Not Quite in the Thick of Things:
The liminal space between the ethnographic researcher and the applied theatre practitioner

Emily Temple

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of

Philosophy in Education

University of Warwick

Centre for Education Studies

December 2017

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

From the University of Warwick, I would like to thank my supervisor, Jonothan Neelands, for his motivation, insight, and the invaluable lessons he taught me about academia, perseverance, and what I am capable of. Anton Franks for his guidance, support, and encouragement, which arrived when I was in need of it the most. I would also like to thank my colleague and friend Rachel King for her wisdom and guidance, and for believing in me even when I did not believe in myself.

Thank you to Kathleen Gallagher for the opportunity to be involved in her remarkable study and for giving me the freedom to follow my research interests within the parameters of that study.

To my friends within the Centre for Education Studies, especially Lauren Jansen-Parks, Jen Kitchen, and Tracy Irish for listening, brainstorming, and developing into my pseudo tribe; I could not have done it without you ladies.

To the Jones and Bett families, for taking me in as one of your own, for listening to me ramble and vent, and for being the pillars of support that held me up and carried me through this often-trying process.

To Jessie, my dear friend, my confident, my cone of silence, thank you for the encouraging messages, for your friendship, love, and support. I surely would have gone insane without you.

To the remarkable Laura Wilson for listening, providing feedback and support; I can never thank you enough for the many ways in which you have helped me.

To the Temple and Brown families, thank you for understanding my need to fly an ocean away to pursue this research process. Thank you for the years of encouragement and love that have lead me to this place and helped see me through to the end of my doctoral journey.

And finally, to the Nelson/Clay/Flach family, thank you for providing stability, safety, and trust. Thank you for listening, for offering advice and encouragement both academically and personally. I love you all.

DECLARATION

The research discussed in this thesis was developed and conducted by the author between June and July 2015. I declare that, apart from work whose authors are explicitly acknowledged, this thesis and the materials contained in this thesis represent original work undertaken solely by the author. I confirm that this thesis has not been submitted for a degree at another university.

ABSTRACT

The focus of the thesis is to examine the overlaps between the role of the ethnographer and the applied theatre practitioner and the liminal space between participant observation and reflective practice in the context of the creation of a verbatim theatre performance with a group of sixth form drama students in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom. As this thesis is an examination of the critical ethnographic process itself and the collaborative negotiations that occur throughout that process, additional caution is taken in the presentation of possible findings. Thick description is used in conjunction with reflection and reflexivity, as is traditional in the presentation of qualitative ethnographic inquiry. The strengths and weaknesses of ethnography as a methodological approach are examined, particularly within the context of collaboration and sharing of information between the researcher and the researched and the resultant affected pedagogic practice and curriculum development. Discussion of possible findings are considered within the context of current literature on the use of ethnographic and applied theatre research within an educational setting. Finally, the thesis concludes with recommendations for possible areas of further inquiry.

1. INTRODUCTION

> We cannot continue to regard the 'writing up' of ethnographic work as innocent. On the contrary, a thorough recognition of the essential reflexivity of ethnographic work intends to the work of reading and writing as well. We must take responsibility for how we choose to represent ourselves and others in the texts we write. (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2006, p. 258)

The purpose of the research discussed within this thesis is to investigate the role of the ethnographer within the context of a verbatim theatre project with a group of 10 sixth form drama students, embedded within a broader, international, longitudinal study. My inquiry further seeks to understand the links between ethnographic study and performance, specifically the creation of a verbatim performance piece with a particular group of young people in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom, and the overlaps between applied theatre research and facilitation and ethnographic research methods within that process. A combination of ethnographic observation, participant observation, and reflective practice was used in the nine-week field work process conducted with 10 students at the Castleton School in the West Midlands, United Kingdom. The names of the students, the school, and the classroom teachers have all been changed within this write up for anonymity purposes.

The case study discussed within this thesis is situated within a broader, international, longitudinal study conducted in five countries: Canada, India, Greece, Taiwan, and the United Kingdom. This project,

titled: *Youth, Theatre, Radical Hope and the Ethical Imaginary: an intercultural investigation of drama pedagogy, performance and civic engagement* [to be referred to as Radical Hope from this point on] has been designed by the principal investigator Professor Kathleen Gallagher who also managed the Canadian site of the project. While the project will be running for four years with a different theatre form being utilized each year in each of the international sites, I will be focusing on the first year of the project within the United Kingdom site, which focused on verbatim theatre, within this write up. I was a member of the United Kingdom team as the ethnographer and as a research assistant supporting Dr Cynthia Prescott (to be referred to throughout this write up as Cynthia or CP in transcribed fieldwork and interview segments) who was the lead researcher and facilitator. The name of the lead researcher I worked with in the United Kingdom team has been changed, just as the names of the school, participants, and classroom teachers have been changed, for anonymity purposes.

The four key aims of the longitudinal study were:

1. Examine for whom and about what students most care, and how hope and care as practiced are related to democratic engagement for youth.
2. Determine whether and how hope can be intentionally mobilized within schools—particularly within drama classrooms— in a context of increasing social and economic instability.
3. Clarify how and why the temporary culture of collective theatre-making works and how specific models of collaborative work in the

drama classroom/workshop space cultivate emotional sensibilities and demonstrate democratic participation across differences with the potential for catalysing broader civic engagement.

4. Clarify how translations of ideas across cultural and linguistic borders, differing pedagogies, cultural aesthetics, genres of digital media, and knowledge mobilization practices build capacities for intercultural dialogue and civic engagement for youth in a global context.

While my fieldwork was conducted within the broader context of the longitudinal study—and my research is closely connected to Kathleen Gallagher's research on critical ethnography and radical hope and Cynthia Prescott's research on hospitality and eco-pedagogy—I will not be examining those themes within this thesis write up as my focus lies elsewhere. I will instead be examining key moments that occurred throughout the generative process, rehearsal, and performance, paying particular attention to the role of ethnography as a method and the overlap in the roles of the ethnographic researcher, and the reflective applied theatre practitioner within those moments. Additionally, I will be examining the way my role as the ethnographer and research assistant was situated within the hierarchy of the overarching longitudinal study my inquiry was nested within. The research questions guiding this inquiry were:

- What connections are there between ethnographic research and devised performance?

- What are the overlaps and dissonances between ethnographic observation methods and reflective practice (specifically within applied theatre research) and how those methods are presented to a wider audience?
- What are the links between the way ethnography and devised verbatim theatre encapsulate aspects of peoples' lives, socially and culturally?

The verbatim process, as it was designed within the longitudinal Radical Hope study, was intended to explore the areas of hope, care, and civic engagement within the daily lives young people. Each research site worked with a different group of young people ranging in age, but our verbatim process was conducted with of a group of 10 sixth form students in the West Midlands, United Kingdom. The overarching themes of hope, care, and civic engagement directed the shaping and planning of the sessions and the exercises used to generate performance material that fit within those themes. While the verbatim process, as a whole, examined these key areas, my research narrowed in on the links between ethnography and performance and the generative applied theatre process itself, and the negotiation of power between myself and the lead researcher, Cynthia, and the overarching Radical Hope project our research was situated within.

This introductory chapter includes the context in which the research was conducted, a detailed overview of the verbatim project design, my orientation to the work, a brief overview of the methods, and the possible areas of significance this inquiry might contribute to the field at large. I will

also briefly examine the ways my research fits within the context of the broader longitudinal study followed by a brief overview of the organization of the thesis and the areas that will be explored in greater detail in the following chapters.

Castleton School, where the research took place, is located in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom. According to the Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED), Castleton is ranked as a 'good' school out of a four-tier ranking system in which schools are categorized as outstanding, good, requires improvement, or inadequate. OfSTED judges a school's 'overall effectiveness' by examining four principal areas: pupil achievement, quality of teaching, behaviour and safety of pupils, and leadership and management, then ranking each area as inadequate, requires improvement, good, or outstanding; the rankings in each of these areas then determines the school's overall categorization (OfSTED inspection report, 2012). A below average portion of the students enrolled at Castleton are eligible for pupil premium, an intervention which provides the school with additional funding for children in local authority care and students who are eligible for free school lunches. The majority of the student population of Castleton School come from a White British background with students of Indian backgrounds as the second highest group (OFSTED, 2012). According to the 2013 census data of the area, this student body makeup reflects the population of the area of the West Midlands in which the school is situated. The participants in the study self-identified as being

from predominantly White British or White European backgrounds, with one student identifying as partially Portuguese. The students self-designated responses can be found in Appendix D: Identity Descriptor Questionnaire and Responses.

The research was conducted over a nine-week period (including planning, contact hours, script development, rehearsal, performance, and follow-up interviews). The sessions were conducted in two alternating open-space drama classrooms (Monk, Neelands, Rutter, & Heron, 2001), Mr. J's room and Miss C's, depending on which teacher the students were supposed to be seeing that day, with additional long rehearsal days and performances held on the University of Warwick Campus. This particular group was chosen in part because of accessibility; the students had a break in their curriculum that allowed us to have the contact hours with them during school hours without disrupting their lessons or exams. Additionally, Cynthia and I both had previously met several of the members of this class when Cynthia had them brought in to work with her MA students on the University of Warwick campus—due to Cynthia's professional relationship with Mr J—for a day long workshop that I assisted with. Given the short period of time available for the generative process, we believed this prior familiarity could potentially aid us when working with the group. While there is compelling evidence within existing literature on the efficacy of applied theatre forms to develop community within student groups as well

as between facilitators or teachers and students (Nelson, 2009; Gallagher, 2007; Neelands & Nelson, 2013), we believed some familiarity would facilitate the process of community and trust development necessary for this particular devising process to succeed, as the primary focus of the performance piece generated would focus on the students' personal interests and stories. This was especially important given the limited contact hours per week and the limited amount of time we had to generate material and construct a script from that material.

Each week we had an average of three to four contact hours with the students with the addition of two long rehearsal days held on the University of Warwick campus towards the end of the process. During those hours, we utilized various theatre games and improvisational activities, along with discussion prompts and exercises to explore what mattered most to the group of case study participants. A detailed account of the drama activities used within the sessions will be included in the following discussion chapters, and a calendar breakdown of the sessions is included in the following section on the Verbatim Project Design. As the ethnographer on the project, I observed the students, kept detailed notes of their interactions, discussions, prompt responses, and the theatrical work they produced. Video and audio recording devices were also used in each of the sessions, and the footage was later transcribed verbatim to compare and contrast to both my ethnographic and reflective notes and Cynthia's reflective notes. These notes and transcriptions were then compiled and

edited into a verbatim play script, that Cynthia and I created together, that was rehearsed and performed for an invited audience. The completed verbatim play script has been included as Appendix C. After each session, Cynthia and I discussed our initial analyses which then fed into the planning and progression of the subsequent sessions. In this way, the ethnographic observations worked reflexively, as a tool, throughout the course of the research allowing us, as a team, to make informed choices that potentially shaped the outcomes of the work produced. Using this approach, my role as the ethnographer within this project relates back to the Hammersley and Atkinson quote that headed this section:

> We cannot continue to regard the 'writing up' of ethnographic work as innocent. On the contrary, a thorough recognition of the essential reflexivity of ethnographic work intends to the work of reading and writing as well. We must take responsibility for how we choose to represent ourselves and others in the texts we write. (Hammersley and Atkinson 2006, p. 258)

This type of reflexivity was essential in the creation of the script produced as well as the write up of this thesis itself. This approach also relates to Kathleen Gallagher's approach to critical ethnography, utilizing a "critically reflexive stance" as a means of "constant (re) examination of the state of the collaboration, will help researchers decouple the far too easy relationship drawn between collaborative, participatory methods and empowering, democratic research" (Gallagher & Wessels, 2011, p. 243).

VERBATIM PROJECT DESIGN

The verbatim project was conducted with a group of 10 sixth form drama students from working class to middle class backgrounds (self-designated), predominantly of White British descent, in an academy in the West Midlands, United Kingdom. The students' self-designated demographic responses including gender, ethnicity, economic group, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, and spoken languages/language preferences can be found in Appendix D: Identity Descriptor Questionnaire and Responses. The research took place in the summer term of 2015 commencing with pre-planning on May 29, 2015 through to the final interviews being completed on July 14, 2015. The chart below shows the initial schedule for the generative process, rehearsal, performances, and follow-up interviews, including two sessions which Cynthia and I were away for that were conducted by Mr J, one of the classroom teachers.

	Monday	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**
Week 1					May 29th 11:20-12:20
Week 2	June 1st	June 2nd	June 3rd 10:00-11:00 (period 2)	June 4th	June 5th 12:20-1:20 (period 4)
Week 3	June 8th 10:00-11:00 (period 2)	June 9th	June 10th 11:20-12:20	June 11th 2:10-3:10 (period 5)	June 12th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3)
Week 4	June 15th 12:20-1:20 (period 4)	June 16th 9:00-10:00 12:20-1:20	June 17th 10:00-11:00 (period 2)	June 18th	June 19th 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4)

		(period 1 and possible period 4)			
Week 5	June 22nd 10:00-11:00 (period 2)	June 23rd	June 24th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3)	June 25th 2:10 - 3:10 (period 5)	June 26th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3)
Week 6	29th June 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4)	30th June 9:00-10:00 12:20-1:20 (period 1 and possible period 4)	1st July	2nd July	3rd July 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4) (Emily and Cynthia away)
Week 7	6th July (10:00-11:00)	7th July	8th July ALL DAY	9th July	10th July All Day Performance
Week 8	13th July Interviews	14th July Interviews			

The sessions were co-planned by Dr Cynthia Prescott [referred to from here on as Cynthia, or CP in transcribed quotations from the devising and interview processes], the lead researcher, and myself and facilitated by Cynthia with support and occasional facilitation by me, situated within the overarching study designed by Professor Kathleen Gallagher—the names of the participants, the classroom teachers, and the lead researcher I worked with from the University of Warwick have been changed for anonymity purposes. In this way, I did not fill a traditionally ethnographic role due to my increased level of participation, which I will address in further detail in

the Chapter 3: Methodology. The verbatim process was initially open-ended, with the intention that it would be lead and structured around the participant's interests and responses. Utilizing a variety of strategies including: improvisation, ensemble building, contracting, group discussion, card storming, value lines (also referred to as spectrum of difference), movement, games, research, and personal storytelling, the participants explored a variety of themes and ideas within the core concepts of hope, care, and civic engagement dictated by the Radical Hope project, but the notions of 'safety' and 'uncertainty' emerged as areas of particular resonance and became the core themes of the performance text. A more detailed description of the workshops will be provided in the discussion chapters.

The structure and planning of the sessions was formative in that exercises and activities were planned in response to the work the participants produced, with the goal of expanding their awareness of the key themes of hope, care, and civic engagement dictated by the longitudinal study (Patton, 2002). Conversations, discussions, peer-to-peer interviews, and in class responses were recorded and transcribed verbatim; these transcriptions along with observations on interactions and movements taken from my ethnographic notes and the video and audio recordings of the sessions were then used to create the verbatim script that Cynthia and I co-wrote and directed. The development process lasted four weeks, followed by two weeks of devising and rehearsal, culminating in a performance on July 10, 2015 for an invited audience composed of

postgraduate students, members of the University of Warwick faculty and staff, friends, and colleagues. For the purposes of this write up, devising is defined as an exploration of various theatre techniques with the intended goal of allowing the participants to voice their own ideas, interests, and experiences and to develop an original performance piece in order to share them with a wider audience (Nelson, 2011).

MY INTEREST IN THE TOPIC

Given the subjective nature of data collection, coding, and analysis of ethnographic inquiry, it is important that every ethnographer acknowledges who they are in the write up: their own biases, their ideologies, and how those constructions have fed into the resultant analysis and coding of the data generated and presented (Gallagher, 2008; Conquergood, 1991; Clifford, 1983). Ethnography can never be fully separated from the ethnographer; therefore, my methodological approach cannot be separated from my identity. Both my personal identity as a white, American woman, from a working-class background and my professional identity as a theatre practitioner and researcher and every facet in between. These multi-faceted identities have certainly played a role in my participation in this research and the ways in which I have interpreted the data generated, which will be explored in further detail in the following chapters.

In the spirit of reflexivity, I will attempt to address my areas of interest within this introductory chapter which have lead me to this inquiry,

stemming from my experience as a theatre artist and educator, and previous involvement in qualitative theatre education research. This is also a means of declaring my orientation to the research, and the areas of interest I bring to the work, which naturally colour the ways I gather and interpret data.

My professional life is constructed from a mixture of theatre work—as an actor and a costumer—and education—as a theatre educator and a qualitative researcher. I have worked as an ethnographer on projects where I have been a removed observer, providing notes and interpretations of observed behaviours and interactions, and transcribed sections of performance, interviews, and classroom interactions. Additionally, I have worked as a facilitator, guiding generative processes, directing scripted pieces, or creating original performance pieces incorporating student contributions. The majority of my theatrical and research experiences prior to my post-graduate study took place in urban environments in the United States (primarily New York City, NY and Boston, MA). Within the United States educational system, schools are designed to develop students into citizens who will become contributing members of society, specifically by filling market needs, because of this the socioeconomic disparities of the population as a whole are reflected and replicated within the student population (Apple, 1995). As such, students in urban environments, like those I have worked in as a theatre educator and theatre artist, are often under-resourced and serve as a funnel for students from lower socio-economic families to remain within those socio-economic brackets,

ultimately entering the lower socio-economic workforce after school (Apple, 1995, Ladson-Billings, 2009; Fine & Weiss, 2003). Having worked in urban environments, most of my previous research and pedagogic experience—and my point of view in the interpretation of those experiences—has a slant toward social justice and equitable access to the arts and education for all populations as those two areas form the foundation of my personal, core belief systems. These various experiences focused my attention on the similarities between the two roles, ethnographer and devised drama facilitator, the overlaps between the two, and the ways in which both roles strive to encapsulate aspects of peoples' lives, socially and culturally, and present those aspects to a wider audience, either through publication or performance.

When I first started my doctoral research, I intended to do an ethnographic study of a drama classroom, examining the development of community within applied theatre work and the potential outcomes on student engagement, retention, and participation. My pilot study was designed as a more observational study, with minimal participant observation, however, over the course of the study my level of participation increased. On one particular occasion, the classroom teacher left me in charge of the class, as the practitioner, with no prior discussion or planning. This experience and the insights I gained from it as a researcher and a practitioner, led me to the study which this thesis focuses on. The more ambiguous role I played within the Radical Hope project as someone in the

bottom of a research hierarchy, under Cynthia, the lead United Kingdom researcher, who was under Kathleen Gallagher the principal investigator of the international, longitudinal study, provided an opportunity to delve deeper into a study of the links and overlaps between ethnographic research and applied theatre facilitation and the applications of those two similar, yet distinct, roles.

METHODS

This was a qualitative study using ethnographic observation, participant observation, and reflective practice as the primary forms of data collection followed by ethnographic interviews with the participants, the classroom teachers, and Cynthia, the lead researcher. This combination produced an information rich case study within a social constructivist frame with the intention of "deeply understanding specific cases within a particular context" (Patton, 2002, p.546).

In the design, enactment, data collection, and interpretation of this project, I endeavoured toward researcher reflexivity. Linda Finlay (2002) defines this as "thoughtful, conscious, self-awareness" which is marked by "continual evaluation of subjective responses, intersubjective dynamics, and the research process itself (p.532)." This allows the researcher to focus on "how we actively construct our knowledge" in order to convert "subjectivity from a problem into an opportunity (p.531)." This was particularly important in this case due to the brevity of the study, the nature of the

research conducted, and the means of reporting findings. Rosanna Hertz (1997) describes the presentation of ethnographic data in this way, "The reflexive ethnographer does not simply report 'facts' or 'truth' but actively constructs interpretations of his or her experiences in the field and then questions how those interpretations came about (p.viii)." In an effort to further support the interpretations of my field notes in this case, follow-up interviews were conducted with the participants, the two classroom teachers, and Cynthia, the lead researcher from the University of Warwick, allowing the participants to directly voice their thoughts and opinions in their words. The ethnographic observation and interview processes and the methodological rationale behind the research design and execution will be discussed in more detail within the methodology and discussion chapters.

POSSIBLE AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

> No single, unchallenged paradigm has been established for deciding what does and does not comprise valid, useful, and significant knowledge… there is no one right way to do social science research. (Bochner, 2002, p. 259)

I hope for this thesis to make a contribution to the current debates on the role of ethnography within education research and devised theatrical performance, and the experiences of those conducting and participating in that research. Bochner, who is quoted above, further states that "it is impossible to fix a single standard for deciding the good and right purposes, forms, and practices of ethnography" and that "alternative ethnography reflects a desire to do meaningful, significant, and valuable work" (Bochner,

2002, p. 260). It is within this spectrum of social sciences research that I situate my research and orientation towards ethnography as a method.

In his book *On Ethnographic Authority* James Clifford asks, "If ethnography produces cultural interpretations through intense research experiences, how is unruly experience transformed into an authoritative written account?" (Clifford, 1983, p.25) This has been, and continues to be, one of the areas of contention within the study and presentation of anthropological and ethnographic work, a tension I will explore within this thesis, though I do not presume to offer any definitive answers. With the write up of this research I have attempted to provide an organized, authoritative account of the 'unruly experience' of this verbatim project focusing on particular key moments and providing an interpretation of those incidents and how they fed into the creation of the verbatim script, as well as my interpretations of the research process itself. I have also attempted to explicate the 'unruly experience' of my ambiguous role within the Radical Hope project, and the benefits and constraints created by being situated at the bottom the vertical power structure of that project.

It is the dichotomy between what research is considered appropriate or 'valid' and research data that arises from more subjective means that I wish to explore further within this thesis. More specifically, the liminality between the role of the ethnographic researcher and the reflective, applied theatre practitioner, specifically within education research, the fine lines between ethnographic observation, participant observation, and reflective

practice. The examination of these liminalities, nested within the Radical Hope project, contributes to both the field of ethnographic inquiry and applied theatre within education and the similarities in methods and the presentation of potential outcomes between the two. In *The Theatre of the Urban: Youth and Schooling in Dangerous Times,* Kathleen Gallagher equates this process of presenting research to an act of storytelling:

> As I tell the story of this empirical research, I have endeavoured to share, as thoroughly as possible, the rich contexts, the diverse characters, and the marginal practices, that we encountered. And a story it is. Some may think that calling it research elevates its status, but there remains the fantastical; it seems clear to me that I am making decisions about which story to tell and how to tell it at every turn (Gallagher, 2007, p. 6).

Similarly, within the body of this thesis I have decided what story to tell, engaging with the relevant literature throughout. I have endeavoured to provide a clear, concise overview of the contexts the research was conducted in, and the reasoning behind the methodological choices and interpretations that were made as I tell the story of this research. And as Kathleen so clearly stated above, "...a story it is" (ibid, p.6).

OVERVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING CHAPTERS

The structure of this thesis mimics the structure of the research itself in that its organization follows the same line of development as the research and analysis did in practice. The Literature Review (Chapter 2), explores the theoretical pillars guiding this research taking the long-standing tradition of

the teacher as researcher into account and interrogating how these theoretical pillars provided a framework for the research process. An examination of the methods used and the decisions governing the approach to the research in practice will be discussed in the chapter on Methodology (Chapter 3). The key moments, or Findings from the process will be presented ethnographically utilizing 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) in a series of Discussion Chapter(s) (Chapters 4-10) to provide context and possible interpretations of events with sections from the participant's interviews transcribed and interspersed throughout, as appropriate, to provide triangulation by providing responses in the participants' own words. The Conclusion (Chapter 11) considers the meaning of the interpretations presented within the discussion chapters, their potential significance to the field at large, and poses a series of questions and recommendations for areas of further inquiry.

I should highlight that the points of view presented in the following sections represent one point of view not *the* point of view. These views reflect my orientation, reflected by my experience and training, and my perspectives on research within the realm of education. The majority of the observations and reflections taken stem from ethnographic research, though they only represent one particular understanding as presented by an individual researcher, myself. 'Education' in the sense of this thesis refers to the field at large rather than only what goes on in schools, but with a

particular focus— which will be narrowed in on in later chapters— on the role of applied theatre within education and the potential links between ethnographic inquiry and the generation and development of verbatim performance with young people.

2. Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review focuses on the theoretical pillars which shaped the research process discussed within this thesis, focusing on two principal areas: ethnographic research practice and applied theatre pedagogy, specifically pertaining to the creation of verbatim theatre with young people in an educational context. This chapter presents a rationale for an examination of the overlaps between the two processes referring to the Radical Hope case study research conducted at the Castleton School that will be unfolded in greater detail in later chapters. The chapter will begin with an examination of qualitative research terminology and the definitions of importance as they pertain to this thesis. This will be followed by an exploration of the ambiguity and overlaps between ethnographic research in practice—specifically the blurred lines between participant observation and non-participant observation— and the reflective practice of applied theatre pedagogy within the creation of generative performance. This will involve references to my role as an ethnographer and assistant practitioner within the verbatim project; I was not a traditional ethnographer in the sense that I was not an 'objective', removed observer—though there were moments I stepped back and observed—and I was not solely a participant observer. My

role was ambiguous, fluid, and negotiated throughout between ethnographer, research assistant, and practitioner, roles which will be unfolded further within this chapter and the following chapter on methodology, taking my role within the tired power structure created by the overarching longitudinal study into account. Finally, this literature review will also include a brief investigation of the history of the teacher-researcher, both within applied theatre research and drama research within educational contexts and where the research presented within this thesis fits within these traditions.

TERMINOLOGY

> I have come to distrust the definitions of disciplines that we invent as our knowledge grows. These definitions are useful for the experts but can be confusing to others. And they may imply divisions and differences that don't really exist. (Zull, 2002, p. xiv, xv)

There is a debate within qualitative research on the particular terms used within the presentation of data. Discussions circle around whether data is 'collected' or 'generated' or 'gathered'; if findings are 'analysed' or 'interpreted'; if qualitative inquiry is performed through 'research' or 'fieldwork' (Eisner, 1977; Wolcott, 1994; Ingold, 2014). Each tradition of qualitative social sciences research favours particular terms, but regardless of what vocabulary is used, as Harry Wolcott says, "everything has the potential to be data, but nothing *becomes* data without the intervention of a researcher who takes note" (1994 p.3, emphasis present in the original text).

Wolcott (1994) further describes three major modes of gathering data utilized by qualitative researchers: "participant observation (experiencing), interviewing (enquiring), and studying materials prepared by others (examining)" (p.9). He pairs this with three ways of handling the data once it has been gathered: description, analysis, and interpretation. Description allows the data to "speak for themselves," (ibid, p.10) through rendering an account that is as close as possible to the data as originally recorded, by taking excerpts from field notes and participant accounts. Analysis takes a more 'scientific' approach by expanding upon descriptions through an examination channelled through a systematic form of some kind in order to identify "key factors and the relationships among them" (ibid, p.10). Finally, interpretation stems from both description and analysis with the intended goal of "understanding or explaining beyond the limits of what can be explained with the degree of certainty usually associated with analysis" (ibid, pp 10-11).

Wolcott's triumvirate of qualitative research methods could be seen as a comparative expansion on Elliot Eisner's (1977) approach to education research. Eisner defined what he considered the three main areas of educational research as "description, interpretation, and evaluation" (p. 72). While Eisner's approach aligns more closely to my leanings as a practitioner, as a researcher I align more closely with Wolcott's categories and methods. The three categories presented by both Wolcott and Eisner

share characteristics in that they all involve an element of comparison to existing research, an element of observation and descriptive reporting, and an element of what is done with what is described. Alan Peshkin takes these three categories and expands upon them further by adding a fourth, more scientific, category of verification (Peshkin, 1993). These terms are at times combined or used interchangeably, creating some confusion over their meaning when taken into consideration of the field at large. Michael Agar (1980) attempts to break down these definitions in an attempt to distinguish the terms in this way:

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

These proposed definitions can be expanded, examining the types of data generated through ethnographic inquiry. Ethnographic studies often produce both objective and subjective data due to the combination of observation and participation the researcher engages in throughout the process which yield different forms of data; observation produces 'objective' data while participation produces understandably 'subjective' data (Ingold, 2014, p. 387). This distinction between these two forms is somewhat problematic, in ways that I will explore in more detail later in this section. This sets up a contradiction between observation and participation and the various methods utilized within qualitative research, specifically within

ethnography, which in the circumstances of this research is more specifically ethnography within the drama classroom.

Tim Ingold takes the argument a step further and suggests that the term 'ethnography' itself has become "so overused, both in anthropology and in contingent disciplines, that it has lost much of its meaning" (2014, p. 383). Ethnography, as a term, simply means "writing about the people" (Ingold, 2014, p. 385) though few anthropologists or 'ethnographers' would use a definition that simple. There have been exhaustive debates on who has the right to make observations, how those observations are reported, what constitutes an 'ethnography' and so on (see Ingold, 2014; Conquergood, 1991; Wolcott 1993; or Gallagher 2014). My intention is not to further these debates, but to declare my positioning within the spectrum of research these debates have created. I also intend to clarify the terminology—for the purposes of this thesis—and the ways in which those terms are defined and utilized within the context of this research and write up.

Ethnography is like a fingerprint, there are as many 'ethnographies' as there are 'ethnographers.' An ethnographer can study the practices of patient care in hospitals and produce a medical ethnography. They can adapt ethnographic method to conduct a virtual study of online communities and relationship development and call it cyber-ethnography. Or they can write solely about their own experiences and reflections and

present an autoethnography. This is in part due to the personal nature of the method itself; every ethnographer has a different way of collecting field notes and interpreting their data because, unlike other methods of research, ethnographic inquiry can never be truly separated from the *ethnographer (*Ingold, 2014). Applied theatre research suffers from a similar complication in that applied theatre inquiry usually relies on reflective practice or participant observation produced by the practitioner, thus making it difficult to separate applied theatre inquiry from the applied theatre practitioner.

Similar to ethnographic inquiry, there is a debate within the academy over what the appropriate terms are to designate the various forms of applied theatre/drama research. Helen Nicholson (2014) discusses the triad of terms used to describe "forms of dramatic activity that are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies" as "applied drama, applied theatre, and applied performance" (p.3). Philip Taylor (2003) breaks these terms down proposing that 'applied drama' is process based while 'applied theatre' is performance based. Judith Ackroyd (2000) further defines the combined process-oriented and performative aspects of applied theatre as sharing "a belief in the power of the theatre form to address something beyond the form itself" (p.1). Applied theatre, like ethnography, is what Ackroyd calls an 'umbrella term' meaning that it encompasses multiple forms of theatre including: devised theatre, theatre education, verbatim theatre, theatre for development, and theatre in hospitals to name

a few (ibid, p.3). Beck, Belliveau, Lea, and Wagner (2011) have taken these definitions a step further and encompassed all of the aforementioned areas of theatrical performance and research into an even broader term, "research-based theatre" which encompasses verbatim theatre (Paget, 1987), performative ethnography (Alexander, Anderson, & Gallegos, 2005; Denzin 1997), and ethnodrama (Saldaña, 2003) by creating a spectrum of research based theatre and performance based research.

For the purposes of this thesis, the terms applied theatre and critical ethnography will be used as the classifications of choice for the specific forms of research conducted within the verbatim case study discussed within this write up. Combining the definitions of Taylor and Ackroyd, I propose that applied theatre, within the contexts of this write up, constitutes a form or dramatic activity with a focus on both the process and the product, in this case the generative verbatim theatre process and the script that was ultimately written and performed as a result of that process. Similarly, I borrow from Kathleen Gallagher's definition of critical ethnography, in that for the purposes of this write up, critical ethnography is "profoundly interested in the relationships of power reproduced in spaces, marked by differently positioned subjectivities" (Gallagher, 2006, p.63). Critical ethnography, as defined for the purposes of this research, also borrows from Soyini Madison's definition of critical ethnography as a form that is reflexive that incorporates an agenda for "social justice of advocacy" (2011, p. 197). These two definitions are used because of the unique

circumstances of this research being conducted within the overarching Radical Hope project, and the power dynamics that created, as well as the themes of hope, care, and civic engagement that were investigated through the generative process, as was dictated by the Radical Hope project.

APPLIED THEATRE

> ...the danger of using the term 'applied theatre'...is that it carries the implicit assumption that 'theatre' is a reified art form with a clearly defined aesthetic that can somehow be taken up and 'applied' in any context. In reality the division can never be so neat, for what is meant by theatre changes according to the manner and context of the application. The very form itself is responsive to the circumstances in which it is used. (Prentki & Preston, 2009, p. 10)

Applied theatre has a rich, expansive history, that in many ways can be traced back to social and political discourse within theatrical performance such as Euripides' *The Trojan Woman;* however, applied theatre, as it pertains to the contexts of this thesis and within the current realm of research, stems primarily from the surge of interest in research in the social sciences following World War II. Additional links may be drawn between the development of the current understanding and application of applied theatre and Bertolt Brecht's use of theatre for social change and disruption in the 1930s, which became readily accessible to English-speaking countries in the 1950s. Brecht's erasure of the 'fourth wall' thus removing the separation between actor and audience and the focus of his theatre work to incite social and political change, specifically, may have served as an influence to the current understanding and practice of applied

theatre (Nicholson, 2005; Prentki & Preston, 2009; Prendergast & Saxton, 2013).

Following the 1950s applied theatre expanded and developed into three primary directions: theatre in for social change, theatre in education, and theatre for development. The uses of theatre for social change further developed in tandem with the 1960s uprising of grass-roots political activism. One of the leaders of this period of theatrical experimentation was Augusto Boal who drew upon the educational theories and beliefs of Paulo Freire and applied them to the development of *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Similarly, in the 1960s within the United Kingdom, Theatre in Education developed a multitude of pedagogic methods and methodologies utilizing active learning that then spread to other areas of the world. Finally, theatre for development arrived a few decades later in the late 1980s and early 1990s as a response to increasing interest in non-profit and non-government organizations to creating lasting, social change (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013; Prentki & Preston, 2009; Neelands 2007). Jenny Hughes and Simon Ruding (2009) describe the complicated interactions between personal development and political objectives present within applied theatre during this time period in this way:

> "The preoccupation of applied theatre practice and research through the 1990s was with establishing 'model' interventions that sought to resolve complex social problems together with a search for 'foundational' texts: evaluation reports with 'evidence' of impact and manuals setting down guidelines for good practice. These approaches risked uncritically participating in wider mechanisms of power and control" (p.223).

This brief history of applied theatre circles back to the quote from Prentki and Preston that opens this section; applied theatre is not a singular title that can define as a neat and tidy set of practices. Prentki and Preston further say, "Applied theatre defies any one definition and includes a multitude of intentions, aesthetic processes, and transactions with its participants" (2009, p. 11). It is instead an umbrella term that encompasses a multitude of theatre forms and research practices across disciplines, genres, and countries, that is frequently inextricably tied to socio-political contexts. It is my intention to use this section of my thesis to probe the areas of applied theatre that are relevant to the Castleton case study discussed within this thesis and how and why the overarching Radical Hope study qualifies as an example of applied theatre research.

Jonothan Neelands describes the purpose and meaning within applied theatre in this way:

> At the heart of all drama and theatre is the opportunity for role-taking—to imagine oneself as the other. To try and find oneself in the other and in so doing to recognize the other in oneself. This is the crucial and irreducible bridge between all forms of drama and theatre work. (Jonothan Neelands, cited in O'Connor, 2010, p. 122)

In this way, applied theatre involves the cooperation of the physical body and the phenomenal/experiential body (Bresler, 2013, p.7). Basically, this means applied theatre involves embodied learning, in which one's thoughts, emotions, and memories of lived experiences influence how their bodies

respond within various circumstances, including participation in dramatic work (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013, p. 5-6). Applied theatre is what Judith Ackroyd (2000) calls an 'umbrella term' (p.3) meaning that the parameters of the field are difficult to define as various drama activities and theatrical forms fall under the categorization of applied theatre (Ackroyd, 2007). The desire to detangle the myriad of classifications for theatre, its techniques, products, and processes, has led to a separation between what Anthony Jackson (2007) calls theatre that is 'social' and 'aesthetic theatre.' Social theatre refers to "theatre that claims a social, interventionist purpose in the real world" while aesthetic theatre involves more "conventional theatre in which artistic effect and entertainment are the principal functions" (ibid, p. 2).

Helen Nicholson (2005) defines applied theatre/drama as "dramatic activity that primarily exists outside conventional mainstream theatre institutions, and which are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies" (p.2). She expands upon this definition stating it is characterised by "the relationship between theatre practice, social efficacy, and community building" (p.2). These definitions, provided by Nicholson, are the most useful in categorizing the research conducted in the case study discussed within this thesis, in that the primary goals of the overarching longitudinal Radical Hope study focused on hope, care, and civic engagement. In this way, the research conducted fit within

Nicholson's definition of applied theatre as they took place outside conventional theatre institutions (within an educational setting), but with the intention of benefitting the individuals involved. The collaborative, international aspects of the Radical Hope project, and the focus of the project on the assessment and encouragement of youth involvement in civic engagement also aligns with how Jenny Hughes and Simon Ruding suggest participation in applied theatre may serve to broaden the horizons of the participants, especially young people, "Theatre that challenges the thinking and behaviour of young people asks them to take an imaginative leap into a world that may have very different routines, roles, values from their familiar environment" (Hughes & Ruding, p. 221).

Over the course of the devising process there was a practitioner-led internal goal of community development within the group of participants as a means of improving the social health of the group (B. J. Wagner, 1976, p. 30) to facilitate the generation of materials for performance. When we started the workshop process the students was divided, having just finished two performance pieces that separated the group—this will be discussed in greater detail in the discussion chapters. While there is compelling evidence within existing literature on the efficacy of applied theatre forms to develop community within student groups as well as between facilitators or teachers and students (Nelson, 2009; Gallagher, 2007; Neelands & Nelson, 2013), given that there was a limited amount of time to generate material, rehearse, and perform the verbatim play, it was especially important to

work toward repairing the social health of the group to make the best use of the limited timeframe. The workshops were conducted with the intention of creating a piece of performance material, a verbatim play script crafted from my ethnographic notes and observations, transcriptions of the audio and video footage, and the reflections of myself, and Cynthia as practitioners.

One of the challenges of applied theatre is how to "balance the moral and cultural values of participants…with the need for artistic freedom" (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013, p.22). This balance was especially important given that the source material for the script was taken from the participants' real stories, experiences, and lives, as is the nature of verbatim theatre (Paget, 1987). The tension between creating an entertaining, aesthetically pleasing piece of theatre that satisfied Cynthia and I's artistic sensibilities while honouring the experience of the process and the needs of the participants was difficult at times. Even though the workshops were conducted with the intention of creating a piece of verbatim theatre, they were held within an educational setting, making the process a mixture of applied theatre and education. Freire describes a similar challenge educators face within the classroom to what Cynthia and I faced as theatre artists and educators within the Castleton study:

> The teacher is of course an artist, but being an artist does not mean that he or she can make the profile, can shape the students. What the educator does in teaching is to make it possible for the students to become themselves. (Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 181)

Within the verbatim process we sought to plan the workshops in a way that would allow the students to be themselves, to share their thoughts, opinions, and feelings freely, so that the resulting verbatim play would be the most truthful expression of who they are possible. The staging of the production sought to create creative distance in a way that would make the reproduction of these stories comfortable for the students as performers, as well as aesthetically interesting for the audience members. The processes of the script writing, staging, and performance of the verbatim script will be discussed in more detail in the series of discussion chapters investigating the key moments from the verbatim process.

While it is true that applied theatre can at times become "prey to the agendas of the sponsors; agendas that may contradict those of the participants" (Prentki & Preston, 2009, p. 14) and the Radical Hope project had a clearly defined agenda in the investigation of hope, care, and civic engagement in the lives of young people in five distinct countries, we had the freedom to pursue the participants interests and our interpretations of those terms. The overarching Radical Hope project restricted some of the choices that could be made in terms of the applied theatre process as a whole. The overarching study, that this study is nested within, required we develop a piece of verbatim theatre within the first year of the study, which this thesis write up focuses on. Additionally, the themes of hope, care, and civic engagement needed to be explored as the primary subject areas the verbatim process. Despite the restrictions placed upon the process, the

verbatim workshops still fall solidly within the current spectrum of applied theatre research and performance. Philip Taylor (2003) says:

> ...theatre is *applied* because it is taken out from the conventional mainstream theatre house into various settings in communities where many members have no real experience in theatre form. The theatre becomes a medium for action, for reflection, but most important, for transformation – a theatre in which new modes of being can be encountered and new possibilities for humankind can be imagined. (p. xxx)

The verbatim theatre process conducted at Castleton School fits within this description because it sought to alter the social health of the group, and to interrogate the roles of hope, care, and civic engagement in the lives of the participants. Further, the Radical Hope study, in Kathleen's words focuses on, "...creating theatre and dialogue with strangers, those in our local classrooms as well as those across cultural, racial, and linguistic divides, to whom we may learn to have some ethical responsibility" (taken from the Radical Hope funding proposal), goals which align with the goals of applied theatre research to move "beyond the scope of conventional, mainstream theatre into the realm of theatre that is responsive to the ordinary people and their stories, local settings, and priorities" (Prentki & Preston, p.9). The following Methodology chapter (Chapter 3) and the series of discussion chapters (Chapters 4-10) will describe the methodology and methods used, and key moments from the workshops in greater detail.

WRITING PROCESSES

> ...if we get rid of traditional notions of 'objectivity' and 'scientific method' we shall be able to see the social sciences as continuous with literature-as interpreting other people to us, and thus enlarging and deepening our sense of community. (Rorty, 1979, p.203)

In the above quotation, Richard Rorty is suggesting a move away from the divisions within the academic community—namely the divisions between the sciences and the social sciences. This would allow for a restructuring of the processes of writing, particularly in qualitative ethnographic accounts, allowing for representations of field work experiences in order to contribute to the field at large. In instances where applied theatre research was conducted in partnership with ethnographic research, as was the case in the Castleton study, this would allow for accounts of the research that included both the ethnographic notes as well as the reflective notes of the applied theatre practitioner. Sanjek cautions "The relationship between fieldnote evidence and ethnographic conclusions should be made specific" (Sanjek, 1991, p.621). This reflexivity and clarity are necessary for the reporting of both ethnographic work as well as applied theatre research.

Unlike more scientific disciplines, "...the important thing about the anthropologist's findings is their complex specificness, their circumstantiality" (Geertz, 1973, p.23). However, this creates a complication in the reporting of research events in that they cannot be replicated, and they cannot be truly generalized, instead their contribution lies within their singularity (Wolcott, 1994; Geertz 1973). What is reported then, often is at

the discretion of the researcher and what they perceive to be elements of importance. Wolcott describes the process in this way:

> In the very act of constructing *data* out of *experience,* the qualitative researcher singles out some things as worthy of note and relegates others to the background. Because it takes a human observer to accomplish that, there goes any possibility of providing "pure" description, sometimes referred to lightheartedly as "immaculate perception. (Wolcott, 1994, p.13, emphasis present in the original text)

This idea of "immaculate perception" is combatted by the development of what Erickson (1973) calls "disciplined subjectivity" which requires a rigorous self-examination of each decision made within the research process as well as in the interpretation of data and the writing and reporting of those interpretations. In this way, the researcher is considered an instrument of the research itself. Trinh Minh-Ha further describes the fluidity of writing ethnographic research in this way, "Despite our desperate, eternal attempt to separate, contain, and mend, categories always leak" (Minh-Ha, 1989, p.94). It is the interpretive nature of this form of reporting that is often criticised when considering qualitative work—ethnographic or anthropological study and applied theatre inquiry included.

Kathryn M. Borman, Margaret D. LeCompte, and Judith Preissle Goetz (1986) challenge that despite these measures qualitative research is 'value-laden' due to the subjective nature of the research style and the connections made between the researcher and the researched. They further

question the "credibility and adequacy of research that does not account for internal and external reliability in the same way that controlled experimentation does" (p. 46). They are not the first to make this assertion, nor will they be the last (see Lubet, 2015; Hammersley, M. & Gomm, R., 2005) and both positions within the argument have valid points. The same challenges are presented in the reporting of applied theatre research, especially when there is a performative element, as by nature live performance is ephemeral and unable to be exactly replicated. Conquergood offers this critique in response, "…pretences; about detached observation and scientific method reveal anxiety about the uncontrollable messiness of any truly interesting fieldwork situation" (Conquergood, 1991, p.182).

The ethnographer, within practice, through the processes of participant observation, analysis, discussion, and publication becomes a site of knowledge; they are actively constructing meaning, drawing conclusions, and developing power dynamics amongst and with the participants they are observing as both an objective outsider and an integrated participant. Within academic publication, however, the process by which the ethnographer comes to their interpretations, utilizing held knowledge to infer connections and possible interpretations of the data they collect, is often inadmissible. This brings up the question of how knowledge is constructed; who decides what constitutes 'knowledge?' How is knowledge

produced and passed on and what role does power play in this production? Michel Foucault challenges these ideas in the following quote:

> Perhaps we should abandon a whole tradition that allows us to imagine that knowledge can exist only where power relations are suspended…We should admit rather that power produces knowledge…that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations…the power and knowledge relations that invest human bodies and subjugate them by turning them into objects of knowledge. (Foucault, 1979, p. 27-28)

In the above passage, Foucault argues for the abandonment of the separation between the field of knowledge and the power relationships present in the construction and presentation of that knowledge. If the body is seen as a site of knowledge, a tool used to make meaning, ethnographically speaking, the processes implemented in the production, analysis, and reporting of knowledge are just as important as the final reported findings themselves. The methodology itself, the various methods used within research practice and the reported discussion of those methods, thus becomes a contribution to the existing field of knowledge. These notions of how data is gathered and reported, how interpretations are developed, and how those interpretations are then shared with the wider public were primary concerns within the verbatim research process.

Conquergood further discusses the notion of 'voice' in the reporting of ethnographic work saying, "…rethinking of ethnography as primarily about speaking and listening, instead of observing, has challenged the

visualist bias of positivism with talk about voices, utterances, intonations, multivocality" (1991, p.183). This notion of voice in the presentation of data as well as the generation of data as opposed to focusing on observation brings into question how field work itself is conducted and what training, if any, is necessary when approaching field work.

TRAINING

> To say any more about intuition, hunches, luck, trusting the process, vision would be next to futile…like the pragmatist, you have to know what you are trying to accomplish; but like the idealist, you have to be open to many ways of getting there. (Kudelka, 2012)

Ethnographic field work and applied theatre pedagogy both share an element of reflexivity and interpretation. The ethnographer decides what in the observational processes is worthy of being noted, what interactions become field notes and the subject for further inquiry, likewise the applied theatre practitioner reads the room, trusts their instincts, and decides how to shape further exercises and pieces of dramatic work (see Wolcott, 1994; Prendergast & Saxton, 2013; Luttrell, 2010). These processes can be distilled down into the act of observation; observing behaviours, observing interactions, observing people, participants, societies, actors, and interpreting the possible meaning of those observations and reporting them in some way, either through published ethnographies or devised performance, as was the case with the verbatim theatre performance. As Kudelka says in the passage quoted at the top of this section, to say more

about intuition or luck would be futile, however, within the realms of ethnographic practice and applied theatre practice, very little is written about observation practices, or the training of observational skills compared to other areas.

Even in the publication of observational studies the content often deals with the product as opposed to the process itself (Brandt, 1972; Spradley and McCurdy, 1972; Bernard, 1988; Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983; Patton, 1990). This is mirrored by the presentation of applied theatre research, in which an audience is present for the final product or performance, but often knows very little of the process leading up to the performance that is produced as a result. Schechner (2004) calls this type of audience "integral" in that their presence is necessary to accomplish the work of the show" (p.220). With the invited performance of the verbatim play, we decided to counter this slightly by holding an open talk-back discussion after the performance. In this talk-back we provided an overview of the verbatim process, how the script had been developed, and provided time for questions and comments from the audience members, allowing them to engage with and understand part of the process that lead to the product they witnessed as audience members.

TEACHER AS RESEARCHER

> There is no such thing as teaching without research and research without teaching. . . . . As I teach, I continue to search and re-search. I teach because I search, because I question, and because I submit myself to questioning. I research because I notice things, take cognizance of them. And in so doing, I intervene. And intervening, I educate and re-educate myself. I do research so as to know what I do not yet know and to communicate and proclaim what I discover. (Freire, 2001, p.35)

In the quotation above, Freire suggests that the roles of teacher and teacher as researcher are linked, and that the two cannot be separated from one another. The focus of an educational researcher, in this way, is to structure their practice according to the principles of a critical paradigm by challenging reductionist attitudes toward knowledge, specifically the questions of what constitutes knowledge and how knowledge is constructed. Freire also suggests that teaching and learning, through the dialogic and applied aspects of education and educational research, the teacher is continually 'researching' how knowledge is produced within different contexts. According to Freire's educational philosophy, each student, teacher, and educational researcher is an "active agent" and as such they are capable of "refiguring, reconstituting, and re-imagining" the meaning of education and learning during any educational event (Freire, 2001, p.37). These are the fundamental principles which provided a framework for the research discussed within this thesis, which this section will discuss, and my approach to the tradition of the teacher as researcher and where this research fits within that tradition.

Burdette Ross Buckingham (1926) described the value and opportunity presented by teacher research in this way:

> The teacher has opportunities for research, which, if seized, will not only powerfully and rapidly develop the technique of teaching but will also react to vitalize and dignify the work of the individual teacher. (p. iv)

Buckingham argued that teacher research serves as a means for teachers to be involved in the ever-changing methods of pedagogy by actively engaging with the research instead of waiting for methods to be "imposed upon them from the results of experiments they do not understand" (Buckingham, 1926, p.370). Buckingham's discussion of the opportunities for teacher research was an early foundation to the role of the teacher as researcher, which experienced a resurgence within education research in the early 1990s, that carries through to today.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) define teacher research as "systematic and intentional inquiry carried out by teachers." While they use this definition for teacher research, they draw a clear distinction between teacher research and research on teaching, namely that research on teaching is often conducted by academics or researchers outside of the teaching community with little consideration for the interests or concerns of teachers. Teacher research, on the other hand, is conducted by the teachers themselves. This distinction between the two forms has created what Houser (1990) and Lather (1986) describe as a status divide between

teachers who engage in *praxis* (practice) and academics or 'researchers' who utilize *theoria* (theory). Within the history of educational research there has been a perceived hierarchy that values *theoria* over *praxis* creating a dichotomy of educational practice and research in which the teacher is relegated to the bottom of that power structure. This dichotomy between *theoria* and *praxis* has contributed to the creation of a hierarchical system in which teachers are frequently directed by outside sources: administrators, education consultants, and textbook and testing companies (Santa & Santa, 1995).

The increasing gaps between practice and theory within educational research cannot be removed from the global, increasingly standards-based turn in education. Joe Kincheloe (2012) describes it this way:

> When educational purpose is defined as the process of training the types of individuals business and industry say they need, educational quality declines. In this situation reformers attempt to transform schools into venues of ideological indoctrination and social regulation while reducing teachers to deliverers of pre-packaged and homogenized information. (p. 2)

He further argues that it is vital to have an awareness of this context in order to understand the challenges facing educators and especially those who undertake research within the classroom setting as teacher researchers.

This has led to the rise of teacher research conducted by teachers and the development of the teacher as researcher. Buckingham (1926) believed that educational research was not intended to be a confined area of

inquiry exclusive to academics and research professionals, "The field of research has no limits other than those of education itself" (p. 379). He further said, "...research is not really a field at all. It is a method; it is a point of view" (p. 379). This 'point of view' as Buckingham called it, provides a support for the teacher as researcher and the dissemination of knowledge gathered and interpreted from the process of teacher research. Joe Kincheloe (2012) says that this type of research, conducted by the teacher as researcher, "positions teachers as professionals who produce knowledge about their practice" (p. 8).

One of the primary criticisms of research conducted by the teacher as researcher is that it lacks rigour and generalizability (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993; Santa, 1998; Santa & Santa, 1995). However, the intention of teacher research conducted by the teacher as researcher is not necessarily to conduct studies that can be replicated by other teachers or produce findings that may be applied to the field at large (Avery, 1990; Buckingham, 1926; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1998). That is not to say that the data gathered by teacher research does not provide contributions to body of educational research and theory (Santa & Santa, 1995). It is within this juxtaposition that I believe the research conducted with the Castleton students fits within the spectrum of research conducted by the teacher as researcher in that it was conducted in a specific context, yet within a broader study that was conducted in multiple countries, so the data gathered and presented by

Cynthia any myself acting as teacher researchers, is specific to the context of the Castleton School, but when combined with the results of the other research sites may have broader implications for the field of applied theatre research at large.

Within current practice, the teacher as researcher is poised within a unique place to conduct research within specific educational contexts that challenges the power dynamics created by the *praxis/theoria* dichotomy. Successful teachers as researchers can bridge the gaps created between "researchers" who conduct education research from a removed perspective without having the lived-in experience and understanding of educators who are enmeshed within the educational environment on a daily basis. This requires the teacher as researcher to use reflective practice, the purpose of which is to, "...problematise the curriculum in terms of what and whose knowledge is valued and in terms of how inclusive and equitable the curriculum is for students" (Neelands, 2006, p. 25). Neelands further states:

> For critical theorists, reflective practice is an emancipatory project...which seeks to empower teachers as agents of social change engaged in a process first exposing and then, through their own politicization and agency, moving from an authoritarian and elitist model of schooling towards a social democratic model. (pp. 23-24)

It was a desire to bridge these gaps, to conduct research that employed both scholarly understanding of theory, and the embodied experience of an educator in the field, that served as one of the foundations for the design of the Radical Hope verbatim workshops. Cynthia and I both

come from backgrounds that combine scholarly research and classroom teaching, and as such it was a natural fit for us to approach the workshops in the role of teachers as researchers. While Cynthia led most of the workshops, there were times when I stepped in to lead a portion of a workshop, or to direct scenes, or work with small groups. Approaching the workshops in this way allowed me to both be involved in the research as a participant observer, as an educator, and as a removed observer, at different points in the process, and allowed for an interpretation of the data gathered from a level of understanding that would not have been possible if I had just remained a removed observer throughout the process. That is not to say that there were not challenges within the research process, or that this was the only approach that could have been taken to the research. Given our experiences and backgrounds, as I have previously discussed within this write up, it was the best fit at the time. The methods used, and the rationale behind the use of those methods, will be discussed in greater detail within the chapter on methodology, and within the series of discussion chapters which provide a detailed account of key moments within the research process, challenges we faced, and possible interpretations of the data gathered.

Dialogic Learning

> The teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is him/herself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while

> being taught also teach. They become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow. (Freire, 1970, p. 80)

In the above quotation Freire discusses his approach to dialogic pedagogy and the joint responsibility of creating and maintaining the learning environment within a dialogic educational environment. Many theorists and practitioners agree with Freire's assessment that a dialogic approach to learning is a critical factor in the transformation of our current educational system (Apple, 1995; Greene, 1995; Taylor, 1992). In his 2004 paper presentation *Freire versus Marx: the tensions between liberating pedagogy and student alienation,* Jonathan Martin proposes that critical consciousness can be fostered by engaging students in dialogue centring around their concerns and "encouraging them to make connections with…broader social structures and relationships" (p. 2). This ability of dialogic learning to potentially engage students with broader social ideas aligned with the focus on hope, care, and civic engagement dictated by the Radical Hope project, making a dialogic approach ideal for the planning and execution of the Castleton study. By following a Freirean model of dialogic education marked by liberal discourse, democratic practices, and critical reflection, (Shor 1992) Cynthia and I attempted to create a public space (Habermas, 1991; Greene, 1995, Franks, 2015) in which "more socially democratic articulations and educational visions might be formed" (Pedroni, 2006, p. 113).

According to Freire, "…education relationship[s] must be based on dialogue among subjects" and "their active presence in the investigation is more important than the collection of data" (Freire, 1977, p.122). Green (1995) also identifies the importance of dialogue, and the ways dialogic education may serve as a means of opening public spaces with students, allowing them to develop and act upon their own initiatives in relation to the principles of equality, freedom, and society. Apple (1995) states that "…[schools] can provide a significant terrain over which serious action can evolve" (p. 10) and the ways we approach and act upon the world are "in part determined by the way we perceive it" (p. 63). He further argues that schools not only distribute knowledge, but produce knowledge as well as beliefs and societal norms (ibid, pp. 48-50).

Within the existing research on dialogic learning and dialogic pedagogy—like with ethnography and applied theatre—there are a plethora of terms used in reporting and discussion. Dialogic pedagogy may be called 'dialogic teaching' (Alexander, 2008), 'exploratory talk' (Barnes & Todd, 1977), or 'dialogic inquiry' (Wells, 1999). While the terminology used may differ, each of the approaches share the core principles of a space that welcomes an open exchange of ideas, an engagement with multiple perspectives, and the development of a safe, collaborative classroom environment (Haneda, 2016). Fine and Weis (2003) argues that the creation of a 'safe' space is essential for the critical examination of social inequities,

describing a 'safe' space as, "a space in which racial, gendered, and economic power are self-consciously analysed and interrupted; a space in which revision is insisted upon" (p. 117).

Any discussion of the processes of dialogic learning and dialogic pedagogy would be remiss without mentioning the work of Lev Vygotsky and the way his interest in the relationship between language and thought (Vygotsky, 1962) influenced the development of dialogic education. Vygotsky's work on the links between language and development stimulated research into the areas of educational development and dialogue, specifically collaborative talk and dialogue with children and the ways open dialogue facilitated development and understanding. Jerome Bruner (1986) expanded upon Vygotsky's research saying, "most learning in most settings is a communal activity, a sharing of the culture" (p. 127). While Bruner is primarily a psychologist and his research focuses on child development and culture, his work has interdisciplinary elements and links into research on educational development and teaching 'best practices' involving a dialogic approach.

The literary theorist Mikhail Bakhtin compares and contrasts 'monologic' and 'dialogic' approaches to teaching and learning. A monological approach, as Bakhtin described it, involves a "tendency to consolidate the authority of the more powerful speaker in the conversation and to discourage further discussion" (Danaher et al, 2006, p. 1). In contrast,

a dialogic approach allows for conversation and discussion that does not necessarily conclude with someone in a position of power or authority having the final say. While Bakhtin does discuss elements of dialogic pedagogy and the effects of a dialogic approach on learning, his primary area of focus was the development of literacy, which while valuable to the body of literature on dialogic learning as a whole, is not as relevant to the case study discussed within this thesis as Freire's approach to dialogic learning, therefore we approached the Castleton study with more of a Freirean slant.

Sue Lyle (2008) says, "The concept of dialogical meaning-making allows the learner to play an active role in developing a personally constructed understanding of the curriculum through dialogic interchange" (p.229). This concept of dialogical meaning-making aligns with Freire's understanding of dialogue and dialogical pedagogy: "…dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person 'depositing' ideas in another, nor can it become a single exchange of ideas to be 'consumed' by the participants in a discussion" (1972, p.61). Instead meaning is constructed through meaningful dialogue, where all members may contribute equally in both learning and teaching. Cynthia and I attempted to construct an environment based upon this system of collaboration and conversation, contributing equally to those conversations, becoming "equally subject to the same process" (Freire, 1998, p.33) as the participants.

Within the context of the verbatim process at Castleton School, a monological approach would not have been effective given the goal of the overarching Radical Hope project to investigate the ideas of hope, care, and civic engagement in the lives of young people and to create a piece of verbatim theatre centred around the students' interests and contributions that would be performed for an invited audience. As such, given the goal of verbatim theatre to present truthful, realistic representation of particular groups of people and periods of time (Paget, 1987, pp. 316-320), the students would need to be active participants in the creation of that material. Given the personal nature of the desired material, structuring the workshops from a dialogic approach, where open discussion without a strictly prescribed power structure, allowed for a more open environment to effectively generate the material for the verbatim play script. Taking a Freirean approach, we worked from the participants' feedback, allowing them to guide the topics of discussion and following their ideas and interests to ultimately create a play that included their points of view, their lived experiences, and their thoughts and opinions. The completed verbatim play script with pseudonyms has been included as Appendix C: Verbatim Play Script.

OVERLAPS

There is a shared goal between ethnographic study and applied theatre in that they both seek to encapsulate aspects of people's lives,

socially and culturally, and to present those aspects to a wider public. James Peacock explains it in this way:

> Culture is shared meaning. To comprehend meaning, one must see the world as others see it, to comprehend experience in terms of the other's frame of reference. This is the endeavour of interpretative ethnography. (Peacock, 1986, p. 99)

While Peacock refers solely to ethnography in the quotation above, the same can be said of applied theatre research and performance, especially when considering the points of view of the ethnographic researcher and applied theatre practitioner. Qualitative research, within the field of education specifically, often refers to "the practice of investigating and interpreting a culture" (Patton, 2006, p.6). "The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom they properly belong" (Geertz, 1973, p.452) In this sense, according to Geertz, the ethnographer is primarily a reader and interpreter of texts, however this assertion may overprivileged texts. This same interpretation of 'texts' can also be said of applied theatre research, specifically the creation of performance as the output of applied theatre research is often a performative text or script.

Ethnographic inquiry and applied theatre research are both, to an extent, also concerned with power dynamics and relationships, especially when considering research conducted within a classroom or education environment. In a review of the current body of literature on power,

Keltner, Anderson, and Gruenfeld (2003) discuss the difficulties of defining power, distinguishing the differences between social power, psychological power, and the resources required within demonstrations of power and power relationships. They further reflect on the ways power relationships effect every aspect of the human existence; this can be related to the built-in hierarchy that is implied and enforced within school systems which sets up the teacher to student power relationship. Dunlap and Goldman (1991) address this by describing the importance of understanding the facilitative aspect of power pertaining to schools, saying, "Facilitative, interactive power has become commonplace when no single individual or role commands decision-making control without dependence or expert knowledge" (p. 5). Within the devising process there was no single individual in complete control or authority as power was negotiated between myself and Cynthia and the participants themselves with various members holding 'the power' at different times—these dynamics and the ways in which the overarching Radical Hope project affected these power structures will be explored in more detail within the findings chapters.

Wolcott describes the processes of qualitative research, participant observation and the interpretation of what is observed, as a series of choices:

> In the very act of observing, a qualitative researcher makes myriad choices in looking at some things rather than others, in taking note of some things rather than others, and in subsequently reporting some things rather than others…that process becomes increasingly

> selective as some of the data now receive most of the attention. (Wolcott, 1994, p.29)

Within these choices there is the added complication of the various forms of relationship, culture, and power that become increasingly complex through participant observation and interpretation. In observing the sessions with the students, I paid particular attention to moments that had 'legs', in other words, the moments that might be useful for reproduction later in performance. As both a drama facilitator, research assistant, and ethnographer, I noted these moments, the body language, the dialogue, and my interpretations of the events, using those notes as a starting point for the planning of additional exercises and workshops with Cynthia. The way those notes were taken varied on what role I was in at the time; when I was acting primarily as an ethnographer, I collected raw notes, typed up on a private, password protected laptop, that were later 'cooked' and then annotated with out of field notes and interpretations at a later date (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13). When I was assisting Cynthia with facilitation or facilitating or directing as the primary practitioner, my notes were written in a notebook during breaks as time permitted, on in a reflective journal as close to the end of the session as possible. Specific examples of these variations in note taking and interpretation will be explored further within the series of discussion chapters. In this way, all of my roles within the research overlapped; my methods as an ethnographer as well as an applied theatre practitioner as well as a research assistant to Cynthia all required

the same types of observation, interpretation, and reflexivity though they manifested in various forms. The liminality of these roles focused my attention on the liminality between applied theatre research and ethnographic research, both conducted within an educational context.

Victor Turner (2007, p.95) describes liminality as a state of being 'betwixt and between,' a transitional phase, usually within the context of a religious ritual, in which participants no longer hold their pre-ritual status, but they have yet to obtain the status they will hold post-ritual. Ethnography, similarly, is a liminal research modality; the ethnographer occupies a liminal space as both removed-observer and participant-observer requiring the use of self-reflexivity in the recording and interpretation of data. In a similar way, the applied theatre practitioner occupies a liminal space as a participant-observer and facilitator, requiring the use of self-reflexivity in their decision-making processes in planning, facilitating, playwriting, and directing. Further, 'interpersonal liminality' allows researchers to "create, challenge, and refigure the power that typically wedges itself in between researchers and participants" (Plump & Geist-Martin, 2013, p. 71). This interpersonal liminality was exemplified in the roles Cynthia and I placed ourselves in as researchers, somewhere between the role of the 'teacher' and yet still separate from the role of a 'participant'.

This is not a new argument, the lines between the social sciences, humanities, and the arts have been blurred for years. What Paget (1987)

described as 'verbatim theatre' can trace its roots back to the early documentary radio ballads presented by the BBC in the 1950s. Theatrical productions like Joan Littlewood's musical *Oh What a Lovely War,* which implemented documentary evidence and verbatim accounts to depict accounts of the varying attitudes about World War I from members of different classes. The Stoke method of documentary theatre which follows a three-stage formula of gathering material, compiling and editing, and rehearsal is another example of the blurred lines between social sciences research and the arts. Ethnographic methods often follow a similar process of observation and gathering of material, compiling and editing, and writing for publication, presentation, or performance. Sampling is done in both, selecting what elements are most suited to performance and production in the case of verbatim theatre and selecting what is relevant for publication or presentation in ethnographic inquiry (Paget, 1987, pp. 316-320).

These are only a few examples of how ethnographic methods have been utilized for decades to contribute to the creation and production of documentary theatre, verbatim theatre, and ethnodrama. Kate Donelan describes the symbiotic relationship between ethnographic field work and dramatic work done with young people in this way:

> I argue that ethnography is a research methodology that is particularly appropriate for studying young people's experiences of drama, given that drama is an ephemeral and processual art form. Both fields involve engagement with the socio-cultural world to interpret and make meaning of human experiences, and they involve the communication of particular and positioned understandings

> within constructed texts, both performed and written. (Donelan, p.20-21)

While the overlaps between the two research forms have been used in practice for some time, and while Donelan begins to draw those connections in the above quotation, there is still room within the current body of literature to develop studies and literature on the connections between the two within a field study context.

A field study "is not a single method gathering a single kind of information" (Zelditch, 1962, p.567) rather, within a field study a participant observer uses various modes within their research: "enumeration to document frequency data; participant observation to describe incidents; and informant interviewing to learn institutionalized norms and statuses" (p.566). In addition to this, interpersonal liminality, "the intertwining, negotiating, and challenging of multiple identities— within ethnographic research contexts" (Plump & Geist-Martin, 2013, p.2) allows the researcher to "create, challenge, and refigure the power that typically wedges itself in between researchers and participants" (Plump & Geist-Martin, 2013, p.71).

In ethnographic fieldwork, there is a necessary element of connection, of as John Van Maanen says, 'living with and living like' those who are being studied (1988, p.49-50). This cultivated understanding, this relationship that is developed with the participants, actors, or co-actors— whichever term a particular researcher chooses or feels comfortable with— is formed with the intention of developing an understanding of 'what goes

without saying' (Bloch, 1977, p. 122). Similarly, with applied theatre within an educational context the practitioner blurs the lines between the traditional roles of 'teacher' and 'student' in order to facilitate the development of community, the sharing of ideas and emotions that are necessary to creating a piece of dramatic performance (Akroyd, 2006; Prendergast & Saxton, 2013). The closeness of these relationships is countered by the distancing that is then required in the 'product' phase of ethnographic study or applied theatre research. This distance is especially important for researchers who study within their own communities; the familiarity of the known puts the researcher at a higher risk of what Malinowski called (and cautioned against) 'going native' in which the researcher became so enmeshed within the community they were studying that they became part of it, thus no longer able to effectively distance themselves in a way that would allow them to analyse and interpret their findings effectively (Malinowski, 1922). These notions were all taken into consideration as Cynthia and I approached the methodological design of the case study, and as I approached the interpretation of the generated data, which will be discussed in the following methodology chapter.

3. METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will explicate the methodological choices undertaken within the research discussed within this thesis. An explanation of the methods implemented will be provided, followed by a discussion of the rationale behind the use of those particular methods. The methodology utilized within this inquiry was multifaceted and complex, combining elements of case study, ethnographic research (within an educational, drama context), and applied theatre techniques. The rationale for each methodological approach and the exaction of the research will be discussed in more detail within this chapter.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

> Because each qualitative study is unique, the analytical approach used will be unique. (Patton, 2015, p. 522)

In determining the theoretical framework for this research several possible options were considered. Originally the use of critical incident theory, from Tripp's (1993) understanding, focusing on particular "incidents [that] appear to be 'typical' rather than 'critical' at first sight, but are rendered critical through analysis...to be critical, it had to be shown to have a more general meaning and to indicate something else of importance in a

wider context" (pp. 24-25, 27) was considered. However, the element of assessment in order to alter or improve teaching practice required as part of Tripp's use and understanding of critical incidents was not relevant to the Radical Hope case study as there was no assessment within the project and so this option was disregarded. However, 'critical incidents' or incidents that have been "rendered critical through analysis" have been highlighted within the series of discussion chapters.

Another potential framework considered was what Joe Norris and Richard Sawyer (2012) term duoethnography, a collaborative research methodology in which "two or more researchers of difference juxtapose their life histories to provide multiple understandings of the world" (p.9). This framework was considered as Cynthia and I approached the research as a team, within the confines of a larger study, and we come from diverse backgrounds and educational contexts. However, the intensely narrative quality representative of duoethnography and the combined reporting done by both 'ethnographers' was not ideal for the reporting of the case study research presented in this thesis. The more focused examination of the overlaps between ethnographic inquiry and applied theatre in an educational context discussed within this write up would not be possible within the frame work of duoethnography. Additionally, Cynthia, who would provide the second half of the 'duo' in a duoethnographic approach does not consider herself an ethnographic researcher and therefore the

framework was not applicable to this particular inquiry, despite the collaborative nature of the research (Norris & Sawyer, 2012).

The methodology utilized within this research adopts multiple philosophical and theoretical influences. However, the work of Brazilian philosopher and critical theorist Paulo Freire—specifically his focus on the importance of dialogue between subjects within the meaning making process—has served as a fundamental influence. Freire states:

> ...in the context of true learning, the learners will be engaged in a continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is equally subject to the same process (Freire, 1998, p.33).

In the design of the devising verbatim theatre project discussed within this thesis, both Cynthia and I attempted to maintain a space of open dialogue with the participants, encouraging their feedback and participation in the process. Taking a Freirean approach, we worked against what Freire (1970) called the 'banking' approach to education in which learners are viewed as empty vessels to be filled by experts which only provides the options of "receiving, filling, and storing deposits" for the learners involved in an educational event (p.58). Instead, we worked from the participants' feedback, allowing them to guide the topics of discussion and following their ideas and interests to create a story about their points of view, their lived experiences, and their thoughts and opinions:

> **ET**: We asked what you thought about those things and what you cared about. Then we went back and we listened to the

> conversations and we had a chat, and we thought maybe that wasn't enough…maybe it was too restricting, the categories [home, neighbourhood, nation, and world] that we gave you. So, we wanted to see if we could have a chat with you about, what you want this show to be because it's based on what you care about. What do you not get to talk about in school, or at home, or in places that you go to that you want a place to talk about? What are you interested in, like, where do you want this to go?
>
> **CP**: It's got to be yours.
>
> **ET**: It's got to be yours. We want to shape it around what you want it to be. That can be anything at all, just throwing things around and we'll see what we get.
>
> **Oregon**: Anything?
>
> **ET**: Anything. (long pause)
>
> **CP**: Scary isn't it? You can talk about anything.
>
> **ET**: You can talk about anything.
>
> **Oregon**: It can be random things?
>
> **ET**: It can be anything at all.

The excerpt above is taken from one of the discussions with the participants halfway through the generative process, on June 17, 2015 in Miss C's room. (Within this except Cynthia has been delineated by 'CP' and I have been delineated by 'ET'; pseudonyms have been used for the students in order to protect anonymity.) This offers an example of our approach to the facilitation and structuring of discussions and generative processes. Cynthia and I attempted to construct an environment based upon collaboration and conversation, contributing equally to those conversations,

becoming "equally subject to the same process" (Freire, 1998, p.33) as the participants.

A collaborative approach was taken to planning all the sessions; Cynthia and I had frequent meetings in which we discussed ideas for the sessions drawing upon our previous experiences with drama facilitation, research, and participation, each of us offering suggestions until a plan was decided upon. We often coordinated the sessions, deciding who would lead what segments of the workshops, at what points I would step aside to take observational notes, paying particular attention to interactions, discussions, or performance pieces created that could potentially become a part of the final script and performance. At times, we adjusted the plan during the session, remaining reflexive and responding to the way the participants were engaging with the work, at times changing direction if something was not working as planned or if an area of interest worthy of further exploration organically presented itself through the work. This worked in part due to the mutual trust between Cynthia and myself, developed through prior projects together, and a respect and understanding of the other's background and training. Cynthia described our working relationship in this way in her follow-up interview:

> **CP**: I think trust is a performance as well. And I guess that's what I'm coming to with like me and you. We performed our trust of each other. We performed that of... so I often would allude to our working relationship and our friendship as well...that certainly came up towards the latter stages.

We attempted to demonstrate this relationship to the participants in the way we acted both towards one another and in the way we approached conversations with them. We were not in the traditional role of 'teachers' in that we were not assessing them, their work, or their participation in any way and we were not in any official capacity as their educators, therefore we were able to develop a rapport with the students that was more familiar than that of a traditional educator. This created a delicate balance between rapport and friendship which Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p.98) summarize in this way:

> When a distinction between rapport and friendship is made in qualitative literature, the overwhelming tendency is to warn against forming friendships because of the hazards of sample bias and loss of objectivity. Theses hazards are linked to over identification, also called 'over-rapport' and 'going native' (Gold, 1969; Miller, 1952; Shaffir, Stebbins, & Turowetz, 1980; Van Maanen, 1983).

Cynthia and I attempted to avoid over-rapport when constructing the space with the Castleton students. Through the use of multiple community building techniques such as contracting and establishing a ritual warm-up activity, we attempted to create a space of open communication with the participants in order to, "create, challenge, and refigure the power that typically wedges itself in between researchers and participants" (Plump & Geist-Martin, 2013, p. 71). In her follow-up interview, Jacqueline, one of the participants described the power dynamics Cynthia and I established with the group in this way:

> **Jacqueline**: Well you like, you weren't in teacher mode, you were acting as our friends and everything, so we got more comfortable

> around you, and like it wasn't hard to share things because we made the contract and everything and we felt safe within this room and everything. So, yeah, it was really nice.

In the above excerpt Jacqueline mentions that Cynthia and I were not in what she termed 'teacher mode' which can possibly be interpreted as describing the way we sought to develop community between and with the participants and the power dynamics we constructed within the classroom space, which differed from the traditional teacher-student power relationship. Oregon, one of the other participants shared a similar feeling in her follow-up interview:

> **Oregon**: It doesn't feel like a hierarchy with you and Emily, you were taking control but you also giving control to us sometimes.

As Oregon mentions above, within the devising process there was no single individual in complete control or authority as power was negotiated between myself and Cynthia and the participants themselves with various members holding 'the power' at different times. The additional authority of the overarching Radical Hope project was always present as well in that Cynthia and I were constantly aware of the requirements of the study and the parameters and restrictions placed upon us to create a piece of verbatim theatre centring around the themes of hope, care, and civic engagement, even though the Radical Hope project was not a physical presence within the workshop space at any point.

While Cynthia and I were keenly aware that we were asking the participants to share their personal stories and feelings, with appropriate contributions from us at times, we also made a conscious effort not to take

advantage of the stories that were shared within the workshop space. Foucault (1979) discusses the invasiveness of social sciences research and encourages the use of self-reflexivity by social sciences researchers as a means of safeguarding the participants. One means of doing this is for the researchers to acknowledge subjectivities in order to illuminate "the hyphens" of the researcher and the researched (Fine, 1994). These concerns were all taken into account, to the best of our ability, in designing the framework for data generation and interpretation within the Radical Hope case study with Castleton School. The specific methods utilized and the reasoning behind the use of those methods will be examined in detail in the following sections.

METHODS

> Why does the researcher trust what he knows?... They are his (*sic*) perceptions, his personal experiences, and his own hard-won analysis. A field worker knows that he knows, not only because he has been in the field and because he has carefully discovered and generated hypotheses, but also because "in his bones" he feels the worth of his final analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, pp.224-25).

As Glaser and Strauss explain in the quotation above, knowledge is a feeling, a bone-deep understanding born from long hours in the 'field', tireless amounts of time taking observational notes, conducting interviews, interpreting and coding data. Traditional ethnography privileges the 'objective observer' but in recent years it has become increasingly clear that

the objective observer, at least where ethnography is concerned, is an impossible fallacy (Conquergood, 1991).

Within current practice there has been a move away from the "once dominant idea of a detached observer using neutral language to explain "'raw' data" (Rosaldo, 1989, p. 37), which is gradually being "displaced by an alternative project that attempts to understand human conduct as it unfolds through time and in relation to its meaning for the actors" (Rosaldo, 1989, p. 37). In this way, "...ethnography is an *embodied practice*; it is an intensely sensuous way of knowing. The embodied researcher is the instrument" (Conquergood, 1991, p. 180, emphasis in the original). In *Researching through Case Study* Joe Winston explains the construction of social knowledge through case study research, which is often used in ethnographic inquiry, in this way:

> If we accept that all social knowledge is constructed, that meaning is necessarily interpretive, the tensions between description and explanation, observation and interpretation are at the heart of the meaning making process in any research event. (Winston, 2006, p. 46)

The challenge within ethnographic research is how to present information in a critical way, but to also maintain the essence of the embodied experience of obtaining that knowledge. Qualitative research in practice, therefore, "makes struggling together for meaning a powerful experience in self-definition and self-discovery," (Ladson-Billings, 2009, p. 190) between the researcher and the participants. In his book *Predicament*

of Culture, James Clifford explains the experience this way, "…identity, ethnographically considered, must always be mixed, relational and inventive" (Clifford, 1988, p.10). The ethnographic process itself, in this way, is just as important as the 'raw data' produced, "…by subjecting yourself, your own body and your own personality, and your own social situation, to the set of contingencies that play upon a set of individuals…you are close to them while they are responding to what life does to them" (Goffman, 1989, p. 125). In this sense the ethnographer, as a researcher, is both a witness to and a participant in the research event itself, thus making reflexivity within practice and publication necessary. Clifford Geertz states, "…what once seemed only technically difficult, getting "their" lives into "our" works, has turned morally, politically, even epistemologically, delicate" (Geertz, 1988, p. 130). This describes the current challenge facing ethnographers of how to maintain the necessary balance between the embodied experience of participant observation or fieldwork and the objective act of writing up, however, as Clifford states, "ethnography is, from beginning to end, enmeshed in writing" (Clifford, 1988, p.25).

Given the subjective nature of data collection, coding, and analysis, it is important that every ethnographer acknowledges who they are in the write up: their own beliefs, their ideologies, and how those constructions have fed into the resultant analysis, interpretation, and coding of the data collected and presented (Conquergood, 1991; Ingold, 2014). Additionally, the question of generalizability is often raised in regard to qualitative research,

especially concerning case study and ethnographic research. Winston responds to this by saying "to seek to reduce all valid knowledge to the measurable and the scientifically proven may fit with the logical positivism that currently dominates political discourse on education but it is epistemologically unsound" (Winston, 2006, p. 44).

It is the dichotomy between what research is considered appropriate or 'objective' and research data that arises from more subjective means, such as participant observation, that I wish to explore further within this thesis. More specifically, the liminality between the role of the ethnographic researcher and the applied theatre practitioner—particularly within education research—the fine lines between objective observation, participant observation, and reflective practice. In order to do that, it is necessary to discuss the history and development of these processes, specifically within the realm of qualitative, ethnographic research within the field of education.

The following portion of this methodology chapter will focus on first, a brief history of critical ethnography, specifically within the field of education, with a brief synopsis of ethnography in a wider context, followed by an analysis of the uses of ethnography within current practice in educational research and within the current body of literature.

Critical Ethnography

Critical ethnography, as a method, stems from anthropology and sociology combining various methodological approaches created from a diverse collection of disciplines such as education, performance, and politics. Critical ethnography, as practice, is often marked by a mixed methods approach documenting quantitative figures, such as the number of participants, the gender makeup and distribution of the case study group, age ranges, ethnicities, religious affiliations, etc. as well as qualitative data gathered through the use of participant observation, reflexive practice, group and individual interviews, and audio/visual recordings (Green, Stinson, 1999, p. 100).

Ethnography, more broadly considered within anthropology, has two meanings: ethnography as product and ethnography as process. Ethnography as product refers to the various forms of writing such as journal articles, books, and publications produced by ethnographers. Ethnography as process refers to participant observation and fieldwork, or the processes of conducting ethnographic research. In this way ethnography as a method can be seen as one side of what Roger Sanjek terms an 'anthropological triangle,' with the two other sides being formed by 'comparison' and 'contextualization' (Sanjek, 2014, p.59). However, in recent years there has been a move away from the 'traditional' reporting from one observed 'objective' point of view and a move toward a "self-conscious

examination of the subjective nature of the research endeavour" itself (Foster, 2010, p. 385). This transition led to the development of critical ethnography where the ethnographer is constantly "turning back" on themselves, questioning research paradigms, positions of power and authority, and the ethical representation and interpretation of research events (Davis, 1999). Within the broad umbrella of critical ethnographic research, ethnography within an educational setting has developed into an active subset of research conducted by, with, and for educational systems.

Ethnography Within Education

> One of the strengths of qualitative methods is the inductive, naturalistic inquiry strategy of approaching a setting without predetermined hypotheses. Rather, understanding and theory emerge from the fieldwork experiences and are grounded in the data. (Patton, 2002, p. 129)

As Patton states above, one of the strengths of qualitative methods lies in the inductive nature of the work, this is particularly true for research within the field of education and creative practice. Patton further states that, "Educators have found that the thick descriptions that qualitative research yields can help to thoroughly recapture the lived experiences of leaders and participants…" (Patton, 2002, p. 6). Within qualitative methods critical ethnography, which "within the field [of education]…provokes an apt research modality for examining the social and artistic relationships and performances inspired by drama work (Gallagher, 2006, p.63)," allows

educators and researchers to "deconstruct and understand" observed behaviours while providing "rich theoretical scaffolding in order to help the researcher interrogate both the situatedness and the agency of the…classroom's characters" (Ibid., p.63). Additionally, the use of case study, "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances," (Stake, 1995, p. xi), specifically, is particularly useful in that it allows for the systematic study of classroom environments and interactions serving the purpose of educational improvement and understanding.

The use of critical ethnography within education research in the late 1980s began to move toward the scientific in an attempt to provide 'validity' to the data presented and move away from anthropological 'story-telling' (Anderson, 1989, p. 10-11). While critical ethnographers use standard validity measures like member checking and triangulation, they are still open to criticism both from fellow ethnographers and those outside of the ethnographic tradition due to the ideological and interpretivist nature of the research (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1983). The validity measures utilized within the case study presented in this thesis will be expanded upon in more detail in the methodology chapter.

The complex dynamics of balancing the personal and the professional, the self and the 'other' have been a near constant tension within ethnographic research; this is also the case for critical ethnography within an education context. The question of validity and rigour within the

presentation of qualitative data deals with "complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists" (Stake, 1995, p.108). This criticism is in part due to the predominate method of ethnographic data collection—participant observation—due to the personal nature and involvement of the researcher in the research event itself and the interactions between the researcher and the researched. Johannes Fabian addresses these criticisms in this way, "These disjunctions between experience and science, research and writing…continue to be a festering epistemological sore" (Fabian, 1983, p.33). This disjunction is also present within applied theatre research, which, like ethnography, relies heavily on reflective practice and participant observation as the primary method for data generation.

Participant Observation

> Ethnography's distinctive research method, participant-observation fieldwork, privileges the body as a site of knowing… doing fieldwork—requires getting one's body immersed in the field for a period of time sufficient to enable one to participate inside that culture (Conquergood, 1991, p.180)

The tensions around the role of participation and observation are constantly under debate within the social sciences, particularly where anthropological study or ethnography are concerned. There is currently what Conquergood (1991) terms a 'return to the body' meaning a return to the previously established practices of anthropological fieldwork that privileged the body, the physicalized participation and involvement of the

researcher with those being researched. This encouragement of a more involved approach can be traced back to Bronislaw Malinowski, one of the founders of the current standards of ethnographic and anthropological fieldwork who stated, "It is good for the Ethnographer sometimes to put aside camera, notebook and pencil, and to join in himself in what is going on" (1922, p. 21-22). In this way, Malinowski recommended participation, more specifically bodily participation, as a means of deepening and intensifying cultural understanding.

Erving Goffman emphasized the experiential nature of fieldwork in his essay, *On Fieldwork*, saying:

> … by subjecting yourself, your own body and your own personality, and your own social situation, to the set of contingencies that play upon a set of individuals, … so that you are close to them while they are responding to what life does to them. (1989, p. 125)

James Clifford further argues this point, acknowledging that, "participant observation obliges its practitioners to experience, at a bodily as well as an intellectual level, the vicissitudes of translation" (1988, p.24). Similarly, Geertz explains this by saying, "Instead of worrying about aesthetic distance, ethnographers try to bring the enormously distant enormously close without becoming any less far away" (Geertz, 1983, p.48). This balance relies heavily on interpretation: the interpretation of events, of cultural understandings, of distance and perception, as well as determining the right balance between participation, distance, and interpretation, which, in many ways, relies upon communication.

Ingold goes so far as to say that participant observation in and of itself is an act of communication saying, "to practice participant observation, then, is to join in correspondence with those with whom we learn or among whom we study" (2014, p.390). He further states:

> Surely participant observation, if nothing else, is just such a practice. It is one that calls upon the novice anthropologist to attend: to attend to what others are doing or saying and to what is going on around and about…" (Ingold, 2014, p. 389).

This form of attention is both an act of observation and an act of communication in that it requires the participant observer to at once be present in the moment, to develop relationship with those they are 'studying', but to also observe and take note of moments and interactions of 'importance'. Johanes Fabian (1983) further states that, "…for human communication to occur, coevalness has to be *created*. Communication is, ultimately, about creating shared Time" (Fabian, 1983, pp. 30-31; emphasis included in the original text). However, when it comes to what Ingold terms 'ethnographizing', "the priority shifts from engagement to reportage, from correspondence to description, from the co-imagining of possible futures to the characterization of what is already past" (Ingold, 2014, p.392). The resultant "schizochronic tendencies of emerging anthropology" (Fabian, 1983, p.37) have created a divide between the personal nature of participant observation and interpretation and the more removed nature of reporting those interpretations through academic publication. This is true of both

ethnographic research and applied theatre research within educational contexts.

"Although ethnography fieldwork privileges the body, published ethnographies typically have repressed bodily experience in favour of abstracted theory and analysis" (Conquergood, 1991, p. 181). It is this disparity between the subjective, bodily experience of the fieldwork and data generation, the embodied practice of participant observation, reflective practice, reflexivity, and initial analysis and the smoothing homogenization of voice into the "expository prose of more-or-less interchangeable 'informants'" (Clifford, 1988, p.49) within documentation and publication that I wish to explore with more depth in the series of discussion chapters and the conclusion of this thesis, focusing on the writing and publication of ethnographic research and the reporting and performance of applied theatre research within educational contexts and the ways the subjective experiences of those research processes, especially the experiences of the junior members of a research team, are often neglected within the current body of literature.

Observation Methods

Participant and non-participant observation methods were utilized throughout the course of data generation in the case study. Using a combination of participant and non-participant observational methods

allowed for a variety of perspectives and enabled me as a researcher and participant to develop a deeper, more triangulated understanding of the participants I was observing and collaborating with. By mixing these two methods I was able to deliberately use participant observation in order to immerse myself in an intellectual, physical, and or emotional way in order to better understand the students at Castleton I was observing and working with, at the appropriate times. Similarly, I was able to adopt a more removed approach at other moments through the use of non-participant observation, which allowed me to step back and view activities or interactions from a more dispassionate position. While it is not possible to be completely objective, especially in cases such as this where my role was so fluid, alternating between practitioner, ethnographer, and research assistant, I attempted to account for this by acknowledging my background and orientation to the work in previous chapters and by conducting interviews with the participants and Cynthia to provide a triangulated view of my interpretations of the generated data.

During each classroom session and rehearsal, observational notes on student and practitioner behaviour were recorded including descriptions of interactions, body language, and dialogue. After each session, out-of-field notes were then taken highlighting points of interest, questions about student behaviours, and possible interpretations surrounding those behaviours. The field notes for the portions of the sessions where I acted as a facilitator were done reflexively as I was a participant observer. Notes were

taken through a combination of typed 'raw' notes in field when the workshop plan allowed for it and I was acting as a removed observer, or handwritten notes in a dedicated notebook taken at available opportunities on the occasions I was acting as a practitioner or as a participant observer. I took time immediately after each session to generate out-of-field or 'cooked' notes that expanded upon observed interactions already noted and to record moments of importance that were not recorded during the session (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13). All of the out-of-field notes were later revisited at the end of the week to reassess possible interpretations or conclusions and to use the gathered information to inform the planning of the following sessions, rehearsals, and the design of the interview questions.

Making the Familiar Strange

The use of the video and audio recordings of the sessions enabled moments of participation to be looked at and analysed from a more removed point of view by 'making the familiar strange' (Erickson, 1973; Delamont & Atkinson, 1995; Mannay, 2010). In spite of a range of strategies to fight familiarity within research contexts, such as ethnomethodology, classroom geography, and play, researchers still struggle to "make strange social context that we assume to understand by virtue of taken for granted cultural competence" (Atkinson et al., 2003, p. 47). In *Interplay Between Text and Performance in the 21st Century,* Duška Radosavljevi explains, "the purpose of the device [making the familiar strange] was to provide a new

perspective on something familiar" (2013, p. 122). Reviewing the video footage of the sessions and the interviews made this new perspective possible by creating an opportunity for analytical comparison, assessing my initial responses and interpretations as recorded in my notes and then reassessing those moments when examining them from a different point of view, at a later date, through the video footage.

The re-examination of the raw and 'cooked' field notes and the processes of coding both those notes, extracting portions for the writing of the script, assessing themes for the construction of interview questions, and the review and coding of the interview transcriptions also provided opportunities for moments of separation (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13). The extraction of key moments for the creation of the verbatim play script and the subsequent casting of the roles also required elements of making the familiar strange. In casting the script for performance Cynthia and I used an element of making the familiar strange by deliberately choosing not to have any of the participants perform their own stories or words in order to provide distance and to safeguard the young people from having to retell stories that could potentially be upsetting or uncomfortable to rehearse repeatedly and share in a public performance; this will be discussed in greater detail with specific examples in the series of discussion chapters.

Case Study

> The case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real life events. (Yin, 2002, p.2)

Case study, "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances," (Stake, 1995, p. xi) or "deeply understanding specific cases within a particular context" (Patton, 2002, p. 546) is a research method that lends itself particularly well to ethnographic inquiry and applied theatre research. This is because the methods of case study "chime with the forms of knowledge generated by the art form of drama itself" (Winston, 2006, p. 43). In order to examine this further and discuss why case study was an appropriate choice for the verbatim research process at Castleton School presented within this thesis, it is necessary to first investigate case study itself: the history, the different types of case studies, the limitations, and where I situate myself and this research within the broader tradition of case study research.

A case study is a research method characterized by an in-depth, detailed examination of a subject or study—the case—and its related contextual conditions. The 'case' that is studied differs from case study to case study and can include a diverse range of subjects, including individuals, organizations, events, or specific isolated occurrences (Stake 2005; Yin 2015; Ridder 2017). A 'case' may also focus on more of an abstraction such as an argument, an ideal, or a claim. Case studies may be conducted using qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. The case study method has been used within a variety of disciplines and professions

within the sciences and social sciences and has become a popular method within education and drama research.

Further, within the social sciences there are three main forms of case study: linear case study, process-oriented case study, and grounded case study. These more generalized categories create multiple subdivisions, including illustrative case studies, exploratory case studies, cumulative case studies, and critical instance case studies. Illustrative case studies, like their name suggests, are primarily descriptive studies. One of the primary purposes of illustrative case study is to utilize one or two key instances within an event and provide a detailed examination and description thus making the unfamiliar familiar, providing readers with a common language and terminology about a particular topic. Exploratory case studies, like a pilot study, are condensed studies conducted before undertaking a large-scale investigation in order to identify questions, or the most appropriate measure and methods to use within a larger at times longitudinal study. Cumulative case studies gather and compile information from multiple sites collected at different times to provide a broader generalization, often to avoid the additional expense of conducting additional, possibly repetitive studies. Finally, critical instance case studies focus on either a unique area of interest that is too particular for broader generalization, or to question an area of the literature that is highly generalized, bringing those assertions under scrutiny (Ridder, 2017).

When approaching case study research, there are additional considerations beyond the overarching methodological approach taken, namely the case selection. While one of the benefits of case study is its inherent specificity, allowing for individualized, in-depth investigations of areas of interest, there are three main types of cases: key cases, outlier cases, and local knowledge cases. Outlier cases are atypical cases that deviate from the standard or norm of a particular area of inquiry, and thus warrant further study or investigation. Key cases are selected based on the inherent interest of the study subject or the circumstances surrounding it (Ridder, 2017; Stake, 1995). Alternatively, local knowledge cases are conducted based on the individual researchers' in-depth knowledge and understanding of the location or subject being investigated; this positions the researcher in a unique position to "soak and poke" or offer reasoned interpretations based upon their rich knowledge of the context and circumstances of the case study in question (Fenno, 1986).

Regardless of the frame of reference for the choice of subject matter of a case study, the methodological approach, or the methods used within the case study, there is a distinction made between the *subject* and the *object* of the case study. The subject of the case study is the "practical, historical unity" (Wieviorka, 1992, p. 10) through which the theoretical focus of the study is viewed. Whereas the object is the analytical frame, the theoretical focus itself, that lies at the heart of the study.

While case study research can take various forms in practice, Hans-Gerd Ridder (2017) distinguishes four common case study approaches, with each approach connected to the work of a particular theorist. The first of these approaches is what Ridder labels the 'no theory first' approach, which is closely connected to Kathleen M. Eisenhardt's work, specifically her 1989 paper, *Building Theories from Case Study Research*. In this paper Eisenhardt details a series with specific, ordered steps constructing a case study, attempting to capture the "richness of observations without being limited by a theory" (Ridder, 2017, p. 283-386). Eisenhardt describes this approach in this way:

> Thus, investigators should formulate a research problem and possibly specify some potentially important variables, with some reference to extant literature. However, they should avoid thinking about specific relationships between variables and theories as much as possible, especially at the outset of the process. (Eisenhardt, 1989, p. 536)

This approach to case study favours qualitative data collection, relying on triangulation through combining interviews, documents, and observations. In this way, Ridder's "no theory first" category based upon Eisenhardt's work closely resembles the Radical Hope project in that the data was gathered through primarily qualitative methods, using my notes combined with Cynthia's notes, as well as interviews with the participants, classroom teachers, and with Cynthia, to provide triangulation of the data.

The second type or case study design Ridder identifies involves "gaps and holes" following the work of Robert K. Yin, which focuses on positivist assumptions, finding gaps in the current literature and understanding and investigating possible areas of inquiry within those gaps. According to Yin, existing theory should be the starting point of a case study and research questions investigating "a 'how' and a 'why'" (Yin, 2014, p. 14) can be developed and shaped using the literature to narrow the scope of inquiry. This approach is appropriate for both single case design and multiple case design, but it is particularly effective when approaching theoretical replication. While Eisenhardt (1991) argues that using multiple cases allows for replication and generalization between cases thereby providing a means of corroboration of positions, Yin (2014) suggests that literal replication may be achieved by selected cases that may yield similar results, or theoretical replication may be sought by selecting cases with predictably contrasting results, thus supporting or refuting theoretical aims.

The third approach suggested by Ridder is based on "social construction of reality" which, unlike the positivist approach of Eisenhardt and Yin, relies on the more constructivist approach of Robert E. Stake. According to Stake, a case study, "the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances," (Stake, 1995, p. xi) should be shaped by an interest in the case. He expands this by including a differentiation between

intrinsic case studies, in which the case is already selected, and instrumental case studies in which purposeful sampling leads to the phenomenon being investigated. Stake's approach aligns with qualitative methods and data collection, specifically observations, interviews, and documentation using triangulation to clarify meaning, with a focus on diverse perspectives and interpretations (Stake, 2005). As Stake (1995) says:

> ...it is true that in case study we deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists—yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding. (Stake, 1995, p. 108)

The fourth and final approach Ridder (2017) identifies seeks to identify "anomalies" present within a current body of understanding, using case study to either support or refute current understandings. Closely linked to Michael Burawoy's (1989, 1991, 1998, 2009) extended case study, the "anomalies" approach to case study begins a focus on "what is 'interesting' and what is 'surprising' in a social situation that existing theory cannot explain" (Ridder, 2017, p. 289). This use of case study as a research modality begins with the literature, seeking to find an understanding of unexplained behaviours and social interactions, which falls outside of the parameters for the Radical Hope study in that we did not seek to identify or further investigate anomalies within the current body of understanding, but rather to observe the generative verbatim process with the 10 students from Castleton School and to report on the areas of significance pertaining the

core themes of hope, care, and civic engagement the longitudinal study sought to investigate in each of the international research sites.

While this review of case study, its history and uses, focuses on the applications of case study within a qualitative, social sciences and humanities focused context, case study as a method is useful across disciplines. Within the sciences, or when approaching marketing or business studies, case study incorporating large scale surveys and survey data or using secondary data analysis or previously existing cases provides an opportunity for broader generalizations or conclusions to be drawn; this is particularly beneficial within scientific falsification studies (Chua, 1986; Klonski, 2013). However, given the small scale of our 10-person study and the context-dependent specificity of this study, the use of large-scale surveys or extensive secondary data analysis was not necessary in relation to the research presented within this thesis. Therefore, while I acknowledge the roles of more quantitative methods, the use of survey data, and secondary data analysis within case study as a method broadly speaking, those areas of the method are not relevant to the case study discussed within this thesis, so those areas will not be discussed in greater depth within this write up.

Each of the four previously discussed case study approaches identified by Ridder encompasses distinct ontological and epistemological assumptions, incorporating substantial methodological differences amongst the approaches. Within the Radical Hope project, specifically the first-year

verbatim process in the United Kingdom site at Castleton School this thesis focuses on, case study was an appropriate choice in that it allowed for an in-depth investigation of observed behaviours, combined with interviews, and observations taken from multiple perspectives. The approach taken in this case lies on the spectrum between Eisenhardt's approach and Stake's approach in that these two approaches are most suited to ethnographic inquiry, which relies on participant observation, observational notes, reflexivity, and interview data. Additionally, the focus on the particularity of an individual case, the verbatim process at Castleton School, and developing an understanding and interpretation of those individual circumstances (as is exemplified by the previously quoted passages from Stake) aligns with the focus of the overarching Radical Hope study, and the focused attention of this thesis on investigating the individual circumstances of the 9-week verbatim process. The specific data gathered and the way it was treated will be explored in greater detail in the following sections on Data Generation and Triangulation, Interviews, and Coding.

Interviews

Data collection was followed by semi-structured ethnographic individual interviews with each of the student participants, the two classroom teachers, and Cynthia. The interviews of the participants were split between Cynthia and myself following a guide of open-ended questions we developed beforehand that met the necessary criteria for both the

longitudinal study and my study situated within the longitudinal study. The semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed for "flexibility, spontaneity, and responsiveness to individual differences" (Patton, 2002, p.343) enabling us to follow up points of interest suggested by the participant responses or to further examine or clarify statements they made. Because the interviews were conducted by Cynthia and myself there is a difference in questioning style and structure that could not be avoided.

If I were to do the research again I would propose having one person conduct all of the interviews in order to maintain consistency in questioning and interviewing style. Bourdieu classifies the interview process as, "a *social* relationship" in which "various kinds of distortion are imbedded in the very structure of the relationship" (1996, p. 18, emphasis present in the original text). The follow-up interviews conducted with the participants and the classroom teachers in this case study yielded varying results as they were conducted by either Cynthia or myself and we both utilize different interviewing styles. Cynthia is more conversational, she uses a more explanatory tone in her questioning, and more dialogue or back and forth in her follow-up questions or discussion with the interviewee. I do not work from this same model, I tend to ask a question and allow the participant to respond, if they don't understand I will rephrase, but I remain more removed as the interviewer, allowing the participants to speak without my contribution to the response. I do occasionally divert from the interview

guide to ask follow-up questions or seek clarity, but as an interviewer I do not attempt to engage in a discussion with the person being interviewed. The difference in interviewing style between Cynthia and myself is reflected in the types of responses we received from the participants and the classroom teachers.

Michael Patton (2002) warns against the combination of guide-based interviewing and conversational interviewing because it can result in unequal amounts of information being collected from each subject. This was an issue with the interviews conducted by Cynthia and myself, in part due to the participants' comfort and familiarity with us, and in part because of the differences in our interview styles. However, it was still essential to conduct the follow-up interviews with the students and the classroom teachers in order to "find out from them those things we cannot directly observe" (Patton, 2002, p.340), and given our limited timeframe and access it was necessary that we conduct the interviews simultaneously in order for each participant to be interviewed. Allowing the participants to respond in their own words, to express their thoughts, feelings, and impressions of the process and the outcomes, enabled me, as an ethnographer, to better, "capture the complexities of their individual perceptions and experiences" (Patton, 2002, p.348). The interview responses also allowed the students to corroborate or refute the interpretations I made in my initial investigations and interpretations of the data (Thurmond, 2001, p. 254). Beer (1997)

further states that, “interviews augment experience, rather than simply reflecting it. They alter meaning instead of delineating it” (p. 127). In future iterations of this research, if one person conducts all of the interviews there will be more consistency and validity to the responses, which will produce a cleaner set of data for interpretation.

The interviews were conducted over three days, with one participant, Rosalind, being interviewed on Friday July 10, 2015, the same day as the performance, due to a scheduling issue and the two classroom teachers and the other participants divided between Monday July 13, 2015 and Tuesday July 14, 2015 the following week. My follow-up interview with Cynthia was also held on Tuesday July 14, 2015. After the initial interview with Rosalind, Cynthia and I decided to add a question about the ways in which the project, if any, had changed the way the students viewed the world in order to assess the goals of the Radical Hope project to investigate the roles of hope, care, and civic engagement and what effect, if any, participation in the research processes had on those areas of the participants’ lives in a more direct way. Two example interview transcripts have been included as Appendix E: Sample Interview Transcriptions. The first sample interview was my interview with Rosalind on July 10, 2015 and the second sample interview was Cynthia’s interview with Eden on July 14, 2015. These two samples were selected because they both offer examples of our differing interview style, and they offer an insight into the way the interview

questions developed over the course of the three interview days with the students.

Data Generation and Triangulation

Data collected and interpreted include my ethnographic field notes and post-session reflections, notes on conversations and planning with Cynthia, reflective journals, lesson plans, video footage of the sessions, audio recordings, the verbatim script, video of the performance and post-show discussion, and video of the interviews with the 10 participants, the two classroom teachers, and Cynthia. I dedicated time after each session to go over my 'raw' field notes and to compose post-session reflections, and add additional 'cooked' notes, additional questions, reflections, or observations added out of field (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13). Relevant portions of the video footage and interviews were transcribed either for use within the script itself or for interpretation.

Cynthia and I drove to each session together, often using the drive over to review the plan for the day, things that needed to be set up, and who would take on which parts of the lesson or facilitation. Similarly, the ride home after each workshop was used to go over our initial impressions of how the session went, areas of particular interest to pursue in the next workshop or areas of concern, and to set up a time to plan the next session. Cynthia and I had regular meetings which were used as periods of reflection, discussion, and planning. As the weeks went on we began to

focus on what pieces would be useful for the script and what activities could be used to generate material to fill in areas of the script that were missing. I kept notes on these interactions and discussions in a reflective journal which I also used for field notes and observations, especially on the days when I took a more active role in the facilitation. Cynthia and I engaged in a great deal of off-record conversation, which eventually, after discussion and negotiation, became additional data for interpretation.

As a result, we developed a purposely collaborative methodology that extended beyond the traditional parameters of participant observation. In some ways, it more closely resembles what Shulamit Reinharz (1998) terms 'temporary affiliation.' Reinharz characterizes this method as experiencing the subjects' world from a personal perspective, which relates to the way Cynthia and I co-constructed the reflective environment that generated a portion of the data and contributed to the planning of the workshop sessions and the creation of the script. Similarly, Michael Jackson (1989) says that, "If we are to find common ground with them [the people we study], we have to open ourselves to modes of sensory and bodily life which, while meaningful to us in our personal lives, tend to get suppressed in our academic discourse" (Jackson, 1989, p.11). This deliberately constructed form of collaboration also relates to the argument Richard Sennett (2012) makes for working models using orchestrated cooperation to establish cohesion. Sennett argues that the core of cooperation is "active participation rather than passive presence" (p. 233), however that form of cooperation is earned

within the rehearsal process. By establishing an environment within the workshops focusing on these ideals, as Cynthia and I modelled it for the participants with our collaborative approach to planning and facilitation, and the way we encouraged them to contribute to the shaping of the workshops, we hoped to earn this form of trust and cooperation from the participants and establish a foundation the students could then expand into other areas of their life. These goals aligned with the goals of the Radical Hope project to examine the role of civic engagement in the lives of the young people involved in the study and to assess how involvement in the theatre processes within the study may or may not encourage their participation in civic activities and citizenship in areas outside of the rehearsal room. It became clear as we were discussing the methodological choices for the research, that a constructed collaborative environment was needed, which required a higher element of participation and engagement on my part than is typical of ethnographic research.

One of the most substantial challenges of ethnographic research and applied theatre research within an education context is how to present data in an objective, critical way. Triangulation serves as an effective means of achieving this by, "increasing confidence in research data, creating innovative ways of understanding a phenomenon, revealing unique findings, challenged or integrating theories, and providing a clearer understanding of the problem" (Thurmond, 2001, p. 254). The use of ethnographic interviews in conjunction with data collection through

ethnographic observation, participant observation, and reflective practice provided methodological triangulation, while regular discussions with Cynthia comparing notes and impressions of the data, served as a means of obtaining investigator triangulation (Stake, 1995). Finally, by interviewing the participants, allowing them to directly voice their thoughts and interpretations of events, I endeavoured to ensure my interpretations were "supported and qualified by a range of data" (Winston, 2006, p.47).

CODING

When deciding what coding method to use I employed Johnny Saldana's method of 'pragmatic eclecticism' meaning throughout the data generation and review portions of the study I remained open, determining the most appropriate coding method to use upon the conclusion of data collection (Saldana, 2009, p. 70). Each set of field notes were coding using a set of motif codes, which is particularly "appropriate for exploring intrapersonal and interpersonal participant experiences and actions in case studies, particularly those leading toward narrative or art-based presentation forms" (ibid p. 151) such as the verbatim play created and performed from the data generated from this case study (see also: Cahnmann-Taylor & Siegesmund, 2008; Knowles & Cole, 2008; Leavy, 2015).

The initial motif codes used were care/community, power, safety, and uncertainty; these core codes were then disaggregated into second cycle codes of care: practitioner to participant; care: participant to participant,

care: practitioner to group, care: anti-community behaviour, safety: participant to participant, safety: practitioner to participant, safety: participant to 'external' (school, work, parents, etc.), uncertainty: participant to participant, uncertainty: participant to 'external' (school, work, parents, etc.). These codes were developed taking the core ideal of hope, care, and civic engagement dictated by the overarching Radical Hope study into consideration. The themes of safety and uncertainty stood out as areas of importance to the participants throughout the process, and they were the two themes the participants selected to serve as the core themes of the verbatim play script, so I believed it would likely be a fruitful code and would yield ample data for interpretation. The idea of care in relation to community and the examples of the different forms of care was chosen specifically because of its relevance to the Radical Hope study. Civic engagement was also considered as a potential code category, however, in except for a few specific incidents, it was not a dominant presence within the verbatim process as a whole or the discussions with the students, despite its importance as a theme within the Radical Hope study. The transcriptions of the follow-up interviews with the participants, the two classroom teachers, and Cynthia were also coded for care, power, safety, and uncertainty.

These codes served as a means of searching, categorizing, and visualizing patterns within the data for analysis, allowing for the recognition of "multiple interrelationships among dimensions that emerge from the

data" (Patton, 2002, p.56) whilst focusing on results that 'fit' the data. Glaser and Strauss (1967) explained the idea of 'fit' in this way:

> By 'fit' we mean that the categories must be readily (not forcibly) applicable to and indicated by the data under study; by 'work' we mean that they must be meaningfully relevant to and be able to explain the behaviour under study (p.3).

Additionally, by reviewing and coding the data by hand instead of using an automated program like NVivo, for example, I was able to glean additional insights for interpretation and gain familiarity with the data which fed into the design of the interview questions and the subsequent coding of the interview responses using the same first cycle motif codes. The themes of safety and insecurity were highlighted as the overarching themes of the generative process through the coding and therefore became the main themes of the verbatim script. In order to combat subjectivity, the anti-community and power codes were used to "consider alternative meanings of phenomenon" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.13) while allowing for a balance between creative and rigorous interpretation. Examples of the coded segments of 'cooked' field notes as well as raw, non-coded segments of the field notes will be included within the series of discussion chapters.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

> It is often the case that those with more power, information, and resources research those with less. (Cohen et al, 2007, p.174)

As stated in the quotation above, research is often conducted *on* those with less power instead of *with* them; this is often the case within

education research, especially that focusing on children or young people. Rather than seeking the explicit consent of the parties involved, consent is often sought through proxies: administrators, teachers, parents, guardians, or caregivers (Cline & Frederickson, 2009). In an effort to combat this, I sought to obtain informed consent from the participants themselves at the start of and throughout the research process.

In addition to obtaining clearance from the Disclosure and Barring Services (DBS check) and an approved 'Ethical Approval Form' from The Centre for Education Studies within the University of Warwick, permissions were granted by Castleton School including the use of any data obtained for future studies and publications, and consent forms were given to the participants and the parents and/or guardians of the participants who took part in the study. The consent forms given to the participants and their parents and/or guardians have been included in Appendix A: Consent Form (Pupils) and Appendix B: Consent Form (Parents/Guardians). The names of all the participants have been substituted with pseudonyms in order to maintain confidentiality within the context of the write up and presentation. Additionally, the names of the classroom teachers, the school where the research took place, and the name of the lead researcher I collaborated with from the University of Warwick have been changed for anonymity purposes. Issues of religious affiliation, race, gender, and culture are only discussed within this write up and presentation of the data where necessary, e.g. scene work or written material that was produced by the

students specifically addressing these issues, or instances that arose in conversation or interviews. Any conclusions drawn from observational data were addressed within the context of the group and or individual interviews in order to allow the students to address the interpretations in their own words.

All records and field notes have been stored on a private, password protected laptop and within private journals. Any outside individuals who need access to the data produced in the study (i.e. supervisors or viva panellists) will be instructed to destroy any and all records or materials when their participation in the examination of the material has concluded. Any ethical dilemmas that arose throughout the course of the study were addressed immediately with my supervisor and with the teachers and facilitators involved within the study.

In saying this, throughout the course of the research design and enactment I tried to remain aware of the fact that consent is fluid in nature, something that is constantly negotiated and renegotiated over the course of a working relationship or fieldwork event. As Gallagher et. all discuss in *Negotiating informed consent with children in school-based research: A critical review* (2010), informed consent can only be obtained when participants have a clear awareness of the social attitudes, behaviours, and beliefs of the researchers seeking their consent. I attempted to do this by providing opportunities for the participants to question my beliefs, my

reasoning for entering their spaces, and by allowing them to withdraw consent for participation or inclusion of any of their observed behaviours or contributions at any time. I sought to provide clear, concise information to the participants on the purposes of the research, the intended uses of the data, and my interpretations at every stage of the process so that they could take an active, informed, collaborative role within the research instead of remaining passive participants who were acted upon and had conclusions placed upon them (Cohen et al, 2007, p.174).

The British Educational Research Association (BERA) states in their ethical guidelines (2011) that "all educational research should be conducted within an ethic of respect for the person, knowledge, democratic values, quality of educational research and academic freedom." It further discusses the responsibilities researchers have to participants, the public, as well as the academic field at large, responsibilities that are to be met through publications, communication of gained and interpreted knowledge, and meeting any and all requirements set by funding bodies, supporting academic institutions, and the participants themselves. In the pursuit of these things ethical issues will of course arise, but by obtaining prior consent, consistently checking in with participants throughout the research, and referring them to any necessary additional support services as required, those ethical dilemmas can be managed and mitigated. In the planning, design, execution, and completion of this research I endeavoured towards all of these things by obtaining consent from the participants and their

guardians, checking in with the participants at various points throughout the process, and by providing them an opportunity to comment on any areas of the process that could have been improved upon or adjusted in their interviews. One method used to establish this open environment with the participants was 'contracting' which will be discussed in greater detail within the following series of discussion chapters.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE DISCUSSION CHAPTERS

> A potential problem with ethnographic studies is seeing data everywhere and nowhere, gathering everything and nothing. The studied world seems so interesting (and probably is) that an ethnographer tries to master knowing it all. Mountains of unconnected data grow but they don't say much... Ethnographers who leave data undigested seldom produce fresh insights and, sometimes, may not even complete their projects, despite years of toil. (Charmaz and Mitchell, 2001, p. 161)

In the above quotation Charmaz and Mitchell address the often-problematic process of writing up ethnographic data, and the difficulties presented in chewing through the, at times, overwhelming amounts of material generated through qualitative inquiry. In selecting the relevant portions for discussion, I endeavoured to approach the data with a critical eye, selecting the most relevant evidence possible that was supported empirically, while at the same time not overburdening or cluttering the write up with an abundance of supportive, but secondary information. The following series of discussion chapters will outline some of the key moments that emerged through data generation and interpretation that demonstrate the overlaps between ethnographic practice and applied theatre techniques, and the challenges and benefits of conducting research as a member of an overarching study, offering demonstrative examples of concepts discussed in the previous theory and methodology chapters. Segments of 'cooked' and coded notes have also been included, where relevant, to provide context for the interpretation processes and how the

processes of data generation and interpretation fed into the creation of the script and performance (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.13).

Several moments stood out as moments of particular interest and relevance, both in the selection of what to include within the script and performance, and in the process of deciding what to discuss within this thesis write up. Each of these key moments will be described and discussed within individual chapters below. Descriptions of the exercises are taken from my ethnographic notes and from reviewing the video and audio footage of the workshops, rehearsals, performances, and interviews. The names of the students, the two classroom teachers, the school where the research took place, and the lead researcher I worked with from the University of Warwick have all been changed in order to protect anonymity. The interpretation of these events has been triangulated either through discussion with Cynthia, the lead researcher and facilitator of the longitudinal study from the University of Warwick, discussions with the two classroom teachers, or through interviews with the participants, Cynthia, or the two classroom teachers. Where relevant, transcribed portions of those discussions and interviews have been included to further illustrate a point or an interpretation that is being presented.

I should highlight that the points of view presented in the following sections represent one point of view not *the* point of view. These views reflect my orientation, resulting from my experience and training, and my

perspectives on research within the realm of education, ethnography, and applied theatre. The majority of the observations and reflections taken stem from ethnographic research, though they only represent one particular understanding as presented by an individual researcher, myself. As Wolcott says, "Just as no researcher as fieldworker can ever hope to *get* the whole story down to every last little detail, no researcher as author can ever expect to *tell* the whole story either" (1994, p.19, emphasis present in the original text). This is true for this series of discussion chapters; I was not able to record every detail of the research process, just as I am not able to tell every detail of the story of this research, therefore a few key events are focused on instead, and I have endeavoured to give as clear, and complete an image of those events as possible.

Key moments are presented using what Geertz called 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) as is traditional with the presentation of ethnographic data. In his 1973 essay, "Thick Description" Geertz further stated:

> Cultural analysis is intrinsically incomplete. And, worse than that, the more deeply it goes the less complete it is. It is strange science whose most telling assertion is its most tremulously based, in which to get somewhere with the matter at hand is to intensify the suspicion, both your own and that of others, that you are not quite getting it right. (p. 29)

In this context, 'cultural analysis' possibly refers to both what one is attempting to describe and how one interprets the events being described.

This also brings up the question of validity in the presentation of findings, which is often problematic when considering qualitative data. While validity in terms of scientific accuracy and replication may not be possible when considering qualitative data, there have been arguments made in support of validity within qualitative research (see Goetz & LeCompt, 1984, p. 221; Conquergood, 1991; Wolcott, 1993). While triangulation may seem to serve as an ample form of safeguarding against errors in interpretations and reporting of qualitative research, it is often not enough (Wolcott, 1984). I attempt to combat this by reporting what I observed, as directly as possible, and drawing conclusions that are as informed as possible, while remaining aware of the fact that I am "not quite getting it right" and that my informants are in the same position (Geertz, 1973, p.29).

In the stylistic presentation of the data I tend to err towards Wolcott's method of presentation, which he described as:

> ...striking the delicate balance between providing too much detail and too little, I would rather err on the side of too much; conversely, between overanalysing and underanalyzing data, I would rather say too little (Wolcott, 1994, p. 352).

In this sense, I tend to provide as much description as possible, presenting my observations as directly and concisely as I can, so that informed interpretations can be drawn, while still allowing the data and the informants to speak for themselves as much as possible. I do not presume to offer the only interpretation of a data set, instead I present the observations as I gathered them, edited, and assessed them for points of interest or key

moments of importance, offering the interpretations I have made as a participant observer, while still leaving room for the reader to draw their own informed conclusions.

Finally, in the transcribed text included from interviews, classroom observations, and rehearsals, slashes / / appear to designate that a word or words were indistinguishable. If a word or phrase appears between slashes it indicates my best guess based upon what is understandable from the audio or video footage, my field notes, or recollections of the interview or observed incident. Brackets [ ] indicate a moment where I have inserted text into the conversation, usually for the sake of clarity or clarification. Ellipses denote a long pause or omitted text, either a word, phrase, or utterance that may be redundant or that does not contribute to the clarity or understanding of the included transcription.

4. Discussion: Inside the Verbatim Workshops

This discussion chapter will begin with a description of the two classroom spaces where most of the workshop sessions took place. While the "the field" is no longer a spatially defined anthropological site researchers enter, (Lovell 1998, Olwig & Hastrup 1997, Olwig 2004) the concept of 'space' for the importance of valid ethnographic description of the spaces of context in which research is conducted is still heavily debated (Schoenfelder 2000, Tomforde 2006, Kokot 2007). As Anton Franks (2015) says, "locations of learning are institutional, social and socially constructed over time, subject to social processes and systems" (p. 231); this is also true of the spaces in which this research took place. Cynthia and I constructed a 'space' for the work to take place within, but in the interest of establishing a sense of the physical spaces in which those constructions took place, I have included the descriptions provided in the passages below, taken from my field notes and the video footage of the two main classrooms, Mr J's room and Miss C's room, in which the workshops were conducted as an attempt to provide an image of the physical 'field' where the majority of the data generation occurred.

Mr J's room had been recently redecorated; the walls were a pale blue and the carpets were a dark grey. Three black chalkboard-painted

amorphous shapes were dotted along the back wall that the students often drew on during breaks or before sessions started. Three large windows divided up the back wall of the classroom, but they were often covered by thick blackout shades that left only a sliver of sunlight showing around the edges. The ceilings were dotted with florescent lights and three heavy metal poles supporting a set of stage lights that could be moved and adjusted to transform the space from a regular classroom into a 'performance space.' A large stack of stage blocks in various shapes and sizes stood from floor to ceiling immediately to the left of the double entrance doors. The students often left their coats, bags, shoes, and personal items on or near the stack of blocks before entering the space for class. A white board covered the front wall and a Welsh dragon flag hung in the upper left corner as a small nod to Mr J's Welsh heritage.

Miss C's room was more like a traditional black box studio, a simple square room with black walls and pale grey carpeting. A half wall split off a section of the space that was used for storage, housing stacks of chairs, small set pieces, and an area for the students to leave their bags and personal things when they entered the room for class. Heavy black stage curtains lined the back wall, blocking the windows and the outside door leading out of the room and into the courtyard outside. Similar to Mr J's room, a set of stage light rigging was suspended from the ceiling enabling the space to be used for performance. A small cork board hung on the front

wall next to the white board with a small wooden desk in front of it. Various papers and pamphlets were regularly tacked onto the board advertising current school events or classroom assignments, and the table was often piled with papers awaiting grading or materials to be handed out in class.

The two spaces had different feels to them, just as Miss C and Mr J were different practitioners, relating to the students in different ways. In saying this, both spaces provided an open-space learning environment and they were equally functional for the purposes of our sessions with the students; Cynthia and I did not change plans dependent upon which room we would be in on which day. These descriptions are included to provide a point of reference because, as per Monica Prendergast and Juliana Saxton (2013), the way "a chosen space is set up also has a big impact on the situated learning possibilities available" (p. 7). As involvement in devised theatre work offers opportunities for both embodied learning and situated learning, the structuring of the space—both physically and situationally as constructed contextually through facilitation—is relevant to the presentation of the data that was generated and the proposed interpretations of that data.

Each session was held in one room or the other, depending on which teacher the students were scheduled to see that day. All 10 of the students (or however many were present in school that day) would meet in the room together, with Cynthia and myself, and either Miss C or Mr J. The chart

included below provides a breakdown of which sessions were held in which room, which days Cynthia and I were absent and the workshops were led by Mr J, and the extended rehearsal and performance days held on the University of Warwick campus. This chart is slightly different from the chart of the initially planned schedule included in the Chapter 1: Introduction. We initially planned to begin the sessions the last week of May, but due to scheduling, testing, and access, we were unable to start until the following week in June, meeting with the students first to go over the project and see if they wanted to participate, answer any questions, and to hand out the consent forms. The chart below shows the final breakdown of the workshops, rehearsals, and follow-up interviews:

	Monday	**Tuesday**	**Wednesday**	**Thursday**	**Friday**
Week 1					~~May 29th 11:20-12:20~~
Week 2	June 1st	June 2nd	~~June 3rd 10:00-11:00 (period 2)~~	June 4th	June 5th 12:20-1:20 (period 4) Mr J's room
Week 3	June 8th 10:00-11:00 (period 2) Miss C's room	June 9th	June 10th 11:20-12:20 Mr J's room	June 11th 2:10-3:10 (period 5) Miss C's room	June 12th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3) Mr J's room
Week 4	June 15th 12:20-1:20 (period 4) Mr J's room	June 16th 12:20-1:20 (period 4) Miss C's room	June 17th 10:00-11:00 (period 2) Miss C's room (no video-only audio)	June 18th	June 19th 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4) Mr J's room (Emily and Cynthia away)

Week 5	June 22nd 10:00-11:00 (period 2) Miss C's room	June 23rd	June 24th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3) Mr J's room	June 25th 2:10 - 3:10 (period 5) Miss C's room	June 26th 11:20 - 12:20 (period 3) Mr J's room (Emily and Cynthia away)
Week 6	29th June 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4) Mr J's room	30th June 9:00-10:00 (period 4) Miss C's room First read-through	1st July 10:00-11:00 (period 2) Mr J's room	2nd July	3rd July 12:20 - 1:20 (period 4) (Emily and Cynthia away)
Week 7	6th July (10:00-11:00) Miss C's room	7th July	8th July ALL DAY Mr J's room	9th July	10th July All Day Performance Warwick campus
Week 8	13th July Interviews Mr J's room	14th July Interviews Miss C's room	16th July	17th July	18th July
Week 9	21st July	22nd July Wrap up, initial analysis and planning for Year 2: Oral Histories			

With this schedule breakdown, Week 1 and Week 2 became about planning, creating the consent forms for the participants and their parents or guardians (which have been included as Appendix A: Consent Form (Pupils) and Appendix B: Consent Form (Parents/Guardians)), and familiarizing ourselves with the Radical Hope project and the materials we had been provided by Kathleen Gallagher and the Canadian team, and introducing the participants to the project, answering any initial questions, and

obtaining the signed consent forms. Cynthia and I came into the Radical Hope project late in the first year, after the original United Kingdom site leader had to drop out due to unforeseen circumstances, so we were at a disadvantage in terms of timing, access, and planning time compared to the other Radical Hope sites in Canada, India, Taiwan, and Greece. The additional complications of losing a week of time we hoped to have by starting at the end of May instead of the end of June made our timeline for the generation of material quite tight. Weeks 3-5 were the primary weeks we had to develop material, for me to transcribe sections of the video and audio footage to use to construct the script, and for the script to be written. Finally, weeks 6-8 were for generating any material needed to fill gaps in the script, blocking, rehearsing, the performance of the completed verbatim piece for an invited audience, and the follow-up interviews after the performances were over.

Cynthia and I drove to each session together, often using the time in the car to discuss the plan for the day, things that needed to be set up, and who would take on which parts of the lesson or facilitation. Similarly, the drive home was used to go over our initial impressions of how the session went, areas of particular interest to pursue in the next workshop or areas of concern, and to set up a time to plan the next session. Cynthia and I had regular meetings, either at one of our homes, on the Warwick campus, or at a local coffee shop in the area, which were used as periods of reflection,

discussion, and planning. At the end of week 3 and through the end of week 5 we began to focus on what pieces would be useful for the script and what activities could be used to generate material to fill in areas of the script that were missing. I kept notes on these planning meetings and discussions in a reflective journal which I also used for field notes and observations, especially on the days when I took a more active role in the facilitation of the workshops. Cynthia and I engaged in a great deal of off-record conversation, which eventually, after discussion and negotiation, became additional data for interpretation.

Each of the workshops was planned, similar to the way Cynthia or I would structure a one-hour lesson plan. Every session began with our ritual ball game which will be explained in more detail in the second discussion chapter, Chapter 5: The Ball Game, and then a variety of drama activities depending on what material we hoped to generate that day, or the sort of discussion we hoped to prompt. To provide a clearer view of the type of drama work conducted in each session, I have included the lesson plans for the first week of workshops, including the aims for the week as a whole, each of the planned activities, the purpose or aim of that particular activity, and the projected time each activity would take below:

Verbatim Workshop Plan **Week 1**
Aims for the week:
• Get to know the students

• Establish a positive learning environment where they feel safe and supported but still challenged by the work. • Obtain their social identity category responses and pseudonyms • Generate material by opening up conversations and physical explorations of their thoughts, feelings about identity and social identities.		
Monday		
Activity	**Instructions/Aims**	**Time**
Ball game ritual	Walking and ball patterns Working on group dynamics	10 mins
Signing in ritual	Telling stories but the meaning and history of our signatures, but each story must fit within a limited timeframe, establishing group sharing, opening up discussion around 'performing identity'	20 mins
Aggressor/Protector	Pick a person to be 'aggressor' and 'protector' – but don't tell them. Move around the space keeping your 'protector' between you and your 'aggressor' using the space as much as possible to avoid getting close to that person. Game ends but moves into an observation exercise. Invite students to observe the way their aggressor walks. Focus on: their gaze, their tension, their pace, where they lead from Does this raise some ethical issues? Draw out conversation about the ways we can avoid caricaturing people … how does the research AND the actor use close observation?	5 mins 5 mins 5 mins
Contracting	If we're sharing personal stories, what rules may we need to make us feel respected and safe throughout this project?	10 mins

	What do we mean by 'safe'? Create a 'contract' with the students, establishing the parameters of play, or the rules of engagement for the space and workshop participants	

Wednesday

Activity	**Instructions/Aims**	**Time**
Ball game ritual	Walking and ball patterns Working on group dynamics	10 mins
Status game	Walk around the space. CP calls out various characters. Student should walk as if they are that person and they should think about the 'status' of this person. How do they perform their status in the space? Celebrity Superhero Out-of-work actor Teacher Pupil Nurse Celebrity Beggar Feedback on this Then, playing cards from 1-10 are handed out. Students must keep their card a secret. If they are 1 they are lowest status, 10 they are highest. Walk around the space as this character's status. Add context: they are in a busy park on a summer's day. How does this change the dynamic? Add interaction: just greetings. How does this change the dynamic?	20-25mins

	Then they arrange themselves according to where they think they are. Feedback and reflection on exercises: how do we perform our identities? Private/public? How does our perception of the identities or status or others affect the way we perform our identity? Do identities change depending on context?	
Mapping identities	Emily and Cynthia show their wallets i.e. driving license, passport etc. We draw conclusions about each other's identities based on this info i.e. ET is American citizen, student etc. Is this enough? What doesn't this picture tell us about this person? Do a cross-comparison of each other – who has status and where? In one day, how many roles do we play? Son, daughter, boyfriend, classmate? Etc.	15 mins
Questionnaire	Categories Students fill out response to questions: What is your ethnic identity? What is your sexuality? Class? Age? Etc. When do we get asked these questions in society? Why do we get asked them? Do they tell us enough about who we are? What questions would you add?	10 mins

Thursday

Activity	Instructions/Aims	Time
Ball game ritual	Walking and ball patterns. Introduce 2nd ball? Working on group dynamics	10 mins
Pick a side and Value lines	5 statements that trigger an AGREE/DISAGREE response • You should always tell the truth • School is a place where I feel safe • If you had a choice would you rather be a happy pig or a miserable genius? • What I do in school will make a difference to my future Any frustrations? How could we change this way of finding out opinions? Then move to the Value line • I feel protected by society • I have no power to change society for the better • My friends mean more to me than my family • The world is fair, the world is unfair • I am able to express my emotions, I have difficulty expressing my emotions • People are innately good, people are innately evil 5 statements that trigger more nuanced opinions How was this? In pairs – what questions would you like to ask?	30 mins
Social Identity	Describe yourself in a sentence If I were to describe you in a book, what should I say? Students pair up. Get them to re-perform each other's sentences.	25 mins

	Could do Inside Out exercise using these sentences above?	

Friday

Activity	**Instructions/Aims**	**Time**
Ball game ritual	Walking and ball patterns Working on group dynamics Could introduce some line of speech from yesterday's responses? They say each other's sentences as they cross the circle.	10 mins
Card Storming/Circles of care	Each student is given a pack of post-it notes Key titles are: School Home Community/Society Nation World What do you care/hope for in each of these places? Students are given time to write, one thing per post-it. They will then place each post-it in the category it belongs in and we will look at them as a group and discuss commonalities, differences, and points of interest. (students may add additional post-its they think are needed throughout the discussion, or to fill in categories that have fewer notes) Students then pick (in pairs) which topic they would like to talk about further. In pairs, students are positioned as 'interviewee and interviewer'. Interviewers should look at their partner's sentences and chose 2-3 that they are most curious about. What questions could you ask to start this conversation?	20-25 mins (Possibly longer)

	Two to three minutes per interview, then the roles reverse. These conversations will be recorded and transcribed to use for scripting exercises later in the week.	
Prompts	By the end, we could take a vote on which key themes we want to focus on for next week. What are the common themes presented by the group? What would they like to focus on as a topic for the remaining weeks/the performance?	

We were not able to get through all of the planned activities exactly the way we initially planned them. For example, Thursday's session did not end with filling in the 'social identity categories' as planned because there was more discussion during the value lines exercise than we anticipated, so we ran out of time during that session. Ultimately we moved the 'social identity categories' to the end of Friday's session because the card storming exercise and paired interviews took less time than anticipated. This type of restructuring and shuffling of activities happened often throughout the verbatim process, allowing the students' interests and participation to guide how long activities or discussions lasted; we were conscious of the limited time frame to generate material which required us to move at a fairly brisk pace, however we did not want to purposely thwart areas of engagement or end activities the participants were responding well to. In this way Cynthia and I were constantly reflexive throughout the workshop process, making adjustments in the moment as needed, and communicating with each

other, checking in throughout each workshop to see if adjustments needed to be made before moving on to the next activity.

At the end of the first week Cynthia and I went over everything we had done that week, discussing what we thought worked well (i.e. the ball game, the value lines exercise) and what planned activities didn't work out as well as we had hoped (i.e. card storming and the student to student interviews). Over the first weekend I transcribed the audio footage of the student interviews and sent the transcriptions to Cynthia, so she could look them over before we met to plan the sessions for the following week. Each week of the verbatim process followed a similar structure; Cynthia and I would meet to plan the workshops, dividing up who would lead which portions of each session—there were times during the workshops when we adapted the plans as needed, including who led which parts as I have discussed previously within the methodology chapter—and then we would regroup after the sessions to see what parts, if any, of the following plans needed to be adjusted, or to plan for the following week. Cynthia described the process this way in her follow-up interview:

> **CP**: One thing I'd say we were really good at was coming away and going, right, what worked? What didn't? What can we take from this? What can we not? And that again comes back to the ethnography thing, so it was like key lines that they'd say, so even down to the games that we played, that essentially were there for ensemble building, they became significant in terms of our theme.

In this way Cynthia and I were utilizing a "critically reflexive stance" as a means of "constant (re) examination of the state of the collaboration," which allowed us to "decouple the far too easy relationship drawn between collaborative, participatory methods and empowering, democratic research" (Gallagher & Wessels, 2011, p. 243). Specific examples of theatre games, drama activities, and open group discussions from the verbatim process will be explored in more detail in the following discussion chapters using thick description and segments taken from my ethnographic notes and interview transcriptions where appropriate.

5. Discussion: The Ball Game

When we began working with the students in Castleton we entered the work in the middle of a class divided. The students had just completed two separate performance pieces, and as a result the class had been split into two different groups, one for each cast; the groups had only recently come back together as a unit before the start of the verbatim process. As a result, the group was suffering from what Betty Jane Wagner (referred to from here on as B. J. Wagner), describes as poor 'social health' (Wagner, B.J., 1976, p. 30). There was a definite division between the students, something both the classroom teachers mentioned to us at the beginning of

the process and again in their follow-up interviews. Mr J described the division in the group at the beginning of the process in this way:

> **Mr J:** I think to begin with they were very much pockets...for their group pieces they were split into two, so they were in a five and a six and even though they became quite good in their groups, it wasn't a collective as all of them.

As Mr J described the students had been divided into on group of five and one group of six (one of the students dropped out of the class before the start of the verbatim process which left us with the 10 students we worked with for the verbatim process). Given this division within the group, the priority became bringing the students to a place where they could work together again, cohesively as a group. According to B. J. Wagner one of the ways to improve the social health of a group is through drama:

> Drama can improve a class's social health because it requires that a person do certain things in relation to other people. Drama says to each participant, You have to "take in" other human beings and relate your response to what they are telling you, verbally and nonverbally. To have a drama at all, a class of students must-cooperate; all have to agree to try to sustain the drama, to support one another's efforts to believe, to share their personal ideas and interpretations with others. (Wagner, B.J., 1976, p. 222).

One of the techniques used to do this with the Castleton students was through establishing a ritual of playing something we called 'the ball game' at the beginning of every session.

The ball game was fairly simple to begin with, but it became more complex each week as we became more accustomed to playing the game. Initially, we all stood in a circle, myself and Cynthia included, and we developed a pattern of names by one person making eye contact with

someone in the circle, saying their own name, and then walking across the circle to take that person's place. That person would then do the same, saying their name and walking across the circle to someone else until everyone in the circle had gone and a pattern was established. We would repeat the pattern a few times, just to make sure everyone felt comfortable with who they were walking to and when, and then an additional layer would be added to the game.

In the second stage of the ball game, an alternate pattern would be established by throwing a stuffed ball around the circle, once again establishing the pattern and repeating it several times to ensure each person in the circle was comfortable with who they were throwing the ball to and receiving the ball from. We would then return to the original pattern with the names, starting with the walking and saying the names and then adding in the throwing of the ball so that both patterns were occurring simultaneously. Eventually a third pattern was added using a different ball that was thrown in a different pattern around the circle so that the walking pattern with the names, the first ball pattern, and the second ball pattern were all occurring simultaneously with everyone moving and speaking, tossing and catching the balls, weaving around each other or ducking or jumping to catch in fluid, concentrated movements, as one group working cohesively.

In saying this, we did not arrive at this fluid, concentrated version of the game immediately; it took weeks of practice and failure, multiple

attempts where the game dissolved into frustrated defeat or fits of giggles, where the patterns were too overwhelming or added too quickly, or the seemingly simple tasks of eye contact and listening were not realistic for a particular session. Cynthia and I were not exempt from this 'failure' of the game. In one particular session, we did not establish the pattern of walking and throwing separately, but instead Cynthia attempted to start the ball pattern while in the middle of a round of the walking. One round of the throwing was completed, but on the second attempt the patterns became confused and we had to stop the game. I have included a segment of my ethnographic notes from this interaction below; transcription of conversation was taken from out of field examination of the video recording of the session. Raw notes appear on the right and cooked notes and impressions appear on the left. In this segment, and in all other segments of notes, Cynthia is denoted as CP and I am denoted as ET:

In this instance Cynthia cut me off, instead of allowing me to offer facilitation of the game to try and start over and keep momentum, she stopped my suggestion, corrected me, and then made the same suggestion I attempted to make. Her tone changed as she kept talking, clearly upset that I had stepped in. Even though she was saying she wasn't with it, her tone and the way she worded things implied the students were at fault and not focused enough, they picked up on this which created a tense environment. The next round of the game had less energy, felt more forced and almost angry

Cynthia and I usually work well together, one of use stepping in where the other falters, and we often take turns facilitating the games, sharing the 'lead' role, but in this session, that faltered. The students are aware of the rapport between Cynthia and I, and the tenseness of this interaction may have affected their resulting behaviour.

CP: So just freeze there. I totally, I'm not with this at all. I need to switch on my brain. Um, right, okay. So, I think this works best when we're all kind of ready, so you've got to be really alert, and I definitely wasn't then at all. I was all over the place.

ET: Usually we establish the ball pattern first, so we know who we're throwing to. Maybe we should go over that and try-

CP: I know. I wanted to throw us into it because I think we kind of, yeah... We can go up another level. So, should we just check that we've got the right ball pattern before we start the walking? So, it goes Elysia-

Elysia: So, who starts it?

CP: The one that you had before. So, who started it before?

ET: You started it.

CP: It was. You see what I mean? (I throw her the ball and we restart the process)

In this excerpt, the game has broken down, in part because the ritual of the establishment of the patterns was not followed in the way it had been in previous weeks. Without any warning, Cynthia altered the structure of how the game was played by introducing the ball pattern in the middle of the game instead of pausing, taking the time to establish the pattern as we had in previous weeks, and then continuing the game with both patterns. After clarification, the game continued on, but the feeling in the room had shifted noticeably and never quite recovered until the game ended and we moved on to other parts of the session. While this is an example of the game not being as successful as it was in other sessions, the ritual of playing the game, as a group, at the beginning of the session was still fulfilled, though in an altered, arguably less-successful form.

The significance of this process of ritual game play to open each workshop session would not become fully apparent until the follow-up interviews conducted with the students a week after the final performance. In this way, the 'ball game' became what Tripp refers to as a 'critical incident': "incidents [that] appear to be 'typical' rather than 'critical' at first sight, but are rendered critical through analysis" (Tripp, 1993, pp. 24-25). During the interviews, several of the students mentioned that the ritual of the ball game—the repeated actions, and the consistency of starting every session with the game—was one of the things implemented by Cynthia and myself that allowed them to connect to one another and work together as a

group. One of the more poignant examples came from an interview with Mush, one of the more reticent members of the group:

> **Mush:** Well I just…I liked the fact that we had the kind of—the ball game at the start of every session because that kind of made me feel more comfortable in going to someone else. As silly as that sounds, because it's such a little thing, like you're saying someone's name and throwing a ball to someone and you're walking towards them--it can have like a big impact because you feel a lot more comfortable with it.
>
> **ET:** What about that made you feel more comfortable? What affected you in that way?
>
> **Mush:** Well, because…me personally, I came to this school brand new and like, I found it quite hard to approach certain people, like in the group. Um…but then like, kind of, having to repeat this process, it just kind of made me feel a bit more welcome because when people are coming to you, like I said, as silly as that sounds, when people say your name it's just like, 'Oh, they know me.'

Mush was the newest member of the group, having just transferred from another school that year, and she often seemed to be on the fringes of the group as a whole. She often talked about being 'the new one' within the group and she did not feel as if the other students 'knew her' so this description of the ball game had particular resonance coming from her. While the above passage from Mush's interview may have been one of the more poignant descriptions of the ball game and its perceived meaning, she was not the only student who referenced the ball game as a key part of the generative process.

Oregon, one of the other participants, described the ball game as a moment of perceived equality during her interview with Cynthia:

> **Oregon**: It doesn't feel like a hierarchy with you and Emily, you were taking control, but you were also giving control to us sometimes ... so, for example, doing the ball game, you'd always let someone else take control... but you always had an underlying hand on it, but I never felt you were like a teacher.

In the quotation above Oregon describes how Cynthia and I allowed the students to take control, to start the game or start certain patterns, and eventually we let them lead the game themselves without our involvement. During the last few rehearsals the students played the game on their own without Cynthia or I involved in any way, but the game always started each session, including the final rehearsals and performance days once the generative portion of the process was complete. As Oregon says, this was something Cynthia and I did to foster community within the group, to create (at least the illusion of) equal power dynamics within the group, taking part in the game ourselves as equal players in the ritual. There was always an element of control held by Cynthia and myself, in that we could stop the game if needed, offer additional instruction, or start the game over if the game needed to be reset, but we allowed and encouraged them to take initiative. This is an example of what Paulo Freire calls 'dialogic teaching', in which the teacher "invites students to assert their ownership of their education...they are doing education and making it, not having education done to them or made for them" (Freire, p.32). While the verbatim process what not traditionally educational in that Cynthia and I were not their teachers and they participants were not assessed on their participation, the

research took place within an educational context, in the Castleton School during their regular classroom hours.

Oregon's interview response, and several other interview responses citing other specific moments throughout the process when Cynthia and I were not in 'teacher mode' but instead approaching them as participating members of the group, focused my attention on the various ways in which identity and relationship are performed within a generative space, by the practitioners as well as the participants. Cynthia mentioned this in her follow-up interview as well, and how the establishment of the ritual of the ball game created a space that allowed for the creation of that environment:

> **CP:** I think when we actually came into the group it was very much about establishing about, yeah ritual really. ...enabling them to feel safe, and I think a big thing of my kind of approach—and this probably cuts across a lot of what I do— is playing with humour and being, um, not taking yourself too seriously and being quite charming actually.

Cynthia went on to further discuss the performance of trust within the space and the performance of relationship and how the performative nature of our relationship as friends and colleagues contributed to the creation of the working environment:

> **CP:** I think trust is a performance as well. And I guess that's what I'm coming to with like me and you. We performed our trust of each other. We performed that of—me and Mr J have got a friendship as well, so I often would allude to our working relationship and our friendship as well, that...that certainly came up towards the latter stages... So, I think it's like—it's such a tapestry of things. It's not one thing... It's just about that atmosphere that you've set up.

As Cynthia stated above, it was not one thing, but a 'tapestry of things' that contributed to the creation of the working environment we developed with the students. The ball game was merely a starting point, a foundational exercise in the development of ritual as a means of improving the social health of the group (Wagner, B.J., 1976). There is no one moment, no singular exercise or session that can be definitively pinpointed as the turning point for the group, however, by the end of the process there had a been a clear shift in the social health of the group. Jacqueline, one of the participants, described this shift in her follow-up interview in this way:

> **Jacqueline**: At the start, we'd just been split into two groups, we didn't really see much of each other... but now we've just grown so close. We've gotten really comfortable with each other. It's just really nice to see that.

The interview transcription above is only one example of the responses the participants gave. Mr J, one of the classroom teachers, provided a slightly different perspective on the shifts that had taken place within the group by the end of the project:

> **Mr. J:** They're always going to have their close friends...but, like on Friday, I walked outside, and Eden was there havin' a fag sitting next to Gabriel and I thought, 'I can't imagine they've had very many conversations together, those two, just the two of them.' I think there was a sense of them really becoming a team...so it was nice for them to kind of achieve that together.

This moment of observed behaviour as described by Mr J is almost a direct contrast to how he described the group at the beginning of the process (as seen in the excerpt included previously in this section) as 'pockets' or as two

distinct groups within a larger collective rather than an ensemble. The two boys mentioned in his story, Gabriel and Eden, were from separate social circles and were not two of the closer members of the group from the beginning, but somehow by the end of the process, on the last day of the performance, they had reached a place where this moment was possible. This is not to suggest that the verbatim process itself was some form of 'magic' that repaired the divisions within the group and helped them develop into a more complete ensemble, rather the change may have been a result of both the process and the participants' involvement within that process. Jonothan Neelands argues for an ensemble-based drama education that focuses around the idea of "the *paedia* of the participatory experience, of being together in drama and how children and young people are changed by that which is important, rather than the form of the drama work itself" (Neelands, 2009, p. 181). In this way, as with the examples highlighted in this section, it is possible that it was—at least partially—the process itself, and the participation within that process that facilitated the changes, the improvement of the social health of the group, and produced the responses which enabled the creation of the script and the successful performance of that script.

There is an additional argument to be made that the personal aspects of Cynthia and I being involved in the process, the participatory roles we took at times, and the more informal elements of our styles as practitioners, especially within this process as we were not assessing the students,

contributed to the data generated and the ensuing material for the verbatim script. Anthropologists such as Malinowski (1922) have frequently reported on the possible importance of ritual activity in dealing with grief or loss, or instances that involve elements of danger beyond their control, but more recently psychologists like Fancesca Gino and Michael L. Norton (2013) have conducted studies on how participating in ritual activity can "reduce anxiety" and "increase confidence" in participants. Further studies still need to be completed addressing these topics, and further investigation would need to be completed attempting to replicate the contexts of the role of ritual within applied theatre research with an ethnographic presence, as in the case study discussed in this thesis. Some potential questions for further investigation include: How can ritual improve the social health of a group of young people approaching an applied theatre process? Does the use of ritualized warm-up activities contribute to a feeling of safety or security within a generative process? It is possible that the ritual of the ball game with the group of Castleton students produced similar outcomes, but it is not possible to draw any definitive conclusions without further inquiry or conducting additional research studies to see if similar results are achieved.

6. DISCUSSION: VALUE LINES

> What is the relationship between the personal and the social and the artistic in drama work? How can socially created artistic work be used to develop a critically conscious and effective ensemble or collective? (Neelands, 2006, p.18)

On Wednesday June 10th, in the middle of the third week of the verbatim process, Cynthia and I were still getting to know the students and attempting to develop a space of trust and open communication within the rehearsal room. We were nearing the end of the time outlined within the timeframe in which to generate material, and we needed more information from the students themselves in order to create a script. One means of attempting to encourage discussion was by doing an exercise that involved giving the students a series of either/or and yes or no statements and dividing the room in half, with half of the space representing yes and the other half representing no. The students would then move to the side of the room that represented the response they chose. The initial statements used were:

- You should always tell the truth. Yes or No.
- What I do in school will make a difference to my future. Yes or No.

- If you had a choice, would you rather be a happy pig or a miserable genius?
- My actions have an impact on the environment. Yes or No.
- School is a place where I feel safe. Yes or No.

After each statement or either/or suggestion the students were asked to say a little about why there were on the side they had walked to. We hoped that given the provocative nature of some of the questions the students might be more willing to engage in discussion, or freely share their thoughts and feelings within the context of the value lines exercise which was less vulnerable than an open conversation. With some of the either/or, yes or no statements, the students had a difficult time choosing which side to be on, sometimes even changing sides one or two times before finally deciding which side of the issue they agreed with; 'would you rather be a happy pig or a miserable genius' and 'school is a place where I feel safe' in particular sparked quite a bit of debate and side-changing. At this point in the activity, we introduced the idea of answering the statements on a value line instead of choosing definitive yes or no values. This allowed the students to fit themselves on a spectrum between the two extremes to allow for more nuance in their responses. "This is a technique that invites participants to take up a physical position on an invisible line to represent where they stand on a particular issue, with opposing views represented at

the extremes of the line" (Gallagher & Rodricks, 2017, p. 14). The two spectrum statements used were:

- My friends mean more to me than my family
- I feel protected by society

Only two spectrum statements were used because we ran out of time and the session ended before the other prepared statements could be used. While Cynthia and I had both remained outside of the exercise during the yes or no and either/or statements, we both inserted ourselves within the first spectrum statement at different points. The excerpt below is taken from a mix of ethnographic notes with direct transcription taken in the field while observing and reflective notes taken immediately after the portion of the exercise I facilitated and then verified or corrected against the video recording of the session. The statement 'My friends mean more to me than my family' had just been used to introduce the spectrum activity. At this point Cynthia inserted herself into the line, placing herself near the 'family' end of the spectrum, next to Eden who was at the extreme right signifying family as more important. The students were spread across the space with a small clump forming near the middle of the room with Jacqueline standing the closest to the left 'friends' section of the spectrum and Eden at the far right 'family' section. In the excerpt below 'raw' field notes and transcribed dialogue are on the right and 'cooked' interpretations and questions are on the left (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13):

In this section I had no notice that I was going to be directing the discussion; Cynthia and I had not discussed this beforehand, so I had to quickly switch from observation into teaching, while still being aware of responses to make notes afterwards.

These responses from Oregon and Geraldine were fairly expected, they have both talked about how friendships are important to them and how they rely on their friends almost as additional family members-this is in part why I went to them first, so there would be some responses in the room that might not meet the exact sentiment of the others at the end of the spectrum who I was unsure would be willing to voice why they were standing where they were.

CP: Okay. I'm in the spectrum, so can you ask questions Emily?

ET: So, you're gathered all in the middle here, so we'll go to you guys first. Why are you here?

Oregon: Because you can like, say like, family, that could be... friends could be like your family like you can have someone that's been your friend since you were a baby and they could like...they could like be your friend, but family as well. They could be just as important as family.

Geraldine: Friends always see a different side to you, in terms of like, when you're going through a hard time and stuff, I always feel like you go to your friends even before you go to your family like with certain types of things, so I'm kind of in the middle.

ET: Then you're here at the end near your friends are more important than your family.

Jacqueline: No, I thought because that side was yes, that I'm in the middle of the room.

ET: Oh, you're in the middle of the room, so you're taking the full extreme. (gestures to indicate the length of the room)

Jacqueline: Yeah.

ET: Was that the same for the rest of you?

I did not expect Eden to speak, but I asked anyway hoping that he would. He is very close to several members of the group, especially Pat whom he calls 'Woody'; they are bonded like brothers, so in a way it was surprising for him to word this response so strongly...

Oregon, **Geraldine, Elysia, and Jacqueline**: Yeah. Yes. (various affirmations)

ET: Okay, so we're starting in the middle and working down then. So, then you're at the, absolutely, 'no my family means more to me than my friends', can you talk a little about that?

Eden: Yeah. My friends obviously mean a lot to me and stuff, but then you're always going to have a bond with your family, which you're not ever going to get with your friends. Being as they're your family, you live with them, you see them all the time sort of thing, so I just think family come way ahead of friends.

This was the first time Eden spoke during this lesson. When he entered Mr J's room that day he went and sat at the side, speaking quietly with Mr J for a few minutes then watching as the other activities went on. We prompted him a few times to see if he wanted to join in and he just shook his head. Mr J seemed unsurprised by this, despite how out of character this sort of silence and lack of participation in the workshop was for Eden. He sat out of the previous exercises completely, including the ball game, but he got up and joined in on the yes or no, either/or questioning activity. Cynthia had attempted to engage him in the discussion of the previous yes or no, either/or section of the activity, but he gave only non-verbal responses, a shake of his head or a shrug. I deliberately went to him to see if he would speak, expecting him to remain silent. Following his response, I continued the activity moving to Cynthia to ask for her reasoning for her placement, and then given their responses I felt the need to insert myself into the spectrum as well so that there was an equitable level of participation from everyone in the room. A transcription of the responses is included below, again with the 'raw' data on the right and cooked questions and interpretations on the left:

Cynthia rarely talks about her father's death; this was a moment of rare vulnerability for her—maybe this contributed to Eden talking to her about his sister after the session?

CP: Yeah, I think...I mean I love, love my friends...um, but I would say like my friends are in a way my family now, like as you get older and stuff that...they're just part of my life, but yeah my mum...my dad died when I was younger, so my mum's on her own, so it's really important to me to keep going back to Liverpool, seeing my brother, and all of that, so yeah. I think, I don't know. I mean I love my friends, but maybe it's...I should be a bit further down because I feel guilty now.

ET: So, I feel like I should place myself because I'm the only one that would be on this end.

CP: Yes.

This was another moment of Cynthia and I demonstrating our connection, the performance of relationship and trust, but it a more humours way that made the students laugh and popped a bit of the tension that had risen during these responses. (possibly because the students know the history with Eden and his sister?)

ET: So, my family's obviously in the States, and there is a reason that I'm away from them, so my friends are much closer and more important to me than my family. My friends are my family, so that's my family of choice because my actual family is very problematic, so I would be on this end instead of in that direction.

CP: I'll be your family!

In the two included excerpts above, within what amounted to less than five minutes, I had to switch between the roles of non-participant observer, facilitator, and participant observer, something an ethnographer or an applied theatre practitioner often does while 'in the field' often without taking notice. This transition was negotiated between Cynthia and myself through verbal and nonverbal signals, through an unspoken understanding of what was needed at that particular moment in the workshop. This was an example of what Wagner describes as direct cooperation, "cooperation that is manifest in exchanges, transactions, and agreements negotiated directly between individual educational researchers and school teachers or administrators" (Wagner, 1997, p.14). Goffman (1963) also noted that this process of cooperation within a corporation—or in this case a research collaboration between students, practitioners, and researchers—serves as a means of defining various ways of being (p. 163).

This form of nonverbal communication was possible in part due to my relationship with Cynthia and the trust we have developed from years of working together on various projects. This relationship was never overtly explained to the students, but it was alluded to, often by our behaviour and the way we responded to one another or worked off of one another within the lesson. In her follow-up interview Cynthia described it this way:

> **CP**: You can't just make an ensemble. That has to be formed. They have to feel comfortable enough to do that. I think there was also something about mine and your relationship as well that, you know, I don't think, I could have had the same banter with them if we

> weren't sort of sharing that ourselves. Like we would often allude to our own friendship or working relationship in that way, and I think that, maybe not consciously, but that fed into that idea of fun and playfulness. And also looking out for each other.

In our discussions after the session and throughout the rest of the process Cynthia and I both flagged the 'family question' of the spectrum exercise as an instance of particular connection; we were both adding parts of who we are 'into the room' just as we had asked from the students throughout the rest of the exercise, yet in our follow-up interviews with the participants none of them identified this moment, or this lesson, as a moment that established trust or community within the process (Conquergood, 1993). While none of the students identified this moment as an instance of particular meaning throughout the process, Cynthia and I both designated it as a turning point or a moment of significance, this is mostly due to Eden, one of the participants who is quoted in the excerpts above.

Eden was usually one of the more vocal members of the group, he had a definite presence within the room and the rest of the group often was affected by whatever energy or mood he brought into the space. On this particular day when Eden entered the room he was more subdued than usual, he sat off to the side at the start of the session, at first on his own and then with Mr. J for a few minutes before once again sitting on his own. He did not participate at all in the first exercise of this workshop (a drama activity exploring status, the performance of identity, and the performance

of status within public spaces through improvisation that has not been discussed within this section), but when we started the yes or no, either/or questions he stood and joined the group. He was still unresponsive verbally; when Cynthia asked him if he wanted to say why he was on a particular side of the room he refused to respond, or just shrugged silently. This changed with the spectrum activity.

I started with the group of students gathered towards the middle of the room allowing them to say a little about why they were in the places they were before going to Eden, as was noted in the cooked section of my excerpted notes. He had taken a position at the right extreme meaning that his family meant more to him than his friends, I reiterated the statement and then asked him to say a little about it hoping to encourage him to bounce off of the sentiments of the statement, but I expected him to remain silent as he had throughout the rest of the session. Following Eden's response, I went to Cynthia, because being familiar with her background I knew her reasoning for her line positioning was slightly different to Eden's. While these moments individually may not seem of much significance, they lead to an interaction after the session ended for the day between Cynthia and Eden that gave some context to his behaviour throughout the day making this yet another 'critical incident' that occurred throughout the process (Tripp, 1993).

At the end of session Eden pulled Cynthia aside and explained to her that he had been sitting at the side during the class because it was the

anniversary of his sister's death. When she was 18 she developed meningitis, and died within a short period of time, the same day of her diagnosis. This interaction between Cynthia and Eden was later paraphrased and included within the script, with Eden's permission. The spectrum activity was adapted for performance, with the students taking seats in the audience on opposite sides and moving to another seat or remaining where they were depending upon their opinions of the questions. Rosalind, who was playing Eden in this portion of the performance, had a chair that was pulled out and separated completely, at the end of the stage in the centre instead of within either of the two lines. A portion of this scene as it appeared in the script has been included below:

> **Oregon**: School is a place where I feel safe. Yes, or no?
>
> **Mush**: I don't think like, anywhere is specifically safe. Like…just there's nowhere where I could feel like nothing would ever happen, like because anything could happen at any time, so I don't think a place could be safe.
>
> **Oregon**: Entirely safe, all of the time?
>
> **Mush**: Yeah.
>
> **Elysia**: My friends mean more to me than my family.
>
> **Pat MaGrain**: Yeah. My friends obviously mean a lot to me and stuff, but then you're always going to have a bond with your family, which you're not ever going to get with your friends. Being as they're your family, you live with them, you see them all the time sort of thing, so I just think family come way ahead of friends.
>
> **Gabriel**: I feel protected by society.

Meredith: Kind of. Is government society?

Mush: Government is crap.

Jacqueline: Well I think... I don't...I'm not scared. Well, I feel like I feel mainly safe because nothing's happened to me where I don't feel safe yet.

Eden Hazard: Um, I dunno, like...I guess sometimes you can feel safe, so if something bad then happens, like there might be someone else in 'society' that could then help you. But...at the same time it would take someone from society to do something bad...so I don't really know.

Rosalind: The other thing I was gonna say, like about all the uncertainty thing is ... y'know that day when I came in and I just sat by the side and didn't join in? ... Well, my sister got meningitis when she was 18 and died within half an hour, so like, you never know what's gonna happen

Silence

Rosalind: But I didn't know if it was too deep

In the performance of this section—and the rest of the performance— Cynthia and I deliberately cast the roles so that none of the students were telling their own stories. This allowed the students some anonymity with the audience and prevented the students from having to rehearse and perform personal stories multiple times in a way that may have become upsetting or damaging over time. This will be discussed in more detail in the discussion chapter (Chapter 10) on developing and performing the script.

The personal involvement of Cynthia and myself within the exercise, the personal answers we provided, and the responses those generated from

the students in turn, created an interesting dilemma. There is a dichotomy between being in the thick of things and remaining objective—balance is required. While participant observation as a method may allow for a more informal relationship with the research participants, allowing the investigator to collect observations on behaviour and interactions as they emerge, it can also make it more difficult for the investigator to remove themselves from that more intimate, informal position when interpreting and presenting the data (Cohen & Manion, 1980; Wolcott, 1994). Maintaining objectivity was a challenge in this case given the personal nature of the discussions and the levels of participant observation, but this was aided by reviewing the sessions on the video recordings, and coding the raw and cooked data, which allowed it to be viewed from a separate, more dispassionate point of view (Erickson, 1973; Delamont & Atkinson, 1995; Mannay, 2010). An example of a coded section of notes from this session is included below along with the colour key for the used codes:

Colour Code: care/community, anti-community, power (positive), power (negative), safety, and uncertainty

Geraldine was often seen as 'flighty', her contributions not taken seriously or laughed off, like her previous response in the lying question, but this was a moment of clarity, and vulnerability and insecurity that the others immediately responded to, nodding and agreeing

CP: You should always tell the truth. Yes or no. (all go to no) You bunch of liars!

Oregon: Some things, like you don't like, because it will hurt someone, so you don't want to tell them.

CP: So, it might be a protection?

Elysia-Sometimes, like the truth, like, it isn't always necessary, like…they're better off not knowing. It wouldn't change the situation. It wouldn't make it any better so maybe, do you know what I mean?

CP: Yes, I do.

Elysia: Like, is it worth all the things that it would cause?

CP: What I do in school will make a difference to my future? Yes, or no (gestures to the left and right, the students move, everyone moves to yes except Mush)

Jacqueline: Well, it's not so much the fact of the subjects, what you do and stuff, but you learn a lot of skills in school, like how to be around people. If you didn't go to school, you wouldn't have those sort of skills.

Geraldine: With the world getting more and more…what's the word? Advanced. You can't get anywhere without qualifications, if you don't go to school you can't get anywhere. It doesn't necessarily make you a better person, just literally you have to. They only care about a piece of paper, so if you don't go

Oregon's body language changed as Mush talked, she crossed her arms, shifted balance to one foot, and her tone became more closed and cool, combative. Mush was similarly closed off.

The students were all looking to Mr J during this exchange, casting side glances, possibly to see if he's offended by what Mush was saying? If he's taking it as a slight? (also)

Power-CP and Mr J, was this a moment of trying to make Mush feel okay about her position since the other students were being combative/defensive? Was it a power play by Mr J to reassert his effectiveness as a teacher?

to school you've got no hope. It's true, isn't it?

Mush: I'm thinking, entirely subject based...social groups get you mixed with people like clubs and stuff. There's not a subject that's going to help me with what I want to do when I'm older. (also)

CP: What do you want to do?

Mush: I want to act. This is theatre, not acting.

Oregon: But you're still developing acting skills. (also)

Mush: Yeah, but I don't think it's going to help me.

Mr J: Did you mean future career or...?

CP: I've deliberately not said...

Mr J: Lots of us have taken 'future' as career because school is there...Your future could be to have a family, then you might need the skills Jacqueline is on about...

Mush: You just have to prove it...

CP: School is a place where I feel safe.

Gabriel: I don't think like, anywhere is specifically safe. Like...just there's nowhere where I could feel like nothing would ever happen, like because anything could happen at any time, so I don't think a place could be safe.

CP: Entirely safe, all of the time?

Gabriel: Yeah.

This moment of vulnerability on CP's part got mixed responses, some nods of understanding (Oregon, Jacqueline, Elysia) and some looks of confusion (Geraldine, Pat, Mush)

Oregon: I think like...my...not that I mean the idea of not safe as in you're going to die, I mean safe as in like yourself. Like safe with the people around you...but, like, everyone's sort of the same. In school you have to dress the same, like you're not able to express yourself and do what you want to do.

CP: I can remember that, having to work out which sort of people to hang around with and whether I felt, are they going to be mean? And all of that, you know, kind of thing, having to work out where you go in the lunch hours and things like that. It takes time to figure out where...I think by sixth form it was okay. It was fine, but certainly when I was younger, just knowing where you feel you're going to be okay is a big deal. (also, and)

Mush: I think there's a big difference between feeling safe and feeling alone (and). So, like if I don't feel safe here, I wouldn't be here; I'd be somewhere else. And even the little things like...I think girls are more like...less likely to wear makeup going in to school than they are going out into town or whatever because they feel like,' oh I know everyone, nobody's going to like...'

CP: Really?

Mush: Yeah.

CP: Honestly because it thought it would be the other way round, like you have to wear makeup in school.

Interesting, like Cynthia I assumed it would be the other way around, but they were all quick to disagree, that being with those you 'know' made it okay to go natural, to be more yourself. This was a moment of dissonance with the group, possible because of age and past experiences, but a moment of connection/shared experience b/n CP and me.

Geraldine, **Elysia, Oregon, Mush**: No. (also)

Elysia: No way, no.

Mush: Even just little things like that, I feel ...we wouldn't actually be here if we didn't feel safe around the people and we wouldn't talk to anyone and we wouldn't...

The excerpt of coded field notes above, shows a portion of one session, the right column which originally held the 'raw' notes, includes the transcribed events as they were taking place, which have been cleaned and corrected in the 'cooking' process. The left column shows the 'cooked' notes, or my initial thoughts, questions, and possible interpretations. Both segments have then been coded considering "alternative meanings of phenomenon" in an attempt to combat subjectivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13). The use of alternative coding categories, like coding for community and anti-community behaviour, assisted in providing "standardization and rigour" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.13) and facilitated the search for possible interpretations present within the data during analysis.

7. Discussion: Red Ball, Green Ball

When we reached the halfway point in the generative process it seemed we had hit a wall. The students did not seem engaged; we were not getting the sort of material we expected or needed in order to produce a viable script despite our best efforts, so we decided to hand things over to students.

The session on Wednesday June 17th, in Miss C's room, started with the regular ball game ritual and then I introduced them to a new game called 'Red Ball, Green Ball', which would later become adapted and a part of the final script and performance. The purpose of the game was to suspend disbelief, to engage the imagination, and to allow the students to inject some of their personality into the game in the hopes that they would be more willing to then engage in conversation later in the session. The physicalizing used within the game is intended to allow the students to get out of their head and remain in the moment, while being open and engaged with what is going on around them, responding to what the other participants create and contribute to the game.

In order to play the game, everyone stands in a circle and one person starts the game with an imaginary Red Ball. Usually the ball is introduced and 'shown' to the participants; it can bounce, it can be thrown in the air

and caught, etc. Once everyone is comfortable and familiar with 'the ball' the person with the ball starts the game by making eye contact and throwing it to someone else in the circle, saying 'Red Ball!' That person then catches the ball and says, 'Red Ball,' to demonstrate that they have caught it, and they then repeat 'Red Ball' and pass the ball on to someone else in the circle. This would carry on with people catching and tossing the ball around the circle, occasionally with outside instructions (from me) on the changing characteristics of the ball:

The ball is now as light as a feather. How does that change the way you pass it around the circle?

Or

The ball is growing: it's getting bigger and bigger and heavier and heavier. How does that change the way you pass it around the circle?

The Red Ball is then returned to normal and the game stops momentarily, so another level can be added to the play. A second imaginary 'ball' is added, the Green Ball. The green ball is passed around the circle in the same way the Red Ball is, with the starting player saying, 'Green Ball' and passing it, with the receiving player saying, 'Green Ball' on the catch and again when they throw the ball on to someone else. The game then starts again with both 'balls' in play.

As with the ritual 'ball game', even though the balls in Red Ball, Green Ball are imaginary, the Castleton students struggled at first to

manage having both balls in play at once with one of the balls frequently being 'dropped' or suddenly falling out of play. The first few times this happened I would stop the game, and ask them what had gone wrong, like in the transcribed exchange below:

> **ET**: Okay, so what happened there? What do you think we could have done better to make the game go smoothly?
>
> **Mush**: Listening.
>
> **ET**: Good. Listening to one another to see who has the ball, and where it's going. What else?
>
> **Gabriel**: Eye contact. Looking at each other more.
>
> **ET**: Yes. Looking to see who has the ball, making eye contact so you're ready to receive it from someone else. What else?
>
> **Oregon**: Paying attention.
>
> **ET**: Right. Noticing who has the ball and where it's going. Do we think we can do that?
>
> *(There are various murmurs of yes, okay, yeah, etc. throughout the group)*

After this exchange, we started the game again, with a bit more success, but we still ended up dropping the ball after only a minute or so of play, so I added another convention. If at any point one of the balls was 'dropped' someone in the circle could say 'I've got it!' bend down, scoop up the ball, and resume playing. This seemed to solve the problem and the game ran smoothly, with both of the imaginary balls being passed around the circle

and someone picking them up and continuing the game if they were dropped.

Additional layers were then added to the game, the Red Ball and Green Ball became associated with emotions, the Red Ball being angry and harsh and the Green Ball being joyful and light. The students threw themselves into it, their body language changing completely with the added emotions, their faces screwing up in anger for the Red Ball, their voices rising in pitch to a light, airy softness for the Green Ball. There was suddenly more variation in the way they were passing the balls around the space, the Red Ball was tossed quickly and aggressively, rapidly moving from person to person, sometimes with someone squatting to catch it and then roll it sharply to someone else, or throwing one-handed like a fastball. The Green Ball conversely was tossed lightly, or batted repeatedly like a balloon in a game of keep-it-up. One student blew on it, as if it was a feather they were keeping in the air with the power of their breath until it passed to the next person.

The Red Ball and the Green Ball were then returned to their original 'neutral' state so that the final layers of the game could be added. The patterns with the two imaginary balls started as usual, but gradually additional imaginary items were added into the game, scissors, a baby, and a chainsaw to begin with. The imaginary scissors and the imaginary baby were included specifically because of their polarizing qualities, and the

various possibilities they presented for improvisation in how they were passed around the circle; they both caused a strong reaction from the participants. Multiple imaginary items were now being tossed around the room along with the Red Ball and the Green Ball and it allowed for interactions between the items when two students with different items were next to each other, or when a student was thrown multiple items at the same time. Three particular moments of interest spontaneously occurred through the playing of the game that would later become a part of the script; I will discuss each of these incidents individually, in more detail below.

The first moment of interest occurred when one particular student, Mush, who had been fairly reticent throughout the whole process stopped in the middle of the game, the Red Ball held in her hand, slightly above her shoulder waiting to be thrown, and said, "I don't think I've ever seen a group of people have so much fun with nothing before." While to an outsider this may not seem like a moment of importance, Mush was the newest member of the group, often separating herself from everyone or expressing not feeling fully involved or included, but in this moment, she was fully engaged, and her peers reaffirmed her assessment by laughing and murmuring and then carrying on with the game. This was one of the first moments within the process where Mush was fully integrated into the group; she made a statement, it was reaffirmed by the others, and she

carried on, participating fully without the hesitancy she often exhibited when participating in full-group activities.

The second moment of particular interest happened when the scissors were introduced. Elysia stopped me as soon as I introduced the scissors into the game with a very emphatic, "You shouldn't throw scissors!" Even though the 'scissors' in my hand were completely imaginary and posed no actual threat to anyone in the circle whatsoever because in reality they didn't exist, because they were introduced with a level of reality within the context of the game Elysia wanted to impose the same rules upon the imaginary scissors that would be imposed upon real, tangible scissors.

To counter this, I purposely threw the imaginary scissors across the circle to one of the students with strong comedic performance skills, Pat, to see what response would be generated. Pat, as I had hoped, rose to the challenge and acted as if the scissors had stabbed him in the gut, grunting the receiving 'scissors' and grasping his stomach around the 'entry wound' where they had pierced him. He then pulled them from his stomach, wiped them off on the leg of his pants and threw them to another member of the circle.

Elysia responded to this yet again by saying, "But you shouldn't throw scissors!" as yet another member of the circle received the scissors. In response to this Eden took the scissors and instead of throwing them, ran them across the circle and placed them in Elysia's hand. At this point Elysia took the scissors from Eden and said, "You shouldn't run with scissors." She

then turned and walked over to me and 'handed' me the imaginary scissors saying once more, "You shouldn't throw scissors" before walking back to her place in the circle.

The final moment of interest generated by the Red Ball, Green Ball game was a result of a spontaneous interaction between two 'objects.' The imaginary baby had been introduced into the game, with several members of the circle responding with horrified expressions when the 'baby' was thrown across the room or handled roughly. After a few cursory passes across the circle the baby stopped being thrown altogether and was instead cradled and then handed from one person to the next, much like a real baby would be. This change was initiated by Rosalind who passed the baby on to Jacqueline who then handed the baby to Gabriel. Gabriel was holding the baby, taking a moment to smile down and tickle its belly and then Pat, who was on Gabriel's right received the scissors. Gabriel immediately curled his left arm up as if shielding the 'baby' into his chest and extended his right hand, palm out, towards Pat, exclaiming, "Keep the scissors away from the baby!"

Again, this was a moment when the imaginary items were given the same importance as the realistic objects they were intended to represent. The baby was seen as vulnerable and in need of protection, which prompted Gabriel's reaction and the change in his body language which shielded the baby from the threat of the scissors which were seen as a tangible weapon.

These responses could potentially be due to the 'suspension of disbelief' instilled within the game, a phrase that was initially coined by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in 1817:

> ...it was agreed, that my endeavours should be directed to persons and characters supernatural, or at least romantic, yet so as to transfer from our inward nature a human interest and a semblance of truth sufficient to procure for these shadows of imagination that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment, which constitutes poetic faith. (Coleridge, 1817)

While Coleridge was referring to the suspension of disbelief within literature, specifically the reading of poetry, the term has since been adapted and used frequently to describe various other situations including the state of imaginative 'belief' present within drama, both within theatrical performance and within the classroom or workshop space. The suspension of disbelief in this sense is really an alternative term for belief which implies, "I believe because I agree to overlook certain factors that would otherwise cause me to not believe." (Martin, 2014, p.1) In the described situations above the suspension of disbelief allowed the students to believe the objects were real within the context of the game, therefore the scissors should not be thrown, the baby should be protected or handed gently from person to person, the scissors should be kept away from the baby, and so on; the participants, in this way, enforced reality upon imaginary objects within the confines of the game.

This was not explicitly discussed with the students. I did not say, "I am now going to ask you to suspend your sense of logic and believe that I

am holding a ball in my hand even though we can all see there is nothing there" because that would have most likely caused them to do the exact opposite. Instead I introduced them to the ball, and every object that followed and the students accepted those objects as constructions of the game, they did not question them, and they actively participated, responding to each new addition or situation fully. These moments were then replicated within the performance and staged within a way so that the audience could also hopefully suspend their disbelief while watching the performers interact with these imaginary objects.

As a facilitator of the game as well as a participant within the game I had to pay attention to interactions between the participants, keep track of each of the 'objects' as they were passed around the circle, as well as observe any moments that might be of use for the performance. This game was an embodiment of the overlaps between the roles of the participant observer and the applied theatre practitioner, specifically of the observational skills necessary for both roles (Wolcott, 1994; Conquergood, 1991). At the end of the session I made notes in a reflective journal with my initial impressions and memories from the game, as I was more involved within the exercise itself and was unable to take notes during the activity of the game. This session was unique in that it is the only session over the course of the generative and rehearsal process that we did not have the video camera because Rebecca wasn't feeling well that morning and she accidentally left the camera at her home. Originally, this session was

supposed to start with the regular, ritual 'ball game', followed by an alternate warm up game led by Rebecca, with the session ending in an open discussion with the students. Instead, we changed the plan so that I would lead a warm up game, 'Red Ball, Green Ball,' and Rebecca would sit at the side and make observational notes while I lead the exercise and participated in the game with the students. An iPad was used for audio recording for both the game and the following open discussion in place of the normal video recording used in each session. As a result, this session resulted in more reflective participant observation notes and out of field ethnographic notes, as it was one of the sessions I was the most directly involved in as a practitioner. Those notes along with transcription from the audio recorder were then used to create the scene in the script, folding in the described interactions in the devised staging of the performance. The final script (with pseudonyms) has been included as Appendix C: Verbatim Play Script within this thesis, including the segment of 'Red Ball, Green Ball' that was played in the performance.

This alteration in the dynamics of the group may have affected the data that was generated, the way it was annotated, and examined in that I have fewer non-participant, ethnographic observations from this session and many more reflective notes. Additionally, the audio recordings were used more heavily in the examination and interpretation of the data generated from this session than the other sessions in the generative

process. The open discussion from the second portion of this session will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter on cultural differences.

8. Discussion: Cultural Differences

Introduction

> ...cultural difference becomes a problem not when you can point to the Hottentot Venus, or the punk whose hair is six feet up in the air; it does not have that kind of fixable visibility. It is as the strangeness of the familiar that it becomes more problematic, both politically and conceptually...when the problem of cultural difference is ourselves-as-others, others-as-ourselves, that borderline. (Bhabha, 1989, p.72)

The notion of cultural difference and reporting or critiquing observations of 'the other' has been a hotly debated topic within ethnographic research for decades (Wolcott, 1994; Kaplan 1987; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). In recent years that debate has centred around the division of space and the ways "space itself becomes a kind of neutral gird on which cultural difference, historical memory, and societal organization are inscribed" (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992, p. 7). This 'ethnographic map' as Ferguson and Gupta call it, has become increasingly problematic in recent years as cultural identity has become difficult to pin to geographical location due to increased mobility and immigration, changes in sovereignty of nation states, and the development of social media and technological advances (ibid, p. 7-8; see also Jameson, 1984; Clifford, 1988). While anthropology as a whole acknowledges that space is socially constructed (Wolcott, 1994; Franks,2015; Monk, Rutter, Neelands, & Heron, 2011) the

"deterritorialization [of culture] has destabilized the fixity of 'ourselves' and 'others'" (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992, p. 19).

This dynamic was especially apparent within the Castleton case study. This discussion chapter will explore some of the key moments throughout the process when cultural differences were particularly apparent. In many ways I was 'the other' within the room as the only non-British person within the workshop spaces and as the only United States citizen in the entire Radical Hope project. However, at the time the case study was conducted I had lived in the United Kingdom for two years, so I had a developed, lived understanding of the area the research was conducted in and a basic understanding of British 'culture' as a whole. It was this familiarity combined with the students' assumed familiarity with American culture due to exposure to television, film, and popular culture that only served to ultimately highlight the cultural differences in the room. These cultural differences, the discussions they sparked, and the way those differences influenced the development of the verbatim play script will be explored within this discussion chapter.

Although there were elements of cultural difference that permeated the entire research process, three moments in particular stand out as particular examples of moments where cultural differences were especially apparent. The first moment happened during the first meeting with the Castleton students on Friday, June 5th in Mr J's room when we did a physical

mapping exercise. The second instance was an exercise in Miss C's room on Tuesday, June 11th that involved Cynthia and I emptying out our purses and letting the students explore and categorize our 'identities' from what they found. And the final example was during an open discussion on Wednesday, June 16th following the Red Ball, Green Ball activity discussed in the previous chapter. Each of these events will be discussed individually, in greater detail below.

Mapping

The first session of the generative process in Mr J's room on June 5, 2015—after the initial portion of the session when we met with the students to describe the process to them, to give out permission slips, and answer any questions—was spent in an attempt to break the ice, to further explore the Radical Hope project as a whole, and to act as an introduction to both Cynthia and I, and the project. (Unfortunately, we do not have video footage of this session because as it was the first session we did not have permission slips returned yet from parents, guardians, or all of the participants so we did not have permission to video at the time. Therefore, descriptions of activities and interactions come from my reflective journal and notes taken on the day.) One of the ways we decided to do this was by using a series of ice-breaker activities with the students, to help learn their names, for them to learn a little about Cynthia and I and our backgrounds, and to begin developing the community of the group.

One of the ice-breaker activities we used was a 'living map' exercise in which we asked the students to imagine the open floor space of Mr J's room was a flattened Mercator map with the far left wall representing North and South America, the upper middle of the room to represent Europe, or specifically England (or "The centre of the universe," as Gabriel, one of the participants called it), and the far right wall where the stage blocks and double doors were to represent Asia. Cynthia then instructed all of the participants to go and stand in the area of the room that would show where they were from on the map; Cynthia and I also inserted ourselves into this exercise.

There was an immediate spatial divide within the room; Cynthia was huddled in the middle of the room with the cluster of students in the 'United Kingdom' while I was on the far side of the room, alone, in the 'United States.' This was the first moment in the process where it became openly, visibly apparent that I was not one of 'them', that I was someone different, from somewhere else in the world, but I was still in this space as a member of this research process. I was somewhat used to this feeling as a student at Warwick, where I was often one of the only international students at a given event and frequently the only American. This moment in the mapping exercise immediately placed me in a position within the research process as someone 'other', someone who was there, participating and observing, taking observational notes, and writing about 'them', about what I witnessed or understood about interactions. This position is not entirely foreign within the social sciences, especially within ethnographic

research, where the ethnographer is often placed within a context where they are the sole member of a group that is observing another group. However, my positioning within this context was complicated because at the time I was living as an expat in the United Kingdom, and I had been there for two years, so while I was 'Other' in the sense that I was a United States citizen, and I had spent most of my life in the United States, I did not feel quite as separated and removed as a member of the group as I might have been if I had taken part in the research within the first few months after arriving in the United Kingdom.

While there is a long-standing tradition within ethnography of representing 'the other' in pieces of text (Malinowski, 1922; Conquergood, 1991; Wolcott, 1994), within recent years there has been a push, especially within feminist research, to negotiate the problems of Othering in the research we do and the ways we write and present that research. This move encourages speaking only for oneself, or speaking for ourselves, which Sue Wilkinson and Celia Kitzinger (2009) describe in this way:

> Speaking only for *ourselves*, we leave Others to represent *themselves*. Instead of speaking for Others, we maintain a respectful silence, and work to create the social and political conditions which might enable Others to speak (and to be heard) on their own terms. (p. 86, emphasis present in the original text)

Wilkinson and Kitzinger further say about the position of speaking for ourselves and its placement within the history and current context of social sciences research:

> This position of speaking only for oneself is in direct contradistinction to the conventional practice of the social sciences,

> within which speaking 'for' or 'about' Others has been the norm. (p. 87)

My position within the Castleton case study, within the broader Radical Hope study, certainly placed me within this position.

This relates back to the debate concerning the problematic nature of inscribing cultural identity to physical, geographical locations mentioned in the introduction to this section. The "deterritorialization [of culture] has destabilized the fixity of 'ourselves' and 'others'" (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992, p. 19), which further complicates the questions of how we approach ethnographic research and applied theatre research and how the research conducted within those disciplines should be discussed or reported. Trinh Minh-Ha (1989) describes the complex dynamic we face as researchers, and participants, in writing about applied theatre research in this way:

> A conversation of 'us' with 'us' about 'them' is a conversation in which 'them' is silenced. 'Them' always stands on the other side of the hill, naked and speechless, barely present in its absence. Subject of discussion, 'them' is only admitted among an 'us', the discussing subjects, when accompanied or introduced by an 'us', member, hence the dependency of 'them'. (p. 65)

The goal of the verbatim study, and the way Cynthia and I approached the generative process and creation of the script, was to challenge this idea of 'us' writing for 'them' by allowing the participants to dictate the topics for exploration—within the required parameters of the core themes of hope, care, and civic engagement—and for a piece of theatre to be created that allowed them to speak for themselves, to tell their stories, in their words, to an invited audience, and through the dissemination of research findings to a wider public. The talk balk after the show and the

follow-up interviews with the students and classroom teachers served as another means of accounting for this, by allowing the participants to discuss the process in their own words.

The introductory mapping exercise was only the first instance where the cultural differences relating to nationality and lived experience between myself and the students became apparent. Throughout the process there were several instances where this divide and the way it shaped interactions and discussions was highlighted. Another example of how my position as someone 'other' within the space was visibly highlighted was through an exploratory exercise Cynthia and I led using our purses in the second week of the generative process that will be described in more detail in the following section.

PURSES

Miss C: "You were personal…you had your purses out."

As part of the overarching longitudinal study, Cynthia and I had the students fill out an 'identity descriptor' form which included background information such as the students' gender, ethnicity, and economic status. The form and the student responses have been included as Appendix D: Identity Descriptor Questionnaire and Responses. This questionnaire form was closely modeled on a similar form used by Kathleen Gallagher with her research participants in the Canadian research site and was used to provide comparable demographic information from our research site for the

overarching longitudinal study. In order to get the students to think about the aspects of their identity beyond the questions asked on the form, Cynthia and I did an exercise with our purses, emptying out our wallets and scattering the contents on two separate pieces of poster board. We then asked the students to engage with the contents, and to describe what they knew about each of us from what they observed.

We divided the students into two groups, half focusing on Cynthia's items and the other half focusing on mine. Each group organized the things they found and put them into sections on the piece of poster paper, separating store loyalty cards, credit cards, our Warwick ID cards, driver's licenses, and passports. After allowing the groups a few minutes to talk amongst themselves, we had them share what they had discovered. Some of them asked questions as they looked over our things:

> **Geraldine**: Emily, how do you have to be to drive in America? Is it still 17?
>
> **ET**: It depends on the state. I was 15 when I started driving.
>
> **Geraldine**: You're joking! (general murmur from the group)
>
> **CP**: Yeah, you're younger in the States, aren't you? Where ours is 17.
>
> **ET**: I had a provisional license at 15 with a work permit, and then I had a full license at 16…
>
> **CP**: Why do you think that is? Think about America.
>
> **Pat**: Freedom! (laughter from the group)
>
> **Rosalind**: It's big, you just can't get anywhere without it.
>
> **Geraldine**: Oh! Is that why?
>
> **CP**: I think that must be why.
>
> **ET**: I think that's certainly part of it.

As the groups shared aloud what they had 'discovered' and what assumptions they could then make about us. The discussion that resulted positioned me within the group as the 'other' in the sense that I was the only non-British member of the group. Even something as simple as the difference in driving age in the except above, showed the differences between the culture I was raised in and the students' culture. I was raised and educated in the United States, I had a United States passport and a Virginia driver's license, things that automatically marked me as 'different' or 'other' within the group, especially when compared directly to Cynthia's British passport and driver's license. While there were some distinct differences in the materials Cynthia and I presented for the students to look through (passports, driving licenses, insurance cards) there were some cards we both had (Boots card, Tesco card, University of Warwick IDs). While these cards in a way showed that I was part of the group, that I lived in the area just as they did and frequented the same stores and places, they also opened the conversation to interrogate another area of cultural difference:

> **Geraldine**: It must have been so weird coming here. Was it not? Is there Tesco in America?
>
> **ET**: No, we don't have Tesco.
>
> **Geraldine**: So, then what is like, your Tesco?
>
> **ET**: Depends. It could be Food Lion or Stop & Shop or Walmart.
>
> **Mush**: Walmart, that's Asda isn't it?
>
> **ET**: Yes, sort of.
>
> **Elysia**: What was that last one? Wall Mart?
>
> **Geraldine**: Walmart. Let's pop down to the Walmart.

Meredith: Yes, let's go to Walmart. (laughter)

While this interaction may seem insignificant in the larger scale of the research project as a whole, it serves to demonstrate the level of cultural difference and the curiosity the students displayed regarding those differences. Many of the students displayed a general understanding, or what they thought was a general understanding of American culture as they perceived it from what they had gleaned from popular culture and social media (like Pat's 'freedom!' statement in the earlier quoted passage). However, as we got to know each other throughout the weeks, the students realized just how different the United States and the United Kingdom were, even in the small, everyday things like where you do your grocery shopping. As these differences were highlighted in discussions, or in questions the students asked me about the States, it made me increasingly aware of the differences between our cultures, and the ambiguous role I was in as someone who was not entirely 'other' but also certainly not one of 'them.' This complex position made approaching the interpretation of the gathered data and the writing of this thesis more delicate than I had originally anticipated when starting the project.

One of the primary purposes of ethnographic research and the writing of ethnographic accounts is to provide the reader with a flavor the research subject(s)' culture and identity to the best of the ethnographer's ability. Boon describes it this way:

> A major interest in the art of ethnography is to convey a sense of the whole society, to typify it in some vivid, compelling manner. Like any essential metaphorical procedure, ethnography thus resembles the arts of visual illusion, if one realizes there is no such thing as simple 'realism' and no possible one-to-one correspondence between that which is 'illusioned to' and the perceptual or conceptual apparatus by which illusion is perpetrated. (Boon, 1977, p. 18)

In this quotation, Boon argues that the ethnographer is tasked with representing a 'sense of the whole society' in a way that makes their culture vivid and compelling to the reader. Johannes Fabian takes this argument a step further in saying, "It is by diagnosing anthropology's temporal discourse that one rediscovers the obvious, namely that there is no knowledge of the Other which is not also a temporal, historical, political act" (Fabian, 2014, p. 1). According to Fabian, it is impossible to remove the idea of the Other from the political context in which they are encountered, just as it has become increasingly difficult given the deterritorialization of cultures and the inability to definitively identify 'cultures' by pinpointing a geographical area on a map (Jameson, 1984; Clifford, 1988; Wolcott, 1994; Franks,2015; Monk, Rutter, Neelands, & Heron, 2011; Gupta & Ferguson, 1992).

However, in recent years this idea of the ethnographer entering the space of the Other and describing their lives from a removed 'authoritative' position granted by membership in the academy has been exchanged in favor of developing spaces where the Other may speak for themselves, and we, as ethnographers and researchers, are being encouraged to instead

speak for *ourselves* (Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2009). It is within this complex web of debate that I situate myself and this research, as someone who was at once 'Other' in my distinct cultural difference as an American woman conducting research within the United Kingdom, and as part of 'them' as an expat, participant observer and research assistant within the process, working with Cynthia and the students throughout this project. I do not propose to offer any firm solutions or answers to either side of the debate, instead it is my intent to present my observations and interpretations of events from within this particular research process with as much detail as possible, and to allow the reader to draw their own conclusions from the presented material. Similarly, at the end of the exercise with the purses, we had a discussion with the students about identity and whether or not what they learned about Cynthia and I based on the artefacts we presented them was enough:

> **ET**: So, after looking…at the exercise that Cynthia and I did with the wallets—these are ways you are asked to identify yourself every day; but is it enough? … Do you think these fully capture who you are?
>
> **Eden**: This *[pointing at the 'identity' descriptor form]* is well, this is entirely well obviously not this … technically like the bottom [*describe yourself in a sentence*] just could be your opinion, like I could say 'I'm the best person in this room' and everybody else's opinion would be that that isn't true … your opinion needs like *other* people's opinions as well.
>
> **CP:** Oh okay…
>
> **Geraldine**: I think it's really subjective because what we're writing is what we want other people to see … so you know what I mean so it's not necessarily … people might add in like extra bits to make them look better when really, you're kinda like *[makes a 'horrible' face]*.

CP: And what if you have a low self-esteem and you don't think that much about yourself?

Mush: And I feel like this is very vague as well like … I could be a serial killer, I'm not a serial killer, but I could just put down like the good stuff …

[giggles from the group]

Mush: I'm not a serial killer!

[more laughter from the group]

Mush: You could just put down the good stuff.

CP: So, there is something really at odds, isn't there? Because this bit here [*referring to age, ethnicity, gender etc on the form*] is based on facts, you know your, actual facts and that's what very often is what gets recorded in our passport and what we put on our job applications, what we do when we go to the hospital and we need to fill out a form. These facts are what people judge us to be.

ET: That's your identity, it's who you are on paper.

CP: And that's a problem because it doesn't tell who you are and your history, but then I think what you're saying is true, you could go in the other extreme and all you've got is an opinion on yourself.

This excerpt taken from the discussion with the students demonstrates how it is impossible to capture all of who someone is by reporting a few facts, just as it is impossible to accurately capture an entire culture in one written account, just as it would not be possible for me to describe every instance of cultural difference that occurred within the verbatim process. This brings me back to the Wolcott quote used within the introduction to the discussion chapters, "Just as no researcher as fieldworker can ever hope to *get* the whole story down to every last little detail, no researcher as author can ever expect to *tell* the whole story either" 1994, p.19, emphasis present in the original text). Within this chapter I have

attempted to capture three specific instances where cultural difference was particularly apparent within the verbatim process. One of the clearest examples of cultural differences between myself and the research participants was an open discussion which took place halfway through the generative process. This open discussion, including transcribed sections of dialogue, will be described in more detail in the following section.

OPEN DISCUSSION

Linda Christensen, in her article "Building Community from Chaos," discusses the challenges of developing community among a group of high school seniors and the effectiveness of using the experiences of their lives outside of the school as a foundation to build upon. Christensen says, "Rather than pretending that I could close the door in the face of their mounting fears, I needed to use that information to reach them (Christensen, p. 51)." Cynthia and I employed a similar tactic when working with the Castleton students, with one open discussion in particular highlighting this approach.

The second half of the session on Wednesday June 17, 2015 following the Red Ball, Green Ball activity (discussed in the previous discussion chapter) involved an open group discussion in which we figuratively handed things back to the students. We were at the half-way point in the generative process and the students seemed disengaged; we were not getting the

material we expected or needed in order to produce a viable script despite our best efforts, so Cynthia and I decided to take a different approach and hand things over to students. We had the students sit in a circle for a discussion that we hoped would be prompted by their interests, to allow for a more dialogue-based form or education and devising following Freire's (1970) emphasis on the importance of the inversion of power dynamics, in which learners come "face-to-face with other knowing subjects" (pp. 36-37). By altering the traditional roles of teacher to learner and allowing the students to guide the direction the discussion would take and the key themes the performance would be structured around, Cynthia and I attempted to embody this form of pedagogy. The following excerpt is taken from the opening of the discussion, transcribed verbatim from the audio recording of the session:

> **ET**: ...We went back, and we listened to the conversations and we had a chat, and we thought maybe that wasn't enough...maybe it was too restricting, the categories that we gave you. So, we wanted to see if we could have a chat with you about, what you want this show to be because it's based on what you care about. What do you not get to talk about in school, or at home, or in places that you go to that you want a place to talk about? What are you interested in, like where do you want this to go?
>
> **CP**: It's got to be yours.
>
> **ET**: It's got to be yours. We want to shape it around what you want it to be, and that can be anything at all, just throwing things around and we'll see what we get.
>
> **Oregon**: Anything?
>
> **ET**: Anything. (long pause)

CP: Scary, isn't it? You can talk about anything.

ET: You can talk about anything.

Oregon: It can be random things?

ET: It can be anything at all.

CP: So far, we've guided it all, haven't we? Like, we've given you prompts, so we thought we'd be a little bit risky and ask you it instead. (pause) And everyone's terrified.
(*there is scattered nervous laughter*)

There was another pause, the students were looking nervously to each other, or pointedly looking at the floor, avoiding eye contact all together as if afraid they would be called on or put on the spot. There was a moment I worried that we had gone horribly wrong, that this was another attempt to get them to speak that had failed to produce results, but just as I was about to change tactics, to try and coax them into talking in another way, Pat, one of the boys in the group chimed in and said, "Football!"

With a single word, the tension popped like a soap bubble with relieved laughter and a quiet murmuring around the circle. What followed was a conversation that lasted the rest of the session that started with football and progressed into a discussion of equal pay for men and women, notions of the American Dream, safety, hate crimes, differences in culture, community, and local events. During the conversation Cynthia and I both shared personal stories; we participated in the conversation with them, occasionally guiding it with questions or comments. In total, the conversation lasted thirty-seven minutes, the remainder of the session

following the opening games, only stopping when the bell rang signifying the end of the class.

This particular session solidified the themes of safety and uncertainty that became the cornerstones of the verbatim play. Various portions of this conversation were edited and included within the script itself, including an actual recreation of this activity where the students sat, on stage, in a circle and performed a portion of the conversation. A copy of the verbatim performance script has been included in Appendix C: Verbatim Play Script of this thesis, this scene appears in Scene Two.

Several of the students mentioned this session, the open discussion specifically, in their follow-up interviews as being a moment that stood out to them as something that developed community within the group and made them feel more comfortable with one another, I have included two examples below:

> **Jacqueline**: Um, I really like the scene where we all sat in a circle and just had a big discussion because it was just really nice to talk to people about different things and see everyone's different views and everything so I liked that… because obviously at the start I didn't know a lot about everyone that I found out now, from what people have shared and everything, so yeah, it's just nice to just get closer to other people.

> **Rosalind**: I think that, you know that big group discussion? That's definitely the one I remember the most… listening to everyone's opinions and stories… and we learned things about you and Cynthia…I think that struck me the most. Everybody got to know each other a little bit better, I think, as we went on it was really nice to just have a free talk about anything you want to talk about.

In these two quotations from the follow-up interviews with Jacqueline and Rosalind, both participants mention hearing other participants' views or stories and opinions as a contributing factor to the development of community or the improvement of the social health of the group (Wagner, B.J, 1976). In this way, it could be interpreted that the switching of the power dynamics of the traditional model of teacher to student, and by opening the discussion and allowing the participants' interests to shape the conversation—as suggested by Freire's model of dialogic pedagogy—the students felt more agency and control and were able to engage with the material in a deeper way (Freire, 1970). However, that is not to say that this opinion was shared or felt by all the participants within the group. While six of the ten students interviewed cited this discussion as a moment that they believe contributed to the development of community and cooperation between the other participants, four members did not cite this as an example. Further to that, one participant, Meredith, said she wished she had been more involved and participated more:

> **Meredith**: Honestly, I wasn't looking forward to it [the performance].
>
> **ET**: ...Can you say more about why you weren't looking forward to it?
>
> **Meredith**: I think that I didn't really understand what we were doing. And I know that you and Cynthia explained it a lot, but I was kind of a bit like, 'Ew, it's my own words' // but then I kind of got used to it and I enjoyed it more.
>
> **ET**: Is there anything you would do differently if you were going to do the process again?

Meredith: Get involved more, probably.

While the majority of the students and the two classroom teachers felt closer to one another and as if the social health of the group had improved, it is a stretch to say this was true for every member of the group, or to identify one specific exercise, session, or set of sessions which contributed to this change.

In his 2004 paper presentation *Freire versus Marx: the tensions between liberating pedagogy and student alienation,* Jonathan Martin proposes that critical consciousness can be fostered by engaging students in dialogue centring around their concerns and "encouraging them to make connections with…broader social structures and relationships" (p. 2). By following a Freirean model of dialogic education marked by liberal discourse, democratic practices, and critical reflection, (Shor 1992) we attempted to create a public space (Habermas, 1991; Greene, 1995, Franks, 2015) in which "more socially democratic articulations and educational visions might be formed" (Pedroni, 2006, p. 113). This open discussion with the students encompassed various topics including football, gender equality, equal pay for equal work, gun laws, and the cultural differences between countries that share a language, namely the United States and the United Kingdom. One of the dominant areas of cultural difference between the United States and the United Kingdom that became a central focus of the discussion was the issue of gun ownership and gun violence in the United States. Several of the students had previously expressed a desire to

move to the United States either for university or after university in previous sessions; part way through this conversation it seemed that some of the students were beginning to question that decision:

> **Mush**: It's weird though, because like, well me especially, I've always thought like when I'm older I want to live in America, have this American dream…and you think, and it's not all it's cracked up to be, as well.
>
> **CP**: You want to move here, don't you Em?
>
> **ET**: I do, I want to stay here. I don't want to go back.
>
> **Geraldine**: Would you honestly say that Britain as a whole is better than America? Being an American, kind of person?
>
> **CP**: An American kind of person. (laughs)
>
> **ET**: I am American, ish. (laughs) I'm a crap American, most people say that anyway, so it's fine. I think it depends on the kind of upbringing you have or the kind of life that you have there or the socioeconomic bracket that you're in. Like, if you have money, America is one of the best places in the world to live. If you don't, it's horrific, like it's truly, and honestly horrific and here [in the United Kingdom] that's not as much of an issue. Like the idea that you can have homeless people dying on the streets doesn't happen here. The idea that someone can die of starvation just because they can't get food, doesn't happen here. The idea that you can die from a tooth ache that you can't afford to go to the dentist or get medication for doesn't happen here. All those things happen in the States daily, and that's the governmental systems and that's—it's not really excusable when you live in a developed country that has access to those resources.
>
> **Geraldine**: Would you say that the most difficult thing though, like because, you have to pay for your… Say if you got poorly and you have to pay?
>
> **ET**: It's one of the biggest factors, at least for me.
>
> **Geraldine**: I think…I couldn't. I don't know what I'd do.

In this portion of the conversation the healthcare insecurity and lack of government support for those who are economically challenged many Americans face—concerns that may not have even registered for many of the United Kingdom students given their access to the National Health Service (the NHS)—opens the conversation to considerations of the broader cultural differences between the two countries. While there are many similarities between the United States and the United Kingdom, some of those similarities may only be perceived because of the prevalence of popular culture such as American made film, television, and other forms of social media (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992). This idea of security and safety then evolved into a conversation about the concept of gun ownership and gun violence that Americans face every day, something the Castleton students had no realistic, lived point of reference for, but were often curious and inquisitive about. Within this conversation I was positioned as the only 'American' point of view, but I did not, and I do not assume to speak for every American or for American culture as a whole, rather I offer my thoughts and opinions, developed from my experiences of living in America and as a United States citizen. This portion of the conversation and the topics it covered represents what was mostly likely the starkest example of cultural difference discussed throughout the research process:

> **Rosalind**: So, do you feel much safer here?
>
> **ET**: Yes. Actually, I was telling Cynthia about that the other day… it took about three months before I realized I was actually safe here; like your cops don't have guns. We have people who walk around on the streets with them, like random citizens can have a gun—

Rosalind: Why do you think that, they like, allow them to have guns? Why isn't that just abolished?

ET: It's become cultural. Like I think—I can't speak for everyone—but I think, as an American citizen, we have very few things that are innately American in culture because we're a mix of other countries. We're a country that's founded on immigrants and that's [gun ownership] one of the things that's foundational; this is who we are, this is part of our Constitution, we have the right to bear arms, we have the right to have guns, we have the strongest military in the entire world, and citizens should have the right to do that as well.

CP: It's a freedom thing as well, isn't it? It's perceived as a liberal, freedom thing. I can…it's my choice to do this.

ET: Like I have the right to do this, to defend what I believe in and to fight off anyone else that I don't like.

Oregon: It's not exactly free if you have to be scared to leave your house though.

CP: Exactly.

Mush: Was your area, like, was your state particularly bad though? Are some states better than others?

ET: My area, well the area I grew up in, was "safe", but then you think that most places aren't actually safe. You can't really say that anywhere is "safe."

Geraldine: It must be so weird though, being here, and just thinking, like that's just…obviously touch wood…that that's just never really going to happen.

CP: But then we do have security issues here.

Geraldine: No, I know, but like I think we take it for granted, like we just walk around, like, and expect nothing to happen when there's people like petrified to leave their homes in America, like ugh.

ET: What's different is that we aren't petrified to leave our house. That's part of our regular life so you just kind of deal with it and go on.

Geraldine: That's so strange.

Rosalind: Something worries me, that you feel like you can go out and just not think about it at all.

CP: So different to our culture, isn't it? That's the thing.

Within this portion of the conversation there are multiple examples of foundational cultural differences: my realization of the 'safety' of the United Kingdom, the difficulty the students had grasping the idea of private citizens in the United States owning guns, and the final statements from Geraldine and Cynthia in particular about the strangeness and the differences between the two cultures. The idea of safety relative to gun possession is particularly complex: the students expressed not understanding how anyone could feel safe in the presence of guns, especially those owned by private citizens, and while I share this feeling and emerging research shows that others in the United States feel similarly (Cook & Ludwig, 2006; Hemenway & Miller, 2001) there is also a substantial body of research that shows many American associate gun ownership with a feeling of safety and increased self-defence (see Kleck & Gertz, 1995; Cook & Ludwig, 1996; Kleck & Getz, 1998). These differences certainly played a part in the conversations with the students, as is demonstrated by their questions concerning life in the United States, and the way they reacted to the differences between their lives and the lives of people in the United States from the answer I provided them (like their shock at differences in driving age between the United States and the United Kingdom referenced in the previous section, and their response to the 'strangeness' of gun ownership). Elements of this were folded throughout the verbatim play script in an attempt to demonstrate those cultural differences and honour their presence in the room throughout the research process. These cultural differences also played a part in how I viewed and interpreted key moments

in the process; I was looking at interactions and events through the lens of a United States citizen living within the United Kingdom, my history and my identity naturally coloured the elements I perceived to be of importance, and my interpretation of which conversations and interactions I thought would best contribute to the verbatim play script.

Near the end of the open conversation a frequent topic of conversation with the students, the idea that 'nothing happens' in their area came up. However, after some discussion and shared stories the students arrived at the realization that perhaps things happen in their area, but they just aren't talked about.

> **Mush**: But that's the thing, like nothing happens here. Once we hear one, like one news story we think…we're like, "Oh my god, it's going to happen everywhere."
>
> **CP**: When you say nothing happens here do you mean like specifically like…?
>
> **Mush**: No, I mean like, in the UK not a lot happens…and when it does happen…
>
> **Rosalind**: Maybe we just don't hear about it.
>
> **Miss C**: That's exactly it. It's not…but it's not in the papers.
>
> **Geraldine**: Do you remember that? Oh, sorry Miss.
>
> **Miss C**: It's alright.
>
> **Geraldine**: Sorry, I just remembered. There was this thing about a white van that was like…
>
> **All**: Oh yeah… (other sounds of affirmation)
>
> **ET:** I think that's something universal, across cultures, 'stay away from the white van.'
>
> **Geraldine**: We like, accused it of being a paedophile and no one would go near it. Things like that.
>
> **Mush**: If you see the white van outside be very wary of it.

> **Oregon**: Nothing ever happens in [the West Midlands], though, really.
>
> **Geraldine**: Let's please touch some wood or something.
>
> **Miss C**: It does happen, it's just it doesn't make…it's not considered enough to be put into the press.

A portion of the discussion was transcribed and included in the closing scene of the verbatim play:

> **Pat MaGrain**: But that's the thing, like nothing happens here. Once we hear one, like one news story we think…we're like, "Oh my god, it's going to happen everywhere."
>
> **Oregon**: When you say nothing happens here do you mean like specifically like…?
>
> **Rosalind**: No, I mean like, in the UK not a lot happens…and when it does happen…
>
> **Jacqueline**: Maybe we just don't hear about it.

In this way, this discussion as a whole stands out as a moment within the verbatim process that encouraged the students to consider the wider world around themselves on a local and global scale and critically assess their conclusions. Additionally, this conversation encouraged some of the participants to consider the way the verbatim play might serve as a way for them to demonstrate a piece of their identities and their culture to a wider audience by sharing it with the other research sites in Canada, Taiwan, India, and Greece. Geraldine summed up her thoughts on the conversation and sharing their opinions and their stories with the other research sites in this way:

> **Geraldine**: I think we should just share, like the whole thing that we've been speaking about in terms of…about crime and how kind of safe we are because I'm sure in the other countries that we're going to be sharing this with, they would be quite shocked. I think it would be interesting for them to hear how we deal with things like that and how they…like with this whole self-defence thing. Like they probably would be, like, so shocked that we don't, that we're not allowed guns, or you know, something like that? I think it would be really nice to show them.

In many ways this conversation was possible because of the environment Cynthia and I constructed with the students. This conversation would not have been possible in the first session, it took weeks of interaction, listening, and the creation of an environment where the participants, and Cynthia and I, felt comfortable sharing our thoughts, opinions, and differences with the groups. One of the ways we accomplished this was through the creation of a 'contract' with the students that I will explore in greater detail in the following discussion chapter.

9. Discussion: Contracting

> **CP**: We're mindful that we're not going to ask you to share too much of your personal lives, I'm not going to do that either, but there is definitely going to be a different level of sharing than Miss would be able to do as a teacher... Think of a set of rules that are okay for us, so we feel safe, but also excited about the work.

One of the techniques used to develop a foundation of collaboration and community and to establish an environment of safety and communication with the students was the idea of contracting. Jonothan Neelands (1984) suggests that a *drama contract*, whether it is explicit or implicit "must be there" to establish the terms between the facilitator and the participants (p.27). Neelands further explains that the purposes of a drama contract include: establishing a dialogue that allows the participants and the facilitator to reflect upon the work; identifying the demands, both physical and emotional, of the work; establishing guidelines for how to approach any problems that may arise; and ensuring that the facilitator does not expect or ask the participants to do anything they are not willing to do themselves—this helps establish an environment where participants feel safe expressing their thoughts and feelings (Neelands, 1984, p.27).

Contracting is something I have done in previous work with young people during devising processes as well as within professional theatre settings to develop ensemble, so I thought it might be beneficial to establish some guidelines and expectations with the participants. The students

themselves dictated what would go into the contract, discussing and agreeing upon each element as a collective group. Cynthia and I guided this by offering suggestions or clarifying language where needed, and keeping a record of the agreed upon contract items. The contract items, created in Miss C's room on Monday, June 8th, included:

1. Don't laugh at each other's stories
2. Respect each other
3. Give constructive criticism and help each other with performance and feedback
4. Do not probe or push someone for an answer, by showing sensitivity and trying to engage even if we don't understand or can't relate to what they're sharing
5. Support each other
6. CP and ET will answer your questions and participate in discussion, as long as they adhere to items 1 (you don't laugh), 3 (don't probe or push us) and 4 (show sensitivity)

The contract was introduced to the students as something that was negotiable, something they could alter or change as the generative process progressed should we find a need for some of the contract items to be adjusted or for additional items to be added. This was done in an effort to create what Fine (2000) calls a 'safe' place in which "racial, gendered, and economic power are self-consciously analysed and interpreted," where the

students would feel comfortable contributing (Fine, et al, 2000 in Fine and Weiss, 2003, p. 117). Neelands further suggests that in "every drama class [participants] have to make a positive choice to join in or not, without this willingness bred of interest and engagement there can be no active drama" (Neelands, in O'Connor, 2010, p.140). Cynthia further emphasized how the contract potentially created a safe environment in which the students felt they could share personal stories and feelings and the importance of our involvement in the contract parameters as well in her follow-up interview:

> **CP**: You don't have a year, you don't have years, you have a few weeks. You have a few hours a week. So, I think the only way we could possibly get them to share feelings was having that agreement that we don't take ourselves too seriously, but we're also talk seriously about things that matter to us.

Cynthia and I referred back to the contract several times throughout the weeks of workshops, bringing the contract with us to each session, or leaving it in the classroom with Mr J or Miss C to keep as a reference on days we were not with the students, but the initial items ultimately were not altered or added to.

During the interviews, some of the participants cited the contract as something of particular significance; several participants stated that it allowed them to open up personally and as a group, which aided in the process as a whole.

> **Gabriel**: I think the thing that made the biggest difference was when we made the contract. So, obviously, we all made a set of rules that we'd all agree on, we all signed. And, obviously, on your and Emily's part, we all said we'd equally do the same thing; we'd share ours and

> we'd keep it to a boundary. We'd all respect each other. And after that I thought it was much better, we were all on the same level type of thing.

In the quoted section above from Gabriel's interview, he cites the contract as the impetus that allowed everyone in the group to open up and discuss things within their comfort zones and the boundaries of the rules of the contract. Similarly, in her interview, Jacqueline described the created boundaries and equality constructed through the contract, and by Cynthia and I contributing and abiding by the terms of the contract, as what allowed the participants to feel safe.

> **Jacqueline**: Well you like, you weren't in teacher mode, you were acting as our friends and everything, so we got more comfortable around you, and like it wasn't hard to share things because we made the contract and everything and we felt safe within this room and everything. So, yeah, it was really nice.

In the above excerpt Jacqueline mentions feeling safe within the space to share things with the other members of the group. This theme of safety and feeling safe to talk about some of the more sensitive topics that were brought up over the course of the devising process was mentioned by several of the other participants. Rosalind cited the contract as 'the rules' in her follow-up interview as being one of the reasons she felt comfortable opening up and contributing to the discussions in the group:

> **Rosalind**: I think in day to day life we wouldn't just sit down, because obviously there are different friendship groups... you wouldn't go and sit down and talk about that stuff in general with them, so now that we've done that, I think everyone's a little more

> aware of everyone's situation and they're more comfortable being around them because they don't feel like they have to pretend to be something they're not. They don't have to hide something they don't want to know now because we made the rules and therefore none of us can be ridiculed or laughed at, and it's like, nicer, than just a general friendship group where you don't want to open up.

In looking back over the data, it became apparent that the notions of safety and security did not fully emerge from the students, but were possibly set up and modelled by Cynthia and myself over the course of the process. The ideas of safety and a 'safe space' were initially introduced through the contracting exercise and then reinforced throughout the weeks of devising, discussion, and rehearsal. This raised a question for Cynthia and myself whether or not we had inadvertently influenced this in the facilitation and shaping of the devising process, resulting in the ideas of safety and uncertainty becoming the overarching themes of the verbatim script, or whether or not those themes would have emerged through the stories the students contributed in discussion which were ultimately included in the script without our influence or participation. This is something to consider when approaching further inquiry or in additional interpretation of the data, especially given the more involved, participatory nature of my involvement as a participant observer, reflective practitioner, and ethnographer, and Cynthia's role as a participant observer and reflective practitioner.

10. Discussion: Developing and Performing the Script

> "If all playwrights are ethnodramatists, then all ethnographers have the potential to become playwrights" (Saldaña, 2003, p. 231)

> **CP**: I think the ethnography and verbatim thing is like a match made in heaven because it's dealing with spoken word and that's what you were there to do, was to record their spoken word. And that then meant the script making and the generation of material just fly because we were able to—you know—there was a kind of perfect synergy of what you were doing as a researcher and what we were doing as artists.

When we approached writing the script, I spent hours going over my reflective journals, my ethnographic notes, and the video and audio footage of the sessions in order to determine first, what moments should be included within the verbatim performance, then secondly, how those moments would be structured. The structuring and shaping of the verbatim play was done in collaboration with Cynthia, through discussion and negotiation. The notes and reflections I'd taken throughout the weeks of the devising process facilitated this process, as Cynthia stated in the quotation taken from her interview above. The writing of the script was yet another moment where the overlaps between the roles of the ethnographic researcher and the applied theatre practitioner intersected in that my notes were utilized to construct the script itself, and my experience as both a practitioner and a performer as well as Cynthia's experience as a practitioner and a performer influenced the way we worked together to create the script. As former performers, we both understand aesthetics and

the requirements of staging a production for an audience, though with the production of this performance we had to consider balancing the aesthetic values of performance with the sensitive nature of the personal, truthful elements of the student's lives that were included.

Monica Prendergast and Juliana Saxton describe one of the main challenges facing applied theatre performance, verbatim theatre included as the necessity to, "balance the moral and cultural values of participants…with the need for artistic freedom (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013, p.22). Saldaña further suggests that it is the "juicy stuff" that "makes theatre exciting" (1998, p. 195). A balance has to be struck between including enough 'juicy stuff' for the performance to be entertaining, while still maintaining the boundaries of ethics. Decisions regarding what is included and excluded must reach beyond aesthetics and storytelling alone when considering the necessities and priorities of academic research and ethics (White & Belliveau, 2010). One of the challenges of applied theatre is how to "balance the moral and cultural values of participants…with the need for artistic freedom" (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013, p.22). This balance was especially important given that the source material for the script was taken from the participants' real stories, experiences, and lives, as is the nature of verbatim theatre (Paget, 1987). The staging of the production sought to create creative distance in a way that would make the reproduction of these stories

comfortable for the students as performers, as well as aesthetically interesting for the audience members.

In the final interviews, we asked the participants what it was like to hear their words performed, to have someone else tell their stories and also what it was like to perform the stories of people they knew. There was a consensus among the responses of there being something 'strange', or 'weird' about the experience. I have included a sample of their responses below, highlighting the shared terminology:

> **ET/CP:** What was it like hearing your words performed?
>
> **Rosalind**: It was really **weird**, like hearing… Like when they say it in person it makes complete sense; it's just really weird to hear yourself in like, through other people's words. It's really **strange**. I've never, ever done it before, so it was really **weird**.
>
> **Jacqueline: Weird**, because I was like, 'Oh my god, I said that!' and yeah…and they said it out loud, so it was just **weird** to hear *me*. And I was like, 'Did I actually say that?' But yeah…
>
> **Meredith**: **Weird**. Because when people say stuff you don't really pay much attention to it, but when you read it back it's like, 'Did they say that?' Like, that's a bit **strange**.
>
> **Mush**: It was very **weird** and kind of cringey? It, yeah it was just—yeah—I can't really say much…but it was, it was good because it kind of made everybody else understand you a bit more, I feel, instead of thinking that, you know, they're judging you or whatever. They kind of understood you because of the way they performed you, so nice and so **sensitive**.

While several of the participants discussed the strangeness of hearing their own words and stories performed, they similarly discussed the need for care

and sensitivity when approaching how they performed the stories of others. There was still mention of the strangeness of performing as others, especially people they know who are in the room, but the strangeness seems to move beyond their own perceptions and into an awareness of ensuring they perform their roles well to honour the stories of their cohort. I have included a sampling of the various participant responses from the follow-up interviews below, highlighting the shared terminology:

> **CP/ET:** What was it like to perform each other's words?
>
> **Jacqueline**: **Strange**, because like, because you—when you're saying it—you had to remember who had said it before and it's just really **weird** that you're saying someone else's words and that they had actually been said before. That's kind of like a really interesting thing about verbatim theatre, because the words have actually been said.
>
> **Mush**: **Scary** because you didn't want to be out of order or anything, but it was nice because…it's just drama isn't it? You kind of see yourself in their shoes.
>
> **Rosalind**: That's obviously really **sensitive**; there's just that line…we were all really careful not to cross it because people in the room had been there and you've always got to be **sensitive** to everything like that and I think we were all quite worried about it, but it turned out really good in the end, so I think we didn't make it too personal, but we made sure that the story was there.
>
> **Gabriel**: It was a very **strange** experience because, obviously, we all knew the stories, but going into such depth about them was quite….it was quite **strange**. And um, obviously, we made sure that it was comfortable for Pat and for Eden, and I think we all agreed that Rosalind was the best person to talk Eden's lines. I think out of everyone, when it comes to Rosalind, she's sort of the most genuine and innocent person, so she can portray it the better. And I think because Eden and Rosalind are such opposite people, it kind of…it was kind of nice to see it--and um--I mean with Eden you can obviously see he's a kind of like a very loud person, but there are

> times where he can actually be a very **sensitive** and genuine person. When Rosalind performed it like that I could actually see Eden sort of turning into that, so it was kinda nice.

In these responses, the selected participants all emphasized the importance of portraying one another with sensitivity and care. This aligns with how verbatim theatre practitioner Anna Deavere Smith (1992) describes the process and experience of verbatim performance, "The theory of the play is that an actor has the ability to walk in another person's 'words,' and therefore in their hearts" (p. 7). This was especially true in the telling of two stories: Pat's story about being in a bus crash a few years prior to when the research took place, and Eden's story about his older sister who suddenly died of meningitis. With Eden's story in particular, we cast Rosalind, a member of the group who was in almost every way the opposite of Eden, to tell the story about Eden's sister. We discussed this with both Rosalind and Eden in their follow-up interviews:

> **Eden Hazard**: The way Rosalind played it…it like, that's why um, I got so—I was so sensitive on Friday because the way Rosalind plays it is so, like emotional. She just said it like, so nicely that it was almost—she sort of played it too good and that's why it hit me sort of thing, but it was honestly, like it was such a nice touch to the play I think.

In the excerpt above Eden mentions that the way Rosalind played the part, the emotion she put into portraying his story was particularly moving. This sentiment was shared by several other participants. Gabriel, one of the

other participants made a point of mentioning this in his follow-up interview:

> **Gabriel:** I think we all agreed that Rosalind was the best person to talk Eden's lines. I think out of everyone, when it comes to Rosalind, she's sort of the most genuine and innocent person, so she can portray it the better. And I think because Eden and Rosalind are such opposite people, it kind of...it was kind of nice to see it--and um--I mean with Eden you can obviously see he's a kind of like a very loud person, but there are times where he can actually be a very sensitive and genuine person. When Rosalind performed it like that I could actually see Eden sort of turning into that, so it was kinda nice.

In this excerpt, Gabriel mentions that Rosalind is the opposite of Eden, which is in part why Cynthia and I cast her as the person to portray this part in the performance. Additionally, Rosalind came across as very genuine in performance, and she was adept at performing sensitive, emotional pieces, so we believed she would be the best person to perform Eden's story about the death of his sister. In her follow-up interview Rosalind discussed what it was like to perform this part of Eden's story:

> **Rosalind:** Um, I think at the beginning I was okay with it and I thought, well I can do that. Once we started rehearsing it, it did get a lot harder. Every time, now, I do feel a lot more—it hits me a lot more—because I think, I can't just say those lines. I know that's kind of a method actor kind of thing, but it's, it's not that, it's just that you don't want to just say them just off the brink. You want to have that concentration that these lines are important; they're important to somebody in the group...Plus I think the idea of messing them up is a lot scarier because I wouldn't want to change these words because they're very precious words. There's more weight to it.

In this excerpt from her follow-up interview, Rosalind mentions the

importance of the words; she describes them as 'precious words' as opposed to just lines in a script that you memorize and perform. She also discusses how each time she performs the part she feels it more, that it becomes more difficult to perform because of the weight of the responsibility and sensitivity required to tell such a personal, impactful story, especially when the person whose story is being told is also in the room, performing with you as another member of the cast. This added pressure and emotional tole is something Cynthia and I considered and did our best to be aware of and alleviate throughout the process. This was something Cynthia and I considered throughout the entire process, and something we struggled at times with when working within the restrictions of the Radical Hope project. If the Radical Hope project had not dictated that we needed to create a piece of verbatim theatre in the first year we most likely would have chosen another theatre form when working with the students, but within this context, as the research was ultimately controlled by the overarching Radical Hope project, that portion of the process was dictated for us, and there was little to no room for negotiation on that particular point.

In the two weeks of rehearsal and on the final day of the performance Cynthia and I made a point of checking in with the students, making sure they were still okay with performing, with having everything included in the script and performance. We made it clear that if, at any point, they wanted something removed or they didn't want something to be performed that we

would immediately remove it and work around it in the performance, but none of the participants chose to take this option.

The students were also constantly checking in with one another, making sure they were okay, just to check in and touch base. This was especially true of Eden, Rosalind, and Pat who were each either performing a very personal story about one of their classmates or having one of their personal stories performed. This falls into what Helen Nicholson (2002) calls the performance of care, "The public actions of the body—what participants say, how they act towards others, and how they relate to each other physically within the specific context of the drama itself" (p. 83). Eden summed up this performance of care, and the lasting effects of it after the end of the drama in his follow-up interview:

> **Eden**: I think so because … without being too stereotypical … you could class us as like lads, lads, lads, no emotions sort of thing, whereas like when we've come to that play, I don't think I've ever asked him [Pat] and he's ever asked me so many times 'Are you alright? Are you alright?' …so the fact that we've started to like proper, proper look out for each other when it was just something as simple as just, you could just class it as just a play sort of thing but actually it meant so much to each other that you'd actually fully cared about each other, so I think theatre has brought a different side of friendship sort of thing.
>
> **CP:** So even someone you know really well?
>
> **Eden:** You might not have that *caring* aspect, but we obviously know, we know that we care about but there wasn't like that verbal all the time … like we don't come in every day and say, 'How are you today?' sort of thing … yeah but when we came to drama it was like after every lesson or just before the lesson it was like, 'Let me know if anything happens or if anything goes wrong' sort of thing.

In the above passage Eden describes the performance of care between himself and Pat specifically, but also for the overall group of participants. This behavior is possibly in part due to the modeling of Cynthia and myself, the way we constantly checked in with one another, and the way we often checked in with the participants, making sure they were okay with the script or the way something was being performed, or just to see how they were doing. This modeling could possibly have influenced the participants and their behavior, though the extent to which Cynthia and I modeled this was not apparent until the end of the process and the data was examined and interpreted as a full set. This is something that would need to be examined in greater detail and focused on more in observation or coded for specifically in any future case studies in order to form any interpretations or conclusions.

11. CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

In this final section of my thesis I will discuss some of the possible implications of the interpretations of the data gathered by the case study conducted at Castleton School presented within the previous chapters, as well as present any possible areas for additional research or consideration. As Stake (1995) says:

> ...it is true that in case study we deal with many complex phenomena and issues for which no consensus can be found as to what really exists—yet we have ethical obligations to minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding. (Stake, 1995, p. 108)

While I do not presume to present any definitive interpretations or conclusions, I attempt to 'minimize misrepresentation and misunderstanding' as much as possible in the presentation of the data and any possible conclusions that may be drawn from it.

This conclusion will begin by returning to the research questions guiding this case study which were originally presented in the introduction:

- What connections are there between ethnographic study and devised performance?

- What are the overlaps and dissonances between ethnographic observation methods and reflective practice (specifically within

applied theatre research) and how those methods are presented to a wider audience?

- What are the links between the way ethnography and devised verbatim theatre encapsulate aspects of peoples' lives, socially and culturally?

I approached this case study as an observational study of a nine-week applied theatre process using ethnographic observation methods to facilitate the creation of a piece of verbatim theatre for performance. The case study was conducted with a group of 10 sixth form drama students in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom; the names of the students, the classroom teachers, and the researcher I worked in partnership with from the University of Warwick, and the school where the research was conducted have been changed to protect anonymity. There are no simple, or conclusive answers to the research questions guiding this inquiry, and I do not assume to provide any definitive answers, instead I merely offer suggestions for areas of further study, a critique of the process as a whole, and possible interpretations of events which may point to potential conclusions that might be drawn. As Kate Donelan says, both ethnography and drama research "involve engagement with the socio-cultural world to interpret and make meaning of human experiences, and they involve the communication of particular and positioned understandings within constructed texts, both performed and written" (2010, p. 20-21). This statement encapsulates my interpretation of the overlaps between ethnography and applied theatre research, as I have discussed within this

thesis through the previous chapters on theory and methodology, as well as in the series of discussion chapters which explored key moments drawn from the data gathered.

As a participant observer within this research I was afforded certain advantages inherit within the method (Cohen and Manion, 1980, pp. 103-104). I was able to gather both verbal and non-verbal data, taking note of behaviour as it occurred, developing interpretations in the moment and throughout the process, and cultivating a more personal and informal relationship with the participants and Cynthia, the lead researcher, over the course of the fieldwork period, follow-up interviews, and through the following interpretation and write up of the data generated. The use of participant observation is a cornerstone of both ethnographic research, as well as applied theatre research, just as both research forms seek to encapsulate some element of peoples' lives, socially and culturally, and present those aspects to a wider audience—through performance in applied theatre and through publication or performance of ethnographies (Conquergood, 1991; Wolcott, 1994; Gallagher, 2007; Gallagher, 2011; Prendergast & Saxton, 2013; Nicholson, 2014). The two disciplines go hand in hand: the observation and precision necessary within ethnographic research lends itself to the creation of applied theatre, or more specifically within this case study, verbatim theatre. The observational tools used within ethnographic research are often implemented within the construction of applied theatre or verbatim theatre, but they are not often

designated as 'research' because they result in the production of creative performance as opposed to the production of journal articles or other academic publications (Ingold, 2014; Prendergast & Saxton, 2013).

As a non-participant observer within this case study I was able to observe interactions, generative exercises, discussion, and verbal and non-verbal communication from a more removed perspective, allowing for a complex view of the bigger picture as opposed to the at times limited view of being in 'the thick of things' as a participant observer. Additionally, the use of audio and video recordings of the sessions that were later transcribed and used for the creation of the verbatim play script and as additional data for analysis, enabled moments of participation to be looked at and analysed from a more removed point of view by 'making the familiar strange' (Erickson, 1973; Delamont & Atkinson, 1995; Mannay, 2010). Reviewing the video footage of the sessions and the follow-up interviews with the participants, classroom teachers, and Cynthia provided "a new perspective on something familiar," (Radosavljevi, 2013, p. 122) creating an opportunity for analytical comparison, by allowing me to assess my initial responses and interpretations as recorded in my ethnographic notes. Reviewing the audio and video footage in comparison to my ethnographic notes and interpretations allowed me to revaluate those moments and my initial assessments by examining them from a different, more removed point of view.

In my final role within the case study as a reflective applied theatre practitioner within an education setting, I endeavored to utilize what Helen Nicholson (2005) refers to as "a reflective ethos, a tradition of creative and critical questioning" (p. 166). As a practitioner within this research I attempted to remain responsive to the participants as an engaged listener and observer, while guiding the exercises in a way that facilitated the creation of the necessary material for the verbatim theatre performance. Nicholson further describes this approach to applied theatre research in this way:

> Contemporary theatre practitioners who work in educational and community contexts are, at best, developing practices that are both responsive to the narratives and cultural memories of the participants with whom they are working and artistically imaginative. (2005, p. 152)

Within this case study I attempted to approach each exercise I taught with an open, attentive mind, collecting mental notes and observations on interactions and participant responses that were later recorded in my reflective journal or in my ethnographic notes. The work of Brazilian philosopher and critical theorist Paulo Freire—specifically his focus on the importance of dialogue between subjects within the meaning making process—served as a fundamental influence in this approach. Freire states:

> …in the context of true learning, the learners will be engaged in a continuous transformation through which they become authentic subjects of the construction and reconstruction of what is being taught, side by side with the teacher, who is equally subject to the same process (Freire, 1998, p.33).

In the design of the devising verbatim theatre project discussed within this thesis, both Cynthia and I attempted to maintain a space of open dialogue with the participants, encouraging their feedback and participation in the process. Taking a Freirean approach, we worked against what Freire (1970) called the 'banking' approach to education in which learners are viewed as empty vessels to be filled by experts which only provides the options of "receiving, filling, and storing deposits" for the learners involved in an educational event (p.58). Instead, we worked from the participants' feedback, allowing them to guide the topics of discussion and following their ideas and interests to create a story about their points of view, their lived experiences, and their thoughts and opinions. The video and audio recordings assisted with the interpretation of these moments by providing a means to reflect upon the moments I was more involved in as a practitioner through an alternate point of view. This allowed the portions of the data generation that I was involved in as a practitioner to be viewed and interpreted along with the other forms of generated data, using both my reflections from being in the moment as a practitioner and later my interpretations of those moments as seen through the video recordings.

My offered concluding reflections are grounded in descriptive data, drawing upon what Wolcott calls "assuming an authoritative voice" acting as "merely a guide calling things to the reader's attention" assuming "the role of interpreter, suggesting parallels between the words and actions in a particular setting and the broader issues of communication and education

across cultural boundaries" (Wolcott, 1994, p. 267). As an ethnographer, applied theatre practitioner, and performer I have interpreted and presented the data in a way that I hope allows the reader to draw conclusions of their own, presenting what is *possible* instead of presuming to present what *is*.

CONTRIBUTION TO LITERATURE

> There is no longer a call for each researcher to discover and defend [qualitative methods] anew, nor a need to provide an exhaustive review of the literature about such standard procedures as participant observation or interviewing. Instead of having to describe and defend qualitative approaches, as we once felt obligated to do, it is often difficult to say anything new or startling about them. (Wolcott, 1990, p. 26).

As Harry Wolcott argues above, an exhaustive appraisal of the broad literature discovered and examined over the course of study during the doctoral process runs the risk of producing protracted, superfluous information. To impose a retrospective description of *the literature* would fail to capture the complex journey towards the development and interpretation of the research. Therefore, instead I have opted to tell the story of the research presented and discussed within this thesis by nesting the literature, within the interpretation and presentation of the data, the discussion of the methods used, examples taken from the process for demonstrative purposes, and the in-depth discussion of those examples.

This approach is not intended to critique the work of the field at large, rather it is an attempt to situate my research within the broader

context of the literature itself, to consider the limitations of current practice and publication within the fields of qualitative ethnographic educational research and applied theatre research in an education context. This approach further seeks to demonstrate my rationale for the methodological approach taken within the specific case study conducted at Castleton School in the West Midlands of the United Kingdom, situated within the broader longitudinal, international study, Radical Hope, as designed by Professor Kathleen Gallagher, as was presented in greater detail within the methodology chapter of this thesis. Finally, this approach was taken as a means to recommend areas for potential further study.

Critical ethnographic research lends itself to an inductive approach, meaning the researcher begins the research with as few preconceived notions about who or what he or she is studying as possible. "Ethnographers tend to believe that if they begin their work with theories to test they will end up only seeing things through that specific lens, or focus" (O'Reilly, 2012). As a critical ethnographer, I attempted to approach the research discussed within this thesis with as much of a blank slate as possible, thus allowing the research to develop and for theories and interpretations to emerge that offered explanations for the observed behaviours and experiences. While it is impossible to be purely inductive—every researcher starts with a research question or questions, an area they are interested in, and a basic understanding of the field, as was the case with this research because it was framed within a broader longitudinal study and there was the

end goal of the creation and production of a verbatim theatre performance piece—I attempted to minimize the effect of any preconceptions or goals by constant reflexivity and regular discussion with Cynthia, the lead investigator for the United Kingdom team within the longitudinal study.

Wolcott (1994) argues that "In the very act of constructing *data* out of *experience,* the qualitative researcher singles out some things as worthy of note and relegates others to the background" (p. 13, emphasis present in the original text). This type of filtering is necessary given the sheer amount of data produced by qualitative study. As Charmaz and Mitchell (2001) explain:

> A potential problem with ethnographic studies is seeing data everywhere and nowhere, gathering everything and nothing. The studied world seems so interesting (and probably is) that an ethnographer tries to master knowing it all. Mountains of unconnected data grow but they don't say much... Ethnographers who leave data undigested seldom produce fresh insights and, sometimes, may not even complete their projects, despite years of toil. (p. 161)

In the above quotation Charmaz and Mitchell address the often-problematic process of writing up ethnographic data, and the difficulties presented in chewing through the, at times, overwhelming amounts of material generated through qualitative inquiry. In selecting the relevant portions for data generated by the case study discussed within this thesis, I endeavoured to approach the data with a critical eye, selecting the most relevant portions, while at the same time not overburdening or cluttering the write up with an abundance of supportive, but secondary information.

The case study discussed within this thesis produced journals full of handwritten notes and reflections, hundreds of pages of typed notes and observations, transcriptions of interviews, hours of video and audio footage, the verbatim play script, and video of the performance and post-show discussion, along with additional pages of interpretations and coded sections of notes and transcriptions. The examination of these data and the interpretation of the overlaps and dissonances between ethnographic research and applied theatre research and the way they both seek to encapsulate aspects of peoples' lives and cultures—in this case the lives of a group of 10 sixth form drama students at Castleton School within the West Midlands of the United Kingdom—contributes to the existing literature on the roles of ethnography within qualitative research and applied theatre research in educational contexts by highlighting and examining the overlaps between the methods used in each.

Within ethnographic research, the ethnographer, through the processes of participant observation, analysis, discussion, and publication becomes a site of knowledge; they are actively constructing meaning, drawing conclusions, and developing power dynamics amongst and with the participants they are observing as both an objective outsider and an integrated participant. Within the verbatim process at Castleton School through my participant observation as an ethnographer, a research assistant, and at times a practitioner within the workshops, I filled these roles by actively constructing meaning within the process, interpreting the

data gathered, and collaborating with both Cynthia and the overarching Radical Hope process our research was situated within. However, the process by which these conclusions were drawn, and the conversations and planning Cynthia and I had over the course of the research which helped us develop the workshop plans and the verbatim script, and our interpretations of the data gathered over the entire verbatim process, while of value and interest to the two of us, are generally inadmissible within publication. This brings up the question of how knowledge is constructed; who decides what constitutes 'knowledge?' How is knowledge produced and passed through publication and the presentation of data? I argue that if the researcher is seen as a site of knowledge, a tool used to make meaning, ethnographically speaking, the processes implemented in the gathering, interpreting, and reporting of that knowledge are just as important as the final reported findings themselves. The methodology used by the researcher or researchers itself, the various methods used within research practice and the reported interpretation of those methods, thus becomes a contribution to the existing field of knowledge.

The Castleton case study is one example of the uses of applied theatre within an educational context, and the uses of ethnographic methods (observation, transcription, participant observation) in the development of a piece of verbatim theatre, and how those methods created a piece of performance which encapsulated the selected elements of those 10 students' lives, at that time, and presented them to an audience at the

performance. Additionally, the data and interpretations discussed within this thesis and any resultant journal articles or publications presents those selected elements to a wider audience within the academic fields of applied theatre, theatre in education, and social sciences research, through publication.

This is in no way to suggest that an exhaustive conclusion has been reached. One of the difficulties of applied theatre research as well as ethnographic research is the singularity of it. As Geertz (1973) wrote, "The important thing about the anthropologist's findings is their complex specificness, their circumstantiality" (p.23). While I can report on my interpretations and impressions of this specific study, I cannot begin to generalize those interpretations to the field at large. An examination of the methods and the methodological framework may provide more generalizability to the field at large, contributing a comparative analysis of the similarities of the methods utilized within both applied theatre research and ethnographic research and the overlaps that occur between the two, but a generalization of the 'specificness' of this piece of research, with these particular students, in this period of time, to the field at large would be overreaching and unsupportable.

I was not a traditional ethnographer within the context of this research, in the sense that I was not an 'objective', removed observer—though there were moments I stepped back and observed—and I was not

solely a participant observer. My role was ambiguous, fluid, and negotiated throughout between ethnographer, research assistant, and practitioner. The ambiguity and fluidity of my role within this case study allowed me to focus on the overlaps in ethnographic method and applied theatre, specifically the various forms of observation used between the two methods and the ways those methods lead to the interpretations of the data and the ways those interpretations were presented, both through the performance of the resultant verbatim play created from the data, and the write up of this thesis and any further publications. Both ethnographic inquiry and applied theatre share a responsibility to share findings to a wider public, either through performance, as is common with applied theatre or performative ethnography, or through academic publication and conference presentations (Nicholson, 2005; Gallagher, 2006; Wolcott, 1994). There is potential for further investigation into the highlighted overlaps between the methods used within applied theatre research and ethnographic research, as discussed within the previous chapters, and the ways in which they could potentially create a symbiotic relationship, as was constructed by Cynthia and myself within this process where my ethnographic observations and data were utilized to facilitate the process of creating the verbatim script. The following section of this thesis will offer a more thorough critique of the Radical Hope project and the challenges and benefits of conducting this study within the parameters of the broader longitudinal study. This critique will be followed by and examination of ways in which future research into

the overlaps between ethnographic methods and applied theatre research within educational contexts based off of the model of the research Cynthia and I conducted could be improved, offering examples from the data collected within this case study, as well as suggestions for other potential areas for further research.

A Critique of the Radical Hope Study

The multi-tiered power structure of the case study discussed within this thesis presents a unique perspective to the body of literature on applied theatre research and ethnographic research within educational contexts. The circumstances of this research, especially as a piece of doctoral research, are singular, specific, and allow a window into the experiences of those conducting field research whose perspectives are not often included in the presentation of research findings, namely the research assistants, or junior members of a research team. While there are many things about the Radical Hope project that are exceptional, the intention of this section of the conclusion is to probe the structure of the study, particularly the structure of the United Kingdom site, and to offer a critique of the structure, experience, and potential outcomes of the study.

This study differed from many doctoral research projects in that the doctoral researcher, myself, had limited sovereignty and control over the direction of the research. As opposed to having the primary control of planning and execution of the research events discussed within this thesis, I

was at the bottom of a tiered power structure, as an ethnographer, research assistant, and assistant educator under Cynthia the lead practitioner of the United Kingdom site of the international, longitudinal Radical Hope study designed by Principal Investigator Kathleen Gallagher. Cynthia addressed some of the complications of this process in her follow-up interview:

> **CP**: You know, it's been really good to be involved in it [the Radical Hope project] because I think there was a structure there that because we were doing—essentially we were doing a project that had already been established....there's a sort of funny negotiation there in terms of responsibility because it wasn't my idea to go in and say, 'what do you want to talk about?' But it's my responsibility to get that right and to negotiate for—that's comfortable for me to feel okay about doing it and for you to feel okay about doing it... I think it really started to click when we weren't just administering someone else's project, when we were taking ownership over it ourselves.

In this response Cynthia mentions one of the positive aspects of the project was that in a way there was a structure built in; we were entering the Radical Hope project in the later stages of the first year, and having an established structure helped us enter the project quickly, however that same structure presented a limitation. She then goes on to discuss how within the parameters of the project we needed to negotiate a way to approach the research that felt comfortable, that felt right for us as researchers and practitioners. This negotiation between our work in the United Kingdom site and the requirements of the Radical Hope project, combined with my negotiation as an ethnographer, research assistant, and practitioner within the United Kingdom site added a layer of complexity, compromise, and at

times frustration to my doctoral process that is not often present in the design of doctoral research.

I believe a portion of our frustration with some of the provided structures of the Radical Hope project stemmed from our lack of familiarity with verbatim as a theatre form and a lack of guidance beyond the initial information shared with us about the project. Cynthia talked about some of this in her follow-up interview and the ways the planning and execution of the workshops and our understanding of the Radical Hope project transformed over the weeks of the verbatim process:

> **CP**: We were exploring the question, 'what do you care about the most?' with a particular group of students in [the West Midlands]. I think what we thought the project was changed over the course of the three weeks. I think because we'd come into it pretty much at the last minute, we were sort of feeling our way through it, particularly at the early stages and I think towards the end of it we got a much better sense of what we were trying to do. Initially, we thought we were there to respond to work that had already been done by Kathleen, so, for example, 'The Teachers' script, and use that as a stimulus. We also thought there was going to be more interaction online with the other groups, but as it turned out it was very much just about those kids.

In the transcribed section above Cynthia mentions how our understanding of the project changed over the three weeks within the verbatim process we had to generate material. Initially, we thought we were supposed to respond to a verbatim play, *The Teachers*, because that was how the first year of the verbatim process was described within the Radical Hope materials, but after repeated rounds of communication with the Canadian research team we realized this was not the case. Also, the elements of online interaction

through the online platform developed for each of the research sites to share material, questions, and interactions that we initially thought the students would be involved in as well turned out to be a platform that was solely for the use of the research practitioners within each of the international research sites and not the participants. The processes of 'feeling our way through' as Cynthia termed it understandably altered the way we approached the planning and execution of the workshops, our aims as researchers, and the prompts we used to try and generate the material we needed within the verbatim play. As Cynthia said in the first transcribed quotation used in this section, "I think it really started to click when we weren't just administering someone else's project, when we were taking ownership over it ourselves." In saying this, even when we started taking ownership of the project, exploring the themes of safety and uncertainty that emerged as areas of particular importance to the Castleton students, we were still working within the parameters of hope, care, and civic engagement dictated by the Radical Hope project.

While the areas of hope and care, specifically what the students cared about, were central to the focus of our generative process, the conversations we had with them, and ultimately the script that was created, the core theme of 'civic engagement' was somewhat elusive throughout our process. The lack of focus on the 'civic engagement' portion of the three core themes may be due in part to the lack of a clear definition of what exactly was meant by civic engagement within the overarching Radical Hope project. Was it intended to investigate participation in politics? Or

was it more concerned with community involvement and youth citizenship? Were we meant to gauge the participants' understanding of political systems and events, or the areas they viewed to be of importance? The focus of this aspect of the project was somewhat muddled from the beginning and did not truly become clear for us until the second year of the longitudinal study, which is not discussed within this thesis. That is not to say that we did not attempt to approach those areas, or that some of those themes did not emerge through conversations, the open discussion detailed in Chapter 9: Cultural Differences which covered the topics of wage discrepancy, gun violence/ownership, and safety, for example. At the heart of the process Cynthia and I sought to investigate the areas of importance to the participants and to use those as the core themes of the verbatim play:

> **CP**: The idea was that we were asking them questions, that were building that sort of ensemble really, and creating a space where they felt it was okay to talk about something that mattered to them.

While this focus falls directly in line with the requirements of the overarching Radical Hope project to investigate the areas of hope, care, and civic engagement, as they pertained to our research participants, the purposes of verbatim theatre to present the 'truth' of an event, to detail word-for-word accounts from the multiple perspectives of those involved and recreate those experiences within performance (Paget, 1987; Gallagher & Wessels, 2011; Wilkenson & Anderson, 2007) presented another area of complication within this research process. Traditional verbatim theatre is

created from word-for-word interviews with real people in day-to-day circumstances, sometimes focusing on particular events such as Anna Deavere Smith's verbatim play *Twilight Los Angeles* about the 1992 Los Angeles riots, or *The Laramie Project* by Moisés Kaufman about the murder of Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming in 1998 (Wilkenson & Anderson, 2007; Richards, 1993; Martin, 1993; Gibson, 2011). Due to the limited timeframe in which to generate material, transcribe interviews, and construct a script within the Castleton case study, combined with the lack of access to recording devices available to the students and the lack of funding available to Cynthia and I to purchase and provide those devices to the students, we did not have the students conduct interviews with members of the community as the Radical Hope study originally intended. Considering the various research sites within the Radical Hope project (Canada, India, Taiwan, Greece, and the United Kingdom) and the vast range of resources available within each of those sites, it is worth considering whether verbatim theatre was an appropriate choice as a theatre modality to dictate to each of the research sites involved in the longitudinal study. Despite the lack of feasibility of having the students interview members of the outside community, Cynthia and I did have the students interview each other within the workshops and segments of those interviews were transcribed and used as Scene 3 of the verbatim play. In this way Cynthia and I slightly altered the verbatim process, making it our own, and adapting it in a way that made it functional both within the Castleton

study and the broader Radical Hope study. Cynthia talked about this in her follow-up interview:

ET: Has going through this process changed the way you view verbatim as a process in and of itself? [If so] in what way?

CP: …I think, yes, the verbatim thing has really clicked for me, but I also like it's…that we were able to play with it. So, yes, it's verbatim, it's the truth, it's what happened, but we also…played around with the structures… But actually, it's having the confidence to go, 'no, I don't want it to be like that, let's take the energy that's also been in the room in the unspoken.' Because it's so much about 'the spoken word' what about the unspoken things? How can we bring that in? Because that's real, that's happened, so how do we find a way for those things to meet?

In this response Cynthia brings up some of the essential questions within the presentation of ethnographic and applied theatre research. How do we include the "unruly experience" (Clifford, 1983, p.25) of the research process into an "authoritative written account?" (Clifford, 1983, p.25) This was also a challenge in the way we approached the process of creating the verbatim script; we constantly questioned what elements to include, what was there beyond the words that could be replicated in performance to provide the most 'truthful' account of the research experience? This also probes at the ethical considerations of conducting a verbatim theatre process with students, and in turn having those students reproduce that in performance for an audience. Cynthia addressed part of this consideration in this way in her follow-up interview:

CP: I think, there's this perceived notion that doing verbatim is somehow, you're able to look at a real-life event in an objective way. There's this claim for objectivity. Whereas, I think, what worked about our piece, which is what I was nervous about, but actually worked, was that it was entirely subjective.

As Cynthia says in the quotation above, one of the things that made our verbatim process successful was the acknowledgement of how subjective it all was. This aligns with Alan Read's (1993) description of the generative theatre process, "the transactions of theatre are deeply bound to negotiations between the self and the other which are themselves the definitions of an ethic" (p. 61). Within the verbatim process these negotiations and the consideration of the ethical dimensions of the process itself are often overlooked by both practitioners and members of the academy (Gipson, 2011), but those negotiations are something Cynthia and I were actively aware of throughout the process. However, this is not to say that we created an absolute, ideal ethical utopia within the verbatim process because as Bauman (1993) argues, "...the foolproof-universal and unshakably founded ethical code will never be found...a non-aporetic, non-ambivalent morality, an ethics that is universal and 'objectively founded' is a practical impossibility" (p. 10).

The restriction of the Radical Hope project this research was situated within requiring that the first year of the project create a piece of verbatim theatre limited the scope of investigation Cynthia and I could undertake and the creative direction we could take in the creation of the performance piece. Many scholars and artists content that at its heart, verbatim theatre is an artistic invention (Gipson, 2011; Wilkenson & Anderson, 2007; Richards, 1993; Martin, 1993), however, attempting to adhere the goal of verbatim theatre to represent 'true' stories with absolute accuracy in an 'objective'

way can complicate and muddle the outcomes of the process both artistically and academically (Pollock, 2005).

Within the verbatim process there were two stories in particular that required a higher level of negotiation, both in deciding how they would be represented in the script, and how they would be approached in performance. One of those stories was Eden's story about the sudden death of his older sister from meningitis, and the other was Pat's story about being in a bus crash several years before our verbatim process. Within the performance of those scenes, Cynthia and I were deliberate in our casting decisions, ultimately deciding to have Rosalind portray Eden and his story about his sister within the performance given her thoughtful, sensitive approach to performance and to have Eden portray Pat in the telling of his story because of the bond between the two boys. In my follow-up interview with Rosalind I approached this with her, questioning what that process was like for her:

ET: You specifically have a really delicate story that we've cast you to tell, and we gave that to you really specifically. What has that been like for you telling Eden's story?

Rosalind: I think at the beginning I was okay with it and I thought, well, actually, yeah, I can do that. Once we started rehearsing it, it did get a lot harder. Every time, now, I do feel a lot more—it hits me a lot more—because I think, I can't just say those lines. I know that's kind of a method actor kind of thing, but it's...it's not that, it's just that you don't want to just say them just off the brink. You want to have that concentration that these lines are important; they're important to someone in the group and they can't just be thrown out like another play //...Plus I think the idea of messing them up is a lot scarier because I wouldn't want to change these words because they're very precious words, they're not just like some // it's a more important line. There's more weight to it.

ET: Do you think there's more weight to it because you know whose story it is, and you know the person behind it than when you're doing a regular play?

Rosalind: Yes. Definitely. I think...I've done pieces of verbatim theatre before. Especially the piece that we just did with our GCSE group that was *The Laramie Project*, but that happened in America. That all happened in the year that we were born actually, but it didn't hit us as much because I, we didn't personally know those people... I think we all respected the story and how important it was tell it properly, but we didn't have the idea that actually you can't change those words, those are words that people said. Whereas here, I wouldn't want to mess up a line because... especially for that person, that a very important story. I don't want to tarnish or just mess up by accident, because that would be awful. I would feel really bad afterwards, but I actually quite like being able to do his character at the beginning and then gradually building that up and showing a different side. I think because I understand the barrier, how people feel behind the curtain, I can see that a lot easier. I think that made it easier, because I spoke to some people and they said they just wouldn't—most of them said actually—that they just wouldn't do it, that they'd refuse. I thought that was quite nice that I got the opportunity to.

In her responses, Rosalind discusses the difficulty of negotiating performing the story of someone within the group, the way it was difficult to separate knowing Eden and the personal nature of that story from the act of performing that story in the verbatim play. Similarly, in her interview with Eden, Cynthia discussed what it was like for Eden to have his story included in the script, and what it was like for him to witness that story performed by someone else throughout the rehearsal and performance process:

CP: that was genuinely the most sort of challenging bit of anything I've ever done because I—that's why I really wanted to speak to you today because I—I still don't know if I got that right. I think we did?

Eden: Yeah.

CP: Do you think? Because I don't want to go like, 'did we get it right?'

Eden: I spoke to Elysia, Geraldine, and Pat about it as well, and the way Rosalind played it…it like, that's why um…I got so—I was so sensitive on Friday because the way Rosalind plays it is so, like emotional. She just said it like, so nicely that it was almost--she sort of played it too good and that's why it hit me sort of thing, but it was honestly, like it was such a nice touch to the play I think.

CP: Yeah. I think um…and I think I was just saying to Pat, I like, it was lovely to see him replaying what I felt like, even though that didn't quite happen like that, we staged it in a way—

Eden: It was still the same aspects of it, yeah.

CP: That it was that feeling of going, that's just so brave to say that, and it but—I still can't even make sense of it because it was such a big thing.

Eden: I always do put—when I tell people—I always do put myself in their shoes.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: To think, and I don't expect much from them, because if I got told that about somebody else, I'd be like, 'Woah.' Like I wouldn't know what to say. So, I never really… I don't obviously know what I'm going to expect. Like some people are going to be like proper touchy, touchy sort of thing, but I'm never like bothered by what people do because it's such a shocked reaction amongst some people.

In this interaction, Cynthia explores one of the core questions we had while going through the research process-was it all *too* personal? How could we negotiate the boundary between including the 'truth' of the process and the stories shared and the artistic recreation of those truths in the performance of the verbatim play? We attempted to navigate these considerations to the best of our ability, remaining true to the intentions of the Radical Hope project, as we understood it, and the structures of verbatim theatre as an artistic modality.

CP: So, yes, it's verbatim, it's the truth, it's what happened, but we also…played around with the structures…

Beyond this, there was the constant question, both throughout the process and in the interpretation of the data afterwards and in approaching the planning of the second year of the process of 'did we get it right?' Cynthia and I attempted to address this throughout, both by checking in with each other, and through checking in with the students, remaining both reflective and reflexive throughout the process and adjusting our practice as necessary (Hertz, 1997; Davis, 1999; Gallagher & Wessels, 2011). That is not to say that there were not areas for improvement, or things that we would not do differently if we were presented with an opportunity to approach the research again; there are certainly areas and actions I would alter if I were to undertake this project a second time, but that is the nature of interpretation after-the-fact and in remaining critical of one's practice and interpretation of research events (Gallagher & Wessels, 2011; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2006; Finlay, 2002).

My role within this research placed me in a unique position as someone who was involved in the day-to-day planning of the activities of our research site working in collaboration with Cynthia, as an ethnographer recording and interpreting observed events and interactions, occasionally as a practitioner within the workshops, and as a research assistant within the Radical Hope project. These fluctuating, ambiguous roles resulted in a similarly fluctuating series of power dynamics, further complicated by the overarching Radical Hope project that superseded and created the context for these roles to nestle within. In this was I was at the centre of what

Richard Sennett (2012) calls to core of cooperation which is, "active participation rather than passive presence" (p. 233) within a research process; I was actively involved in each aspect of the verbatim process at Castleton School, as an ethnographer constantly gathering data, reviewing that data and developing interpretations of observed events and questions about observed interactions, and then gathering more data and repeating the process, while also acting as a research assistant and assistant practitioner planning and administering the workshops with Cynthia. It is the complicated dynamics and challenges that arose from this combination of roles, and the unique perspective gained from living within the convergence of these positions within a research process, and the questions that arose in critiquing the structure of that process, that presents an opportunity for further areas of research and potential contributions to the body of scholarly research on applied theatre research and ethnographic research conducted within educational contexts with young people. Additionally, it presents an opportunity for additional investigation into the experiences of all those involved within a research process and the way those experiences and the understandings they create can contribute to current body of literature, despite the fact that within current practice these points of view are not considered or included within published research (Conquergood, 1991; Rorty, 1979).

AREAS FOR FURTHER INQUIRY

> I'm not saying we're going to succeed in this; we don't even know whether success is possible. But because we don't know, we still have to try. (Habermas, 1994, p.97)

As the body of literature on applied theatre and ethnographic research continues to expand, there is an opportunity for further study on the connections between the methods used within ethnographic research and applied theatre research practices and the presentation of the data generated to a wider audience. Expansion of the research of studies like Kathleen Gallagher's *Youth, Theatre, Radical Hope and the Ethical Imaginary: an intercultural investigation of drama pedagogy, performance and civic engagement* [Radical Hope} project and Kate Donelan's (2010) investigation into ethnography and intercultural performance may provide a template for a more deliberate investigation into the partnerships possible between the two research forms. Additionally, an examination of the practices of applied theatre practitioners and ethnographic researchers, the types of observation used, and the means by which their interpretations are generated may provide additional insight into the overlaps and dissonances between the two disciplines. There is potential within the presentation of data generated by both forms to communicate aspects of cultures and peoples' lives to a wider audience through publication and performance. There is a story to tell in the overlaps between ethnographic research and applied theatre research, their methods, their interpretations, the means of reporting findings, and the potential partnerships to be formed between the

two disciplines, and the experiences of those involved within those research processes, both the practitioners and the participants.

My primary recommendation to those seeking further study into the areas of applied theatre research within an educational context coupled with ethnographic inquiry involves the methods of reporting. Traditionally, in the reporting of applied theatre research within an educational context, the lead practitioner reports the findings in journal articles or books, however, when conducting research with the added presence of ethnographic inquiry, as was the case for the research presented within this thesis, this dynamic should be re-examined. I propose that findings should be presented by both the ethnographer and the reflective practitioner, with both sets of interpretations of the data being considered of equal importance and value in the consideration of the data and its implications to the field at large. The data generated through ethnographic observation, reflective notes and journals, 'raw' and 'cooked' notes, interviews with participants and practitioners, and any audio or visual data should all be considered of equal value and importance, as both the ethnographer and the reflective practitioner were of equal, though unique, presences within the research (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 13).

In this case study, for example, in the moments that I was acting as an ethnographer, as a removed observer, my interpretations of observed events and dynamics may provide a more complete picture than Cynthia's assessment as she was 'in the thick' of the research. Cynthia further

reiterated this point in her follow-up interview when I asked her what it was like to have an ethnographer as part of the research:

> **CP**: …that was brilliant for me because when you're facilitating, obviously, inevitably you're in the moment, you're in the thick of it, so to know that you were on the outside observing and having those sharp sorts of assessments of group dynamics, noticing things that I literally can't see because I'm giving an instruction or I'm talking to another group—that was brilliant.

In the transcribed section above Cynthia mentions how valuable it was to have a removed observer, someone who was able to take a more 'outside' view of events as they were happening and provide an alternate interpretation of those events. Likewise, in the moments I was acting as a facilitator, I was not able to make the same sorts of removed observations or conclusions because I was involved in the teaching. In this way ethnography and applied theatre research are similar in that they both require observation and interpretation: the applied theatre practitioner observes their participants, develops interpretations, and makes decisions on what to do next or how to incorporate generated material into performance while in the thick of things, whereas the ethnographer makes observations and develops interpretations over time based upon those observations from a more removed role as a participant observer or 'objective' non-participant observer (Conquergood, 1991; Ingold, 2013; Anderson, 1989; Taylor, 2003). Each of these points of view offers a unique interpretation of the data generated and as such, they should be presented either jointly within publication and presentation to provide a more complete picture of

observed and interpreted events, or separately, but making note to the other possible interpretations possible such as those from the other researcher present and accounting for those interpretations. Similarly, this raises the question of who within a research process can or should present interpretations? Publication of research is often a complex and at times politically fraught process where junior members of a research team rarely have an opportunity to present interpretations or an assessment of their research experiences in their own words (Rigg, McCarragher, & Krmenec, 2012; Sandler & Russell, 2005). This has led to a gap in the current body of literature, that does not account for the experiences or contributions junior research team members have made to existing research. Within the unique context of the Castleton case study within the broader Radical Hope study, while I was a junior member of the Radical Hope team, as a research assistant to Cynthia the lead researcher in the United Kingdom site, I was also acting as an ethnographer collecting and interpreting observational notes, and contributing to the planning and development of the workshops, and acting as a practitioner at times throughout the research process meaning I made substantial contribution to the creative and scholarly work of the research process, beyond what a typical 'research assistant' would. Additionally, due to the unique circumstances of my involvement within this research, and the many roles I filled within the United Kingdom research site, comprising my doctoral research, I am afforded an opportunity to present my experiences and interpretations of the research and the research process itself. This particular set of circumstances creates

an opportunity to contribute to the current gap within the body of literature, by presenting the point of view and interpretations of a researcher working from the bottom of a tiered power structure.

Further, when considering applied theatre research with populations of young people, particularly within in an international, longitudinal study like the Radical Hope project, we need to more directly consider the processes and the purposes of applied theatre. Namely whom is this type research applied to? Who is applying it? What are the intentions and purposes of that research and how can they be regulated across countries, years, and multiple sites, effectively, and in a way that honours the experiences of all involved within those processes? There is also the question of how theses process and their outcomes are then presented to wider audiences and how the process itself can be included within that presentation.

Within the write up of this thesis, I have endeavoured to provide a clear, concise overview of the contexts the research was conducted in, and the reasoning behind the methodological choices and interpretations that were made as I told the story of this research. I have attempted to provide areas for further study, namely a more focused inquiry into the overlaps between ethnographic method and applied theatre research within an educational context, more closely examining the process of observation and interpretation within each method and the presentation of those interpretations either through performance or publication and a deeper

investigation into the questions of who applied theatre research is *applied to*. When considering these areas of inquiry, we also need to more assertively ask how can the body of scholarly research take into account the experiences of all those involved in a research process? How can the voices and experiences of 'junior' members of research teams contribute to the body of literature and how we approach the planning and execution of future research processes? How can we, as researchers, more accurately and equitably provide opportunities for those involved in research events, both the participants and the practitioners, to contribute to the construction of knowledge and understanding?

I have endeavoured to convey a clear picture of several of the key moments from the case study considered within this thesis through the use of thick description and interpretation, while leaving enough leeway for the reader to develop their own informed interpretations and conclusions. While I present a set of interpretations and recommendations for further study, I acknowledge they are not the only possible interpretations or recommendations to be considered when examining this data and the proposed research questions. There is still room for further inquiry into the areas of ethnographic research coupled with applied theatre research in an educational context and the overlaps in the methods utilized by each and the means of reporting findings. Beyond this, there is an opportunity to expand the way research is reported, either through performance or

publication, so that the experiences of all of those involved within the research process may be heard and considered.

12. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, J. (2007). Applied theatre: An exclusionary discourse. *Applied Theatre Researcher, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ackroyd, J. (2000). Applied theatre: Problems and possibilities. *Applied Theatre Researcher, 1*(1), 1-13.

Ackroyd, J. (2006). *Research methodologies for drama education*. Trentham Books.

Agar, M. H. (1980). *The professional stranger: An informal introduction to ethnography*. New York: Academic Press.

Ahearn, L. M. (2016). *Living language: An introduction to linguistic anthropology*. John Wiley & Sons.

Alexander, B. K., Anderson, G. L., & Gallegos, B. (Eds.). (2004). *Performance theories in education: Power, pedagogy, and the politics of identity*. Routledge.

Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status, and new directions. *Review of educational research, 59*(3), 249-270. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED307285.pdf

Anderson, M., O'Connor, P. (2015). *Applied Theatre: Research: radical departures.* London: Bloomsbury.

Apple, M. (1995). *Education and power.* 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., and Delamont, S. (2003). *Key Themes in Qualitative Research.* Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

Bagley, C. (2008). Educational ethnography as performance art: towards a sensuous feeling and knowing. Qualitative Research 2008:8.

Beck, J. L., Belliveau, G., Lea, G. W., & Wager, A. (2011). Delineating a spectrum of research-based theatre. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *17*(8), 687-700.

Beer, D.W. (1997). "There's a certain slant of light": the experience of discovery in qualitative interviewing. Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 17, pp.110- 129.

Bhabha, H. (1989). Location, Intervention, Incommensurability: A Conversation with Homi Bhabha. Emergences 1(1), 63-88.

Bloch, M. (1977). The disconnection between power and rank as a process: an outline of the development of kingdoms in central Madagascar. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie, 18(*1), 107-148.

Bochner, A. P. (2002). Criteria Against Ourselves. *The Qualitative Inquiry Reader*, 257.

Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2002). *Ethnographically speaking: Autoethnography, literature, and aesthetics* (Vol. 9). Rowman Altamira.

Boon, J. A. (1982). *Other tribes, other scribes: symbolic anthropology in the comparative study of cultures, histories, religions and texts*. CUP Archive.

Booth, D. W., & Gallagher, K. (2003). *How Theatre Educates: Convergences and Counterpoints with Artists, Scholars and Advocates*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Borman, K. M., LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1986). Ethnographic and qualitative research design and why it doesn't work. *American behavioral scientist*, 30(1), 42-57.

Bourdieu, P. (1996). Understanding. Theory, Culture and Society, 13(2), pp.17- 37.

Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Rational Aesthetics.* Translated by S. Pleasance and F. Woods. Dijon: Les Presses Du Réel.

Bowers, C. A. (1995). *Educating for an ecologically sustainable culture: Rethinking moral education, creativity, intelligence, and other modern orthodoxies*. Suny Press.

Brandt, R. (1972). Studying Behavior in Natural Settings. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bresler, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Towards embodied teaching and learning* (Vol. 3). Springer Science & Business Media.

British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011) *Ethical guidelines for educational research*.

Burawoy, M. (1991). Reconstructing social theories. *Ethnography unbound: Power and resistance in the modern metropolis*, 8-27.

Burawoy, M. (1991). Reconstructing social theories. *Ethnography unbound: Power and resistance in the modern metropolis*, 8-27.

Burawoy, M. (1998). Critical sociology: A dialogue between two sciences. *Contemporary Sociology*, *27*(1), 12-20.

Burawoy, M. (2009). *The extended case method: Four countries, four decades, four great transformations, and one theoretical tradition*. University of California Press.

Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Siegesmund, R. (2008). To dwell in possibility: Poetry and educational inquiry. *Arts-based research in education*, 51-53.

Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. G. (2001). Grounded theory in ethnography. Dans PA Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & LH Lofland (Éds), Handbook of ethnography (pp. 160-174).

Christensen, L. (2000). *Reading, writing, and rising up: Teaching about social justice and the power of the written word*. Rethinking Schools.

Chua, Wai Fong. (1986). *Radical Developments in Accounting Thought.* The Accounting Review. 61(4), 601-632.

Clifford, J. (1983). On ethnographic authority. *Representations, 2,* 118-146.

Clifford, J. (1988). *Predicament of culture.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Cline, T., & Frederickson, N. (2009). *Special education needs, inclusion and diversity.* McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (2009). Inquiry as stance: Practitioner research for the next generation. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. (1993) *Inside/Outside: Teacher Research and Knowledge*, New York, Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. (1998) 'Teacher research: The question that persists,' *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10, pp. 19–36.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). Research methods in education.

Cohen, L. (81). en Manion, L. (1980) Research Methods in Education. *London & New*.

Coleridge, S. (1817). Willing Suspension of Disbelief. *Jackson, H. (1985) ch, 14*, 314.

Cook, P. J., & Ludwig, J. (1996). *Guns in America: results of a comprehensive national survey on firearms ownership and use* (pp. 13-14). Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Cook, P. J., & Ludwig, J. (2006). The social costs of gun ownership. *Journal of Public Economics*, *90*(1-2), 379-391.

Coleridge, S. T. (1971). Biographia literaria, 1817.

Conquergood, D. (1991). Rethinking ethnography: Towards a critical cultural politics. *Communications monographs*, *58*(2), 179-194.

Davis, C. A. (1999). Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others. London: Routledge.

Delamont, S. and Atkinson, P. (1995) Fighting Familiarity: Essays on Education and Ethnography. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Sage.

Denzin, N. K. (2003) Performance Ethnography, Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as experience*. Penguin.

Donelan, K. (2010). Drama as intercultural education: An ethnographic study of an intercultural performance project in a secondary school. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *24*(1), 19-33.

Donelan, K. (2002). Embodied practices: Ethnography and intercultural drama in the classroom. *NJ*, *26*(2), 35-44.

Dunlap, D. M., & Goldman, P. (1991). Rethinking power in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *27*(1), 5-29.

Eastland, L. S. (1993). The dialectical nature of ethnography: Liminality, reflexivity, and understanding. *Qualitative research: Applications in organizational communication*, 121-138.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of management review*, *14*(4), 532-550.

Eisner, E. W. (1977). Critique. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *8*(2), 71-72.

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: an overview. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 273-290.

Erickson, F. (1977). Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *8*(2), 58-69.

Erickson, F. (1973). What makes school ethnography "ethnographic?". *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *4*(2), 10-19.

Fabian, J. (1983). Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fabian, J. (2014). *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. Columbia University Press.

Fenno. R. F. (1986). Observation, context, and sequence in the study of politics. *American Political Science Review*, 80(1), 3-15.

Fine, M., & Weis, L. (2003). Silenced voices and extraordinary conversations… Reimagining schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens. *Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage*.

Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" the researcher: the provenance, process, and practice of reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research*. 531-545.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). The critical incident technique. *Psychological bulletin*, *51*(4), 327.

Forester, J. (1992). Critical ethnography: on fieldwork in a Habermasian way. *Critical management studies*, 46-65.

Foster, M. (2010). The power to know one thing is never the power to know all things: Methodological notes on two studies of Black American teachers. In Luttrell, W. (Ed), *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice* (pp. 384-398). New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* (A. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.

Franks, A. (2015). How environment affects Learning: School teachers engaging with theatre-based pedagogies. *Dramatic Interactions in Education: Vygotskian and Sociocultural Approaches to Drama, Education and Research*, 229.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Freire, P. (1998). Pedagogy of freedom. London: Bowmann and Littlefield

Gallagher, K. (2006). (Post) Critical Ethnography in Drama Research. *In*: Akroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 63-80.

Gallagher, K., & Wessels, A. (2011). Emergent pedagogy and affect in collaborative research: A metho-pedagogical paradigm. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, *19*(2), 239-258.

Gallagher, K. M. (2011). In search of a theoretical basis for storytelling in education research: story as method. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *34*(1), 49-61.

Gallagher, M., Haywood, S. L., Jones, M. W., & Milne, S. (2010). Negotiating informed consent with children in school-based research: a critical review. *Children & Society*, *24*(6), 471-482.

Gallagher, K., & Rodricks, D. J. (2017). Performing to understand: cultural wealth, precarity, and shelter-dwelling youth. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *22*(1), 7-21.

Gallagher, K. (2008). The art of methodology. *The methodological dilemma: Creative, critical, and collaborative approaches to qualitative research*, 67-81.

Gallagher, K. (2007). The theatre of urban. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press Incorporated.

Gallagher, K. (2014). *Why theatre matters: Urban youth, engagement, and a pedagogy of the real*. University of Toronto Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (Vol. 5019). Basic books.

Geertz, C. (1983). Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Knowledge. *New York: Basic*.

Geertz, C. (1988). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author.* Stanford: Stanford University Books.

Gibson, J. (2011). Saying it right: Creating ethical verbatim theatre. *NEO: Journal for Higher Degree Students in the Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*, 1-18.

Gino, F., & Norton, M. I. (2013). Why rituals work. *Scientific American*.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers. White Plains, NY.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative designs in ethnographic research. *New York: Academic*.

Goffman, E. (1989). On fieldwork. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 18*. 123-132.

Gold, R. (1969). Roles in sociological field observations. In G. McCall & J.L. Simmons (Eds.), Issues in participant observation: A text and reader (pp. 30-39). Menlo Park, ci: Addison-Wesley

Green, J., Stinson, S.W. (1999). Postpositivist Research in Dance in Farleigh. *In:* S. H. and P. Hansteing, *Researching Dance: Evolving Modes of Inquiry*. London: Dance Books, pp. 91-123.

Greene, M. (1995). Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gruenfeld, D. H., Keltner, D. J., & Anderson, C. (2003). The effects of power on those who possess it: How social structure can affect social cognition.

Gupta, A., Furgeson, J. (1992). Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* vol 7 no 1, pp. 6-23.

Habermas, J. (1991). The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). Ethnology: Principles in practice. *New York: Tavistock*.

Hammersley, M. and P. Atkinson. (2006). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge

Hammersley, M., & Gomm, R. (2005). Recent radical criticism of the interview in qualitative inquiry. *Developments in sociology, 20*, 91-102.

Hammond, W. (2008). *Verbatim: Contemporary documentary theatre*. Oberon Books.

Harvie, J. (2013). *Fair Play - Art, Performance and Neoliberalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haseman, B. (2006). A Manifesto for Performative Research. Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy: theme issue 'Practice-led Research', 118, 98-106. The University of Queensland.

Heddon, D. (2008). *Autobiography and Performance*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hemenway, D., Azrael, D., & Miller, M. (2001). National attitudes concerning gun carrying in the United States. *Injury Prevention*, *7*(4), 282-285.

Hertz, R. ed. (1997). *Reflexivity and voice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Temple University Press.

Houser, N. (1990). Teacher-researcher: The synthesis of roles for teacher empowerment. *Action in Teacher Education, 12,* 55-60.

Hughes, J. & Ruding, S. (2009). Made to Measure?. *In:* Pretenki, T. & Preston, S., ed. *The Applied Theatre Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 9-17.

Hunter, M. A. (2008). Cultivating the art of safe space. *Research in Drama Education*, *13*(1), 5-21.

Ingold, T. (2014). That's enough about ethnography!. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, *4*(1), 383-395.

Jackson, A. (2007). *Theatre, education and the making of meanings: Art or instrument?*. Manchester University Press.

Jackson, Michael. (1989). Paths toward a clearing: Radical empiricism and ethnographic inquiry. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition [Electronic version]. Psychological Review, 110, pp.265–284.

Kleck, G., & Gertz, M. (1995). Armed resistance to crime: the prevalence and nature of self-defense with a gun. *J. Crim. L. & Criminology*, *86*, 150.

Kleck, G., & Gertz, M. (1998). Carrying guns for protection: results from the National Self-Defense Survey. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, *35*(2), 193-224.

Klonski, R. (2013). The case for case studies: Deriving theory from evidence. *Journal of Business Case Studies*. 9(3), 261-266.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (2008). *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research: Perspectives, methodologies, examples, and issues*. Sage.

Kokot, W. (2007). Culture and Space–anthropological approaches. *Ethnoscripts*, *9*(1), 10-23.

Kudelka, James. "Choreographing the 'undanceable'". *Globe and Mail.* 2012.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review, 56,* 257-277.

Leavy, P. (2015). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice*. Guilford Publications.

Lovell, N. (Ed.). (1998). *Locality and belonging*. Psychology Press.

Lubet, S. (2015). Ethnography on Trial. *NEW REPUBLIC*, *246*(9-10), 38-43.

Luttrell, W. (Ed.). (2010). *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice*. Routledge.

Mackey, S. (2016). *Applied theatre and practice as research: polyphonic conversations*. Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance, 21:4, 478-491.

Madison, D. S. (2011). *Critical ethnography: Method, ethics, and performance*. Sage.

Malinowski, B. (1922). Argonauts of the Pacific. *Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, NY*.

Mannay, D. (2010). Making the familiar strange: can visual research methods render the familiar setting more perceptible?. *Qualitative research*, *10*(1), 91-111.

Martin, C. (1993). 'Anna Deavere Smith: The Word Becomes You', *The Drama Review*. 37(4), 45-62.

Martin, J. (2004). *Freire versus Marx: the tensions between liberating pedagogy and student alienation*, Paper presented at the Annual Conference Workshop of the Social Theory Forum, Boston.

Martin, G., (2014). Notes on Willing Suspension of Disbelief.

Mienczakowski, J. and Morgan, S. (1994). Ethnographic Drama Research: Combining Research, Creativity and Performance, Mask, 16:4, 13-19.

Miller, S.M. (1952). The participant observer and "overrapport." American Sociological Review, 17, 97-99.

Minh-Ha, T. T. (2009). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana University Press.

Minh-Ha, T. T., (1989). Other. *Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism, Indiana University Press, Bloomington*.

Monk, N., Rutter, C. C., Neelands, J., & Heron, J. (2011). *Open-space learning: a study in transdisciplinary pedagogy*. A&C Black.

Morrison, K. R. B. (1995b). Dewey, Habermas and reflective practice. Curriculum, 16(2), pp. 82-94

Neelands, J. (2009). Acting together: ensemble as a democratic process in art and life. *RiDE: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *14*(2), 173-189.

Neelands, J., & Nelson, B. (2013). Drama, community and achievement: together I'm someone. *How drama activates learning: Contemporary research and practice*, 15-29.

Neelands, J. (2004). Miracles are happening: Beyond the rhetoric of transformation in the Western traditions of drama education. Research in Drama Education, 9(1), pp. 47-56.

Neelands, J. (2006). Re-imaging the reflective practitioner: Towards a philosophy of critical praxis. In, J. Ackroyd (Ed.). Research methodology for drama education. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.

Neelands, J. (2007). Taming the political: the struggle over recognition in the politics of applied theatre. *Research in drama education*, *12*(3), 305-317.

Nelson, L. (1999). Bodies (and spaces) do matter: the limits of performativity. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, *6*(4), 331-353.

Nelson, B. (2009). Beyond belonging: the relationship between community and power for urban students of color. Drama Research: International Journal of Drama in Education, 1, pp.60-74.

Nelson, B. (2011). *Drama and multiculturalism: power, community and change* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Warwick).

Nicholson, H. (2005). Applied theatre: The gift of drama. *Nova Iorque: Palgrave Macmillan*.

Nicholson, H. (2014). *Applied drama: The gift of theatre*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nicholson, H. (2002). Drama education and the politics of trust. *Research in drama education*, *7*(1), 81-93.

Norris, J., Sawyer, R. D., & Lund, D. (2012). *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (Vol. 7). Left Coast Press.

O'Connor, P. (Ed.), (2010). *Creating democratic citizenship through drama education: The writings of Jonothan Neelands*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

Office for Standards in Education (2010) School Inspection Report. London: OfSTED.

Olwig, K. F., & Hastrup, K. (Eds.). (1997). *Siting culture: The shifting anthropological object*. Psychology Press.

Olwig, K. R. (2004). "This is not a landscape": circulating reference and land shaping. In *European rural landscapes: Persistence and change in a globalising environment* (pp. 41-65). Springer Netherlands.

O'Reilly, K. (2012). *Ethnographic methods*. London: Routledge.

O'Reilly, K. (2009). *Key Concepts in Ethnography*. London: Routledge.

Paget, D. (1987). 'Verbatim Theatre': Oral History and Documentary Techniques. *New Theatre Quarterly*, *3*(12), 317-336.

Patton, M. Q. (2006). Foreword: Trends and issues as context. *Research in the Schools*, *13*(1).

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative research and methods: Integrating theory and practice.

Peacock, J. (1986). *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedroni, T. C. (2006). Can the subaltern act? African American involvement in educational voucher plans. In: Apple, M. & Buras, K., eds. The subaltern speak. New York: Routledge, pp.121-140.

Perry, M. (2011). Theatre and knowing: Considering the pedagogical spaces in devised theatre. *Youth Theatre Journal*, *25*(1), 63-74.

Perry, M. (2010). *Theatre as a place of learning: The forces and affects of devised theatre processes in education* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).

Peshkin, A. (1993). The goodness of qualitative research. *Educational researcher*, *22*(2), 23-29.

Plump, B., & Geist-Martin, P. (2013). Collaborative intersectionality: Negotiating identity, liminal spaces, and ethnographic research. *Liminalities: A Journal of Performance Studies*, *9*(2), 59-72.

Prendergast, M. & Saxton, J., eds. (2009). Applied theatre: International case studies and challenges for practice. Chicago: Intellect, The University of Chicago Press.

Prentki, T. & Preston, S. (2009). Researching through case study. *In:* Pretenki, T. & Preston, S., ed. *The Applied Theatre Reader*. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 9-17.

Radosavljevic, D. (2013). *Theatre-making: Interplay between Text and Performance in the 21st Century*. Springer.

Reinelt, J. G., & Roach, J. R. (2007). *Critical theory and performance*. University of Michigan Press.

Reinharz, S. (1998). *On becoming a social scientist*. Transaction Publishers.

Richards, S. L. (1993). Caught in the Act of Social Definition: On the Road with Anna Deavere Smith. In *Acting Out: Feminist Performances*. University of Michigan Press.

Ridder, H. G. (2017). The theory contribution of case study research designs. *Business Research*, *10*(2), 281-305.

Rigg LS, McCarragher S, Krmenec A. (2012). *Authorship, collaboration and gender: fifteen years of publication productivity in selected geography journals*. Professional Geographer 64, 491-502.

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston: Beacon.

Russell, D. R. (1993). Vygotsky, Dewey, and externalism: Beyond the student/discipline dichotomy. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 173-197.

Saldaña, J. (2005). Ethnodrama: An Anthology of Reality Theatre. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.

Sallis, R. (2007). From Data to Drama—the Construction of an Ethnographic Performance. *NJ, 31*(2), 7-20.

Sandler JC, Russell BL. (2005). *Faculty-student collaborations: ethics and satisfaction in authorship credit*. Ethics Behav. 15, pp. 65-80.

Sanjek, R. (2014). *Ethnography in Today's World: Color Full Before Color Blind.* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Schechner, R. (2004). *Performance theory*. Routledge.

Schoenfelder, M. (2000). Vom Forschungsareal zum Forschungsgegenstand: „Raum“ und seine Bedeutung für die Ethnologie. Hamburg: unpubl. MA.

Sennett, R. (2012). *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*

Shaffir, W. B., Stebbins, R., & Turowetz, A. (1980). Fieldwork experience. *New York: St. Martin's*.

Shor, I. (1992). Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Silverman, D. (2005). Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook, (Second edition). Thousand Oaks, CA; London: Sage Publications.

Spindler, G. D. (1982). *Doing the ethnography of schooling: Educational anthropology in action*. Holt McDougal.

Spradley, J. P., & McCurdy, D. W. (1972). The Cultural Experience. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques*. Sage publications.

Taylor, P. (2003). *Applied theatre: Creating transformative encounters in the community*. Heinemann Drama.

Thurmond, V. (2001). The point of triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* vol 33 no 3, 254-256.

Tomforde, M. (2006). The Hmong Mountains: Cultural Spatiality of the Hmong in Northern Thailand. Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

Tracy, S. J. (2013). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell.

Tripp, D. (2011). *Critical incidents in teaching (classic edition): Developing professional judgement*. Routledge.

Tripp, D. (1993). Critical Incidents in Teaching. Developing Professional Judgement. London: Routledge.

Trueba, H. (2013). The Meaning and Use of Context in Ethnographic Research: Implications for Validity. *NABE Journal* vol 6 no 2-3, 21-34.

Turner, V. (1982). Dramatic ritual/ritual drama: performative and reflexive Anthropology. *A crack in the mirror: Reflexive perspectives in anthropology*, 83-97.

Turner, V. (1974). Pilgrimages as social processes. *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*, 166-230.

Turner, V. 2007. The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Van Maanen, J. (1995). An end to innocence: The ethnography of ethnography. *Representation in ethnography*, 1-35.

Van Maanen, J. (1983). *Qualitative Methods Reclaimed* (No. TR-20-ONR). Alfred P Sloan School of Management Cambridge, MA.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). Tales of the field. *On writing ethnography, Chicago*.

Wagner, B. J. (1976). Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a learning medium.

Wagner, Jon. (1997). The Unavoidable Intervention of Educational Research: A Framework for Reconsidering Researcher-Practitioner Cooperation. *Educational Researcher* vol 26 no 7, 13-22.

White, V., Belliveau, G. (2010). Whose story is it anyway? Exploring ethical dilemmas in performed research. Performing Ethos International Research Journal, 1(1), 85-95.

Wilkenson, L., & Anderson, M. (2007). A resurgence of verbatim theatre: Authenticity, empathy and transformation. *Australasian Drama Studies*, (50), 153.

Williams, R. (1983). Drama in a Dramatized Society. Performance.

Winston, J. (2006). Researching through case study. *In:* Akroyd, J., ed. *Research methodologies for drama education*. Staffordshire: Trentham Books Limited, pp. 41-61.

Wolcott, H. F. (1989). *A Kwakiutl village and school-25 years later*. Afterword to the second printing of A Kwakiutl village and school. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Rowman Altamira.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Sage.

Woolsey, L. K. (1986). The critical incident technique: An innovative qualitative method of research. *Canadian Journal of Counselling*.

Ybema Encyclopedia of Case Study Research p 348-352 "the interplay of individual agency and social structure."

Yin, R. K. (2003). Case study research design and methods third edition. *Applied social research methods series*, *5*.

Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research: Design and methods (Fifth).

Yin, R. K. (2015). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. Guilford Publications.

Zelditch Jr, M. (1962). Some methodological problems of field studies. *American journal of Sociology*, *67*(5), 566-576.

Zembylas, M. (2003). Interrogating “teacher identity”: emotion, resistance, and self-formation. *Educational theory*, *53*(1), 107-127.

Zull, J. (2002). The art of changing the brain: Enriching the practice of teaching by exploring the biology of learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

13. APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORM (PUPILS):

Radical Hope: Verbatim Project

CONSENT FORM: Pupils

Project Title:	***Radical Hope: Verbatim project***
Name of Researchers:	***Dr Cynthia Prescott and Emily Temple*** ***Please contact (Cynthia Prescott on*** [redacted] ***or by telephone on*** [redacted]

Tick each box to show that you agree to the questions:

1. **I have listened to, and understood, a description of the project** ☐

2. **I have had the opportunity to ask any questions I may have.** ☐

3. **I agree to take part in the above study and am willing to:**

3.a. Answer a short questionnaire at the beginning and end of the project ☐

3.b. Take part in a short interview about your experience of the project ☐

3.c. Have the recording of the process and the final performance shown to other researchers and collaborators ☐

4. **I understand that a description of my part in the project, some of my written work, or anything in Question 3 might be shared with other researchers and may be published as part of academic research. All participants will choose a pseudonym** ☐

Please write your name and the date here:

YOUR NAME **Date**

_____ _____

14. APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM (PARENTS/GUARDIANS)

Request for Your Child's Participation

in a Course-related Study

Your child is invited to be in a research study about the relationship between creative drama activity and youth engagement with civic life in schools and communities. We are asking that your child take part because s/he is a student in Mr J's class, and he has given me permission to conduct research in his classroom as part of the requirements of a PhD course at the University of Warwick within the Centre for Education Studies, as well as within the context of a broader, international study that is taking place between five different countries worldwide utilizing various theatre-making forms over the course of the next four years. Please read this form and indicate whether or not you give permission for your child to participate in this research.

Purpose of the research

The four key aims of the project are: to examine for whom and about what students most care; and how hope and care as practiced are related to democratic engagement for youth. To determine whether and how hope can be intentionally mobilized within schools, and particularly within drama classrooms, in a context of increasing social and economic instability. To clarify how and why the temporary culture of collective theatre-making works and how specific models of collaborative work in the drama classroom/workshop cultivate emotional sensibilities and demonstrate democratic participation across differences with the potential for catalysing broader civic engagement. And to clarify how translations of ideas across cultural and linguistic borders, differing pedagogies, cultural aesthetics, genres of digital media, and knowledge mobilization practices build capacities for intercultural dialogue and civic engagement for youth in a global context.

What your child may be asked to do as part of this research

If you agree to have your child in this study, your child will take part in a regular drama lass that uses theatre games and improvisation to explore different types of power in students' lives. There will be a follow-up interview with several of the students to discuss what they did in class and ask them to talk more about their ideas of performance and civic engagement in their lives.

Time required

Your child will participate in their regularly scheduled Drama class, and may be asked to interview for 30-45 minutes during a free period.

Benefits

There are no direct benefits to your child's participation in this study. At the end of our data collection, your child's teacher will receive a brief memo describing our research and summarizing our initial findings.

Confidentiality

Your child's participation in this study will remain confidential, and his or her identity will not be stored with any data that we collect. We will protect your child's identity and that of other participants by assigning pseudonyms. Some data and formative writings about this research will be shared with other researchers within our university and the four additional research sites, and we may include this data as part of a scholarly article. While we will quote directly from interviews, documents, and observations, we will use only the assigned pseudonyms in all parts of our analysis and/or in discussions with our colleagues. Real names will not be used in any of these conversations and the students and instructors understand the importance of maintaining confidentiality in discussing research data. We will not use the information you share with me for any purpose other than in relation to our work in the University of Warwick, the broader context of the international study, and a scholarly article without your knowledge and permission.

All research-related material will be stored privately and will not be accessible to others. The list connecting your name with your pseudonym will be kept separately and will be destroyed once all the data have been collected and analysed.

Participation and withdrawal

Your child's participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent at any time without penalty. You may withdraw your child from this study or your child may withdraw on his or her own by informing me (no questions will be asked).

Contact

If you have questions about this research, please contact Dr. Cynthia Prescott at [redacted] or Emily Temple at [redacted]. Alternately, you may call (Emily) by telephone at [redacted].

Agreement

The nature and purpose of this research have been satisfactorily explained to me and I agree to allow our child to take part in the study as described above. I understand that I am free to discontinue participation at any time if I so choose, and that the investigator will gladly answer any questions that arise during the course of the research.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name (print): _____

I have the authority to grant the foregoing consent for our child:

Child's name (print): _____

15. APPENDIX C: VERBATIM PLAY SCRIPT

Scene 1

Traverse stage. Performers are sat in amongst audience.

Gabriel enters: Lovely weather we're having!

Park sounds (four tet) Performers enter

Jacqueline: We asked what you thought about 'home', 'neighbourhood', 'nation' and 'world' and what you cared about. Maybe it was too restricting, the categories that we gave you. What do you not get to talk about that you want to talk about?

Gabriel: It's got to be yours.

Silence (performers walk around the space looking at the audience, maybe they freeze)

Elysia: Anything?

Jacqueline: Anything.

Silence (how do we show awkward silence?)

Gabriel: Scary isn't it? You can talk about anything.

Jacqueline: You can talk about anything.

Elysia: It can be random things?

Jacqueline: It can be anything at all.

Gabriel: And everyone's terrified.

Silence

Eden Hazard: Football.

Everyone breathes together as a 'sigh of relief'

Gabriel: What about it?

As this is happening, they start to form the circle walks. The football is introduced straight away.

Eden Hazard: It's good to play. And to watch.

Gabriel: So, do you play it in school?

Eden Hazard: Yeah, when there's matches and in P.E.

Gabriel: Right. Are you in a team?

Eden Hazard: Yeah, there's a school team.

Jacqueline: What do you think about, so okay, what about um…girls playing football?

Geraldine: Yeah, that's fine.

Jacqueline: Yeah, that's fine.

Rosalind: for males it can go up to millions

Pat MaGrain: But, like I agree with the boys getting more money because I've been playing for like 10 years and I'm nowhere near as good as some lads that have been playing for half of that.

Oregon: Yeah, but there's Jess Carter. When she was here she was better than every single lad in our year, hands down. She was absolutely insane. There's not one person that was better than her.

Pat MaGrain: Yeah, but if you think about it, this is a public school, like if you go to a professional football the lads are like a million times better than the girls are

Meredith: This is a pride thing too though, well no because if you were like married to someone and the man was on half of what the woman was on he'd be like looking for another job.

Jacqueline: My fiancé earns less than me.

Pat MaGrain: It depends on the type of man.

Eden Hazard: I wouldn't stereotype all men to be like that.

Ball game comes to an end

Scene 2

Circle walks continue with identity descriptions

All: How would you describe yourself?

Pat MaGrain: Family and friend oriented, quite protective of what I care about (can sometimes be a bit moody, I suppose).

Geraldine: Overly enthusiastic, put everyone before myself, always there for people when they need me. Very sarcastic.

Oregon: This student is a top boy. Energetic for the most part (except mornings) and doesn't take things too seriously. Has a decent barnet too.

Meredith: A tall happy guy who loves drama, music and to eat.

Rosalind: A very 'bubbly' and energetic person who if you're on the right side of, is a very nice person. Has a great sense of humour but thinks he's funnier than he actually is. Very loud person and apparently has a 'boomy' voice.

Jacqueline: I believe I am an open minded individual, I have an external, but also internal locus of control. I don't like to judge, I just like to be content.

Gabriel: Not very passionate about anything and easily amused, but gets moody easily too.

Mush: Caring, friendly, and always wanting to please others.

Eden Hazard: Caring, loud and has a good sense of humour. Sociable, sometimes sarcastic

Elysia: I am bubbly, outgoing and strange, with elements of dizziness. However, make sure to be completely loyal and caring to others.

Red Ball, Green Ball – very playful

Mush: I don't think I've ever seen a group of people have so much fun with nothing before.

Scissors! All freeze and look – we gasp.

Elysia: You shouldn't run with scissors.

All: Laugh

Elysia: But you shouldn't throw scissors.

Baby! All freeze and look down – we gasp

Gabriel: Keep the scissors away from the baby!

Another object – stun gun!

Rosalind: So, do you feel much safer here?

Gabriel: Yes. When I moved here I had a stun gun because I lived in NY and then in Boson, and when I moved in they took it from me at Customs. And it took about three months before I realized I was actually safe here; like your cops don't have guns.

Elysia: Is that why people carry guns? In case someone were to just randomly attack?

Gabriel: That's the excuse, that you have the right to self-defense.

Geraldine: I can never imagine just seeing a gun.

All shout: Stun gun! And watch it move through the air.

Rosalind: I think life's so chaotic and so random…and people are so…like unstable, actually

Silence and freeze

Mush: I think we take it for granted, like we just walk around, like, and expect nothing to happen when there's people like petrified to leave their house in America, like ugh.

Gabriel: What's different is that we aren't petrified to leave our house. That's part of our regular life so you just kind of deal with it and go on.

Eden Hazard: That's so strange.

Oregon: Something worries me, that you feel like you can go out and just not think about it at all.

Scene 3

Pat MaGrain and Gabriel

Gabriel: How do you feel about the word disaster? Do you feel like the world is a disaster?

Pat MaGrain: Some parts, but um…everything in the world that goes on, that isn't controlled by humans, is just natural disaster. I think disaster that's caused by humans is bad because it's because of us, and not the role of the world, but we are the world, so…we are a part of it.

Gabriel: Do you actually feel like the world is a free place?

Pat MaGrain: Some parts are, other parts aren't, because, like, they're dangerous places that we can't go because like we could get murdered.

Eden Hazard and Geraldine

Eden Hazard: So, would you say you do not feel safe in circumstances such as school, or in the world in general, or what do you mean? What do you think about that one?

Geraldine: I think you've…there's elements of safety in such places as school because obviously they need to keep it safe, but I think there's much more…chance of something bad happening due to the amount of people. When, when you go to the world…I mean, that's like depending on whether it's out of your comfort zone, you don't know what could happen. You don't know the sort of routine, as you would at home where, probably, you'd

have dinner around the same time; you'd go to bed at the same time; you'd watch tv with the fam-i-lam at the same time You feel safe in that routine, as if like nothing could happen to it…

Oregon and Elysia

Elysia: Um, some people wrote down fear and worry and anxiety, what kind of feelings do you get from school? Do you agree with the fear and anxiety and worry?

Oregon: Kind of, like, I think there's day to day things like, especially in 6th form it's like what you're wearing/

Elysia: Oh yeah/

Oregon: Like do you look good in it or um have you, like obviously me being a new one, um, like you kinda come to this school with no friends…so you kind of have to make that and you don't necessarily feel comfortable around everyone and you don't want to get involved in everything cos they're all gonna be judging

Mush and Meredith

Meredith: When you think about nation or country, and your feelings about it…you've said the idea of it being complicated?

Mush: Yeah.

Meredith: I kind of know what you mean, but I'd love for you to tell us a bit more about that.

Mush: Well I mean, in everything there's a complication, but obviously when you think of nation and country, there's so many different, like, interpretations and different…feelings toward it. You can have positives like patriotism and stuff like that, but then obviously there's a lot more complicated stuff, like you can think about war.

Meredith: You mentioned patriotism as something that was a good thing?

Mush: Yeah.

Meredith: If your country is going to war, or if you have an armed forces, do you see supporting them as something that is patriotic?

Mush: I suppose that's more, um, the dark side of patriotism I would have to say. You're supporting your country, bur for a very wrong reason I think

Jacqueline and Rosalind

Rosalind: So, when you hear the word 'neighborhood' what comes to mind?

Jacqueline: Um…somewhere that you feel welcome.

Rosalind: What would make you feel welcome?

Jacqueline: Having a friendly environment, and just…feeling a part of something. Just being with your family and friends.

Rosalind: How would you make people feel welcome within a community?

Jacqueline: Being reliable. Always being there for people. Um, giving people the space that they, that they want. Looking out for each other. I help out a lot with the people around me, and I know that, as a community they would do the same for me; that's why I view them as my friends and family. Obviously, it wasn't like that to begin with; they were strangers to me. You have to…slowly grow that trust and then…Then, that's how you develop friends and that's how you make people feel welcome.

Scene 4

Performers re –perform the spectrum scene

Oregon: You should always tell the truth. Yes or no. (all go to no) You bunch of liars!

Elysia: Some things, like you don't like, because it will hurt someone, so you don't want to tell them.

Oregon: So, it might be a protection?

Rosalind: Sometimes, like the truth, like, it isn't always necessary, like…they're better off not knowing. It wouldn't change the situation. It wouldn't make it any better so maybe, do you know what I mean?

Meg: Yes, I do.

Pat MaGrain: Like, is it worth all the things that it would cause?

Oregon: School is a place where I feel safe.

Mush: I don't think like, anywhere is specifically safe. Like…just there's nowhere where I could feel like nothing would ever happen, like because anything could happen at any time, so I don't think a place could be safe.

Oregon: Entirely safe, all of the time?

Mush: Yeah.

Elysia: My friends mean more to me than my family.

Pat MaGrain: Yeah. My friends obviously mean a lot to me and stuff, but then you're always going to have a bond with your family, which you're not ever going to get with your friends. Being as they're your family, you live with them, you see them all the time sort of thing, so I just think family come way ahead of friends.

Gabriel: I feel protected by society.

Meredith: Kind of. Is government society?

Mush: Government is crap.

Jacqueline: Well I think… I don't…I'm not scared. Well, I feel like I feel mainly safe because nothing's happened to me where I don't feel safe yet.

Eden Hazard: Um, I dunno, like…I guess sometimes you can feel safe, so if something bad then happens, like there might be someone else in 'society' that could then help you. But…at the same time it would take someone from society to do something bad…so I don't really know.

Rosalind: The other thing I was gonna say, like about all the uncertainty

thing is … y'know that day when I came in and I just sat by the side and

didn't join in? … Well, my sister got meningitis when she was 18 and died

within half an hour, so like, you never know what's gonna happen

Silence

Rosalind: But I didn't know if it was too deep

Silence

Geraldine: I think like…my…not that I mean the idea of not safe as in you're going to die, I mean safe as in like yourself. Like safe with the people around you…but, like, everyone's sort of the same.

Elysia: There's a story from Liverpool … It's quite recent, but there was a robbery…he…the person when he was stealing the car he tried to stop him and he pulled an electric stun gun on them, um and then stole the car and then three days later he went and stole the money.

Pat MaGrain: Right.

Elysia: And it was just…it's like, people were like shopping in this Tesco while he stole the car.

Pat MaGrain: Right.

Elysia: And it could have been anyone, like you run into this person stealing this car. It's just weird, because it's just like a normal day, you're going shopping and …

Pat MaGrain: And I think that's what you're all saying; you're just going about your everyday routine and we don't know do we, what might happen?

Meredith: It's like things that happen completely by accident and then things like you can control

Scene 5

Bus Scene:
(As the lines are spoken students gather in the center of the stage a create 'the bus' with their bodies)

Eden Hazard: Um…oh, um…Back when I was in year 7 or 8 I was in a bus crash…um…that two people died in. I mean like, from year 7 to year 11 I probably took like hundreds of thousands of bus journeys like to and from school and like you just don't really think of anything other than them sort of going along…and then…

Jacqueline: Did you know the people that died?

Eden Hazard: Yeah, so what happened was that someone from the other way, like they had, they had a…heart attack at the wheel or something so they came across the road when we were coming.

Pat MaGrain.: So, there was….it was the driver of the bus and the guy that they crashed into?

Eden Hazard: So, the person in that car died and the driver of our bus died. See it was like…because we hit a tree and the tree was like on the driver's side, so like the driver hit the tree and it sort of came like through the bus and the person sitting behind where the driver would sit, he like sort of got caught under everything.

Jacqueline: Whereabouts were you sat?

Eden Hazard: Sort of in the middle of the bus. (*he positions himself in the center of the bus, where he would have sat)*

Geraldine: Do you, like, remember…the aftermath of that?

Eden Hazard: Yeah. So, I remember … 'cause they have the emergency door at the back…so people at the back kicked that through. And obviously people that were behind it they stopped to try see if they could help. So, we just all sort of followed to the back of the bus and then we all got off and just sat on the other side of the road. And we just sort of just like sat down and like I didn't really know what was going on. Really.

Jacqueline.: Okay. That's…that's a really important story, particularly when talking about, 'do you feel safe when you go to school?'

Pat MaGrain: Do you have any memories of this happening?

All: Yeah.

Rosalind: I just remember everyone was talking about it, and it was kind of like … this big thing because obviously people died.

Meredith: I remember Miss Delman couldn't read out the notice she got so upset by it.

Mush: There was like…I remember she listed who would not be in school or something? Like she, she read out who was like…

Elysia: Didn't they do like a nice assembly for it as well? In memory?

Geraldine: Yeah. Yeah.

Rosalind: Oh.

Eden Hazard: I remember it like, it all kinds of…

Pat MaGrain: It's sounds like that's pretty traumatic, so thank you.

Oregon: I can't believe that man died though…

Scene 6

Ball game

Pat MaGrain: But that's the thing, like nothing happens here. Once we hear one, like one news story we think…we're like, "Oh my god, it's going to happen everywhere."

Oregon: When you say nothing happens here do you mean like specifically like…?

Rosalind: No, I mean like, in the UK not a lot happens…and when it does happen…

Jacqueline: Maybe we just don't hear about it.

16. Appendix D: Identity Descriptor Questionnaire and Responses

Social Identity Categories

Name:_____

Pseudonym:_____

Gender:_____

Race:_____

Class status (upper class, middle class, working class, etc.):_____

Sexual Orientation:_____

Religious Affiliation:_____

Where were you born?_____

First Language:_____

Additional Languages:_____

Describe yourself in a sentence:

If I were to describe you in a book, what would I say?

Identity Descriptor Responses

Jacqueline: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: British; Class Status: Middle Class; Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: n/a; Place of birth: Newcastle under Lyme; First Language: English; Additional Languages: n/a

1) I care about my family and friends more than anything, and I am someone who would do anything for them.
2) Family and friend oriented, quite protective of what I care about (can sometimes be a bit moody, I suppose).

Elysia: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: White Caucasian/British; Class Status: Middle Class; Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: Christian, but I don't go to church; Place of birth: Warwick; First Language: English; Additional Languages: ---

1) I'm an over-enthusiastic person, friend and family oriented.
2) Overly enthusiastic, put everyone before myself, always there for people when they need me. Very sarcastic.

Pat MaGrain: Gender: Male; Ethnicity: British, ¼ Portuguese; Class Status: Middle Class; Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: No religion; Place of birth: Warwick, England; First Language: English; Additional Languages: ----

1) Rather energetic, enjoys life as much as possible and doesn't take life too seriously.
2) This student is a top boy. Energetic for the most part (except mornings) and doesn't take things too seriously. Has a decent barnet too.

Gabriel: Gender: Male; Ethnicity: English, American, Irish; Class Status: Working class; Sexual Orientation: ~~Straight~~ Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: --; Place of birth: Warwick, UK; First Language: English; Additional Languages: N/a

1) A tall happy guy who loves drama, music and to eat.
2) A happy chappy amazing guy.

Eden Hazard: Gender: Male; Ethnicity: British; Class Status: --; Religious Affiliation: Christian; Place of birth: Warwick; First Language: English; Additional Languages:

1) A very energetic, loud character who loses concentration easily.
2) A very 'bubbly' and energetic person who if you're on the right side of, is a very nice person. Has a great sense of humour but thinks he's funnier than he actualy is. Very loud person and apparently has a 'boomy' voice.

Oregon: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: Scottish, Irish, Swedish, British; Class Status: Middle class; Sexual Orientation: heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: not sure, open minded; Place of Birth: Britain, Warwickshire, Warwick; Frist Language: English; Additional Languages: N/A

1) I believe I am an open minded individual, I have an external, but also internal locus of control. I don't like to judge, I just like to be content.
2) I am open minded and have a good sense of humour. I always like to be happy and have that content feeling with others around me. I think that everything happens for a reason and with that in mind, do whatever you believe in. I also love trees.

Mush: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: English, Irish, Belgium; Class Status: In between middle & working class; Sexual Orientation: Straight/Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation: Roman Catholic but don't practice; Place of birth: Warwick; First Language: English; Additional Languages: None

1) Not very passionate about anything and easily amused, but gets moody easily too.
2) Never takes opinions too seriously and just like to laugh a lot. Only does what makes her happy.

Rosalind: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: British; Class Status: Middle/Working class; Sexual Orientation: Straight; Religious Affiliation: Christian; Place of birth: Warwick; First Language: English; Additional Languages:

1) Caring, friendly, and always wanting to please others.
2) I would say I'm a caring, friendly person who likes to be in the company of others.

Geraldine: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: British; Class Status: Middle class/working class; Sexual Orientation: Straight; Religious Affiliation: I don't know—haven't followed a religion so far; Place of birth: Warwick; First Language: English; Additional Languages: None

1) Caring, loud and has a good sense of humour. Sociable, sometime sarcastic.
2) This person is very caring and has a great sense of humour. She is loud and very sociable, and tries to get along with everybody.

Meredith: Gender: Female; Ethnicity: British; Class Status: Middle Class; Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual; Religious Affiliation; don't practice; Place of birth: Leicestershire; First Language: English; Additional Languages: n/a

1) I am a bubbly outgoing person, who is loyal and caring to others.
2) I am bubbly, outgoing and strange, with elements of dizziness. However, make sure to be completely loyal and caring to others.

17. APPENDIX E: SAMPLE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS

In the two sample interviews included below, one conducted by Cynthia and the other conducted by me, slashes (/ /) appear to designate that a word or words were indistinguishable. If a word or phrase appears between slashes it indicates my best guess based upon what is understandable from the audio or video footage, my field notes, or recollections of the interview or observed incident. Brackets [ ] indicate a moment where I have inserted text into the conversation, usually for the sake of clarity or clarification. Ellipses denote a long pause or omitted text, either a word, phrase, or utterance that may be redundant or that does not contribute to the clarity or understanding of the included transcription.

Interview: Emily (ET) and Rosalind

ET: Okay, I have a couple questions for you. It will be a conversation, just a chat. You don't have to answer them if you don't want to. If you have any questions you can ask at any point, okay?

Rosalind: That's fine.

ET: If you can just state your full name and your age for the record.

Rosalind: Rosalind…and I'm 17.

ET: Okay. Great.

Rosalind: I had to think about it for a minute. (laughs)

ET: See? The first one is already done. Easy.

Rosalind: (Laughs) Alright.

ET: Okay. If you were going to describe this process to someone who was unfamiliar with it, how would you describe it to them?

Rosalind: I think I would describe it as going through blocks…so you have to first get everyone to work together with each other, because even though we work together every single day, I don't think people really know each other that well. And by doing this exercise, we've become a lot closer, I think. And then you have the next process where you have to start getting the information and where you have to start doing these things, and then slowly, but gradually you create this piece, which is kind of like blocking all of these things together. So, I think it's very much like blocking a stage, it's almost like the whole thing is rehearsal, leading up to something, but you don't think it's rehearsal at the start.

ET: You mentioned that you work with each other every day, but then Cynthia and I are new.

Rosalind: Yeah.

ET: So, what was it like to have two completely new people come in and enter the group?

Rosalind: I think it was quite fresh. I think it was scary at first for people because they were like, 'Oh they don't know us.' // But I think we realized that we don't know each other that well either, so it didn't feel awkward, it just felt like we all were kind of starting fresh together with individuals rather than as a group, and you guys were the individuals, if that makes sense.

ET: So, was there anything specifically that we did as teachers to help develop that process?

Rosalind: I think, especially the ball game. We just had a lot of fun. We just kind of messed about a bit. We went back to kind of younger ages when we were all just a bit (makes a face), yeah let's just have a laugh with it, not take it too seriously. I think that really broke down the worry of it, because it just made it fun every morning. Towards the end got very competitive with it, like we have to do this, and we have to get it done. And even now we find it really fun doing it without the balls, just because we look like a mess really, but we're doing it. It's a lot of fun.

ET: What was it like having those stories—you said that you didn't really know each other that well, but through this you got to know each other—so you're telling your stories and each other's—

Rosalind: I think in day to day life we wouldn't just sit down, because obviously there are different friendship groups, you know? So, when you—

you wouldn't go and sit down and talk about that stuff in general with them, so now that we've done that, I think everyone's a little more aware of everyone's situation and they're more comfortable being around them because they don't feel like they have to pretend to be something they're not. They don't have to hide something they don't want to be now, because now they can share it in a safe environment because we made the rules and therefore none of us can be ridiculed or laughed at, and it's a lot nicer than just a general friendship group where you don't want to open up.

ET: You said about it being safe—was it just the contracting that made it feel safe, or was there anything else that went into that?

Rosalind: I think.... I think it comes down to the people as well, because I think we have a bunch of people that are very respectful of each other, and I think...I definitely think that the contract was the start of that. I think once we all knew that this was actually quite serious and that people were able to open up and say what they needed to feel safe, I think that contract really helped because I don't think I would have said some of the stuff I did if that wasn't in place because I would have felt, 'Ooh, I don't want people to judge me,' or anything like that.

ET: You specifically have a really delicate story that we've cast you to tell, and we gave that to you really specifically. What has that been like for you telling Eden's story?

Rosalind: I think at the beginning I was okay with it and I thought, well, actually, yeah, I can do that. Once we started rehearsing it, it did get a lot harder. Every time, now, I do feel a lot more—it hits me a lot more—because I think, I can't just say those lines. I know that's kind of a method actor kind of thing, but it's...it's not that, it's just that you don't want to just say them just off the brink. You want to have that concentration that these lines are important; they're important to someone in the group and they can't just be thrown out like another play //...Plus I think the idea of messing them up is a lot scarier because I wouldn't want to change these words because they're very precious words, they're not just like some // it's a more important line. There's more weight to it.

ET: Do you think there's more weight to it because you know whose story it is, and you know the person behind it than when you're doing a regular play?

Rosalind: Yes. Definitely. I think...I've done pieces of verbatim theatre before. Especially the piece that we just did with our GCSE group that was the Laramie project, but that happened in America. That all happened in the year that we were born actually, but it didn't hit us as much because I, we didn't personally know those people. I think only a few went home and really just sat down, and that's when you get the method acting kind of, just really deeply going into these parts. I don't think you'd feel as much

pressure than like—I think we ended up changing some of the words because we didn't like have as much respect. I think we all respected the story and how important it was tell it properly, but we didn't have the idea that actually you can't change those words, those are words that people said. Whereas here, I wouldn't want to mess up a line because if it was a lesser line...that's the thing though, you don't want to say there's lesser—less important things than others, because then, especially for that person, that a very important story. I don't want to tarnish or just mess up by accident, because that would be awful. I would feel really bad afterwards, but I actually quite like being able to do his character at the beginning and then gradually building that up and showing a different side. I think because I understand the barrier, how people feel behind the curtain, I can see that a lot easier. I think that made it easier, because I spoke to some people and they said they just wouldn't—most of them said actually—that they just wouldn't do it, that they'd refuse. I thought that was quite nice that I got the opportunity to.

ET: We were really specific about that, we knew that you would do it well because you had done his line before. We knew you would take it seriously and we felt like we could trust you with that. Obviously if you'd been uncomfortable with it we would have adjusted that, but you've done a brilliant job with it.

Rosalind: Thank you.

ET: Going through, is there anything that you would change about the process? Anything that you think we could have done differently?

Rosalind: I think probably the...because we had a short period to do it in, I think line learning, like if we had the scripts a bit, obviously we couldn't because of how short a time we had all together, but if we had just gotten that a bit sooner then I think people would feel a bit more safe because I think still people are bit like, 'God I'm scared I'm going to forget my lines.' (laughs) And stuff like that. So, I think that would be—but also bringing it in later has made people go like, 'right, we need to have these, we need to do the work.' I think they might have just dawdled a bit at the beginning. I think it was good that we did it in that way, actually. I don't think there is anything else that I would change really.

ET: Is there anything that stands out as a highlight, as a point that was a turning point in the process? Something that really stands out to you?

Rosalind: I think the standing out point was, I know this was much further down the line, and I think that even though we had got a really good connection, I think that Wednesday when we had all day together, and when we had those times when we were just in stitches, laughing at what we were doing, and stuff like that, I think that was the turning point because it just showed how close we'd all become. Even though it was much

later, I think that just signified what we had done, and what we had achieved by bringing everything together.

ET: Did you have any other questions or comments?

Rosalind: No, I don't think so.

ET: Thank you very much.

Interview: Cynthia (CP) and Eden

CP: To be official we have to say what your name is and your age.

Eden: Okay, I'm Eden and I'm 17.

CP: Thanks Eden. Alright, so the first questions is, if you were to describe this project to an outsider, someone who doesn't do drama, what would you say we did?

Eden: Um. I'd probably just talk about how you know obviously we were going to create a play in general um and then it was just sort of like a massive group activity where you—where you research what you've done in class, what you've spoken about, and then transform that all into a play depending on what you've said. That's what the outcome of the play is sort of thing.

CP: So, it was what we were doing in class fed into a script?

Eden: Yeah.

CP: Yeah, okay. So, what was it like then, um, obviously we've met before in the university, but, what was I like having two outsiders kind of come in for a few weeks and work with you?

Eden: Well, at the very, very start because we've only spoken to you like once and them Emily was like, was part of it sort of.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: It was quite weird at first because obviously we'd never spoken to you about and it was getting quite deep like within the first two lessons.

CP: Yes, straight in. Give me it, give me your emotions. (laughs)

Eden: Straight in, yeah. And then like, then it's come to like sort of and it got halfway through and it felt like completely normal. It felt normal for you to come it. It felt normal for the teachers to sit aside or join in.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: And it felt quite normal just to talk about whatever we really wanted, and then it was—then you were like sort of included as well, being as you were obviously talking about you thought as well.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: And it actually felt just completely normal sort of thing.

CP: That's really interesting. So, I wonder, can you pinpoint like what were the things that you think we did to make that feel comfortable?
Eden: I think when it was like talking about, 'can you bring stuff in?'

CP: Ah, right.

Eden: It was stuff like that. And then we were speaking obviously about really sensitive stuff like the bus crash and stuff. So, when we spoke about

that as a group, and then, and that's when we were talking about the Liverpool story as well, so obviously we could talk to you.

CP: Ah, yeah.

Eden: It felt like we was like part of a whole group and you could literally share whatever you wanted.

CP: Right, I see.

Eden: And it was really nice to talk about.

CP: So, I guess—some of the others have been saying like different to what you'd get in with a teacher.

Eden: Yeah, because teachers are under certain rules where if you was to go tell them something maybe they would then have to go share that with somebody else sort of thing.

CP: Right, okay, yeah. That's really interesting, isn't it? Because our play was about safety.

Eden: Exactly.

CP: And yet, we were always trying to make sure you felt safe to talk about those things.

Eden: Yeah.

CP: Okay, so when we were generating the material you and Pat played a highly significant role in actually bringing stuff forward. Can you tell me a little bit about that process and what that was like?

Eden: Well, I remember doing—I was with Pat when we were talking about the news article, like which news articles we were going to do, and he literally said straight away, 'I think it would be nicer if I was to pick something which has hit me, like was sensitive to me' sort of thing.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: And I said to him, like, 'are you sure you're okay with that sort of thing?' And he was completely fine with it, but I think it was like more—it was like in a nicer way because obviously he knows he can feel part of the group and feel safe within this group to go say that.

CP: Right, yeah.

Eden: Whereas it was the same with me. Whereas because I felt comfortable talking to you and Emily at the same time, I was more than happy to share my story with you.

CP: I um, I think I said the other day, that was genuinely the most sort of challenging bit of anything I've ever done because I—that's why I really wanted to speak to you today because I—I still don't know if I got that right. I think we did?

Eden: Yeah.

CP: Do you think? Because I don't want to go like, 'did we get it right?'

Eden: I spoke to Elysia, Geraldine, and Pat about it as well, and the way Rosalind played it…it like, that's why um…I got so—I was so sensitive on Friday because the way Rosalind plays it is so, like emotional. She just said it like, so nicely that it was almost--she sort of played it too good and that's why it hit me sort of thing, but it was honestly, like it was such a nice touch to the play I think.

CP: Yeah. I think um…and I think I was just saying to Pat, I like, it was lovely to see him replaying what I felt like, even though that didn't quite happen like that, we staged it in a way—

Eden: It was still the same aspects of it, yeah.

CP: That it was that feeling of going, that's just so brave to say that, and it but—I still can't even make sense of it because it was such a big thing.

Eden: I always do put—when I tell people—I always do put myself in their shoes.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: To think, and I don't expect much from them, because if I got told that about somebody else, I'd be like, 'Woah.' Like I wouldn't know what to say. So, I never really… I don't obviously know what I'm going to expect.

Like some people are going to be like proper touchy, touchy sort of thing, but I'm never like bothered by what people do because it's such a shocked reaction amongst some people.

CP: It is, yeah. It is. And I think there's another thing that occurred to me, so last week we had the stuff with the teacher, the PE teacher, and I was really worried that you weren't going to come in, and yet it was all—it was about you.

Eden: Exactly.

CP: So, there was a weird thing going on, which was it was a week when you were excluded in that official thing, but then you were massively included in this play.

Eden: Exactly, if anything I was more—

CP: You were playing Pat's thing, you were—so can you talk to me a little bit about that weird state of being excluded but also included in the play? Was there anything that you thought about?

Eden: Well I obviously got told I was going to be excluded at the start of the week, which then that felt really weird because I got told I was excluded but then I got told I was still alright to come for drama.

CP: Right.

Eden: So that's where the whole problem was with my mum, because she was like obviously you can't get excluded and then come in for drama.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: So, I was still quite happy that although I as excluded I was going to come in for drama because I knew I would have felt within the play, but that I didn't want problems outside of drama to affect the play.

CP: Right.

Eden: Because I knew that could also have an effect and then maybe I wouldn't be able to play it as good, maybe I wouldn't have been able to turn up.

CP: I see.

Eden: Because my mum said to me as well, she was like, 'If they're really going to do that' she said, 'then I don't want you going in for drama.' So, there was also that touch where I was like 'Ooh' and now my mom's sort of siding one way, when—so it was all, it got quite awkward in a way sort of thing.

CP: Oh, okay. What, she didn't want you to just go in just to do a drama play if you're being told off?

Eden: Exactly.

CP: I see, yeah. But there was something particularly memorable for me, which was when you had that thing that happened, and obviously we don't' fully know what happened, but yeah it all kicked off, basically, didn't it?

Eden: Yeah.

CP: But then you came in and you were just like, 'Right. I'm gonna work." And you were just so in the zone. It was, it was almost like you were saying to the teacher, you were just in with us.

Eden: It put me in such an awkward place because drama means loads to me, but PE also means loads to me as well.

CP: Right, right.

Eden: Because when I'm older it's either a PE teacher, or a drama teacher.

CP: Right. Aw, right?

Eden: I'm still debating whether which one yet. So, it put me in such an awkward place, but when I'm in drama I seem to concentrate way more than any other subject because it's like a way of letting things out and just concentrating on drama // It's in the way you sort of playing a different character, so it's like you're not playing yourself, so it's nice to just act as something else sort of thing, just for a bit, just to then like, get out of your mind zone and not think about how you're feeling.

CP: Totally know what you mean. Yeah. That's why—yeah. Always. Yeah. Escapism isn't it?

Eden: Exactly, yeah.

CP: But it isn't as well, because you're kind of, completely, it's when you feel most alive, I think, when you're acting.

Eden: Yeah, because you're still constantly thinking you're still—

CP: You're just on it.

Eden: You're on the ball, sort of thing, yeah.

CP: That's really exciting: PE teacher or Drama. I think you'd be really good.

Eden: Thank you.

CP: So, what was it like then—we've talked a little bit about those moments—what was it like performing as Pat in the—you've talked about Rosalind—what was it like performing as your friend Pat?

Eden: Well he obviously, because obviously he's like one of my best, one of my closest, closest mates, it was…in a way it was really, really hard because you've also—you've got to worry about his aspects of it and stuff, but then all of a sudden it was like really, really nice because although obviously you wouldn't want to be part of that bus crash, it was nice to then say I sort of know—even though it was in a drama piece—I know how you feel and stuff. But yeah, I did find it really difficult because obviously there is only so far

you can go, and I didn't want to like…I kept on asking him after every lesson, just like before—

CP: Is it alright?

Eden: 'Is it alright?' and 'How am I playing this?' sort of stuff. Um, but he was totally fine, and I thought he like was really good with it all, sort of thing, to even bring that story in the first place, but then how we acted it and stuff it was a really good piece, as well as making sure that he wasn't upset about it.

CP: That he was okay. And that was, you know that was really impressive to me, was the way everybody was going, is this? You were all kind of looking out for each other.

Eden: Yeah.

CP: And that was something like, if we'd have tried to force that on you, like, 'Make sure you're looking out for each other.' It wouldn't have worked.

Eden: No, it wouldn't have worked as well.

CP: It was a genuine caring.

Eden: Caring about each other.

CP: Yeah, it was lovely, really lovely to see. So, was there anything that you found particularly challenging about the project that you think we could do differently? Was there anything that if we were to do it again?

Eden: If anything, I would say, which at the time I thought was quite challenging, but then it turned out to not, I thought the fact how we started on the Wednesday and then we were all so worried not having lines, not having the play by Friday. But then now I look at it in contrast, I think that actually worked better.

CP: Yeah.

Eden: Because I think the pressure and the quickness of getting it done and having to—how concentrated everyone had to be; I think that actually made it work really, really well.

CP: Okay. It's a gamble, isn't it?

Eden: Yeah. Some people would have—

CP: You could have done it over weeks and then it's a bit flat.

Eden: A bit dull and boring because you've done it so many times.

CP: Yeah. But, yeah. I mean, that was—that was tense for us as well. (both laugh) But thankfully everyone was really on it.

Eden: Exactly, yeah.

CP: And that was that team work thing. And I think, to be honest, we couldn't have done it with a younger group. It's because you're in A level.

Eden: No, because they wouldn't have had the concentration sort of thing.

CP: Yeah. You needed to be your age, and just mature and it was great. So, tell me a little bit then, about—you know one of the things that we're looking at in this research project is about how can theatre change our perceptions of others. How can it make us see people differently? Would you say that that's in any way happened during the process and the performance?

Eden: I think so, because without being too stereotypical, when you've got me and Pat, you could class us as like lads, lads, lads, no emotions sort of thing, whereas when we've come to that play, I don't think I've ever asked him and he's ever asked me so many times "Are you alright? Are you alright?" like so many constantly times so the fact that we've started to like proper, proper look out for each other when it was just something as simple as just, you could just class it as just a play sort of thing, but actually it meant so much to each other that you'd actually fully cared about each other so I think theatre has brought a different side of a friendship sort of thing.

CP: That's really interesting. So, even someone you know really well? You might not have *that* same—

Eden: You might not have that *caring* aspect, but we obviously know we know that we care about each other, but there wasn't like that verbal all the time ... like we don't come in every single day and go, "How are you today?" sort of thing.

CP: 'Are you alright?' (both laugh) Yeah, no that's fine.

Eden: Yeah but when we came to drama it was like after every lesson or just before the lesson it was like let me know if anything happens or if anything goes wrong sort of thing.

CP: That's really sweet. That's really nice. Well, I just want to say, on record, that I've just loved working with you, loved seeing that.

Eden: It's been really, really good. I've enjoyed it.

CP: Good, I'm really glad. And I look forward to seeing your work next year.

Eden: Definitely.

CP: Thank you.