hints at the possibility of a "supra-meaning" group members may have held in common — a sense of profundity associated with this improvisation. Additional explication is required to make such a link.

In terms of process, these group members, with an exceedingly brief discussion went over to the stage and did what they had expressed concern with doing. They acted without script and without props. Comments made by those acting indicate that they even surprised themselves with the quality of their ending and the improvisation in general.

This "successful" experience, in addition to the physicalization exercise provided a taste of what it was like to act with a very few rules (anchored anomie) in a manner applauded by others. This experience in common, particularly because they could not articulate
the process, was an experience of transformation — of the profound. There was a "magic" in creating the improvisation both for those acting as well as those who felt uncertain about being able to do the "magic". The words group members used on this and later occasions bore a quality of profundity:

- Jessie will get up there and somehow...go ahead. Eil) A-14-449.
- The thing at Anna's was magnificent... Jes) A-18-504.

This improvisation took place virtually at the end of the meeting. What impact the improvisation experience had superimposed on group members' carefully constructed cultural-meanings emerging out of their earlier discussion was, however, unarticulated prior to the meeting with Cam on August eighteenth.

At the beginning of the August eighteenth meeting, confusion concerning meanings held by group members was expressed immediately by Eileen. She began to summarize group meanings concerning the play's format and content. However, she bracketed her description with the statement that her own meaning had shifted. She stated that she had been influenced by the ease of the improvisation and the work Cam had been doing with lights. Her new interpretation of the discussion was a lack of confidence in themselves.

If group members experienced a meaning in common at this point, it was apparently confusion. In some disarray after Eileen's opening comments, other group members stepped in and indicated that they were less concerned about their own capabilities than the audience being willing to accept theatre without props and sets.
Cam's response to group members was framed in a "profound" sense of theatre. His comments appeared to rest on a presumption that there were universal elements in theatre. For example, if theatre was "good theatre" any audience would respond. The problem of creating good theatre was to ensure that as actors they felt the experience genuinely. Then the audience, no matter who they were, would also experience and respond. Through these means, his paradigm of theatre led him to an entirely different analysis of group members' anxiety. The meaning he derived from group members statements was that they did not have sufficient confidence. That was what was missing.

Group members struggling with these shifts of meaning in listening to Cam's statements did not entirely change their interpretation of "the situation". One member gave, more specific example of their anxiety:

- ... We had a big joke about trees. That no one wanted to be things. We wanted things to be there and... We don't want abstract improving to that degree. Not like someone mentioned real rooms... as we talked further, but not to the extreme that people are going to be trees. Jes) A-18-496.

Cam's rejoinder at this point appears to have provided a missing link or reinforced for group members' cultural-meaning in terms of structure. He distinguished between what they might do within the group for fun or for developmental purposes and what they would do externally for an audience. He assured them they would not have to be a "tree" in the play.

At this point, group members exchanging views with Cam, appeared to shift meaning. Their response returned to cultural-meaning
expressed in terms of urgent need for something concrete. This expression of meaning was consistent with Cam's analysis of the heart of their concerns:

- But it does also trigger the possibility "If I can do that, I can do other things with my body and create another image of this physical presence that I have, other than what I am. Because that's what you have to do as an actor. If you can't do that, then we have a real uphill struggle. No matter how many rooms and buildings and real saws and trees you drag on to a stage, it's not going to do you a damn bit of good. Cam) Yeah I think people realized that. That wasn't what they were saying. But like I started to say, "We needed something concrete. Jes) A-18-497.

In terms of cultural-meaning, what is most interesting about these interchanges is how group members definition of "concrete" underwent change related to their changing meaning of theatre. This time their call for "the concrete" had an inflection of "starting to do" as opposed to having a product -- a script or an outlined framework for the play. It is through this discussion that they contrived to have an all day theatre workshop where they have an opportunity to act, "concretely".

At the beginning of the workshop group members' tone and content in their talk indicated both excitement and some trepidation. Their talk and actions emanated a dynamic quality, even when they were struggling with what they ought to do. This dynamic quality in their interactions suggests a substantial change in meanings.

Opportunities for exchange about the personal (the "Objects Exercise"), activity in small groups, and "successful creation" leading to a sense of concrete progress both in the doing and in recognition of producing a product in this way, all these elements led
group members to a new commonly held sense of "theatre", their process, and themselves as a group.

On that day, to varying extents all members found themselves able to improvise, to act spontaneously provided with a few vague rules. Members were not always clear about what few rules had been suggested. Despite some indications of frustration and inability to act in the moment most took some relish in being able to improvise.

There was no formal, reflective discussion among group members during this workshop. They did not articulate at the time a commonly held view of the process in which they had been engaged. Although neither the group members nor the study had access to such discussion of process, group members "sudden ability to improvise implies a tacit "cultural-meaning" in their actions. Through a lengthy process of data analysis relying on other theoretical works, the study has referred to this part of their experience as "anchored anomie".

In other words, group members had a sense of common experience in present action in theatre. Prior to this their strongest sense of common experience was to distinguish themselves from the community and to experience a sense of urgency in activity and uncertainty. They had finally experienced the exhilaration of running with an idea in relatively unimpeded fashion without at the same time running down into silence. Instead they had come to discover something concrete at the end of the process. Related to this highly valued quality of the concrete, they had recognizable foundations for scenes and they were "doing", they were acting. This was transformation!
Summary

The study continues herein with the supposition that in group members' paradigmatic actions, they would only "explore" or loosen one anchor at a time. This summary reviews that aspect of group members' interactions. Group members' interactions prompted many more changes related to anchors during this stage. Only those of major significance during and around each meeting will be described.

By the last meeting of the first stage group members had begun to experience "group entity" chiefly in an external sense. That is, they could define themselves as "group", but primarily in contrast to the community. Socializing at meetings had begun to change this, but only to a limited extent.

Internally, there was tremendous diversity among them. On topics other than research into the history of the town or their experience of the community, group members' experiences in common were limited.

Most significantly, since those attending meetings changed from one session to the next, this inconsistency made it difficult to develop a sense of group. As outlined in "Sustained Uncertainty", through various means they formed a stronger anchor in "group entity" by the last meeting in that stage. Experiencing some foundation they began to address a second anchor "structure", related to theatre.

At the beginning of this stage group members experienced a breaking point resulting from their efforts to strengthen their structural anchor in "something concrete". Their anchor in group entity collided with a developing anchor in structure, Cam's proposal.
His proposal buffeted their growing anchor through group entity in more than one way. First, they had accepted Cam as "expert". A probable implication of conferring that status is the underlying assumption that "the expert's" paradigm is the correct one. In addition, they had something concrete. To reject something proposed to fill a collective yearning required a collision of cultural-meanings.

In the tally, however, their process of dealing with the collision strengthened their anchors. First, they came to a spoken consensus on at least two major points. They did not wish to act as objects, they wanted to have some props and sets. They also wished to spark an emotional response from the audience. Thus, as a group they began to make some decisions about a "theatre paradigm".

Another tremendously important structural implication of the evening was that they had laid down "process" tracks for group discussion. They had discussed many things in group before and generally the expectation had become that they would make decisions consensually. However, this time they relied on a more methodical process, following around the circle so that each person might speak. They also recorded participants' contributions.

These interactions strengthened in the moment both structural and group entity anchors. They had created a process for dealing with breaking points. This additional foundation may have allowed a group member to raise another structural concern, one of roles. Based on time requirements, they proceeded to divide, conceptually,
administrative activities from acting. At least one group member separated them, however, on a basis consistent with a traditional paradigm of theatre — one assuming hierarchy and a different process:

- It makes sense. The producer produces. In a professional production you're not arguing for your opinion any more than you're up there saying, "I think your left arm should be..." Ann) A-14-432.

This apparent thickening of structural anchor, however, wound together two different theatre paradigms. These paradigms rested on differing assumptions concerning process and decision-making. The substance of future cultural-meaning collisions thus became imbedded in their "current" anchor of structure.

The improvisation which some group members spontaneously created strengthened their structural anchor to some extent. The success of their actions confirmed that the process existed and was possible for at least some to do. It may have also weakened temporarily a solid sense of commonly held meaning since those who did it actually had the experience on which to rely for confidence. 8

One group member had already begun to experience confusion about a theatre paradigm at the next meeting with Cam. This led to a prolonged discussion about "theatre". Through Cam's clarification of elements of his theatre paradigm (including an emphasis on the profound) he provided group members with an anchor in structure which apparently appealed to many on the basis of its profound quality and promotion of self-expression in "safe" terms.

He reframed "their problem" into a universal sense of "good" theatre and "bad" theatre shifting away from the Goetheim audience as
being a "special" audience. He placed the stress back onto members having confidence to experience and express meaning to audiences. In response to Cam's reframing, group members reverted to their position of needing something concrete in terms of structured anchor. As indicated earlier what they meant by "concrete" had shifted.

Despite initial confusion of meaning among group members, this experience was tremendously important. It was significant as a test of group entity and structure. This was the first time any group members directly spoke of resistance to Cam's ideas in his presence. One member even referred to the historical tension concerning who should make decisions.

In response, discussion included additional role clarification concerning Cam in terms of the writing process. It also included Cam's clarification of theatre activities on an internal and external basis. "Fun" and "exercises" were related at this point to activities internal to the group.

Both group entity and structural anchors having been strengthened, group members and Cam determined to respond to their urgent cultural-meaning need of "concrete" theatre action. The all-day workshop was the form chosen. Group members' interactions during the all-day workshop further modified their anchors. This occurred in so many ways that I mention only the most outstanding related to long term changes.

With respect to their group entity anchor, Cam's format promoted intense, dynamic actions. During at least one "exercise" group
members shared personal information with emotional shading. Group members also expressed their sense of being able to do this as a group. Many clearly enjoyed this intense opportunity for interactive self-expression. Attraction to collective "anchored anomie" became cultural-meaning.

Though group members expressed varying senses of success in the process, commonly, group members exuded a sense of accomplishment. Their immediate need for something concrete was apparently satisfied by the end of the day. Any questions or concerns no longer reflected that issue. Based on observations in the field, my sense of it is that at this point they finally felt anchored in a structure. They still did not know all the intermediate steps between these activities and final performance. However, they could do this step and in the doing their actions produced both skill and product.

Before leaving structure as anchor, it is important to consider a by-product of group members' experience. The group was broken into small groups for doing exercises and improvisations. New relationships sprang from this. There was also opportunity for more people to participate in leadership within the small groups. This added more strength to growing anchors.

Finally, concerning both group entity and structure, there was a larger turnout for the workshop. Virtually all "participants" who had been attending sporadically came together with the addition of two "new members". Given that they were committing themselves to specific activities by the nature of the activities, this gave an air of certainty concerning a core working group.
Resulting from their interactions of this period, group members did not again face entirely anomic conditions concerning the project. They had constructed anchors and planted them sufficiently well so that during the remainder of the project they might alter one without automatically destroying "other anchors".

This concludes a description of participants' cultural-meaning emerging through these meetings. The final section in "Anchored Anomie" turns to emerging meanings for "the participant-observer" during this period.

**THEMES DIRECTLY RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION AS CONSTRUCTED AT PRESENT**

As a relatively brief period of time had elapsed since the commencement of the study, meanings I had brought with me to the fieldwork still largely influenced my observations in the first meeting of this period. However, both group members' interactions and readings were beginning to result in a new sense of the experience.

**CULTURAL-MEANINGS FOR PARTICIPANT-OBSERVER**

Through scouring resources on methodology, by this time I had become aware that there were certain repercussions in entering the field rapidly. For example, the study would have to be guided largely by an inductive process. A cogent, formal theory had not been discovered beforehand, which would act as a platform for comparison with experiences in the field.

As group members swept from two meetings in a swelter of tension, to the third in a swarm of excitement, I was struck by the magnitude
of their change. The morning, afternoon and evening of the workshop sped by. Group members exuded enthusiasm particularly in the morning and afternoon. They spoke in animated fashion. They laughed. I had a sense of observing and experiencing something profound without having the words to explain this transmutation. On recognizing a dominant theme of change through this experience, I began to reconstruct, to look for what other things had been changing for "this group".

In addition to methodological resource material, I had also begun to read Social Construction Of Reality. Based on field experiences, I was attracted more by the sections concerning groups creating reality than I was focused on the references to theatre, for it was not until the workshop that group members actually began to focus on "doing theatre". The fieldnotes suggested many different themes at this point. The possibility that there were subgroups within "the group" was barely conceived at this time. Limited action had been taken to explore this possibility.

Prior to August twenty-fourth Eileen had taken part in the first interview of the study. A primary purpose of this interview had been to discover how the theatre club was constituted. Eileen also had a wealth of information about the town as she had grown up there. Having been gone for a number of years she seemed all the more enthused to have a sense of the place and to discover it with someone. I valued highly the time and energy she poured at me. Contact with Eileen in this form was important not only for purposes of gathering information, but in terms of developing a relationship.
Part of the "disadvantage" of being a participant observer is that one does not wish to interfere in the dynamics of the group. However, I also came to realize that it would be difficult for people to have a sense of relationship with me if I was always the "relatively" silent partner.

The first three interviews suggested certain advantages in interviewing all participants. The interview format provided an opportunity to establish rapport with each member separately as previously described. As well, it was in part a way around being solely identified with the gatekeepers.

On reflection, in an odd sense, as I was the only one who had this connection with everyone, and as the interviews gave them an additional opportunity to reflect (sometimes to vent), it appears that these interviews would have been one element prompting a sense of cohesion among group members. On the other hand, in taking opportunity to reflect in a manner that they would not otherwise, group members may also have experienced and expressed differences among themselves that they might not have articulated without the interviews. It is impossible to know the precise impact of the interviews, however as also indicated previously.

DATA RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION FRAMEWORK AS CONSTRUCTED DURING THIS STAGE

At the outset of this period, based on analysis from the first three meetings and an interview, interest began to shift beyond a
single-minded focus on providing evidence that group members were learning and providing the "content" of what they were learning. The study was beginning to search for other aspects of learning.

In addition to recording both evidence of "group members learning" and the content, data analysis began to include not only what group members were learning, but also how they were learning. As part of how they were learning, where and when they were learning emerged as important during this stage. Their references to phone calls between group members and their statements indicated that they were constructing anew their meanings, often after meetings were over:

- Cam said an idea can be great but it must go somewhere. So I did come up with an idea. Jessie and I talked about it. Eil) J-22-105.

Group members described reconstructing alone and arriving at new meanings prior to meetings:


In one instance, that of the two breaking point meetings, a seismic shift occurred between one meeting and the next. This shift erupted because group members had considered Cam's suggestion for the play between meetings. After some reflection a few had rejected his proposal. Group members' learning was not confined to the formal events, although the exchange which sparked the change very often was.

Toward the end of these sets of meetings consideration was being given to what it literally meant to learn in a context wherein education was not the stated goal. At first, however, this led back to an assumption that the study needed to evince "group members'
learning" because of the tacit nature of "education" in this context. This prompted continuation of the search for evidence that they had learned.

Content Areas Of "Group Members' Learning"

Group members' interchanges were continually raising new ideas and questions for them. The "content areas" listed in this segment comprise a selection of those which emerged as most significant in terms of group members' cultural-meaning, the community, their relationship with the community and theatre.

a) Concepts Related To The Community's History

During this period, although group members no longer specifically allocated meeting time to exchange their research discoveries, they continued to express what they had learned on their own through sharing information on a variety of aspects about the community.

- Electricity only came on for so many hours of the day. There was big excitement when it came on all the time. Eel) A-14-350.
- They no longer called it sauerkraut... Jes) There was an article in the paper. Eel) They called it pickled cabbage. Jes) And they just sort of sat around here and didn't get involved at all. They just kept on farming. Jim) A-24-596.
- The Journal was, it was really crude. My god, they just described things in gross detail. Ann) A-14-365.
- Contest is looked for. The puck will be faced off at 8:00 P.M. sharp. Admission adults .025. Now that was the first inkling that I got... Eel) There was a women's hockey game and they had some guy pick 'em up. [Group members laughed.] Joy) A-14-376.
- You were talking about a concentration on some of the parties and social events. The hospital ball. I've been reading a novel about someone setting up a paper. And how in the first few issues, for 20 to 30 years any wedding or anything was such a big social event it would take up half a page describing it in
detail. It happened so seldom. As things progressed it would turn into a one inch notice. Joy) A-14-382.

About this time, group members' discussion began to lead into their expression of another sense of relationship with the community.

b) Interest In Community Development

As the research and discussions continued, some group members' comments indicated a new perspective concerning the community. This perspective suggested a different relationship leaning towards a sense of doing something for the community. This included for a few the notion of changing the community:

- When this idea first came up I thought, "Sure I'll go along with this, no big deal. But listening to those tapes and reading the newspapers, I'm really excited about just trying to imagine what it was like... And so we have... The younger people can try to imagine what it was like... Leaving it up to them... A-14-338.
- Because people now sort of think "how could they ever smile?" Like they didn't have t.v. or an electric can-opener or whatever and, and they just think it would so hard for them to live. The old people can sit there and smile at this that they did. And then the younger people, "Well gosh, you know they actually..."Yeah this was fun". Deb) A-14-347.
- Everyone knows the excitement at your first vehicle. The very idea that someone had one reflected on you, you know... I was talking to this 82 year old. He said, "You know, I drove in that car once. Eil) It's still exciting. Jes) A-14-349.

c) Theatre

The following data is intended to demonstrate group members' general inexperience with "professional theatre", particularly vocabulary generally associated with theatre.
Learning Related To Change/Process

This representation of data is consonant with my first course of action, that is, collecting "before" and mainly "after" data on group members' learning.

- The physical whatever word it is, moving stuff off stage in order to create a different atmosphere. (Ann) A-14-334.
- The book tells you. I can't remember. All those sounds. (Eil) A-14-343.

The first comment was made by one of the most experienced members of the group, Anna. She was regarded as a "serious actor" and was more familiar with different kinds of theatre than most of the other group members. The second comment came from the producer who had spent considerably more time with the theatre club than most. Both of these comments were made after the group had met several times. It must be emphasized that these comments were included only to signify how inexperienced the group members were. One might also consider their courage in being willing to pursue such a project given their admitted inexpertness. The next subsection begins to record their change, the "during" as opposed to "before and after" affect.

- Metamorphosis, Group Members' Reflection On Process:

In the first stage group members had attempted to create a process of theatre for themselves through their paradigmatic actions. Their consideration of such process was more as "outsiders trying to get in". While some of that sense continued, during this stage group members began to express more frequently their reflections about
changes in their process. Through the breaking point meetings and the all-day workshop they took the opportunity to articulate and clarify process considerably.

- Eileen is concerned with that and I really agree with her. The more we talked, it seemed our initial ideas turned out to be more of a variety night show. Jes) A-14-295.
- In the beginning I was really thinking characterization and women's role. But I got off on a tangent. How many things in any space in ... that people who have read the Best Of Goetheim or people that have lived there then will recognize... A recognizable short journal...a journal of a specific period of time. Ann) A-14-319-20.
- And what we did, we took something concrete, writing in a newspaper article "Pink Pills for Pale People"... advertising. And so what we did was, Eileen, Anna and I went up there. It was the same type of thing we did at Anna's and then took a scene off of that. But we had to have something concrete to start. Jes) A-18-513.

Some group members also began to reflect on their needs in the process. They articulated them to Cam more clearly and emphatically than they had in previous meetings:

- Yeah I think people realized that. That wasn't what they were saying. But like I started to say, "We needed something concrete. We're getting anxious. The thing at Anna's was magnificent and we realized the goodness of it and how useful it is, but the fear is if we don't do something now, we're not going to get anything done... As we talked we were saying we need those exercises but we have to start doing something. So it went right to the other extreme of the concreteness. Jes) You're just really bare naked up there without anything, a room. It is lack of confidence. One person all alone in the middle of that space, right now just there can it, we know it can be done. But I don't think any of us want to... I think may be if we did it... Eil) Yes exactly... Jes) we'd feel differently about it. Let's do it. Get up there. Eil) Exactly. Like last week. Jes) do it. Get up there and do something. It's so hard for us to grasp. The things you say, we know they're valid. But to actually see ourselves doing them... Eil) A-18-504.

Some also expressed consideration of their process on future activity:

- When we're writing it and putting it into our own language anyway. It's not going to be as difficult to learn your lines. Joy) A-14-432.
Constructing A Spectrum Of Theatre

In various discussions group members began to refer to different activities falling under the auspices of theatre. Although they did not create a list distinguishing various forms to my knowledge, their words describing their activities became more specific during this stage. This spectrum has been described previously in "Emerging Lexicon". That segment may be consulted for more detail. Data provided herein is a sampling only:

- Eileen is concerned with that and I really agree with her. The more we talked, it seemed our initial ideas turned out to be more of a variety night show. Jes) A-14-295.
- It's not us taking a bathe if we want to put on some experimental theatre. Ann) Experimental theatre is a great word. Jes) A-14-305.
- But not for this heritage thing. Jes) Yeah I had fun. And the exercises he wanted us to work on afterwards and stuff. I don't mind in that kind of situation being a table, or combine.

Theatre As Bearing A Profound Quality For Some Group Members

The analysis included in this subsection might have been attached to "Constructing A Spectrum Of Theatre". It has not been included in an attempt to avoid possible confusion.

Insofar as the study has posited distinctions in spheres of meaning, the "profound" has been associated with supra-meaning. This sphere of meaning, is not to be placed at one end of the spectrum. This is a quality of meaning which individuals may diversely attribute to any "theatre" on the spectrum.

The prosaic sphere of meaning tends to be assumed, if no point is made otherwise. In "Sustained Uncertainty", a description of Cam's paradigm of theatre was attempted. Within this description the claim was made that he experienced theatre as imbued with a profound
quality. However, in that first Act-Play there were limited references to the possibility that participants carried such a sense of the profound related to theatre.

During this stage, group members did express excitement when speaking of the experience of improvising. Some of their comments suggest a profound quality associated with their experience of improvisation. Certainly they refer to change they have experienced. This suggests an unusual slant on learning:

- When you do stuff like that "Use the pail", you wouldn't never have thought of that earlier. It just happened. Speaking of pale... Eil) A-14-455
- Thing was it is exciting. I still think that. I still think we could get together in a group and start talking about it and still get all excited about it. Ann) A-14-313.

Insofar as their comments hinted at a sense of the profound sphere, this suggests a most important aspect of their learning related to meaning.

To the extent that group members continued to spend much of their time in improvisation and modifying developed scenes, their activities in the next stage were the same. However, in the sense that improvisation was no longer an entirely new experience, group members' meanings changed.
Group members' responses may be attributed in part to Anna's status. She was regarded as one of the best actors in the group. I have included her in the "Serious Actors" subgroup orientation.

This was a shift. Immediately after the physicalization exercise, Cam's words in the spirit of creative speculation did not remove the possibility of actors representing objects.

Some of them will become parts of whatever action takes place. They'll all become different characters. They may become things, animals, buildings... We'll see where we go from here. A-1-264.

Criteria were threefold for choosing which group members' descriptions of objects to include. First, I chose examples based on quality of the recordings. There was much laughter and shifting during this exercise. The recorder was not equidistant from everyone. I also selected on the basis of whether "the object" or an aspect of the conversation concerning the object surfaced as part of the storyline in the play. Finally, I wished to indicate how the encounter provided an opportunity for group members' to learn about more personal aspects of each other. Discussions concerning some objects appeared to be more intensely meaningful for group members.

I suspect that emerging "distance" in relationships between two members of "the cast" would explain in part the demise of this scene.

This reemerged as a problem for the person asking the question in final performances. During the final performances, to her own chagrin, this participant tended to say others' lines if they hesitated long. Reference is made to this in the fifth Act-Play.

At this point, one group member indicated as a joke, that another group member who was absent, one of the teenagers, could make every meeting since she has nothing better to do. This eventually reemerges as a breaking point.

This incident epitomizes the difficulties with attempting to ascertain "cultural-meaning" at all times. Through interactions meanings change. It is impossible to verify whether members of a group continue to hold some meaning in common unless there is common impetus in their actions or they articulate meaning in common. Even in these instances, as I indicated in ruminations of Part Two, individuals' externalizations may differ from their internalizations for various reasons.

Group members experience of the improvisation may have "proved" that tacit knowledge and learning was possible. Even if they could not precisely articulate a process, they could do it. There is no data which directly evinces this, however.
D. PLAY ACTING:

The Third Act-Play

The players cannot keep counsel; they'll tell all.
- Hamlet, III, ii, line 133

We started with four people. What — we had Eileen, Joyce, and they got their characters and they couldn't get into them. And the scene wasn't right and it started out as four being trapped in a train station during a snow storm... And we were supposed to reminisce and it turned into just me and Jessie in something completely different... But you know, when you get there, you look back and say, "Gee that's a weird process". But you never would have got there without the other. Jay) S-13-p.25.

EMERGING CONTEXT

TIME OF YEAR

Summer beckoned and autumn answered. Although fall began to insinuate, itself, the season seemed less and less significant during sessions. The meetings were all in the theatre within the school. The building's internal weather system, cold, became the season for a time, until we were greeted with whatever had happened to the external weather upon emerging from the building.

On occasion, the weather changed substantially during a meeting since meetings ran from one and a half hours to ten hours. External weather demanded attention when requiring added action of us, such as chipping frozen rain from car windows or driving by the brake.

PERIOD OF TIME

As interpreted through data analysis this stage in group members' activities took place over the most prolonged period. The period
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extended from August thirtieth to October fourth. This included fourteen meetings.

LOCATION

The theatre had been clearly established as the primary location for the group's formal meetings. As one session followed another however, people continued to use other rooms of the school when working in small groups.

During the early part of this period, particularly during the "improvising" substage, after the session was over many of the members would gather in one of two bars. This was a place for letting off creative steam, for joking and teasing, and for discussion and reflection.

As well, there were indications throughout this period that people were continuing to confer outside of the meetings on topics important to them. As in early stages, on some occasions they would do this through conversing on the telephone.

- It killed me, when Eileen talked, when I talked to Eileen the other day on the phone and was asking what... I was selling brushes... Ann) [Anna is making reference to working out historically accurate information for a scene.] A-30-282.
- I was going to phone you about fourteen times today, but I didn't have time. Len) S-6-898.

In addition to the phone line, during this stage a few of those participating in the same scene arranged to work on "their" scene outside of the formal meetings. As participant observer, I was not privy directly to these experiences, and as I have only a few references to them in the data, I cannot provide a more detailed
description. Nonetheless, their discussions during these subgroup meetings would have influenced the perceptions of at least those participating as part of the subgroup in terms of process and progress related to the project.

Finally, the majority of first interviews with individual participants were conducted during this period. In these interviews group members spoke of their experiences with the theatre club, how they became involved with project and their experiences with process. This interaction required reflection and articulation of experiences in which they may not have engaged otherwise. Data from interviews with group members has been interspersed throughout this Act-Play. (See Appendices, Section Two "Checklist Of Questions For The First Set Of Interviews" for additional details.)

ATTENDANCE

The size of the group did not change substantially after the workshop. The same people also began to consistently appear for meetings. Basically a core group became identifiable. Various group members continued to emphasize the need to find more people for the "technical" tasks.

An earlier suggested need for more men to round out the cast was not formally voiced during this time as it had been prior to the workshop. However, two men were invited to join the project during this period. Two people also ceased to be involved in the production during this period, one a man, another a woman.
There was a particularly distinct change in the nature of attendance as between the first meetings of this stage and the later ones. At first the whole group met each time, beginning and ending the meeting together (except for those who were unable to attend the session and those who had to leave early). However, as the play took form and the scenes were set, a "rehearsal schedule" was created.

For those who were not in the first scenes being rehearsed in a session, the actors could attend later. As well, people were able to leave when their "part" was done. At first they tended to come early and stay to watch what else was being done. Gradually, however, they began to take the opportunity to come later and to leave when their scene was over. Those whose scenes were not being rehearsed on a particular evening would not attend at all. In this manner small group interactions were emphasized during the meetings. This format also had implications for socializing after meetings. The larger group was no longer in tact by the end of the meeting to socialize, to discuss, and to jointly reflect.

EMERGING PATTERNS OF PROCESS

INTRODUCTION

In the workshop, group members began to create scenes through Cam's direction and format. Though substantially modified over a period of time, several of the scenes begun through their improvisations in the workshop, did form part of the "final" play.
For example, Cam eventually used the content and the characters of one particular improvisation, a grandmother and grandchild, to create the outer framework for the play.

If an improvisation "had something" as Cam referred to it, he had group members "re-work" those improvisations. The actors began to re-work scenes even during the workshop. In terms of group members' work at this stage, parts of scenes and whole scenes were created or improvised, but even this partially improvisational work declined as their sessions continued. Strictly speaking, it is a contradiction to "repeat an improvisation". An attempt at repetition transforms the nature of the act. It is no longer improvised. The interaction is planned. In an interview Cam came to refer to this distinction as "very goal oriented improvisation" (S-6-p.1). Nonetheless many group members continued to refer to their work simply as improvisation and the study follows their direction.

There was a key distinction between group members' experience in the workshop and their activities which followed it. Their improvisational processes emerging in the workshop was a relative unknown to most group members. During the all-day workshop they completely "surrendered" to Cam's direction. The workshop was a beginning, other meetings were continuations, their activities concerned with reshaping and embellishment. Hence the distinction between the "Anchored Anomie" period and "Play-Acting".
EMERGING SHAPES OF GROUP MEMBERS' INTERACTIONS

Although group members' interactions during this period emerged through several shapes, acting surfaced as key. Their other interactions including discussions, were generally guided by what happened in terms of their acting during much of this period.

Emerging Shape Of Group Members' Interactions, Discussion

The first half dozen meetings after the all-day workshop began with everyone sitting in a circle on the stage. On two of these occasions the session was begun with the "story circle" exercise followed by discussion of direction and reading scripts together. However, after September sixteenth, the circle format for discussion was abandoned generally.

Throughout this period the focal point for most group members' activities was creating the play. They spent the lion's share of time on improvising and acting, formally. The majority (about eighty per cent) of large group meeting sessions beginning in September were taken up with acting. Other related activities were squeezed into informal discussion, or administrative work on the sidelines.

Thus it was that discussion, a shape of interaction upon which group members came to rely heavily in their first few meetings did not continue to be their main manner of interaction. Although there was extremely limited large group, formal discussions at sessions, there was much evidence of small group, informal discussion.

On a relatively regular basis at the beginning and end of each session, as people came in gradually and then left, group members
would discuss personal experiences, raise questions they had about the play, and make suggestions about their concerns. In addition, as "audience members" awaiting their time on stage, group members discussed various aspects of their activities with each other. A few group members made reference to technical meetings in the latter weeks of this period.

In contrast then with meetings described in prior stages, group members generally carried on their discourse informally within small groups, chatting as it were. Particularly after the first few sessions of this period, when they gathered to socialize at the bar those attending also talked informally of matters related to the project.

After September thirteenth there was a single exception to gathering in small groups to discuss. One meeting wherein Cam was not present group members took this opportunity to express experiencing a breaking point. Formally, as a group they proceeded to go through the play to determine what they felt comfortable with doing. Much of their activity still took shape in terms of acting, but discussion among all group members present was an imperative part of their interactions.

As previously described this Act-Play covers several weeks during which group members had fourteen meetings. Data collected from this period is more substantial than from any other period. In addition, because of the small group discussion format, it was impossible to collect data from all interchanges in which group members were engaged.
Given these complexities, the following constitutes a bare overview, a sampling of content from group members' discussions. These excerpts were taken from various meetings and informal gatherings during this time. They reflect group members' tendency to harken back to events concerning "acting".

a) Exchanging Experiences Concerning Research For The Project

Both research and process for researching continued to be a topic of discussion among group members in these sessions. This was particularly the case in their meetings immediately after the all-day workshop. Cam hoped to add several scenes to those commenced at the workshop. In light of this, at the beginning of the two meetings which followed the workshop, group members discussed their research and additional details of community history:

- Does it mention anything about the irons and the electricity? Jo) Where did you see that? Jes) In that paper, it says "12 Hour Power". There's an article in there about all night power. Ann) A-30-825.
- There was quite a bit about the Hapsberg Hotel and it's such a dive now. I thought it would be interesting to draw people's attention to what a wonderful thing it was when it was built. There was a fire while it was partially under construction and people escaped in their night clothes... Joy) In Gotheim. Oh really? Eil) S-5-848-49.
- Lenore, how long did your mom have the switchboard? Eil) Twenty-five years. [Eil describes how the family gave up the front part of their house for this purpose.] It was one of the last offices in this area. Len) Good Lord. Cam) A-30-792.

Source for research also formed part of their discussion on research. A few people had continued to encourage others to read selections from the Goetheim Journal of 1915. Based on their discussion Cam appears to have developed an idea for the play. He
invited members to assume a specific research task. Group members were to bring a journal article with them to the August thirtieth meeting.

Many group members did complete this assignment for that meeting. At this meeting and the next they discussed content and process of the research mainly in light of this assignment. In one or two instances, participants also "gave" research findings to others who might need it:

- Oh right on! That's what I needed was prices. Jes) I found it and then I was thinking if somebody was doing the car bit... Len) S-5-831.
- I'm not interested in the farming aspects. But I thought if someone else was... I copied it down. Len) S-5-833.
- I was trying to get some of my facts right about this telephone business. You know, like I don't know if there were payphones in 1915. So I spent a day at the Journal and came up with a few things that I passed around here for other people. Tips for their things. Couldn't come up with anything for my own. Went to the Museum. Couldn't come up with a damn thing there. And I phoned Sask-Tel business office. And I talked to a gal there. Ended up talking to the librarian in Regina. Len) S-5-839-41.

As may be noted in the latter instance, one member at least, Lenore, was persistent in her pursuit of information. Through her efforts she traced information not widely available.

At the September fifth meeting, it was apparent that the research task Cam had given them encouraged several group members to consult both the "Goetheim Journal" newspapers of 1915 and the Best of Goetheim.¹

- That's like that other article in there about the guy that froze to death. Eil) Yeah. Joy, Len, Jes.)
- Why does the post office have a customs sign over the door? Cam) Used to be the custom office. Eil) Herein the middle of Saskatchewan? Cam) Yeah, I read that. Jes) S-5-884.
Data analysis suggested that, if not all group members, a majority were developing a common base of "historical facts" associated with the area through relying on a common set of resource materials.

In addition, those who came from the area continued to make contributions based on their experience with the community. In the following example Lenore was attempting to build into the play phrases common to the community:

- You know, she has to, like, in that scene, where she's the mother, she can say "Be quite once." Len) Yeah, I've got "extra" in my thing. Jes) And she should say, "You're extra doing that so I'll get mad at you". She's gotta bring some of that in there and then her language won't seem so proper. Len) You were there when we were asking how to talk? Jes) [To Len] S-5-835-37.

As well during this time, various references, in a variety of contexts were made concerning the contemporary community:

- I hear you were at Fred's today. Len) [To Cam] Where? Cam) Fred's Sporting Goods. You can't do anything in this town... Len) [I believe she was implying "Without everyone knowing it." ] S-5-838.
- You mean because you work in the school your neighbours won't talk to you? Participant) Because I'm not Catholic. Participant) Period? Participant) ... But you're so bad. Cam) Oh yeah. But she didn't even give me time to prove that I was bad. I tell you I've never been more minoritized than in this town... S-6-1030.
- Yeah I know this town scares me sometimes. Participants) S-6-1031.

On the whole, however, according to available data, during these meetings group members refrained from discussing the present community except as audience. The community as audience was nonetheless a most important concern, particularly for some.

Lenore spoke as one coming from the community. She made several references to her sense of the community as audience and what that
should mean in terms of shape and content of the play. There was some urgency expressed on one particular occasion when she, Anna, Cam, I, and intermittently Jessie conversed after the September sixth meeting.

- And that's why we have to keep everything plain and simple and easy. Len) But you see, no — [Lenore continues thereby interrupting Anna.] Like the title and everything else. It's got to be something that everybody's going to be able to relate to. Len) S-6-993-95.

- You can't make fancy, it's got to be meat and potatoes and vegetables. And don't put any sauce on the meat or anything. You can't dress it up, it's got to be plain and simple. Len) S-6-1002-03.

At that time those listening did not appear to be entirely receptive to her concerns.

Nonetheless, the community as audience continued to surface in small group conversations. Some comments suggested a process of self-editing; some comments indicated ongoing disagreement in the group. The following is an excerpt from a conversation approximately a week later. Once more some of the group members were socializing after the meeting.

- She said we'll be good ambassadresses of Goetheim after this. We'll know so much about Goetheim. Len)... Like I really don't know Goetheim that well. Do you think that some people might be offended by some of this? Bill) I don't think they will. Len) I think we've watered it down to the point where there's nothing in it. It's got no sting. Participant) S-13-1085.

Bill at this point has asked this question as a newcomer. It is most interesting to note that within a week Lenore's response appears to have shifted to some extent.

One "concession" made by group members was to refrain from using "real people's" names in the play. References were made, however, to
locations existing in the community including stores that had existed in the area during the years covered by the play.

This question of relationship to the community as audience continued to resurface throughout the remainder of the project. While group members did not hold a common response among themselves, they did on occasion act with common concern. Their actions in this sense are described in later segments as "breaking point actions". Unquestionably, the matter of relationship to the community as audience was both an explicit and implicit element in group members' interactions regarding development of the shape and content of the play.

b) Exchanging Ideas About The Shape And Content Of The Play

On August thirtieth at the meeting which followed the all-day workshop, Cam raised content and shape of the play at one point in their process of creating scenes. He reflected on what had been developed thus far and stated an overall objective for content:

- One thing we've stayed very clear from except in an oddly indirect way is the religion... in our little dramas... except... and that could be the best piece of writing... [Cam's voice was inaudible at this point on the tape, however based on fieldnotes, I believe he was referring to the Train Station scene.]
  Cam) A-30-793.

- One thing I want to mention here is to make sure we cover all the main aspects of cultural life here in its vastness. We should be reflecting somehow, sports, medicine...[Cam) A-30-799.

As indicated in the introduction, during this series of meetings group members' interactions were mainly devoted to creating the play. Discussions of shape and content of the play were often limited to small group discussion.
In addition, when individuals apparently experienced sufficient
dissonance concerning direction of acting in terms of themselves or
that which they observed of others, they did speak in the general
group. Only a few, however, raised such concerns in this way:

- Are we still trying to... The main thing is to, like actual
German Catholic sentiments... Are we supposed to remember that.
Isn't that one of stipulations of getting this grant? Len) A-30-815.
- No there were no stipulations on the grant. Those were
suggestions that were made. And uh, it's unrealistic. Eil) I
think what, you know even this stuff we have today. A-30-816.
- I've explained...did I... the way I would like them to be as if
they are part of something else rather than explicitly. I'd
rather... one of the things on the telephone conversation could
be a baptism...part of the culture. Cam) A-30-823.
- Has anyone come up with a name for this production? Len) Our
know what. Cam wants Goetheim in it. Jes) Anna wants "Goetheim
`comma` Upon A Town Once." S-5-834.
- Has everybody heard the good news? Eileen has come up with a
perfectly good name for the play. Cam) We'll take it. Jay) I
want to hear it. Eil) Naw, just put it on the posters. Doesn't
matter. [The tape is insufficiently clear to determine who the
latter speaker was. Eileen then explained "Home Quarter". Group
members said very little in response... A few say they like
the title.] S-6-937.
- How can it be a 1927 Studebaker. I thought this was 1915. It is
not? Len) Lenore you missed two main meetings, I told you on the
phone it was no longer established. It never really was
established that it was 1915. It was just that that was one
- See I thought this was restricted to 1915. But, it's not. Len)
No, it's not Cam) Oh, okay. Len) S-5-842.

These are examples of some group members' discussion for purposes of
clarification with the large group present.²

c) Exchanging Concerns Of An Administrative Nature

As Eileen had promised, administrative concerns were not on
meeting agendas. As sessions became transformed into "bouts of
acting" and formal large group discussions receded in the main, no clear opportunity was presented for common consideration of administrative matters. On very rare occasions Eileen raised administrative concerns related to creation of the play:

- What are we missing? Cam) A title and nobody's getting out of here tonight because I have to have one. Eil) S-5-882. [Previously, Eileen explained that she needed a title for promotional material.]

Other than a few such instances, matters of an administrative nature arose primarily through role crystallization, that is the need for a pair of hands, or once more through individuals' expressing specific interest or concern. Raised in this context, discussions related to administrative matters often had an element of tension. This was to continue even after the project had drawn to a close.

d) Exchanging Ideas About Group, Identity, And Personal Information

Throughout this period, group members continued to divulge more about themselves and more about what they thought of each other. They also spoke more frequently of a sense of the group.

- And I was just looking at the close relationship of these German people. Because, like, I've never experienced any family closeness until I lived with these people for a while. It's just strange to me. But it's nice, it's nice. Allie) S-5-856-59.
- I thought you'd think it was funny. Cam) S-18-1099.
- That is the delight to me. Two or three people — our little group have been able to get on stage with an idea and work something out. That it is possible. Ann) S-6-943.
- See how much fun we have when you're not there? We didn't accomplish a hell of a lot. But we sure had a good time. Jes) [She is speaking to Cam about their activities as a group during the prior session wherein he was absent.] S-13-1075.
- So you need all kinds of people in order to make a success. Like everybody's input. Len) Yes. Cam) S-6-1005.
An interesting observation was made during this time about the content of the play and how it reflected on intentions of some group members concerning community development:

- This is a woman's poem. Ann) ... Us women wrote it. We women. Allie) There's a slightly feminist tinge to this whole play. Cam) [Several laugh.] I wonder why? Who did that? Jes) [Her voice conveys an air of mock shock and laughter follows on the heels of her questions.] S-16-1089.

Cam was referring to the number of women's roles in the plays. However, he was also referring to many of those roles having a strong, assertive quality about them. For example, scenes included one representing a discussion among some of the first nurses in the area, another depicted an all women's hockey team with "fighting spirit" which existed in 1915.

Some group members also began to act more informally towards each other during this period:

- I never even considered what I put on. I just put on something for warmth. Len) ... I washed my hair that was my concession. Ann) S-6-899.
- Has anybody got any gum? I have to be chewing gum all the time. Jes) Geez lucky for you I stopped at McDuff's confectionery. Len) Alright! Jes) S-6-901.
- Relax! Jim) I'm not relaxed. I don't know what I'm going to say. Jes) [She is referring to trying to improvise lines for her character in the Wheat Pool scene.] S-13-1068.

This "informal" behaviour amongst themselves included beginning to play very mild "pranks" on each other.

- Can we make her laugh? Jes) [Jessie is referring to the fact that one of the actors is having her picture taken. The suggestion is to "break her up". Jay immediately begins laughing hard, -- fake.] Hey guys be nice. Eil) S-6-902.
With a sense of increasing intimacy, most group members began to share a range of their feelings with each other. Eventually this range included their concerns about inexperience and change:

- You have to change your opinion a lot of times on a lot of things. Just ask me. [Jessie laughs.] I've changed my opinion so often through this whole bloody... Len) Oh, I know. Ann) [She interrupts Lenore who continues to complete the sentence.] thing. Len) S-6-1006.

Lenore continued to describe how she had been feeling about the project:

- I felt very, very insecure and lacked so much self-confidence for myself, but not only for myself but everybody else in the cast. I did not think we were capable of putting on something like this. I looked around and thought "Who has the experience? Which one of you can claim any experience in doing anything like this before?" Not one. Not a single one — a lot of guts but no experience.

Len) I was watching for that and I thought, "You know, this is really amazing. Now, here's a gang of rank amateurs [Jessie laughs] and they've got more hutzpah than ninety-five per cent of the professionals I have ever worked with and I've worked with some really fine theatre. And that gives me incredible confidence.

Cam) S-6-1008-12.

In this way they began more frequently to share some of their pleasures, their frustrations and even their fears with each other in small groups and informally during large group sessions.

e) Exchanging Ideas of Process

Distinctions between group members' discussions on their processes and their discussions on content and shape of the play became exceedingly difficult to separate. Admittedly, such a distinction is a heuristic device, a conceptual tool for data
analysis. Once more, given constraints on data analysis collection, and the amount nonetheless collected, a sampling has been selected for this segment.

- Next week, I want to nail down a script. So that you guys can — so I only have to come here once a week for the next three weeks and just oversee what you've got. Cause you guys are going to rehearse your own scenes by yourself. Each take turns with a scene and direct it. I'll come and string them together... There's a couple scenes missing... Cam) A-30-813-14.
- Well I mean, I don't want it to be a religious play, but I still think, I don't know... Len) Well we certainly haven't finished here. Bring ideas. Got some more ideas, bring them along... Cam) A-30-821.
- Should we bring another headline? Eil) Yes... I'm counting on people to bring stuff. Cam) A-30-824.
- How many scenes have we got lined up? Cam) S-5-867.
- Some changes? Lor) Oh God, yes. Cam) Cause I notice that Dr. Spiegel wasn't there then. Lor) Sure that kind of stuff, or delete altogether and make up a name. Lor) S-6-894.
- That could potentially be a major scene. I don't know. So let's work on that right now. Cam) S-5-866.
- I woke up this morning...Cam) Oh, no. Ann) [She appears to recognize the opening line of the story circle.] I ran out of gas. [This is an aside referring to how Cam started the first story circle.] Pink pills... Joy) [Another reference to content in the first story circle which also related to first improvisation group members did.] And my horse was lame. — So this has to be period. [Cam refers to creating a story as though they are living in 1915.] So I called a vet. [The laughter increases throughout these series of events.] Cam) S-5-846.
- People always get more serious when they have a piece of paper in front of them. Cam) [He is speaking quietly to Eileen about shift.] A-30-792.
- Two people. Other people that haven't been up yet. Cam) Come on Jessie, be into it. Jay?) A-30-809.
- I mean, eventually we'll get so that her interjections are the same ones everytime. Ann) Probably. Yes and they have to be in the right spots. So when you work it out tell me. Cam) A-30-803.
- To look at the people and remember what they said is easier. Len) S-6-908.

When Cam distributed the first script, group members responded with such comments as:

- [People laugh.] Nice touch. Jay) I'm still reading. Ann) Yes, you ought to read this one. Jay) Most of that stuff is yours I just added a little bit for transitions. Cam) All of a sudden
your name is Jay. I can't call you Jay. Oh how dramatic. Jes)
It is pretty good. It's better than, uh, uh...Jay) I like uh,...

These kinds of responses from group members continued through a second
version, but with later versions, another perspective emerged
concerning change. Even one of the "serious actors" in speaking with
a fellow participant quietly made this admission, "I got that down. I
hope they don't change it, I'll be screwed." (S-16-fieldnotes.)

The quotations selected in this segment may suggest a sense of
scattered activity. The scattered sense in this selection was
purposeful. The "eclectic" tone was intended to reflect a specific
quality about group members' discussion of process. Since their
discussions about process were so frequently responses or reactions to
their focal point, acting, and as their process related to acting
changed, so did their discussions. In other words the contents of
their discussions were not fluid, with content thematically flowing
from one of their conversations to another. Rather group members
discussions came in pieces attached to something else. 3

Group members "bits and pieces" discussions are best understood
within a description of process associated with their acting
interactions. Their breaking point actions and paradigmatic actions,
being also coiled about their acting interactions, these two sets of
descriptions have been combined.

Emerging Shape Of Group Members' Interactions, Acting

During this period between August thirtieth and October fourth,
processes emerged based on Cam's direction of group members
interactions beginning with the all-day workshop. However, a study of
the data indicates that during this series of meetings Cam's own sense
of certain aspects of their process changed.

First, for example ideas about whether there would be a script
and then a possible format of a script changed over several meetings.
Data evincing such changes were recorded within the previous Act-Play
"Anchored Anomie". Second, Cam also indicated in the first meetings
of this period that group members would each direct scenes themselves.
However, a limited timeframe and participants general inexperience
appears to have required Cam's presence on most occasions.

In contemplating other changes it is most important to recognize
two distinct focuses emerging in their theatre processes. First,
there was the process of working on "writing" or creating individual
scenes. Small groups came to focus on this work. Cam described his
role in these processes as making "sure that it's there and that it
works in scene form" (S-6-p.3.). However, Cam appears to have been
concerned not only with providing direction and process for creating
individual scenes. As well, he was most concerned with the overall
structure of the play.

- I also have to be aware of shaping the structure into the overall
presentation. Putting up, making sure there's a beginning, a
middle and end. Cam) S-6-p.3.

For instance, he determined which set of their improvisations would
form the outer framework of the play. He established the two act
structure and the organization of scenes in the scripts he produced
during this set of meetings.
Cam also wrote and directed the opening scene of the play. He directed improvisations for the end of the play. In this sense he contributed as both writer and director to creation of the larger framework of the play and to development of individual scenes.

A second focus in group members' interactions was also most important in terms of signifying change in process. Their activities which began with a main focus on creating the play shifted emphasis towards a main focus on performance or staging the play. All of these changes of focus emerged in meetings which followed the foundational all-day workshop.

Cam's process unfolded, initially taking group members unaware. In interviews they expressed a sense of surprise concerning process. 

- They didn't necessarily understand it all. [Cam is speaking of the exercise of bringing antique objects to the all-day workshop.] It was important for me to understand and for me to observe because I was sitting essentially outside of the group in many ways. If they understood it fine. If they didn't just fine... What I wanted them to experience was what they experienced. Cam) S-6-p.2.

- But I was surprised to see that that turned out to be the groundwork for the play cause that wasn't the original intent. Jim) You think it wasn't. Mad) In Cam's mind maybe it was. But I don't think in anyone else's mind it was. Jim) O-1-p.31.

- It progressed so nicely that it just sort of happened. Like when we were doing those two skits with those three objects... Who would have dreamt that those would have formed the whole basis for the play. If anybody had known that that was happening at the time we would have been so scared and upset and worried about what was going to happen and what we were doing that it would never have worked. But because it was just sort of step by step and it just evolved you didn't even know that that was what you were doing. Suddenly there it was. Joy) S-23-p.7.

In these subsequent meetings, guidelines for additional work were laid down gradually based on Cam's initial sense of direction as modified by participants' responses and time constraints.
- If I were to be here all the time... I would let you guys write everything. (Cam) Okay. Ann) Because you would have the time to go through that process absolutely. (Cam) S-6-941-42.
- A large number of my decisions are simply made on the technical aspects. What can we do technically with the talent that we have, to tell this story adequately and clearly. And uh, ... so a great many decisions are based on that. (Cam) S-16-p.5.

It is these developing guidelines, their emerging processes of change which the study attempts to represent through dividing group members' processes into three substages. Although there are no fine demarcations possible, group members did experience shifts over time:

a) "'Still' Improvising": Exploring and Decision-Making

Despite the all-day workshop being their main experience with improvisational work, during the first half dozen meetings group members improvised a few whole scenes including those associated with the Goetheim journal assignment. In addition, they also improvised beginnings and endings of scenes.

b) "The Bulk Of It Is There": Fleshing Out, Filling In And Editing Out

A script was handed out within a few meetings. Although some improvisational work continued to be done, it was done so in the context of the script as a reference point.

c) "Split And Polish": Near Completion Of Editing, Beginning To Polish

This third transition in group members' interactions was more difficult to pin down. No single interaction or objectivation marked emergence of this transition for group members. However, in the final three meetings, Cam's directions began to include focusing on nuances of content, nuances of acting. He also began to raise questions and indicate to the actors and "the technical crew" what would be required for lighting and sets in a particular scene.
Al, as "the lighting person", and both Jim and Cam spent time during meetings of August and the first part of September putting the lights and panels in good working order. As group members were working on the stage, they discovered that there were several difficulties with the condition of the stagelighting. Recognizing this, they set to work on replacing lights, realigning their focus and determining problems with wiring.

The three shared a joke which seemed to symbolize their experience with working on the lighting, "Move your actors to the lights" (Jim S-30-1163). Much of this repair work was conducted during and in between actors working on various scenes.

In the two Act-Plays prior to this, "Sustained Uncertainty", and "Anchored Anomie", much of the data came from group members. The data from Cam was limited. In this section, the ratio of the two shifted. This shift reflects an emerging shape change in group members' interactions.

While group members were improvising and acting, most of their speech and actions were devoted to that activity. Relying solely on data from these actions would constitute reconstructing variations on the script. While improvising and acting, group members asked some questions, but not many. They also responded with statements, but only occasionally.

In contrast, Cam corrected them, made suggestions, explored some of the actions himself. It is his comments which give a sense of emerging patterns of process during parts of this period. However, group members' actions and statements indicating their experience of
breaking points, a few other pieces of group discussion, and individuals' comments from interviews interspersed among acting interactions provided insight into group members' experience.

a) "Still" Improvising: Exploring, Decision-Making

During the three meetings which followed the all-day workshop, from August thirtieth to September sixth, group members' interactions continued to focus on improvisational work. As Cam's explicit role was to direct their improvisational processes the study begins with his description of the first steps. Description based on observations in the field and data analysis supplement Cam's overview. This composite description is interspersed with data from group members' interchanges. Taking up a chronological course, group members' reflections after their interactions have been provided at the end of the following segment.

Description Of Process For Scene Creations

Although the following description consists of a series of steps, it is important to note that most group members were uncertain of steps in their processes for several meetings. Without having experience with comparable processes, or without having an intentional framework beforehand, it was difficult for group members to articulate "steps in a process". Their statements suggest they did not initially experience their improvisational activities in those terms. One fundamental explanation for this is that each scene's development had slightly different occurrences, different people, different
requirements. No two scenes were developed at quite the same pace. These steps then are "generalizations" to elements which group members most commonly experienced through their processes.

1) "All Talked Out": Preparation For Beginning An Improvisation

This stage was suggested by the director. Cam described the first step or stage as becoming ready to do an improvisation:

- Knowing when it's ready, when the group is ready to do an improv... Like a lot of time I spend waiting for the right time to say, "Okay. Go do it." S-6-p.4.

When asked for details of how a group becomes ready, Cam described two steps in the process. He alluded first to his own condition of readiness and then to the group's through discussion:

- Well you talk about something enough, and usually I wait until a specific, a very specific idea occurs to me. And then I can gauge if others are, how can you say — involved somehow. Cam) S-6-p.3.
- Yeah, you talk and talk and talk and talk... This is pre-getting on stage. This is the pre-getting ready part where everything seems to be talked out. "And well why don't we do this and can we talk about this. Or should we do this?" And there's pauses and it's awkward. It's that, before they actually get on stage to do something. And then, suddenly jump and say, "Okay, you're at a meeting, you're this, this... Go". And then they go and it goes like crazy. Cam) S-6-p.3.

In terms of those "jumping up", most scenes involved dialogue between two people, sometimes three. For scenes which had not been established through the workshop, volunteers were required. There were no apparent patterns in the volunteering, although those younger, and those who generally spoke little in the group were also not among the first to volunteer. Each person eventually did have a series of roles in several scenes, some more than others.
Often, it appeared that those who got up to do the improvisation had participated in a shift from talking about the scene to beginning to take on a character or suggest lines. In other words, they were the people who began to express specific ideas of what the improvisation might sound like.

One example of a scene developed on this basis was the "Telephone Scene". Lenore began the process by speaking of her experiences and others joined in with ideas:

- You'd have to call around to discover where a call came from. [She is referring to an incident in which a woman called and then fainted.] I envisioned two people. Eil) [Based on data analysis I inferred from this she meant "in the scene"]. On boring afternoons, we'd dial two numbers and not say a word. Each one would answer. Len) "Hello!" Joy) "Hello?" How come you're phoning me? We'd just... Len) You're mean! Joy) [She laughs.] That has possibilities... Cam) A-30-804-05.

Joyce and Lenore then got up and began to improvise a scene.

As Cam described it, in some instances group members' improvisations went "like crazy", or rolled along with an inevitable sense about actors' interchanges as the scene, "Pink Pills For Pale People", had done. However, more often than not having begun, those participating would find themselves slowing down or stopping prior to any apparent conclusion in the content of the scene.

2) "Mid-Improvisation Gap": Improvisation Losing Impetus

Most improvisations reached a "block" which was exposed by a gap in the actors' exchanges. These were most recognizable when actors' pauses slipped into a silence or one of them spoke out of character and asked for help.
I need help... Ann) [This was an improvisation. Anna was popping in as a voice, as an offstage character to support the flow of the improv work.] A-30-806.

In other instances, actors began to repeat themselves. Cam referred to situations as ones in which "nothing was happening" or they were "going nowhere". After several improvisations were done, group members also began to recognize this as a gap or problem. The following is an excerpt from group members' first attempts at the "Wheat Pool Scene" which happened to have missed the first step of being "all talked out". In addition, the person who had done most of the research in the area, Joyce, was unavailable on the evening the improvisational work was begun.

- I know sweet piss all about wheat. Somebody else start it. Jes) [This is followed by a series of jokes from several group members. It is difficult to determine who they are. I refer to them as participants.] Where's the beef? Participant) We're out of butter. Participant) Get the green stuff out of Jay's fridge. Participant) There's nothing going to make this group talk nastily about anything. Because they're all basically supporting what's going on. So we have to make it, we have to introduce something or somebody or some situation. Cam) "That's right." Jes) [She interrupts him to agree.] That is going to make them go "Yuck" and start talking. Something has to happen here. Cam) S-5-867-71.

Fieldnotes from the occasion and the tapes indicate that after Cam's intervention, the group "roars" right on. They no longer experienced a problem with timing or getting stuck and they eventually reach a conclusion.

3) "Getting Unstuck": New Direction To The Improvisation

Various suggestions were made to assist stalled actors. As described in "Anchored Anomie" initially some of these suggestions
came from Cam and some from group members. However, by the end of this series of three meetings, group members made fewer and fewer suggestions.

During this time those group members continuing to assist from the audience appeared to have discerned to some extent Cam's technique of asking concrete questions. On occasion they asked concrete questions, themselves, or they had responses to concrete questions which the scene thus far had evoked for them:

- What did you come here for? Maybe you could have just popped out... Cam) While she was out? Jay) The way she was sitting looking distraught, made me think she was on the front steps and gramma came home from the walk. That's the first thought that came to my mind. Eil) Gramma's second home. Don't knock. All that's ... it's just a suggestion. A conscious image with which you can work somehow. I don't mean for you to actually get up and do it. Cam) A-24-684.
- You are about to get engaged. That's all you want to know. Joy) S-5-879.

Another apparent way of "unsticking" was to suggest using no words, but instead to explore through movement:

- Okay. Wait'll you get there. We're watching. You've got us. As soon as you start moving your movement is telling a story. You don't have to talk anymore. That's what acting is about. That's why it's three dimensional. Once you start moving, we're watching you because that's part of the story. Okay. Okay. That's what's not written down. Just do the moves without words. Do it till you feel comfortable. Cam) I like that I think... Jay) [He is responding as the actor to Cam's direction.] S-6-928-32.

Group members generally found themselves "stuck" several times during an improvisation and sometimes over several meetings. For example, many actors required several attempts at finding a "satisfactory" conclusion to a scene. Related to this, group members' experienced another step in their initial processes of working on scenes.
4) "Go And Work On That": Working On Improvisations Among Actors

In some instances, it would become apparent eventually that despite various suggestions, group members had reached a large block of some sort. Rather than keep others' work in abeyance, in a few instances, Cam would make another suggestion and then he would ask the actors involved to work on their own. However, he very rarely took that course of action. When he did so, at a later point he would seek out the actors to discover how they were proceeding on their own.

More frequently, an improvisation was gone through at least once to some apparent conclusion. Cam would then request that the actors begin a second time. During that process Cam would identify aspects which he believed needed work. Then the actors would be asked to work through these on their own.

- That's where you ended it. Cam) S-6-896.
- Let me just say, this is a great idea. Work on it. [Laughter from several group members.] I like the poem idea. Work on it as though... do some choreograph — choreography, the poem. Cam) [He is speaking to several women who are working on a poem which will become part of the play's opening.] A-30-776.

This process of improvising and then repeating interactions intermingled with more improvisational work became a creative "tread-mill" of sorts. One set of actors would be on the stage interacting while others would be off elsewhere in the school working on a scene. Those who had returned from working on a scene and awaited Cam's involvement sat in the audience and sometimes offered suggestions to those on the stage.
5) "Variations On A Team": Repetition Of Improvisations With New Actors

As this process continued, larger parts of the scenes were repeated. In some instances, however, scenes were repeated from the workshop, but with a new actor. For example, Jay was asked to take the place of Jessie in the scene "Pink Pills For Pale People" since men were more often salespeople during this historical period.

This precipitated a variation in their processes. It required adjustment for both those who had already worked on the scene and those entering into it.

- Do I know you?... What's my name? Jay) [He is being asked to step into a partially developed scene as a character. Jay is standing on the stage facing Anna as he says these words. Laughter follows Jay's questions.] ...Good blackout line. Cam) No punch! No punch! [I believe Eileen is "satirizing" Cam's frequent directions.] Eil) A-30-798.

Although those who had developed roles were also generally those who performed them in the final production, there were a few scenes in which people were "substituted". There were several instances of this particularly in the middle substage "The Bulk Of It Is There".

6) "Going On": Continuing To Work On Emerging Scenes

This was not so much a step as a commonly held assumption of continuance, a search throughout group members' improvisations and ongoing acting directed towards the sense of having a complete scene which could become part of the play. Criteria appeared to be based on a certain kind of response to the work being done. Responses included both those experienced by the engaged actors and those observing, Cam, and whoever comprised the audience.
- What hits your guts... What causes you to react. Well, I would think, what causes you to feel something from it... Getting bumps from it. Len) S-6-961.
- It was a great ending. Cam) S-6-896.

Generally, there were many group members in the audience during this series of meetings. Their periodic laughter, clapping and even shouting out responses provided affirmation of how "effective" actors' work was.

During this period there was one particularly strong cue for group members which affirmed that they were "actually working on scenes in a play". At the meeting of September fifth Cam provided each member with a copy of a script based on their mutual work.

7) The Script

Relying on taperecordings of group members' interactions on stage, Cam had created a first script. According to his statements, these were group members' own words, he had merely shaped the scenes.

- Most of that stuff is yours I just added a little bit for transitions. Cam) S-5-843.

Group members generally expressed delight with the work. At the time several observed at the time improvements Cam had made. Cam also indicated then that these "lines are not written in stone". At that point he encouraged group members to "change lines", "change emphasis" and suggested that they would "change scenery".

With this first script came several transitions. In an informal interview Cam had predicted a transition in group members' actions. Transition in their actions became apparent when they began to act, relying on the script.
- You know all the lines, you don't have to rely on this.
  Cam) S-6-927.
- Not too bad for reading. But there's some difference in the level
  of spontaneity. Cam) S-6-924.

In contrast with their improvisational work, group members
suddenly ceased responding directly to each other. Instead, they read
the script as Cam's statements indicate. Thus, for many group members
the script came to mediate their actions.

- And I was, uh, what I was trying to do was see her lines and see
  my lines next so then I could make some eye contact before I had
  to say my line. So that's the restriction of the script.
  Ann) S-6-1016.

Cam eventually described his impression of their transition to some of
the group members. He indicated that part of his future strategy
would be to breathe life back into their interactions on stage.

- Now the work is going to be in getting life back into it. Cam)
  That's right exactly. Len) S-6-1014.

While this sense of script as "the word" was the main response
from group members, it is important to note that not all group members
viewed the script in such a way. This is best illustrated by an
excerpt from the same small group discussion:

- Except that the words of the script I knew were the words that I
  wanted. Ann) S-6-1017.
- Like you said, too [she is referring to Cam], "Those words aren't
  Cam) If you're not comfortable with it change it. And even if
  you don't get the words exactly right as long as everything's
  said... Len) Yeah. Well all your stuff is all ad lib. Cam) Yeah.
  Len) Cause it was written with you in mind. Cam) S-6-1018-20.

This conversation suggested several important ideas. First,
emerging for participants were two different senses of script. These
differences emerged even when two individuals had been conferring
considerably throughout their process thus far as Lenore and Anna had
been doing. Second, Cam hinted that he was taking into account differences in group members' response to the script when he developed it.

In a small group discussion Cam indicated that when drafting the script he considered specific individuals playing in a particular scene.

- I know that you're not going to -- you're not going to go... Cam) [I assumed from his accompanying gesture that Cam means freeze up or get stuck for words.] Yeah. Len) And Joyce will respond. Cam) Yeah. Len) S-6-1021.

Although he did not express it to group members directly, he stated in an interview that when developing the script he also contemplated a scene's relative place in the play, and qualities he associated with a scene. For example, Anna's scenes with Allie were to become the backbone of the play. Because of the relative significance of their scenes their words were most important. Many more of their words and lines became cues for others' scenes. Precision concerning these "cue lines" at least was required. The latter distinction leads to another indication of transition for group members.

A second most important transition emerged with the coming of scripts. The script brought additional assumptions of structure for group members. With the confirmation of scenes and actors playing certain roles, meetings began to be conceptualized more and more in terms of rehearsals. Among other things, this required organizing a schedule so that those working together in the same scenes could attend those particular sessions. As meetings increased in number, it became important to make certain that the right combination of people
would attend at any one time.

- Okay, the script is still being developed. And there's still a lot more in the tape recorder that has to be sort of transcribed. But there's definitely lots of material there for the basis of the script. And I think we can start and we should actually start going through the scenes right. Now and for the time being can we do the stuff that involves you and you because you're not going to be here tomorrow? Who else isn't? Cam) S-6-919-22.

This subtly signaled a transition in theatre paradigm. It was a major step in shifting the concept of meeting from large group process and decision-making to rehearsing in small groups. That subtle transition was to have tremendous impact particularly in later meetings of this stage.

The scripts also brought an additional hint of imminent transition in process. Group members' interactions were concerned entirely at first with creation of the play. Arrival of the scripts suggested that, if not the entire play, parts were "here". This sense prompted another shift in direction.

8) The Beginnings Of Technical Work: Shifting to Performance

The majority of group members' work during this period was dedicated to construction of scenes. However, Cam also very gradually began to attend to individuals' acting in terms of technical aspects of their performance.

- Don't upsetage yourself. Cam) Where am I going to, how am I going to talk then? Jes) Like that. Cam) S-6-925.
- The trick to making pauses work is to throw focus on, on something. Don't keep it in yourself. If you keep a pause in yourself it just dies. If you look at something. Cam) S-6-926.

This was to eventually become their focus in the meetings prior to and including the dress rehearsals and public performances.
Finally, with the emergence of the scripts another element of Cam's role emerged, one previously outlined.

9) Creation Of The Play's Framework: Cam's Process

In the introduction the study referred to two creative processes, one the collaborative work on individual scenes and a second, creation of the larger framework or structure of the play. Cam facilitated and directed group members in the first process. Concerning the second, this conceptual work largely fell to him. This became most apparent with issuance of the script.

First, because he had compiled all of their work, Cam was more conversant with what existed. He, therefore, also had a sense of what was "missing". During this stage, in terms of the larger framework, he expressed several needs. He spoke of a need for a "binder", a theme and framework which would run through and bind the individual scenes together. Eileen and he also discussed the need for a title. She was apparently more concerned at this point than he with determining one. There was a third need to which he referred several times: "I think we're missing a beginning." (S-6-p.3.)

As more of Cam's role emerged with appearance of the script, and as they began to experience repetition in their acting activities, group members began to speak of a sense of process. However, discussions concerning their experiences did not occur within the larger group setting. Rather their discussions took place in socializing at the bar and in the interviews I had with them during this period. Based on extrapolation of data analysis, some discussion
of this topic among group members would have occurred also in small
group activity such as during telephone conversations among friends
and as part of their discussion when two or three actors came together
to work on scenes.

10) Reflections On Process

As indicated previously, many group members were not explicitly
aware of Cam's intended process or even their responses and changes to
process as emerging at the time. There were no attempts at a formal
meeting to reflect on this process jointly.

Some of their reflections on process occurred through
interactions with Cam "after the fact". For example, it was not until
after the first script was distributed that a few group members
discussed with Cam "his process" for the all-day workshop. Even after
he elaborated, it was not clear that those group members present
understood what he intended.

The following is an excerpt from Cam's discussion with Anna and
Lenore while socializing after the September sixth meeting. Others
were listening in part to this conversation, but it was difficult to
determine how much they heard since, except for Jessie's rare
interjection, they did not contribute verbally to the conversation.
As well, seating arrangements were awkward and there was considerable
noise.

This conversation was significant as one of the few occasions
during the remainder of the project wherein several group members and
Cam reflected together on what process had occurred. The conversation has been provided as a foundation for other data. Data supplementing this is primarily derived from interviews, wherein group members were requested to reflect as individuals on their experience of past meetings. In addition, data from fieldnotes have provided instances of group members' asides to each other and small group discussions during meetings.

Returning to the conversation of September sixth, in their discussion they considered their process mainly in terms of the all-day workshop. Within his description of their process, Cam specifically referred to the exercise during the all-day workshop wherein they had brought and described historical objects.

(This was not included in "the steps" of this stage since that activity occurred prior to these meetings.)

- I try to make you intellectualize which... Intellectualize first, before you bother experiencing so I can, we could discuss the purse... All those physical objects, you know. Very intellectual experience. It was boring. But for me that was very vital because it was a concretization of experiences that I wanted, that I knew would be valuable later on. And they would, because we shared them. We shared them, all those physical things with everybody. And it was boring and "Why are we doing this?" Nobody said that, but I could see it from time to time. And uh, we had to go through that so when it came time to call on something, it was there. That it was shared and we knew what we were talking about. And just the experience, all of the things that were said were shared too. You see, it wasn't just a matter of when you had her purse, what you said about it may have — Nobody remembers what you said. But it may have somehow twigged something somewhere. Cam) S-6-967-74.

Lenore remained silent during and after his description, nodding part of the time. Anna responded with:
- And I was picking up things that I thought were old or were supposed to be something, cause I didn't realize the exercise, that it had to be something that meant something. Ann) S-6-980.

Cam continued to embellish for a minute or two. Then Lenore changed the topic of conversation, focusing on new material improvised.

During the first set of interviews a few individuals' expressed some links with what Cam had described in the small group discussion.

- That Saturday that we all brought our little trinkets and sort of started putting stuff together. We left the room for a while and thought about something to do and then came back in and did it. But in a way we sort of made it up as we went along. But we did give it some thought beforehand. Jim) O-1-p.31.

But for the most part while group members made some connection between the discussion of historical objects and the process of creating the play, they did not explicitly express what those links might be in terms of group work.

The following is an excerpt from interviews with two different group members whose description of their experiences of process drew nearest to making such a link.

- It amazed me how we started with nothing and built a play out of it. Like you take a skunk fur — and we got two scenes out of that skunk fur... How you take what you know it was like and you take the skunk fur and try and relate something to it. Al) O-4-p.11.

- We made them in the past. I suppose because the artifacts we had were old too had something to do with it. Cam said, "Don't worry about making it old or historical or anything. Just take your little trinkets and go make up a play. And lo and behold they were heritage just because we happened to be thinking along those lines. We all made them old. Jim) O-p.31.

Data from interviews then, suggested that group members had not fully grasped Cam's intention — or they could not explicitly express such links in their experience.
Cam included in his description of September sixth a reason for refraining from advising the group of his intention for the exercises during the workshop itself:

- I couldn't tell you before cause then you'd intellectualize... Cam) Ah! Yeah! Ann) And would have distanced it. To say now what I did makes sense. Cam) Yeah). Ann) S-6-977-78.

In addition to making limited links with some exercises in the workshop, group members did not tend to include in their descriptions of process as they experienced "it" an "all talked out" step. One person did refer to talking as a step, but this seems to have meant for her the act of talking as characters, in other words, dialogue:

- And then we talked about some of it and I guess it was taped. And they started to pick out — began writing a script from it. I didn't even know they were doing that. Lor) 0-4-16.

In describing process as they experienced "it", most group members appeared to focus on what happened on the stage when they were acting.

- I was stuck when she [Loretta is referring to Joyce during their improvisation together] asked me about an embarrassing incident. Lor) [In character, as a younger nurse Joyce turns and asks her, "What's the most embarrassing thing that has happened to you.] 0-4-p.17.

- First of all the character, and then second of all usually you're thinking of something to say. [laughs] ...sometimes I have things to say, but they don't come out right. I can't think of them fast enough. Jay) S-13-p.25.

- I mean we were trying to work things out on stage. But if you have to stop and think, "Will this work or not?", then it's not spontaneous. So, the improv is good for that. Ann) S-6-939-40.

- What I did was, I wondered what kind of a situation would you be in where you might show somebody the board and yet be friendly enough with them and not feel constrained — tell jokes... Len) S-6-936.

- No just spontaneous. Spontaneous. See in improvisation you don't have a goal. If you have a goal I think it would be easier. So you just improv until you have a whole tape and then he [Cam] cuts out the garbage and then he makes a scene. Jay) S-13-p.25.
Most importantly, interspersed with data concerning on their internal experience of improvisational process, group members frequently then linked Cam with the process. The previous quotation refers to Cam's role in editing. Others referred to this as his role in terms of future expectations:

- I can't wait to see how you script that. Len) [She is speaking to Cam about the improvisation of the Wheat Pool scene.] Yeah, I can't either... Cam) A bunch of cattiness Len) [She smiles and shakes her head.] S-6-989-90.

As indicated previously, only a few large group discussions aimed at reflecting on process occurred hereafter in the project. However, during larger group meetings small group discussions concerning process arose "on the sidelines". In particular, when new participants appeared, at least one or two group members became whispering interpreters, making sense of the activities for newcomers. For example, when Jo and Arthur appeared I observed one participant quietly explaining, "We improvise it and then it's taped."

(S-10-Fieldnotes.)

Given shifting activities and the need to participate, these precious insights were generally "asides", tucked into spaces between group members' changing activities. Being interstitial, these comments were necessarily terse. For example, in the instance described no additional explanation was given concerning improvisations or what was expected to happen thereafter. 4

Once more, all these fields of data indicate that group members' experience of process contained a common sense of surprise, of change,
and a limited description of Cam's role. For newcomers a sense of mystery or profundity might well be evoked through group members' description of process.

Throughout all of the meetings of this period, and from all of the data collected from interviews, the conversation between Cam and primarily Anna (although others such as Lenore and Jessie were present) provides the richest detail in merging descriptions of their experiences with "the" process:

- You were playing around, you [Cam is referring to Anna] and Allie, from my perspective, playing around with the raw material, with the essence of that scene. And you had to sift your way through it in order to feel all the ramifications. And it felt awkward and it felt dumb. Felt silly. But you were there! And you were playing around with it. And I encouraged you, "Go ahead! Go for it!" ... and you did. And so when I listened to it again, I picked out your words, six words. — And they were said. And it was just, it lived! I cut out all the other stuff. Cam) That's the dynamics of this particular process, having us as untrained people and then having somebody who can listen to it and ferret it through, finding your way through to some stuff that was an essence of it. Ann) S-6-953-56.

- But you see I don't think that, that we the people who are going through this process on stage are intellectualizing much. Ann) No, you don't have the chance to. Your doing it. Cam) Yeah right. Ann) I'm the one who has the opportunity to be able to do it. Cam) And yet if your views of what was happening with our things were totally negative or opposite to ours, I don't... we couldn't accept it. So you are obviously ferreting out important things... Ann) S-6-963-65.

It is important to recognize the symbiotic nature of the roles which were being described. Anna's statement was to become foreshadowing for a breaking point which some group members would experience in future interactions. (This breaking point is described as being a part of group members' experience of the next subprocess.)

Cam continued with a description of his role, apparently in agreement with Anna's point:
- And also, its an agreeable manipulation. The whole thing is that. It's introverted to the extent where we've all agreed to go into the situation and uh, to be manipulated in certain kinds of ways. ... Well the whole thing goes back to my sort of basic premise of "In order to realize an experience, you have to be there... And so I try to make you be there. Cam) S-6-966-67.

Prior to leaving this segment, it is important to consider Cam's perspective on group members' sense of process. Of the exercise in the workshop he stated in an interview:

- They didn't necessarily understand at all. That is irrelevant. It was important for me to understand and for me to observe because I was sitting essentially outside of the group in many ways. If they understood fine. If they didn't just fine... What I wanted them to experience was what they experienced. In order to make their relationship with their physical reality, i.e. going back to the thing we talked about earlier, as actors being part of a physical reality, uh, that brings the truth into the situation. It brings, the — what you're trying to present, a reality. I can't use another word. Cam) S-6-p.2.

His concern then, was not with group members understanding the process but rather having a certain experience which would influence their improvising:

- They come from them, themselves. And they were using them as part of themselves... So we can't go wrong from my perspective. If you are using yourself you can't go wrong. If you are trying to build reality into a scene, if it's based on reality that reality is going to be there. Cam) S-6-p.1.

In fact, Cam indicated at another point that he had refrained from describing his intended process to group members on the basis that they might intellectualize about the process rather than entering into an experience.

In light of these statements it is most interesting to note that when asked in the interview about how group members were doing, Cam replied:
- The last five improvvs have been just really exceptional in terms of the... No it's exceptional period. By any, any standards. Improvising is something quite, quite different from other kinds of theatre skills. And, uh, amateurs, professionals, there's really no distinction. Any cast couldn't do any better than these guys are doing. Cam) S-6-p.1.

Although Cam did not make these statements to group members formally in a large group, or at any other time in my presence, group members themselves apparently experienced some sense of success.

They did continue to express ambiguity with respect to content of the play and process, on occasion:

- How often do you have to do this so you more or less know what you are doing? Ann) S-6-(Fieldnotes).

Nonetheless, ambiguity group members experienced appears to have been tempered with a sense of concrete progress through their interactions.

Most importantly, there are signs that during this period at least a few group members began to contemplate the possibility of ambiguity being a necessary part of such a process. Data analysis indicates that at least the "serious actors" began to relate ambiguity with exploring and to link exploring with a significant part of their acting processes.

In the September sixth conversation, Cam and Anna suggested that a sense of stumbling around in improvisation was necessary for arriving at "the essence of an experience — of being there". In the interviews a few group members expressed a similar perspective on process:

- Yeah, we had to go through all that thing to have it be, "'This means so much to you. 'But you mean more'..." [She is describing a subtext which emerged through her most recent lengthy improvisation with Allie.] You have to work through something in order to find it. Cam) S-6-951.
We started with four people. What — we had Eileen, Joyce, and they got their characters and they couldn't get into them. And the scene wasn't right and it started out as four being trapped in a train station during a snow storm... And we were supposed to reminisce and it turned into just me and Jessie in something completely different... But you know, when you get there, you look back and say, "Gee that's a weird process". But you never would have got there without the other. Jay) S-13-p.25.

Some group members began then to share this aspect of Cam's paradigm concerning the necessity to tolerate some ambiguity.

Based on data analysis and data disclosed herein, it is apparent that group members did tolerate considerable ambiguity about process during this period. They had a number of meetings without expressing intense senses of breaking points as a group. Prior to the last meeting of this part of the process, however, group members did experience a breaking point.

Emerging Shape Of Group Members Interactions, Breaking Point Actions

During the series of meetings from the end of August through the remainder of the project, in the press to act, to create the play group members continued to experience breaking points. Yet, in contrast to the ongoing dissonance which had plagued them in their first meetings their breaking points as expressed in the larger group were relatively few in number.

During the entire period from August thirtieth to October fourth, there were two breaking points which group members seemed to experience most intensely. Group members experienced one during the four meetings included in this "subprocess", group members experienced the second during the next stage of editing.

757
a) Breaking Point Clarity

- I don't think Lyle ever could really understand the concept of what we were trying to do. Um. And that's not a fault. At that time you know it was frustrating for everybody to have Lyle around. And I think it was the right -- I still feel we did the right thing to ask him not to be in that project. Maybe I could have handled it a little better. ... I think he was, you know, "Give me a script, and now I'll act. I just want to act". Eil)

At the meeting on September fifth Cam distributed the first script to group members. During that meeting participants seemed quite elated. Their evening concluded with laughter over group attempts to create a title for the play. It was with great contrast then, that the next meeting began with Cam's announcement that Lyle, one of the members, had been asked to leave the project.

b) Indications Of Discomfort

There is some difficulty in reporting details of group members' interactions connected to this breaking point for many of their related actions did not occur at formal meetings. I was privy to the informal small-group discussion at which Eileen made her decision to ask Lyle to leave the project. This discussion was not taped. An announcement was made at a formal meeting which was recorded. I was present also at a second informal discussion following the formal meeting. However, those present made brief allusions only to the situation. Several group members did refer to the incident in later interviews. Interviews with group members were barely begun at this point. Thus my contact with Lyle was limited to three meetings and a small part of the workshop which he had attended.
An additional difficulty in providing details of group members' interactions concerning this breaking point is the sensitive nature of this incident. For ethical reasons of confidentiality, data samples related to this series of group members' interactions have been limited in the body of this work.

Based on data collected, it is apparent that on September fifth and sixth Eileen had been contacted by at least four other group members expressing frustration with Lyle. Eileen then contacted Lyle for the purposes of asking him to leave the project. Data analysis, derived from the sources of data outlined, indicated that through their experience of breaking point several group members had come to discover some common assumptions about behaviour internal to the group which they found disturbing.

Data analysis suggests that some participants' emerging concerns with respect to interactions internal to the group included: a) some form of commitment to their theatre processes, for example, willingness to work was expressed in terms of willingness to do research, improvisational work and to learn lines; and b) a form of general behaviour when creating collectively — being respectful of others engaged in the process.

Those who expressed concerns suggested that they did so on the basis of Lyle's commitment to the project and their ability to work with him. I had observed on occasion that some group members responded adversely to his comments and contributions. In particular,
some experienced irritation when he engaged in making jokes to one
side at a volume sufficient to disturb others during large group
discussion.

However, prior to group members' breaking point it was my
impression from field observations that if there were tensions related
to Lyle they were relatively low key and on a plane with other
"tolerated" concerns and ambiguities. For example, some participants
joked with Lyle himself, about "killing him off" early in the play as
"the son who went to war".

Data suggests, however, that one incident occurring at the
evening meeting of September fifth set off a flurry of complaints. At
the end of the evening group members held a "brainstorming session" to
produce a title for the play. The session was marked by boisterous
shouting, and much laughing. During this session, several
participants interpreted Lyle's actions as mimicking, making fun of
one of the other group members. (I did not observe this activity.)
Based on this interpretation of his activities, at least four group
members were so upset that they spoke with Eileen about being upset.
It was at that point that Eileen, as producer, determined to do
something. Then, during the day of September sixth she spoke with
Lyle and asked him to leave the project.

Prior to doing so she had consulted several, but not all group
members and she spoke with Cam. Her decision and her actions were
then described formally to all group members at the meeting that
night. As Eileen's course of action had occurred outside of the
meeting, Cam assumed a role of "Senecan reporter".
Okay, we had a really interesting event today. One of our almost group members, was asked to not... to no longer participate. And uh... That's right. It turned out that several people were concerned about his attitude here. And it was disrupting, generally disrupting the group. And uh, so the producer made the decision to ask him to leave. And it was a really difficult thing to do. Because uh, how do you tell somebody that a whole bunch of people didn't want him around, because he was causing an undefinable kind of trouble. And, uh, [pause] we did the best we could. Do you have anything to say Eileen? S-6-911-14.

At this point there was a long pause. When I quickly scanned the circle most people were looking off to some distant point or down at the floor. I observed several group members make eye contact swiftly with another person in the circle, then avert their eyes. Cam broke the silence.

- Too many people have made too much of a commitment to the activity here. Uh, but there was just a tension. I could feel it when he walked in the room. It was like a little screw got batten down a little bit. Everybody got a little bit tighter. And there wasn't quite the looseness that happens... He was here not enough. Or he was absent enough that the difference was quite observable. And even though you may not have noticed it yourselves, but it was there. [Eileen speaks so quietly the taperecorder did not pick it up. Jessie then speaks in an equally muffled voice. There is a long silence. This part of the session ends with Cam speaking once more after a long silence.] Any other feelings? [Cam's question is met again with silence. Some people continue to look down at the ground or off into the distance. Cam continues.] Where's Jim? Cam) S-6-915-19.

Group Members' Response

Group members did not directly address the issue again formally during this meeting. They proceeded to improvise and act out various parts of the script. However, manifestations of their exuberance died with the inception of this discussion. Field observation and interview data indicated that many participants had not been aware of Eileen's actions before Cam's quiet announcement. Several group
members expressed a sense of dissonance from the experience. One member expressed her experience most explicitly:

- I was kind of surprised when they asked Lyle to leave. ... Well I felt it was quite abrupt. Participant) O-4-p.6.
- I don't know what went on to tell you the truth. I just heard he was mimicking different ones or something and this and that. But there was so much fooling around going on anyway. I didn't know if he was that much worse than the next person or not. Nobody really said. Participant) O-4-p.7.

Significantly, although most participants expressed experiencing a breaking point during this time, all were not experiencing a common breaking point. Data suggests at least two different cues for group members' experience of jarred meanings. First, whatever the nature of Lyle's actions, some experienced enough concern to take action. Based on data analysis, these were breaking point actions for some.

As producer, Eileen, apparently judged this to be a breaking point of sufficient proportion that she felt compelled to respond. Although she did not expressly articulate this, from interview statements of others and indirect references, it is my impression that she was most concerned with conflict among group members jeopardizing new found direction with the improvisations and the script. Her action was consistent with her earlier pledge to remove "administrative" problems from meeting agendas so that the actors could get on with acting.

On the other hand, many group members apparently experienced the announcement of her actions as a breaking point, however quietly they expressed it. Several concerns were raised through small group discussions. The previous quotation indicated that there was talk outside of the formal meetings, "I just heard he was..." Certainly
participants speculated about what others were feeling and what might happen next. Some thought about alternative routes which might have been taken.

- I think it left a lot of people were wondering, "Am I next, or what?" Participant) 0-4-p.7.
- They didn't say, "Lyle, look this is what we see, this is what we feel, we're giving you another chance...Honestly, because a person deserves a second chance to prove that they can do it. Participant) S-16-p.14.

In interviews several who raised the subject indicated that they would have preferred the route of discussion.

Cam indicated in an interview that he regarded this as a decision for the group. He interpreted the situation as follows:

- It's okay, you can make excuses for somebody who is pulling their weight and is disruptive. But if they're not pulling their weight and they're disruptive, there's no room for that... Cam) S-6-p.4.
- But, if you don't know, if you're new to the group and you don't know the etiquette, you can't do it, or be sensitive to it. You don't do it. And Lyle is just insensitive to group feeling. S-6-p.3.

There was a second, informal small group discussion about the situation immediately after the meeting. Group members made some fleeting reference to the incident when socializing. Strikingly, they spoke of concerns both "internal" to the group and "external" to the group.

With respect to internal considerations those speaking were generally supportive of Eileen's actions. Those speaking were among those she had consulted before taking action. At this point, these group members alluded vaguely to frustrations with working with Lyle as an actor. In attempting to come to terms with the experience Cam asked whether Lyle had participated in the workshop exercises wherein
group members shared their objects and described the objects' personal importance. He had spoken of the exercise as significant in terms of bringing people together as a group. It was determined that Lyle had missed the exercise, coming later.

One brief reference was also made at this time to "external" considerations. Since Lyle was one of the participants who came from the community, they might experience some future trouble from the community. The topic shifted swiftly back to their anticipation and speculation about the script to be developed from recent improvisational work.

A meeting was scheduled for September seventh, the day after the incident. While group members seemed to be somewhat quieter, their interactions were parallel to those of previous meetings. They continued to work with the script. The work very much relied on the script as a reference point. Improvisational work done by group members hereafter was primarily for the purposes of fleshing in and filling in the gaps of "that which existed".

b) "The Bulk Of It Is There": Fleshing Out, Filling In And Editing Out

- We'll leave that for now. Because that was, its so close now. You definitely got... the bulk of it is there. Cam) S-25-1128.

The previous segment provided a generalization of group members' processes in creating scenes. That segment outlined apparent steps in group members "goal directed improvisations". Although group members' interactions suggest that each scene emerged out of a similar series of exchanges, yet, with each scene there were also variations
in group members' activities. In other words, the process was not precise in terms of "steps" or the amount of time required to create what would be accepted eventually as a scene for the play.

The title of this segment reflects the study's continued endeavor to describe group members' main focus in their activities during this series of meetings. More specifically, this title refers to their common desire for conclusion with respect to writing or creating a scene, combined with a future sense of "polishing" work to be done. Editing in terms of polishing work tended to mark a shift in group members' interactions towards a strong focus on performance aspects of acting rather than creation of the play. (Polishing aspects in group members' acting interchanges will be explored in additional detail in the segment which follows.)

During these meetings of mid September, under Cam's direction group members found themselves focusing on fleshing out and filling in scenes. Roughly speaking, most of their improvised scenes went through a fleshing in process through group members' interactions during seven meetings, from September seventh until approximately September twenty-seventh. However, there were scenes wherein they were engaged in this process prior to this time and ones which required this work after this period.

During this series of meetings, while group members' focus lay mainly with their acting activities, several noteworthy changes occurred. In terms of change concerning the size of group, several
people joined the project during the seven meetings. Although Cam could not attend, on September ninth group members met to continue work on scenes developed.

At that time Eileen introduced two new people to the project. Jo had been initially involved with the project and had gone away on holidays. She returned to the project as stage manager. Arthur had been invited to participate as well, although it was not entirely clear in what capacity. He had hoped to act in the play, but eventually joined the sound and lighting crew. At the next meeting, on September thirteenth another person joined the project, Bill who was to participate as an actor in several scenes.

Fieldnotes suggest an interesting contrast between this "influx" of people and the influx associated with the all-day workshop. In the earlier incident, it seemed that those joining at that time were a part of what brought a sense of group to the project. All of those associated with the project underwent a process of forming a group at that time. In contrast, at this point, these three people experienced entering or being absorbed by "something" extant. In this sense their coming served to affirm a sense of group in terms of internal and external qualities.

In addition to changes with respect to the size of group, other changes emerged gradually in their activities. This was a period during which group members' actions changed considerably, yet subtly so, shifting from an emphasis on creating the play toward an emphasis on performing "it". This transition was extremely subtle insofar as explorative acting was required for two distinct activities. They
were writing through acting exploration. Their acting exploration was also necessary for purposes of determining how to present what had been created.

What was most striking about this process of shifting from a focus on creating the play to performing "it" was a parallel shift in group members' experience of emerging structure. As they moved toward concern with performance, the meetings became more and more "rehearsal-like". For example, on September thirteenth Cam announced that there would be no new improvisations, that they would work with what they had. In fact, no entirely new scenes had been improvised for at least one meeting before that.

With the coming of a script and "a stage manager" on September sixteenth, a rehearsal schedule was drafted. Cam had requested the schedule and had asked for a "Call Board" so that notices of schedules could be posted and thereby made available to cast and crew. These transitions were all reinforced with Eileen's announcement at the September sixteenth meeting. She stated then that only cast members were to sit in a circle on the stage at the beginning of the meeting.

This request concerning the circle marked a most important change. Since the all-day workshop, most meetings had begun with group members coming together to sit in a circle for announcements and discussion. At the September ninth meeting, even in Cam's absence, group members had adopted this as a starting point in addition to the circle story exercise. As indicated in the next segment concerning
group members' breaking point actions, one member even expressed uncertainty as to what to do after that point. "We did it. How dumb. We don't know what to do after this." (S-9-1050.)

After this transition at the September sixteenth meeting, group members did not generally begin meetings with circles. They began with working on "the first scene" on the schedule. (See the Appendices, Section One for samples of rehearsal schedules.) Over the next meetings, the process of working on one scene and then another became more and more formal, particularly as the larger framework was created in the second and third versions of the script.

There were several implications arising from a shift toward rehearsal-like structure. Eileen's announcement concerning the circle being limited to cast members, signalled a general change in treatment of the stage space. Fieldnotes of the period suggest more formality about when and for whom it was appropriate to be on stage. For example, when improvisations were being taped for purposes of creating a script from them, my attendance to the equipment during an improvisation was frequent and "normal". However, as performance became the focus, although the tape might still be used for script revision purposes, it became more "intrusive" to step into that space when group members were acting.

To understand this shift it is important to recognize several shifts which created a change in ambience. First as previously described, the rehearsal schedule brought with it a focus on small group work. Generally, the group as a whole was no longer present for an entire meeting. In addition, there was less of a sense of many
small groups working in various locales. In other words there were fewer focal points, and less hubbub generally other than through some group members' antics performed during breaks.

In earlier stages the work of exploration had been joint, with Cam facilitating their process of exploration based on his professional expertise. As they moved toward performance considerations, Cam began to direct on a line by line basis. There was less discussion even between the actors and himself. At this point often there were no other group members sitting and watching as an audience. If other group members were in attendance, there were few in number and they were frequently occupied with small group discussion about costumes or other "background" work.

Most importantly, with a shift toward performance, I had the impression that the entire stage had become the focal point, the big picture. Previously, the focus had been placed more immediately on exchange between the actors. In improvisational acting, where they were actually physically standing, and a small space around them, constituted the stage or the space with which they were working. During "rehearsals", however, Cam was looking to "the big picture", their actions within the entire space. Whatever the purpose, including changing the tape or moving the equipment for proximity sake, stepping into the stage that had become a big picture was to jar that picture.

Consistent with the stage as the big picture, there were more and more technical implications. These surfaced as singularly significant
in the third subprocess and in dress rehearsals. Nonetheless, lighting of various parts of the stage, and some props began to appear in the third week of Septembers.

Distinctions between their processes focused on creation of the play and focus on presentation of the play may be better understood through general description of their emerging processes during this period. Although there are some parallels between steps outlined in "Still Improvising" and those which group members' interactions of this period suggest, there were also considerable changes with their eventual shift towards performing.

Description Of Process For Fleshing In And Filling Out Scenes, Acting

The study has distinguished between the first three (August thirtieth to September seventh) and this mid series of meetings (September seventh to the twenty-fifth) of this stage. The primary distinction considered was a stronger emphasis on improvisational work in Cam's and group members' activities during the first three meetings. Their work was directed toward creating a core set of scenes, almost like a rough draft with pieces still in outline form.

With this series of meetings the larger framework was virtually completed, with the exception of a conclusion for the play. In other words, during these later meetings they established how many Acts there were to be, how many scenes and the approximate length of the production. The framework for most scenes were also determined. In addition, their interactions suggested a growing concern with performance toward the end of this series of meetings.
Ten generalized steps were provided in the previous segment to describe processes in which Cam and group members engaged to create additional scenes after the all-day workshop. Many of these activities became compressed or sped up given group members' growing familiarity with process. Some steps such as "The Beginnings Of Technical Work" received a slight increase in attention as performance gradually became a more important focus. In addition, some steps were altogether different as they shifted to filling in parts of scenes during these latter meetings.

An example of this has been briefly described previously. The seventh step referred to as "the Script" changed between the last set of meetings and these. Rather than shifting from improvisational work to having a script as they had done in the three meetings at the beginning of September, during this period they changed from developing a script to a process of revising "the" script. As well, group members' "Reflection Of Process" (the tenth step as described), did not reoccur during these mid September meetings. This may have been one many changes eventually prompting group members' breaking point actions during this period.

However, as described, many of their interactions during this time did include steps in which they had engaged during the first three meetings, and which became compressed through their interactions in these meetings. This passage proffers an overview of this compressed aspect of their processes. Parallels with process of the
first three meetings in this period begin with group members' difficulties in proceeding with attempts to add lines and change lines.

Generally, in this stage Cam had them do a scene at least three times in a row, working on various aspects of the scene. At this point in their processes he had them reinforce what they had done by repeating their actions on their own. As well, he asked some actors to work on parts of the scene on their own. These interactions closely resembled "steps" two, three, and four described in the first three meetings as "Mid-Improvisation Gap", "Getting Unstuck", and "Go and Work On That".

There was, as well, an incident during this time resembling "Variations On A Team" (referred to as step five). On the evening that Bill attended for the first time, Cam announced that Bill would replace Jay in the Train Station Scene. (Since this particular incident prompted a "quiet breaking point", a more detailed description will be provided in the segment which follows. This was not to be the only incident of such substitution and as in the previous meetings, it required some adjustment for those leaving the role, those remaining in the roles and those taking on the role.

- You have to adapt the scene for you. (Cam S-18-1095).
- Yeah for you it works. For Jay it didn't work. You're quite right. Cam) S-13-1069.
- She couldn't react to him the same as she reacted to Jay. When she did, it didn't work and she couldn't figure out why. So by asking her to be aggressive, she had to react differently. Cam) S-16-1402. (Interview).

One of the assumptions described in the previous segment as a quasi-step, "Going On": Continuing To Work On Emerging Scenes".
emerged from group members' interactions in those first meetings. During these meetings, for the most part group members continued to operate on the assumption that through their acting, they were developing a scene which would become part of the "final" play.

However, it was also during this time that they cancelled plans for new scenes. They had discussed the possibility of a Christmas scene. It was determined not to proceed with improvising it. In addition, Cam and group members' began to consider scenes and parts of scenes they had developed in order to determine whether the scenes should remain in the play. For instance, during this set of meetings they decided to drop one of the scenes which had been developed during the all-day workshop.

In the workshop Cam had responded with favourable comments about characters being created for the "Mr. McDuff Scene". However, actors working on that particular scene appeared to be uncertain what to do in developing the storyline. As well during this series of meetings Eileen indicated that someone else ought to be placed in her role as a nurse because she did not intend to act. With the limited enthusiasm the other actors had concerning the scene, they determined not to pursue it. Work on the scene ceased.

Creation of the first script during the September fifth meeting was described as a seventh step in that substage of their processes. A parallel "step" during these meetings of mid September was the creation of revised versions of the script. Cam continued to modify
the script based on group members acting throughout this period. The ten steps previously described became compressed as group members' creation of the play shifted toward an emphasis on revision.

Their interactions in revision, however, reflected a gradual shift between revision for the purposes of creating the play and revision in terms of actors' performances. The focus of this segment is how they proceeded to revise both individual scenes and the larger framework of the play.

1) Processes Of Revision Concerning Scenes

Consistent with focus on group members' activities, the first part of this description dwells on revisions they made in terms of creation of the play.

- Orientation In Group Members' Activities Toward Creation Of The Play Through Acting

In an interview immediately prior to this set of mid September meetings, Cam described both his process in creating the first script and future direction he expected to take in terms of a process of revision through group members' acting.

- I see all the elements therein to making a good scene. So for me to take the basic stuff and much of the dialogue and to reshape it and add little bits of transition here or there is a relatively simple task. We'll start working immediately on what's scripted. The version I've typed... Just to make sure that it's there. Cam) S-6-1381.

When the first script was distributed to group members they began to read and then act from it going through the work scene by scene. Initially, no specifics regarding how they would proceed were provided. However, Cam gave a more detailed account of his
assumptions concerning processes in which they were engaged when one of the participants, Jessie, indicated that she was not clear what it was they were supposed to be doing in acting out the script.

- What I would like you to do is what you are doing right now. Do as much of the scene as you can -- Cam) [Jessie interrupts him as he is beginning the latter sentence.] What's that? Jes) Well what these people are doing now is like changing lines. Making them more comfortable. After you've read them a couple of times and worked them a couple of times do it again. Shake it all down. Work them all out. Cam) S-7-1045-46.

Revisions to the scripts then, were to be developed based on group members' exploration of the scenes as the scenes had taken new form through the first script.5

"Shake it all down" came to mean, through their interactions, acting out the scene with a view to determining whether they as actors felt comfortable with the scene -- whether their sense of the characters and the situation they had developed through improvisation continued to be convincing to them and Cam. In addition, as they were to focus on this experience as actors, Cam had the opportunity to experience the scene as represented through their acting. He brought to this process a particular set of concerns in terms of creation of the play. These included concerns with the flow of the scene and the impact of the scene.

Cam's concerns with the flow and impact of scenes appeared to be balanced between small elements of group members' interactions and large elements in terms of how a theme or meaning would unfold for the audience.

- It seemed to go awfully quickly. Yeah, I was just thinking, did we miss something? Jes) I don't think so. Rob) There has to be a little bit more developed. Cam) S 25-1-.82.
- Do it again. Okay. I want to listen to it. And this time, play with it a little bit. You're running through lines like they're turned on by a tap. S-7-1036.
- We'll probably give you a lot more business. Little things to do... Serve yourself a cup of tea and spill it... We'll keep you active and her static. S-16-1.38.
- But I still think the cleverest improv and the cleverest art is the one that's most unexpected. And yet when you think about it, it's the logical conclusion. I love listening to Mozart. Mozart never goes down the same road. Yet where else could it go? Cam) S-16-1395. (Interview)
- I don't feel an overriding necessity to change [I interpreted this to mean something or anything in a scene he was observing as director.] A large number of my decisions are simply made on the technical aspects, so... Cam) S-16-1398.

At first, most of the emphasis appeared to be on adding to the play, filling in gaps, embellishing. Many of the gaps to be filled within individual scenes were transitions from one theme or series of interactions to another. As well, work on establishing a beginning and an ending for each scene was part of their concerted effort.

A comparative overview of their process in goal directed improvisational work and their work in fleshing in the scenes has suggested parallels in process. The study has suggested that group members' steps were primarily compressed during this subprocess. Unlike their very first improvisations, this new work was constrained to the extent that it was intended to fit within what had been developed. Otherwise revision of the whole scene was required. On occasion, in fact they found themselves revising whole scenes or changing at least the inflection of actions in a scene.

Exploration in terms of partial scenes resembled in the main what participants had been asked to do in the original improvisations. Cam would ask them what they felt like saying or doing, having assumed the character and at least part of the situation.

In later meetings Cam also suggested a line or action to the actor to see what he or she thought.


This appeared to be an abbreviated form of "all talked out". Cam would then encourage them to try doing or saying what they had talked about if he did not disagree. One participant described this part of the process of improvisation as she experienced it:

- You just have to let your imagination go further...Jes) You really do. Cam) Really fast! Jes) S-7-1040.

Cam used various words to encourage their exploration, including suggesting trying out varying intensities in actions. Much of his effort seemed to be focused on continuing to explore after initial efforts had been made:

- Play with it. Cam) S-18-1.38
- Push it. Be abnormal if you have to. Cam) S-7-1037.
- Let's take it one step further. Let's add something Cam) S-27-1242.

On occasion, he would suggest bypassing an attempt to articulate what one felt like doing. This appeared to be the case most often when one actor had taken the initiative to explore something discussed and Cam wished to maintain impetus through the other actor's response. "Don't think. Respond!" (Cam S-18-Fieldnotes.)
Cam and the actors frequently conferred after they had explored through goal directed improvisations.

- But it certainly helped you coming in. No question. Cam) Yeah. That changes it totally. Yes) Yeah for you it works... Cam) S-13-1068-69.

Generally, it was Cam who asked of them what the actors had experienced, what they thought and felt about the improvisational work.

- What do you guys think? Does it feel better?" (Cam S-25-1.66.)
- Okay, you fix it then. That's fine with me. [She laughs a little.] S-13-1071.

However, Cam did not always do this, and for a period of time a question arose about group members' comfort with content. (The segment which follows concerning group members' breaking point actions offers additional consideration of this aspect of their interactions.)

If Cam and the actors seemed satisfied with the work or they did not question the work, they would "keep it". The work would be added as a revision to the script.

- That's a lovely transition. Great! Let's keep that. Cam) S-7-1042.
- Now I like that. Insert it. Cam) S-7-1042.

However, if the first exploration attempt "did not work", did not appear to fit or make sense, or to affect them in the desired way, then exploration continued. This paralleled group members' experience with "Getting Stuck" in their first improvisational work.

Described in "Anchored Anomie", one method Cam used to encourage group members to explore a scene was to ask them to be "concrete". Cam would ask the actors to describe concrete details either of their character or some aspect of the situation.
- What luggage do you have? It's shape? Do you pick it up? Cam) S-18-1095. [This is paraphrased in part since he was standing some distance from the tape recorder and a few of the words were not absolutely clear.]

There were rare occasions when a stumbling block was not overcome through acting at the meeting.

- When we left off with this — we left with a bunch of question marks. Ann) S-23-1120.

Most often Cam would take responsibility at this point for attempting a solution. "How I'll work that, I'm not sure." (Cam S-16-1.71.) A very few of the participants were "allowed" or took the opportunity to work on a major stumbling block on their own at this point in time: "I'll do something. I'm just going to leave it here." (Ann, S-30-1172.)

Process included in this description thus far has addressed Cam's and group members' additions to the script. It has thereby neglected aspects of their process related to revision or editing in terms of removing material. Although neither Cam nor group members specifically articulated criteria for editing, data analysis yielded at least two bases for cutting out bits of scenes.

During this time Cam appeared to have been observing group members' acting out the script repeatedly to develop a sense of what he determined did not fit, what was jarring or distracting generally. When an action or statement did not fit with his sense of the scene's direction he asked the actor to remove the line or section by refraining from doing it. Sometimes he would ask to substitute a line or action immediately or the actors would be invited to explore.
A second basis for editing was arguably a part of the first. Some aspects of scenes were removed or changed because they were historically inaccurate, anachronisms and thereby jarred the meaning of a scene. Observation of these kinds of problems in content were raised by both Cam and group members.

There was a key element which Cam increasingly addressed in this period of editing in which they were shifting between creating the play and performing it. This basis for editing appears to have merged editing in terms of acting for purposes of creating the play and acting for purposes of performing the play. This was a focus on "sub-text". Cam described sub-text in a number of different ways to actors when directing them. This included asking the actors to create movement to suggest sub-text:

- The problem as the scene is written now, we're talking the text. In other words you shouldn't be stating this stuff. People don't talk about it. That's why I threw the peas in there. Peas is talking about a whole bunch of stuff. The meaning in what you're saying with this stuff comes back more a little at a time and that kind of stuff. If you want to say something, don't talk about the thing your doing, talk about something else while meaning what your doing. Or move. Don't say it, move it. Do something, take a hand. You know. Do something physical which will represent the words... communicating the real meaning other than by using the direct words. Using the direct words just kills it. (Cam) S-7-1039.
- I want you to communicate all that stuff without using those words. S-16-1.57.

These quotations exemplify the quality of merging play creation and performance. The lines were being changed and concurrently, aspects of the actor's performance were being considered.

Significantly, it was not always apparent in group members' interactions when sub-text was being created, or simply being made
explicit rather than implicit. Cam frequently began with asking actors to express explicitly either what their character was feeling, or what that scene's sub-text was. If the actor could tell him (which was not always the case) and if Cam agreed he would invite them to express those feelings in an action or a statement.

If Cam disagreed he suggested the sub-text he experienced, and on occasion he also suggested an action to imply the "sub-text". In a few instances, he also walked on stage and became the character to try out the action or experience suggested. In other words, having articulated sub-text through various means, they would explore how best to express subtly the sub-text in the scene without stating it. Their exploration included creating whole new actions and statements, or modifying those already being done.

For instance, Cam's description of sub-text suggested actors use of action to portray a certain state of mind.

- Do something before you speak so we know the guy is an invalid. ...I want you to look at him in such a way we can see there's no recognition. Let frustration show. Cam) S-7-(Fieldnotes)

In addition to using actions as a method of reflecting sub-text Cam also suggested techniques in dialogue. For instance, he asked actors to talk about something seemingly mundane, but with incongruous intensity to convey an underlying significance. Other suggestions included use of partial statements, and a sense of change in timing.

As previously described, when group members worked on sub-text, aspects of their work affected both the content of the play and their performances as actors. There were other aspects of the work which also led them to focus on their performance.
- Orientation In Their Activities Toward Performance Through Acting:

The study's description of group members' shifting orientation from creation of the play toward performance, emerged from several sources including a statement by Cam during this period. When being interviewed Cam suggested two different aspects of their work. He roughly divided them into two separate activities.

- Well, there's a script there now. We just start rehearsing. Cam) S-16-1392. (Interview)

His statement suggested a relatively clear division between these two aspects of the work. Yet the two aspects appeared to continue to be linked for him as this quotation from the same occasion indicated:

- I don't feel an overriding necessity to change... [He refers here to his criteria for revising the script. In the context of the entire interview I interpreted this to mean that he changes something mainly when he feels an overriding necessity to change it.] A large number of my decisions are simply made on the technical aspects, so... What we can do technically with the talent that we have to tell this story adequately and clearly. And uh, so a great many decisions are based on that. Cam) S-16-1394.

In addition, these two aspects of the work appeared to be blended in group members activities for several weeks. Despite having a script at this point, Cam speaks on October fourth of producing a "final draft" of the script for the stage crew. They continued until then to embellish some scenes, re-work others, and create an ending.)

With the introduction of a script, group members' interactions did change strikingly. As described in prior segments, they relied upon the script. This affected both their ability to improvise parts of scenes and their performance. Their actions were stilted because they were reading the words off of the pages.
Cam had predicted this problem. He articulated the problem, however, primarily in terms of concern with performance. Cam spoke of "breathing life back into the work" on a number of different occasions, and in a number of different manners:

- The fun is done. Now the effort is putting it back into a kind of inspirational form... Do them with seeming conviction. Cam) S-13-1064.
- You're running through lines like they're turned on by a tap. Cam) S-13-1064.

When interviewed he suggested at least one process intended to assist actors in rediscovering intense meaning in the play and in their actions:

- It's like when you've been doing a play for so long you end up being bored by it... But that's not to say, uh, you can't rediscover the reality of a situation. You just drag out some of the original things you had to make the play or to make it real for yourself. You go through them again. Yeah, that's possible to repeat that... in an abbreviated form, that process. Cam) S-6-p.2.

In addition to work on sub-text of the play, when directing actors' performance, Cam asked actors to "physicalize", or to establish clearly in their own minds where unseen parts of the setting were. That is, they were to concentrate on seeing or making concrete for themselves places and objects which they were miming. He apparently asked actors to do this for several purposes.

First, he appeared to rely on this as a technique for making the situation "real" for them once more. Instead of "dragging out some of the original things", he asked actors to drag out or make more concrete the illusive, imaginary aspects of their setting.

Second, he also asked them to physicalize in order to embellish or enrich aspects of their performance so that they would establish
for the audience, the "real" quality of their mime, and the emotional state of their character.

- We'll probably give you a lot more business. Little things to do... Serve yourself a cup of tea and spill it... We'll keep you active and her static. S-16-1.38.
- Pick your spot. Either its this nail or this nail. But I want you definitely to relate to the same place each time. S-27-1241.

Cam directed actors' physical movement for several purposes in addition to physicalization. Another of the purposes has been described previously, expression of a scene's sub-text. Cam directed group members in terms of conveying emotional state through the volume and tone of their voice and in the speed and amount of their movement.

In addition to these, Cam also advised them on basic physical techniques so that the audience might hear and see them, unimpaired by distraction. As part of this direction he was also making certain that no one through their actions shifted focus from whatever was most important about a scene.

- Don't upstage yourself. Be open so we can see. Cam) S-7-1033.
- Almost upstage him. Cam) S-25-1.29
- We haven't had a chance to look at you. Take a beat to look at it and then go. Cam) S-25-1.30.
- It has to be bigger. That's the look make it bigger. S-27-1131.

Cam's instructions of this type were to increase and continue through the dress rehearsals.

The description in this segment conveyed important elements of process related to Cam's and group members' work on individual scenes. Throughout all of this activity, Cam's work included continued development of the play's larger framework.
2) Processes Of Revision Concerning The Play's Framework

At the August eighteenth meeting Cam had expressed his role as one in which he would "string all of those stories into some kind of cohesive shape" (A-18-528). Much of his work emanated from this sense of role. In the first meetings of September Cam had been concerned with developing a beginning and a "binder", a theme and an outer framework to bind the individual scenes into a play. During the mid September set of meetings Cam continued to work on creating a beginning and the play's outer framework.

Prior to September thirteenth, scenes in the script were all based on group members' improvisations. Cam had only added and reshaped their scenes. On September thirteenth he requested that group members' attempt two scenes which he had "pre-constructed or scripted". In other words, this work began to vary from earlier processes in that the work was not created through group members' improvisations, but through Cam's efforts to create opening and closing scenes as part of the larger framework.

The first scene created by Cam and through his direction opened with two men setting up a telegraph pole. They referred to this as Goetheim station. This scenario was followed by two women, apparently aboriginal people, who stared at the pole and who talked of leaving this place of the "singing trees".

After these brief scenes had been acted out, Cam then directed group members in creating a human train. He placed them in various
positions and asked them to "chug" across the stage. They entered from one side of the stage and exited on the other. Jay was asked to announce that Goetheim was the next station.

Cam directed them through this scene. He told actors where to stand, what to do, and what to say. Jessie and Allie appeared to be somewhat uncomfortable with the idea when called upon to speak with a Cree accent as two aboriginal people determined to leave behind the "singing tree".

As Cam literally arranged group members into a train, and then asked them to move across the stage, group members snickered and laughed about their train. There was some groaning and some playful pushing and shoving. Significantly, even during the following meeting some group members wondered about the human train and how it looked.

- You want us to do this? Participant) [It was difficult to determine from the tape who asked this question.] No. I'm not kidding. Cam) [Immediately after one participant asked Jim how it looked. Jim was the only actor present who had not formed part of the train, for he had been working on the lighting.] Did it look like a train? Lol) Very good. Jim) S-16-1080.

The next in the series of opening scenes created at this point consisted of group members as "pioneers" reciting a poem about the "homestead quarter" which referred to the title of the play. The poem had been written by a few of the women in the group. Cam had the group begin to recite the poem as a piece of choral work.

These scenes emerged as the beginning of the play. They established some of the dominant themes in the play. Cam had assumed responsibility for the majority of the scenes' creation. He directed them without relying on their exploratory, improvisational process.
- I wish we had Allie and Anna. I've taken all the improv and worked on a rough structure... And I've decided that the stuff that Allie and Anna did could basically be used as a rough. And everything could be shoved in it. Cam) S-13-1060.

Cam continued to take responsibility and authority for creating the overall framework of the play. He did this in a variety of ways which included directing work on creating an ending in later sessions. He also began to concentrate on individual scenes in relation to the larger framework in terms of content and timing. It was apparently with this in mind that he fostered some additional improvisational work after this point.

- Well what do you think? Is there more there? We barely re-establish them. S-16-1.40.

Creation of both transitions within scenes and transition from one scene to another also became a concern for him. "Any ideas how to get into it? Go from Susan to Joy?" (Cam S-16-1.61.) For example, it was because of such a concern, that subscenes of the telephone scene were created. They were developed so that the scene would not be experienced as a series of brief, abrupt moments. Consideration of framework was to continue to be a concern even through dress rehearsals, although by then virtually all of the work had been done.

In an interview during this period, when he was asked about how he organized the scenes and the structure of the play generally, Cam described a definite framework:

- The first half is all newspaper stuff... for the most part light, not... engaging fun. But then there's that series of improv that are quite heavy. You can't mix the two. Cam) S-16-1399. (Interview.)
- I shuffled them in terms of pacing. Cam) [He is referring to the series of scenes derived from the "newspaper stuff".] Cam) S-16-1399. (Interview.)
There were two striking elements to this part of processes in which Cam and the group were engaged. First, during this set of meetings I began to have a sense of how web-like the work was becoming. As one decision was made with respect to one action or scene, the repercussions had to be traced through that scene and others. Since adjustments emerged increasingly as significant in terms of a focus for their actions, more detailed description is provided in both the next segment and the next Act-Play.

A second most important element of change for group members was associated with the coming of the script and the need to develop an outer framework for the play. Given that Cam assumed this work as his responsibility and given a shift towards more rehearsal-like structure, Cam came to make more editorial decisions. This was reflected in their process in working on individual scenes. The context of their process in scene creation is important for an understanding of their interactions during this period.

Details Of Cam's And Group Members' Emerging Process

As their process in creating the play and working on actors' performances was one of incessant halts, discussion, revision, and replay, Cam and group members gradually developed a language and a sense of timing for the work. Some group members swiftly developed a sense of processual language and timing. Others laboured with how
best to proceed. Whether they appeared to respond with ease or with
hesitation and ambiguity to Cam's directions, nonetheless, group
members did not ask many questions. 6

1) Language For Stops And Starts

In this process of acting while under direction, of most
immediate concern for actors was a need to determine how one knew when
to start acting, and when to cease if required to stop before the end
of the scene. Once one stopped in the middle of a scene, how did one
know when to commence acting and where to begin in the scene?
A set of words and phrases came to be used relatively consistently.
There was some variety.

- Do it again. Do it again, okay? Cam) S-7-1036.
- Do it. Cam) S-25-1124.
- Okay. [Depending upon the tone a simple, judging from group
members' response to the word, an abrupt "Okay" seemed to imply,
"Stop doing anything else and listen or start".] Cam) S-18-1.08.
- Okay so let's try it. Who wants to do it? S-28-1.11.
- Let's go, take it from the top. Cam) S-27-(Fieldnotes).
- Whenever you're ready. Cam) S-16-(Fieldnotes).
- I'm sorry I've got to stop you again. S-25-(Fieldnotes).
- And what's the line cue? Cam) S-27-1241.

As previously described many participants did not use this
language because the language is a director's, that is it has a
directive quality. They did not have that role generally, rather they
responded to direction. However, most participants, did develop a
sense of when to start and how and where to start. Gradually, Cam did
not have to ask them expressly to stay and start as frequently as he
had.
The actors began to do this of their own accord. For example, eventually group members began to recognize the importance of beginning farther back in terms of the script once having been stopped. They would then start dialogue several lines earlier. This provided an opportunity to see whether changes they were making flowed smoothly when incorporated into the "old material".

If actors' sense of timing was not that of Cam's, he still gave them indication of when to start and where. He also used language in their exchanges to evaluate where the work was in such process.

2) Dissatisfaction And Being Stuck (Ambiguity)

Language of stops and starts emerged from a sense of necessity to change something. Apprehension of problems came from two sources, mainly, Cam's experience of something jarring in the scene or group members' getting stuck. When group members became stuck, the problem became apparent through their silence or their hesitancy. When Cam experienced a concern, this required language to acknowledge that there was a problem.

- It's not going anywhere. Cam) S-7-(Fieldnotes).
- It's not working. Cam) S-13-(Fieldnotes).
- I'm not getting any sense of urgency. Cam) S-18-1.15.
- Excuse me, that line "John Haufmann" just does not make sense. You'll have to work it in another way. Cam) S-25-.31.
- There's nothing there at all. Cam) S-25-1.31.
- The picture still isn't quite right. Cam) S-28-1.10.
- I can't remember where we're going to. That's where I'm mixed up. Jes) S-18-1097.
In addition to language emerging for "dissatisfaction", they also began to express "satisfaction" with content and progress in the work.

3) **Satisfaction/Progress** (Certainty)

Satisfaction was expressed on both a short term basis and a more long term basis in Cam's and group members' interactions. Both of these expressions of satisfaction are described herein as expressions of "interim" and "final" satisfaction.

- "**Interim**:"

  As their process included a rotational approach to working on scenes, group members would do a scene a number of times and then another scene would be done. At some point, then, they would leave a scene to go on to another or finish for the evening because there were problems which apparently could not be resolved within the timeframe or there was "interim" satisfaction with what improvements had been made.

  - "We'll leave that for now. Because that was, it's so close now. You've definitely got the... the bulk of it's there. Cam) S-25.1 .89.
  - There's lots to work with there. Cam) S-7-(Fieldnotes).
  - It's getting there isn't it? Cam) S-25-.66.
  - I think we'll leave it. It's so close it's there. I think we'll add a bit - at the top and a couple more physical pauses. Cam) S-25-1.25.
Cam's expressions of satisfaction on a temporary basis grew more frequent as this series of meetings progressed. In meetings toward the end of September, Cam also began to express satisfaction with a more "final" ring.

- "Final":

There was a difference in the words Cam and group members used to express satisfaction of a more final note. In addition to use of different words, there was a distinction in their tones of voice associated with more final satisfaction related to a scene. They expressed "final" satisfaction with excitement or quiet pleasure which seemed reserved for this experience.

- That really plays. Cam) S-25-.1
- It reads. Cam) S-23-(Fieldnotes).
- That works a lot better. Eil) S-23-.58.

When Cam expressed such satisfaction with a scene, this appeared to signal for that scene a distinct shift toward focus on elements of performance. During these meetings, however, he did not express this sentiment frequently in relation to the scenes. It was in the next series of meetings he was to do so.

Data analysis suggests that expression of satisfaction with a more final sense to an individual's satisfaction was not achieved with all scenes. They became pressed for time. In those instances, dissatisfaction ceased to be expressed and an emphasis on elements of performance signified a transition.
4) Language Of Decision-Making Processes Concerning Scene Content

Particularly in the first three meetings of this period group members continued to do some improvisational work to fill in gaps. At that point they did not express experiencing being pressed for time; there was more opportunity for actors "to explore" generally.

In later meetings when people were experiencing some time constraint, their discussion did not always take place. As previously described at this point Cam often provided them with a direct suggestion. He also chose to outline a choice in applicable situations, thereby carving out some certainty for an actor when he or she had no intuitive first response. Cam's use of choice as a directive technique continued through the dress rehearsals.

- You can either do this... or you can do that ...but you can't do both. Cam) S-18-(Fieldnotes).
- We have two problems... Jay) [Based on Jay's tone of voice and the context of the situation, I took this to be a satire of Cam's use of the technique.] S-28-.69.
- Play it one way or the other... go with one of them. Cam) 0-7-2.51.

In meetings after the middle of September, Cam began to shift responsibility away from actors' taking the time to "work things out on the stage" as Anna had described the process. More frequently he began to add and edit out. Some type of editing Cam refers to as "fixes". (He fixes it usually.)

- I think I'm going to rewrite this scene. Cam) What are you going to do with it? Jes) I'm going to fix it. Cam). S-13-1070.

Sometimes he would discuss this with group members before doing so, and on occasion he did not. This practice continued in meetings after this period as well.
- I'm going to have to think about that a whole lot. Cam) S-13-1068.
- No keep going, I'll edit. O-4-1185.

Rather than taking time in a meeting to explore, they did save time during later meetings by having Cam edit scenes after the meeting. This saving of time, however, meant that at the next meeting group members' would receive another version of the script. As a result, these new lines would have to be memorized after that meeting, rather than using the following meeting to reinforce what actors had developed themselves. In this manner two quite different processes in terms of theatre and decision-making were brought together.

The context of their overall process in scene creation was important. In portraying aspects of Cam's and group members' processual experiences through their emerging lexicon of scene creation, subtle shifts may be more highly illuminated. In particular, shifts concerning their decision-making processes about the play's content and form were most significant.

For group members, such shifts concerning decision-making, coming amidst so many other changes, caused them to experience ambiguity and dissonance, rooted in blurring paradigms of theatre. Decision-making concerning content of the play and various roles involved in process was once more a source of breaking points for them. Group members expressed experiencing breaking points on a number of occasions during this set of meetings.
Emerging Experiences Of Ambiguity And Anomalies
Shifting Shapes Of Group Members' Interactions, Breaking Point Actions

During the meetings in the first two weeks of September, group members' continued to benefit from a relatively commonly held sense of impetus. With each meeting there was more concrete proof of "a play". Experienced ambiguity, anomalies appeared to be pressed into the background with group members' experience of excitement, of impetus. Their sense of certainty appeared to hold the foreground for most during the second week of September.

However, during mid September meetings ambiguity which group members' had been pushing aside began to slowly emerge with respect to several aspects of their interactions. During meetings held in the third and fourth week of September a number of breaking points were experienced by individuals. As with the previous set of three meetings described as "Still Improvising", most group members experienced at least one relatively intense bout of dissonance. What precipitated their experience of breaking point also varied with the participant.

Within the first three meetings of this stage, group members had been involved in breaking point actions concerning what was acceptable behaviour in the group and decision-making process concerning such issues. Through that experience of breaking point they appeared to focus on internal issues most closely connected to a sense of group identity.

This series of meetings beginning with September seventh brought a shift from one orientation in process to another. They moved from a
focus on creation of the play to a stronger emphasis on performance. Most importantly, this was reflected in a parallel shift from a relatively collective decision-making process to one more commonly associated with "traditional theatre" — a hierarchical one with the director and the producer having a dominant role in various aspects of decision-making. In fact the role descriptions the theatre club had provided reflected the latter orientation. (See Appendices, Section One.)

Breaking points which group members expressed experiencing during this period emerged mainly from their questions and concerns related to various roles in theatrical process. For example, in addition to their ambiguity concerning roles of actors and directors in decision-making, ambiguity concerning other roles began to surface.

With the attendance of Jo there was to be a stage manager. However, she was not clearly advised what her duties were since that role had not been reconsidered in terms of elements specific to process of creating the play. 7

The stage manager's actions did not obviously and immediately affect at this point those who were acting, the largest group of those participating. They did not directly experience initial dissonance concerning her role. Although Jo expressed an intense experience of breaking point, her experience of ambiguity was mainly confined to Jo as the person endeavoring to "occupy" the role of stage manager.

On the matter of roles other than actors' and directors', responsibility for costuming emerged as another breaking point
experience. A breaking point related to costumes — what was to be done, who was to do it emerged. However, this breaking point was experienced mainly by a few and only mildly by all when some of the actors were obliged to fend for themselves in terms of costumes. (This breaking point experience will be considered in the next segment as people's method of coming to terms with ambiguity concerning costumes surfaced during that time.)

Breaking point experiences related to theatre roles other than actors and directors were experienced, then, primarily by individuals attempting to assume the role. This might also be said of actors' beginning to experience a growing dissonance related to their activities as actors. However, since there were ten actors in the play by mid September, actors comprised a substantial majority of the group. As well, their acting, their interactions with Cam were the primary focus of meetings.

Given their numbers and circumstance, when the actors' experienced a breaking point, they brought a sense that this was the group's breaking point. Arguably then, those breaking points more commonly experienced at this time were disruptions of meaning related to process and roles concerning actors and the director in creating both the play and polished performances.

Significantly, group members' breaking points concerning theatre process and roles were most strongly expressed during meetings when Cam was absent. For example, when Cam was not able to attend the September ninth meeting group members began with the "story circle". However, there were many interruptions, laughing and joking so that
progress through the exercise was both slower and participants appeared to be less intensely involved than in past instances when Cam was present.

Apparently individuals experienced a difference in the effect of the story circle. One group member experienced sufficient frustration with this perceived change in group members' interactions in Cam's absence to remark, "Why does it work when Cam's here?" (S-9-1049). I interpreted this expression of frustration as being linked with those who had thought initially that the group should have been capable of creating the play without relying on an outside expert.

During this meeting group members "played", as they were to describe "it" to Cam at the next meeting. Most agreed that they did not work as they had at previous meetings. There were some indications that they were not sure of how to proceed as a group after the story circle:

- We did it [the story circle]. How dumb. We don't know what to do after this. [It is difficult to discern from the tape which participant makes this comment.] S-9-1049.

During the meeting on September ninth, group members' appeared to transform their ambiguity into a temporary state in which some had the opportunity to improvise unabatedly or "play" during the session. This experience did not escalate into an intense experience of breaking point for group members. However, through the next three meetings, September thirteenth, sixteenth, and eighteenth a stronger shift in process emerged which set off a breaking point meeting on September twenty-third.
At the September thirteenth meeting, Cam produced a substantially revised script. Consistent with his undertaking to do so in his role as director, he had devised a script which contained a larger framework for the play. This meant that group members did not participate in Cam's creative decisions to place one scene in prominence so that other scenes would be required to create additional framework.

When Cam produced this version of the script the group was still meeting as a group. On this occasion, however, they did not have an opportunity to observe all creative work associated with the play for Allie and Anna were not there to do their parts. With the new script, their scenes had become the larger framework. In addition, there were new volunteers, Bill had been invited to participate as an actor. It was on that evening that Cam asked Bill to step into the role that Jay had developed in the train station scene.

Cam's request was greeted with silence from participants. The fieldnotes suggested an experience of tension. This was the first time it was apparent one might "lose" a role one had developed without volunteering to do so. Jay did not explicitly express experiencing a breaking point at that meeting or in a later interview. However, having interviewed Jay that day and remembering his excited tones when speaking of the part, I interpreted his silence and barely discernible "slump" in posture as implying an experience of breaking point. This was eased slightly when Cam asked Jay to assist in directing that scene.
This decision to substitute Jay with Bill marked an orientation toward the director having unilateral authority on aesthetic matters. It also implied the placement of artistic value in a position of primacy over one placing collective decision-making as a priority. This orientation was reflected in one of the few statements acknowledging implications for Jay and offering some explanation. "This is the hard world." (Cam S-13-1062.) Cam also added that Jay had several other roles in which he "shone."

From a theatrical perspective, Cam's decision was manifestly sound. Bill was much closer to Jessie's age. The storyline suggested that the male character would either be slightly older than or of the same age as the female character. Bill was also larger than Jessie and this brought a physical tension to the scene which had not been previously evident.

Beyond this issue concerning who would act in which roles in the play, some group members were experiencing a growing emergence of breaking points related to shifts in theatre processes and their roles. As previously described, their processes began with collective involvement in research discussion and in their first stages of improvisational acting. However, with the arrival of the first script, their process emerged as one of revision, adding and editing. This process of adding and editing came to involve primarily those working on a particular scene. Thus a subtle shift toward small group emphasis emerged. Cam tended to consult with the people in the scene concerning changes they were making through acting, or revisions he would make if they had not found a "solution" to a stuck point.
- I think I'm going to rewrite this scene. Cam) What are you going
because I have my damn lines memorized. [Later in the discussion
Jessie agrees to have the scene changed.] Okay you fix it then.
That's fine with me. [She laughs a little.] S-13-1070.

This shift in emphasis away from larger group decision-making was
propelled further by additional factors.

Some discussion occurred among the larger group at the beginning
of meetings and after if they socialized. However, even these
opportunities for gathering died out initially with the coming of the
rehearsal schedules. The idea of rehearsal schedules was suggested to
deal with specific concerns.

Cam had begun to express some concern with limitations in the time
remaining to them and continued to do so periodically until the dress
rehearsals were held.

- Is there anything else we can work on? I wish we had more time.
  Cam) S-18-(Fieldnotes).

Cam's concern with time appeared to be related to their ability to
bring such a large group together with sufficient frequency. Although
the following quotation derives from group members' interactions at a
later session, Lenore's question indicates some sensitivity to
negotiating scheduling meeting dates.

- Oh, could we discuss Wednesday? Len) Oh yes. It's a nice day.
  Jay) I'm just saying I've never asked for any changes...
  Len) S-28-1139.

Anna's and Allie's absence at the September thirteenth meeting
reinforced this as a problem. Since they were unable to attend, no
work could be done that evening on the series of scenes newly shaped
to create the outer framework of the play. That resulted in several
days delay until the next meeting date. It was thereafter, that a rehearsal schedule was set up.

Abiding by a rehearsal schedule had additional consequences in terms of group involvement in decision-making and group activity. With the rehearsal schedule emphasis shifted to small group work as previously described. In addition, group members had no opportunity to socialize, to discuss and raise concerns precisely when a shift in editing process emerged.

The shift from large group decision-making process to small group decision-making process began to shift again. As time grew shorter and shorter, Cam began to edit more on his own from one script to another. As new versions of the script came out two concerns emerged for group members who were acting.

The first manifestations of a common experience of breaking point concerning shifting process was expressed relatively quietly by individuals. A few began to express concerns about memorization of lines. When a new version of the script appeared, group members expressed uncertainty about process.

- Because I know the lines. I memorized them. I don't want it to change at all. Jes) S-13-.01 (Bar).
- I got that down. I hope they don't change it. I'll be screwed. Jay) S-16-(Fieldnotes).

One group member, Jessie finally expressed openly at least one aspect of confusion concerning shifting process and revision of the script.
1) **Breaking Point Clarity**


The question Jessie was raising on a personal note was raised indirectly in group members' frustrated comments when they did attempt to memorize lines.

2) **Indications Of Discomfort**

Jessie's query of Cam signaled her recognition that processes in which they were engaged were distinct from the "usual" theatre process. Her concern with respect to changing lines was couched in terms of her role and her duties as an actor. The discussion which follows indicated additional "cloudiness" concerning process.

The first audible response was from Bill, her co-actor in the scene. I interpreted his reply as suggesting that she practice the character's temperament as he perceived it.

- Be bitchy. Bill) [He laughs and appears to be making a joke about practicing being in character.] I can't be bitchy. Jes) [She laughs.] Memorize lines Cam) — Just go over and over what he and I did? Try to remember. Jes) Yeah. Cam) No but usually you have a piece of paper and you get somebody and they read their lines and you... Jes) S-18-1102-03.

Cam's first brief reply had served to raise additional inquiry.

3) **Response**

Cam provided an additional response to Jessie's questions. This response was ostensibly a clarification of process. However, his comments also illuminated some initial element of contradiction concerning the phrase "memorizing lines".
- You shouldn't worry about memorizing lines. You guys know the lines and I would prefer that you just did it so often that whatever hit, whatever worked, whatever felt best, you used. I would be quite happy if no lines ever, ever appeared on a piece of paper. Cam) S-18-1105.

On the heels of Cam's latter comment, they leapt once more into acting through one of the scenes.

It is important to consider the context in which their discussion occurred. The scenes on which Cam, Jessie and Bill had been working were two scenes associated with the "Train Station Scene". These constituted two of the most highly "worked" scenes of the play. Actors developing the scene were extremely familiar with the contents of the scene.

This was not to be the end of group members' concern with changing lines and memorization. Many group members were not in attendance and therefore missed participating in this conversation. As new versions of the script surfaced, with more changes in lines and as time constraints became more pressing, this issue was to emerge gain.

In addition to a growing concern with memorization related to changing lines, there was a second emerging concern. Several group members began to express discomfort with the content of certain scenes. This experience of breaking point was most intense for several group members resulting in another breaking point meeting. Group members met on September twenty-third to review the contents of the play.
1) Breaking Point Clarity


With the new version of the script distributed on September thirteenth several concerns were expressed directly and indirectly by some group members about what they were being asked to do. It is interesting to note that when initially reflecting on their "symbiotic process" with Cam, one group member indirectly predicted the possibility of a breaking point concerning disagreement on content.

- And yet if your views of what was happening with our things were totally negative or opposite to ours, I don't... we couldn't accept it. So you are obviously ferreting out important things... Ann) S-6-963-65.

2) Indications Of Discomfort

There were to be four main concerns raised about emerging contents of the play. As previously described, Cam had been taking a more dominant role in editing with the pressure of time. They had also agreed with Cam at the August eighteenth breaking point meeting when he described part of his role as director and writer being:

- My job is to string all of those stories into some kind of cohesive shape. We may not see that shape til latter stages. This is not unusual for any theatrical endeavor. Cam) A-18-528.

However, two of group members' four concerns came from Cam's constructed beginning. As previously described these were scenes which group members had not improvised. The scenes constituted the larger framework upon which Cam had worked. When Cam organized them
into a human train for one of the opening scenes, some expressed some surprise and discomfort at that time. As previously indicated they looked to others for approval when doing the train:

- Did it look like a train? Lor) Yeah, very good. Jim) Sounds like a train? Lor) Very good. Looked like a Via Rail. I was really impressed that last time. Jim) S-16-1-.20.

Creation of the train was reminiscent of some group members' objections at the August eighteenth's meeting concerning acting as if they were an object, a tree or a saw. No direct references were made to those earlier discussions concerning distinctions between acting for themselves and acting for an audience. Group members did not "register" direct objections with Cam, though joking protestations were made at the time.

In addition, Jessie and Allie indicated some hesitation in playing the two women looking at the telegraph pole. They appeared to be mildly reluctant to use Cree accents, but did not expressly refuse to do so when first asked to take on these acting roles.

Two other concerns arose about two scenes which had been developed through group members' improvisational work. In the case of the two scenes developed through improvisation, group members had directly expressed to Cam some discomfort with the scenes. Changes to one of the scenes caused particular anxiety.

Cam had edited the "Nurses" scene without having discussed the content beforehand with those in the scene. This was not problematic when people were happy with the changes, which was the case generally.
In this instance Cam had filled in a gap. His addition was discovered when Lenore read Joyce's part in the scene because Joyce could not attend the September sixteenth meeting.

Cam had added lines for Joyce describing her most embarrassing experience as a young nurse. When Lenore read the lines for the first time, she hesitated. There were several tentative, surprised sounding laughs from the audience. Jessie protested at the time because Cam had based the embarrassing incident on one she had experienced.

Jessie had described her experience at a social gathering, not during an improvisation. She indicated to Cam that her statements had not been made for the purposes of placing them in the play.

- That was "off the record" tape. You said it. Cam) Relax. They're good lines Jim) S-13-1.19.

A few thought the lines were an entertaining addition as Jim's response suggested.

At the meeting which followed, held on September eighteenth, when Joyce came to the lines she was apparently reluctant to have them in the play.

- Okay I though you wouldn't have any trouble with it. I thought you'd think it was funny. Cam) I wouldn't say that. Joy) [She laughs a little.] I don't care if you'd say that or not. I thought you'd have fun saying that. Come up with another opening embarrassing line. Then you don't have to say it. Cam) S-13-1099.

Nothing more was done concerning the lines at that point. This incident, however, was key in prompting the September twenty-third meeting during which several changes were to be made.

Previously, during improvisational work, one of the key criteria for acting had been whether actors were comfortable with their
characters', their lines and their actions. Cam had encouraged each one to express their feelings and then to act them out. Work related to the sub-text in scenes had revolved around "what they felt they would say or do" as a character which had emerged from their personal experience and under circumstances which they created through improvisation. Distinction between person and character was not always made clear as this conversation taken from a later session discloses.


Cam and Debbie proceeded to have a discussion about historical roles of women as related to the sub-text of the scene. She decided to continue in the role leaving the dialogue untouched and appeared to be comfortable with what she was doing once she began to wear part of her historical costume. That instance was consistent with earlier process wherein personal comfort was a criteria for changing lines. The incident concerning the Nurses scene, then, was unusual and clearly signaled a change in editing process.

The fourth concern emerged from initial questions related to the Wheat Pool Scene. In contrast with the three other sources of concerns for group members, some group members were concerned because this scene had not been revised. From the first day when the scene
was improvised references were occasionally made concerning the theme of "cattiness" in the scene. The meeting of September twenty-third provided some group members with an opportunity to change the scene.

3) **Group Members' Responses**

Cam was apparently unable to attend the meeting of September twenty-third. I was not present when the decision was made to run through the entire play with the notion of reviewing it to deal with some of these concerns. Data analysis indicates that this decision emerged between the meeting of September eighteenth and twenty-third.

As producer, Eileen was one member who, in consultation with others, had a major role in determining the direction of the meeting.

- ... we'll take this opportunity to go through the entire script so we can see what's wrong and we want to change. Cause I know there's some things you think are [inaudible] ... and you don't want them in. Eil) S-23-1108.

On the basis that Eileen was one of those involved in shaping the meeting, the study has quoted substantially from an interview with Eileen wherein she spoke at length of the incident and how it came to pass. In that interview she referred to what appeared to be the primary concern which precipitated their breaking point actions, agitation related to the lines in the Nurses scene:

- Either they wanted me to either take it directly to Cam or they needed the consensus of the whole group. And they might have stood up together and said, "We can't say it". But Loretta and Joyce would have read that. Totally — Joyce might have backed down. I'm not even sure she would have. But if he had insisted they do it, totally against anything they wanted to do, they'd have done it. And so that's really all that happened was that I, I felt that — let them work it through in a rehearsal. Eil) N-27-p.9.
It is interesting to note, however, that she also hinted at a more commonly held concern, that they had not all been able to participate in observing the entire play in proper order of scenes. This consideration was reinforced by Jessie's statement in an informal private discussion with me after one of the meetings.

- At, at that point people were feeling kinda scattered and wanted to run through it all. — So about a week before we had set that day. And I really thought Cam was supposed to be there. Eil)
N-27-p.10.
- I thought about it. The group was scared. We needed to run through it... needed to see it. Cam didn't need to with his experience. Jes) S-28.

There was a duality of purpose in group members' actions at the meeting. Some desired to run through the whole play as a group; others had a concern regarding specific content. On that basis they proceeded.

Prior to describing process in which group members engaged through their breaking point actions during this meeting, it is important to consider one additional comment which Eileen made about group members' concerns. This comment sheds light on their anxiety, once more with respect to roles in theatre process. They clearly experienced conflicting demands:

- The man himself [she is referring to Cam] isn't the least bit intimidating. The knowledge he had was. We were afraid that if, — people were afraid that if you said anything, and Cam said, "Well, I don't have to spend my goddam nights coming to Goetheim and get that kind of shit"... we'd have lost our director. I think that was the intimidation more than the man. Eil)

On one hand they did not wish to offend Cam. They clearly valued his assistance. However, once more the issue of theatre paradigm had arisen. At least some group members clearly included within their
paradigm the specific audience as criteria for what was appropriate. They experienced dissonance with being asked to do certain actions before that community as audience.

4) Process For Determining Who Decides And How Changes Will Be Made

Initially group members simply began to run through the play. The first two concerns were addressed swiftly, being in the opening scene of the play.

- Indian women. Why can't they be two women talking. Participant) S-23-1110.
- Does that train look as stupid as it feels? Participant) S-23-11.

With respect to Jessie and Allie using Cree accents they decided that they would suggest doing the few lines without the Cree accent or simply take them out altogether. However, when they came to the matter of the train there was no immediate consensus. Some thought it felt "stupid". Others disagreed. This raised the question of who would decide what to change:

- Well I want some other opinions. Participant) S-23-1110.
- Oh yeah we're not slicing anything. What I was learning was seeing it over and I was going to ask one of you to go out and off stage. Cause I want somebody else to see what I saw. Participant) S-23-1112.

On that basis the group did the human train several times. They repeated it as often as was required to give all those who wanted the chance to step off stage and observe the remaining group members perform it.

Opinions expressed throughout this discussion eventually indicated a consensus to "leave the train in":
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- I have no problem with the train. The train looks like people pretending to be a train. But that doesn't bother me a bit. I think it's kind of amusing. Participant) I think it's a great way to open the play. Participant) S-23-1111.
- It's not as pukey as it feels. Participant) S-23-1114.

The latter comment was established as a theme for group members. One participant repeated it stating, "That's a classic" (S-23-1114). Thereafter this line was used as a running joke, a theme on several occasions.8

As group members proceeded through the play they developed additional nuances of process. Concerning the two other scenes about which group members expressed anxiety, they began to articulate criteria for critiquing scenes. The "Wheat Pool Scene" generated the most discussion among group members related to criteria for a scene. Among criteria group members named, "relevancy" was the first.

- I think it's relevant. Participant) Do you? I think there's too much cattiness and there's not enough about the Wheat Pool. Participant) It's probably a lot more close to actual events.. that's not the purpose of this. Participant) No. Participant) S-23-116-17.

It is most interesting to note that relevance, and "closeness to actual events" are not considered sufficient qualities to refrain from changing the scene. It is suggested that the purpose of "this", the play, lies beyond these criteria. Unfortunately, these group members did not continue on to make explicit their understanding of the purpose for this production.

Based on data analysis, in particular group members' discussion about the community, the study suggests that they thought the purpose
was to reach the community members. Portraying that which might remind them of the past in a light that would embarrass community members was what these group members hoped to avoid.

In the same vein, during this process group members also discussed performance and character.

- I think the scene itself plays really well. You guys are carrying it off pretty good. Participant) S-23-1117.

This phrase "plays well" was first used by Cam. Through observing several circumstances in which group members and Cam used the phrase, I interpreted them to mean generally that a scene flowed, that "it" presented a "real quality" in terms of characters and situation.

As group members continued to use this process, in addition to broad criteria for assessing a scene, they also framed criteria for specific editing in terms of lines. Again, it is interesting to note that they relied on feelings concerning action in the scene. However, this time they were expressing a sense of what another actor "would or wouldn't" do.

- You wouldn't phrase it that way." Participant) S-23-(Fieldnotes.)
- I don't think you would stand there. Participant) S-23-.35.

Notably, it was not entirely clear where person and character were to be separated in terms of what an individual would or would not do in a scene.

With this shift toward one actor suggesting what another actor might or might not do in a scene, there was a significant response from group members. Once a change was suggested by anyone, it was also determined that the person who should then decide on what change should be made was the actor who was playing the character.
- Let Jessie — or however Jessie wants to say it. Participant) S-23-1115.
  During their "review" process group members began to distinguish and to indicate as well what was not available for consideration and change. They did so by stating that some areas still required additional work and were not ready for critique.

- When we left off with this — it was left with a bunch of question marks. S-23-1117.

  Remarkably, in performing the entire play without a director, through this process and their group discussion it became apparent that participants had developed and were continuing to develop a sense of confidence that they could do this.

- I'm doing something in the kitchen. You just have to let that get established. Allie) S-23-1119.
- Some of us should be warming up. Lor) S-23-1119.

  On that evening, group members enacted the entire play based on the most recent version of the script. It was the first time that all of them had had an opportunity observe all of the play thus far developed. By the end of their process they had revised the remaining two scenes of concern.

  As the quotation from the interview with Eileen describes, they worked on a few lines concerning an embarrassing incident which they inserted into the Nurses scene for Joyce. They also discussed the problem of the predominant quality of cattiness in the Wheat Pool. One person suggested that there was a difficulty in the process of improvising the scene.

- Yeah this hasn't got anything to it anyway... facts... Like what's happening. The wrong person... none of us knew anything about it, so... Participant) S-23-1115.
The participant vaguely referred to an odd situation which was recognized once they began to improvise. In virtually all the other early improvisations they had been structured so that a person who had researched a particular area was involved in the improvising. However, Joyce, who had done a substantial amount of research in the area of the Wheat Pool, happened to be absent on the day of that improvisation process.

During their first improvisation, "the scene" had been slow to start. Those who had volunteered suggested that they knew little about the Wheat Pool. Cam had then indicated the need for dramatic tension or conflict. Introduction of tension had taken the form of "cattiness" as some group members expressed it.

To rectify this perceived problem of limited information or "facts" in the scene, group members asked Joyce to suggest additions. She did this in consultation with others in the scene. It is interesting to note that despite this being a farming based community, there were several indications that many group members did not in fact have a strong grasp of the Wheat Pool's purpose. Those having to begin the improvisation initially, without Joyce, declared that they did not know a great deal on the subject. Among those were several long-standing members of the community. Although coming from a farm family herself, Joyce had determined to learn more.

On this particular evening another participant appeared to be coming to grips with the purpose of the Wheat Pool. Her reflection about the Wheat Pool emerged from group members' discussion in editing the scene.
- They were unable to sell it, eh? I suppose there was that problem too years ago. Ior) They could always sell it but the price was always really low in the fall and the small farmer suffered for it. Joy} [Paraphrased] S-23-1118.

The participant, Loretta, was not only an actor in the scene, she and her husband had owned a small farm in the community for years. She was considered to be a "typical" member of the community by many of those in the group.

In summary, group members' process for the evening emerged as they "went along". Minor concerns with a line or two in a scene were quietly addressed. Four major concerns which several participants held emerged and were eventually raised and also addressed.

They dealt with these major concerns primarily through the process Cam had used. Participants "worked through" a scene to decide whether there was a problem for them. If they experienced a problem they explored to discover alternative directions for the scene.

- But, what happened was, I think that the group dynamics was what changed it. When we, when everybody realized that we were all feeling that was a sort of disgusting line, but we were able to come up with some that was suitable and was just fine. Like Joyce said to me, "What can I say that's embarrassing if I can't say that? And I don't want to say that?" And so we ended up with the stockings in the chapel. And that came out of, — that, that I think that it was the little bitty things like — that, um, that were fraying on a lot of people. And when we talked about it all together we realized that, that we were making mountains out of some mole hills. Let's just simply make a change, offer him the change and he'd probably accept it because it was a sensible change. Tell him you're uncomfortable with what you're doing, then offer him something else. Eil) N-27-p.9.

Prior to leaving this segment it is most important to emphasize that not all group members experienced the same breaking points. For
example a few of the actors liked the scenes and the lines in contention. Others had not experienced such intense concern with respect to content as those wishing to make changes clearly did.

Eileen's description of their process suggests that when group members had an opportunity to come together as a group, and to work on it together, those who had experienced intense concern were greatly relieved. However, group members' experience with breaking points did not entirely conclude with this meeting.

In the instance of the prior breaking point meeting on August eighteenth, group members had had an opportunity to begin the meeting with Cam consulting them about what had transpired at the prior meeting. On that occasion, he had received no notification before attending the meeting of what group members had done. However, that was not to be the case with this breaking point meeting.

One of the participants spoke with Cam first, describing the meeting. This was in contravention to a general agreement that Eileen would describe the meeting to Cam when next she saw him. Whatever the content and tenor of that conversation prior to the meeting of September twenty-fifth, Cam and Eileen had a "falling out" for several meetings. Their strained relations visibly affected the next three meetings. Eileen was much less accessible; she did not attend most of those meetings.

There were also strained relations between Eileen and the participant who had gone to Cam outside of the meeting. To these tensions was added Eileen's familial support from Debbie. The meeting of September twenty-fifth was considerably subdued. Even the
men who had begun to "play" and improvise during breaks refrained from
doing so.

As group members went through the scenes, they included in their
interactions most of the modifications they had made at the prior
meeting. Some of these Cam observed and did not change, again.
Others he suggested were problematic. However, he left changes to
those in the scenes.

- Excuse me. That line "John Haufmann" just doesn't make sense.
  You'll have to work it in another way. Cam) S-25- 1123.

The meeting on September twenty-seventh brought some rebound in
group members' apparent energy. Tension in group members'
interactions appeared to be relaxing. However, this was not to be the
case for long. There were few meeting times remaining prior to
performance.

During the three meetings after September twenty-seventh, Cam
directed group members in an effort to complete editing and to focus
on polishing performances. As they "rehearsed" more and more,
additional elements were brought to bear in their acting. For
example, they began to bring the scenes together progressively through
these meetings.

- Stand-by just means wait. Stand nearby. Cam) Well let's just go
  stand-by then. Jay) [He laughs.] S-27-1129.

This explanation refers to the need for actors to anticipate, to
be ready to begin the next scene when the scene on stage ceased to be
rehearsed again at that time.
c) "It's Close": Shifting Focus, Editing And Polishing

- It's close. It needs something, melody? Cam) S-28-1.22.

Although group members experienced breaking points interlaced with their "acting impetus" throughout the meetings from August thirtieth to October fourth they pressed onward toward "performance level" production. Cam worked with and directed them in their determined efforts. Following the breaking point meeting of September twenty-third, group members' common breaking point actions were limited so that there was little interference with their common drive toward a completed script and a polished performance.

Group members' thematic concern of creating the play and polishing actors' performance has been described in terms of two subprocesses thus far. Emerging from data analysis these two were entitled a) "Still Improvising": Exploring and Decision-Making (descriptions of meetings included those held on August thirtieth to September sixth) and b) "The Bulk Of It Is There": Fleshing Out, Filling In And Editing Out (descriptions of meetings included those held on September seventh to September twenty-seventh). This segment, "It's Close: Shifting Focus, Editing And Polishing", details a third shift in Cam's and group members' emphasis related to their theatre processes.

There were three meetings, September twenty-eighth, September thirtieth, and October fourth, during which group members' interactions continued to build on efforts to complete a script and to begin to consolidate work with respect to actors' performances. As always, these compartmentalizations of meetings must bear elements of
the arbitrary. However, time was such a significant element in group members' interactions particularly with the deadline concerning performances. Therefore, the study has endeavored to rely on stages as a generalization, choosing activities and concerns most common to group members.

Several elements in Cam's and group members' interactions set these three meetings apart from the earlier meetings. First, during this time some made a pointed effort to have actors stop relying on their script while rehearsing. This sense of timing seemed to be linked with the number of days before the first performance.

- Can you do it without a script, Jim? Cam) S-28-1144.
- Jessie, know your fricking lines by Monday and be able to say them. Len) S-28-1145. [Paraphrased.]
- Please everyone, learn your lines. We will no longer allow scripts on stage. The performance is in a week and a half. Cam) S-28-1150. [Cam announces this at the end of the September twenty-eighth meeting for those in attendance.]
- No more scripts on stage. Cam) S-30-.25.

Second, and in some contrast with early efforts to have group members cease to use their script on stage, Cam indicated at the beginning of the October fourth meeting that he wished to finalize creation of the play.

- What I'd like to do tonight is to set the script so that when I come on Monday I can hand out the copies of the final draft so that the technical crew can mark their exact cue times... Cam) O-4-1180.

There was a third element which emerged as an increasingly significant activity in group members' interactions. Ongoing work on lighting intensified during this time. They began to also work on "sound". Props and costumes were being gathered. With these meetings more and more of the "technical" aspects were being introduced. As
Cam's statements indicated this was another purpose for a final script. The technical crew needed it for cues.

Addition of "technical" activities brought increased complexity to the task of simultaneously assessing actors' interactions for story creation, maintaining a script which reflected current story creation, and assessing their performances. At this point work on linkage between scenes had begun as well.

What had not been apparent initially became suddenly clear with the burgeoning of layer on layer of imponderable detail. Every meeting framed endless effort to adjust, to tune, to balance. Adjustment was relational in terms of the stage as "the big picture". The "big picture" was now in a constant state of flux. Adjustments were not limited to the linear. Scenes prior to the one being viewed also had to be adjusted on occasion after the fact.

Description Of Their Process In Editing And Polishing, Acting

Cam's and group members' common desire to produce a "final" draft of the script was pursued once more during this set of three meetings. Cam's statement that he intended to "set the script" on October fourth, indicated that he thought they had not done so before that meeting.

With the end of the October fourth meeting most of the script remained static. Although group members received "new lines" to memorize at the first dress rehearsal, these were the lines, including an ending, which had been developed at the October fourth meeting. There were still to be a few line changes after that.
As previously suggested group members were in a constant state of adjustment while acting. Change in the context of acting was to be thematic for group members. They also experienced change concerning the group. While the core group did not change in number, one person was "substituted" for another during the first of this set of meetings. This was drastic "Variations On A Team".

As a result of Allie's absences on at least two key occasions, a new participant was asked to assume Allie's roles. Helen joined the project on the evening of September thirtieth with only ten days to the first performance. Among several parts, the primary character which she played was the "granddaughter" who had one of the largest and most pivotal roles in the play. (Additional detail is provided in the next segment concerned with breaking points.)

In terms of other elements of change experienced by group members during this period, meeting conditions shifted once more. There were still no large group discussions during this period. However, as most of the scenes were being "rehearsed" in a single evening, almost all the group members began coming to the meetings again.

Group members' were also now more familiar with the basic structure of the play through their review of the play at their breaking point meeting. Most content had been discussed in the large group on September twenty-third. Those who sat in the audience were able to respond to scenes and to "improvements". There was a sense of collective hubbub once more.

When not acting most group members' activities were concerned with some small group background work, such as lighting, sewing, and
working on props. Some group members also took the opportunity to raise questions about administrative work. For example, Eileen took advantage of group members' presence to speak of ticket sales. She encouraged everyone to purchase them if they had not.

- I'm pretty sure we'll sell out. I have been advertising yet...
  Eil) I didn't know that. Len) S-28-1134.

Having the entire group attend meetings again, afforded them once more an opportunity to socialize however briefly, after the session. Some group members arranged to meet following the October fourth meeting. This was to be their final opportunity to socialize until parties were held after their performances.

In the midst of all of these rapid changes, one shift in group members' actions was relatively slow and constant. At this point, their interactions at meetings suggested more and more strongly a sense of rehearsal. Scene by scene group members acted out the play with Cam observing and directing their actions. They continued to repeat the scenes on average about three times making changes with each "repetition". By the last of these meetings this format, with a focus on polishing performance was well established.

1) Process Of Revision Concerning Scenes

With the majority of their activities being other than goal directed improvisation, generally their focus had shifted to line by line direction from Cam. This now included imbedding technical
aspects of the work. Prior to descriptions of those processes, it is
most important to describe group members' remaining concerns and
interactions in creating the final bits of scenes.

- Orientation Toward Creation Of The Play Through Acting:

During the first meetings at the outset of this stage group
members' main activity was to improvise scenes to add to those
developed at the all-day workshop. The study's processual description
of those first meetings at the end of August outlined a series of
steps in group members' improvisations. That account of the period
included ten steps in group members' interactions.

Description of the second series of meetings from September
seventh to September twenty-seventh noted that group members had begun
to compress those steps as their interactions became a familiar
pattern. In particular, the description observed a change from
creation of the script to revision of it through group members' acting
endeavors and Cam's editing. As well, this description focused on
their changing orientation from concern with creation of the story to
performance.

During this period there were very few scenes requiring
improvisation. They worked mainly on creating transitions from one
scene to another in the form of creative ideas to introduce characters
in the scene, or the situation; Yet, whenever group members engaged
in goal directed improvisational work, they generally received
considerable attention from those attending in the theatre. Group
members appeared to retain a fascination with improvisational process.
Improvisational work also tended to require more of their time than "rehearsed material". For although their improvisational steps became compressed, there were still more steps associated with that work than group members "rehearsal work" or work on polishing actors' performances.

In addition, even with constant readjustment in "rehearsing" scenes, -- changing positions, lighting, emphasis on words, any "stuck periods" did not appear to be prolonged. It is difficult to determine why this would appear to be so as there may have been many elements involved for group members. However, based on data analysis, arguably, in rehearsal adjustments Cam was the prime explorer and his "vocabulary" of solutions was broader and more swiftly available to him.

Improvisational work then, even when goal directed, appeared to demand a disproportionate amount of meeting time in relation to "rehearsal work". As described, improvisational work also tended to have a higher profile, with group members' observing. Based on these considerations what proportionately small amount of improvisational work group members did still gave the general impression of being an important and large part of even these later sessions.

Goal directed improvisational work accomplished during these sessions was primarily concerned with creating transitions (finding creative ways of beginning and ending a scene, introducing a new theme or another scene), simply rounding out a scene, and discovering an end for the play. Much of this work involved Anna and Helen whose characters created the larger framework and whose scenes were supposed
to introduce others. Anna, Helen, and Cam spent considerable time looking to find ways to introduce the smaller scenes of others. They also worked very closely to discover a striking conclusion to the conversation between the granddaughter and grandmother.

Another significant piece of improvisational work done during these meetings was directed at continuing to round out the Telephone Scene. Cam wished to lengthen one part of the Telephone Scene for balance, so that the scene was not so brief as to be abrupt. A quotation from improvisational work done concerning the latter has been included herein because these particular interactions provide an excellent example of how compressed the steps had become in which group members were engaged in improvisational work.

When commencing the improvisational work, Cam asked for two volunteers to improvise a brief, but confused telephone conversation. For purposes of the scene, Jay and Helen volunteered to be recipients of a prank set up by Lenore's character as a telephone operator "showing her friend the ropes". This part of the scene begins when Lenore's character has just rung and connected two people in the community who do not like each other. Since both respond to the telephone ringing, both assume the other must have called.

After Jay and Helen initially said hello and asked who was calling they stopped, unsure of what more to say.

- Keep going, I don't know. Cam) [Jay begins to improvise again.] I don't know. What did you call me for? Jay) I pulled the plug. Len) [Lenore is explaining that as switchboard operator she has cut the two actors off and brought this piece to a close.] I'd like for them to go on a bit. Because it has great potential. Cam) [Helen, responding to Cam's direction steps back into character.] Where's your manners? Hel) I don't have them. Jay)
[He laughs which is followed by laughter from the audience. I suspect this has to do with his reputation for disturbing others with his energetic playing.] I have manners, I know who I'm calling... got you. Jay) Good, much better. Cam) O-4-1184-85.

This was a "full-fledged" piece of improvisational work, although not overly long. Several actors improvised this together. More commonly during this series of three meetings improvisations were limited to creation of modification of a line or two. For example, Cam would observe a problem with a scene and discuss with the actor editing an action or a phrase.

- You know it's a great little sketch. It's just got a stinker of a punch-line. Cam) S-28-(Fieldnotes)

Editing generally required a brief discussion of "the problem" and possible changes. Sometimes Cam suggested those changes; on other occasions he left it to the actors to edit the lines.

- The information is too complete. In other words, you're over-stating the obvious. Everybody here knows what the Pool does. You don't have to tell about "spring". All you have to do is make reference to it and it will accomplish the same thing... Take out the fall and spring bit. That's the essence of it. Because what happens here is, it now doesn't seem like a natural progression... To get back to Myra. Cam) S-28-1.52.

- There's too many "I'm sorrys". I don't know whether you ad-libbed some or there's that many in the script. Cam) There's 3 or 4. Hel) There's too many. We should cut some or change them into something else. Uh, find another way of saying it. Would you do that? Cam) [He is speaking to Helen and Anna.]

As described previously, however, in some instances, even when attempting to explore alternatives through improvisation, group members could not discover an acceptable solution.

- Yeah well we tried that though, remember? We were going on and on trying to think of things about Susan [Jessie's character in the Train Station scene] that we could say that wasn't sub-text or whatever. Ann) O-4-1187.
In those instances when nothing was discovered by the end of the meeting, Cam generally came to the next meeting with a revision in the script.

As described previously, with the coming of the script, there was a rehearsal-like emphasis in meetings. With the pressure of time, Cam became more and more directive. There was less time for individual actors to explore and so Cam, having begun their process with facilitating others' exploration, shifted to making specific suggestions. He shifted once more to directing which included at times even physically placing or positioning the actor. This occurred more frequently with adjustments for technical elements.

- Something more has to happen here. Cam) [They try a series of changes with lighting. Eventually, they close the curtain to change the backdrop.] S-28-1137.
- I'm not used to having this music box. Ann) [She appears to offer this as an explanation for several points during which she has forgotten her lines.]

Sometimes changes made in these instances actually affected the storyline, creating new elements. However, much of this work was oriented towards polishing actors' performances.

- Orientation In Their Activities Toward Performance Through Acting:

A key concern for Cam during these three meetings was to have actors do the scenes without scripts. Previous descriptions related the tremendous impact the scripts had on group members' interactions.

- And I wish you'd put the scripts down. Because the scripts are slowing it back from coming alive. Cam) Yeah. Len) S-28-2-1143.
Anna had reflected with Cam about how the scripts had physically come between her and the other actors. She needed to look at the paper rather than react directly to them.

The previous segment also provided an account of some of the elements involved in removing the script from group members' interactions. Many actors were reluctant to memorize lines which could and did change from one revision to another. Some simply could not keep up with the memory work given the changes.

In the first meeting of this set of three, Cam worked at encouraging actors to put down the script. During the second meeting on September thirtieth, actors were advised they could not use scripts. Cam then spent time reminding them of missing lines and missing actions. "What happened to the towel?" (Cam, S-30-1173.) A prompter was also needed. This task was assumed by those sitting in the audience.

Many actors appeared to be thinking and remembering in terms of concepts or elements of story rather than lines. Their actions when they missed something suggested this. Noticeably, they were less likely to stumble about searching for the "correct words", than to flow along smoothly, simply omitting a piece of the story. If they did hesitate, realizing something was missing, the actor would frequently say one or two words describing a key element in the missing piece such as the activity or the location involved, "Wedding" (Anna S-30-1173). By October fourth, the problem with script and memorizing lines had begun to dissipate with more group members being familiar with "their lines".
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Cam's efforts to "breathe life" and meaning back into the play for actors through their actions continued. He became more adamant about "concretely" visualizing those things they were miming.

- Let's physicalize the location of the car... He [Cam refers to Jim whose character is the one mesmerized by the car] has to do that. Cam) I shift my gaze a little. Jim) Don't do that. Cam) I wonder if we should put the car over there and walk around it. Jim) S-28-1147.
- This table is getting sloppy. Get those corners sharp in your mind. Cam) S-30-1166.

Cam's focus on physicalization appears to have been based on a combination of concerns in terms of both precision of performance and attempts to make the play more "real" or meaningful for actors, so they could bring this element of meaning to their performance.

In addition to these efforts to bring meaning to the forefront of actors' performances, Cam continued to work on sub-text of the play. For instance, much of Cam's work with actors during these meetings was once more focused on making sub-text explicit. In contrast with prior meetings, however, emphasis shifted from contemplation of sub-text for purposes of creating or revising the storyline, the play.

Instead, emphasis was placed on comprehending sub-text so that the actors might reflect nuances of meaning in their performances. Cam devoted considerable time during these meetings in eliciting actors understanding of sub-text or explaining it in various terms including noting the "punch-line" of a series of actions or statements. "Punch-line" appeared to be the element which drove home the meaning.

Although work on sub-text was central in Cam's activities with actors, he also worked with them on other related elements of their performance. Rhythm and tempo of a scene was one of these elements.

- That lovely little scene is actually a very nice scene. [Cam is referring to the Wheat Pool scene.] Except for whenever one participant's [paraphrased for purposes of confidentiality] cues come there's this big hole. Cam) Everybody's waiting for her. Ann) S-30-1177.
- You are very uneven. Cam) S-28-1.10.

Elements illuminated thus far emerged as significant to group members' processes because these elements commanded a substantial amount of their attention during this period. However, returning to the stage as "the big picture", Cam appeared to direct many different kinds of changes in addition to those disclosed. His criteria for editing as he described it in mid September emerged from a specific response to something he had experienced. He would make changes if he felt "an over-riding necessity to change" something.

- So whatever you did, do it, cause it looked just fine. Cam) S-28-1140.
- I liked you better Joyce when you crossed right, there. Be almost there looking at the stuff. It looks so much more natural. Cam) S-28-1141.
- I want a little more reaction on "Somebody has to stay back here and uh, do the thing. Muttering... yeah...) S-28-1.99.
- Say it sarcastically straight out. Cam) S-30-1164.

As was the case during earlier meetings, some of his urges to change or edit were based on aesthetic sense such as rhythm and tempo; others were based on technical aspects of theatre such as actors being heard and being seen by the audience.
Throughout these meetings, particularly with the addition of the technical elements of light, sound and props, he was constantly making adjustments.

- Now we have to worry about how we're going to get this stuff on here. Cam) [He is contemplating the problem of getting the props onto a platform which is "Gramma's home". S-30-1167.

In this segment description of group members' interactions has been singularly concerned with interactions between Cam and the actors, for activities at meetings revolved around this relationship. Administrative matters derived direction from needs arising from "the acting". For example, it became apparent that there were some props which would have to be moved and the curtains would have to be opened and closed for specific scenes. A need for additional stage crew emerged: "I need two more bodies... Jo) S-28-(Fieldnotes). These needs arose as much from work related to the play emerging as a whole, as they did from work on individual scenes.

2) Process Of Revision Concerning The Play's Framework

In describing the meetings of mid September, the study distinguished clearly between Cam's work on the play's larger framework and work on individual scenes. Initially, work on individual scenes tended to occur with Cam facilitating actors exploring and working through revisions in the scenes. In contrast, work associated with the play's larger framework was done by Cam alone. He generated scripts which reflected development of that framework.
However, as those meetings continued and individual scenes began to fit into the larger framework, these two apparently distinct areas of work began rapidly to merge. When their emphasis shifted to final editing and polishing, as was the case with this sequence of meetings, it was exceedingly difficult to separate work on individuals' from work on the play's larger framework. Although this segment has retained separate descriptions of these processes, once more, this distinction has served primarily as a heuristic tool.

In terms of work on the larger framework, perhaps most distinguishable at this point was Cam's consideration of which scenes to remove from the play and which might be "saved" through substantial modification.

- We're going to cut the church scene, that little church thing? Cam) Huh Jim) Into two? Jay) In two and then in two until there's a minimal... And unless you come up with something brilliant with "pink pills" that's gone too. Cam) Check. Jay) [This appears to be another way of affirming Cam's statement.] It's just not working at all... It just doesn't have zoom. Cam) S-30-1175-76.

With respect to the latter scene, despite his comments it was Cam who chose to rewrite the scene for the next meeting of October fourth.

- I thought you could have lots of fun with it. Cam) It was. Jay) And it feels so good to come out there minus that damn bowl and nail him in the shoulder. Ann) It felt great. Jay) [Smiling and nodding so that Joyce and Anna laugh.] C-4-1192.

As a new scene it was received with laughter throughout and a round of applause from those in attendance.

One of Cam's key concerns during the mid September meetings was to develop a beginning and the "binder" for the play. He did develop
a beginning for the play as well as the binder or framework. These elements were incorporated into a version of the script, with group members making some changes at the September twenty-third meeting.

Having the beginning and the "binder" in place Cam's concern shifted thereafter to creating an ending for the play.

- In other words, no I haven't. Have you? Cam) Do we need one? Jim) That's one of the things we're working on. Cam) 0-4- 1181.
- Is this going to be the end of the... Ann) No. Cam ) [Jessie and Cam then confer about a poem which she has been writing. She leaves to obtain it and they begin to work on it.]

By September twenty-eighth Cam had alerted group members concerning a shift toward bringing all the individual scenes together. The following quotation used in a prior segment stresses the experience of bringing them together from an actor's perspective of the rhythm and flow of scenes.

- These scenes will connect with one another and you will literally, when the lights come up, you'll feel the transfer of the energy from one scene to the next. And that will very much influence how things go. Cam) S-27-1240.

When they were able to follow one scene with another, this description may have matched the experience. However, in the interim as previously described, there were the constant halts, the constant adjustments to make the play all of one piece. This included changing one scene to mesh with another.

- There scene is so good and so touching that we had to change ours. Ann) [Anna and Lenore discuss the emotional impact of the scene and then Ann describes the process of change involved.] "And so is a good dog." The words are still the same. [Anna refers to her lines in the play.] But the delivery had to be changed because he [Cam] said you couldn't come off of that. Ann) S-28-1133.
Their activities were to focus on change and adjustment in the context of the larger framework until the curtain closed on the final performance. This was a dominant theme in Cam's and group members' interactions.

**Details Of Cam's And Group Members' Emerging Process**

During their meetings of mid September group members' processes of revision to the script began. Since so much of their meeting time was devoted to processes of revision through acting, descriptions of those meetings included details of their process in terms of language they used.

Words used during these three meetings did not appear to alter much from those words and phrases group members had used during earlier meetings. Two major changes appeared to affect their process and language.

First, most participants appeared to experience concerns with time constraints. As indicated previously, Cam made reference to such concerns in the middle meetings of September. It was in this context that their work, exploration, change, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction took place. Second, some actors developed a sense of language and timing more rapidly than others. However, at this point most seemed to respond more quickly to Cam's instructions than they originally had.
1) Language For Stops and Starts/Dissatisfaction

Since group members generally did less exploration in the form of goal directed improvisation throughout these three meetings, their stops and starts tended to be briefer. The pace of their repetition in rehearsing scenes quickened. However, group members then went through more scenes in an evening. The meetings became slightly longer during this period.

Their stops tended to be briefer. On the other hand, there tended to be more stops in the progress of a scene, arising from a variety of concerns outlined. On occasion, however, substantial concerns with content still arose. Based on data analysis, such concerns may have been regarded as a "step" back, a sign of being farther behind. Although no one articulated this experience, tension seemed more apparent when this kind of stop occurred.

- Would you take it back to where it makes sense. Cam) (He is speaking to those doing the "Wheat Pool Scene". 0-4-1183.

The clear intention was to be finished with actually writing the play.

- Let's finish this scene off now. We lost the cue... Cam) S-28-1144.
- What I'd like to do tonight is to set the script so that when I come Monday I can hand out the copies of the final draft so that the technical crew can mark their exact cue times... Cam) 0-4-1180.

2) Dissatisfaction And Being Stuck

Group members' and Cam's dissatisfaction in the mid September meetings was linked with not being satisfied concerning the content of
an individual scene. Their expressions of dissatisfaction did not change during this period. However, their concern appeared to intensify as indicated in data provided with respect to their "starts" and "stops".

3) Satisfaction/ Progress (Certainty)

Their process was not so formal that Cam had to articulate "his seal of approval" for each scene. Moving on from one scene to another suggested some sense of progress with the work, that is, unless a problem was clearly identified. In that case someone undertook to work on the problem.

As scenes became fleshed in, Cam generally did remark on their state.

- It's okay. It has a very natural kind of natural life to it. Cam) S-28-1.62.
- Nice energy in that scene. Cam) S-28-2.20.
- That was actually pretty good. We won't bother doing that again. By the way this is the best scene going right now. Cam) S-30-2.06
- That was actually pretty good. We won't bother doing that one again. Cam) S-30-1166.

This happened with all but a few of the scenes.

4) Language Of Decision-making Processes Concerning Scene Content

Many group members had experienced a breaking point concerning decision-making and content. A description of their breaking point actions in a meeting held on September twenty-third has been provided previously. Thereafter group members demonstrated some resistance in terms of revisions to the script. These will be outlined in the following segment concerning group members' breaking point actions.
during this period. However, for the most part, Cam as director
simply "directed" actors.

As previously described, during these three meetings, group
members did not tend to explore as much as they had in early session.
In addition, there was less time apparently for group members'
breaking point actions during these last three meetings prior to dress
rehearsals.

Emerging Experiences Of Ambiguities And Anomalies
Shifting Shapes In Group Members' Interactions, Breaking Point Actions

Although their tension was to escalate with the coming of dress
rehearsals, many group members began to express experiencing tension
during these meetings. Much of their tension appeared to be directly
associated with time.

- Geez, we're not going to make it out of here by midnight. Ann)
  S-30-1158.
- Anything anyone wants to work on? Cam) My essays. Jay) [He speaks
  of assignments he has to do for university classes.] O-4-1193.

Tension in terms of time constraints became group members' context
from which their other concerns emerged. Such experiences of tension
were not, however, expressed by group members as breaking points.
On the other hand, group members did express an experience of their
meaning being jarred during this period.

- I started learning mine [lines] but they are getting changed.
  S-28-(Fieldnotes).

Major among their concerns was ambiguity concerning changes, and
revisions to their scenes. With rehearsals came some line changes.
More importantly when considering whether to memorize lines, they
experienced ongoing uncertainty as to whether those lines might be changed.

In contrast with group members’ delighted response to the first script and the first revision, at this point after several revisions they no longer expressed a sense of excitement, but a sense of uncertainty regarding what they were to do in order to prepare. Jessie’s question of “what to do in between” was one example of their concerns. Revisions became change associated with uncertainty rather than exploration.

- Well you don’t know what’s going on? I don’t either. Jay) [These statements followed a suggestion for changing the punch-line in the scene.] S-28-1146.
- Is that my line? Participant) [It is difficult to determine who the speaker was.] 0-4-.18.

Then they were asked to do without their scripts. Group members were "losing" access to their script amidst a welter of adjustments.

- No script. I’m doing real swell here trying to sort out coughing at the same time. Ann] S-28-1148.

Although group members who were acting did express concern, generally they did so quietly as an aside to another actor, or they spoke of their concerns indirectly. During these three meetings there were no breaking point actions. However, some group members began to express resistance to some directions. They did so through various means, including lack of involvement in certain activities and in terms of responses with some humour attached.

- Are we going to use it. Before we start running around looking for it? Participant) S-28-(Fieldnotes).
- [Cam was in the process of questioning historical accuracy in one scene] "Diaper pins?" Cam) [There was much noise with Bill muttering.] "Who cares?" Cam] 0-4-1189. [Cam calls break soon after.]
- You said last time you wouldn't have to do that cause you would hear him anyway. Cam) I lied. Jes) [She laughs]. S-30-1168.

Some also began to speak up and support or respond to concerns on behalf of each other.

- Say it sarcastically straight out... [Cam is speaking to Loretta who is having difficulty being heard given that she has her back to the audience.] I don't know what I'm going to do with you Loretta, you're upstaging yourself. Cam) But she's in the worst position. Len) [She has been advised on occasion that she is doing the same thing.] S-30-1164.

Resistance was not the only manifestation of tension for group members. Quotations relied upon in previous segments indicated that the men in particular found improvising physical movement a way of releasing "energy", "I'm a fidgeter" (Jim, S-30-1178). They took advantage of breaks or lulls in group members' interactions to improvise on their own. Many of their improvisations appeared to be spirited and exuberant and not about much else. However, during these sets of meetings a few of their improvisations also appeared to acquire a satirical quality about them.

- Build the suspense. Bill) Keep it going. Jim) [They are "directing" Jay who is playing the piano during the break.] O-4-1190.

Notably, most of the men involved in the project began to improvise more and more. On at least one occasion, Jim walked between rows of seats saying, "Excuse me. Excuse me," as though people were sitting there. Their "noisier" improvisations caused consternation for some of the women particularly during discussions.

In addition to "restless improvising" (or "wrestling" improvisations) group members also began to play some pranks on other
members. For example, on one occasion Jay leapt out at one or two other participants and at me when we were entering into the darkened theatre. The following is an example of one member "teasing" another member with respect to administrative meetings and matters.

- I'm pretty sure we'll sell out. [Eileen has been asking everybody whether they have all of the tickets they want in case more tickets may not be available.] Eil) ... I didn't know that. See I haven't been at... Len) The business meetings? Jes) [There have been no business meetings. Jessie is "leading Lenore on. After another minute or so Jessie tells her there haven't been any. I suspect that Jessie is also hinting at the fact that the burden of this work has fallen to Eileen.]

Tension and concern with changes and ambiguity in the face of time constraints were thus expressed in group members' actions through a number of different manifestations. With one exception most of their unease did not shift into full-fledged breaking points. If there was such a shift this was experienced primarily by a few individuals and their actions did not emerge as an urgent focus for all group members, at the forefront of meetings.

1) Breaking Point Clarity

Given their purposely hushed behaviour, there is little data to evince a struggle among group members concerning costumes. Yet, there was an accumulation of vague references and a shift in plans which indicated a muted breaking point for some group members.

In spite of having an ongoing sense that some group members were experiencing tension on the topic, my first concrete impression of such tension came when I volunteered a few articles of clothing for costumes prior to the first of the dress rehearsals. I asked the
stage manager to whom I should offer them. She indicated that I might "diplomatically" take them around to the actors to see who might need them rather than look to any one being in charge of costumes. Her tone of voice and unusual smile suggested that there was something out of the ordinary occurring.

2) **Indications Of Discomfort**

In the first meetings of this stage, some group members were beginning to experience a need to make a decision about roles associated with organizing costumes for the play. One person in particular offered to commence work in this area:

- Eileen, do you know what costumes, like what they wore? Participant) Yes. Eil) Okay, is there anything that has to be sewed? Participant) It all depends on how it's presented. If it's done using a scrim, I think that a lot of scenes won't demand a whole lot of special costuming. Group scenes could be in the shadows something like that. Cam) S-5-864.
- Cause, the reason I was asking Eileen cause if you know something definite, I could start sewing stuff. Participant) S-5-865.

However, by the third week of September no formal announcement had been made at any meetings with respect to costumes. Whatever decision had been made was conveyed informally. It was at a meeting near the end of September that another member made reference to responsibility for costumes. When I inquired of Eileen what had happened she spoke of a misunderstanding about responsibility for them. (Our conversation was informal and unrecorded.)
3) Response

An apparent outcome of group members' "muted breaking point" was to have the participant who offered to sew costumes create some of the costumes and then to have her oversee those costumes obtained by others. Group members contributed to one another's wardrobe.

- We're doing that on our own, right? Jay) Yeah, everyone's sort of responsible for their own. Ann) Less or more... Jay) [I interpreted his manner as one of making a joke in reversing the vague phrase "more or less".] Yeah, just check it out with Lenore. Len) S-28-1149.

Group members' occasional asides concerning this misunderstanding added to the "complex whole".

There was one partial exception to a muted quality in breaking points during this time. Confusion and concern with respect to roles and associated responsibility, was to have much broader ramifications related to actors' involvement in the project.

1) Breaking Point Clarity

- Tell her either she's going to commit herself to come here or we'll find someone else. (Pause) I shouldn't say — tell her that... It shouldn't come from me. Participant) S-30-06.

On September thirtieth after the meeting had begun, group members realized that neither Jay nor Allie were at the meeting. Between the two actors there were few scenes in which one of them was not a character.

2) Indications Of Discomfort

Since mid September Cam had expressed growing concern with having insufficient time. By the evening of September thirtieth his concern
was heightened when it appeared that they would not be able to proceed.

- We can't do a damn thing without... Cam) Alexandra. [Eileen and Debbie both finish Cam's sentence, using Allie's formal name.] Or Jay. I mean there's things that couldn't be done. Ann) Can't do anything that needs work. Cam) It's already 7:00. Joy) S-30-1154.

In particular people spoke with considerable concern for Allie's absence for she played one of the two main characters. "Her" scenes were among the first in the play. In addition, it was these scenes which comprised the play's larger framework and these were being adjusted more than others. They required more time because of this. It was the second time Allie had not been available recently.

While Eileen was attempting to trace Allie's whereabouts, Jay arrived about forty-five minutes late. He apologized most formally almost in the style of an announcement. In observing the occasion, I had the impression that he was making an apology as one "professional" to his peers.

- I'd like to apologize to all you guys and to Cam for screwing up tonight. Jay) S-30-1157.

His statement appeared to reinforce a sense of gravity about such acts of lateness as being "unprofessional".

Soon after it was discovered that Allie had not been aware of the rehearsal. Eileen, having reached her by telephone, asked that Allie attend as soon as possible. It is difficult to tell what transpired for Eileen did not describe her conversation with Allie entirely. She returned to say that Allie was baby-sitting and could not simply leave
that job. At that point Cam asked what alternatives there were. He asked whether anyone might take over the role since they had to proceed to work on it.

Eileen then contacted Helen, another theatre club member who had indicated some interest in assisting with the project. Without knowing all of the details, Helen appeared within half an hour and began to read the part from the script.

3) Response

This decision to change cast members happened so swiftly, the implications of having to effect the transition emerged as focus for group members' interactions thereafter. In contrast with the situation concerning Lyle, there was no formal endeavor to discuss the situation. There was no quiet shuffling concern expressed. Data collection took the form of observing people's actions for they did not appear to speak of the circumstance even in informal discussion or asides. They continued to work relatively intensely on whatever they had begun to do prior to that decision.

A few did express some concern in interviews after the project concluded. Some expressed their wish that Allie return to the club. (Allie did work on another project within a month of this one). Many indicated in the interviews that it was unfortunate but necessary given the timeframe. One person, however, suggested that there was a problem with the time demands on people.

- It's the time. They just couldn't take the time to do it. [Loretta is referring to others who had been involved in the club's first production but indicated that they could not be
involved in this one.) And I think that's where the trouble's going to run into, for a lot of people. And that's why I thought with Allie... They're going to run into that from here on in. People are really tired. Lor) O-4-p.11.

In the moment they simply redirected themselves to assisting Helen's entry into the project. Cam inquired shortly after the incident about whether there was sufficient time to insert Allie's name into the program to acknowledge her contribution to creation of the play.

When Helen arrived, there was an immediate shift in focus for some. A few group members began to work through the logistics of replacing Allie. Lenore asked how they would proceed.

- Will she be put in all of Allie's parts? [Paraphrased] Len) S-30-1159.
- Just read for now. Cam) [He is speaking to Helen specifically, for everyone else was supposed to have their lines memorized for that meeting.] S-30-1167.

Anna "tutored" Helen describing what to do.

Cam began to some extent where he had with the other actors, attempting to assist them in becoming "emotionally" comfortable and clear, developing and reshaping a particular role for the person. However, once again, their "steps" were compressed. For example, initially he commenced with advising Helen of developed sub-text rather than having her explore sub-text as an actor.

- Unless you'd rather...Hel) Ah, I'd rather you do what you'd like to do. What feels comfortable. — Why... First, why are you here and what's going on? You obviously feel free... Make tea for yourself here. You're not really bored. That's the subtext. But you really want to talk and she picks that up. You're not responding like you should. Something has to be not quite right... You wouldn't actually state what's bothering you. Cam) Okay, now I understand. Hel) S-30-1160-62.

Much of the work, then, for Helen constituted working from a script. However, Helen was to experience some improvised work.
She worked with Anna and Cam on developing a conclusion to their characters' conversation and on creating a few transition points. As well, she and Jay improvised a piece for the Telephone Scene which has been described previously. Despite some opportunity to improvise, her experience of improvisational process was different from those attending earlier, for much of the work at this point was rehearsal-like, the steps compressed.

With the coming of Helen there were to be no more "Variations On A Team", no more substitutes, no more new group members. However, group members continued to experience a multitude of changes and adjustments.

At this point, there was a weekend break. Thereafter, group members would meet daily for dress rehearsals and then the three performances. After the October fourth meeting, Cam forewarned some of an impending stretch:

- Next week is going to be a very... Cam) [He is attempting to speak to those attending the bar after the meeting. Several are chatting intensely and do not here him at first. Eileen catches their attention.] Listen up, gang. Eil)... really fun, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. Cam) Are we getting tense? Bill) [He is smiling.] It's going to be really tense. You're going to have a headache for three days. Cam) And its six thirty from now on. Right? Ann) And not only that we won't have a chance to have a drink after the rehearsal because the bars will be closed. Cam) [This is a reference to group members' having an opportunity to unwind after the intensity of their acting interchanges.] 0-4-1405-06.

His predictive description was to reflect the experience of most.
Emerging Patterns Related To Group Members Paradigmatic Actions
Tension Between The Two Helixes

During meetings of this stage, from August thirtieth to October fourth, group members' paradigmatic interactions reflect a quality of continuity. During this period, their shifts between a "get something concrete" approach to a "go with it" approach gradually lost an abrupt quality. In these meetings group members' dual approaches merged to the extent that tension between these approaches changed to group members' coordinated efforts in using them.

In the first two Act-Plays, substantial detail was afforded concerning patterns of shifts emerging from group members' paradigmatic interactions. Described as strands of a double helix, these patterns were outlined in terms of three sub-patterns:
a) Patterns Internal To Meetings; b) Patterns Unfolding For Entire Meeting; and c) Patterns Describing Changes In Meetings Over Time. These patterns grew less distinct, however, given group members merging rather than shifting approaches as observed. Since these three sub-patterns "sub-merged", as substitute the study provides a composite summary.

The second Act-Play, "Anchored Anomie" posited that group members' diminished shifting was linked with participants' reduction of ambiguity. The study proposed that group members' reduced experience of ambiguity was related to their emerging paradigm of theatre. It was suggested that during the series of meetings in mid August group members began to develop a paradigm of theatre, aspects of which they came to hold in common.
One impact of sharing at least some common paradigmatic basis for theatre was that group members' paradigmatic responses became more consistent with common intent in activities. The second Act-Play provided an example of this. Through group members' joint experience with improvising, their emerging concept of improvisation provided them with a meaning-in-action home for many members' "go with it" approach.

In this stage, descriptions of group members' interactions have emphasized their sense of impetus toward completion of the play through acting. This suggests meaning-in-action emphasis on "get something concrete". However, to the extent that improvisation for the play's content and for tension release (at least for the men) was still important in this stage, group members relied on "go with it" approaches. In other words, their impetus "rested" with both helix strands of their paradigmatic actions coiling "cooperatively".

During this period, for the most part group members ostensibly had a sense of both getting something concrete and going with it. They had some opportunity to improvise and to explore for the first three meetings. Although their exploring after the first three meetings was impeded by a concern for time and a shift in structure to "rehearsal" and the beginnings of "polishing performance", at that point they were obtaining a strong sense of "getting something concrete". Group members received a script. More and more scenes emerged from their work. They began to rehearse.

Within their meetings during this period, there was one major "test" of both group members' emerging paradigm of theatre and their
reliance on coordinating their double approach to interacting within that paradigm. This test was their breaking point experiences arising out of changes in decision-making process previously described. Even this test, however, served to crystallize their theatre paradigm.

Group members' breaking point actions in the meeting of September twenty-third emerged as an attempt to come to terms with a distinction in theatre paradigm between group members' and Cam. Strikingly, whatever commonly held aspects of theatre groups held, paradigmatically, they had begun to resemble Cam's as described in the first Act-Play, "Sustained Uncertainty". However, one large distinction erupted as a result of changes in decision-making process regarding content of the play.

In the August breaking point meeting, Cam had delineated between internal actions, those activities reserved within the group, and external actions, those activities for people outside the group — the community as audience. However, where he drew these lines and where some group members drew them clearly differed. Where some group members drew them affected their paradigm of theatre. Appealing to a specific audience was a priority for them.

Cam's paradigm of theatre as previously described did not have such a focal point. He was more consistently concerned with actors experiencing creation of meaning so that their experience in creating meaning for themselves could be universally experienced by audiences. It should be noted that Cam was not entirely alone in his convictions as one group members previously quoted declaration indicated:

- Like I really don't know Goetheim that well. Do you think that
some people might be offended by some of this? Bill) I don't think they will. Len) I think we've watered it down to the point where there's nothing in it. It's got no sting. Jim) S-13-1085.

On the occasion of September twenty-third, however, despite some differences of opinion with the group, actors reviewed the play for content about which they were concerned. Their paradigmatic approach of getting something concrete ceased to drive them entirely and allowed them to jeopardize their relationship with Cam on paradigmatic criteria concerning whether the "something concrete" was acceptable.

Their concerns and actions were an echo of their meeting on August fourteenth. This time, however, there was no question that they at least had something concrete with which to work. In this meeting they continued to rely on some "go with it" meaning-in-action as they had come to rely on the approach for improvising in the first few meetings. They used this "go with it approach" to arrive at substitutions in content for the play. With this step of independently working on the play to revise it, their paradigmatic actions became more tightly coiled — meshed together.

There is one more noteworthy pattern which emerged as related to these two helix strands of meaning. With the growing number of men involved in the project, the study began to detail actions more common to men than women participating in the project.

The men often continued to improvise during breaks, before and after meetings, and throughout one or two meetings in the earlier sessions of this stage. Their actions suggest a strong orientation to the "go with it" approach with an interesting purpose. Relationship
between these two strands varied, then, to some extent depending on a group members' orientation.

- But Jim or Jay will go with whichever direction the direction is going. Whatever's happening out there, they do. And, and they're okay with that. You know, they... Uh remember the night when we were testing the wind? ... The sound effects for the wind. And two of them were wrestling on the stage or something. And then, all of a sudden the speakers came on with the wind. And instantly they're up battling this strong wind — holding on to each other [she laughs] and stuff. They can just go with whatever's going on. Eil) N-27-p.8.

- I don't know. I guess it's just a, a sense of, of self in that they're willing to give whatever direction the thing is going. And yet, can somehow, somehow it ends up going in the direction they wanted it to. Which is really interesting thing. When you watch it go around in a circle. Eil) N-27-p.8.

- But as far as needing direction, well this, — tell them to be a tree and they were a tree. You know, it was really, and [pause] they, they seemed quite, they seemed quite easy to accept, or willing to go along with the way things were coming out, you know. Eil) N-27-p.8.

As work on the play continued, the phrase "wing it" emerged. The phrase was almost in exclusive use by the men involved with the project. Use of the phrase included not only those who were acting, but Al, the lighting person.

The next section "Emerging Structure" proffers additional consideration of this general difference in orientation between the men and women in the project as an "emerging subgroup". The section begins, however, with a larger context of subgroup, group members' relationships external to the group and the project.

EMERGING STRUCTURE

During this set of meetings tremendous change occurred in terms of group members' interactions related to their emerging senses of
structure. Their interactions and statements suggested that they experienced a developing structure commonly held. For example, although most could not provide details concerning a process of improvisation, most expressed a common sense of excitement and the sense of being able to do "it". They continued to step out onto the stage and to improvise and to act with Cam's direction.

As the play progressed toward dress rehearsals, their interactions indicated a mutual sense of structure shifting from improvisational work to "rehearsing", a notion more consistent with what group members experienced as "traditional" theatre. This section considers that transition.

Group members also appeared during this time to have come to hold in common some process for addressing breaking points. The September twenty-third meeting wherein they reviewed the play indicated reliance on process they had used in an earlier breaking point meeting.

The focus of this section is not entirely one of process, however. Previous Act-Plays have explored changes in structure in terms of "parts of the whole". For the purposes of offering broader context, this section continues to provide an overview of many aspects of changes experienced by group members.

EMERGING SUBGROUPS

Within the first two Act-Plays, group members' experience with links between this theatre project and the theatre club were explored. During this time, connections with a provincial association, a larger framework extending beyond the community were strengthened.
a) Provincial Association

As indicated in the previous Act-Plays, there was a larger context within which the project had emerged, that is the Goetheim Community Theatre Club. It was during this time that group members who worked toward developing the Theatre Club were able to make direct contact with representatives of a provincial theatre association.

Two people attended the meeting of August thirtieth to discuss future contact with Eileen and Jessie. Although they did not participate in the session which consisted mainly of participants engaged in improvisation and acting, they did spend a brief time in discussion with Jessie as club president. I was not present at their informal discussion. However, Jessie indicated at a later date that the Club eventually received an invitation to participate in a provincial theatre festival. Apparently she and Eileen received compliments on the group's initiative as well from the attending representatives.

What was most interesting at the time in terms of group members was that they did not hesitate to continue with their improvisational work and their acting despite the presence of "outsiders" to the group.

b) Club Structure

This was to be the final period during which group members would seek additional assistance from other theatre club members. The Theatre Club's annual meeting was held in mid September. At that time group members solicited assistance. It is not clear from data
gathered whether those who sold tickets and ushered were from the Theatre Club. Individuals who took on these tasks were not among those who attended the annual meeting. Data suggests, rather, that Eileen contacted these women at a later date.

c) Internal and External Structure

"Anchored Anomie" detailed group members' growing sense of group entity. That Act-Play also recorded Cam's statements distinguishing between actions for themselves in the group and actions for an audience. During that set of meetings and the first meetings of this stage group members continued to make such distinctions. As previously described, however, there was some uncertainty as to where to draw the line.

Some thought wholly in terms of appealing to what they had come to experience as the community's culture.

- And that's why we have to keep everything plain and simple and easy... It's got to be something that everybody's going to relate to. Len) S-6-994-95.
- Just like, you can't make fancy... It's got to be meat and potatoes and vegetable and don't put any sauce on the meat or anything. Len) S-6-1000-03.
- Should we have hung him? Cam) How much time do you get for suicide? Eil [People laugh.] People didn't know. We put that in [into a potential scene for the play]. Lyl) Oh yeah, that would really go over swell. Ann) S-5-855.

Others expressed interest in going beyond that as indicated in Jim's concern with not "watering down" the play's "sting" (S-13-1085).

As time became more and more limited, Cam had less time to explore and consult first with the larger group, and then even with
the actors in the scenes. Group members' questions about where to draw internal and external lines regarding content and acting escalated to breaking point experience for several. A more detailed account of their experiences of breaking point have been described within a previous segment. Significant for this segment's purposes was group members' sense of structure.

Members who had not met as a group for several meetings, had the opportunity to come together and determine what they were prepared to do. In this manner, for many they reestablished "the group" as the decision-making body to some extent. They also reaffirmed a relatively commonly held sense of the community, although there may have been some disagreement among group members in terms of strategies in their relationship with the community.

These concerns about the nature of their relationship with the community did not end with their experienced breaking point of September twenty-third. Dress rehearsals and performances which were now looming would keep this issue at the forefront of group members' meaning-in-action.

b) Demographics Of Those In "The Group"

During the set of meetings from August thirtieth to October fourth two people, Lyle, and Allie ceased to be involved with the project. Four others, Jo, Arthur, Bill, and Helen joined during this time. With these changes there were some shifts in demographics within the group.
**Familial Relationships:**

Although several new participants joined the project during this time, there were no changes in the familial relationships among participants. In terms of marital status, when the project began a majority of the participants were married. However, since all who joined the project during the all-day workshop and those who joined during this period were single, the ratio had changed to a balance of seven group members who were single, seven having families. (These numbers exclude the two people who were no longer with the project.)

**Gender Grouping:**

With Bill's arrival the number of male group members rose to five, six including Cam were involved with the project. When Jo joined the project as a stage manager the number of female group members reached nine, ten with myself as participant observer.

Although the group still consisted of a majority of women, with additional men joining they appeared to establish a sense of their own group. Once improvisational work began, two different sets of behaviours were observed among the men and the women.

Particularly the men who were acting continued to "improvise" during breaks, during discussions and after meetings. While Jessie and Allie were observed participating occasionally in a faked fight, dancing or singing, or indulging in small pranks, the other women rarely participated in such activity.

The women's responses to the men's activities varied. During the final interviews, at least one of the participants referred to the
men's activities as "being hyper". Depending on the lateness of the hour, the sense of urgency concerning performance, and depending upon the person, a response might be a laugh, a shaking of the head, a disapproving look, or a reproof. Noisy behaviour such as drumming on assorted substances was rarely "overlooked" or greeted kindly.

These exchanges indicate emerging differences in group members' actions, based at this point primarily along gender lines.


- What do you find enjoyable about working on this particular play? Mad) The people, actors. They have to have a creative mind. So naturally they come up with some of the Wittiest comments in the world. And they do some of the corniest things because they have to be creative to do what they do. Like Jay throwing himself on the ground and other things like that. It's just so funny. [He laughs.] Al) 0-4-p.14.

- They can just go with whatever's going on. And uh, I think Jay's a talented person. And I think Jim, and I, I think that Jim is too. And so, they have this whole sense about themselves. Where they can [pause], they can keep themselves... I don't know. I guess it's just a, a sense of, of self in that they're willing to give whatever direction the thing is going. And yet, can somehow, somehow it ends up going in the direction they wanted it to. Which is really interesting thing. When you watch it go around in a circle. I'll explain that. Um. [Pause.] Well, actually I guess it's easy to explain. It is obvious that people respected Jim's and Jay's talent. So it's really easy to listen to them or to let them work it through the way they want. [Pause] But as far as needing direction, well this, — tell them to be a tree and they were a tree. You know, it was really, and [pause] they, they seemed quite, they seemed quite easy to accept, or willing to go along with the way things were coming out, you know. Eil) N-27-p.8.

- And, and he [Eileen refers to Jay] said, "Don't worry Eileen. You know, and he was, I think that was really typical of all of the guys. The — all three of the guys. that, and, and Al, too, that. Oh — they had no panic about things getting —they, they just seemed to feel so in contr — either so in control of it or — had maybe... I, I could not speak for them so I don't know. They give you the impression that they were either so in control, or they didn't look at it as, something that was totally, ea — totally earthshaking. I mean, "if we get it done, we get it done. And if we don't get it done, what the hell. We did the best we
could sort of thing. There was, you could really see that in the
guys. And I think that kept everybody really level. Um. They, it
was probably a big help. Can you imagine that nine people [Eileen
speaks of the cast at an earlier time] who got into a panic. You
know [she laughs] it is enough to have a few. That's uh, actually they were really very good with it — you know, as far
as emotions and keeping them in check and stuff. Eil) N-27-p.7.

This distinction between men's and women's activity in the
project did not appear to explicate entirely group members'
experienced breaking points with Iyle's. His "disruptions" as they
were described by some were not improvisations in quite the same
physical style. Based on data analysis they took the form of jokes
and comments made to those around him as commentary or as in direct
response to the group's main activities.

Age and Occupation:

Although two people ceased to be involved in the project, with
the four new people being variously, eighteen, twenty-one, twenty-six,
and thirty-one, the group's average age shifted once more slightly
toward mid-twenties. However, the broad range of group members' ages
did not change throughout the project being from fifteen to forty-two.

Those joining the project affected the composition of the group
in terms beyond changing the average age and the balance of gender
groupings. Those joining the project provided more diversity to group
members' spectrum of occupations, which now included a teacher and a
librarian.

Subgroup Orientation To Theatre—Group:

The "General Context" described participants as bringing with
them at least four different orientations to the project. Emerging
from fieldwork data analysis, their orientations were as follows:
a) Organizational Developers (including a P.R. Person);
b) Socially-Motivated Persons; c) Serious Actors; and d) Pranksters.

With those joining the project during this set of meetings, three participants were oriented towards organizational development, three were "serious actors", two were "prankster" in orientation, and six might be described as "socially motivated". With this last set of people a relative balance among group members' diverse orientations shifted toward a majority of those "socially motivated". However, this shift in orientation must be considered in light of group members' breaking point actions and their paradigmatic actions, their efforts to hold in common a paradigmatic sense of theatre.

One final note on the matter of group members' orientation to the project is in order. A majority of the first set of interviews were held during this period between August thirtieth and October fourth. Through reflection in the interviews a few group members began to consider explicitly their own orientation and differences in orientation among themselves.

- I've never thought about it really. I'm just trying to figure out why I don't think about the acting — or why don't consider it important or whatever, because obviously it is to most people. (Jim) 0-1-p.29.

In fact, interview data was a rich source of data concerning group members' differences in orientation to the project.

This period, then, with the number of changes in members within the group also brought shifts in orientations. However, after
September thirtieth, although others contributed to the project briefly, handing out programs at performances, taking tickets at the door, raising the curtain during performances, there were to be no more changes in the "core" participants. As described previously, despite changes to and for group members during this period, newcomers were ostensibly "absorbed" by a group that did exist rather than sparking off a sense of reformulation as a whole new group.

With the increase in the number of meetings per week, the greater challenge was to ensure the presence of those needed. In addition, the sense of group was challenged with a shift to rehearsal structure requiring small group interaction. Toward the end of this period dynamics among group members depended to some extent on the constellation of those rehearsing.

EMERGING ROLES

Once more, during this span of meetings between the end of August and the beginning of October, group members' primary concern was focused on theatre roles associated with creating and preparing to perform the play. They experienced some changes or "refinements" in emerging roles and new roles emerged during this period.

Emerging Theatre Roles

This segment begins with a description of roles which had begun to emerge for group members prior to this set of meetings. The segment concludes with brief descriptions of those roles emerging through group members' interactions during this time.
1) **Emerging Refinements Of Director's Role**

Fourteen of the group members' meetings have been included in "this stage". Changes emerging through group members' interactions in these meetings were more gradual and subtle than they had been in early meetings when group members were struggling with anomic conditions. One of these gradual shifts was described in some detail in terms of group members moving from creating the play to concentration on polishing actors' performances.

Throughout this time, Cam's role was shifting both in terms of directing their activity and responding to issues linked with time constraints. Ostensibly, group members did understand the multiple nature of his activities concerning facilitating their improvisations and both creating and editing the script.

- See we've got ourselves a writer and a director all in one. I think we're damn lucky. I'm really glad you're here. I really am. Ann) S-6-938-40. (Bar)

Cam had indicated at the outset of this series of meetings that he expected to facilitate their improvisational processes and revision of their work. Facilitating these processes required development of a number of steps which included sensitivity to actors' emotional state.

- I just try to be as demanding, demand the same kind of respect for them as I would expect, as I would want. I don't like being laughed at even though something funny has happened. It breaks my concentration. It destroys a little bit of me. Cam) S-6-p.3.
- I can work with people like that. It doesn't really bother me. But it does bother other people. And since this isn't really... I don't have much to say about it. Cam) S-6-p.4.

The latter statement Cam made in an interview when considering the issue with Lyle. With that statement he expressed a self-defined limitation concerning his role.
In addition to facilitating group members' improvisations, he also expressed explicitly that a chief aspect of his role included creating the larger framework for the play. He was "to string" the scenes together, and having done that, he indicated that he expected group members to have an opportunity to direct.

- Next week I want to nail down a script. So that you guys can--so I only have to come here once a week for the next three weeks and just oversee what you've got. Cause you guys are going to rehearse your own scenes by yourselves. Each take turns with a scene and direct it. I'll come in and string them together... There's a couple scenes missing. Cam) A-30-814.

Apparently within a short span of time, less than a week, he had begun to experience pressures of time. Consideration of how much time improvisational processes were absorbing may have caused reassessment reflected in this conversation.

- If I were to be here all the time... I would let you guys write everything. Cam) Okay. Ann) Because you would have the time to go through that process absolutely. But because I'm in the position I'm in, I can afford to short cut it a bit. Because the essence of the scenes are all there. All I did was make some bridges and add a bit of colour. Cam) S-6-941-42.

Based on data analysis reflected in descriptions of "Emerging Patterns Of Process", the script was not "nailed down". Cam instead became involved in a long process of revisions. These revisions included both guiding actors through "improvising and acting" as well as editing on paper. Cam began to develop criteria for these emerging processes:

- A large number of my decisions are simply made on the technical aspects. What can we do technically with the talent that we have, to tell this story adequately and clearly. And uh, ... so a great many decisions are based on that. Cam) S-16-p.5.
He began to work on sub-text, and on transitions, in the play and a variety of other elements as previously described. This, too, he expressed as his role.

- Okay, in a general situation or a general scene, people know where they want to go. They know what their ultimate goal is and in trying to get there they jump important moments. They jump from moment to moment. They miss the connection and those connections are transition. If you were in a play — they would jolt, they would startle you and you'd wonder why the hell are they doing this? It would bother you. And those are the transitions. And they are what a writer's craft is...largely composed of. Cam) S-6-p.3. (Interview)

However, as Cam shifted toward being directive as a director and chief editor as a writer, there were implications for those taking on acting and producing roles.

2) Emerging Refinements Of Producer's Role

Interestingly, Cam spoke of the producer's role as one in which there was tremendous amplitude. He indicated that in his experience people acting in the role of producer had substantially different approaches to the position.

- Particularly if the producer is a very active producer and in this case there is, Eileen. Then she can do whatever she likes. Cam) S-6-p.4.

Cam suggested that in his theatre experiences ambiguity was associated with the producer's role generally. In the instance of the project, there was additional ambiguity.

The role of producer as recorded in their Theatre Club materials was based on a particular paradigm of theatre. (See the Appendices, Section One for this record.) Group members' were still endeavoring to attain a common paradigm during these processes. However, as the
study has indicated previously, it was tremendously difficult to define any role without a clearer sense of what process would be used.

Group members' discussions during their breaking point meeting of August fourteenth created some assumptions concerning the producer's role. Eileen promised then to take over administrative duties. As was the case with Cam's role, as new concepts and tasks emerged out of their exploratory process, and as time pressures became more immediate, lack of clarity concerning decision-making process reemerged concerning the producer's role.

Given that people came to Eileen with their concerns and complaints, data analysis indicates that she adopted certain assumptions about their intent. Manifestly, Eileen interpreted their actions to meant that in her capacity as producer, they expected her to do something about their concerns and complaints. This was the basis on which she asked Lyle to leave the project. It was in this context as well that her influence was brought to bear in holding the breaking point meeting of September twenty-third. She did not generally bring administrative work to the meetings.

Eileen had expressly undertaken to keep administrative work out of the way of group members so that they would not be distracted. In addition, based on the rehearsal orientation to meetings, there was frequently no place to bring matters for group discussion during this period. It was also during this set of meetings that Eileen announced she would not act in the scenes she had helped to create. On
September sixteenth she announced that only actors were to sit on the stage. She thereby lost links with acting which she had maintained until mid September.

Some became disconcerted with decision-making process related to the producer's role during the situation with Lyle and even with organization of the breaking point meeting. Eileen found herself distanced from many group members toward the end of this series of meetings. Unresolved issues concerning responsibility for costumes was another instance of ambiguity associated with emerging roles. Eileen was frequently linked with this ambiguity, again through group members' ambiguity concerning the role of the producer.

3) Emerging Refinements Of Actors-Writers' Role

Through a series of group members' interactions actors-writers' either "emerged into" actors or ceased being an actor, becoming defined instead in another role as Eileen had done. A series of cues led to actors as "cast members". There was a photo session so that those in "the cast" and the director would have their pictures in the programs to be handed out at the performances.

- Everybody in the cast get up there okay? [Photo session for the program.]

In addition, as indicated by mid September only "members of the cast" were to sit in the circle on stage.

When cues suggested actors as a group, the spectrum of their activities narrowed. Their role as audience and contributors to
improvisational process decreased with the declination of that process. Whereas, at the all-day workshop and the first two meetings group members had made suggestions when watching improvisations, thereafter this practice no longer continued.

- You are about to get engaged that's all you want to know. Joy) S-5-878-79.
- [Anna is describing her actions as an audience member to those doing an improvisation which later came to be entitled the "Wheat Pool" scene. I yelled at you at one point and Cam turned around and said, "Shhh!" I said, "Isn't that just like Lenore? She's right into that. Ann) S-6-991.

Even actors' involvement in revisions of their own characters' lines changed. The prior section documented in detail group members' breaking point and their actions related to the question of decision-making concerning their actions and lines as actors. This fine balance was crucial. Anna described the tension between the director's role and actor's role related to this process. Her description as previously noted assumed an eerie quality of foreshadowing.

- And yet if your views of what was happening with our things totally negative or opposite to ours, I don't... we couldn't accept it. Ann) S-6-964-65.

Actors' roles became separated through their interactions in these meetings from writing elements. The shift to a rehearsal format with scheduling scenes and Cam directing their acting, appeared to solidify these roles. They began to focus on polishing for performance which entailed at this point a tremendous capacity for adjustment. This adjustment included not only revised lines but the introduction of the technical side of theatre.
4) Role Crystallizations. Technical, Backstage Roles:
Stage Manager, Stage Crew And Wardrobe

With the introduction of the technical side emerging the need for a technical crew also emerged. Cam brought this to Eileen's attention initially, based on estimating stages of progress.

- In two weeks we will need a stage manager. Cam) [He was speaking to Eileen at the time.] A-30-(Fieldnotes).

Eileen asked Jo to attend nine days later. Although she rarely spoke at meetings, she did respond in the interviews to questions about her role:

- And what does the stage manager do? Mad) I'm just learning that. What does the stage manager do? I really don't know... What am I learning so far?... I've learned that they work quite closely with the sound and lighting crew. And they're either in the booth cueing them in the booth or when the lights go down in the back cueing them. Plus working the stage crew, the props, everything else that gets on stage. As far as I know in our position, getting props together and stuff like that and be more -do props or whatever. And that's all I've learned. Jo) S-28-p.8.

When Jo attended, her presence as stage manager prompted additional discussion concerning technical work. Shortly thereafter, Cam and Jim spoke of commencing the backstage work.


Although Al had begun work with Cam and Jim on the lighting soon after the all-day workshop, their attention had been focused on upgrading the lighting. Cam had swiftly discovered a problem with the stage lighting. There were dark patches. Some light bulbs were burnt out, some were not aimed properly.
- But you can notice it sometimes when people are walking. All of
  a sudden they get darker and that's bad news. You've got to have
  these sections overlapping enough — that they are overlapping.
  Cause they are distinct areas. Al) 0-4-p.4.
- But once I get these set, it shouldn't have to change.
  Al) 0-4-p.5.

As their work advanced toward polishing for performance nights,
lighting for specific scenes had to be explored, determined, noted,
and practiced. This aspect of his role was emerging for Al when he
was interviewed. His description refers to a process of creation and
a process of precision.

- And if you — especially this play — it takes a lot of
  organizing. You've got to always be one scene ahead of what's
  playing... Because there's so much changing, going on from one
  part of the stage to the next. And almost every scene has a
different lighting set up... lighting different areas. And then
there's the scrim — requiring different lighting. Al) 0-4-p.2.
- I've got to have a script in front of me because for one thing
  they're always changing the lines. [He laughs.]... Oh yeah, I
  got to know when they say their last word. Bang! The lights got
to come off right now. And if I don't know what the last word
is... it looks kinda dumb. Al) 0-4-p.1.

In spite of having prior experience as a lighting person, he
indicated that in those earlier experiences, the lights were either
"on" or "off". The first stage of upgrading the lights and the
experimentation and the ongoing adjustments were new experiences for
him.

In addition to lighting and sound, as their work progressed, it
became apparent that more pairs of hands were needed to open various
sets of curtains, to flip switches, and to move sets and props.
Having announced at one meeting that she needed two more people, at
the next meeting Jo "had" a stage crew consisting of two youths,
apparently from the high school doing these tasks.
Finally, the question of wardrobe was raised in early September. However, the question came up informally. For the person offering to "do some sewing", her offer was apparently to do just that, some of the costume work. There was some misunderstanding concerning the offer and, as was described in a description of "breaking point actions" during this period, the responsibility of obtaining costumes fell to each actor to some extent.

- We're doing that on our own, right? Jay) Yeah, everyone's sort of responsible for their own. Ann) Less or more... Jay) [I interpreted his manner as one of making a joke in reversing the vague phrase "more or less".] Yeah, just check it out with Lenore. Len) S-28-1149.

Once more "roles" were defined largely in terms of needs emerged through group members' acting interactions. However, in responding to specific needs there were several incidents which group members' expressed as being confusing as a result of this process.

5) Role Crystallization To The End Of This Stage

Two dominant themes concerning their common sense of structure emerged in group members' interactions during this time. First, they shared a common sense of impetus in creating the play and then having their performance polished. That sense of overriding impetus pressed many other interests, questions and concerns, to the background for many group members. In terms of roles, less significance appeared to be placed on devoting time to discussing and defining roles. Having an immediate need fulfilled emerged as their first commonly held priority.
For the most part, when they experienced dissonance or jarring of meaning, then individual participants tended to ask questions and raise concerns privately. They also tended to do this with another individual, not in the larger group. Their process of maintaining vague roles caused some behind scenes consternation. This was the case particularly in terms of administrative matters and the producer's role.

Group members had been relieved from the urgency of assuming responsibility for administrative tasks. Many members still retained a sense of involvement with those tasks, but with no method of having an impact on the decision-making process.

A second dominant theme emerging in group members' interactions and which affected their experience of emerging roles was the shift to a "rehearsal format". This shift from large group involvement to small group involvement with no opportunity for collective discussion, and critique affected group members' ability to interpret and sort out assumptions concerning roles.

During this period, through group members' interactions emerged several refinements in roles as experienced by those "in the role". As well several needs emerged through their exchanges, resulting in rough creation of new roles. This was to be the last "expansion" period for a group members' creation of roles.
Producer/Director-Script-Creator-Editor/Actors-Writers-Editors-Cast/Stage-Manager/Lighting and Sound Crew/Wardrobe/Participant-Observer.
b) Emerging Leadership, Friendships, "Distance"

For group members an important facet in all these relationships, leadership, friendships, and "distancing in a relationship", was an element of trust.

- So my first thoughts of Cam were, "I'm going to trust this guy, because what he says is right. I really enjoy the way he does it. I really like some of the things. Bill) S-27-p.11.

(Interview)

- Well you get to find out — even just rehearsing. You learn to know how far, you can trust them — or if you can trust them. Or how loyal they're going to be. Like, say, if anything would happen if you would blow a line — would they jump right in to cover up for you or would they let you stand there and get embarrassed. And you can after being with them for a while you can kind of feel this out. And with this dram business, ever since I started this, like there wasn't anybody, other than Della, that I knew before and I've made some really good friends since then that I would never probably meet in ordinary life — like what I was doing before. Len) S-6-p.12

More specifically with respect to leadership and legitimacy, during these meetings group members valued many of the same qualities they had in the previous set of meetings. For instance, Cam continued to be valued for his expertise, although, briefly during the breaking point meetings, group members' own concerns predominated over his paradigm and sense of direction.

Those among the group who also felt able to ask questions concerning their experience of ambiguity were generally valued. This was particularly the case when they clarified matters which concerned others of the group.

- Whatever we use for a set is going to have to be highly mobile and highly invisible. So start thinking about it. Cam) What do you mean "highly visible"? Eil) We don't want to see it. Cam) S-6-923.
One participant was valued by group members because some thought of her as reflecting the interest and taste of the community. For those who thought of the participant in these terms she provided them with a sense of direction concerning community response.

- She is, she is a very typical person of this area. Exactly. Typical. And that's why we have to keep everything plain and simple and easy... Len) S-6-994-95.

- And her perception to this whole play, or her reaction to this whole thing is how 75% of the audience is going to react... And she likes things cut and dried and plain and simple. Just like, you can't make fancy... Len) S-6-1000-03.

- When we came off our "Pink Pills For Pale People" scene she was really laughing. And she said, "That's funny. I'm glad there's something like that there, kind of thing." And it made me feel very good cause I knew that's part of the audience that we're going to be appealing to... Ann) S-6-1003-05 (Bar).

Group members experienced several transitions during these meetings, moving from improvisational work to polishing their performances. Legitimacy in terms of qualities valued shifted for group members as their meanings-in-actions changed. For instance, in improvisational stages and in stages of exploring for revisions to the script, those who could work on their own and were expressly encouraged to do so were highly valued. Generally, these were the "serious actors", with a few exceptions. As dress rehearsals drew near, group members also began to value those who were able to do without their scripts, who had memorized their lines, or had learned their parts in such a way as not to stumble.

Given that group members' senses of context changed, however subtly over this time, many experienced changing experiences of
legitimacy in others' acceptance of their actions and their acceptance of others actions. This may proffer an explication for one observation concerning those who were friends.

Significantly, those who acted in scenes together had not worked together before, nor were they family. Even the few who were friends or who had begun to develop friendships with other participants at the outset of the project did not act together in a scene.

- She and Jim, eh. What a team, eh? Ann) Yeah. Len) We don't have a scene with them do we? Cam) No. No. [Several people respond.]... No. She won't. Ann) S-6-1021-22.

However, several of those who improvised a scene together developed friendships, a sense of camaraderie during these weeks of meetings. Jessie's growing friendship with Jay and Bill during their work on the "Train Station Scene" exemplified this experience.

While some participants were developing friendships, some were also experiencing "distancing". Breaking point actions concerning costumes did not result in resolution of some participants' feelings. In addition, Eileen disclosed in an interview that she was beginning to experience some sense of exclusion from several group members by the end of this set of meetings.

Quite apart from individuals' feeling some sense of friction with other individuals, or a sense of being outside of the group, there was an emerging distinction between the men's improvisational activities and some of the women's responses.

- [Jay is making a drumming noise.] Jay, stop it. [Anna shouting.] That noise? Jay) Yeah. [Some laugh] Just a childish way to get attention. Jay) I know I have a two year old... [After a pause] That was my mother's voice I guess. [Anna laughs]. S-6-906.

When this friction flared among group members, it seemed to subside swiftly.

c) Ritual Activities

The second Act-Play refers to "Ritual Humour" as an emerging "structure" which group members brought to their activities. Group members continued to create running jokes during this period as well. Opportunity to do this with each other was affected in their transition from improvisational work to rehearsal and small group work. However, with the September twenty-third meeting group members heard one line which became a very long standing joke.

As previously described, when Jessie stepped outside of the "human train" to assess the affect, she remarked, "It doesn't look as pukey as it feels." (S-23-1114.) The line seemed to strike a chord in their common experience with the project. Jay responded immediately to Jessie's remark. He referred to her statement as "classic" (S-23-1114).

At a meeting after Jessie made the comment, Joyce repeated her comment as though assessing a scene she was observing: "It doesn't look as pukey as it feels!" (S-28-1138.) Joyce was greeted with uproarious laughter from group members present. The study posits that group members apparently experienced humour as tie among them.

In addition to humour as a bond for group members' they also came to recognize the story circle as an important ritual. Cam had
initiated the story circle as one of the first exercises of the all-day workshop. At the end of their story Cam had complimented group members' on their ability to do the exercise. Most had expressed delight with the exercise — once it was over.

At a subsequent meeting, Cam modified the beginning words of the exercise and asked group members to do it once more.

- I woke up this morning...Cam) Oh, no. Ann) [Recognizes story circle.] I ran out of gas. [This is an aside referring to how Cam started the first story circle.] Pink pills... Joy) [Another reference to content in the first story circle which also related to first improvisation group members did.] S-5-846.

When Cam could not attend the September ninth meeting, group members began the meeting with the story circle. At that time, some did not experience the exercise as having been done "successfully" when Cam was absent.

The significance of the story circle may be best represented through the eyes of a participant who came after the story circle practice had died out. In this instance, he had been advised of the experience and been given to believe that the group was about to indulge in the experience, again.

- Yeah, my first surprise was, "Everybody sit in the circle". Nobody told me what the circle was. I didn't have any clue of what we were doing... In that sense I didn't know what to expect. I didn't know the way Cam was doing it. Cam is such a different director from the other two plays that I've done. But that was the only surprise. Bill) S-27-p.8.

- What was the circle? Mad) The first night I went he said, "Okay everybody get in a circle. And Lenore was sitting beside me. I said, "What is the circle?" She says, "We just sit in a circle and toss ideas back and forth". And we got in a circle and ended up reading the play... I've never been involved in a warm-up. That's what Lenore told me... She said we say a word and continue. I was looking forward to that. But we ended up just reading the play. Bill) S-27-p.8.
Although Cam only initiated the story circle twice, group members were to revive this ritual once more before the end of the project. "The circle" had clearly become part of many group members' emerging lexicon — of rituals.

EMERGING LEXICON

The introduction to this Act-Play described a general shift in data collection. It indicated that Cam spoke much of the time during meetings with group members' responding through their actions as actors. Group members' lexicon of commonly held words related to theatre process appeared to be growing. However, this was difficult to determine since, often, they were not using the words but responding to Cam's use of the phrases or words in his directions.

Within the section "Emerging Patterns Of Process" there are two segments describing language used in Cam's direction of group members in their process of revising individual scenes. Those words have not been repeated herein.

"Fun":

The word fun continued to be used in a manner suggesting expressive exploring. Sometimes, the individual's tone of voice would suggest a profound quality through the word associated with excitement in exploration. However, on other occasions, group members seemed to associate the word with a light-heartedness, not being profound.

- Darling, darling. Jes) We're going to have fun working on this.
  Cam) S-6-895.
- The fun is done. Now the effort is putting it back into a kind of inspirational form... With seeming conviction. S-13-1064.

In one instance, in this stage a group member's comments suggested a link between "fun" in terms of exploring through improvisation, and "playing":

- You see, when you were talking resentments, and I mentioned it to Cam before, it seemed to me when Allie and I read the script it edited out all of our play time on stage. Which I think was necessary. I mean we were trying to work things out on stage. S-6-938-39 (Bar.)

Group members continued to use these words in intense fashion throughout the remainder of the project.

"Working":

This was one of the few words which many group members seemed to grasp quickly and to begin to use both to ask for critique and to provide it.

- And she knew enough, she was experienced enough to know what worked and what didn't quite well. Bill) S-27-p.9.
- I like it Cam. Is it working? Jay) Yeah, I think it is. Cam) I love it. Bill) 0-4-1183.

The following quotation taken from a group member's discussion of their processes relies on two distinct meanings for the word "work":

- I mean we were trying to work things out on stage. But if you have to stop and think, "Will this work or not?" Ann) S-6-939-40.

"Work" and "working" emerged as one of group members' key words during this time of both improvisation and polishing.
"Wing It":

Although many group members began to use the word improvise or "improv" for their more "spontaneous" acting interactions, some still used other words for this experience. Both "wing it" and "brainstorming" were still being used virtually exclusively by the men in connection with improvisation:

- I kind of had an idea. I don't know. I winged it more or less. Al) 0-4-p.13.
- An extra idea when you're brainstorming always helped... Yeah, where I work we do that some times. We, we're even taught the word brainstorming in engineering, and how to use it. You get a group of people together and you first think out loud. It might be wild and outrageous and totally radical and eventually a chunk of it might apply to the end product. Al) 0-4-p.12.

Interestingly, group members did not appear to spend time attempting to create a general description of their processes. Rather, their discussions and therefore the words they used were ones to describe their immediate concerns while engaged in these processes.

"Flat":

Cam began to use this word to describe a scene with no dramatic impact. Group members' also appeared to develop a sense of this word very quickly and began to use it, again for purposes of critique.

- The first three or four times you read it through it was flat. There was just nothing there. Jim) 0-1-p.18.

"Stuck, Blocks":

Although these words were very rarely used during these meetings, one could see group members experiencing them during improvisational experiences. One participant used the expression in an interview to refer to an experience when she did not know what to say or do in response to another actor's improvised line.
- I was stuck when she asked me about an embarrassing incident. (Lor) O-4-p.17.

"Big Hole, Gap":

These were not words which group members had begun to use in this stage. Cam was using them in his direction and descriptions to group members. He was apparently describing his experience of watching a scene come to a sufficient halt to produce a sensation of creating a "hole" in the fabric of the actors' theatrical allusion.

- ... That lovely little scene... It's actually a very nice scene except whenever her cue comes there's this big hole. Cam Everybody's waiting for her. (Ann) S-30-1177.

As previously described with a shift of focus toward performance, actors' timing and tempo became extremely important.

"Turn":

In one of the first meetings of the project, Cam had begun to speak of a concept, the "dramatic turn", which he held as key to his paradigm of theatre. He did not refer to the concept frequently, nor directly although some of his references to sub-text made some reference to it. During these series of meetings he explained the concept in the following manner:

- But I still think the cleverest improv and the cleverest art is the one that's most unexpected. And yet when you think about it, its the logical conclusion. I love listening to Mozart. Mozart never goes down the same road. Yet where else could it go? (Cam) S-16-1395. (Interview)

Although using a synonym of sorts, a few group members indicated that they understood what Cam had meant by the concept of the dramatic turn.

- You're allowed to twist the words around and make puns a lot as long as you put something together yourself. (Jim) O-1-p.31.
"Sub-Text":

This was another word Cam used frequently during the last of the meetings of this period. Although group members did not use the word much, they apparently began to understand the concept.

- The problem as the scene is written now, we're talking the text. In other words you shouldn't be stating this stuff. People don't talk about it. That's why I threw the peas in there. Peas is talking about a whole bunch of stuff. The meaning in what you're saying with this stuff comes back more a little at a time and that kind of stuff. Cam) S-7-1039.

The section, "Emerging Patterns Of Process", illuminates how influential Cam's conception of "sub-text" was in terms of directing actors. He relied on this concept with respect to both revising the script and polishing actors' performances.

Structure Of Scenes:

In group members' breaking point meetings of August, they had begun to use words suggesting that they were making distinctions among types of theatre from "experimental theatre" to "theatre exercise". To add to this sense of theatre in structural terms, Cam began to describe the play in terms of distinguishing among scenes. He spoke of "major" and "minor" scenes.

- That could potentially be a major scene. I don't know. So let's work on that right now. Cam) S-5-866.

"Rules":

This is a word which a few group members had begun to use in meetings immediately prior to this series. The word surfaced during this period once more, but it was not used commonly or constantly as other words listed herein.
- Go buy the car somebody. Cam) Jes, it's your idea. Go ahead. Jay) The rules of it, is that if you make it up, get to read the article. Jes) I made it up, I'm in there. I'm in...Ann) Okay, now I know the rules, is there any other rules? Jay) Yeah, Deb. Go for it. Deb, Deb, Deb. Joy) Note when Deb goes down to do improv -- first pushed, none want to take on more, reversal. S-5-877-78.

"Running Joke":

Although group members had been creating them since virtually the first meeting of the study, they only began to use the phrase "running joke" in formal sessions during this time:

- Like, that running joke with forty-five years going through there. Ann) S-6-945.

This lengthening list of words which group members were beginning to use in common evinces their growing sense of meanings held in common.

EMERGING TEMPO AND RHYTHM OF ACTIVITIES

This span of meetings might be described as a medley, a series of songs which marked small shifts, some smooth and unnoticed in the moment, others, not quite so smoothly joined. Though nuances of tempo and rhythm shifted during this time, they began to build gradually in volume and intensity concluding with a compelling, drumming rhythm. Within the musical arrangement, the larger framework, there were three apparent themes.

The musical pieces began with the sound of jazz resonating from the "suite" of the second Act-Play. The theme linking the first series of songs took shape in terms of style and instrumentation. They were upbeat, syncopated, and of wind and brass.
A second, longer series of thematic pieces emerged from the first series of songs. These pieces featured more interplay of bass instrumentation with percussion, reaching for a constant, regular rhythm. The pieces in this part of the medley provided colouring through shifting intensity of volume.

Emerging as a third series of songs, this set began to combine themes of the first two with variations. However, this series brought a special element to the combination, featuring more of the percussive, with flashes of cymbals. Through a series of transitions they gradually shifted sufficiently to conclude with less improvisational influence. Tempo, ever increasing produced a sense of impetus.

EMERGING CULTURAL-MEANING

INTRODUCTION

This Act-Play has emerged through the sculpting process of data analysis to represent the greatest number of group members' meetings. While this stage endeavors to portray fourteen meetings, the first two stages afforded descriptions of three meetings. Given the wealth of data linked with "this stage", description herein has been confined primarily to those meanings group members' came to hold in common and which emerged as sufficiently significant to compel them toward joint meanings-in-actions. This range of focus is consistent with the espoused purpose of the "Emerging Cultural-Meaning" section.
Group members' most compelling focus during this time emerged as an unwavering resolve to follow processual threads from the all-day workshop as the basis for weaving a play and presenting it. In their pursuit of these processual threads, their threads changed, had to be untangled and on occasion, they both created and rerouted threads. Throughout this process, "acting" emerged as group members' key activity, and as substance for their thread, their acting activities also "acted back" on them as experienced structure to shape their process and thereby their direction.

The phrase "Play Acting" was chosen as a title for this Act-Play as a descriptor for group members' emerging cultural-meaning linked with acting, throughout these meetings. "Play-Acting" was intended to convey group members' fervent focus on acting. It was also intended to convey an emerging sense of their acting experience in common. The phrase, was selected for its descriptive breadth. A phrase was needed which would be sufficiently broad to include a subtle shift in group members' acting interactions during this series of meetings.

Group members both created and were subject to subtle, but constant change while continuing their acting interactions. Their shift in meanings-in-actions began with "anchored anomie", very much represented as "ludic - play" in the second Act-Play. Emergence of change in group members' theatre processes became apparent only when they were coming to an end with their process.

Shifting from initial creation of scenes, using improvisational interactions, their efforts came to be channelled into revising a
formal script combined with polishing their performance. Through this shift their interactions changed from improvisational work to a rehearsal format.

Although group members did experience shifts during this period, their interactions throughout this stretch of meetings suggested commonality in effort to continue to "act" and thereby to progress towards creation of the play and polished performances. Their sense of impetus had been shaped in prior meetings by their struggle to develop a common sense of direction.

GROUP MEMBERS' EMERGING COMMONALITY OF MEANING

a) Starting Point Of Commonality

This segment returns to prior stages to act as a reminder of cultural-meaning group members brought with them to this third stage of their interactions. Descriptions of group members' interactions in the first stage, "General Context" and "Sustained Uncertainty" interpreted group members' experiences of anomic conditions as their common starting point, their cultural-meaning shaping participants' interactions. They experienced anomic conditions in several respects.

Many participants experienced anomic conditions as individuals in the community. They experienced themselves as "outsiders" to a community wherein people tended to have remained from one generation to the next and wherein a strong German Catholic tradition influenced daily life.

Initially, participants also experienced anomic conditions linked with the project and the group. Interviews during this period
confirmed group members' concern with anomic conditions related to their activities:

- I take it from what happened, because we sort of stagnated for two solid months — July and August — nothing just happened out of all of that... It was really good when we finally got together and did that thing, that one Saturday with Cam. Until that point we were pretty lost. Jim) O-1-23.
- Yeah there was a lot of work going into it, but nothing coming out of it. I was getting pretty discouraged. And I was off for most of that time working and I didn't really know what was happening. And I'd come home and nothing had happened. And I'd been gone for two weeks and this thing's still sitting there. I was almost to the point where I was wondering if this thing was going to go at all. I didn't want to give up on it. I don't think I was to that point. I certainly had my doubts. Jim) O-1-p.24.
- Oh just this past two weeks. I was ready to quit just before we started those improv... After that Saturday that we worked from ten A.M. to ten P.M. I felt really good. I had a headache next day and the rest of the day but I finally felt like I did something in that group. Allie) S-16-p.14.
- I kept getting quite hyper because I didn't think things were moving along as fast as I thought they should. But I guess, for people that are in it, it didn't seem to bother them. So I guess it was going alright. And now I can see it has kinda come together. I see that there's a lot of different points in different things. Lor) O-4-p.6.
- ... But now that it is at this stage and I have been involved a little bit more, now it's a priority again... This working with nothing, I didn't enjoy [emphatic]. Was there a point in time when it seemed like there was something to work with? Mad) Oh yeah, after a couple of these workshops. Len) S-6-p.15.

Group members' series of breaking point actions in response to experiencing anomic conditions within the group, began to produce some sense of resolution however temporary. With a multitude of tensions directly and indirectly related to a struggle with a theatre paradigm, group members' launched into two breaking point meetings followed by the all-day acting workshop.

As described in the previous Act-Play, "Anchored Anomie", in a series of interactions, group members developed a stronger sense of
group entity through several means. These included explicitly distinguishing between themselves and the community through discussion of research. Their breaking point meetings during the second stage also provided them with a sense of structure in terms of decision-making process. They developed a common sense of direction, a theatre paradigm through discussing the content of the play.

In terms of creating a specific sense of structure, group members also clarified among themselves, and with Cam, his role and that of the producers'. These clarifications were not to remain clear, but they were experienced as being clear at that time. During these meetings, Cam also provided an important "piece" in their theatre paradigm puzzle. He offered a solution to their conflict regarding theatre paradigm and paradigm in terms of group members' relationship with the community. He articulated what had been for some a tacit distinction. Cam came to distinguish between actions appropriate internally (among group members), and actions appropriate externally (for a community audience).

Distinguishing activities on the basis of internal and external context assisted group members in mediating tension between their desire to explore and their sense of anomic conditions when interacting in the community in those terms. Cam's express distinction between external and internal activities manifestly allowed group members to "leap" into the all-day workshop as an exploratory "go with it" activity, but as an activity which was considered internal to the group.
- Like when we were doing those two skits with those three objects... Who would have dreamt that those would have formed the whole basis for the play. If anybody had known that that was happening at the time we would have been so scared and upset and worried about what was going to happen and what we were doing that it would never have worked. Joy) S-23-p.7.

Through their interactions of that day in the workshop many group members' also experienced an increasing sense of both group entity and structure. They could do this acting, and they had "something concrete to show for it".

Based on experience they had brought with them as individuals overlaid with experience of the project thus far, group members carried with them to the meetings of this third stage a common sense of impetus, of excitement contrasted with earlier experience of anomic conditions. They also carried with them seeds of ambiguity and conflict in paradigmatic actions from earlier, temporary resolutions.

b) Emerging Commonality Of Cultural-Meaning Through Interactions

The previous segment described many aspects of group members' emerging cultural-meaning. Of those described, group members began this series of meetings with two most compelling cultural-meanings.

Group Members' Cultural-Meaning And Breaking Point Actions

First, group members experienced an ever stronger view of the community as homogeneous and in that homogeneity an unwillingness to support new initiatives. Group members' experience of themselves as outsiders to the community continued to be emphasized through their discussions during the first of these meetings.
Group members' development of an internal sense of group was constructed at first through contrasting themselves with the community. Apparently, "go with it" paradigmatic approaches were thus purposely confined to activities "internal" to the group. This common belief concerning the community, and their subsequent attempts to delineate internal and external activities was to engender breaking points once more related to their ongoing development of a theatre paradigm held in common.

A second compelling cultural-meaning was more immediately associated with their evolving theatre paradigm. Emerging from the all-day workshop experiences, group members retained in common a relatively specific sense of theatre process, "play-acting". Their sense of process was primarily based on their discussions and what they had already experienced as process through improvisational work.

Focused at first on "play-acting" as improvisational work, during these meetings through their theatre process group members had several experiences which became significant in terms of their emerging cultural-meaning. For example, many group members experienced a sense of the profound related to theatre through their collective creation of meaning in the moment.

- It always amazes me. The way these things work out. Ann) S-16-1093.
- Yes. Because I felt good about doing it. [Silence.] I think its helping me a lot, personally -- for my own. It makes me feel better. It makes me feel good. You know, what I'm trying to say? Inside, I feel good. I feel happier with myself. Maybe, I've had these things and never have had the opportunity to express them or whatever and now I'm having this chance and maybe that's why it makes me happier, I feel better about myself. Len) S-6-p.14.
It amazed me how we started with nothing and build a play out of it. Al) O-4-p.11.

Balanced with this experience of profound meaning through intense group exploration, their process as experienced at this point also allowed for certain protection. As individuals acting, they might impose through subtle self-censorship, some "control" on content. In other words, knowing that a community audience might eventually observe some of the content, this may have shaped to some extent their "spontaneity" in improvisations.

During improvisational work Cam's methods of facilitating their process was to ask actors what they felt and whether they were comfortable with their actions and lines. Given this focal point on their feelings and meaning in improvisational work, group members experienced themselves exerting substantial control. In this sense of process, most significantly, despite succumbing to "go with it" inclinations, they were not hampered with spectres of anomic conditions related to their experience with the community despite.

Another important element of cultural-meaning associated with their initial experience in theatre process emerged through their play-acting. Fundamentally, they had at last begun; they were "on the road". With the all-day workshop and the first two meetings of this stage, most significantly group members began to garner a sense of impetus attached to their theatre processes. Group members' acting interactions had responded at last to their most compelling breaking point plea for something concrete.
- Well it was when we were talking about — What are we 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.... just got to be that way: Things that are going to happen on the stage. Eil) A-1-235-37.

Acting on stage, working towards creation of a scene satisfied group members' need driving one of their paradigmatic approaches, a need to "get something concrete". In this vein, when Cam presented group members with a script based on their improvisational work, virtually all expressed delight. Through this process a sense of impetus became for group members highly valued and thereby important in terms of their cultural-meaning.

Ostensibly there were several benefits which group members derived from their emerging sense of theatre process as "play-acting". Group members were finally able to experience their paradigmatic approaches working in harmony. They were engaged in "getting something concrete" and "they were also able to "go with it" as previously described. Tension between their paradigmatic actions had been virtually eliminated.

In addition, group members' experience of being anchored through a sense of group entity and through a sense of structure flourished during this stage. In particular, some of group members' comments suggested that they had experienced profound meaning in terms of coming to have a sense of group entity. Their comments ranged from a changed perspective of individuals in the group to their sense of commitment to "the group".

- Well you get to find out — even just rehearsing. You learn to know how far, you can trust them — or if you can trust them. Or how loyal they're going to be. Like, say, if anything would
happen if you would blow a line — would they jump right in to cover up for you or would they let you stand there and get embarrassed. And you can after being with them for a while you can kind of feel this out. And with this drama business, ever since I started this, like there wasn't anybody, other than Della, that I knew before and I've made some really good friends since then that I would never probably meet in ordinary life — like what I was doing before. Len) S-6-p.12

- You see a different part of a person. In that first play, Jim was involved in the lighting and that kind of thing — and stage. You only see that part of him. He took on the acting, this part. You see a different side of him. And also being more closely involved with him, too. He has such a sense of humour which wasn't apparent in that first production. Len) S-6-p.10-11.

- But it's sharing those concrete experiences... that we trusted each other to be able to explore further. Cam) S-6-976.

- Because you've got to get in and learn your lines and you've got to because it's not fair to the rest. Lor) O-4-p.13.

A sense of profundity related to group entity may explicate some group members' experience of breaking point related to Lyle.

In terms of structural anchors, jointly experiencing this concrete theatre process gave group members' a sense that they could repeat this process even though they could not articulate it. However, this meant that with respect to their anchoring in structure, group members appear to have held assumptions implicitly concerning an emerging sense of their theatre process, "play-acting". One of their assumptions became key in their interactions.

Group members continued to assume an absolute quality associated with a paradigm of theatre. This assumption merged with their theatre process as part of theatre paradigm. Within a few meetings they were confronted with this assumption in terms of confusion concerning "theatre roles". They were also confronted through gradual, but decidedly significant changes in their theatre process.
In the description which follows consideration will be given first to group members' latent confusion in theatre paradigms when engaged in improvisational processes. Thereafter the study contemplates implications of change for them when they shifted away gradually from improvisational work as a basis for their theatre processes.

Some group members spoke of distinctions between improvisational work they were experiencing and what they had experienced before they had such past experience in terms of theatre processes:

- First of all it's harder to get into character when you're not that sure of who you are playing yet. When you have a script you read the script and then you see the character and you become the character. Jay) S-13-p.8.

Process for actors and their "role" as actors were not the only comparisons made. Group members had, in prior stages relied on a conceived paradigm of more "traditional" theatre.

- It makes sense the producer produces. In a professional production you're not arguing for your opinion, any more than you're up there saying "I think your left arm should be..." Ann) A-14-432.

The group member in this instance was suggesting that the actors are not normally involved in decision-making process related to "the director's role" and "the producer's role". In other words, as in that instance, administrative matters would not be on the agenda. Ongoing administrative matters would not be issues for decision-making within the domain of actors in a "professional" or more traditional structure of theatre. The group member's argument for professionalism of theatre as she understands it implies that they should be shifting into a "professional theatre" paradigmatic perspective.
However, having begun to develop a sense of group entity and as part of their structure a sense of participating in decision-making generally, group members apparently had some difficulty in adopting this "professional hierarchical" paradigmatic perspective of theatre. Improvisational work tended to reinforce a sense of group process and involvement. This was particularly the case when group members made suggestions as members of the audience in terms of actors "getting unstuck" and in terms of assuring historical authenticity in scenes. When they ceased to have this role, Cam continued to consult with actors individually about their feelings and their concerns in improvisational work. His role initially was more as facilitator than director.

The interesting paradigmatic conflict regarding theatre lies in group members attempting to promote one processual paradigm while engaged in another. While valuing their ability to have involvement in decision-making process in all aspects of the project, many group members were reaching toward what they understood to be a "professional model" based on a hierarchical decision-making process. Although this anomaly in paradigm was imbedded in their activities and their cultural-meaning process, group members did not respond to their dissonance until one of their most strongly experienced cultural-meanings was pressed into the centre of their activity. Then group members responded with breaking point actions.

Their experience of paradigmatic anomaly concerning decision-making process became exacerbated, ironically, with their
gradual shift toward a more hierarchical process. As described in "Emerging Patterns Of Process", shifts came with distribution of the first script. Although they continued to do improvisational work, Cam and group members' efforts were soon devoted to revision of the script. Eventually, their focus utterly shifted toward polishing actors' performances.

As time constraints became a source of cultural-meaning, roles changed. To save time, Cam became more directive as writer and "director". Consistent with that, their conceived structure became rehearsal-like. They met more frequently, but not as a group. Thus, their theatre process changed substantially. "Play-acting" was not as group members had initially experienced it, although they continued to act. Decision-making process had shifted away from group members to director and to a lesser extent in terms of administrative matters, to the producer.

In the process, group members were beginning to be cut off from their anchor through group entity. By the third week in September they were not meeting together as a group either during the meetings or through socializing thereafter. Neither was their contemplated structure remaining entirely the same given the shift away from improvisation toward revision and polishing performance in rehearsal format.

Despite these changes, group members appeared initially reluctant to respond other than through continuing to act. They appeared to be reticent to tear apart and bring to a halt impetus they had experienced through acting on stage and through receiving a script.
They had enjoyed "this theatre process" as a process responding to their cultural-meaning quests for the concrete.

Group members' orientation for most of this period, then, appeared to arise from a commonly held intent to learn and do what was needed to be done in terms of an unfolding theatre process with "absolute" qualities. Crucial to this commonly held intent is an assumption that there was something absolute about that theatre process despite constant, subtle changes.

Their theatre process proved not to be "absolute". Instead, anomalies began to surface between their two juxtaposed paradigms of theatre, one stemming from an improvisational, collective approach, the other from a hierarchical decision-making process. Group members appeared to experience a tension between disturbing their sense of progress, that is, one of their cultural-meanings, to confront conflicts with other cultural-meanings including disruption of their growing sense of anchors in group entity and structure — as absolute.

If they questioned, raised concerns, this might bring their impetus to a halt, thereby also quashing progress and creation of the concrete. Apparently, the thought of producing full-fledged breaking was an effective deterrent to group members' initiating breaking point actions for several sessions. By mid September, they also had no forum, no joint meeting time in which to initiate this action formally or informally in socializing.

When group members finally did take breaking point action on September twenty-third, it resulted from a sense of urgency with
respect to one of their most compelling senses of cultural-meaning, what they were prepared to perform before a community audience. When Cam began to edit and add content to scenes both in terms of lines and actions, group members did not object for a period of time. They finally objected when they experienced conflict between wishing to avoid disruption of their theatre process internally, and being unwilling to act or say certain lines externally, in the community’s presence as audience.

As previously described group members met as a group in the final week of September to address their concerns with respect to a few lines and actions in the script. This afforded them an opportunity to reaffirm their sense of group entity and decision-making structure through meeting together and developing a process as a group to review the play and to modify troubling actions and lines. However, their actions precipitated some small crisis in relationships.

In addition, group members were not able to resolve concerns related to maintaining an absolute quality in their paradigm of theatre. Once again, a fundamental aspect of their paradigm was in conflict with their "expert's" paradigm. Lines between actions external to the group and those appropriate internally to the group were not drawn in the same place by everyone involved in the project.

Group members initiated no more breaking point actions during their remaining meetings. However, it is interesting to note that a change occurred after their breaking point meeting of September twenty-third. The study posits that at this meeting, through their breaking point actions, group members reinforced a sense of group
entity and decision-making as vital to that sense of entity.
Thereafter, when group members were dissatisfied with revisions they were more likely to display some acts of independence in the form of resistance or whispered revolts.

The description thus far outlines group members' cultural-meaning as though homogeneously experienced by all group members. The study has indicated previously that other group members did not experience and respond in the same manner. For instance, both prior sections, "Emerging Patterns Of Process" and "Emerging Structure" referred to different emphasis in responses between men and women concerning tension.

In "Emerging Lexicon" sections the study has recorded group members' use of the word "fun". In terms of paradigm many group members appeared to speak of having fun as outside the theatre paradigm, as being of "personal" purpose. In this sense they might also have experienced some tension between the personal purpose of having fun in contrast with the need to "work".

- Well, at least we had a good time with it. Eil) A-30-800.
- They're having a lot of fun with it. I'm having fun. Deb) S-9-p.24.
- See how much fun we have when you're not here? We didn't accomplish a hell of a lot. But we sure had a good time. Jes) S-13-1075.
- The fun is done. Now the effort is putting it back into a kind of inspirational form... With seeming conviction. Cam) S-13-1064.

On the other hand, for some "fun' became fused with part of their process in terms of "go with it" exploration.

- Feel free to make it big, very, very, big. It's easier to bring it down. But go for it. Yell, scream, rant, rave. Have fun with

- You see, when you were talking resentments, and I mentioned it to Cam before, it seemed to me when Allie and I read the script it edited out all of our play time on stage. Which I think was necessary. I mean we were trying to work things out on stage. But if you have to stop and think, "Will this work or not", then it is not spontaneous. So the improv is good for that. S-6-938-40.

For the most part, the men appeared to maintain a strong connection between theatre process and "go with it" throughout this stage long past an emphasis on improvisational work devoted to creating the play. Their behaviour during breaks, during acting, and even during discussions suggested that they continued to improvise and to bring a sense of exploration and fun to their process.

They also espoused the view that they were less immediately concerned with distinctions between internal and external actions. The study has quoted one group members' concern with "watering down" the play too much (Jim, S-13-1085). I took this participant to be implying that they had taken "the sting" out of the play in deference to the audience since his remark came as a response to a question about whether some in the community might find some offence in certain aspects of the play. Some of the men's apparent low key response to a relationship with the community as audience was to change.

Group Members And Reflections On Change:
Their Emerging Cultural-Meaning Of Adjustment

Previous sections alluded to a developing context of change in group members "play-acting". They experienced this context of change in their "play-acting" as part of a shift group members experienced in
theatre process, toward revision of the play and then polished performance. When they began to revise and polish both play and performances, a process of adjustment emerged. As one aspect of their work was changed, all of the repercussions had to be "chased" in that scene and all others. As September faded, group members were exposed to ongoing change, of lines, of actions, of lighting, and of sub-text.

Prior to the all-day workshop, group members experienced such a constant state of flux that change was their experience of structure. In their improvisational work, they began to act in concert conveying some sense of commonly held structure. With the coming of script revision and adjustment, now, group members began to experience and reflect back on changes to "something" that had been there.

Rather than the maelstrom of anomic conditions they experienced in their meetings of the first and part of the second stage, in this stage their experience of change could be described in terms of contrast.

- I thought right from the start there'd be lots of little parts which wouldn't be bad to learn the lines for. Sort of the way I pictured it to start with but we changed our minds on it so many times. It's sort of come full circle back to how I thought it would be. Joy) S-23-p.8.
- The people that we have in the play right now — a lot of them didn't come to the regular meetings we had this summer. It was like that before. It just didn't seem like there were very many of us. Jim) O-1-p.11 - It progressed so nicely that it just sort of happened. Like when we were doing those two skits with those three objects... Who would have dreamt that those would have formed the whole basis for the play. If anybody had known that that was happening at the time we would have been so scared and upset and worried about what was going to happen and what we were doing that it would never have worked. But because it was just
sort of step by step and it just evolved you didn't even know that that was what you were doing. Suddenly there it was. Joy) S-23-p.7.

- I've got to have a script in front of me because for one thing they're always changing the lines. [He laughs.] Al) O-4-p.9.

- I didn't know that that's what they were doing when we were discussing these things. So that was another surprise for me. Then after we had that first script, somethings were changed -- and that was changed. And we didn't know it was going to be changed either. Some of that came -- I guess after they went to the bar one night or something. And then neither Joyce nor I liked some of that so we changed some of it again. And then Cam put a few changes in... Yeah. And then that was it. Lor) O-4-p.17.

- Oh just this past two weeks. I was ready to quit just before we started those improvs... After that Saturday that we worked from ten A.M. to ten P.M. I felt really good. I had a headache the next day and the rest of the day but I finally felt like I did something in that group. Allie) S-16-p.14.

- Like everybody's ideas, they tend not to be the same. You know you can't argue with everybody else. You have to change your opinion a lot of times on a lot of things. Just ask me. Len) [Jes's laughter can be heard suddenly in the background.] Oh, I know. Ann) S-6-1006-07.

During these series of meetings group members spoke in terms of experiencing a tremendous amount of change but not with the same sense of anomie conditions, or "being lost". They also frequently couched their sense of change in terms of a sudden or abrupt experience.

For purposes of the study, it is also interesting to note that prior to this stage group members had barely begun to speak of their experience with change in breaking point meetings. (See "Anchored Anomie", "Data Related to Adult Education Framework As Constructed During This Stage" for additional detail concerning group members' consideration of change in earlier stages.) It is difficult to determine whether this was in part due to the interviews in which participants were invited to reflect on what they had experienced.
This section continues to act as a reminder of the hermeneutical circle in my process of creating the Mobile-framework. There were many meetings during this stage. Yet these meetings were contained within a five week period. Throughout this set of meetings, opportunity to do library research was limited by the time commitment of fieldwork given the number of meetings and interviews I was attending.

CULTURAL-MEANINGS FOR PARTICIPANT OBSERVER

Group members' excitement, their transformation during the all-day workshop spilled over into the first two sessions of this stage. My fieldnotes were saturated with recordings of the magnitude of their change during this period. Group members' desire to share their enthusiasm surfaced in the form of reflection, creation of stories and exchange of humour. From this experience with group members I began to link a sense of the profound with their experiences. It was at this time that I also began to connect a kinesthetic sense to field experiences with group members.

I recognized a sense of momentum in group members' interactions when in contrast, as their actions which had been transforming became a pattern of more formal structure. Changes in their acting interactions became much more subtle over the course of these meetings. One aspect of their changing interactions confounded data collection.

Through studying methodological materials, I had determined to study what meaning group members' were making of their experiences.
When, as a group, they were discussing various aspects of their endeavors, this fit with intent in terms of data collection. However, when group members began to respond instead to Cam's direction through revising their acting, this constituted a different basis of data.

Noting their response to Cam's direction did not clearly illuminate what meaning they were making of their process generally. Although recognized as a problem, this shift in data content of group members' interactions, for purposes of analysis and representation, was unresolved. Interviews provided some "relief," but data from the interviews could not offer instances of group members constructing meaning together as a group.

Given that there was limited time to pursue additional library research during this period, data analysis in the field mainly relied on works already considered. The following is a passage from undated "Reflective Notes" drafted in approximately late August. The passage contemplates concepts of theatre from the social framework proffered in Berger and Luckmann's The Social Construction of Reality (1966). (See Chapter Five for additional details of links made in data analysis.)

Theatre As Having A Universal Quality

I am, at this point still left with uncertainty as to whether there is this thing called "theatre" (judging from the diverse perspectives of group members). That being a problem, the question of whether "theatre" has universal qualities sets off a whole series of questions.

Theatre In Relation To "Sub-Universe" Versus "Universe"

Might "theatre" as these group members are experiencing it
with some commonality be related to a possible confusion between "subuniverse feelings" and "universe or feelings associated with the sacred"? It is difficult to judge from the brief bit of theatre experienced at this stage... However, the change of energy and direction of the group at that point suggests this is worth pursuing in later stages. This may be very much related to shifts between paradigms. It is very interesting that the sub-universe and universe "skip" the profane.

When group members shifted from improvisational work to revision, and then performance, I became absorbed with certain emerging elements in their process.

This set of fourteen meetings afforded long stretches of opportunity to observe Cam's process of facilitating actors' improvisations and revisions. Data analysis concerning their theatre processes was extremely limited at the time. In the field I did develop some sense of Cam's techniques for encouraging group members to "create" concrete detail and to work with sub-text, to collectively build stories based on emotional, physical response to social interactions. When contemplating Cam's techniques in facilitating actors, I began to consider development of theatrical substance as parallel to much of what Berger and Luckmann had been describing as a general process of social construction of reality.

In post field data analysis, this led to contemplating group members' theatre experiences in terms of "anchored anomie". That analysis also led to additional explications of group members' experiences of change. In addition, however, out of this analysis surfaced a problem.

I was concerned with group members' meaning as actors. Part of their meaning was a sense of "theatre" as social framework, paradigm.
The book *Social Construction* was not focused on theatre as perspective and could not offer assistance with this aspect of data analysis. It was during this time that I renewed my determination to consult books written by those writing from a perspective of theatre as a discipline and profession.

During this period fieldwork also prompted additional consideration of the concept "learning". As described in "Anchored Anomie", through data analysis I had come to recognize a pattern in group members "breaking points". (This is an anachronism since I had not begun to use the phrase "breaking points".) I observed that group members would seem happy or satisfied with their interactions at the conclusion of one meeting, only to return to the next meeting with intense concerns.

They indicated on at least two separate occasions that they did not experience concern until having an opportunity to reflect on their interactions after the meetings. Considerable construction occurred between meetings. "Learning", then, was not confined for many to formal events.

Group members also chose to discuss matters informally with other participants outside of meetings. During this series of meetings I came to recognize not only that group members were "learning" outside of formal meetings, but in addition this might become one of the most singularly important considerations for anyone attempting to facilitate group members' process.

Finally, my interactions with group members during interviews sparked some consideration concerning the concept of "learning". As
previously described, no attempts had been made to build into their process a step for formal discussion and reflection concerning their process.10 Until mid September, most of the group members were discussing and reflecting through "breaking point actions" to deal with an urgent need. They were also discussing and reflecting informally when socializing. As these "group" opportunities began to diminish, opportunity to reflect was offered to individuals in the interview format.

What became apparent in many of the first interviews was that group members had not expected and did not expect to reflect about process as a group. Some group members, however, were interested by questions raised for them in the interview process.

- I'm a little intrigued about it myself. Because I've never thought about it before. Jim) O-1-p.29.
- You learn more about yourself with probing questions. Bill) This was paraphrased in part because of sound difficulties with the audiotape.] S-28-1136.

This underscored for me a difference in orientation which shaped their process. As an adult educator, I was surprised by an absence of emphasis on jointly reflecting on process. In particular, this grew out of a sense that group members experienced some pride in being able to participate in creation of the play without being able necessarily to describe the process. That was not their first priority — being able to respond to improvisation or direction in terms of acting held that place.

This was not to be the only surprise for me arising out of the interviews. When asked what they had learned, many participants were
initially nonplussed. Despite tremendous transformation even they recognized, manifestly, many group members did not link this experience of transformation with learning. Although data do not provide a clear statement from group members on this point, data analysis suggested that group members tended to consider learning in a formal "institutional" context, that is attending lectures or classes.11

There is another most important observation arising out of both the first set of interviews and field observations. For some group members, they were clearly concerned with certain kinds of exposure in the community. I began to wonder during this stage whether there was an inherent conflict in the study's purpose given group members' emerging concerns. Generic objectives were to study what was significant for group members — yet what might be significant for them were fears of exposure in the community. Such ethical concerns have been ongoing throughout the work — hence the endeavors to maintain confidentiality.

Fieldwork and experience with interviews was beginning to alter my assumptions about the concept of "learning". However, it was to require substantially more data analysis and library research to begin to articulate and contemplate implications of this field analysis related to learning.

DATA RELATED TO ADULT EDUCATION FRAMEWORK AS CONSTRUCTED DURING THIS STAGE

The parallel section in "Anchored Anomie" began to reach beyond documenting "what" group members "learned". In other words, during
the earlier stage, field data analysis was gradually becoming concerned not only with content of group members' learning, but how and when group members learned. During this stage, with substantially more time in the field and the opportunity to consider some theoretical resource materials, additional consideration was being given to the concept of learning.

The study had begun with a sense that reflection on "learning" ought not to be confined to an emphasis on the individual from a behavioural psychology paradigm. Despite this intuitively based conviction, "operationalizing" that sense in research strategy required some time.

**Group Members Learning In Terms Of Social Process**

By this stage, an emphasis on understanding learning within a context of social interaction was barely emerging to the forefront in data analysis. Although the set of "working assumptions" described in Chapters Five and Six were not yet developed, experiences which would provide the basis for conceptual exploration had been observed through fieldwork.

Although all of the working assumptions related to meaning, learning and social construction had not been developed during this fieldwork stage, some implications in terms of the concept of learning emerged at this time. For example, group members' sense of the profound, a need for a common framework and a common meaning became apparently linked to group members' learning. (Through data analysis and theoretical work, eventually these came to be described in terms
of paradigms, anchors, spheres of meanings and breaking point actions.) It was becoming apparent, then, at this stage that group members' social interactions affected how they conceived of what was important to learn, content of what they were to learn, and their response to learning.

Group members' transformation from a paralytic state of ambiguity to being able to "improvise" suggested how significant was their social construction in influencing what they were prepared to "learn", could learn. The significance of the story circle, the impact of creating a collective story, was another important example that their learning was not just a "piece of information" transmitted to individuals thereby causing change for them. They learned a tremendous amount through their interactions as a group in building a collective picture.

This, then, was the commencement of a labourious struggle to begin to consider "learning" from beyond the behavioural psychological paradigm. In spite of this intent toward shifting paradigms in terms of "learning from a social process orientation, data analysis still included retrieving data from within the more "traditional" conceptualization of learning. A meld of psychology and social paradigms may be perceived in data analysis from interviews which focused on group members' learning styles.

**Learning Style**

Few group members specifically mentioned their preferred "learning style". The following quotations derive from an interview
with one of two participants who were engaged in various forms of teaching.

- I'll give you an example. The other night we were doing our scene he came up on the stage and there were other people. He was very quiet and talked to us. He wasn't yelling it from the back of the theatre saying "No, that's wrong. Please do this again." Although he does do that. But I really like the way he came down. He just gives so much more in the sense of what the scene should be all about. Like I was talking about before. I really wasn't sure what the scene was all about. After I went through the first night with him well then all my questions were cleared up because he explained to me... Another thing he does is he gives examples which is something I haven't had before. He'll take a line and go with it. Bill) S-27-p.11.
- And he'll say it the way he thinks it should be said. And I like being shown things once in a while, if I'm not quite sure. Bill) S-27-p.12.

Although few group members referred specifically to their "learning styles", several others spoke appreciatively concerning Cam's practice of coming down to the stage and providing examples for them in private conversation.

Somewhat related to learning styles, field notes also began to record distinctions among group members in terms of different "rates of absorption". One example used in the fieldnotes was one participant continuing to refer to "improvising" as "jamming" although most others had begun to use the word "improvise" (S-16-Fieldnotes.) Again, this notation fits with learning from an "institutionalized" paradigmatic framework wherein learners all begin at the same place, study at the same time and may be tested at the same time. This marks a paradigmatic struggle within data analysis work related to the concept of learning.
Resources

One area in which consideration of group members' learning displayed signs of shifting paradigm was consideration of resources. Group members indicated a number of resources upon which they relied in terms of theatre process. These data were gathered from references in formal conversations, informal conversations, and interviews.

Data indicated that group members used a number of different resources depending to some extent on their emerging role in the project. For example, with respect to lighting, the lighting person was engaged not only in specific lighting configurations for this production. He also worked with Cam and Jim in upgrading lighting available. He cited resources for his learning as follows:

- Well the basics I got from Cam. Al) Oct-4-p.4.
- I learned all this in the last three weeks... I read a book and had Cam yell at me. Al) Oct-4-p.2

Other group members also made reference to at least one book available on lighting and sound. In an earlier stage Eileen also spoke of a reference book.

In addition, Cam was a major resource for all group members. He was a resource to them through more than one means. Predominantly, he expressly "taught" through statements. For example, as recorded in "Emerging Patterns Of Process" on occasion he defined sub-text, or advised an actor on technical aspects of performance such as "upstaging", or he explained theatre vocabulary:

- Just a standard rule, "Don't talk while you're moving". Cam) [He goes on to outline some exceptions.] S-6-932. (Bar)
- I've explained... did I... the way I would like them to be as if they are part of something else rather than explicitly. I'd rather... one of the things on the telephone conversation could be a baptism... part of the culture. Cam) A-30-823.
- I'll tell you something, throw too many numbers at people they don't remember them. It's best to throw only one number at them. S-5-876.

As well as teaching by way of statement, Cam acted as a model, demonstrating actions. He also "tested" possible actions or lines. Most often, those acting appeared to learn by observing others acting with Cam facilitating and directing them.

Although limited, discussion and reflection among group members themselves was still occurring. Their breaking point meeting is an excellent example of learning through discussion and action with peers. In spite of their doing so less frequently in the large group, they continued to discuss in small groups. Anna's work with Helen is also an example of learning collaboratively in small groups. The interviews might also be added in as a "structure" and opportunity for individuals to reflect about their experience.

- I've never thought about it really. I'm just trying to figure out why I don't think about the acting -- or why don't consider it important or whatever, because obviously it is to most people. Jim) O-1-p.29.
- You learn more about yourself with "probing questions". It's great. Bill) Yeah. And you get to talk about yourself too. Jes) [They both laugh. This was paraphrased in part because of sound difficulties with the audiotape.] S-28-1136.

Consideration of resources for group members' learning, then, carried some elements of focus on the concept of learning as social process. Data analysis concerning what group members learned, while
still focused on the individual and behavioural "proof" of learning, also began to include a social perspective of learning as well in terms of reflection on process and consideration of emerging roles.

Content Areas Of Group Members' Learning

Resources for learners as listed began to recognize social aspects to group members' learning. In addition, contemplation of their learning in terms of social construction of roles, of emerging structure, was most important in group members' process. Although data analysis was not clear on relationship between participants' learning and emerging roles based on social construction, data was recorded which might bear on this work.

- And what does the stage manager do? Mad) I'm just learning that. What does the stage manager do? I really don't know... What am I learning so far?... I've learned that they work quite closely with the sound and lighting crew. And they're either in the booth cuing them in the booth or when the lights go down in the back cuing them. Plus working the stage crew, the props, everything else that gets on stage. As far as I know in our position, getting props together and stuff like that and be more -do props or whatever. And that's all I've learned. Jo) S-28-p.8.

- And I was quite relieved when I didn't get the part. So I thought, "I'll work backstage. Learn how to make the theatre work." So I was working with the lighting technician Jack... and sort of learning how to run the lighting board. Built some of the sets and stuff. Built most of the sets actually. Jim) So you hadn't done any of that before — building sets? Mad) No. Jim) How did you go about learning? Mad) I worked with Jack.... Did you guys have a title? Did you call yourself something? Mad) I got called stage manager in the program. But at the time I thought I was just part of the technical — whatever you called the crew. Bill) 0-3-p.7.

- Yeah well, we worked more or less together, cause I wanted to learn how to run the lights too. And in fact, the one night he didn't show up because of the snow storm — production night, "We got to go folks", so I phoned Al up and brought him in and showed him how to do the lights. And I was backstage doing what Jo's doing now telling him "Okay, let's have the lights on". Luckily
it was an easy thing. It was just on or off. We just either light the stage or we don't light the stage. Bill) O-3-p.7.

These two people had come to define their tasks and what a stage manager is through their own experience with two productions and based on their interactions with others. What they were asked to do and how others referred to them had implications in terms of how they expressed their learning.

Other examples of group members learning as developed from their aspect of role may be observed in this data gathered concerning "lighting". In these instances, those who worked on the lights, Jim and Al, indicated a different perspective from the actor, Anna, who had developed a sense of the "lighting" word "Blackout" related to her actions, her last line.

- And it was easy. Like there was nothing for lighting on that [first play the theatre club did]. It was just "on", "off" in that play. Al) O-4-p.3.
- Move your actors to the light. It worked! [He laughs.] Jim S-30-1163.
- "Blackout". Ann) [She is indicating that she now has a sense of how lighting works with scene.]

The following series of quotations suggest, once more, slightly different perspectives among "the learners". The actors' statements at the time displayed their new sense of mime and sub-text in terms of their actions as actors. Their statements demonstrated that they had come to rely on some of Cam's paradigmatic concepts of theatre.

Jim, as actor, former stage manager, and crew who were currently building the sets, reconceptualized those tasks, alluding once more to Cam's paradigm of theatre.

- I'm doing something in the kitchen. You just have to let that get established. Allie) S-23-1119.
- You don't want me to put anything else in there? Just go with the script? Len) Well I don't care. Cam) I was just going to say the widow that's chasin' all the men. Or that's not necessary, because she knows what I'm talking about? Len) Exactly... Leave it the way it is. Cam) S-7-1043-44.
- ...We could be setting up the stage. And the audience could be sitting here watching us do this. That would be great theatre. Jim) S-27-1130.

From a perspective of learning in terms of social interaction, one of the most significant episodes in which group members apparently learned and demonstrated a shift toward Cam's theatre paradigm, was ironically, when they had their breaking point meeting on September twenty-third. During that meeting group members expressed and relied on criteria for both their theatre process of revising and criteria for critiquing a scene.

Their process of revision included letting actors "work through" the changes. Group members described criteria for retaining or discarding scenes and lines in a scene included the "relevance" of the scene, and the scene "playing well" (S-23-116-17). (See "Emerging Patterns Of Process" for additional elaboration.) During the first meetings of this stage some group members also indicated that they had some sense of their process.

Group Members' Learning Related To Theatre Process And Change

In the previous segment, the study provided data analysis of group members' experience with sensation of change. Closely linked with their sensation of change was their contemplation of theatre process in which they were engaged.
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- I mean we were trying to work things out on stage. But if you have to stop and think, "Will this work or not?", then it's not spontaneous. So, the improv is good for that. Ann) S-6-939-40.
- I can't remember where we're going to. That's where I'm mixed up... [Bill describes the content of their subtext, motivation of the characters] I haven't give you anything in what we've been doing to play with that, yet though. Jes) S-18-1097.
- Yeah well, we tried that though, remember? We were going on and on trying to think of things about Susan that we could say that wasn't subtext or whatever. Ann) [She is responding to Cam's suggestion to improvise a transition.] Ann) 0-4-1187.
- You just have to let your imagination go further... Jes?) You really do. Cam) Really fast? Jes) S-7.2. 1.08. [The two are discussing what it means to do improvisational work.]

A few group members explored more fully a sense of their process in terms of their role and Cam's role in their process.

- But you see I don't think that, we the people who are going through this process on stage are intellectualizing much. Ann) No, you don't have the chance to. You're doing it. Cam) Yeah right. Ann) ... And also it's an agreeable manipulation. The whole thing is that. It's introverted to the extent where we've all agreed to go into the situation, and uh, to be manipulated in certain kinds of ways. Well the whole thing goes back to my sort of basic premise of "In order to realize an experience you have to be there... And so I try to make you be there. Cam) S-6-965-968. (Bar)

Unfortunately, group members' discussions were limited to a focus on processes linked with their improvisational work. Although they did take breaking point actions with respect to subsequent processes of revision and polishing performance, they did not discuss in the larger group their perspective on how those processes had emerged.

There was, then, no reservoir of data wherein group members described their sense of theatre process related to emerging roles, revision of the script and polishing actors' performances through acting. As a result, to consider these aspects of group members' acting, the study came to rely on field observations. As data in the "Emerging Patterns Of Process" section portrayed most group members
developed a sense of when to start and how and where to start acting when they were revising, so that Cam's requests of this nature became less frequent.

In addition to group members' "learning" about and constructing theatre process they continued to learn about the community through their interactions.

Concepts Related To The Community

Group members' discussions about the community's history continued sporadically during this stage. In the first meetings after the all-day workshop group members were still working on improvisations. Most of their references to community history occurred then as part of their effort to create scenes. However, they continued to speak of community history as they attempted to ascertain whether content of their scenes was historically accurate.

- Does it mention anything about the irons and the electricity? Jo) [Approximately] Where did you see that? Jes) In that paper, it says "12 Hour Power". There's an article in there about all night power. Ann) A-30-825.
- I was trying to get some of my facts right about this telephone business. You know, like I don't know if there were payphones in 1915. So I spent a day at the Journal and came up with a few things that I passed around here for other people. Tips for their things. Couldn't come up with anything for my own. Went to the Museum. Couldn't come up with a damn thing there. And I phoned Sask-Tel business office. And I talked to a gal there. Ended up talking to the librarian in Regina. Len) S-5-839-41.
- There was quite a bit about the Hapsburg Hotel and it's such a dive now. I thought it would be interesting to draw people's attention to what a wonderful thing it was when it was built. There was a fire while it was partially under construction and people escaped in their night clothes... In Gotheim? Oh really? Eil) S-5-848-49.
- You know, she has to, like, in that scene, where she's the mother, she can say "Be quite once." Len) Yeah, I've got "extra"
in my thing. Jes) And se should say, "You're extra doing that so I'll get mad at you". She's gotta bring some of that in there and then her language won't seem so proper. Len) You were there when we were asking how to talk? Jes) [To Len] S-5-835-37.
- They were unable to sell it, eh? I suppose there was that problem too years ago. Lor) They could always sell it but the price was always really low in the fall and the small farmer suffered for it. [Paraphrased] S-23-1118.

During this stage, discussion of the community's history had begun, however, to recede as an important element in group members' exchanges.

Significantly, in commencing to consider learning from a perspective of social interaction, "content areas" of group members learning" might constitute a repetition of all those areas of exchange listed in "Emerging Patterns Of Process" including administrative matters and a sense of group entity. This brings to a close contemplation of group members', Cam's, and participant observer's interactions of this period. The next piece of the Mobile-framework, the fourth Act-Play represents a sculpture of group members' intense constructions during their dress rehearsals and their performances.
NOTES

1. The latter is a collection of biographical pieces written about families who had lived in the area for several generations. The collection also included a selection of newspaper articles from earlier decades. It had been published for purposes of recording the heritage of the community.

2. This title is a substitute for the original. Once more in attempts to maintain confidentiality such a substitute has been proffered.

3. This description is not intended, however, to suggest that there were no larger themes to be observed in group members' many discussions. It merely emphasizes that the content in their discourse was not continued from one conversation to the next.

4. Based on indications that much of group members' learning was through observation of "theatre activity" rather than structured instruction, I assume that the "interpreters" considered their piece of information vital because it was difficult to observe. Cam was not there on the occasion and what he did with the tape was not observable because it did not occur at meetings. However, the assumption was that the rest of their process might be observed at meetings.

5. The introduction to this Act-Play emphasized a shift in data and provided explication for that shift in data. It recognized a shift away from attempting to discern common meaning held by group members' through their statements and a shift toward focusing on Cam's statements, his construction of emerging process.

   This segment, in addition to the ones before and after, particularly reflect an emphasis on Cam's construction because his role was commonly held to be the most directive of their process at this time. In addition, data from group members' is limited generally during these meetings. More specifically, data from them is limited in terms of this written media, for much of the data came in the form of their physical actions as opposed to verbal exchanges.

6. Much of this data might have been located in "Emerging Lexicon" within the "Emerging Structure" section. That section will refer to this data. This data on language was located in this section to convey more details of Cam's and group members' emerging process prior to consideration of group members' breaking point actions.

   There is also an important distinction between this lexicon and the words selected for "Emerging Lexicon". The language described in this section was not used by group members so much as they heard and responded, or did not respond to these words and phrases. Generally, those words and phrases contained in the "Emerging Lexicon" segments have been words and phrases used by participants as well as by Cam.

   As director, Cam mainly "produced" the verbal language of starts and stops, particularly as their process assumed a structure of
rehearsals. The study was most concerned with whether group members understood this language and whether they began to react and to use those terms consistently with Cam's apparent meanings. In addition, however, these phrases also convey something generally about the process in which they were engaged.

This ambiguity is partially attributable to general experience with putting on a production. An interview with the person who had been the "stage manager" for the only other major production the theatre club had presented, shed some light on that experience. Jim described his role as stage manager in the following terms:

- I built some of the sets and stuff. I built most of the sets actually. Jim) So you hadn't done any of that before — building sets? Mad) No. Jim) How did you go about learning? Mad) I worked with Jack.... Did you guys have a title? Did you call yourself something? Mad) I got called stage manager in the program. But at the time I thought I was just part of the technical — whatever you called the crew. Bill) O-3-p.7.

He acknowledged ambiguity related to this role even in the theatre club's first production which was considered by club members to have been a more "conventional production" since they had begun with an existing script.

Approximately three years after the project I attended a "going away" party for the participant who had said, "It's not as pukey as it feels." At that party group members improvised a "roast" for the participant. During the roast the line was repeated with great relish.

During most of the middle substages there was a disparity among scenes regarding their state of development and polish. The contents of some scenes changed only minutely after the October fourth meeting, while at least one piece of the Telephone Scene was being improvised for the first time at the same meeting.

The final scene had yet to be drafted. However, in the main their interactions at this time indicated a shift toward intent to do final bits of editing, complete the outer framework of the play and focus at last on polishing performance with the addition of props, lighting and sound.

Although no successive efforts were made to build large group "reflection and discussion" into their theatre process, given that interviews provided group members with an opportunity to make explicit that which had been tacit, one must assume that the interviews had some impact on their interactions.

My experience with the first set of interviews certainly had an impact on what I did with the second set of interviews. (This is explicated in additional detail in "The Part Is Over", the fifth Act-Play.)