Writing, identity, and change: a narrative case study of the use of journals to promote reflexivity within a Drama Studies curriculum.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS IN EDUCATION

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

ALEXANDRA SUTHERLAND

June 2005

Abstract

The study adopts a case study examination of three student reflective journals written about class and field based applied Drama experiences over one year. The journals were written as part of a curriculum outcome to develop reflective practice, for one Drama Honours paper (Educational Drama and Theatre) at Rhodes University Drama Department, South Africa. Based on a narrative inquiry approach, the study documents the changes in identity, discourse, and representation of self and other, which emerge through the journal writing process. The research analyses how identities are constructed through reflective writing practices, and how these identities might relate to the arguments for the development of reflexivity. The development of reflexivity is seen as integral to contemporary educational policies associated with lifelong learning, and the skills required of graduates in South Africa's emerging democracy. These policies centre on means of preparing students for a world characterised by change and instability, or what Barnett (2000) has termed a "supercomplex world". The research findings suggest that journal writing within a Drama Studies curriculum, allows students to construct subjectivities which support Barnett's claim that "the main pedagogical task in a university is not that of the transmission of knowledge but of promoting forms of human *being* appropriate to the conditions of supercomplexity" (Barnett, 2000b:164). In addition, the development of different writing genres within a Drama Studies curriculum allows students to develop disciplinarily relevant ways of discussing and researching artistic processes and products. A reflective journal is a potential site for students to interrogate and construct emerging identities which enable them to negotiate diversity, thus preparing them for their lives beyond the university.

Table of contents

Preface **2**
1. Introduction **3**
1.1. Locating narrative: linking drama, education, and research 4
2. Research Approach **8**
2.1. Locating ways of seeing 10
2.2. From 'methodolatry' to research strategies 15
2.3. Method and postmodern research design 16
2.4. The research question in relation to social setting 18
3. Story making and story listening: Introducing narrative and reflective practice **22**
3.1. The educational context of this study 22
3.2. An overview of the purpose and perceived benefits of reflective journals 25
3.3. The use of journals in the Honours EDT course 28
3.4. Situating reflective practice 30
3.5. Locating my educational philosophy: Curriculum and identity 33
Interlude **40**
4. The Master Narrative **45**
4.1. 'Reflective practice', reflection and reflexivity 46
4.2. The meta-narrative of global change and how it relates to higher education 48
4.3. Barnett and a world of 'radical unknowability' 51
4.4. What is lifelong learning? 54
5. Constructing the narrative anthropologist **59**
5.1. The application of narrative analysis in this study 60
i) From chaos to coherence 65
ii) Developing a reflexive voice 65
iii) Narrativization of events: Plot, style and roles 67
5.2. The Protagonists: an introduction to the research participants 69
5.3. From Chaos to Coherence: Examining how students negotiate difference and instability through their journal writing 73
5.4. Developing a reflexive voice 81
5.4.1. Writer identity and authorial presence 84
5.4.2. Writer identity and the autobiographical self 87
5.4.3. Questioning of self and social context 92
6. "Becoming rather than being" **105**
7. Appendices **111**
APPENDIX 1: Reflective journal questionnaire 111
APPENDIX 2: Consent form 112
APPENDIX 3: Honours EDT course outline 113
APPENDIX 4: Honours journal criteria hand-out 116
8. References **117**

Preface

Thank you to my supervisor, Lynn Quinn, for such a supportive, collaborative and encouraging working relationship.

This study is dedicated to Clara, Jojo, and Lorraine, for their trust, openness and honesty. And for teaching me so much.

And to Nick, who became my patient husband mid-way through this journey.

1. Introduction

> How individuals recount their histories – what they emphasise and omit, their stance as protagonists or victims, the relationship the story establishes between teller and audience – all shape what individuals can claim of their own lives. Personal stories are not merely a way of telling someone (or oneself) about one's life; they are the means by which identities may be fashioned (Rosenwald & Ochberg 1992:1).

This study will approach all texts as stories. It will locate research, education, and the participants in the study in terms of narrative. John Tulloch (1999) speaks of researchers as story-tellers, which in the postmodern tradition, implies that all research has a degree of fictionality and/or multiple truths. Kvale (2002) defines a type of 'affirmative' postmodernism in relation to qualitative research and postmodern conceptions of knowledge, which, "while rejecting the notion of a universal truth, it accepts the possibility of specific, local and community forms of truth, with a focus on daily life and *local narrative*" (Kvale 2002: 302, emphasis mine). The 'expert' researcher is unable to capture the truth or even a truth of experience and Ang (1996, cited in Tulloch 1999:1) argues that researchers need to be aware of, and confront their texts as narratives. This is particularly relevant within the context of the politics of representation and legitimation – how are people and events characterised and positioned? Which versions are perceived as more legitimate and why?

These questions are central to this study, which examines how a specific group of Drama Honours students narrate, through journal writing, their experiences of working with drama processes in local communities. The way students position themselves and others in the text and the context, informs my examination of how and under what circumstances, post-graduate students can develop a critically reflexive voice. I will argue that the use of journal writing in a post-graduate Drama curriculum, provides an alternative, more self-reflexive means of creative expression for Drama students to experiment with a range of voices and discursive genres. Reflective writing allows students to identify and negotiate their experiences of coping with the inherent instability of real world practice, which in turn develops abilities associated with lifelong learning.

Feminist research introduces the notion of theory as story, where "the personal is the grounding for theory" (Richardson 2000:927). My choice for this piece of research links to my own story. My interest in reflective practice as an enriching approach to learning is due to my own narrative history. The most recent experience concerns the writing about my own story of becoming a teacher in higher education when I put together a portfolio of my teaching philosophy, as part of the course work submission for this Masters degree. I experienced this process as theory producing, learning inducing, and self-affirming. This story is linked to my past educational history of writing a journal while doing my post-graduate studies in Drama over ten years ago, and my experience of reflective writing as integral to developing an approach to education as *praxis*: a conversation between theory and practice. I will be using the ideas of the narrative inquiry movement, which is also aligned with the notion of *praxis*, in that the binary of theory and practice is diffused. Narrative inquiry is characterised by temporality, whereby each experience is understood as having a past, a present, and an implied future (Clandinin & Connelly 2000). Journal writing becomes a site for *praxis,* and in treating journals as narrative accounts of experience, Witherell & Noddings (1991) argue that narrative can be an epistemological tool that can open ways of knowing ourselves and other knowers. I will be arguing that the journal writing process opens possibilities for negotiating uncertainty, difference, self and other. In a world characterised by instability, or to use Barnett's (2000a) words, a world that is "radically unknowable", a journal becomes a site for the construction of identities which can effectively prepare graduates as lifelong learners.

To provide a context to this study, I wish to start by outlining my approach to narrative in relation to research. This serves to also introduce the paradigmatic approaches I am drawing from.

1.1. Locating narrative: linking drama, education, and research

An approach to practice and research as narrative, requires alternative research methodologies and paradigms. These alternatives should challenge traditional research

practices, which Bruner (1996) describes as dominated by logico-scientific discourse and genre. Narrative form and inquiry challenge the linear sequence that dominates traditional research practices, the structure of which move towards closure and certainty (Bleakley 2000). Postmodern research approaches are based on a science of *mistrust*, in which doubt and suspicion inform an approach to any research method, and no method is therefore privileged (Richardson 2000). Richardson further (2000:928) asserts that this allows writers to embrace the subjectivity of the "situated speaker" whose personal experience of knowing and telling about the world is valuable. Such a stance implies that the journal writing encouraged by students through course work, and the personal narration of self and situation, can and should be considered valid research enterprises. For Richardson (2000), writing is a method of inquiry. Richardson (2002: 40) argues that

> framing academic essays in writing stories displace[s] the boundaries between the genres of selected writings and autobiography, repositioning them as convergent genres that, when intertwined, create new ways of reading/writing.

While this thesis is not strictly a writing story as Richardson might define it, it does seek to place my story and thus myself as a researcher, a writer, and a person, into the 'academic' text. A journal too, can manifest as "convergent genres" as it draws from narrative and theoretical genres as part of the reflective process.

Many of the research methods I will be discussing are drawn from, or influenced by the qualitative inquiry movement. "The interpretive and critical paradigms, in their several forms, are central to this movement, encompassing complex epistemological and ethical criticisms of traditional social science research" (Denzin & Lincoln 2002:xi). It is an inter-disciplinary, multi-paradigmatic research (*ibid).* Berry (2000) argues that critical theory is an important orientation for arts education, as it critiques dominant empiricist and rational paradigms that devalue the emotional-expressive arena and cultural contexts within education. I am particularly drawn to narrative as an approach and a methodology. If my research writing, and identity as a researcher can be constructed as a story teller, the methods I use to analyse and theorise about my research can be framed around narrative structures too. A narrative approach seems an appropriate metaphor and framework to link drama, education and research. Drama and theatre

are located and embedded in the world of fiction, and the applied theatre processes which I teach, use the world of narrative and fiction to structure a safe "as if" or "what if" space within which we can rehearse and play out alternative identities.

> Drama tells stories. In its creation, there is a process of storying; engaging in drama, we engage in an exploration and inquiry into people's lives. Narrative complexity is developed by creating distance from a story through a reading back (Linds 1999:276).

The process of role creation through improvisation and rehearsal procedures links the dramatic arts to the ideas of social constructionism (explored in more detail in sections 2 & 3.5). Social constructionism is a postmodernist inspired movement aligned to narrative approaches, in which language (talking and writing) becomes the process by which individuals, in relation to others, continuously create themselves (Crossley 2000). The drama process too, is about exploring, through the safety of fiction, who we can become, how our identity can continuously be created.

As in the drama/theatre process, writing and research require a sensitivity to the 'audience' – the people who will interact with what is presented, and the researcher, like the director, mediates the nature of that interaction. Drama allows us to understand our reality through fiction. Narrative provides a framework and metaphor through which fiction and reality can be mediated.

It is within this context that this research has evolved – to examine how students, and myself, story our/their lives, through the reflective journal process.

I have chosen not to structure this thesis in a particularly conventional way. The various sections do not all address specific headings, such as 'research methodology', or 'literature review'. This is because I found it counter-intuitive within the narrative, and postmodernist approach I have identified, to reduce such components into isolated and bounded chapters. I have therefore chosen to adopt a non-linear, integrated structure, which makes explicit my research approach, conceptual argument, paradigmatic influences, as well as incorporating relevant literature.

The next section examines the approach to research I have chosen, which also introduces how my story influences my choice of research design, and the paradigmatic lens that informs how the research texts are read and re-storyed as part of the research write-up.

2. Research Approach

Case studies have been identified as relevant for drama education research design, as well as a central aspect of critical research, as they can approach 'subjects' as participants and potential experts, as opposed to objects of study (Caroll 1996). "The case study is useful when, as is usual in drama, the researcher is interested in, and deeply involved in, the structures, processes and outcomes of a product" (Caroll 1996:77). My relationship to the research process is explored in more detail below. Stake (2003:136) identifies some of the characteristics of a case study, the basis of which is that it is a "specific, unique bounded system". Merriam (1999:19, cited in Henning 2004:41) notes that

> A case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved...[and are] distinguished from other types of qualitative research in that they are intensive descriptions and analyses of a single unit or bounded system such as an individual, a program, event, group, intervention or community.

Henning (2004:40) insists that a researcher should be able to answer the question '*this study is a case of what*?' For the purposes of this thesis, this study is a case of the effect of the use of journal writing to develop reflexivity in one Drama Honours course at a South African university.

In order to study the case, I have selected the following data to analyse:

- Three Honours student journals, written over the 2003 academic year. These journals were written as part of the course work for the Honours Educational Drama and Theatre module (EDT), and were aimed at developing a critically reflective practice. Students were required to write about their experiences of practicing EDT in class as well as 'real world' contexts, throughout the year. More detail regarding the context of this course and the students involved follows in sections 2.4 & 3.1.
- Questionnaire (see Appendix 1), based on Langer's (2002) suggested questions, in which the same three students, as well as students from the 2002 Honours year (two responded), provide views on their journey through being required to write a journal, and the effect that this process might have had then and now.

I have selected the Honours students from 2003 to focus on, as it will allow me and them to gauge, with the benefit of distance from their identity as a Rhodes University student, how and if the journal process contributed to developing identities associated with lifelong learning (all of these students are currently working professionally). As I have argued, these identities may equip these graduates with the subjectivities required to act in an unstable world characterised by change. This is based on Barnett's (2000a) argument that "the main pedagogical task in a university is not that of the transmission of knowledge but of promoting forms of human *being* appropriate to the conditions of supercomplexity" (Barnett 2000a:164).

Although this sample is small within the context of social science research, the aim of the study is to examine in detail and depth, journal writing over one academic year. This will allow me to generate a particular, focused case study, of one group of students, taking one course, at one point in time. In addition, the nature of a half-thesis requires a high level of selection and focus.

Taylor (1996:43) argues that if reflective practitioner researchers authentically commit to multiplicity, "means need to be found where all those involved in the investigative process have a voice". I have therefore included written questionnaires in which participants are again reflective, as they think back on the journal writing process. The research design also involves the three students feeding back on my analysis of their journal writing. This 'meta reflection' involves them as co-researchers in conversation with their past voice and my researcher voice. All participants have given their signed consent regarding the use of their journals, and were able to withdraw as a participant at any stage. Please refer to Appendix 2 for a copy of the research consent form.

As a researcher, I need to reduce bias and subjectivity, and address the trustworthiness[1] of the data analysis. Richardson (2000) uses the metaphor of a crystal as a more appropriate image than 'triangulation' as a means of validating data in

[1] 'Trustworthiness' has replaced 'truth' in relation to validation in social science research, the latter being problematic as it assumes an objective reality (Riessman 1993).

qualitative research methods. It is argued that triangulation is a limited term when looking at the multiple and complex nature of human experience. "What we see depends on our angle of repose. Not triangulation, crystallization. In postmodernist mixed genre texts, we have moved from plane geometry to light theory, where light can be *both* waves *and* particles" (Richardson 2000:934, emphasis in the original). My research approach involves mixed genre texts (interviews, questionnaires, narrative journal writing), and the inclusion of the students' voices, both past and present, peer voices, my own voice and the theoretical lens through which I weave these genres, allow for a multitude of perspectives to enter into data collection and analysis

Mannion (2001) suggests a poststructuralist reading of journals, in which the journal author is seen as storyteller. I have already established narrative as an appropriate organising principle to link drama, research, education, and issues of identity within education. My reading of the journals is a reading of a narrative, in which theme, plot, characters, metaphor, action, setting and outcome form a structure which guides a reading of these texts. A poststructural orientation falls under a postmodernist research approach. In the following section I will explore research paradigms influencing qualitative research, and those informing this study.

2.1. Locating ways of seeing

> It [different paradigms] is a bit like looking out over the same terrain from different mountain tops (Holliday 2002:17).

Although this is a qualitative research design, within qualitative research there exist a range of orientations that inform the ontological and epistemological approach of the research design. Guba & Lincoln (1994:104) argue that the qualitative researcher "must understand the basic ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions of each, and be able to engage them in dialogue". Holliday (2002:18) provides a useful distinction between *naturalistic qualitative* approaches, aligned to the ideas of positivism, postpositivism and realism, and what he terms *progressive qualitative* approaches. These approaches exist on a continuum, with the naturalistic orientations representing the more 'traditional' empirical approaches on one end, and the

progressive orientations (including critical, postmdodern, constructivist[2], and feminist approaches), which he has grouped together to be positioned at the opposite end of the continuum. The ideas of poststructuralism and social constructionism which I have introduced as influential lenses through which I am reading this piece of research, would fall under a progressive qualitative research. Holliday summarises the difference of the approaches at each end of the continuum as follows: "So whereas naturalists believe that meaningful social worlds can be discovered by 'being there', progressivists argue that there is no 'there' until it has been constructed" (Holliday 2002:21). Science treats knowledge as a mirror of reality, whereas postmoderism treats knowledge as a social construction (Kvale 2002).

Riessman (1993) reiterates that in qualitative research, the researcher's epistemological position, values, and often their own biography, influence how research is reported and interpreted. I have established a particular lens in relation to the research, which falls between a critical and postmodernist orientation.[3] I have discussed in section 1 the story of how I have come to value reflexivity, and reflective writing through journals, as an intimate part of my own educational narrative. One of the values that drives me as a teacher and practitioner, involves pushing myself and my students to take risks in our practice – to embody landscapes that we may feel threatened by. In particular, this involves encouraging students, and myself to practice drama with communities we might perceive as particularly challenging, due to vast social, language, and cultural differences. The three students focussed on in this study, took that leap, and emerged changed people, just as I have done. I will be discussing in more detail the ideas of Chapell, Rhodes, Solomon, Tennant & Yates (2003) whose work examines the link between pedagogy, identity and change. One of the key questions they ask is "What political and ethical issues emerge from using pedagogy to change identity?" (Chapell *et*

---

[2]Schwandt (1994) places social constructionism as a sub-category of constructivism. Whereas constructivists focus "on the matter of individual minds and cognitive processes, they [social constructionists] turn their attention outward to the world of inter-subjectively shared, social constructions of meaning and knowledge" (p.127).

[3] Henning (2004:40) draws on Holliday's (2001) use of the term *progressive paradigms* to name more effectively the many methodologies under postmodernist research. I am slightly uncomfortable with the term progressive, which perhaps has a more radical interpretation in the United States, than I associate it within my own context. I prefer to name the particular 'isms' I am dealing with, all of which might be called 'progressive'.

al 2003:10). This question is essential for reflecting on how and why I do what I do. I will be referring to the political and ethical implications of my curriculum, research design, and this study throughout my discussion.

I believe that when students write about their experiences in a real world context, they are documenting and processing an understanding about who they are becoming in relation to a context which is wider than their immediate identity as a student. These values also inform the orientation I am using, which informs the research design.

Caroll (1996:73) draws a parallel between drama education and a critically (or what Holliday (2002) would call a progressive) oriented research model, in that both deal with interpersonal relationships, role, power, and context. The way poststructuralism and social constructionism approach issues of text, pedagogy and identity resonates with not only a narrative reading of the world, but also with the improvisatory, polyvocal nature of educational drama praxis. I, as an educational drama practitioner and teacher, in turn identify with this approach and the values and subjectivities they promote. As Denzin & Lincoln (2002: xiii) observe, "there seems to be an emerging consensus that all inquiry reflects the standpoint of the inquirer, that all observation is theory-laden, and that there is no possibility of theory-free knowledge".

Riessman (1993:61) proposes questions regarding the relationship between authorship and interpretation which have significant value in guiding how one frames and writes a piece of research into being:

- Whose voice is represented in the final product?
- How open is the text to other readings?
- How are we situated in the personal narratives we collect and analyse?

Much of this study concerns the relationship between voice and identity. As a person writing a Masters thesis, my writing identity, and by extension my voice, is socially defined rather than controlled by me (Chapell *et al.* 2003). My identity as a researcher in this text, affords me a privileged status as a 'someone who knows' (*ibid*), and the nature of a Masters thesis in many respects demands that it is my voice that must

represent the final product. I am for example, obliged to declare the originality of my work, and the thesis is the means by which I can be judged to have 'mastered' a subject area. Clandinin & Connelly (2000:147) discuss the dilemma of voice in research:

> One of the researcher's dilemmas in the composing of research texts is captured by the analogy of living on the edge, trying to maintain one's balance, as one struggles to express one's own voice in the midst of an inquiry designed to tell of the participant's storied experiences and to represent their voices, all the while attempting to create a research text that will speak to, and reflect upon, the audience's voices.

My first audience for this piece of research, are the examiners, and my knowledge of what is expected from a Masters thesis mediates what and how I write.

As part of the research process, I have included the voices of the research participants in a number of guises, the most pertinent of which relates to the second of Riessman's (1993) points. The participants were asked to feedback on a draft of section 5, where I discussed my analysis of their journals. Two offered alternative interpretations to some of my points, which I have included in the final discussion of the data. In addition the full journal texts are available, should future readers request them.

The last point regarding my situatedness, has particular relevance for the research design. I am literally situated in the research text in my hand-written comments and feedback to students journals, as well as fulfilling multiple roles within the research frame, all of which, I now realise, are particularly loaded in my favour in terms of power over meaning and message. As a course supervisor, I am actively shaping the way students see their experiences through my questions feeding back to their writing and the way the curriculum and assessment is structured; as a researcher, I am deciding what has significance, and due to the constraints of a 'half thesis', having to make choices as to what to highlight, and what to relinquish to the background, or to make invisible; as a practitioner who is trying to develop a critically reflexive stance in myself, and in the students I teach, I challenge those I interact with either as a teacher or as an educational theatre practitioner, to read the world in a certain way. However, a progressive qualitative research model does not see the fact that the researcher is

embedded in the research 'site' as problematic. For some theorists all we can study is our own experience.

Postmodernist research approaches recognise that a researcher can only ever provide a partial, situated reading of any situation, and researchers are always, in some way, part of their research settings (Denzin & Lincoln 2002). What is required, is a vigilance and reflexivity from the researcher, in terms of how she is situated, why choices are made, and how these influence meaning and interpretation. The ideas of poststructuralism deliberately privilege these situated knowledges in which our partiality – who we are and where we stand – are valid means of research (Gough 1998). The requirement of my students to reflect on their practice through journals is also a validation and acknowledgement of their own situated knowledge.

Transparency about how conclusions and interpretations are made from the data, is essential. Carr and Kemmis (1986:156) argue for a critical educational science, in which educational change can only occur if it is *participatory* and *collaborative.* These authors link such an approach to the process of conscientization as proposed by Paulo Freire, in which a critical educational science "aims at involving teachers, students....in the tasks of critical analysis of their own situations with a view to transforming them in ways which will improve these situations as *educational* situations for students, teachers and society" (Carr and Kemmis 1986:157). This study involves me as researcher and teacher, investigating if one of my teaching practices can encourage the development of reflexivity in students, which will enable them to act in and on the world in new ways. This requires myself and the students in the study, to become critically reflective participants of our own practices and narratives. The research process involves another cycle of action, reflection, and transformation.

2.2. From 'methodolatry' to research strategies

When I started this research story, I found myself feeling constricted and inadequate in the face of the need for *a* method. I read books on research in education, all of which had *that* word: social *science*. I don't feel comfortable in a scientist's skin. I was perhaps feeling uneasy about what Janesick (2003:64) calls *methodolatry* "a combination of *method* and *idolatry*, to describe a preoccupation with selecting and defending methods to the exclusion of the actual substance of the story being told". This is where my own biography starts to impact on the research. I started my University studies intending to become a psychologist. When I eventually 'made it' to Honours (having been told repeatedly throughout undergraduate studies that it was near impossible to be accepted as a post-graduate psychology student) I discovered a discipline which claimed to study human behaviour, yet adopted scientific methods to do this: human behaviour became objectified, standardised, quantifiable and predicted. And if one was in it (as I was) to make a difference, and change situations for the better, the methods used to do this seemed to involve a person by person model of change. Certain branches of psychology certainly critique an individualistic, decontextualised and pseudo-scientific approach, but the dominant paradigm that informs training and research in post-graduate psychology, then, and now, is a scientific one. I am inspired by the performative psychology movement, a radical counter-paradigm to mainstream psychology (and research practices) which questions the belief that the individual is the unit of human psychological life and that prediction of human behaviour is both possible and desirable (Holzman 2004). This movement is located within social constructionism and promotes a collaborative, community centred approach to psychology, calling for "psychologies of *possibility* not prediction ... Psychologies created not by a few experts, but *re-created* in many places and many times over with the participation of ordinary people" (East Side Institute 2004: 4). A collaborative, relational, and evolving approach to knowing and being resonates strongly with a drama praxis which is inherently dialogical and unstable in nature. "Since the play of drama never ends, the search for pure and final expression never occurs" (Berry 2000: 81). In confronting my fear and the

implications of 'methodology', I needed to find an approach to research design which embraces some of these philosophies.

2.3. Method and postmodern research design

Berry (2000) assumes a cultural studies[4] approach to the dramatic arts, arguing that methodology serves to obscure rather than reveal:

> In modern society, methodology has become an intellectual and cultural commodity that supposedly sheds light on our world but, in fact, only serves to eliminate a larger cultural context. Dramatic arts informed by a cultural studies position cannot risk an empirical perspective. What is given authority in cultural studies is *purpose and context*, not method (Berry 2000: 48 emphasis mine).

However, one does need to find a way/s of making meaning from data – and the way one frames and links purpose and context, it could be argued, becomes a kind of method. What Berry (2000) is arguing, is more to do with a rigid right/wrong way of approaching research often associated with clearly defined methods for achieving objectivity and truth in scientific paradigms. Perhaps the kind of methodologies she sees as ideologically problematic, are the ones that claim that "any method of theory has a universal and general claim to authoritative knowledge" (Richardson 1991 cited in Denzin & Lincoln 2002: xi). This is what I, like Berry, feel uncomfortable with. Methodology as a term is so closely associated with scientific rigour and its implications of objective, depersonalised and decontextualised ways of looking at the world. It feels like a strait jacket. Yet, as Denzin & Lincoln's (2002, 2003) work around the qualitative inquiry movement shows, a new wave of research methods allow for approaches that not only value subjectivity as an integral part of the research process, but allow for movement, across methods, time, and context, in the most creative of ways. These authors isolate seven research 'moments', none of which are caught in a particular time, but also operate in the present. These range from traditional, through modernist and postmodern, to now, the "future moment" (p. xi):

---

[4] *Cultural studies* is an umbrella term encompassing approaches such as poststructualism, postmodernism, deconstructionism and postcritical theories (Berry 2000:35).

> The present moment is defined by messy, experimental and multi-layered texts, cultural criticism, new approaches to the research text, new understandings of old analytic methods, and evolving research strategies (Denzin & Lincoln 2002:xi).

Method in this approach is not a rigid, bounded, restricted way of treating research. Janesick (2003) compares the art of choreography to qualitative research design, in that to do both well, one must refuse to be limited to one approach. To use another metaphor, it is not the finished building which the data must then inhabit. Instead, method becomes the organising principle, or scaffolding, on which one can build, take down, reconstruct, create new passages, stairways, and inter-leading doors. Janesick (2003:47) also draws on improvisation as a guiding principle, which has both "structure and form yet is totally free". In many ways, this "structured spontaneity" (Taylor 1996:31) is the guiding form of educational drama processes too – whereby the actor-teacher structures the basic outline of the drama, which the performer-audience then improvises within, making moment to moment decisions about where the dramatic action will go.

Holliday (2002) insists therefore, that a researcher should not begin by choosing a method. "Methods can be sufficiently flexible to grow naturally from a research question, and in turn from the nature of the social setting in which the research is carried out" (Holliday 2002:21). This view can be linked back to Berry's (2002:48) assertion that purpose and context have primacy in critical and postmodern orientations. At this stage, it would be useful to elaborate on the purpose and context of this research, and how this informs methodological approaches.

2.4. The research question in relation to social setting

Purpose: The research question

In what ways can journal writing in a drama curriculum, contribute to the reflexive abilities and identities required of graduates to effectively participate in a "super complex" [5]world?

Purpose also has to do with the audience of the research – who is the research for? For whom is the knowledge intended? As will be outlined in the final section of this thesis, the research has an impact on my own future practice, as well as the participants in the study who discovered new learning and insights through the re-visiting of their journals and the journal writing process. It is also intended for future students and teachers, to understand the reasons for and effects of writing a journal in an educational programme. The research also intends to provide an alternative perspective to the use of journals within a higher education curriculum, and a drama curriculum in particular. The literature on the use of journals in higher education tends to assume a fairly functional stance, and a lack of depth and detail into the changes and shifts that occur for journal writers, over an extended period of time.

Context: Social setting

If one assumes a poststructural orientation, the power relations inherent in the context of the research are significant, particularly in terms of how they are mediated by discourse. I have already alluded to my recognition of the power relations inherent in my position/s within the cast of characters which make up the research design. It is also significant, that all of the participants (myself, the three students whose journals I analyse, and the four students who responded to the questionnaires) are all white, English speaking females, who have at least an Honours degree in Drama studies at a South African university. Students who take Drama at Rhodes to a post-graduate level, are overwhelmingly white. In the current economic climate, Drama studies is often

[5] A term coined by Barnett (2000a&b), discussed and contextualised in section 4.3.

viewed as recreational rather than vocational, and those students who continue with Drama to a post-graduate level, are usually situated in contexts where their economic backgrounds afford them a range of choice and agency with respect to post-university possibilities. Alternatively, passion for the discipline has overwhelmed 'practical' arguments for more 'prosperous' career possibilities. Rhodes University as an institution, is also lagging in terms of attracting students representative of South Africa's demographics, and in Drama, females out-number males by about three to one. The EDT course tends to attract primarily female students – in the five years I have been running this course from third year to masters, I have only had two male students electing to take it as a speciality. This is probably due to the less public, performance based nature of this type of drama, and its association with teaching, still viewed by many as a 'female' nurturing type skill. Structurally too, EDT uses collaborative strategies and the authority of the educator is deconstructed through various improvisatory and role based techniques. Hierarchical and traditional rights to authority are challenged in this medium. I also wonder about the extent to which I implicitly favour female collaborations – that I feel more comfortable as a teacher working with other women, that perhaps I can better identify with their agendas for wanting to do this type of work.

The other 'participants' in this study, are those that are talked about by the students- the groups that students chose to work with, using educational drama processes for developmental purposes. All of these participants are based in Grahamstown's under-resourced township community, most are black and speak Xhosa as a first language. The specifics of each group will be discussed in more detail further. What is significant about the social context of the people in the study, are the issues of race, language, class and culture, which distinguishes the students and myself, and the communities with which we work. This fragile landscape is based on a fundamental difference in terms of how those identified with the university (either as students or lecturers), and those who come from and live in Rhini township, experience living in the world. Themes of centre and margin, us and 'other' are very prevalent in Grahamstown, even in the way the town is laid out. The university, as a locus of privilege, power, and colonial values, dominates the geographical and political landscape of the town. This setting is

an important part of how students negotiate their way through difference, and how they narrate their experience in this context. This context is discussed further in section 3.1.

These students are students of Drama Studies – and are accustomed in this discipline to performing texts, rather than writing them down. Within a Drama studies curriculum, students are guided through various means of expression, yet this is achieved primarily through various performance modes. When students engage with drama academically, the notion of writing oneself into the academic text is excluded in line with an inherited academic culture that often requires the exclusion of the "I" voice in academic discourse. Writing a journal requires the evocation of different kinds of voices within the higher education context. In addition, effective reflection on practice is viewed as better achieved through writing rather than speaking as "it is not limited by the spontaneity and immediacy of expression and then presents both a more complex option for exploration of ideas and feelings " (Bleakley 2000:13). However, in a postmodernist and poststructuralist sense "we need to restore the primacy of writing over the primacy of speech" (Bleakley 2000:19), in order to challenge a view of language as transparent and explanatory. The indeterminacy of language needs interrogation, particularly written language, as according to Derrida, it has greater indeterminacy than speech (*ibid*). For Derrida "speaking could be just as much said to be a second-hand form of writing as writing is said to be an inferior form of speaking" (Sarup 1998:37).

The purpose and context of the research, then informs how the researcher makes meaning from the data. I have already suggested a poststructural reading of the journal texts. Poststructuralism treats language as discourse in which the texts that are produced are always "partial, local and situational" (Richardson 2000:930). "[N]arrative theory suggests that we can think of all discourse as taking the form of a story and poststructuralist theorising invites us to think of all discourse as taking the form of a text" (Gough 1998: 118). From a methodological point of view, narrative analysis takes the story as its object of investigation (Riessman 1993). Discourse refers to how language constructs and is constructed by the world – language mediates power, position, and context. Meaning is therefore never fixed, as texts are relative and relational. "Fixed meanings mean fixed worlds, worlds that exclude, privilege, and marginalise, and that

silence truths, knowledge, histories, and other elements of power" (Berry 2000: 84). Both reader and writer bring their own discourses, or life texts, to the text, which influence how the text is read and indeed, created. When viewing journals from this perspective, Mannion (2001: 104) maintains that "learners' journals do not act as 'windows' upon a reality. There is no intrinsic meaning waiting to be discovered that is unmediated by somebody's discourse".

Riessman (1993:5) notes that a narrative approach is appropriate when examining identity change and formation. "Because the approach gives prominence to human agency and imagination, it is well suited to studies of subjectivity and identity". Clandinin & Connelly (2000:19) argue that narrative inquiry is appropriate for educational research because "Experience happens narratively. Narrative inquiry is a form of experience. Therefore educational experience should be studied narratively". I will explore more precisely how I approached a narrative analysis of the journals, in section 5, where the relationship between the way I went about the analysis and the interpretations that arose, can more effectively be observed.

The next section, will deal more specifically with what constitutes reflective practice, and how this relates to my curriculum and educational philosophy. Following the view that all educational programmes promote (and suppress) certain subjectivities, the relationship between education, curriculum, and how the 'self' is conceived, will also be explored.

3. Story making and story listening: Introducing narrative and reflective practice

Volbrecht (2001) aligns Donald Schön's seminal work on reflective practice with narrative inquiry, quoting the following extract to illustrate this relationship:

> When (the practitioner) demonstrates what he [*sic*] takes as a story sufficient for interpretation, when he focuses on certain details while leaving others in the background, he appears to be guided by a repertoire of story types, interpretive explanations, and psychodynamic patterns (Schön 1983 cited in Volbrecht 2001:68).

Schön's views link reflective practice and narrative. When we reflect on our practice, we construct a personal story about our experience and choose how it is told, what to fore-ground, and what to leave out. Reflective practice is also intimately connected to theories regarding experiential learning[6]. Usher (1993) assumes a poststructuralist stance, connecting theories about learning from experience to storying:

> ...learning from experience is a kind of 'writing' that creates a world, a fictional text, in which we are the central character in the story. A text is woven, creating the self as a character in its own story, from the 'raw material' of our experience, our being-in-the-world. In effect, learning from experience is a process where we textually create and recreate ourselves but without being confined to one textual strategy (Usher 1993:175).

Educational drama theorist Philip Taylor (2000) also draws on Schön and advocates the development of a reflective practice for all drama educators, as " to be an arts educator is to be a reflective practitioner. Both give birth to ideas: both search for a medium to express and honour their vision" (Taylor 2000: 85). I will briefly turn to how reflective practice relates to drama, by exploring the contextual factors that inform this study.

3.1. The educational context of this study

This study involves the use of reflective journals[7] with postgraduate students of Educational Drama and Theatre (EDT), as a means of facilitating critically reflective

---

[6] Due to the constraints of a half thesis, I am unable to explore theories of experiential learning in any detail.

[7] The literature at times uses the term 'learning journal' to refer to the use of journals in education. I prefer the term reflective journals to specify the link to reflective practice.

practice. The EDT course is not about how to teach drama, but how drama can be used as an educational and developmental medium. I myself am a drama educationalist, guiding students how to use drama as a pedagogical and developmental tool. This course challenges perceptions regarding the locus of meaning in theatre, and the role of performer and audience, by applying the theatre arts outside of designated theatre spaces. Fundamental to this approach is that 'audiences' become participants, co-creating the dramatic action as it occurs. This drama form concentrates on the power of newly defined audiences who participate in the theatre process and contribute to meaning making in the moment. This is a radical shift from the role played by most theatre audiences who usually passively receive an end product. In some ways, the underlying principles of the many kinds of practices that fall under the term EDT are also examples of reflective practice. The medium harnesses the ideas of Schön's *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action* (explored in more detail in section 3.4). Participants are required to make decisions in the moment which will influence the course of the dramatic fiction. There is always a reflection phase, either during or after the experience (or both), whereby participants examine the choices made and deconstruct what happened, how it felt, and why.

For the drama student, assumptions about what constitutes theatre, theatre space, audience, and performer are unsettled and revisioned through this approach. One of the most common responses from second year students introduced to this aspect of drama is the fear and excitement that for the first time, drama is "not about me". I believe this course needs to develop practitioners who can interrogate who they are and how they relate to their audience, who are also participants in creating dramatic meaning and action. I have therefore introduced reflective journals in the Honours course, as a key means of developing reflexivity, and the notion of an EDT *praxis*. Ideally, I would like to introduce journals at a third year level too. However, the current curriculum structure excludes this possibility as EDT may only be taken as a practical option.

The Honours EDT course is one paper that students may elect to take, out of a range of approximately eight possible choices. Rhodes Drama department places a particular

emphasis on performance, and physical performance in particular, and has developed a reputation nationally for producing graduates skilled in dance and physical theatre. The process based, community focused nature of the EDT course does not fit neatly into the overall product based nature of the department. The course at an Honours level is half theoretically and half practically based. Most students who elect to take this paper at an Honours level have done it at a third year level, although the EDT option at third year is entirely practically based. At an Honours level, students are required to attend seminars on a weekly basis, which are conducted either by the course supervisor, or themselves. For the practical component of the course, the whole Honours class works together on a small project. From Term 2 students are expected to start to work independently, researching, setting up, and implementing their own EDT project with a group of their choice. More detail on the kinds of projects the students in this study were involved in will be outlined in section 5. Please also refer to the Honours course outline in Appendix 3.

EDT as a subject area has a danger of becoming very functional, judgmental and didactic in its practice. Part of my approach for its place in the department is to challenge commonly held notions that EDT is, as one post-graduate student articulated to me when I first arrived in the department in 2001, Drama that is "generally shoddy, contrived and embarrassing ... an easy course which spawned bad, didactic theatre". I have therefore shaped my teaching and learning of this subject area around my belief that the practice of EDT is as rigorous, and as much of an art form as anything else students may do in Drama. Although it is certainly not one of the most popular courses in the department, its reputation has shifted to be a viable option for students to consider. It is also the only course that consistently requires students to apply knowledge in a diverse range of contexts outside of the University.

Rhodes University is one of the smallest universities in South Africa and prides itself on offering a safe, intimate teaching and learning environment. The vast majority of academic staff are white, and the university administration mainly consists of white men. The same is true for senior academics such as Heads of Department and Deans. The student body in 2003 consisted of 51% white, 36% black (25% of whom are were from

outside South Africa), and 13% coloured and asian students (Rhodes University Vice-Chancellors Annual Review 2005). Grahamstown is a colonial style settler town, with an estimated population of 102 000 people, of whom 90 000 live in Grahamstown's township. The town is dominated by Rhodes, one of Grahamstown's major employers. Like many South African spaces, there is a vast divide in income and resources between those who reside in the township, and those residents who live in the colonial style side of town. Rhodes's engagement with the surrounding communities is mostly uncoordinated, and differs greatly from department to department. As you will see from the examples of practice in this study, I encourage students to engage with a diversity of communities in their exploration of practice in real world contexts. It is therefore critical that they become reflexive about how they interact with those contexts. I will provide more detail on the kinds of projects and the communities we engage with in section 5.

I use reflective journals as one way of synthesising learning from experience, and developing a reflexivity which will facilitate how students negotiate the unknowable instability of applying knowledge in real world situations. I will now turn to a brief literature overview of the claimed purposes and benefits of using reflective journals in higher education.

3.2. An overview of the purpose and perceived benefits of reflective journals

O'Rourke (1998) has identified a number of possible educational benefits associated with 'learning journals'. These include students developing confidence in cognitive ability, writing ability, encouraging critical reflection and a move from surface to deep learning, as well as providing insights into a students' own learning style (O'Rourke 1998: 401-404). Many of these points relate to South Africa's National Qualifications Framework (NQF) level descriptors required of graduates as lifelong learners, such as developing abilities to take responsibility for learning, and evaluating the quality of learning (Council on Higher Education 2001). Moon (1999:19) notes that the ability to reflect, and writing journals, have separately been associated with the process of metacognition, which she defines as "the process of overviewing one's own mental functioning" an ability one hopes that graduates would acquire by the end of their

studies. Research into what students identify as particular about learning in higher education includes the notion that learning can be seen as transformational – "the key to changing and developing as a person" (Toohey 1999:131). What this study will show, is that the journal becomes a site for documenting this transformation, and the relationship between the writing process and shaping of identity is indeed transformative. A study by Hettich (1990) reveals that undergraduate students "believe journal writing stimulates critical thinking, provides feedback about their learning and gives them an opportunity to express themselves" (Hettich 1990: 39). This is supported by the feedback from my questionnaire to past students. For one student "journal writing... is hugely beneficial for developing critical and reflexive writing...having to write everyday about thoughts, processes and analyses helps greatly with an educative writing style as well as improving critical and analytical thinking" (Questionnaire A 2005:1). All respondents to the questionnaire identified how the journal aided them in identifying their strengths and weaknesses, and facilitated a site for generating ways to improve practice and learn from experience. Moon (2000) provides a useful overview of the reasons and theorised effects of including reflective journals in educational contexts. The points below resonate with my reasons for using journals as a teaching and learning tool, and provide a useful base from which to inform my discussion and analysis of the uses of journal in a higher education drama course. Of the many possible uses, journals are often used in education

- To record experience
- To develop learning in ways that enhances other learning
- To deepen the quality of learning, in the form of critical thinking or developing a questioning attitude
- To enable the learner to understand their own learning process
- To facilitate learning from experience
- To increase active involvement in learning and personal ownership of learning
- To increase the ability to reflect and improve the quality of learning
- To enhance problem-solving skills
- To explore the self, personal constructs of meaning and understand one's view of the world

- As a means of slowing down learning, taking more thorough account of a situation or situations
- To enhance creativity by making better use of intuitive understanding
- To free-up writing and the representation of learning
- To provide an alternative 'voice' for those not good at expressing themselves

(Moon 2000: 189-193).

Mannion (2001) maintains that the potential of journal writing in higher education has not been effectively studied or conceptualised. This view is shared by Jarvis (2001), and Hiemstra (2001) who notes that the journal has been under-utilised practically as a teaching and learning tool. While my literature search has revealed several articles and books on journals as a teaching and learning tool (see Boud 2001, Dacre & Mackey 1999, Hettich 1990, Hiemstra 2001, Jarvis 2001, Mannion 2001, Morrison 1996, Langer 2002, Moon 1999 & 2000, O'Rourke 1998, Woodward 1998), the majority of these theorise about the benefits and effects of reflective writing as a teaching, learning and research tool and how to set up structures to support such writing within a curriculum. However, there seems to be a lack of in-depth analysis of what is occurring for students as they develop their reflective writing practice over a period of time. While it is generally assumed that the development of reflexivity is essential for graduates[8], and that a learning journal may be one way of developing this, there is a lack of investigation into what shifts, changes, and challenges to identity and skills might occur throughout the process of writing a journal as part of a higher education course.

I will argue in section 4 that the development of reflexivity in students in higher education is connected to the skills and identities required of 'lifelong learners'. It is argued that lifelong learning enables people to successfully negotiate uncertainty. Edwards, Ranson & Strain (2002) note that one of the gaps in the literature and research on lifelong learning, is that while lifelong learning has been developed through policy, very little research has been done into people's learning practices, or a theory of learning which can inform such policy. "Thus, there is a limited empirical base for the

[8] See for example Luckett's (2001) argument about the necessary development of this ability in the South African context, referred to in section 4.

development of lifelong learning policies, a lack of theory of learning and a limited emphasis on individual responses to change processes" (Edwards *et al.* 2002: 531). This is similar to the literature on the use of journals in learning programmes, which provide rationales for their use, rather than a complex understanding of the practice of integrating journal writing within a curriculum.

How, and under what circumstances, does reflexivity develop? How does writing about practice impact on learning and identity? What is the role of the reader/audience in the reflective writing process? These are some of the questions which inform the analysis of the three journal/ists under investigation.

3.3. The use of journals in the Honours EDT course

Students in the Honours EDT course are required to submit journals on a quarterly basis. At the beginning of the year, I provide an outline regarding what the purpose of the journal, is and suggested criteria (see Appendix 4 for an example). The literature on journals supports my experience of the fine line between imposing too much structure, and allowing room for students to develop their own response to journal writing, while doing so with rigour and depth. There is no set, or 'right' way to do a journal, and space needs to be made in a supportive way, for students to discover and create their own way of making the task the most educationally meaningful for them. O'Rourke (1998:404-405) notes that

> When learning journals are first introduced, tutors are often disappointed by the tentative use students make of them: Simply telling students to keep a journal does not work. They need to know why they are being asked to do something, and how to do it or else they draw on their common sense. And in common sense journals and diaries are records of events or places for private emotional splurges.

Most of my students have admitted to their initial reluctance, perceiving that it would be tedious, time consuming, and indulgent. However all respondents to a written questionnaire I conducted as part of this research, noted that on reflection, they found it to be a very useful learning tool (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the questionnaire):

> Every week, my journal writing became more and more useful and in the end it became a thing I really needed to do straight after my lessons! A finishing off of my process! I loved writing it as I could reflect and learn after every lesson, looking at it more objectively and in so doing be able to see other areas of going about things or of changing some aspects to make the action work better and more smoothly. My response to journal writing has changed so drastically that I could honestly say that when I am next in a workshop processes I will write journals of my own free will (Questionnaire A 2005:1).

As a means of supporting the journal process, I give written feedback after every submission (once per quarter), and suggest areas that students could explore in more detail, or alternative readings of the situation discussed.

The journals are not a formal part of the assessment of this course. Boud (2001) discusses the tension between assessment and reflection and the need for a distinction between writing for learning and writing for assessment purposes:

> The conventions of assessment demand that students display their best work for it to be judged. Students therefore are interested in portraying themselves in the best light possible. It is in their interest to demonstrate what they know and disguise what they do not know – an attitude that is quite the opposite for reflection. Reflection involves a focus on uncertainty, perplexing events and exploration without necessarily knowing where it will lead (Boud 2001:16).

Reflection and reflective practices should encompass risk taking and improvisatory activities (Bleakley 1999, 2000). However, students do need structures to support the development of their reflexive voice. Several studies show that students generally do not start out with the ability to write reflectively (Dacre & Mackey 1999, Jarvis 2001, O'Rourke 1998, Woodward 1998). Woodward (1998) maintains that "[r]eflection tends to remain private and actual reflection on action seldom becomes explicit unless specific processes are put in place for this to occur. It is by making these thoughts explicit that a greater depth of understanding takes place" (Woodward 1998:417). Student feedback attests to the powerful motivating factor of having to submit the journal to the course supervisor for feedback. The same questionnaire about the experience of writing a journal was sent to past students, two of whom responded. One student said "[w]riting the journal for a 'reader' helped me to be disciplined in writing my response" (Questionnaire D 2005:1). Another, reflects on how the course supervisor can encourage detail, depth, and the development of reflexivity:

> I also wrote a lot more than I think I would have, had there been no one else to read it. This was because I just couldn't write a statement (such as "What a terrible class!") without explanation. The course supervisor would inevitably ask 'Why?' and 'What could you have done better?' "Explaining" this to the reader also meant that I was explaining it to myself. Anticipating their response meant that I was learning and getting feedback even before I had handed it in (Questionnaire C 2005:3).

Although I have elected not to make the journal a part of formative or summative assessment, I do give an impression mark based on the suggested criteria. Studies overwhelmingly support the unfortunate fact that students are assessment driven, and progress and student identity is valued numerically (Ramsden 1992). To ensure that their journal insights have meaning in their learning, I always set an examination question for their final paper, which asks them to demonstrate their understanding of reflective practice by selecting an aspect of their experience in the course to analyse and reflect on. This model is supported by Morrison (1996) who suggests alternative ways for assessing reflective practice, such as setting an essay which uses journal writing as a research source.

But what exactly is reflective practice? I will briefly explore two dominant models of reflective practice in relation to what these mean for the teaching and learning in the EDT course.

3.4. Situating reflective practice

Morrison (1996) outlines two models of reflective practice which inform his study on the use of learning journals in higher education. The two types are 'ideal' models, in that they represent essential characteristics of the many versions of reflective practice that exist. The one Morrison conceives as "apolitical", based on the seminal work of Donald Schön's *The Reflective Practitioner* (1983). The second is a political model rooted in the ideas of the philosopher Habermas.

The first, and perhaps the most influential, is Schön's (1983) pioneering work on the defining characteristics of professional practice. Schön argues that these need to be accounted for in training programmes. He demonstrates that the capacity to reflect *in* action (while you are in the moment) and *on* action (after and away from the moment) is integral in developing a cycle of continual learning which influences improved practice. Reflection-in-action refers to an immediate, spontaneous 'reframing' of an approach to a situation. For example, the following extract from my teaching portfolio, discusses an instance where I *reflected-in-action*, although the removed reflection of this moment, would be construed as *reflection-on-action:*

> Jo-Anne Vorster of the ADC recently observed me give four lectures....In my pre-interview with her, I discussed issues around concerns about over-structuring lectures, and lacking an ability to keep students engaged. When I gave these lectures with her observing me, I realised that as I became aware of Jo-Anne's reflective eye watching me, my own reflective eye identified that I was in the process of overcoming these concerns in that moment, as a result of having identified these issues and needing to 'impress' an important audience member (Jo-Anne). I therefore found myself 'performing' ways of addressing these issues, in the lecture, at that moment. Theatre practitioner Augusto Boal (1992 & 1995) calls this process *metaxis* which refers to the parallel experience of being both actor and audience to one's own actions, or to use Schön's (1987) terminology, I was acting and reflecting *in* action (Sutherland 2004:97).

The writing of a journal about previous experience, is an example of *reflection-on-action*. This process is characterised by "an ordered, systematically structured, deliberate and deliberative, logical analysis of events and situations" (Morrison 1996:318). For Schön, the process of reflection-on-action is also a building of theory (Moon 1999).

In his chapter entitled "From technical rationality to reflection-in-action" (pp.21-69), Schön (1983) argues that much professional knowledge has been developed in the twentieth century, within a scientific/positivistic framework. He demonstrates how the "technical rationality" on which professional knowledge has been grounded, is fundamentally limited. The positivistic divide between pure and applied knowledge is unhelpful as "[i]ncreasingly we have become aware of the importance to actual practice of phenomena – complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value-conflict – which do not fit the model of Technical Rationality" (Schön 1983:39). Schön proposes a

model (*reflection-in-action)* which acknowledges the messiness inherent in the application of professional knowledge in real world contexts. He argues that practice and reflection on practice is a valid body of professional knowledge in itself (Dacre & Mackey 1999). Schön's identification of "uncertainty, uniqueness, instability, and value conflict" (1983: 42), as key characteristics of applied practice in real world contexts, link with Barnett's (2000a:63) identification of "uncertainty, unpredictability, challengeability, (and) contestability" as core concepts "that are key to understanding the post-modern university" (Barnett 2000a:65). Developing an ability to reflect *in* and *on* action, is an essential means for effectively negotiating a world of "radical unknowability" (*ibid*). Barnett's ideas will be discussed in more detail in section 4.3. What I will argue, is that developing a reflective practice through journal writing is one way that students can learn to effectively negotiate contexts which are uncertain and unknowable. Further, this prepares graduates for the kind of reflexivity needed as lifelong learners (discussed in section 4.4).

However, Schön's model has been critiqued for its decontextualised and apolitical approach, which is accused of producing "social, political and cultural myopia in reflective practitioners" (Morrison 1996:318). I will deal with these critiques further on.

In contrast, Morrison proposes a politicised model of reflective practice, based on the philosopher Habermas' ideas of reflective practice in bringing about social and individual empowerment and emancipation. "In this view, it is not enough to understand and interpret the world; rather the task is to change it" (Morrison 1996:319). My own teaching philosophy, and curriculum approach, resonates with this latter view. As a teacher in higher education, my 'ideal' student and graduate, is someone who demonstrates critical reflexivity as expressed in the move from interpretation to active change.

According to Morrison (1996), Habermas establishes various stages through which social emancipation through reflective practice can occur. Smyth (1989, 1996) extends this model, and the organising principles of his stage-based structure provides a useful framework for understanding how and when critically reflexive practice might occur. His

model specifically refers to developing socially critical educators, but can extend to reflective practitioners too. The process is outlined as

1. *Description* of what is occurring
2. *Information* giving meaning about the generalities and the specifics,
3. *Confrontation* in terms of how it arrests the taken-for-grantedness, while providing the spaces within which the
4. *reconstruction* of transformative action can occur
(adapted from Smyth 1996:41).

I will discuss this process in more detail when I analyse the journal writing, in section 5. Smyth's confrontation stage is a key part of a critically reflective process, and distinguishes it from Schön's through its emphasis on the historical and social processes that influence a situation. Part of my analysis of the three students' writings in this study is to understand when, and how, the "confrontation" and "reconstruction" stages might occur. Stages 1& 2 maintain reflection at a certain, fairly superficial, level. If my curriculum is about 'change' - personal and social change, and the creation of subjectivities to effectively participate in a world characterised by change, it is vital to understand the conditions in which these various stages occur. At this point, I will briefly explore my teaching philosophy, as it informs how I structure my curriculum and in relation to this, the kind of subjectivities that are encouraged through my teaching and learning practices.

3.5. Locating my educational philosophy: Curriculum and identity

Chapell *et al.* (2003) demonstrate how a curriculum constructs particular kinds of subjectivities. Any curriculum structure therefore contains "implicit theorisations concerning the nature of the self, its development or capacity for change, and the way the self relates to others or to society more generally" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:9). As Freire (1972) notes "every educational practice implies a concept about man [*sic*] and the world – educational practices do not exist apart from beliefs about people and the world" (p.21 cited in Dacre & Mackey 1999:53). It is therefore essential to make explicit how I understand identity and change and how it relates to my beliefs about education.

> Teaching is a performative act. And it is that aspect of our work that offers the space for change, invention, spontaneous shifts, that can serve as a catalyst drawing out the unique elements in each classroom. To embrace the performative aspect of teaching we are compelled to engage 'audiences' to consider issues of reciprocity. Teachers are not performers in the traditional sense of the word in that our work is not meant to be a spectacle. Yet it is meant to serve as a catalyst that calls everyone to become more and more engaged, to become active participants in learning (hooks 1994:11).

The above views of educator and activist, bell hooks, articulate some of the fundamental principles which influence what I believe teaching should be about. hooks' emphasis on *reciprocity* between teacher and learner, and a view of teaching as a *catalyst* which inspires *activity* and *engagement* with knowledge, forms some of the basis of my philosophy of education.

Grumet (1976 cited in Cortazzi 1993) approaches curriculum as a narrative, or "a collective story we tell....about our past, our present and our future" (*ibid*:12). To conceptualise one's curriculum choices as a story, rather than a predetermined map, is to approach it as a changing evolving concept that responds to context and the people in it. This approach to curriculum resonates with a particular understanding of identity as a shifting construct, in relation to the people and contexts one is operating in. A story has a basic structure, but the detail and approach to its telling changes from creator to creator. What Grumet suggests, is that the personal experiences and educational history of both the teacher and the students inform how a curriculum is interpreted and responded to. This has a bearing on how I read students' progress, and how they respond to a critically oriented curriculum.

Part of the educational philosophy that has been influential on EDT includes approaches to pedagogy of 'liberatory' educationalists such as Paulo Freire and bell hooks. I am therefore heavily influenced by these writers' emphasis on a "problem solving" approach that recognises and acknowledges that "no education is ever neutral" (Hope & Timmel 1995:8). This notion that education and by extension knowledge and research reflects the values and ideological approach of the producer, broadly falls within a constructivist and critical approach. By extension, I am drawn to the ideas of

social constructionism , a critically orientated approach which resonates with many of the foundational principles of drama (and by extension, all arts) education.

Social constructionists Gergen & Wortham (2001:116-117) critique what they term *exogenic* and *endogenic* approaches to knowledge, two epistemological orientations which have influenced key debates and thinking about learning and knowledge. Exogenic approaches are aligned to positivist/technicist approaches in which knowledge is "world centred" (*ibid*:116), absolute, objective, and something to be controlled. The educational approach is curriculum/content centred involving a traditional top-down, or "banking" approach as termed by Freire (1973). Endogenic approaches are "mind centred" (Gergen & Wortham 2001:117) and emphasise the powers of individual rationality to construct meaning. This orientation is often based on learner-centred approaches to education, where active engagement with the subject matter, through for example, class discussions, is encouraged over a straight lecturing or banking approach. Grundy (1987) uses Habermas's *knowledge-constitutive interests* to explore these approaches, whereby an exogenic approach encompasses a technical interest which is concerned with control, and an endogenic approach is aligned to a practical interest which is concerned with understanding.

In relation to the above understandings of pervasive educational traditions, Boud (1989: 40-43) provides a useful framework for understanding how different educational paradigms construct identities which resonate the underlying belief system of the approach (cited in Chapell *et al* 2003 & Usher, Bryant & Johnstone 1997). Chapell *et al.* note that "reflection on experience as a pedagogical tool" has become "the most pervasive strategy apparent when there is a learning for self-change and self-work" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:10*)*. How reflective practices manifest is dependent on how one approaches them through the curriculum.

Boud (1989, cited in Chapell *et al* 2003: 12, & Usher *et al* 1997: 94-97) identifies four main traditions of learning, specific to adult education:

1. the training and efficiency tradition
2. the self- direction or andragogical tradition

3. the learner-centred or humanistic tradition
4. the critical pedagogy and social action tradition

A brief overview of what each entails in terms of an approach to subjectivity will be explored.

The training and efficiency tradition: This tradition relates to the exogenic approach, aligned to technicism and positivism as outlined above. In this approach, the kind of subjectivity that is encouraged is one that conforms to the ideals of positivism, so that the socio-cultural specifics of learners are removed. 'Learner' becomes a neutral term.

> The self that is operative here is the classical scientific self – individualised, undifferentiated, an essentially abstract entity, the 'monological self', the self-contained individual having no transactions with and affected by anything 'other' to itself – a kind of pure 'learning machine' (Usher *et al.* 1997:94).

The self-direction and andragogical tradition: This tradition sees experience as central to knowledge production and acquisition, and is therefore particularly influential in adult education (Usher *et al.* 1997). This approach constructs the learner as active, assuming responsibility for their own learning and direction, by drawing on the personal resources acquired through experience. However, this approach can be critiqued because learning from experience is treated as an unproblematic 'given', and a source of authentic knowledge (Chapell *et al.* 2003).

> The self of andragogy is the transcendental self of the Enlightenment. Persons are seen as individualistic and unitary with a core rationality enabling them to systematically reflect on and know their experience. They are pre-given and decontextualised and, although they are accorded a biography since without it they would have no experience, the assumption is both that they can both distance themselves from it and that it is a linear record of the unfolding life of an essential self which can be, in principle, always decoded (Usher *et al.* 1997:96).

The learner-centred or humanist tradition: This tradition, like the andragogic is the endogenic, "mind-centred" approach, outlined above. Both the andragogic and learner-centred traditions promote the discourses of autonomy and self-empowerment. Both accept the notion that there is a core, true self to be discovered through enabling (rather than didactic and oppressive) educational practices. Both the learner-centred and andragogical traditions believe that "education can lead to a greater awareness of self

through cultivating a self which is independent, rational, autonomous, coherent and which has a sense of social responsibility" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:13). However, this view has been critiqued for its individualistic stance that locates change within individuals, while social structures remain unchallenged.

Gergen & Wortham (2001) similarly argue that all three approaches are problematic in that they locate knowledge individually. "If we declare knowledge to be essential to survival, and to reside in the heads of separate individuals, what forms of cultural practice are invited; what groups are privileged; what traditions or potentials are suppressed or obliterated?" (Gergen & Wortham 2001:118). Here, a critical stance is assumed which questions the ideological agendas for such approaches, which at the most basic level ask whose interests are being served (Gibson 1986). For critical theorists, individualistic approaches as outlined above, ironically do not liberate or empower, because they serve the interests of dominant social structures. Foucault for example, argues that self-reflection can produce another form of control through self-surveillance. These ideas will be discussed further in the 'Interlude' section.

The critical pedagogy tradition: Grundy (1987:19) names this as an "emancipatory cognitive interest" which is fundamentally concerned with attaining social change rather than personal autonomy. It is aligned with social tradition of activists like Paolo Freire (1973). This approach views the self as socially constituted, whereby the aim of education is to identify and analyse one's ideological positioning, and free oneself of 'false consciousness' (Chapell *et al.* 2003). However, from a postmodern perspective, this approach is also problematic in its approach to the self:

> The problem with this approach is that it theorises a self which is capable of moving from 'false' to 'true' consciousness: that is, a rational and unified self which is capable of freeing itself from social situatedness. It is this which links critical pedagogy with the andragogical and humanistic traditions, traditions which it opposes for their individualistic approach (Chapell *et al.* 2003:14).

As a critically oriented approach, social constructionism attempts to address these critiques. It therefore proposes that "knowledge is a by-product not of individual minds but of communal relationships" (Gergen & Wortham 2001:119). A relationally based stance is also echoed to an extent by the *South African Qualification Authority (SAQA)*

who adopt Cornbleth's (1990) notion of curriculum as social practice in articulating a need for curriculum to be "an on-going social process comprised of the interactions of students, teachers, knowledge and milieu" (SAQA 2000: 5). Curriculum is about, and involves people, as Grundy (1987:6) points out: "[t]o think about curriculum is to think about how a group of people act, and interact in certain situations. It is not to describe and analyse an element which exists apart from human interaction". Theatre too is fundamentally about how a group of people act, and interact in certain situations, and therefore an educational approach to teaching theatre is pivoted on relationships and interaction. An approach to teaching, learning and the drama curriculum therefore needs to account for, and respond to, the people and contexts in which knowledge is situated and evolves.

Chapell *et al.* (2003) argue that identity is fundamentally linked to education, as any educational programme is about personal and/or social change. Crossley (2000:9) locates narrative approaches within a social constructionist paradigm. In these approaches, "the inextricable interconnection between 'self' and 'social structures', particularly the interrelationship between 'self' and 'language", are emphasised. In narrative approaches and social constructionism, the conception of self, or the "I" of reflective discourse, rejects the notion of a core self that is discovered through self reflective practices. Rather, identity is understood as relational, and therefore constructed through social relations. Pedagogically, social constructionism emphasises learning as creative rather than discovery based, and when one uses self reflection as a pedagogical tool, "the pedagogy of self-reflection insists not on discovering who one is, but on creating who one might become" (Chapell *et al.* 2003: 23). I will argue that the reflective writing process actively constructs those identities that are in the process of 'becoming'. Such a pedagogical approach relates to Criticos' view of emancipatory education as "an education which is generative not consumptive, concerned with perception not reception, searching not researching" (Criticos 1993:159). The idea of the self in this paradigm, is one in which the self changes in accordance to the different relationships that one is engaged in, "with selves being realised as a by product of relatedness" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:21). One of the central tenets of a critically reflective practice, is in the interrogation of the relationship between the individual and the social

context in which s/he practices. For narrative inquiry, and for a narrative to be understood, this relationship is also key.

I use drama theorist Taylor (2000) as the theoretical basis for introducing Honours students to the uses and ideas behind using reflective journals as part of their course work. Taylor locates reflective practitioners as "story-makers" and "story listeners", in which the researcher/practitioner listens and responds to their own stories, and those of their students/subjects, so that their practice space become sites for "story –telling, story responding and story-creating" (Taylor 2000:85). The idea that reflective practice (of which this research is one example) might be based on a cyclical, narrative based structure of telling a story, listening to the stories of others, and creating new stories, could be conceived as a metaphor for the process of "creating who one might become" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:23).

This discussion has provided an overview of the educational philosophy that informs my curriculum, and therefore an approach to identity that is fore-grounded through it. While I have argued that the lens which I am adopting for this study centres around the ideas of poststructuralism and social constructionism, I got to a stage in the process where I wondered if I could 'walk the talk'.

Interlude

A motivation

> Education, as Freire noted rightly, can be used to free people or to domesticate them; when students write reflectively, I think they are being liberated (Sandford 1998 cited in Moon 1999:8).

I made use of this quotation to open the research proposal for this thesis. One reviewer remarked that it seemed a bit tacked on – to me it seemed self explanatory in light of what I was proposing and the pages of contextualisation and motivation which followed. Another asked me "freedom/liberation from what?" I found this a thought-provoking question. When one advocates, as I did in the teaching portfolio I wrote as the culmination of the course-work component of this degree (submitted in April 2004), that my educational philosophy is associated with many of the ideas of liberatory pedagogy and paradigmatic approaches which Grundy (1987:19) names as having an "emancipatory cognitive interest", never had I thought of interrogating the 'given' of what freedom might mean. Yet, as I started a new writing journey researching a component of my own teaching in higher education, I started to realise some of the naiveties inherent in that particular story. In particular, the contradictions which arise in the requirement to interrogate one's own practice, yet not feeling legitimate as a writer to interrogate some of the rhetoric surrounding some of the theory which resonated with what (I thought) I believed in. Much of this current research story concerns notions of authorship, and self in relation to the texts we write. The literature on writing reflectively supports the belief that writing constructs identities for writers (Clark & Ivanic 1997, Richardson 2000). My reading and writing for this piece of research allows me to reflect on my evolving identities as a writer, researcher, and practitioner. At this point in this story, I need to confront the person who claims to have an interrogative, critical stance, yet whose writing reveals the acceptance of certain concepts as having universal meanings. I have also outlined in the introductory sections, how I have shifted from the ideas of critical theory towards postmodernism. My own story reflects how identities are fluid and changing in relation to the available discourses and the related subjectivities which are presented as one navigates social structures.

A dominant term which is prevalent in the storying of South African education policy, is "democracy" and "emerging democracy" (see Luckett 2001, Strydom, Hay & Strydom 2001). Democracy and freedom are related concepts, but are by no means neutral, universally understood terms. When one starts to enter a poststructuralist terrain which "suggests that language cannot be seen as carrying definitive meaning or as representing any pre-existing reality" (Chapell *et al.* 2003: 41), the unstable meanings of these terms need to be examined in relation to how language, subjectivity, social organization, and power are linked (Richardson 2000). South Africa's adoption of the Outcomes Based Education (OBE) system for example, is centred around a particular, predetermined concept of the 'truth' of democracy, and this 'truth' constructs not only curricula, but the identity of teachers and learners too. The map of the new education system could be seen to promote neo-liberal capitalism as the 'truth' of democracy towards which we are compelled to strive (Hagemann 2004).

Poststructural discourse theory maintains that language is a form of social practice, so that discourse both shapes, and is shaped by, social structures (such as knowledge, identities, social relations) (Fairclough & Wodak 1997; Phillips & Jørgensen 2002). Poststructuralism and discourse theory share many characteristics with the ideas of narrative analysis and inquiry, in that both see language as playing a central role in identity construction. What then, do the terms 'freedom' and 'democracy' mean pedagogically, within a South African higher education context, and within my own use of them in my texts?

My 'given' use of the term emancipation has its roots in my readings of critical approaches to education, and in particular what Habermas distinguishes as 'emancipatory cognitive interest' (Grundy 1987). In this approach, education is a project toward individual and social empowerment, and emancipatory knowledge "is socially transformative, it seeks to move beyond understanding to overcoming those ideological interests that act to the advantage of some groups and the disadvantage of others" (Morrison 1996:319). However, as Usher & Edwards (1994) note, the meanings of emancipation can also be associated with the grand narrative of modernity, in which

"the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge is legitimised on the grounds that it results in progress towards the emancipation of humanity" (Usher & Edwards 1994:160). I have also briefly discussed (in section 3.5), how critical pedagogy has been critiqued for promoting a rational, unified vision of the self. The 'givens' of the organising principles of democracy and freedom need to be treated as discourses, and the ideologies which support them, deconstructed.

Winberg (2004:91) adopts an "extra-textual" (based on the poststructural ideas of Foucault and Bourdieu) narrative approach to understand how the story of post-Apartheid higher education is constructed, and under construction. She notes that a dominant theme throughout policy documents is one of inclusion rather than exclusion, so that democracy is associated with an equity agenda in relation to education. Winberg (2004:92) further identifies how "policy documents are future oriented and utopian". What then, are the realities for students in relation to the shifting meanings of democracy, particularly in a context of what some might understand as an autocracy in which particular meanings associated with equity as promoted by the ruling party, mean a *lack* of equal opportunity in terms of access, funding and employment for some population groups, as the state uses affirmative action policies to address the imbalances of the past? What does democracy mean for the students in this study, who are required, by the way I approach the teaching and learning in their course, to not only apply their skills at grass root level, but also to interrogate their own 'situatedness' in relation to these contexts? Or for the communities with whom these students worked with: prisoners, adolescents with learning disabilities, and learners whose guardians rely solely on government grants. When students are asked to extend their practice beyond their comfort zones, the reflective journal can become a site for students to negotiate these experiences and taken-for-granted assumptions. For the communities who participate in the dramatic process, I believe that the paradigmatic approach of these processes require a level of participation, choice and agency which can shift ways of relating and being in the world. The dramatic process can therefore create new communities by providing a meeting space where difference is negotiated.

But what does freedom, liberation, emancipation mean in this story? When I say that I believe that writing reflectively can be a liberating experience, what do I think that writers are being liberated from, or towards? Bleakley (1999:320) points out that questions need to be asked around the assumption that emancipation is a "transparently valuable educational goal". Drawing on Foucault's exploration of discipline and punishment, the liberation supposedly brought about through reflective practices which promote autonomy, merely "shifts normalising discipline and punishment from outer control by sanctioned authorities to self-authority, as a form of self-surveillance dissimulating as emancipatory self-development"(*ibid*). Foucault demonstrates the relative, unstable meaning of the term emancipation, which in this case is far from liberating, rather maintaining the *status quo.* However, this critique emanates from a particular kind of reflective practice rooted in a personal-confessional genre aimed at self development and based on the idea of a unique, authentic self (Bleakley 2000, Chapell *et al.* 2003). The relationship between conceptions of identity and the kind of pedagogical practices that encourage different identities, is a key component of this research story. What 'liberation' or 'emancipation' means relates to what one conceives as knowledge, and what constitutes the self. Which brings this conversation back to the ideas of social construction, discussed earlier. One of the major theorists writing about social construction and the related field of narrative psychology is Kenneth Gergen (1991, see also Gergen & Gergen 2003, McNamee & Gergen 1992, Shotter & Gergen 1989). For Gergen (1991), the kind of identity that the postmodern world promotes, is one based on play and risk. Pedagogically, social construction invites us to embrace the unknown, so that education is about a continual process of *becoming*, rather than *arriving* (at knowledge, truth, an authentic self). "It implies that there is no necessity to search for an invariant or definitive story" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:22). For me, liberation is the creativity embraced in the notion of *becoming*, of the ability to write and rewrite our texts in relation to others. Social constructionism posits a relational approach to knowledge and being, whereby relationships precede the individual (Gergen & Wortham 2001). Emancipation, therefore, is about understanding the nature of relatedness. Because Drama, and EDT in particular, are social acts and processes, they can provide the spaces for understanding difference, self and other.

Journals can become one means of understanding the nature of relatedness that drama processes provide.

This section has introduced some of the theoretical and personal stories that have influenced this research and my evolving thinking. The next section, aims to introduce the broader context – the meta issues, people, theories and policies that impact on the case study I will be discussing.

4. The Master Narrative

Higher education in relation to the development of reflexivity and lifelong learning.

Saleem Badat, the current CEO of the Council on Higher Education in South Africa articulates the core functions of higher education as teaching, research and community engagement.

> Higher education institutions exist to provide well-conceptualised, well-designed and well-implemented teaching, learning and research programmes that enable students to graduate as intellectuals, professionals and critical citizens who can think theoretically, analyse with rigour, gather and process empirical data, and do all this with a deep social conscience and sensitivity to the development challenges and needs of our society and continent (Badat 2004:6).

The demands of higher education in South Africa reflect, to a certain extent, the demands globally on a renewed sense of the place and function of the university within an increasingly globalised world dominated by capitalist economics (see Barnett 2000 a & b, Edwards *et al* 2002, Lemmer 1998, Race 1999). However, South Africa as an emerging democracy faces specific challenges with respect to transformation and equity related agendas, as emphasized by Badat in the closing ideas of the section quoted. The demands placed on graduates are complex, and at times conflicting. It is therefore important that South African higher education institutions locate strategies that will enable the development of a graduate who can meet the specific needs of an emerging democracy, within the context of increased globalization. Educational policy recognizes the significance of lifelong learning, as a means of achieving "a democratic polity, a just, equitable and inclusive society, and a strong, globally competitive economy" (Pendlebury & Enslin 2000:149).

Badat's ideas also promote a vision of a particular kind of person that a South African graduate should become, in order to address these agendas – graduates should not only be socially conscientious, but also rigorous thinkers and critical citizens. Kathy Luckett, a prominent academic researching issues in South African higher education, argues that the skills required of South African graduates should "enable graduates in

developing democracies to operate in diverse social settings and develop complex notions of identity and citizenship" (Luckett 2001:49). Luckett further maintains that "it is therefore vital to include in the HE curriculum an opportunity for learners to think about their own values, ethics and social responsibility and to develop levels of reflexivity" (*ibid*: 51). The development of reflexivity encompasses an understanding of values, ethics and social responsibility, and is intimately connected to the project of lifelong learning.

4.1. 'Reflective practice', reflection and reflexivity

It needs to be stated at this point, that the distinctions between reflective practice, reflection, and reflexivity are murky. There is a general tendency in the literature to use the terms reflection and reflexivity interchangeably. All three terms suggest an activity which is about learning from experience, and should lead to change in understanding about the self and the world. Weber (2004) attempts to separate reflexivity from reflection, by suggesting that reflexivity looks at a more over-arching set of interrelationships "between the sets of assumptions, biases and perspectives that underpin different aspects" (Weber 2004:vi), whereas reflection considers the same set of interrelationships, but examines a more particular, discrete aspect. For example, I can reflect on one component of my research, but be reflexive about all components of research and the relationships between them. For me, the scale of the idea or experience under the lens is less important than how one looks through the lens, so I find this distinction unhelpful. A postmodern perspective would distinguish between *reflective* practice which is associated with liberal humanism, and critical *reflexive* practice "that problematises the 'subject', and investigates the conditions of possibility for construction of subjectivities" (Bleakley 1999:317). Bleakley (1999) argues that regardless of which term one uses, the meaning of reflection and/or reflexivity, is mediated by the paradigm in which it is used. Usher & Edwards (1994) note for example, that in a postmodern world, the meaning of Schön's reflective practice (explored earlier) has shifted to include a critical and personal reflexivity. However, Bleakley (1999) explores how Schön's (1983) pioneering exploration of 'reflective practice' is "in danger of becoming a catch-all title for an ill-defined process" (Bleakley

1999:317). For example, reflection can be construed as intense introspection or "navel-gazing" (Taylor 1996:27), implying an indulgent, rather than a potentially interrogative activity. "Reflection has become a by-word for introspective personalism, an internal act of thinking about thinking" (Bleakley 1999: 320). Bleakley (1999, 2000) critiques humanist approaches which privilege individualistic self –expression, and warns of the danger of the "potential narcissism in psychological and therapeutic introspection, and the subsequent marginalising of cultural and historical processes in privileging personal development" (Bleakley 2000:14). Certainly, if reflection occurs in isolation, and without any form of dialogue, it may divorce action from context. Bleakely (1999) argues that if reflection is reduced to a cognitive event, intuition and passion are denied, and reflection turns in on itself rather than acting as a conversation between self and other. Reflective processes are contextualised when learning and reflection are understood as part of a social, relational process (part of a social constructionist approach which I have discussed). The role of a mentor or supervisor or peer in mediating personal reflections in educational contexts is key in promoting reflection beyond the personal. For example, Atherton (2003) argues that authentic reflective practice requires another person to probe and ask relevant questions to ensure that reflection "does not get bogged down in self-justification, self-indulgence or self-pity" (2003:1).

For the purposes of this study, I am drawn to the following definitions of reflexivity, a term which for me is related to reflection and reflective practice in terms of the way it mediates the relationship between self and other (not self and self), and most importantly, self and context. In addition, I will be arguing that including opportunities for critically reflective/reflexive practice in higher education, can allow students the space to negotiate complexity, uncertainty and situational peculiarity, all of which are characteristics of a postmodern world (Usher & Edwards 1994), or what Barnett (1999 a & b) has termed a "supercomplex world" (discussed in section 4.3).

Reflexivity can be defined as "a practice of observing and locating one's self as a knower within certain cultural and socio-historical contexts. Reflexivity leads to self-awareness, scholarly accountability, and recognition of a range of human truths" (Sinacore, Blaisure, Justin, Healy & Brawer 1999: 267). Edwards *et al* (2002) provide a

simpler definition, defining reflexivity as "the capacity to develop critical awareness of the assumptions that underlie practices" (2002:533). Some writers would call this reflection. Reflexivity and reflection when used in this document, are aligned to critical ontological, epistemological orientations, and can be associated with a pedagogical model which attempts to diffuse the binaries between theory and practice, mind and body, subjective and objective, self and other, inner and outer worlds, fiction and non-fiction.

4.2. The meta-narrative of global change and how it relates to higher education

The specific requirements of the South African higher education system can be seen as a micro-example which can be generalized onto a broader international arena. South Africa's multi-cultural and multi-lingual population presents particular challenges and opportunities for higher education. However, with the globalisation, and the massification of higher education internationally, the challenges of an increasingly diverse and demanding student body is a feature of contemporary higher education globally. Winberg (2004:92) uses a narrative approach to analyse South African higher education policy, noting that "narratives of South African higher education are located and framed within a meta-narrative of global change and the impact of new social and economical contexts on the contemporary South African university".

The very concept of 'university' and 'academic knowledge' has radically shifted with the development of postmodern thinking. "The notion of authoritative knowledge has been permanently undermined, for a postmoderist perspective suggests that all knowledge claims are local, partial and contextually specific" (Luckett 2001:54). Globally, universities are increasingly required to justify their existence, and we are witnessing a move towards "performativity" (Lemmer 1998), as "disciplines are called upon to demonstrate their use-value in the global market" (Barnett 2000b:257). The advent of the postmodern condition has fundamentally altered the university's relationship with society, no longer shaping, but being shaped by, society (Light & Cox 2001:2). The function of higher education has shifted so that the valued product of a university degree is not so much the quality of learning but the qualification gained (Race 1999).

Light & Cox (2001) associate this with the 'discourse of excellence' which "is not so much concerned with 'what' but rather 'how'" (*ibid:* 3). Curzon-Hobson (2002:181) maintains that "if one is to claim anything about the essential nature of the roles or values underpinning higher education, it can only be that it has become a site of increasing flux, ambiguity and inconsistency". This state has fundamental consequences for knowledge production, which higher education no longer has a monopoly over (*ibid.*).

As a result of these shifts, Gibbons, *et al.* (1994) propose a framework with which to explore the ways in which knowledge production has changed. The ideas associated with what they term "Mode 2 knowledge" are repeatedly referred to by writers on issues in higher education (see Barnett 2000a & b, Light & Cox 2001, Luckett 2001), and are therefore briefly explored here.

Gibbons *et al.* (1994:1) identify two types of knowledge production, which they compare and contrast as a means of understanding shifting trends in knowledge producing institutions. Mode 1 knowledge production is associated with more traditional means of disciplinary based, cognitive, and academic knowledge, whereas Mode 2 knowledge is "transdisciplinary and located in a context of application" (Light & Cox 2001: 8). Mode 2 knowledge production reflects the changing role and function of higher education in a globalised context. The differences between the two modes, are summarised in the table below:

Mode 1	Mode 2
▪ Problems are set and solved in a context governed by the interests of a specific (usually academic) community. ▪ Knowledge produced within a discipline. ▪ Characterised by homogenity. ▪ Knowledge is organised hierarchically; individually based structures. ▪ Quality assurance limited to peer review	▪ Knowledge carried out in the context of *application.* ▪ Knowledge produced transdisciplinary. ▪ Characterised by heterogenity. ▪ Heterarchical and transient structure; collaboratively based structures. ▪ Quality determined by wider social, political, economic criteria. ▪ More socially accountable and *reflexive.*

Table 1: Mode 1 & Mode 2 Knowledge production (after Gibbons *et al.* : 1- 11, emphasis mine).

Mode 2 knowledge production reflects the ways in which "higher education has become a key recipient of society's focus and demands" (Light & Fox 2001: 2). Luckett (2001) suggests that Mode 1 knowledge has relevance as a foundation from which to build Mode 2 knowledge, particularly in the context of the under-preparedness with which many students enter higher education in South Africa. She suggests that Mode 2 knowledge has particular usefulness at a post-graduate level, and that "this is best achieved via experiential and reflexive learning" (Luckett 2001:51). Gibbons *et al.* (1994) identify reflexivity as a key characteristic of Mode 2, an ability they associate with learning in the Humanities. What is problematic about a model which promotes Mode 1 at undergraduate, and Mode 2 at a postgraduate level, is that reflexive discourse needs developing, and according to Bleakley (1999:319) "is not a learned technique but a surfacing artistry". If one is encouraging a pedagogical model in which experiential learning is facilitated through reflexive processes, which the case study under discussion is based on, questions arise about how reflexivity can be taught, learnt, or encouraged. For example, Bleakley (1999) discusses Ecclestone (1996) who suggests that a developmental approach should be used when developing critically reflective practice. She advocates a more functional, technical and simple problem-solving approach at the beginning, moving, as one's practice advances, towards a more complex type of reflective practice (Bleakley 1999: 318). This approach could be compared with a progression from Mode 1 to Mode 2 knowledge, a progression that Luckett (2001) suggests. However, Bleakley (1999) criticises such a progressivist model as reinforcing a technical-rational, linear developmental approach, the precise basis of which reflective practice is opposing. Reflexivity attempts to move away from a linear progression that favours certainty and closure, a sequence which dominates scientific knowledge (Usher & Edwards 1994). "Such developmentalism denies the value of suffering the complex right from the start, perhaps relishing open-endedness, chaos, or unpredictability in learning, and valuing its ambiguities, paradoxes and twists" (Bleakley 1999:318). For Bleakley (1999), reflection is a risk taking, improvisatory activity in which the development of intuitive ability is valued. These ideas resonate with the ideas of social constructionism which I have established as key to my research approach.

For the study of the performing arts, Bleakley's emphasis on play and improvisation is particularly relevant. As Berry (2000) argues, an important orientation for arts education, is one that critiques dominant empiricist and rational paradigms that devalue the emotional-expressive arena and cultural contexts within education. Reflective practice is vital for the study of Drama in higher education. In addition, Drama as a discipline assumes a kind of reflective practice which Bleakley advocates. As Linds (1999:275) argues "the dramatic process is a medium for reflective action. Participants are engaged inside a *metaxic* process[9] that explores the slash or gap in me/not-me, operating in one body in the two autonomous worlds of actor/character". Linds maintains that this kind of reflective practice promotes a "groundlessness which disrupts the taken-for –granted worlds" (1999:275). Hopefully this assumes a stance away from a technical or humanist/individualistic interpretation of reflective practice. One of the questions this study explores, centers around how reflexivity as a subjectivity, and reflective practice, can best be facilitated within a Drama curriculum.

4.3. Barnett and a world of 'radical unknowability'

Barnett (2000a & 2000b) criticizes higher education curriculum design for not adequately preparing graduates for what he terms a "supercomplex world" (2000b: 255-265), which relates to earlier writings positing a world of radical unknowability (Curzon-Hobson 2002). His definition of a world of supercomplexity can be linked to the postmodern condition[10], and framed within the particular challenges of globalisation:

> A *supercomplex* world is one in which the very frameworks by which we orient ourselves to the world are themselves contested... it is a fragility in the way we understand the world, in the way in which we understand ourselves and in the ways in which we feel secure about acting in the world (Barnett 2000b:257).

Barnett's proposal for a higher education curriculum aimed at addressing a supercomplex world, involves "embracing the domains of being, knowing and action; in

---

[9] Metaxis, a term used by theatre director Augusto Boal (1992,1995), refers to the process of being both actor and audience to one's own experience. Reflexivity requires metaxis – a subjective/objective approach that allows one to stand outside oneself.

[10] It should however be noted that Barnett finds the term postmodern highly problematic, and deliberately does not use it (see Barnett 2000b:265).

other words, a project of ontology, epistemology and praxis" (2000b:263). Barnett (2000b) associates curriculum development with the development of a mode of being which will enable students to "live out the uncertainty principle" and develop "a particular disposition towards knowledge, action, oneself and the other" (Curzon-Hobson 2002:183). His identification of the instability of understandings around self-identity and action, leads to the identification of particular subjectivities that need to be encouraged in order to prepare students effectively for a world of supercomplexity. In the South African context, Luckett (2001) proposes in her outline for "an epistemically diverse curriculum", that appropriate subjectivities for graduates are those associated with lifelong learning, and include context sensitivity, social responsibility, meta-cognition, adaptability, flexibility and developing reflexive thinking (Luckett 2001: 49-55). Similarly, for Barnett (2000b) "supercomplexity shows itself discursively in the world of work through such terms as 'flexibility', 'adaptability' and... 'self-reliance'" (Barnett 2000b:258). These subjectivities are supported by the 'autonomy of learning' category in the level descriptors for the Higher Education bands on South Africa's National Qualifications Framework (NQF). This category relates specifically to a learner's capacity for lifelong learning, and includes "the extent to which a learner is self-reflexive about, and can evaluate the quality of, his/her learning, and eventually that of others" (Council on Higher Education 2001, page unknown). The shift in South African policy towards the development of identities and skills associated with lifelong learning is consistent with a global trend in education, which is trying to prepare students to operate in a world which is characterised by continual change and a lack of certainty. Perhaps all of these abilities have been privileged to enable students to confront and deal with difference, an ability particularly relevant to the South African context. Edwards *et al.* (2002) note that a common policy response internationally to a changing context is the emergence of lifelong learning as an educational focus.

Edwards *et al.* (2002:526) maintain that a critical form of lifelong learning requires the development of reflexivity, which is based on a view that "contemporary change processes require greater reflexivity by individuals, organisations and societies and that

this is achieved through learning" [11]. For Luckett, Barnett, and South African education policy, developing high levels of reflexivity is a key requirement for graduates, and in particular, for students learning and eventually working in a developing democracy. A society in transition and early development is characterised by perhaps more change and uncertainty than other contexts. However, Bleakley (1999:320) interrogates the view that "reflection should automatically be linked to empowerment, emancipation and autonomy; and the assumption that autonomy and emancipation are transparently valuable educational goals". Such assumptions emerge, according to Usher & Edwards (1994), because educational theory and practice are rooted in modernity, which promotes humanistic individual freedom. Humanistic focus on the individual and personal autonomy has been the subject of much critique as "this version of self-empowerment through the fostering of personal autonomy is seen by critics as illusory: largely because social structures and forces remain unchallenged" (Chapell *et al* 2003:13). Usher & Edwards (1994) show how emancipation is part of the grand narrative of modernity, in which "scientific knowledge is legitimised on the grounds that it results in progress towards the emancipation of humanity" (Usher & Edwards 1994: 160). One of the key policy foci within South African education concerns the development of skills and identities associated with the lifelong learner, as a means of achieving equity, and an emancipatory based educational agenda. This can be observed, for example, in the critical crossfield outcomes of OBE, and the autonomy of learning category outlined above. These skills involve helping people to learn how to learn, by developing capacities such as relational and critical thinking and problem solving and collaborative learning (Pendlebury & Enslin 2000). South African education policy is driven by the goals of emancipation and autonomy, which are linked to the ability to reflect and evaluate. However, these abilities, and the subjectivities they promote, are by no means natural or transparent, and the educational processes which lead to these goals inform what autonomy or emancipation might mean, within a particular paradigm. What follows is a brief exploration of the context and debates surrounding the development of lifelong learning as a key pedagogical goal.

[11] Light & Cox's (2001:12) call for the development of the *reflective professional* within higher education is linked to the ability to manage an environment of uncertainty and change.

4.4. What is lifelong learning?

In a historical overview of the development of the notion of lifelong learning, Edwards (2000:10) concludes that "[l]ifelong learning is an English-language construct, part of a family of related notions, largely but not solely fabricated by male educators within the contexts of Northern Europe and America".

Edwards therefore positions the development of lifelong learning within the centred and privileged status of male, English speaking, Western hegemony. Lawson (2000: 56) identifies the underlying values in the literature on lifelong learning, as emerging from a liberal democratic and egalitarian position, in which education is associated with a right of citizenship. Perhaps due to the powerful influence of Western ideology, the notion of lifelong learning has become an internationally used framework for the development, debates and definitions of mainly 'post-compulsory' education policies, including South Africa (Field & Leicester 2000). In South Africa, "lifelong learning is commonly regarded as a necessary condition for a flourishing democracy" (Pendlebury & Enslin 2000: 152).

Lifelong learning centres around preparing people to cope in an ever changing, uncertain world, and in particular the world of work (Edwards *et al.* 2002). In essence, this means developing learning capabilities that will allow a person to transfer skills and abilities across contexts, and develop a degree of flexibility which facilitates adaptiveness to diverse situations. It arises out of a belief that a reliance on initial education is no longer sufficient, particularly within the needs of neo-liberal economic policies which demand a flexible, adaptable labour force (*ibid.*). On a policy level, it is seen as "addressing issues such as economic competitiveness in a global marketplace, social inclusion and social cohesion" (Chapell *et al.* 2003: 3), all issues which feature in South African education policy. South African policies of lifelong learning are associated with agendas to increase access, quality and mobility for learners (Pendlebury & Enslin 2000). Field and Leicester (2000) see lifelong learning as an embracing, comprehensive approach that encompasses several domains:

> Because 'lifelong learning' is used both normatively and widely, to include liberal, vocational and social aspects, we would suggest that it goes beyond the blurring of boundaries to a recognition that these aspects of learning/education are, in practice, interrelated. The agenda for lifelong learning encourages education for citizenship (political), seeks for wider participation (social), and emphasizes the importance of learning for economic prosperity (vocational) while recognizing the importance of individual choices and personal development (liberal) (Field & Leicester 2000: xvii).

Lifelong learning arises from a context of globalisation and postmodernism in which traditional approaches to knowledge production are being challenged and questioned. On a less abstract policy level, Chapell *et al.* (2003:3) argue that lifelong learning "foregrounds learning and pedagogy, not merely to make people more skilled or more rounded citizens, but to construct identities that can 'perform better'". Questions arise as to what, or who defines what better performance means: as a worker who can conform to the economic needs of the labour market? Or, is this an ability people need in Barnett's conception of a supercomplex world, to "negotiate their own lives more reflexively" (Edwards *et al.* 2002:526). Field & Leicester (2000) support the view that lifelong learning moves beyond skills and knowledge, to include the development of the personal traits necessary to cope in a world of change and uncertainty.

Edwards *et al.* (2002:530) identify a number of traditions through which lifelong learning can be interpreted, including humanist, economist, and social. Boud & Miller (1996) for example, associate lifelong learning with an individualistic, humanist psychological tradition. Because the concept of lifelong learning is applied in a range of situations, including corporate organisations, learning institutions and organisations of social change, different paradigms operate in terms of how it is applied. Similarly, Bleakley (1999:319) isolates different perspectives which use reflective practice and apply it differently. He argues for reflective practice to be grounded in an aesthetic domain, rather that the technical, critical, or postmodern educational spheres. Edwards *et al.* (2002) define a social frame, which "focuses on learning that can promote changes in social structures and engagement by individuals in a relevant social setting with intersubjective processes that promote greater empowerment, reciprocity and equity" (Edwards *et al.* 2002:530). Edwards (2000) demonstrates how the development of the

meaning of lifelong learning is closely tied to enable adults to become active citizens[12] in a liberal democracy. It seems that this definition resonates with several themes in South African education policy, and with Luckett's (2001) aims for the skills needed by South African graduates, discussed earlier (see section 4.2). However, as Pendlebury & Enslin (2000) point out, the ideals of lifelong learning do not always fit neatly with the complexities of a 'lifelong learning for all' approach in the post-Apartheid South African context. Edwards *et al.* (2002) introduce the critique that lifelong learning policy and philosophy does not address situations where people lack access to even the most basic education.

Under Apartheid, the notion of lifelong learning was actively obstructed through separate and unequal development. Post-Apartheid educational policy needs to address the needs of adults who, under Apartheid, were unable to acquire a starting education, as well as ensuring equitable educational access to all South Africans, despite financial constraints (Pendlebury & Enslin 2000). Pendlebury & Enslin (2000) demonstrate the complexities and ethical implications of promising an education for all across a lifetime approach, and show the extent to which this has not, and cannot, be delivered under the current economic and social conditions in South Africa, particularly at a grassroots level. These authors question the feasibility of entrenching lifelong learning as a constitutional right, without the capacity to deliver it. However, while these crucial issues provide an important context to the overall application of lifelong learning in South Africa, the lifelong learning project in relation to higher education can be more effectively applied due to the infrastructure and resources available. As Luckett (2001) argues, experiential and reflexive learning are essential in equipping graduates with the capacity to contribute to the economic and social needs of the country.

[12]However, citizenship too is far from a neutral term, and "The concept of 'citizenship' is central as a device for conjoining the private domain with the public domain, but it starts from a position which emphasises the value of 'individuality' as an ethical principle" (Lawson 2000: 59).

It is clear that developing abilities associated with reflexivity are regarded integral to achieving the goals of lifelong learning. However, Barnett (2000b) notes how certain curricula constructs, such as reflexivity, can be perceived as supporting a performativity agenda. He uses an example of the requirement of developing self-monitoring skills (such as reflexive capacities), which are not always linked to performativity, except when, in for example vocational type courses, "students are asked to demonstrate publicly their power of self-monitoring" (Barnett 2000b: 261). Barnett's concerns can be linked to Bleakley's (1999, 2000) critique of a humanist promotion of self-autonomy, which is seen as individualistic and another form of surveillance (see discussion in interlude section). Similarly, Edwards *et al.* (2002:525) warn of the development of "a more behavioural, adaptive version of lifelong learning dominating policy and practice, in which reflex rather than reflexivity is taken to be the locus of learning". I have argued in section 3.5 that the development of reflexivity is a curriculum goal of my course, and that a journal presents an opportunity within a drama curriculum to develop a critical reflexivity.

Despite these critiques, all these writers see the development of reflexive capabilities as a key requirement for the contemporary university graduate, and an integral component of lifelong learning. Barnett applauds curricula which show "signs of providing students with powers of reflection, capacities to act in the world, a greater awareness of self and metacapacities that generate personal and interpersonal resources not just for coping with supercomplexity but also a mode of effective being within it" (2000b: 263). Luckett sees the development of personal and reflexive competence as key in avoiding the higher education curriculum becoming "colonised by market forces" (2001:51). This is supported by the Department of Education (DoE), mindful that policies of lifelong learning can over-emphasise the economic competitiveness agenda at the expense of democratic, social, and personal needs.

> If it is too narrowly associated with work, there is a real danger of [education] becoming purely instrumental and vocational. People must be enabled to develop the skills, to understand and integrate all aspects of life, the economic, the social, the political, the psychological, so as to create a better future (DoE 1997:1 cited in Pendlebury & Enslin 2000:153).

Edwards *et. al.* (2002) promote a particular type of reflexivity needed if lifelong learning is to achieve an objective of preparing people for an uncertain world. "[I]t is through self and social questioning (reflexivity) that people are able to engage with and (en)counter– be affected by but also affect – contemporary uncertainties" (2002:527).

The development of reflexivity is also associated with pedagogical aims relating to personal and social change – particularly in terms of adapting to, and being adapted by, the inherently unstable, fragile, and uncertain contexts that are part of the global and postmodern age. As I have argued in section 3.5, the approach that I strive to take through my curriculum and this study is aligned with the ideas of social constructionism. This paradigm promotes a particular approach to identity and change. This view emphasises the indeterminacy of identity, and promotes a relational approach to identity construction. For the development of reflexivity it is worth re-emphasising that "the pedagogy of self-reflection insists not on discovering who one is, but on creating who one might become" (Chapell *et al.* 2003:23). How this process might occur, is explored in the next section which will provide a detailed analysis of the journal writing process in relation to the creation of different identities.

5. Constructing the narrative anthropologist

> Always, for learning to occur, the inquirer in this ambiguous, shifting, participant observation role is meeting difference; allowing difference to challenge assumptions, values, and beliefs; improvising and adapting to the difference; and thereby learning as the narrative anthropologist (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:9).

One of the overwhelming themes that emerges from the students' writing in the analysis of this study, is that as they navigate their growing sense of themselves as possible theory producers, artists and practitioners, is their increasing ability to negotiate, meet, and challenge difference. Each student engages with the Honours EDT course and reflects on their experiences in this course in the following ways:

- As a *participant* (following someone else's workshop/drama structure) and/or
- A *facilitator* (crafting, shaping and facilitating a workshop/drama structure for others) and/or
- An *artist* (one or both of the above).

The requirement to narrate, analyse and theorise about educational drama experiences which they have participated in, casts the students in the role of participant-observer, as they observe themselves and others in practice, through reflective writing. The role of participant-observer is rooted in social science research methodology (and anthropology in particular), and suggests that journal writing is a research activity, or, as Richardson (2000) suggests, that writing can become a method of inquiry. For Schön (1983), the reflective conversation that occurs by reflecting *in* and *on* action, turns practice into research. Clandinin & Connelly's (2000) concept of "learning as a narrative anthropologist" brings together the ideas of negotiating difference and knowledge production that I will use as part of the organising principle for my discussion of the journals and writers under analysis. Please note that although the bulk of this discussion refers to my analysis of these journals, reference will also be made to the participants' responses to written questions, asking them to reflect on their journal writing for my course (see Appendix 1 for questionnaires, all responses available on request). In addition, I have included in the discussion the participants' insights and reflections in

response to the first draft of this analysis (received in June 2005), as a means of enriching and deepening the interpretations arising from the data.

Before embarking on the discussion and interpretation of the data, I will briefly explore how I went about applying the ideas of narrative analysis to the data.

5.1. The application of narrative analysis in this study

Henning (2004) notes that narrative analysis may be viewed as a specialised form of discourse analysis. She provides a useful set of guiding questions which influence how a text can be read:

- "In what kind of a story does a narrator place herself and those whom she narrates?
- How is the story part of a larger societal narrative?
- What discourses are evident in the story?
- How are the coherence and cohesion of the story maintained?
- Why is the teller sharing the story?
- What are the story archetypes in this story, especially the protagonist and the antagonists?
- How is the story plotted and how is conflict presented?
- Are there any epiphanies in the story?
- What is significant about the beginning and end of the story?"

(Henning 2004:123).

Not all of the issues raised by these questions are relevant to this particular analysis, but they do provide guiding principles containing some of the central ideas about what constitutes narrative. Clandinin & Connelly (2000) summarise these as emplotment, character, scene, place, time, and point of view. For a narrative inquiry approach, it is crucial to acknowledge context too, although earlier approaches, such as Labov's[13] model, decontextualise the narrative by ignoring the relationship between teller and listener (Riessman 1993). However, if one sees narrative analysis as a form of

[13] William Labov (1972) adopts a structural approach to narrative in which all narratives contain specific characteristics, each with their own function. Labov's work, although critiqued, is, according to Riessman (1993:18) "paradigmatic" in that "most investigators cite it, apply it, or use it as a point of departure".

discourse analysis, as Henning (2004) has suggested, the social discourses and politics around the narrative cannot be ignored.

Much of the literature on narrative analysis deals with oral narratives. Riessman (1993:69) suggests that written narratives require considerable adaptation of methods used for verbal accounts, and perhaps the inclusion of other approaches. What I will outline in this section, is how I went about analysing the written journal texts, informed by and through a narrative perspective. By making explicit the 'how' of my interpretation, I am also addressing the contested issue of validity in narrative methodologies. What Riessman (1993) proposes, is a transparency about one's research approach that will make it possible for others to assess the trustworthiness of the research. She suggests that this can be achieved by "describing how the interpretations were produced, making visible what we did, [and] making primary data available to other researchers" (Riessman 1993: 68). From an ethical, as well as a validity perspective, asking participants to look at and respond to a researcher's interpretation of their narrative, allows a researcher to see how her interpretation might correspond with other interpretations. My experience of asking the participants in this study to reflect on my analysis of their work supports Riessman's (1993) contention that such reflections can be an illuminating source of theoretical insight (discussed in more detail in sections 5.3 and 6).

I started the analysis process by drawing on the ideas of content analysis. The first phase of the process involved the reading through of all texts in order to gain an overall impression of the content. The next phase involved what Henning (2004) refers to as *open coding*, in which the texts are again read, and units of meaning are identified. "In open coding codes are literally made up as the researcher works through the data" (Henning 2004:105). The way codes were then used was informed by a narrative reading of the texts. In this initial phase, the following themes, or groups of meaning were identified:

1) *Surprise – dealing with the unexpected*: This theme was divided into:
   a) times when the unexpected was noted, for example, the writer noticing that a group was highly responsive to an exercise when resistance was expected.

b) instances in the writing where the unexpected was noted, and theorised about, analysed further, or confronted. As I worked more with this theme, I included Edwards *et al's.* (2002:533) definition of reflexivity as "the capacity to develop a critical awareness of the assumptions that underlie practices", as a guiding criteria.

2) *Feeling overwhelmed, daunted, uncertain*: This manifested particularly in the beginning stages of the writing where students were dealing with many new, and unknown situations.
3) *From chaos to coherence*: This entailed noticing how students documented their ability to manage instability and the unknown, and how they began to trust their own practice and instincts.
4) *Negotiating difference*: This included instances where Schön's (1983:42) identification of "uncertainty, uniqueness, instability, and value conflict" as key characteristics of applied practice in real world contexts, became evident in the writing.
5) *Language anxiety:* This theme included concerns about not being understood, or participants not understanding due to language barriers. This was a theme that I had expected to emerge with more prominence, but subsequently realised that I had imposed it as a category rather than it having emerged from the data. When I started to look at patterns within and between the themes, it became clear that themes 2, 3, 4 & 5 above, could all form one 'code', as all were dealing with the negotiation of difference and the unknown. These themes subsequently merged into a theme I called *From Chaos to coherence – learning to negotiate difference.*
6) *Praxis*: I identified these as moments where students were generating theories, through an analysis or understanding of practical application. This included synthesising different knowledge systems, for example, theoretical, personal, and practical.
7) *What has been excluded, missing, or within the subtext*: Instances where an issue or event is observed, but not confronted, analysed or interpreted further, would be included here. An example would be when a student notes a participant's hesitancy to speak in English, without deconstructing, or confronting the circumstances that may give rise to this behaviour. This theme also looks at the discourses used, and

the implications in terms of how people are positioned or represented through discourse, without clear statements being made.

8) *Roles*: These included how the narrator represented herself in the text, how the people written about were cast, or positioned, as well as the fictional choices that the writer made as a practitioner, which included fictional roles for herself and the participants with whom she worked. Observations about how a writer identity is created - through discourse, structure, metaphor, and content – are included under this theme.

From this initial phase, I selected five main themes to work with, which were inter-related, yet distinct enough to form a theme in themselves. These were

1) Surprise
2) From chaos to coherence
3) Roles chosen, given and assumed
4) Praxis
5) What is excluded, missing, or underneath

Within these thematic patterns, I looked at how experience was structured. For example, when reading a reflection on one particular experience, I would note how the narrative started, and what changes in perception or representation occurred about the experience. Often, an experience would initially be named as 'a disaster', but as the narrator wrote about it, the representation of the experience would shift from the initial 'chaos' perception, to the inclusion of moments where constructive and meaningful events occurred. I also looked at the discourse used in the reflection on an experience. I would notice where the narrator was in the text (if at all), and how others were represented. The way language was used, metaphorically or otherwise, became an important part of understanding how the writer constructed identities and meaning through writing.

One of the central features of narrative thinking concerns temporality. Every event has a past, a present and an implied future. A narrative approach sees people in a process of personal change and "from an educational point of view, it is important to be able to

narrate the person in terms of the process" (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:31). For this reason, change was noted at a micro and macro level. A change could be observed within a discreet narrative of one experience, or even exercise, but this also needed to be seen within the overall, year long process which the student was narrating, so that the past, present, and future were recognised and included as essential to the analysis. Linked to this, Clandinin & Connelly (2000) see action as a narrative sign, so that a particular action needs to be understood in light of the narrative history to that point, which gives meaning and informs the action. Therefore, a particular example that might fall under one of the five themes identified, would then be cross referenced across time, to inform how personal change was occurring.

Because some students were reflecting on the same event, comparisons between how the event was narrated by different individuals became an unexpected, but crucial part of the analysis. These comparisons highlighted how identities were being constructed and negotiated by different writers, and provided an important means of understanding how and under what circumstances, reflexivity develops.

A final consideration, which occurred during the final stages of the analysis, was an examination of my own teacher voice in relation to my written, in text feedback in the students' journals. I examined what I, as a teacher, noticed and challenged, and how this could be interpreted in terms of what kinds of thinking, and identities, I was promoting through my comments.

This analytical procedure will be expanded on in my discussion in section 5.3 below, where the recontextualisation of the data, "when the final data are integrated as evidence in an argument" (Henning 2004:6), will make the research process explicit.

For the purposes of this analysis, which are bound by the limitations of a half thesis, I am going to discuss the three journal examples around the following key issues which both link and distinguish the three writers (Jojo, Clara & Lorraine) in this case study.

i) From chaos to coherence

One of the overwhelming themes that emerged from all three journals I have called "from chaos to coherence " (after O'Rourke 1998). The journal becomes a tangible site for ambiguity and change, and most importantly, a reference for how such instability can be constructive and developmental. This theme demonstrates how the journal writing process and product becomes a site for learning how these students effectively negotiated their way in a world characterised by change and instability – Barnett's world of 'supercomplexity' and 'radical unknowability'. For all three students, working with unknown and at times chaotic contexts, the reading of these contexts shifted from being perceived as threatening and limiting, to a normal part of the diverse landscape of real world practice. This supports Schön's (1983:42) argument that "uncertainty, uniqueness, instability and value conflict" are central characteristics of professional practice which need to be reflected on and incorporated into professional learning programmes. I will show that by writing through the experience[14], the writers re-vision the experience as a site for learning, rather than as a failed action. For Cooper (1991:99), journals "allow the writer to impose form on the often chaotic experience of life. Journals allow us to examine our own experiences, to gain a fresh perspective, and by that means begin to transform the experiences themselves".

ii) Developing a reflexive voice

Part of the motivation for this research stems from a disparity in the literature of an analysis of what is occurring for students as they develop their reflective writing practice over a period of time. While it is generally assumed that the development of reflexivity is essential for graduates[15], and that a learning journal may be one way of developing this, there is a lack of investigation into what shifts, learning, and changes to identity occur throughout the process of writing a journal. What is compelling about this study, is how distinct the three voices are that emerge through the writing process. While it is

[14] I will at times refer to writing *through* rather than writing *about*, to highlight the process of the act of writing shaping thinking and learning. Writing *about* implies a closure, rather than the process which writing *through* implies.

[15] See for example Luckett's (2001) argument about the necessary development of this ability in the South African context, referred to in section 4.

understandable that the way experience is narrated in each journal is unique due to the "autobiographical self" (Clark & Ivanic 1999) which each writer brings to the text, what is significant for this study is the way that each individual negotiates the development of their own voice within the inherent instability of this particular educational practice. O'Rourke (1998) argues that journals allow insights into a student's own learning style, and by fore-grounding the writing process, the journal "encourage(s) experimentation with style and registers. This makes them a good vehicle for critical reflection" (O'Rourke 1998: 404). What this study reveals, is that because of the multi-genre demands of this particular style of writing, each individual constructs a voice through the writing process, and this voice negotiates the learning and insights of past, present, and future identities that relate to each other in and through the act of writing about experience. Cooper's (1991:99) research on the use of journals suggests that "we literally write our own stories, simultaneously incorporating our own future, as we reconstruct our past".

The development of their reflexive voice, is also the development of an identity as a producer of knowledge, which links to the authorial presence of the writer in the text. Within my discussion of the shifts in the writing voice, I examine how the writer deals with *praxis* (the integration of theory and practice), and where examples of *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action* initiate a cycle of action, reflection, and subsequent change to practice and understanding. In addition, I will draw on Smyth's (1996) model of stages in critically reflexive practice, noting when, how, and if a writer is able to *confront* an experience by analysing *'how did I/they/ the situation come to be like this?'*, and *reconstruct* practice and thinking by suggesting *'how might I/they do things differently?'* A recurrent theme in all three analyses I titled "Surprise", whereby assumptions were repeatedly counteracted by how participants in workshops reacted or behaved contrary to expectation. Whether these assumptions were interrogated, or merely noted, differed between individuals, and changed over time. I will argue that a journal has the potential to become a tangible site for action-research, but that the ability to confront the ideological, historical, and social processes that inform practice and social interactions, needs time and space to emerge. What is clear from the students' journal writing in this study, is that in order for students to be able to feel

comfortable in developing an expressive critical voice that articulates personal and social change, they first need to develop their reflective voice in a contained, structured, supportive way. I deal with the issues of developing a critically reflexive practice in more detail in section 5.4.3.

iii) Narrativization of events: Plot, style and roles

Central to this research is an understanding of what identities emerge throughout a post-graduate educational programme, and how these relate to the identities which a specific curriculum promotes. Because I am using the ideas of narrative inquiry to inform my methodology, issues of representation of self and others are central in understanding how a narrative can reveal and conceal identities and themes. Riessman (1993) demonstrates how narrativization is linked to identity.

> Human agency and imagination determine what gets included and excluded in narrativization, how events are plotted, and what they are supposed to mean. Individuals construct past events and actions in personal narratives to claim identities and construct lives (Riessman 1993:2).

My discussion here involves the discourse[16]around how the writer characterises herself, her peers, and the communities she works with. Clark & Ivanic (1999) identify three aspects of writer identity which are relevant to understanding the writer's identity in the text:

> Firstly, writers bring to any act of writing an 'autobiographical self': their personal autobiography up to that moment. Secondly, writers create through the act of writing a 'discoursal self': a particular representation of the self through practices and discourses they enter into as they write. This representation is shaped partly by their personal history, partly by the subject-positions available, and partly by other factors in the immediate social context. Thirdly, writers differ in how far they have a sense of 'self as author', and in how, and how far they establish their authority and authorial presence within a piece of writing (Clark & Ivanic 1999:136).

What is particularly relevant too, is the fictional roles which the writer as a drama practitioner structures for others to experience. Fundamental to educational drama processes and strategies is the evocation of an "as if" context, whereby participants and

[16] I use the word discourse as an understanding of how language shapes and is shaped by social structures (Fairclough & Wodack 1997). In narrative analysis, "language is understood as deeply constitutive of reality, not simply a technical device for establishing meaning" (Riessman 1993:4).

facilitators assume roles within an imaginary situation. My discussion of roles within the writing therefore examines the roles that the writer assumes throughout the writing journey, the roles she chooses for others and herself as part of her fictional drama structures, and the roles she uses to represent others – peers, myself as supervisor, theorists, and the participants/communities which she works with. I also examine my own voice within the journal text, which takes the form of my written feedback to students' journal entries. It is important to examine what identities/roles I promote through my conversations with the writing voice in the journal.

Another issue relevant to how the narrative emerges, involves the relationship of the writer/narrator to the text and the people in it. The distance between the narrator and the event is significant in revealing how the student is working through new experiences, and how these are dealt with through the narration. Identities are further revealed in how the text is structured – how the event is narrated through structure and discourse in terms of what is noted and documented, and what is left out. Connected to these issues are the metaphors that are used, and become recurrent themes. One theme that is revealed in all three journals deals with 'barriers'. This theme is connected to the area discussed above regarding 'negotiating difference' and involves negotiating boundaries and barriers between self and other, particularly with regards to differences in language, class and culture.

Although I have distinguished these three areas (from chaos to coherence, developing a reflexive voice, narrativization of events) as a means of providing an overview for the reading of the analysis, it is important to highlight that they are all related. In particular, I will not treat narrativazation as a separate discussion, because it is integral to the whole process of interpretation. How the writer constructs the narrative and represents self and others will therefore be integrated in the discussions under "From Chaos to coherence (5.3) and "Developing a reflexive voice" (5.4) below. For example, one student's writing might reflect an emerging voice and identity as a theory producer, which relates to the development of praxis, and reflexivity. This reflexivity in turn manifests in the discourse around the context and people surrounding the event. As has been explored, the literature on reflexivity argues that the development of reflexivity

is central to identities associated with lifelong learning, and that developing skills associated with lifelong learning enables people to successfully negotiate uncertainty (Edwards *et al.* 2002). Negotiating uncertainty relates to the first theme discussed, that of charting the course "from chaos to coherence". These three organising principles should therefore not be interpreted in a hierarchical or linear way, but should rather be seen as interwoven threads within the text.

5.2. The Protagonists: an introduction to the research participants

You will meet three students in this discussion. It is important to provide a brief context of who they are, and the educational drama projects they are reflecting on. All the Honours students worked together for their first term projects. Their first experience was an introductory workshop at Amasango School in Grahamstown, a school for street children and children who have dropped out of mainstream schooling due to situations of poverty and neglect. The second experience involved two workshops on Macbeth for Gadra Matric School learners. All of these learners were studying English as a second language. The school is specifically aimed at improving matric (final year of secondary schooling) results of learners who need to improve their marks to attend further or higher education institutions. Each student chose their own projects for the rest of the year, and you will notice that some chose to work together. In order to distinguish quotations from journal entries, all journal quotes will appear in italics, followed by a page number which refers to the complete copies of the journals discussed, which are available for consultation if requested.

Jojo: Jojo had done educational drama at a third year level, and had decided that this option was going to be her primary focus in her Honours year, as she had developed a passion for it. She established very early in her journal writing, an identity as a healer, recognising the restorative aspects of developmental drama processes, and her own need to make a difference. On page 1 of her journal, in response to my request for a 'manifesto' of why they were taking this course, she states *"I essentially am very interested in drama therapy and in the ways drama can be used to heal and bring about change" (p.1a).*

This statement raises the curtain for the kinds of projects she subsequently chose. For her second term project, she ran workshops at Amasango, a school specifically for street children, and children with emotional and behavioural difficulties. She joined Clara as a co-facilitator, working with young offenders at the Grahamstown correctional facility (hereafter referred to as 'the prison'). For her final project, she ran life-skills based drama workshops at Kuyasa Special school with young people with moderate disabilities (for example, learning disorders and Downs Syndrome cases – often referred to as Special Needs). All of these projects were located in disadvantaged communities, where the vast majority of participants were first language Xhosa speakers and spoke English as a second or third language. Jojo entered her Honours year with below average written academic results, and a strong practical ability. As will be demonstrated, her ability to express herself in writing improved significantly across her courses by the end of her Honours year, and can be attributed to the journal process. After she graduated, Jojo worked for Ubom! Eastern Cape Drama Company based at Rhodes, which has a strong community and educational focus.

Clara: Clara had also taken educational drama at a third year level. She took it at an Honours level recognising that the experience would probably serve her well after her studies, although I do not think this work at that stage was her main passion. She also identified strongly with performance and script writing, and entered Honours with a strong academic record. One of the roles that started to emerge through her writing was a strong identification with the idea of theatre making. Her reflections started to highlight the value of transformation as an essential goal of any educational drama experience she created, and she tended to analyse her drama experiences in terms of theatrical structures, such as the use of rhythm and space as a means of enhancing the transitions between 'real' time and 'fictional' time. One of the roles that reoccurred in Clara's journal I named 'magician', due to her emphasis on transformation. She would often highlight the value of ceremony and ritual as a key strategy in her work. Again, this value is introduced in her 'manifesto' also her first journal entry:

> *I want to be able to stimulate the imagination of others, and facilitate incredible journeys of personal and group discovery (p. 3b).*

This identity resonates with her other passions in drama, acting, directing and script-writing, and perhaps indicates a need to hold onto an identity as an artist.

Clara worked with Lorraine for her second term project, running workshops with Grade 8 learners at Nathaniel Nyaluza High School in Rhini township in Grahamstown. She initiated the prison project with young offenders, which she worked on for terms 3 and 4. Clara was also a tutor for the Drama 1 *Theatre Making* course, during her Honours year. Clara is now working for a community theatre organisation, running educational drama workshops and programmes for teachers and in communities on Johannesburg's East Rand.

Lorraine: Lorraine had not done educational drama at a third year level, and as a result, a strong feeling of insecurity manifests in her writing. Lorraine's main passion lay with performance (acting and dance), although she indicated a strong desire to engage with socially meaningful work. Her first entry in her journal establishes this interest, and includes her past narrative as influencing her present choices:

> *When I heard about the workshop with street children, I was so excited. This is exactly the kind of work I love to do. I have been involved in similar programmes in Swaziland working with school children using drama to educate them. But, this was 4 years ago and because I had not done EDT last year, I felt a little doubtful of my abilities to command a child's attention and actually help them to learn something from the experience (p.1c).*

The above extract also demonstrates the strong presence and reference to an autobiographical self in the writing (discussed under section 5.4.1). Later, but reflecting on the same experience, she expresses this desire further:

> *I want to reach out and make a difference. But at the same time, I am very aware that my role is not that of Good Samaritan (p. 2c).*

As is established from the above opening statements in her journal, this student expressed a complex mixture of inadequacy and reflexivity. Her journal writing establishes (amongst other things) an identity as a perfectionist and someone who wants to make a social difference. However, along with this, is the identity of an 'apprentice', someone who is always learning, and feeling intimidated by the 'expert systems' (discussed further in section 5.4.1) which she is learning about, and with. I

found her journal writing the richest of the three, yet surprisingly, her questionnaire reveals that perhaps, due to her highly critical and reflexive eye, a journal did not suit her learning style. I will address this tension between my perception of the quality and insights of her writing, and her perception of a journal encouraging her to be over-critical, further in this section.

Lorraine worked with Clara at Nathaniel Nyaluza, and then established her own project at Archie Mbolekwa school. Both these schools are in the township. Lorraine used drama to aid Grade 6 learners (age 11 and 12) to speak, read, write, and understand English. This school, although English medium, is made up of Xhosa speaking teachers and pupils, and draws learners from some of the poorest sections in the township. After graduating, Lorraine worked in Taiwan, teaching English.

There was one more student in this Honours class, which the journal writings at times refer to. However, this student is not included in the study as he disposed of his journal as soon as he had graduated. This student was strongly resistant to journal writing and he found dealing with affective aspects within course work, such as self reflection, very difficult. Although I could have included his thoughts on the journal process, it became very difficult to contact him and I eventually elected to focus on the three in the study. I do recognise that his thoughts and experiences of journal writing could have provided a significant perspective. In his final evaluation of the course, he wrote the following about journals: "I understand the point of this – for you, the examiner and I to plot my development as a practitioner – but I must say that sitting down to write entries was as tedious an activity as any. In theory I agree with the journal, in practise, no" (Honours EDT course evaluation 2004). This student was generally resistant to many strategies I used throughout the course, although I do know that he learnt and gained from his experiences. However, his personal and learning style generally did not fit many of my outcomes (particularly in terms of the developing of praxis and reflective abilities), and I often questioned why he had chosen to take this paper at all. Having got to know this student, and his fairly unique personal and learning style, I was unsure if pursuing his participation would have shed any significant light on the study.

Before the discussion moves towards an analysis of these students' writing in the broad areas identified, I wish to highlight the nature of the 'real world contexts' that these students were practising in. The range of projects which these students' were involved in, were not the safe, vaguely knowable and predictable middle class worlds from which they came. All of the groups that the students interacted with came from very different backgrounds, distinguished by differences in language, class, culture, race, and in the prison context, gender too. For these students, negotiating difference is also ethically, aesthetically and practically negotiating the complexities of a South African social landscape. For their practice, a 'real world' context was often a very real introduction to communities from radically different contexts to their own.

5.3. From Chaos to Coherence[17]: Examining how students negotiate difference and instability through their journal writing.

> Chaos, contradiction and confusion are central features of contemporary practice, and the ways in which these aspects are made manifest in writing about work can be addressed in the documentation of practice (Freeman 2002:102).

Part of the writing process seems to allow these students to narrate how they improvise and adapt to the unexpected – and reveals to themselves that far from the chaos which memory captures, they managed to adapt, survive, cope and learn. The process of writing about some of those events that are experienced as chaotic in the moment, shifts the interpretation of the experience from chaos to meaningful, useful learning. This is alluded to by both Clara and Jojo in their responses to my questionnaire. Jojo considered the ability to revision experience as a major benefit:

> One major benefit of writing down a session of planning and analysis is that I can always refer back to what was written, and after re-reading it, I can look at it in a much more objective light, being able to see things from a totally different angle to that which I had thought before. This can also sometimes bring about different solutions for any bumps or areas which don't go smoothly! (Questionnaire A 2005:1).

For Clara, the writing process became a catalyst for generating new ideas.

---

[17] O'Rourke (1998) uses this term in relation to journal writing bringing coherence to the fragmentation that results from mass modular higher education. I use it slightly differently to capture the process of meaning that journal writing can bring to lived experiences which feel unmanageable and chaotic.

> I find that writing like this is a way of focusing your mind: it encourages you to turn vague impressions into concrete analysis and sparks ideas and realisations that you wouldn't have if you didn't think about your experiences in a fairly structured and detailed way (Questionnaire B, 2005:1).

While these are useful impressions garnered from the benefit of hindsight, I wish to turn to concrete examples from the journals which support my argument that the reflective writing process facilitates a tangible documentation of managing and negotiating instability and difference effectively.

The following extract is from Jojo's journal. She is discussing a particularly chaotic experience at Amasango school (carried out in the second term of her Honours year), where she was working in a very cramped inadequate space with continual interruptions from staff members which broke the fragile space and time of the fictional world. She starts her reflection of this workshop as *"I have just finished my class and I am feeling rather despondent. For me the class went terribly" (p.64a)*, yet as she processes the whole experience through writing about it, she starts to identify the learning that occurred for herself and the participants despite the chaos she has described until this point:

> *At least I know they had fun!*
> *And they are working together a lot better so positive aspects are coming out of my lesson even though the message isn't! (p69a).*

By the end of her narrative of this particular experience (p.70a), her despondency is forgotten and she ends the reflection on this experience talking about the positive steps she wishes to take to alleviate the difficult circumstances of her workshops. This is discussed in brackets, signalling an aside, rather than a definitive claim: *"(I now feel I need to be a little more assertive!)"* (p.70a).

The two examples from Clara and Lorraine's writing, are also examples of journal writers documenting instances of Schön's *reflection-in-action*, an immediate, spontaneous re-framing of an approach to improve practice in the moment (Schön 1983). The journal provides a tangible space and perspective to *reflect-on-action* and consolidate learning from experience. Being able to recognise when *reflection-in-action*

is occurring, is linked to recognising how one responds to instability and uncertainty. Boud (2001) maintains that:

> In developing expertise of any kind, it is often more helpful to become more deliberate and conscious of the process and more aware of the decisions being made by others and ourselves. It is through exposing these decisions to scrutiny that the assumptions behind them can be identified and a conscious decision to act from a new perspective can be taken (Boud 2001:13).

Lorraine's example appears early in her EDT experience, and also reflects the dynamics of team work and facilitation. Here she documents her dilemma over whether to interject to rescue a situation which a peer is facilitating:

> *X's questions were not very clear. This is where I had a little mental dilemma. I could see that the students were losing where the discussion was going but initially, I didn't feel as if I had the right to interject – being a not-very-experienced facilitator. But I saw a way out of the confusion, and took it, asking a question that would open up the discussion a bit. My confidence needs to be worked on a bit, I think – more do or die situations* (p.9c).

What is significant here, is Lorraine's recognition of the value of the unexpected and the unknown, in helping her to take risks and develop her practice. She expresses her initial belief that she was unsure, due to her inexperience, whether she had the right to intervene. By writing through the experience she is able to validate her actions, and start to shift her identity from one who is 'not worthy' to someone who takes an ethical stance to serve and strengthen the experience for the participants. This example supports Mannion's (2001:99) belief that "keeping a journal may help adults break habitual modes of thinking and change life direction through reflective withdrawal and re-entry". Much later in her journal, she facilitates a workshop which she first describes as "*It felt so terrible!*" (p.32c). However, by the end of her reflection on this experience, she has not only noted several positive and constructive events, but is able to recognise the inherent instability of real world contexts: "*I have never encountered such a see-saw experience – one day is absolutely amazing and then next is downright shameful. But I suppose these days appear to make you think and plan much more carefully*" (p32c). For Lorraine in particular, who names and stories herself as 'inadequate', her journal writing documents many experiences where she responds to difficult situations in a constructive, aesthetic, and ethical manner. Although her feelings of insecurity reappear in different guises throughout the journal, she starts to recognise her tendency

to write about the negative, rather than understanding her strengths. From half way through the year, she starts to contextualise her own practice more, and temper her perfectionist voice. The following extract is from the last quarter of her Honours year:

> *I laugh as I admit this. One of the greatest things that I have learnt as a person in this EDT process is that perfectionism has no place when I am being a facilitator. I have realised that the reason I get so critical of myself is that I focus greatly on the things that I am NOT doing, as opposed to the things that are actually quite successful. I am always imagining the beady eye of the EDT genius gods to be on me, making notes of my failure. Again, I laugh* (p.36c).

It is significant that she notes that "perfectionism has no place when I am being a facilitator", indicating an acknowledgement of the instability of real world practice. However, it is notable that what Lorraine remembers about journal writing, is not my interpretation of how it aids her in working through insecurity and chaos, but that it exaggerated her already critical voice. In her questionnaire, she names this as a distinct disadvantage in her case:

> In constantly assessing my performance, I tended to become over-critical at times. While I was in a practical, I often viewed the experience through my own critical eyes, writing my journal before the session had even concluded. For the same reason a journal can be an advantage, in my case, it proved also to be a bit of a disadvantage in that I became too involved with the issues to be dealt with that I scarcely had time to see what I was doing right (Questionnaire C 2005:1-2).

Lorraine's overall memory of journal writing as a student, is that it made her focus on the negative rather than the positive in her work. However, there are many examples in her journal where she works through difficult experiences, and finds moments in her practice and in the participants' response which highlight learning and development that is occurring for both herself and the groups with which she works. As a researcher, I found Lorraine's journals perhaps the most insightful in terms of developing the personal and social questioning which leads to reflexivity (discussed further in section 5.4.3). In addition, her narrativization of her experience is rich and complex in its multi-genred approach, which creatively navigates subjective and objective readings of an event. A personal narrative of experience often reflects a performed or preferred self (Henning 2004). For Lorraine, who recognises her highly critical voice, negotiating difference was a painful experience which exposed and confronted an 'ideal self' which required order and perfection. Through her writing, this ideal self is challenged as the imperfections of working with the unknowable are fore-grounded. Clark & Ivanic

(1999:82) argue that "the activity of writing is an arena of struggle as well as conformity". Although this confrontation and struggle may lead to vulnerability and insecurity, it attests to a change and shift in the way this student relates to herself and the world in a more reflexive way. Real and sustainable change is uncomfortable, and education should involve risks. Lorraine acknowledges this discomfort, and the subsequent growth that came from it, when she sent me a response to an earlier draft of this chapter:

> I think I was trying to anticipate a lot of the critiques that may have come my way; by acknowledging them first, I was, in a way, protecting myself. I often refused to re-read what I had written because it seemed that it would just be a re-hashing of failure. I really should have spent more time reading it because I was so surprised to read the extracts of what I had written..... Sometimes, it didn't even seem like it was me writing. It sounds strange but I was actually quite impressed by what I wrote. There seemed to be a very clear voice in the text, even if it was self-deprecating much of the time. I was able to see very clearly what I was talking about and had I re-read my journal entries, I think a lot of the turmoil of my EDT practice would have disappeared (Lorraine, personal communication, 7 June 2005).

In reflecting back on her journal entries, Lorraine articulates how identity shapes and is shaped by the writing process. The person who wrote this text, now seems alien to her, and she is now able to see the richness of her writing. Further in her correspondence, she challenges my interpretation that perhaps a journal did not suit her learning style because it fore-grounded her critical voice:

> You mentioned that journal writing did not seem to suit my learning style. Is that possible? Could it not be that aspects of my "ideal self" were in conflict with the journal writing process and that this could be overcome? Even after only two years, I think I would be more receptive to the idea of writing a journal. This chapter has highlighted for me, the artistic palette that is a journal (Lorraine, personal communication, 7 June 2005).

Lorraine's participation in this research has resulted in an unexpected outcome: she has begun to see her past 'inadequate' self in a new, more affirming way. Her feedback has also given me insight into how to more effectively support the journal writing process more effectively, which I will return to in section 6.

The following example of how journal writing facilitates the navigation of difference and instability comes from Clara's journal. Clara is reflecting on a particularly chaotic and

disorganised experience at Nathaniel Nyaluza school in term 2, where they (she and Lorraine) encountered many difficulties in setting up and implementing the workshops. Although she does highlight the difficult, inadequate circumstances, her writing is evidence of how writing through the experience allows one to see the complexity of it, and notice different aspects which can change the perception of it from 'chaos' to 'coherence'. For example, she starts by emphasising the non-transformative possibilities of the tiny room, after much disorganisation from the school at the start:

> *Finally we were given the library to work in – an area that was quite cramped and small, and filled with books. This rather anti-transformative space was not a very encouraging start, especially because we had been told we would work in the hall* (23b).

However, further into her reflection of this experience, she finds aspects of transformation of time, space, and role as she writes through the experience:

> *I think we set up the meeting between the tribes quite nicely – my group was really looking forward to it – we had selected a spokesperson and decided to show our worshipping ritual to them as part of our culture. For the first time there was a definite sense of tension in the room when they entered the space of the meeting and stood opposite each other* (25b).

In her overall conclusion of the two workshops, the structure echoes the journey from chaos to meaningful learning:

> *By now we had run out of time, making this quite a disappointing session, especially because we didn't even have time to reflect. However, it was not an utter failure, in that I think Lorraine and I adapted, recovered, and improvised well, and the class really enjoyed its time with us* (26b).

The cycle of adaptation, recovery and improvisation echoes the cycle which Clandinin & Connelly refer to as "allowing difference to challenge assumptions, values, and beliefs; improvising and adapting to the difference" (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:9). What all these examples show is what the literature on both narrative and reflective writing maintains: that writing about our experience gives it a tangible form, shape and new meaning. It also provides the opportunity for students to process how they responded to the unknowable.

Freeman (2002) draws on Freud's distinction between memory and remembrance as a useful way of understanding the process of writing about experience:

> Whilst memory serves to put the past into some semblance of chronological order, absorbing that which is being remembered into a deliberated continuum which locates the distant past at one end and the present at the other, remembrance destroys the separation of past and present[....]through remembrance past is not made subject to an act of revival but one of renewal (Freeman 2002:96).

The non-linear characteristic of remembrance of events through writing allows those experiences to be renewed through a fresh interpretation. This new interpretation invariably repositions what memory has marked as 'failure' or 'disaster'. The repositioning, or re-interpretation, overwhelmingly places the event in a more detailed context, from which renewed meaning can be drawn. This meaning highlights moments where strengths were fore-grounded, where considered actions and reactions occurred, and where improvements can be made for the next time.

Connected to the above observations are theories around the act of writing. Clark & Ivanic (1997) demonstrate how writing shapes, and is a tool for thinking. For Richardson (2000:923), writing is a way of knowing, "a method of discovery and analysis". There are several examples in these journals, of writing shaping thinking, and becoming a way of knowing. The following example is from Jojo, who initially struggled to express herself verbally and in writing. However, her commitment to improving her writing in her journal and responding to my feedback had a significant effect, resulting in an overall improvement in her written work across her courses. Her example is supported by research which indicates that journals are key in developing student confidence and cognitive ability (O'Rourke 1998). Jojo's development and shifts in identity are discussed in more detail in the next section. The example below shows how the process of writing allows a fresh insight which significantly moves her interpretation. Interestingly, Jojo is talking about a situation where she asked participants in her Special Needs group, to write down suggestions – and the politics of writing comes to the fore in her experience:

We then wrote down the different activities we could do while camping and this is something I won't do again because they are all very conscious of writing down firstly, and secondly they can't do it very well so it takes such a very long time. Or maybe next time I'll write or they can do little symbols or picture which illustrate our point. But that could take an awful long time too! Maybe I should just persevere with the writing because at least it is practice for them and I'm not checking their spelling or anything! Actually, come to think of it, it's probably because they were writing in English, so next time I will definitely encourage them to write in whichever language they feel comfortable with. (p.113a).

In the above example, through her narration of the situation, she moves from rejection of writing in the future, through to finding ways to include the participants in the documentation of their ideas, through to enduring the slowness of their writing because it might be educationally useful for them, to the final, more reflexive reading of the situation which takes into account issues of language and context.

What the above discussion reveals is what Cooper (1991:97) argues: "Telling our stories is a way to impose form upon our often chaotic experiences, and, in the process, to develop our own voice". Developing a voice is intimately connected to the development of an identity. Clark and Ivanic (1999:158) argue that "acts of writing depend on the multiple identities that writers bring to them and that acts of writing in themselves constitute an on-going struggle over possible identities". For Jojo in particular, the complexity and depth of her use of language, and ability to articulate, analyse and become reflexive about her experiences shifted greatly over the year as she grappled with claiming the legitimacy to theorise about practice. This legitimacy is tied to the claim for authority and authorial presence in the writing. This is in contrast to Lorraine's writing which expressively negotiates the tension between the highly personalised, and theorised academic discourses that such texts demand. If one conceives of a continuum of the available genres and discourses that the students in this study use at the start of the journal writing process, Jojo's highly anecdotal style would be positioned at one end, while Clara's objective academic stance would be positioned at the other. Lorraine settles early in her writing in the middle of these extremes. Because the genre of journal writing is undetermined and diverse, the exploration of different voices and identities is encouraged. Extending our ability to negotiate and apply a range of genres, and therefore voices, prepares us for a world of

supercomplexity. For Paola (2003:143), this is directly linked to social power: "the more genres one has access to – and the more sub-genres within each genre – the greater one's potential social power and influence". The ability to express oneself in a wide range of contexts is a vital means of currency in social situations, and can enable us to negotiate diversity effectively, and respectfully.

A journal provides an important space to apply and experiment with a range of communication styles which is important in consolidating and expressing knowledge. It therefore plays an important role in exploring a range of voices (O'Rourke 1998). The theme of negotiating difference and change will be discussed further throughout this section, as it weaves its way through all of the participants' writing. The next section deals with the journey towards developing reflexivity, in relation to voice and identity.

5.4. Developing a reflexive voice

What is striking about Jojo's writings in her journal at the beginning of the year, is the impression that she believes that she has no authority to make claims or suggest theories about what occurred and why. This is exhibited through the hesitant use of language *"I'm not sure why, but.."* (p.22a) and repeated use of a suggestive rather than a committed stance through the use of words like "perhaps", "maybe", in relation to her reflections on her experiences. This is linked to an identity of self as author, and also, to an ability to reflect and be reflexive. For Clark & Ivanic (1999:152) "viewing oneself as an 'author' - feeling authoritative and feeling the right to exert a presence in the text, if often related to the sense of power and status writers bring with them from their life-history".

In my initial attempts to deconstruct the writing, I began to get frustrated with her writing at the beginning stages of her journal. She often repeated descriptions of a class based practical or a workshop she had run as "interesting" or "very interesting" with no qualification of what this might mean and why. For example *"it was good in coming up with different points from different sides – very interesting"* (p.9a), and *"the enrolment was nice, it worked pretty well"* (p26a). 'Interesting' and 'nice' became empty, placating

adjectives, which in a way, obscured any tension or negativity in the narrative. One of the identities Jojo exhibits in the beginning I named as 'Polyanna' – someone who will see the good in everything, who actively seems to defy an opinionated stance as if she has no right to it, or it will reflect negatively on her. For example, there were clearly group problems amongst her peers in the creation of their group project in Term 1. However, she is careful never to assign blame, or separate herself from the group: "*Oh well, we did have our moments and when we did it was all worth it in the end*" (p.22a). This is in stark contrast to both Clara and Lorraine, who claim authorial presences from the very beginning of their journal writing. Although both students are very different in how they claim their authorial voice, it becomes clear that they enter their Honours year with an ability to reflect on experience in an analytical and critical way. For example, they were all required to reflect on their first EDT experience together, which involved a workshop at Amasango school. One of the major differences that students are required to negotiate in this course, involves the stark differences in class, race and culture between their privileged status as white Rhodes post-graduate students, and the disadvantaged communities with whom they often work. Often, students construct language as a barrier when expressing anxiety about applying drama strategies in these contexts. Differences in language are often named as a tangible, non-prejudicial obstacle to navigating vast differences. However, students quickly discover that language is a far less rigid barrier than initially constructed, and that their approach to the nature of their interaction is what sets up the boundaries and levels of understanding. I will use two extracts from each student's writing about language and the participants in this particular workshop, as a way of highlighting the different ways writers present themselves and others in the text.

Jojo:

1. *She (*the school principle) *sat all the kids down onto the mat. She was speaking to them all in Xhosa and this made me feel a little anxious as to how we were going to keep focus in facilitating* (4a);
2. *Although I could not understand much of what was being said (being in Xhosa), I felt that this was a beneficial part in understanding how they viewed drama* (p.5a).

Clara:

1. *The first exercise was a warm-up in silence. I think that the silence was a good idea, because of the language barrier between the English speaking facilitators and the Xhosa speaking children. This was so we set up relationship without having the immediate distancing of an interpreter* (p.6b).
2. *I think the effectiveness of the workshop would have been severely undermined if we hadn't had Xhosa speaking facilitators, and the whole experience really made me want to learn at least the rudiments of Xhosa. I feel a negative alienating effect in having to have an interpreter* (6b).

Lorraine:

1. *What struck me greatly were the questions that the children asked once Daniel, Mongi & Jojo had done the mime piece. It was here that I realised that I really need to learn how to speak Xhosa – there was no way that I was going to make any profound impact linguistically* (1c);
2. *I left the school with a great sense of elation, accompanied by varying levels of frustration. I want to speak Xhosa. I want to reach out and make a difference* (2c).

For Jojo at this early stage of her writing, she tends to distance herself from the other people in the text through the representation of the children as "them". She also makes a statement without extending to why this makes her feel this way. Throughout this reflection (see pages 4-7a), she positions herself outside the narrative by mostly commenting on what others are experiencing, but not always what she is experiencing. For example at one stage she comments "*both games worked well in getting them comfortable with each other*" (6a). Considering that the experience took place in an after school context where the participants already knew each other quite well, I noticed how Jojo removes herself from the group dynamic and story at this stage, constructing the growing comfort as "theirs". This is in contrast with the other two students who position themselves in the text in an authorial manner. Clara tends to take a more critical reflexive stance, expressing clear and assured opinions. Lorraine's stance is more self-reflexive in terms of her frustration at not being able to interact with the children due to her inability to speak Xhosa.

5.4.1. Writer identity and authorial presence

A writer's sense of authority in relation to the text is often assumed to increase when using the personal claim to "I" in the text (Clark & Ivanic 1999). However, the genre of a journal demands the use of the personal pronoun. This is unlike most accepted genres in academia where personal experience is seen as unstable and irrelevant because it cannot be substantiated. The use of "I" in this context varies greatly in terms of authorial presence in the text.

> A rather obvious way of claiming authorial presence is to use first person references. However, even this is not so simple as it may seem, because the nature of this claim to authorship depends on what, exactly, the 'I' is portrayed as doing (Clark & Ivanic 1999:155).

A journal asks the writer to use personal experience as a source for authority. The way this authority is claimed therefore varies from student to student. What is important for me as a course leader is that this experiential knowledge is validated, and claimed as important through the establishment of an authorial voice. This emphasis in my curriculum is based on the premise that practical experience is a valuable means of knowledge production, a belief which is not always part of the mainstream thinking of academic knowledge producing systems (Toohey 1999). Moon (1999:34) maintains that "writing a journal calls on students – and staff – to relearn a lost language. We are trained to favour academic over expressive language.... The very requirement to write in the first person singular may be an important reason why journals contribute to improved learning".

Jojo's journey toward the development of an authorial voice is significant. When I compared her hesitant tone, with her writing about theory texts, I started to realise how in the beginning stages of her writing, she did not see herself as having the right or authority to judge in any way the theoretical or social texts she was encountering. For example, in Term 1, I set a task which required students to engage with theories of developmental psychology in relation to arts education. For their class practical, they were required to introduce an aspect of the material using drama processes to do so. In her reflections on the theory she was introduced to through peers, she accepts the

authority of the theory, and by extension, will not commit to critiquing how it was introduced practically by peers. One group for example, tried an exercise based on emotional memory, which was not particularly well implemented, or received. Jojo's conclusion to this was "*Anyhow, their intention was there! They were trying to tap into unconscious to use self as a source in order to make the performance more truthful*" (p.17a).

Jojo's task for the same exercise dealt with the work of Vygotsky, and she includes in her journal (pp 20-21a) notes on his theories. I was interested in how she took these notes, exhibiting a one to one relationship with the authority of the text. For example, her notes did not contain her own voice, but an abbreviated voice of the text, with no evidence of herself in conversation with the text through questions, ideas, or links in the summarised notes. In theatre terms, it was like an exact re-enactment of an observed scene, with no interpretation, reconstruction, improvisation, or sense of an individual voice or signature in the reading of the theory. Jojo's relationship to theoretical texts introduces the relationship between authorial presence and the knowledge systems which impact learning.

Dacre & Mackey (1999) draw on Giddens' (1991) discussion of expert systems as relevant for reflective journals. Expert systems are defined as "systems and practices expounded by authorities to which we turn seeking advice, answers, validity and authentication for our own practices and lifestyle decisions" (*ibid*:61). Dacre & Mackey (1999) argue that developing an ability to address the experts or authorities that students use, or those systems that influence their practice, is part of reflexivity. The addressing of these systems is also a developing of a *praxis*, as it requires students to identify and integrate how theory feeds practice and vice versa. At this early stage of Jojo's journal writing, she is reluctant to address, or converse, with these expert systems. As part of my feedback to students, I ask them to consciously reflect on how theory influences practice. As a result of this request, Lorraine and Clara started to address the expert systems as a way of producing their own theories about their practice. The following example from Clara's journal highlights the authorial presence in the text through the integration of an expert system (in this case, Dorothy Heathcote,

the 'guru' of drama-in-education). In this example, she is trying to address the authoritative presence of the prison warder who participates in the dramatic activity, but can get over-bearing:

> *Perhaps we should experiment with using a tactic that Heathcote uses with dominant students: give him a role of importance that allows him to be involved but not take over; perhaps we should even en-role him in a subordinate position to subvert the usual power dynamics of the group* (58b).

By referencing the 'expert system' of Heathcote, and re-directing it to her own immediate experience, a reflexivity emerges in terms of understanding the subtle shifts in power that can result from different activities.

For Lorraine, these expert systems are included, but sometimes positioned as another unattainable goal in relation to her feelings of inadequacy. In the following example, she addresses two different types of experts: Heathcote, who represents the theorised authority, and Nyaki, her translator, who represents an expert system in relation to his understanding of the language, culture, and educational context of the children she is working with.

> *When I read the letter.., I had to deal with the translation process once again. I found it difficult to maintain my role as the head scientist when having to speak really simply to them. I always have Dorothy Heathcote in mind when I am speaking to a class – employing the correct register. Having Nyaki there was really helpful in communicating instructions but sometimes I felt as though my role was a bit undermined by it* (p.24c).

This example highlights the complex variables that need to be accounted for in the moment to moment exploration of practice. Another example in Lorraine's journal, refers to my role as a supervisor, observing her practice towards the end of the Honours year. Here again, she interprets the expert system as a pressure. My presence is assigned the role of 'critic', referring to my feedback as "correction" and "criticism" (pp 41 – 43c). She ends this reflection on a disheartened note "*I know I should take all criticism and use if to my benefit but I can't help feeling just a little useless*" (p.43c). For this student, expert systems are intimidating, rather than inspiring possibilities for practice and knowledge.

Dacre & Mackey (1999) note that reflexivity develops once practitioners locate their own practice in relation to the experts or authorities they are using. However, these authors' research found that "on the whole, students and professionals are reflective about their *own* methods, but they do not always place their own work in the context of whole 'expert systems' and *then* critique the work" (Dacre & Mackey 1999:62, emphasis in the original). They conclude that: "Critiquing the expert-systems, as part of reflection, encourages drama practitioners to revise such systems, becoming innovative experts themselves" (*ibid*: 63). However, as I will argue when discussing the development of reflexivity in more detail, students first need to develop confidence in a constructive evaluative voice in relation to their own and others' practice, before they can challenge the power structures that 'expert systems' often represent.

The following discussion deals with a further aspect of writer identity that is evidenced in these journals: that of the autobiographical self.

5.4.2. Writer identity and the autobiographical self

Because writing about personal experience and practice is related to constructing a particular identity in relation to context, self and reader, writing a reflective journal can be understood as a type of autobiography. As has been noted, part of a writer's identity in the text is the 'autobiographical self' that concerns how a writer's life-history mediates what is told and how it is told (Clark & Ivanic 1999). Marcus (1995) notes how autobiography is associated with mixed and transgressive genres. The requirement to write personally in a post-graduate course, could be construed as transgressive in an academic context which often devalues personal knowledge and voice. Toohey (1999:46) for example, identifies how self-reflective knowledge is undervalued in academia because "it is regarded as too personal and individual to have any predictive power". The complexities of writing personally, reflectively, and critically involve a mixed genre, multi-voiced approach. Typically in drama studies, performed texts are mixed genre and often experimental, yet this is not seen as transgressive in the context of the kind of performance texts encouraged at Rhodes. However, students' written academic work tends to conform to the requirements of the 'academic essay' in

Humanities, in which the "I" voice is suppressed unless a student is particularly gifted at writing. Swindells (1995) provides a useful perspective on the development of a personal voice, which is conceived as a political act. "In making a claim to a political voice, the autobiographer is often in the process of contesting, explicitly or implicitly, what the authority of the 'educated' account has to offer" (Swindells 1995:7).

Denzin & Lincoln (2002) argue that writing is never innocent, always political and ethical. It seems however, that Jojo in the first half of her Honours year, wishes it to be innocent, by constructing an innocent persona who will not rock the boat. Like Lorraine, she constructs an 'ideal self' in her writing. She does not, at this stage have the confidence to assert her right to contest the 'educated' account, and therefore adopts a style which is often anecdotal, providing a surface reading of events. However, a profound shift takes place towards the end of Term 2, half way through her Honours year.

As Jojo starts to feel more comfortable with her own writing voice, and the legitimacy and value of commenting on experience, she starts to place herself as a narrator in and close to the people and experiences in the text. For example, her reflections at the beginning of Term 3 indicate this shift clearly. Not only is her use of language more varied and complex, she takes herself and ideas with a greater seriousness. At the start of Term 3 her journal presentation changes. In the first half of the year, her journal was hand written and often peppered with colloquial language use. Examples can be found on page 72a,with the colloquial use of the words "crappy", and "dude". From the second half of the year, her reflections are typed, and her hand written workshop outlines are far more carefully presented and thought through, with clear examples of *praxis* as she documents what the effect of an exercise might be. The following example indicates how as a narrator, she places herself within the text more deliberately:

> *I think this structure worked well because we were able to see how drama ready they were, how well they worked together and how comfortable they were with using their bodies, and interacting them with different situations, topics and people. We did a mirror game and it was quite enjoyable for me because during all this partner work I had to join in and partner up with someone. This was very interesting from me as I was really able to get first hand experience or a feeling*

as to what they were comfortable doing and what they found easy or challenging (p.76a).

In this example, she is able succinctly to identify why the workshop structure was effective. She then moves the narrative to her personal experience of participating in the workshop, and extends this to reflect on her renewed identification with what the other participants are going through. This paragraph moves beyond a description of what happened, to integrate conceptual, contextual, and personal factors. The genre and discourse becomes more complex, as she integrates personal experience with theory and practice.

At the beginning stages of Jojo's writing during the first half of her Honours year, there was a tendency to stick to level of plot rather than meaning: framing the narrative sequentially through linking sentences "and then and then". The descriptive approach fails to assign meaning to the event – which would bring it to the level of theory as to why something occurred and what it might imply. This relates to learning theories associated with deep and surface learning. Learning by doing is one way to facilitate deep learning as a deep approach comes from an intention to develop a personal understanding of the material (Ramsden 1992). The notion of deep learning was established by the ground breaking research of Marton & Säljö (1984) who found that students who thought that learning was about memorizing text were distinguished from "deep learners" who "seemed to have seen themselves as creators of knowledge who have to use their capabilities to make critical judgements, logical conclusions and come up with their own ideas" (*ibid:* 40). This type of student is in essence, the 'ideal' student for many educators, leading to much research and debate as to how to promote deep learning in students in higher education. Active or experientially based learning is recognised as one of the most effective means of acquiring knowledge, and facilitating deep learning, and these methods are being increasingly applied in higher education contexts (for examples see Biggs 1999 and Ramsden 1992). Luckett (2001) argues that an essential part of curriculum change for the South African higher education context should entail students' controlling and accepting responsibility for their own learning. With responsibility comes ownership and knowledge which is personally meaningful, and, by extension, the political act of developing a personal voice which is

valued and heard within the curriculum. Luckett (2001) advocates experiential teaching and learning as essential for meeting the (often conflicting) demands placed on graduates "because experiential learning is one of the best ways to get learners to engage and commit themselves to their studies and future careers, but also because this entails critical epistemic shifts" (Luckett 2001:56). What Jojo's journal demonstrates, is that for her, Luckett's epistemic shift involves a shifting identity as a creator of knowledge, part of Marton & Säljö's (1984) *deep learning*. She starts off submitting to the authority of academic written texts, and her observations on experience tend to remain at the level of what can be verified, seen, undisputed (the plot level). Usher & Edwards (1994) note how Foucault argued that practitioner based knowledge is suppressed, devalued, or denied as important, because scientific dogma states that truth is only that which faithfully represents the real world. It seems that Jojo in the beginning stages of her writing, conforms to this grand narrative too. What is significant in terms of my curriculum goal of developing a culture of reflective practice in students, is the shifts that Jojo makes so that by the end of one year of journal writing, she is able to claim a voice as a knowledge producer, and critically assess her own and other's practice. This is demonstrated in the following extract. Jojo is reflecting on a difficult workshop given at the prison during the second half of her Honours year:

> *Clara felt that the energy was down but I don't agree, I think it just makes a very big difference about the amount of people who are participating as there were less ideas and responses to feed back off and therefore the pressure to speak or respond was greater for them. I also felt that, as lesson planners, we should go back to the beginning about our facilitation with two people and the split focus and all that because, I think we both had different views on the lesson and this created a bit of tension between the two of us* (81a).

Ramsden (1992:42) notes that the difference between deep and surface approaches relate to "whether the student is searching for meaning or not when engaging with a learning task". As Jojo gains confidence in her reflective writing voice and identity, she is able to find legitimacy in her own meaning making in relation to practice and context. This is supported by the literature on the benefits of learning journals which maintain that "when the learning journal is an active, experiential self study aid it can help students move from surface to deep learning both within and across modules" (O'Rourke 1998:404).

It is therefore evident, that in order to learn from experience, means of reflecting, processing and conversing about that experience are essential in order to create opportunities for what Luckett terms "epistemic shifts" (2001:56). It becomes clear through the analysis, that reflective writing allows us to learn from experience and construct identities that can support that learning. Jojo subjectively experiences an event and then objectively explores it in a removed time and space – which facilitates a change, clarification, and a renewed perception in relation to the experience. This cycle of action and reflection leads to change in thinking, ideas, and identity. Through writing, she actively constructs and consolidates these changes. Her writing shapes and is shaped by the experience. A curriculum requirement to write about practice opens up a landscape that allows a person to re-look at their experiential journey and chart its course from different perspectives.

The metaphor I have constructed through my writing about the journal as a journey, suggests that the journal writing process is a mapping process too. It allows the writer to see where they were at a point in time, and what the relationship is between then, and where they are now. This journey creates a map of learning from experience. Lorraine highlights these benefits:

> At the end of my Honours year, I had in my hand, material proof of my development during that year...my position had changed from being just a student, to one of both student and teacher. This was quite a big change because most of my education was geared towards pleasing my teachers. Now that I had the opportunity to look at my performance from a more objective point of view, a lot of my development is self induced (Questionnaire C, 2005:2).

I will now examine in more detail, the journey these students take towards developing my curriculum goal of reflexivity. Part of this journey involves the development of a drama *praxis*, in which the journal becomes the site for integrating theory and personal practice, as part of a cycle of action, reflection, and change. What change means, or how it occurs, differs from individual to individual. I have already outlined that as a teacher in higher education, my 'ideal' student and graduate, is someone who demonstrates critical reflexivity as expressed in the move from interpretation to active change (see section 3.5). "In this view, it is not enough to understand and interpret the

world; rather the task is to change it" (Morrison 1996:319). The following discussion examines how, when, and if writing a journal can achieve this curriculum goal of developing reflexivity. For Edwards *et al.* (2002:531), reflexivity involves "the capacity to develop a critical awareness of the assumptions that underlie practices" and therefore involves self and social questioning. I will therefore use self and social questioning as a basis for the discussion of evidence of reflexivity in the journals.

5.4.3. Questioning of self and social context

The journal writing of all three students demonstrates an ability to acknowledge and question their own assumptions. It seems as if self-critique is acceptable and expected as a student, which could relate to the self-monitoring paradigms requiring 'self knowledge' which have become part of an increasingly psychologised society (Bleakley 2000). A common theme in all three journals I titled "surprise" whereby assumptions about how a group would react to drama processes were continuously challenged. As the students become more comfortable with the personalised genre of the journal, they are able to dialogue more effectively with themselves, leading to a reflexivity about assumptions, rather than a noting that events turned out differently than expected. As mentioned, Lorraine demonstrates a high level of self-reflexivity from the start of her journal writing, whereas the other two students grow in their ability to evaluate themselves and their assumptions.

Clara, for example, starts her journal writing by providing a broad analytical overview at the expense of the particular dynamics of significant moments, including her own feelings in response to particular events. She tends to place herself at a cognitive, academic distance, through her use of a critical objective voice. She focuses her analysis on the structures and strategies used in her experiences, rather than interrogating herself in the process, or how participants behaved. The following extract demonstrates her focus on structure and strategies, and is a reflection on the *Macbeth* workshop with Gadra Matric School:

> *On reflection, I think we could have put the role-play later, so it had a more obvious link with Macbeth's situation, because I felt we linked that up too late, and the connection we made was rather tenuous. The role-play was a good*

analogy to help them understand Macbeth's situation, but we never made that as clear as it needed to be (p.12b).

Her voice establishes a right to critique, yet is devoid of the kind of emotional involvement which both Jojo and Lorraine include. Her narrative structure frames the reflection as a problem finding and solving. The structure tended to describe what happened and assign meaning to it, locate a problem within in it, and would conclude by suggesting a way of improving the situation. Clara adopts an academic genre in her writing, which does include herself in the text, but the self that is constructed is an objective, unemotional one which defines her authorial presence as a 'judge'. What I will argue, is that this identity is constructed because she feels confident with her academic voice, and this is the ideal self which is presented. What her choice of genre and voice conceals, is a lack of confidence in herself beyond an identity as a thinker. This identity shifts as her journal writing documents her growing identity as an artist as well as a theoriser, and she focuses on the need for theatrical transformation as a validation of practice.

The narrative strategy used in the beginning stages of her writing approaches the event as a problem that needs fixing, and the following extract demonstrates this approach:

> *There was absolute silence during the scene, indicating that they were engrossed in what was happening, even if they didn't fully understand it. I think we should have thought much more carefully about the transition towards watching the scene again, making it clearer that we were watching out of role, and perhaps making a bit of a ritual about de-roling. We could also have set it up to be more exciting creating a clearer audience and performance space* (13b).

Clara demonstrated an exceptional analytical ability, which I rewarded as a teacher. However, when I examined these texts through a researcher's eye, I started to recognise how this student has learnt the academic game and plays it very well. Clara assumes an academic identity and in so doing, uses a disembodied writing genre which often removes the social and affective dynamics which impact on her practice. Bleakley (2000:12) notes that "the kinds of writing employed will constitute the kinds of reflection enacted". Many students learn to "appropriate" and become "appropriated by" the limitations of academic discourse as they "invent the university by mimicking its language" (Bartholomae 1985:134 cited in Clark & Ivanic 1999:135). The kinds of

identities that can be explored are therefore limited by the adherence to a type of genre. For Richardson (2000:925) this means that "our sense of Self is diminished as we are homogenized through professional socialization, rewards and punishments". I am part of this system, because as a teacher, I did reward her high level of analysis. In response to my interpretation of Clara's academic style as being part of playing the academic game, Clara provided an alternative insight:

> ...your comment that I was playing the academic game...implies that I deliberately just wrote what I thought would earn the highest praise, and that's not true. In whatever style it's written, I wrote my journal spontaneously and sincerely. I think the academic style of it is probably at least partly a result of mental habit – I was writing many essays and debating a great at the time, so that was the discourse in which I functioned (Clara, personal communication, June 13 2005).

In her reflections on my interpretation of her chosen genre, Clara highlights how discourse is mediated by our context. I have also noticed how my writing style shifts in relation to the discourses that are dominant in my life at the time. What is also significant is not only what dominates the writing, but what is excluded too.

Clara's adoption of a particular kind of academic discourse became strikingly clear when I started to notice the way her reflections focused only on the actual face to face drama workshop, rather than the context in which these workshops took place, or how she felt about them. She instead adopts an analytical stance that discusses what occurred, why, and how it could be different or improved. Due to her initial construction of herself as a thinker, she focuses on cognitive processes in her writing, to the exclusion of the emotional political and social context which might problematise it. For example her writing on the Nathaniel Nyaluza workshops in the second term are titled *"EDT reflection: Lesson 1"* (p.23b), with no mention of even the most minimal of contextual details such as age group or school name. At this stage, instead of negotiating difference, difference is ignored at a macro level.

However, like both Lorraine and Jojo, Clara's writing about her experiences reveal how "the activity of writing is an arena of struggle as well as conformity" (Clark & Ivanic 1999:82). Although Clara adopts a highly objective analytical genre, what she speaks about alludes to the need to embrace an artistic identity too. Her analyses often centre

around the artistic dimensions of the experience, in terms of how it could be improved to make the dramatic experiences more transformative.

When this student chooses the prison as her main project, she provides very little detail regarding the context leading to the establishment of this project and interrogation of herself and the dynamics of the unusual space in which she is working. When I started this research, I assumed that this student would emerge as the most critically reflexive due to her ability to analyse so well. However, at this stage of her writing, her analysis refers to the micro-level of the experience. Her understanding and interpretation of the experience is limited to the workshop structure and artistic strategies. This is in stark contrast to Jojo, who worked with Clara on the same project, and included her shifting feelings about working in the prison. The following example demonstrates Jojo's development as a "narrative anthropologist" and demonstrates her growing ability to "allow(ing) difference to challenge assumptions, values, and beliefs; improvising and adapting to the difference" (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:9). She starts her reflection relating to her first visit to the Juvenile section of the Grahamstown prison by admitting "*.... I didn't think I would really be up for that sort of thing, and truthfully, the whole idea of working with convicts or prisoners really scared me" (*p.74a). Her first experience of walking through the prison brings home the gravity and reality of the situation: *"You can never prepare yourself for what a prison is like before you enter the totally freezing, dark and sadly dismal corridors and surrounding"* (p.74 –75a). Yet the openness and responsiveness of the young men obliterates her preconceived ideas:

> *It was incredible to see how they just came, expecting something to happen, and so ready and responsive to the idea of doing drama! So, I lost all fears of working with them, and rather got really excited to see what they would be like and what we could learn from them as well... (*p.75a).

Here, Jojo writes about how her assumptions were challenged, leading to a change in thinking and relationship with a group of people she had originally considered as 'other'. Although Clara has advanced analytical abilities, Jojo is able to 'confront' her emotional reactions to the experience, and note the gravity, and reality of entering a prison. It is at this stage that Jojo's 'Polyanna' identity (her ideal projected self) is confronted, and she starts to take herself and her emerging identity as a theory producer more seriously.

What I noticed when comparing this reflection to Clara's, who shared this experience, is that Clara consciously removes the context from her reflections, focusing on the actual drama workshop moments. She tended to use the word 'participant' as a neutral term, as if the specifics of who they were and where the workshop was happening was immaterial. This is despite her conceptualisation of highly creative and relevant developmental drama experiences which indicated a high level of understanding and sensitivity in terms of where the participants were coming from. Her choices of roles and fictional contexts, attests to her social sensitivity, and critical thinking that was occurring. For example, she notes in her journal that the participants often talk about life outside the prison. She uses this to create a drama experience which will allow them to play empowering creative roles (such as entrepreneurs who must pitch a business idea to the bank) which will extend their role repertoire beyond a 'victim' stance. However, her writing about these experiences establishes an identity as a knowledge producer within an academic genre that removes her creative critical thinking around this context.

Clara provided insightful reflections on my interpretation of her exclusion of some of the contextual factors in her experiences. In her response to a draft of this section she explained:

> I think the reason why I didn't put much detail about the "participants" is because I was very concerned in my own mind about having preconceptions or making judgements about a group before I met them (so I would self-censor, even before I wrote it down, anything that indicated that). It's not that I'm unaware of the social structures in which I work, I just don't want to make assumptions based on those structures, or define people according to them. In addition, I suppose I wanted the circumstances of the group to be irrelevant; I didn't like the idea that such contingent factors would make barriers between us. Basically, I was avoiding issues about being a privileged white student that are sensitive in my own mind (Clara, personal communication, 13 June 2005).

In this perspective, Clara highlights the difficulty faced by many people, of how to ethically navigate the complex social landscapes of post-Apartheid South Africa. In her feedback to my interpretation, she makes explicit how sensitive she was being to the social context and who she was in it. My curriculum and personal beliefs ask for an

acknowledgement, and eventually a confrontation concerning how I/others have come to act and be in this way. However, as a teacher I need to be sensitive to the many vulnerabilities, insecurities and challenges faced by students (and often myself), when working in situations charged with a history of mistrust, uncertainty and divide. In South Africa, social identity and power is still very much marked on our bodies through race and gender – and when we speak, through language too. Clara's means of navigating the complexities of a South African narrative that is played out on a day to day, interaction to interaction basis, is to focus on the moment to moment, person to person experiences, in her reflections. I have a relationship with Clara, as I have kept in fairly regular contact with her since she graduated. Her insightful feedback to my initial interpretation of her journal writing, left me with uncertainty, and grappling with ethical dilemmas regarding my current relationship with her, and the distancing nature of the research process. Nespor & Barbar (1995:50) note how "research is a way of imposing order on an external world", resulting in levels of re-representation, each of which removes the work and people in it, further from the original site. Clandinin & Connelly (2000) argue that uncertainty is an essential characteristic of narrative inquiry.

> Part of the writer's uncertainty comes from knowing, and caring for, specific participants. Abstract theoretical categories might be uppermost prior to the research, but participants, and one's relationship to them, are key by the time the research text is to be written. The researcher learns that people are never only (nor even a close approximation to) any particular set of isolated theoretical notions, categories, or terms. They are people in all their complexity. They are people living storied lives on storied landscapes (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:145).

Riessman (1993) notes that by taking analyses back to those studied, important theoretical insights can arise from their responses. Clara's re-interpretation of my interpretation enriches, and humanises, the research process.

In an example of writing constructing identity and shaping thinking, Clara's writing starts to change. From half way through the year, her writing starts to identify for herself and the reader how the academic identity may be a way of protecting herself from the types of fear that Jojo describes when anticipating working in a prison context. The following extract from Clara's journal, establishes her growing ability to question and understand herself in relation to her practice:

> *One thing I discovered in this workshop and especially in this section, is that I have a tendency to distance myself when I get nervous, or when I am not sure how to relate to people I'm working with – I withdraw into quite, cold teacher mode which is probably not very engaging!* (39b).

What emerges from Clara's journal is how she protects herself by maintaining a level of distance and academic objectivity. This interpretation is confirmed by her recent acknowledgement in response to my analysis, discussed above. Towards the end of her Honours year, her journal demonstrates a meeting between her academic self, and herself as an embodied practitioner, and with it, an increased embedding of self in the text. From her recognition of her tendency to withdraw when nervous, the following extracts chart the change in her practice:

- *I felt that as a facilitator I was becoming much more human and approachable*;(47b)
- *I also find things easier to explain, as I am no longer intimidated by the prospect of them not understanding something* (47b);
- *Because it was clear that they were enjoying every minute, I felt much less pressurised and as a result, facilitated much better* (48b).

Her journal therefore charts the journey of her own defence mechanisms and how these barriers decrease, resulting in not only improved practice, but ways of negotiating self and other. Language differences are also no longer perceived as a barrier, but something that is part of the social landscape that must be dealt with and negotiated. What is significant about her increased self-reflexivity, is that it resonates with what she projected as an aim for herself at the very beginning of the year:

> *As a drama facilitator, I would like to stifle the know-all, the preacher, and the boss in me: to learn to listen to other people's voices rather than speak* (3b).

Her journal writing shapes the journey towards this aim.

By comparing Clara and Jojo's writing, the necessity of separating analysis from reflexivity becomes clear. Analysing learning from experience does not necessary lead to an explicit questioning of self and social structures. Part of reflexivity involves what Smyth (1996) calls *confronting*: "Theorising one's practice and the circumstances of its enactment is one thing, but being able to subject those theories to interrogation and questioning that establishes their legitimacy is another matter" (Smyth 1996:52).

Smyth (1996) outlines the process towards a critically reflective practice as follows.

1. Description – *what did I/they do?*
2. Information – *what does it mean?*
3. Confrontation – *how did (I/they/ the situation) come to be like this?*
4. Reconstruction – *how might I/they do things differently?*

(adapted from Smyth 1996 & Morrison 1996).

As discussed in section 3.5, my own teaching philosophy and curriculum design aims to foster an ability to confront theory and practice. It is during Stage 3, "Confrontation", where insights into the ideological and political processes that inform an experience are identified. However, it is this stage which is often missing from students' reflections, and it is this stage which is essential in distinguishing reflective practice, from critically reflective practice. My written feedback to students often asks them to think about a situation in its wider context. I noticed in all three examples that students would notice and document a particular social dynamic, but would stop short of suggesting the social, political, or ideological implications of the observation. For example, Clara notices, on pages 23 –24b, how the teenagers she is working with easily slip into playing different genders. My hand-written comment in the text is "this is interesting – does this continue during your work with them? What can you infer from this?" (p24b). As a teacher, I often see powerful moments to extend observations to theory and social commentary, and wish to model this for my students too. At times, my voice is highly critical about the discourse used, and how others are represented. At these times, I take a moral stance to confront 'givens'. For example, Jojo discusses her preconceptions about working with a special needs group: *"Before going there I expected a lot more pupils with severe downs syndrome and in actual fact I was surprised how normal they really are"* (p.99a). Although Jojo is documenting the inaccuracies of her preconceived ideas, I felt the need to challenge some of the discourse by drawing a line from the word "normal" and commenting "[T]his is a relative term" (p.99a). I again challenge her discourse when she positions Amasango School as 'other' by referring to it as "my lessons in the township", despite the fact that she is comparing it to Kuyasa School which is in very close proximity to Amasango. Technically speaking, neither school is "in the township". My comment in relation to the subtext of this statement is "[B]e

careful of referring to 'in the township' as a generic experience. Amasango is for children who have severe behavioural problems due to abuse, neglect and poverty". I am often amazed at how many students selectively ignore specific circumstances, and as a teacher, I need to 'walk the talk' if my curriculum is based on social and personal change. Mannion (2001) adopts a post-structuralist approach to reading and responding to journals in higher education. As a reader, he suggests a conscious disruption and interruption of coherence and closure in journal texts. "It is the intention of deconstruction to create openings for different thinking outside the epistemologies of certainty" (Mannion 1999:110).

Lorraine, a student who felt that she was always behind theoretically and practically in relation to her peers who were more experienced having taken the EDT option in third year, was the one student whose journal writing embraced the challenge of confronting self and context. In the following extract, she confronts her lack of reflexivity, and in the process, writes her own reflexivity into being. She had structured a drama in which the participants were from a poor, fictional village, which had a treasure that went missing. In her planning, she had not thoroughly analysed the closeness of this context to the participants, who come from some of the poorest parts of Grahamstown's township. In the following extract, she brings together an analysis and reflexivity in relation to the experience:

> *I think the most fundamental issue with this session was that the children were not so far removed for their context. They therefore took it very personally when the treasure was stolen. What I should have done is relocate the situation to a place that was a very definitely far away from Grahamstown and where the stakes manifested themselves in a different way. Maybe the treasure could have been water in a drought stricken land. Archie Mbolekwa is one of the poorest schools in Grahamstown and therefore, economic standing is a great issue and something that the children are well aware of* (p.40c).

The above extract involves all four stages in Smyth's model, in that she interprets what happened, confronts the social context which impacts on the experience, and suggests ways her practice and the experience could be reconstructed. In an example from earlier experiences, Lorraine starts to confront the politics of language, by questioning herself and the social context:

> *I made the mistake in saying that they should discuss in English. This emphasis was a bit unnecessary and limiting for them. It was clear that English was not very much in their grasp. They were very eager to discuss the picture in Xhosa, but the pressure to speak in English made them a bit uncomfortable. I now understand why I hated standing up in a French class and saying orals – I was myself and was judged as such. If I were playing another role, there would be less pressure on me, the person. It seems obvious, but I feel as if a beam of light has been shed on the matter. Teaching 2nd language English through drama requires a lot of layering and investment into a concept before just speaking English* (20c).

This is a reflection on her first experience with this group, and demonstrates her ability to negotiate difference by identifying with the pressures of speaking a foreign language. My written feedback in her journal in relation to this insight gently asks her to extend her confrontation to the power and politics inherent in language usage: "Yes, and you need to be in tune with the culture of their interactions as a group – which is mediated by Xhosa. It is therefore very unnatural for them to have to speak in English to each other" (p.20c). I notice how I avoid commenting what I am thinking regarding the need for a reflexivity about the hegemony of the English language and a need to read the power constructs that operate through language. As a teacher, it is important to respect where students are coming from too. This view is supported by Boud (2001), who sheds light on the reasons why students may resist a more critical reflection:

> The more that journal writing moves into the realm of critical reflection, that is, the questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions about oneself, one's group, or the conditions in which one operates, the more it is necessary to consider the inhibiting gaze of others,...the greater the need is to take into account the interventions of those who may read one's writing (Boud 2001:15).

Smyth's (1996) confrontation stage is a key part of a critically reflective process, and distinguishes it from Schön's through its emphasis on the historical and social processes that influence a situation. However, most students at this stage of the development of their reflective voice, tend to 'master' Schön's model, which tends to focus more on stages 1, 2 and 4. Clara for example is highly adept at describing, giving meaning, and suggesting ways to change. Her reflections are strong in terms of documenting moments of reflection-in-action, and then using those moments to change practice. The following example demonstrates the learning that can come from documenting a spontaneous dramatic decision that deviated from the original plan:

> *One participant demanded that there be a receptionist, so I quickly became one, which was convenient because I could then use the role to seat them appropriately. I was reminded how much I enjoyed being teacher-in-role, and I think it is one of my strengths. I am resolved to use it more in the next session because they seem to find it very engaging and it is a good way to give instructions in an interesting way* (p.53b).

Although my goal as an educator is ultimately to encourage a critically based reflexivity, I realise that the type of reflective practice that develops through journal writing in this course does prepare students as lifelong learners who must navigate instability and change. Mannion (2001:97) argues that "we may see the rise in interest in learning 'aids' (like journal writing) which encourage the reflective practice of the lifelong learner as s/he navigates between an ever more diverse range of disciplines and ever more diverse ways of interpreting knowledge".

This is not to say that Schön's model does not have relevance. It has taken me some time to recognise that providing the opportunity to develop a reflective and potentially critically reflexive voice is significant. Schön's model can be conceived as political, and even subversive, in a context in which theory has status over practice. This is very much part of the Rhodes context, whereby all post-graduate drama students' written examinations must contribute at least 60% to final marks, according to University directive[18]. Schön proposes practitioner knowledge as a praxis of theory-in-action, which validates situated knowledge as significant and theory producing (Bleakley 1999, Usher & Edwards 1994). For Schön "practice becomes research when the practitioner engages in a reflective conversation with the situation" (Dacre & Mackey 1999:56). While Morrison (1996:318) describes reflection-in-action as drawing on tacit spontaneous knowledge, he critiques it as "competency-based, monological-individual and isolationist". However, I agree with Bleakley (1999) that theories that value spontaneity in learning are indeed subversive (and therefore political):

[18] An application in 2004 by the Drama department to equalise the split between practice and theory to 50/50 at the Honours degree level, was rejected.

> Reflection-in-action is a 'hands on' business, rooted in the immediacy and heat of practice, the sticky moment of indecision, feeding on sudden shifts in circumstance – the unique and irregular – and forcing improvisation and risk. It is not a cold, detached and disembodied rationalising of that practice as a clinical dissection. Reflection-in-action, as described by Schön, feeds on the unique and the indeterminate, and encourages improvisation – it is not a learned technique but a surfacing artistry... (Bleakley 1999:319).

Bleakley's (1999) ideas suggest that the risk taking improvisatory nature of reflection-in-action as a 'surfacing artistry' might be significant in negotiating supercomplexity (as defined by Barnett, 2000 a&b). The ability to reflect *on* action, in a separate time where experience can be consolidated, is key to learning from the ephemeral nature of improvisation and embodied knowing. The writing voice encouraged in reflective writing is neither 'academic' nor 'confessional'. As Bleakley (1999:319) reiterates, "disembodied, cognitive, distancing reflection is sterile. Reflection needs body, passion, sensitivity to context". He is equally dismissive of the "personal-confessional" genre, "with its introspective gaze, and anecdotal, value-laden expression" (Bleakley 2000:13). Emihovich (1995:40) maintains that academia's aversion to emotion results in "desiccated intellectuals". She argues that one strategy for integrating emotion and reason is through narratives, of which journal writing is one example.

What is clear from the students' journal writing in this study, is that in order for students' to be able to feel comfortable in developing an expressive critical voice that articulates real change (Habermas' model), they first need to develop their reflective voice in a contained, structured, supportive way. My teaching philosophy is based on a critical model, and my reflective voice in my feedback to students (and how my curriculum is structured) models this. However, at this stage of students' developing an ability to reflect, Schön's model is adopted as a contained means of negotiating the politics of developing a critical voice.

Reflective writing practices can encourage graduate identities which enable individuals to succeed in a world in which "every framework for knowing and every sense of the world, of ourselves and of our relationship to the world is contestable" (Barnett 2000a: 63). Edwards *et al* (2002:527) argue that "it is through self and social questioning

(reflexivity) that people are able to engage with and (en)counter – be affected by but also affect – contemporary uncertainties". The students in this study demonstrate an exceptional fortitude to enter risky contexts and rise to the challenges of meeting difference with integrity and an emerging reflexivity.

6. "Becoming rather than being"

I have resisted writing an end to this study. Starting to write this thesis many months ago was an equally difficult process. At the beginning, I too was negotiating uncertainty, unsure where and how the pieces of a very disparate puzzle might come together. I am now, again, at the boundary of uncertainty, unsure where, and how, to leave this text. Endings imply closure, as well as the start of new beginnings. I am reminded that

> Part of the narrative inquirer's doubts come from an understanding that they need to write about people, places, and things as *becoming* rather than *being*. Their task is not so much to say that people, places and things are this way or that way but that they have a narrative history and are moving forward (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:146, emphasis in the original).

One of the research participants, in her feedback to my analysis of her journal, reiterates her sense of narrative history and of moving forward:

> I find it difficult to respond to what you wrote because the Clara that wrote the journal is different to me now. So I might think that your interpretation is wrong, but truthfully I might be responding to how I see myself today, having forgotten the way I felt or behaved at the time I was writing the journal (Clara, personal communication 13 June 2005).

I agree with the view that "The narrative text is fundamentally a temporal text – about what has been, what is now, and what is becoming" (Clandinin & Connelly 2000:146). I will use this temporality as a way of leaving this text.

What has been, involves a focus on particular texts, written by particular people at a particular time. Their past writing, informs my current research focus, as well as providing new insights for the participants.

I have argued that I believe that the journal writing process is an important site for the experimentation with a range of genres, expressive practices, and identities. By incorporating journals in a post-graduate curriculum, students are able to use journals as a tangible site for *praxis*, and an emerging reflexivity. What my analysis of these journals has also revealed, is that writing about and through an experience, facilitates a re-visioning of that experience so that students start to identify how they navigated

challenging, unstable, and fragile circumstances. By writing about their experiences in real world contexts, students are also learning to negotiate diversity, and the journal asks them to evaluate themselves and the circumstances in which they work. For the students who participated in this study, journals also became a source of validation of personal experience and knowledge. "It changes the learning process as a student because it validates your own knowledge and experience...it adds another method of learning to your portfolio – the ability to learn from yourself" (Questionnaire B, 2005: 1). This view resonates strongly with the principles of lifelong learning.

These developing abilities relate to Barnett's (2000b) argument that in order for higher education to play a meaningful role in a supercomplex world, curricula need to promote the development of a mode of being which will enable students to "live out the uncertainty principle" and develop "a particular disposition towards knowledge, action, oneself and the other" (Curzon-Hobson 2002:183). In the South African context Luckett & Sutherland (2000:104) argue that

> [I]t is vital that lecturers in higher education rise to the challenge of producing graduates who demonstrate the competencies such as self-reflexivity, self-confrontation, creativity, adaptability, team-work, systems-thinking and risk-taking.

This study has demonstrated that journal writing can be a site where such competencies are explored.

What is now involves how the participants in this study perceive the relationship between their journal writing, and their current professional status. One student (Clara) articulates how what she learnt through journal writing has specific implications for her as a lifelong learner:

> As a professional, it has changed my learning process because it documents how I have progressed – writing down reflections of myself as a teacher concretises and clarifies where I am at a particular point, and encourages me to actively think of how I teach and how I can improve. It also ensures that the learning process continues - I can't get complacent or stagnant if I continually examine what I am doing and what results I am getting. I see journal writing as an opportunity to breathe out, to order my thoughts, and make sense of why a lesson went a particular way (Questionnaire B, 2004: 2).

Jojo expresses a need to re-discover herself through her past writings:

> I feel I want to re-read my own journal and try and see these things! Because it's a whole new learning curve and a totally different way of looking at my work and my ideas! Not just through the journal and what I said, but actually reading it with the eye that you have given it....and saying...well why was I saying it like that? (Jojo, personal communication 13 June 2005).

Before I began this research, I was feeling uncertain about the uses of journals within my curriculum. All of my past students, as well as the participants in this study, have identified the major disadvantage concerning the use of journals, as the time involved in writing. In an already packed curriculum, I was considering sacrificing this element. However, my writing of this thesis, has fundamentally changed my thinking about the place and potential of journals within a Drama Studies curriculum. What has also changed, is my relationship with the participants in this study. We have got to know each other in new, caring ways through the dialogues which have been part of the research process. In these growing relationships, they have changed me. Through their insights, I have stopped being an ex-teacher, as they reveal how they are growing, and how much they have to teach me.

Perhaps what is most significant about this study, is the journey it charts for three individuals, revealing the richness in learning and change that can occur through the journal writing process. Lorraine comments on this too:

> It was interesting to see that our journals actually did document a journey – one of immense growth. I really like the quotation by Bleakley, saying that the process "is not a learned technique but a surfacing artistry" (Lorraine, personal communication, 7 June 2005).

Lorraine's use of Bleakley's notion of a surfacing artistry alludes to the fact that 'now' never stands still, there is always an implied past and future. This leads to my way of ending this narrative, by discussing *what is becoming*: what are the implications of this study?

One of the aspects that all three participants highlighted as useful and interesting in their feedback to section 5, was the reading of their peer's journal extracts. They were all struck by how different each approach was, and how much they had learnt and

understood from each other as a result. Lorraine commented "I had not expected such a difference. It made me realise that I never really was so much at a disadvantage at all. They too were learning, growing and re-structuring their ideas" (Lorraine, personal communication, 7 June 2005). This is an interesting outcome, as we do talk about our different practical experiences in class. What this might reveal, is how much richer and deeper reflective writing can be, as a teaching, learning, and evaluation tool. Although I did not explicitly include it in my overall discussion, I realised when analysing the journals, the extent to which the journals indicate how my curriculum and teaching is being received, processed, and interpreted. Journals can be a highly honest, and non-judgmental evaluation tool.

Feedback from the questionnaire indicated that most students felt uncertain as how to start the writing process, unsure what the 'right' way might be. It has become clear through this research that the development of one's own writing voice is an extremely important part of learning and the development of a reflective practice. A tension therefore exists, as to how to facilitate access to the diversity of approaches to journal writing, without compromising what Bleakley has called the "value of suffering the complex right from the start, perhaps relishing open-endedness, chaos, or unpredictability in learning, and valuing its ambiguities, paradoxes and twists" (Bleakley 1999:318).

As a result of these insights, I have decided to structure opportunities to read extracts from each other's journals at the start of term 2, after students have started with the grappling with genre, voice, and the discovery of a reflective identity. One student also suggested that future students read this study, as it became so clear for her the purpose and effects of journals.

A further implication of this study concerns the place and effect of journal writing in a Drama Studies curriculum. The very nature of the Dramatic arts can problematise established research, teaching and learning traditions, as the theory and practice of performance offers a number of more transient and ephemeral texts. "The arts, if anything, are non-conventional language systems that require their own unique modes

of comprehension" (Taylor 2000:82). The dramatic arts struggle to find a place with traditional research structures which see text and meaning as that which can be documented and ultimately written down. Although there is a legitimate argument calling for more progressive approaches to research which would recognise performance as research and knowledge production, artists, and students of the performing arts need to find ways of articulating the relationship between theory, (artistic) action and reflection. Performing artists need to find accessible and artistically appropriate ways of documenting and discussing their work. Professor Hazel Barnes from the University of KwaZulu-Natal, reiterates this point.

> When I started off as a drama student, the text was more important, the study and interpretation of texts. Now we have gone to the other extreme where embodiment is more important. I think text is one of the tools that embodied performers have and therefore students should engage with it creatively and expressively; and then I think because performance is ephemeral we have got to learn to talk about it and write about it, otherwise it does get lost, so it is important to increase those skills (Professor Hazel Barnes, personal communication, Pietermaritzburg, 6 April 2005).

The journal may be an appropriate tool to enable Drama students to develop an understanding of the relationship between theory and practice, and a way of creatively and theoretically expressing what they do and why they do it. This has direct implications for research, if students can learn to talk about artistic processes and products in meaningful, rigorous and engaging ways. In South Africa, there is a dire need for a research tradition which can increase scholarship around Drama and performance processes. We need to develop a discourse to do so.

Writing not only shapes thinking, it also generates subjectivities (Bleakley 2000, Clark & Ivanic 1997). Chapell *et al.* (2003) demonstrate how educational programmes also construct particular subjectivities. What this study has demonstrated, is that the particular subjectivities that reflective writing and an aspect of Rhodes Drama Studies curriculum encourages, involves the catalyst for the development of critical reflection and creativity. For Barnett (2000: 69) "these two capacities – creativity accompanied by critique – are the capacities that a world of uncertainty and contestability requires". Journals can provide the site for the development of such capacities.

I will now leave this text, a text which reveals that I have claimed certain identities through how, and what I have chosen to write. Through my writing, I have constructed lives, ways of reading the world, alternative relationships between myself and others. Usher & Edwards (1994:148) ask "are we as researchers, researching the world, or ourselves as makers of knowledge claims? Can research ever be anything more than a subtle form of writing the self?" I have argued that all writing practices are part of the process of identity construction and creation. As I leave this text, a new story opens, for me the writer, and you, the reader, a process that will involve another form of reflection as we think about what has been written, what it means, and what it will become.

7. Appendices

APPENDIX 1: Reflective journal questionnaire

Questionnaire for research participants on journal writing in the Honours Educational Drama and Theatre module:

Please respond, in writing, to the questions below. If you feel that you have already responded to specific questions, please signal under which number this might be.

1. Please comment on your *reactions* to initially being required to write a journal, and how your responses to writing the journal evolved throughout the year (and beyond if appropriate).
2. What do you see as the *benefits* of writing and using a journal as part of this course?
3. What were the downside, or *disadvantages* of using and writing a journal?
4. In what ways (if any) did producing a journal change your *learning process* (both as a student, and now as a professional)?
5. Have you *continued using* a journal in other courses or situations? If yes, please explain.
6. What sort of *courses/educational situations* do you think a journal might be beneficial for?
7. What for you was the *role of the 'reader'* (ie the course supervisor) of the journal?
8. If you had *advice* for *future students* about writing a journal, what would it be?
9. Can you identify ways the course leader could *aid* you in writing and using a journal effectively?
10. How do you feel about the *'act'* of this particular style of *writing*, within the context of *drama and performance*?

Respond in any way you wish – typed, handwritten etc – just clearly mark which question you are responding to.

Please note that anonymity will be kept at all times when incorporating your responses into this research.

APPENDIX 2: Consent form

Consent to participation in a research study and the publication of results.

Thank you for verbally agreeing to participate in this research project aimed at investigating the educational and developmental effects of critically reflective journals, with specific reference to graduates of drama studies. The purpose of this form is to obtain your informed, written consent for your involvement in my research. Your participation involves the following:

- Access to your journal, written as part of the Honours Educational Drama and Theatre module, 2003
- Completing a written questionnaire, and possibly a follow up interview
- Providing Alex with any further background information on your experiences as an Honours student, and your subsequent working life
- Reviewing my analysis of the journals, for feedback on my interpretations

. Before any results are published, you will be able to see them and discuss any changes that you feel are necessary. You are also able to withdraw as a participant from the research at any time.

Attestation of agreement and confidentiality:

I, Alexandra Sutherland (the researcher) do hereby swear that all information obtained as a result of this research will be treated in such as way that the confidentiality of the provider of that information will be maintained.

Signed: Date:

I, ... (research participant) do hereby acknowledge that I have been informed of the nature, method and purpose of this research project, and have given my informed consent to participating in the project.

Signed: **Date:**

APPENDIX 3: Honours EDT course outline

EDUCATIONAL DRAMA AND THEATRE

COURSE SUPERVISOR: MS A. SUTHERLAND

COURSE RATIONALE

This course aims to introduce students to the theoretical and practical applications of drama and theatre media for education, conscientization, change and development.

Theoretical background will be coupled with opportunities to apply various methods and approaches to developmental drama and theatre, with a diversity of participants such as school groups, community groups and groups with particular therapeutic needs. Students will be able to develop overall skills associated with being a developmental drama practitioner such as

- Conceptualizing and structuring drama and theatre programmes/productions with and for different groups
- facilitation, workshopping, directing, and performance skills with specific relation to a developmental/educational contexts
- methods of research and evaluation of developmental drama/theatre programmes

EDT embraces a varied and eclectic range of approaches, including the *drama-in-education* and *theatre –in-education* methodologies, Augusto Boal's *Theatre of the Oppressed* techniques, community theatre, dramatherapy, and theatre for development. Fundamental to all these approaches is the notion of audience as participant in creating and influencing dramatic action and meaning. Students will explore aspects of these approaches as a way of developing their own skills, theoretical understanding, and practice. We will also analyse key debates regarding the positioning of developmental drama within artistic practices.

COURSE OUTCOMES

By the end of this course, students will be able to

1. Conceptualise and plan dramatic art processes relevant to clearly defined developmental/educational/artistic objectives
2. Effectively facilitate/implement a range of EDT experiences with sensitivity and appropriateness in relation to objectives and the needs of the audience/participant. [*Effective facilitation* in this context refers to an ability to implement a planned structure with flexibility and an understanding of how theatricality can enhance and add meaning to the experience. Appropriate use of questioning and language skills is also relevant in this regard]

3. Critically evaluate educational drama as a participant, facilitator, and researcher. This includes developing skills as a critically reflective practitioner in the light of
4. personal experience and educational drama theory, and an ability to integrate educational drama theory and practice through practical and theoretical research
5. Research and debate a range of arguments and approaches to understanding the theory and practice of Drama for educational and developmental purposes.

TIME COMMITMENTS

There will be one double period session every week for seminars. In addition, time will be required for conceptualisation, planning and implementation of EDT experiences in local settings of the student's choice (approx 2 hours/week). From the second term, practical applications will be explored on a weekly basis with a group of your choice.

COURSE STRUCTURE

The theoretical component of the course aims to provide a philosophical and historical examination of educational drama and theatre, as well as an exploration of various techniques available to the practitioner. Students will be given the opportunity to explore various approaches and concerns through practice.

The seminars will explore aspects of the following themes:

- Understanding educational philosophies influencing arts education and EDT practice
- An investigation into various approaches to using drama and theatre for development
- A study of selected practitioners and theorists, and their contributions to the development of EDT
- An exploration of techniques developed for the effective use of drama for development
- Investigations into specific applications of EDT techniques – in education, development, and healing contexts
- A study of contemporary scholarship & debates on Educational Drama and Theatre
- A review of current research on EDT in South Africa
- Implications of Outcomes Based Education (OBE) system in South Africa for the practice of EDT

PRACTICAL WORK

Students will conceptualise and implement at least three EDT programmes during the year with groups of their choice; as far as possible, these will be linked to existing community, school or NGO projects, and should reflect a diversity of experiences. In the first half of the year, the project will be conceived and implemented by the whole Honours EDT group. From the second term, each student is encouraged to develop their own practice individually by researching, setting up, conceiving and structuring their own weekly experiences with one group. It is important that an integrated approach is taken in dealing with theoretical and practical aspects of the course. A fundamental means of relating theory and practice and developing reflexivity as a practitioner will be through the development of a learning journal. (see below)

ASSESSMENT

Assessment in this course is via the following means:

Learning Journal

Each student will be required to keep a journal of your experiences throughout the course, in which you provide a reflective analysis of your own understanding, practice, development and learning. These journals will be handed in at the end of each term. This journal is an important documentation of your processes, progress and learning, for both yourself and the examiners.

Short Assignment (approx 2500 words)

This assignment is based on writing a short proposal for an organisation and developing a detailed workshop plan which addressed the aims and objectives of the applied uses of drama in real world contexts.

Research Assignment

Students select a focused research topic on an area of EDT, in consultation with the course supervisor. Students write a paper of approx 4000 words, and facilitate a seminar/workshop around this area of research with the class and invited guests.

Assessment criteria will be given out to students prior to each assignment & examination.
Assessment criteria for the whole course will be presented at the first meeting.

PRACTICAL EXAMINATION
Students will present a theatre programme /educational drama session of their choice in consultation with the course supervisor. Your journal will also be used as a means of assessing your understanding on this course.

WRITTEN EXAMINATION
Students will write one three-hour paper. This paper includes practical and theoretical investigations into key areas covered throughout the year.

APPENDIX 4: Honours journal criteria hand-out

Honours Educational Drama and Theatre: The development of a journal

The **purpose** of developing an EDT journal is to

- Develop your skills as a critically reflective practitioner (see Taylor's outline of this over the page)
- Allow you space to process and document your own learning and development
- Encourage you to continually think about the links between theory and practice
- Allow me to connect with where you are at in terms of your learning in this course
- Provide the external examiner with evidence of your year's work in relation to the course outcomes

What should your journal contain?

A critically reflective journal is different from a diary, in that it should be written both personally (subjectively) **and** objectively. Like many EDT processes, you are required to be both actor and audience of your experience. For example, you may **describe** what happened (in a seminar, a workshop that you are part of or are facilitating), and how it made an impact on you, but you are then required to **analyze** and **interpret** why an event occurred, how it might impact on your understanding or future practice, how this might link to theory or other practitioners.

"The critically reflective component of your journal manifests in the dialectical interaction between description, analysis, and interpretation. The reflective process of description, analysis and interpretation helps facilitate greater understanding, interaction, and action" (from a handout sourced from Ogden 1996 & Wolcott, 1994).

Suggested criteria for EDT journals:

- Clarity and observation in presentation of events or issues
- Evidence of speculation
- Evidence of willingness to revise ideas
- Honesty and self-assessment
- Depth and detail of reflective accounts
- Evidence of creative and critical thinking
- Relationship of journal entries to other coursework, theories etc
- An ability to synthesise ideas and sources of your understanding

(Adapted from Moon, J (1999) Learning Journals Kogan Page, London)

Critical Reflection = "Demonstrates an awareness that actions and events are not only located within and explicable by multiple perspectives, but are located in and influenced by multiple historical and socio-political contexts" (Hatton & Smith, 1995 in *ibid* p.103).

Feedback: You will hand your journal in at the end of each term, and I will give you detailed feedback on your writing. There is no mark for this journal, but it will be used as evidence for your final EDT prac mark, and the end of year written exam contain one compulsory essay which asks you to critically reflect on one EDT project you have done this year.

8. References

Atherton, J. (2003). *Learning and teaching: Reflective Practice.* [On-Line] Retrieved 4 December 2003 from the World Wide Web: http://dmu.ac.uk/-jamesa/learning/reflecti.htm

Barnett, R. (2000a). *Realizing the University in an age of supercomplexity.* Buckingham, SRHE & OUP.

Barnett, R. (2000b). Supercomplexity and the Curriculum. *Studies in higher education.* 25/3 255-265.

Badat, S. (2004, November 12 - 18). Never sacrifice research to politics. *Mail & Guardian (Education & Democracy special feature)* 20/46 , 6.

Berry, KS. (2000). *The Dramatic arts and cultural studies. Acting against the grain.* New York, Falmer Press.

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university.* Buckingham, SRHE & Open University Press.

Bleakley, A. (1999). From reflective practice to holistic reflexivity. *Studies in higher education.* 24/3, 315 – 330.

Bleakley, A. (2000). Writing with invisible ink. Narrative, confessionalism and reflective practice. *Reflective Practice.* 1/1, 11-24.

Boal, A. (1992). *Games for actors and non-actors.* London, Routledge.

Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire. The Boal method of theatre and therapy.* London, Routledge.

Boud, D. (2001). Using journal writing to enhance reflective practice. *New directions for adult and continuing education.* 90/summer, 9 –17.

Boud, D. & Miller, N. (Eds.). (1996). *Working with experience.* Routledge, London.

Boud, D., Cohen, R., Walker, D., (Eds). (1993). *Using Experience for learning.* Buckingham, SRHE & Open University Press.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press

Caroll, J. (1996). Escaping the information abattoir: Critical and transformative research in drama classrooms. In P. Taylor (Ed.). *Researching drama and arts education: Paradigms and possibilities.* London, Falmer Press.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Education, knowledge and action research.* London, Falmer Press.

Chapell, C., Rhodes, C., Solomon, N., Tennant, M., Yates, L. (2003). *Reconstructing the lifelong learner. Pedagogy and identity in individual, organisational and social change.* London, Routledge Falmer.

Clandinin, DJ. & Connelly, FM. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry. Experience and story in qualitative research.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Clark, R. & Ivanic, R. (1997). *The Politics of writing.* London, Routledge.

Cooper, JE. (1991). Telling our own stories. The reading and writing of journals or diaries. In C. Witherell, & N. Noddings (Eds). *Stories lives tell. Narrative and dialogue in education.* New York, Teachers College Press.

Council on Higher Education. (2001). *A new academic policy for programmes and qualifications in higher education.* Unpublished discussion document.

Cornbleth, C. (1990) *Curriculum in context.* London, Falmer Press.

Cortazzi, M. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* London, Falmer Press.

Criticos, C. (1993). Experiential learning and social transformation for a Post-Apartheid learning future. In D. Boud, R. Cohen & D. Walker (Eds.). *Using experience for learning.* Buckingham, SRHE & Open University Press.

Crossley, ML. (2000). *Introducing narrative psychology. Self, trauma and the construction of meaning.* Buckingham, Open University Press.

Curzon-Hobson, A. (2002). Higher education in a world of radical unknowability: an extension of the challenge of Ronald Barnett. *Teaching in higher education* 7/2, 179-191.

Dacre, K. & Mackey, S (1999). Self interpreting animals: action research and the reflective drama journal. *Research in drama education* 4/2, 51 – 72.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y.(Eds). (2002).*The Qualitative inquiry reader.* Thousand Oak, Sage.

Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y.(Eds). (2003).*Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* Thousand Oak, Sage.

East Side Institute (2004). Manifesto. Unpublished brochure. New York.

Edwards, R. (2000). Lifelong learning, lifelong learning, lifelong learning: a recurrent education? In J. Field & M. Leicester (Eds.). *Lifelong learning: Education across the lifespan.* London, Routledge Falmer.

Edwards, R., Ranson, S., and Strain, M. (2002). Reflexivity: Towards a theory of lifelong learning. *International Journal of lifelong education.* 21/6, 525-536.

Emihovich. C. (1995). Distancing passion – narratives in social science. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.). *Life history and narrative.* London, Falmer Press.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T.van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse as social interaction.* London, Sage.

Field, J. & Leicester, M. (2000). *Lifelong learning: education across the lifespan.* London, Falmer Press.

Freeman, J. (2002). Writing the self: the heuristic documentation of performance. *Studies in theatre and performance.* 22/2 , 95 – 106.

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* London, Penguin Press.

Gergen, K. (1991). *The saturated self.* London, Sage.

Gergen, K. & Gergen. M. (2003). *Social construction. A reader.* London, Sage.

Gergen, K. & Wortham, S. (2001). Social Construction and pedagogical practice. In K. Gergen (Ed.). *Social Constructionism in context.* London, Sage Publications.

Gibbons, M. *et al.* (1994). *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies.* London, Sage.

Gibson, R. (1986). *Critical theory and education.* London, Hodder & Stoughton.

Gough, N. (1998). Narrative and educational inquiry. In J. Mousley, N. Gough, M. Robson & D. Colquhon (Eds.). *Horizons, images and experiences: The research story collection.* Geelong Australia, Deakin University.

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

Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: Product or praxis.* London, Falmer Press.

Guba, E. & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Hagemann, F. (2004). *Thinking beyond the already recognizable: The body, space and place in learning through drama.* Unpublished paper presented at the Dramatic Learning Spaces conference, University of KwaZulu Natal, Pietermaritzburg.

Henning, E. with van Rensburg, W. & Smit, B. (2004). *Finding your way in qualitative research.* Pretoria, van Schaik.

Hettich, P. (1990). Writing as a mode of learning: Journal writing: Old Fare or Nouvelle Cuisine? *Teaching of Psychology.* 17/1, 36-39.

Hiemstra, R. (2001). Uses and benefits of journal writing. *New Directions for adult and continuing education* 90/Summer, 19-26.

Holliday, A. (2002). *Doing and writing qualitative research.* London, Sage.

Holzman, L. (2004). *Creating stages for development: An exploration of global practices that relate to human beings as performers and improvisers.* Unpublished paper presented at the International Drama and Education Association Congress, Ottawa Canada, July 2004.

hooks, b. (1984). *Teaching to transgress.* New York, Routledge.

Hope, A. & Timmel, S. (1995). *Training for transformation: a handbook for community workers.* Gweru, Mambo Press.

Janesick, VJ. (2003). The choreography of qualitative research design. Minuets, improvisation and crystallization. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry (2nd. edition).* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Jarvis, P. (2001). Journal writing in higher education. *New directions in adult and continuing education.* 90, 79-86.

Kvale, S. (2002). The social construction of validity. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.) *The Qualitative inquiry reader.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.). *The discourse reader.* (1995). London, Routledge.

Langer, A.M. (2002). Reflecting on practice. Using learning journals in higher and continuing education. *Teaching in higher education.* 7/3, 337-353.

Lawson, KH. (2000). Rights and obligations: values in lifelong learning education as a political programme. In J. Field & M. Leicester (Eds.). *Lifelong learning: Education across the lifespan.* London, Routledge Falmer.

Lemmer, EM. (1998). A new context for the University? Postmodern strands in international patterns of higher education policy and practice. *Progressio 20(1),*16-33

Light, G. & Cox, E. (2001). *Learning and teaching in higher education. The reflective professional.* London. Paul Chapman Publishing.

Linds, W. (1999). The metaxic journey of the drama facilitator/inquirer. In C. Miller & J. Saxton, (Eds.) *Drama and theatre in education. International conversations.* Victoria BC, International Drama in Education Research Institute.

Luckett, K. (2001). A proposal for an epistemically diverse curriculum for South Africa higher education in the 21st Century. *South African journal of education* 15/2 , 49 – 61.

Luckett, K. & Sutherland, L. (2000). Assessment practices that improve teaching and learning. In S. Makoniki (Ed.). *Improving teaching and learning in higher education. A handbook for South Africa.* Johannesburg, WUP.

Mannion, G. (2001). Journal writing and learning: reading between the structural, holistic, and post-structural lines. *Studies in continuing education* 23/1, 95-115.

Marcus, L. (1995). Theories of autobiography. In J. Swindells (Ed.). *The uses of autobiography.* New York, Taylor & Francis.

Marton, F. & Säljö, R. (1984). Approaches to learning. In F. Marton, D. Hounsell & N. Entwistle (Eds.). *The experience of learning* . Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press.

McNamee, S. & Gergen, K. (1992). *Therapy as social construction.* London. Sage.

Moon, J. (1999). *Learning Journals: A handbook for academics, students and professional development.* London, Kogan Page.

Moon, J. (2000). *Reflection in learning and professional development: Theory and practice.* London, Kogan Page.

Morrison, K. (1996). Developing reflective practice in higher degree students through a learning journal. *Studies in higher education.* 21/3, 317 – 331.

The National Qualifications Framework and Curriculum Development. (2000). Pretoria, South African Qualifications Authority.

Nespor, J. & Barber, L. (1995). Audience and the politics of narrative. In J.A. Hatch & R. Wisniewski (Eds.). *Life history and narrative.* London, Falmer Press.

O'Rourke, R. (1998). The learning journal: from chaos to coherence. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education.*23/4,403-413.

Paola, R. (2003). Narrative discourse in research on teaching. *Journal for language teaching.* 36/1&2, 134-145.

Pendlebury, S. & Enslin, P. (2000). Lifelong learning for a new society: The South African case. In J. Field & M. Leicester (Eds.). *Lifelong learning: Education across the lifespan.* London, Routledge Falmer.

Phillips, L. & Jorgensen, M. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method.* London, Sage.

Race, P. (1999). Why assess innovatively? In S. Brown & A. Glasner (Eds.). *Assessment matters in higher education.* Buckingham, SRHE & OUP.

Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to teach in higher education.* London, Routledge.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., 923-948). Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Richardson, L. (2002). Skirting a pleated text. De-disciplining an academic life. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Qualitative inquiry reader.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Riessman, C.K. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* California, Sage.

Rosenwald, GC. & Ochberg, RL. (Eds). (1991). Introduction: Life stories, cultural politics, and self-understanding. In *Ibid The cultural politics of self-understanding.* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Sarup, M. (1998). *An introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodenism [2nd Edition].* New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Schön, DA. (1983). *The reflective practitioner.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schwandt. T.A. (1994). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Shotter, J. & Gergen, K. (1989). *Texts of identity.* London. Sage.

Sinacore, AL., Blaisure, KR., Justin, M. Healy, P., Brawer, S. (1999). Promoting reflexivity in the classroom. *Teaching of psychology.* 26/4,267-270.

Smyth, J. (1996). Developing socially critical educators. In D. Boud & N. Miller (Eds.). *Working with experience.* Routledge, London.

South African Qualifications Authority. (2000). *The National Qualifications Framework and curriculum development.* Pretoria,

Stake, RE. (2003). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Strydom, K., Hay, D. & Strydom, A .(2001). Restructuring higher education curricula in South Africa: the leading policy formulation and implementation organisations. In M. Breier (Ed). *Curriculum restructuring in higher education in post-apartheid South Africa.* Bellville, Education Policy Unit, University of the Western Cape.

Sutherland, A. (2004). *Teaching portfolio.* Unpublished Masters course work portfolio. Rhodes University, Grahamstown.

Swindells, J. (Ed). (1995). *The uses of autobiography:* New York, Taylor & Francis.

Taylor, P. (Ed.). (1996). *Researching drama and arts education: Paradigms and possibilities.* London, Falmer Press.

Taylor, P. (2000). *The drama classroom: action, reflection, transformation.* London, Routledge Falmer.

Toohey, S. (1999). *Designing courses for higher education.* London, The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Tulloch, J. (1999). *Performing culture. Stories of expertise and the everyday.* London, Sage Publications.

Usher, R. (1993). Experiential learning or learning from experience. Does it make a difference? In D. Boud & D. Walker (Eds.). *Using experience for learning.* Buckingham, SRHE & Open University Press.

Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and education.* London, Routledge.

Usher, R., Bryant, I., & Johnston, R. (1997). *Adult education and the postmodern challenge.* London, Routledge.

Vice-Chancellors Annual Review 2004. (2005). Unpublished report. Grahamstown, Rhodes University.

Volbrecht, T E. (2003). *Plot and practice. A narrative inquiry into AD, language policy and lifelong learning as frameworks for literacy development at the University of the Western Cape.* Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town.

Weber, R. (2004). Editor's comments. *MIS Quarterly* 2/74, v-xv.

Winberg, C.(December 2004). Symbolic representations of the post-apartheid university. *Theoria,* 89-103.

Witherell, C. & Noddings, N. (Eds). (1991). *Stories lives tell. Narrative and dialogue in education.* New York, Teachers College Press.

Woodward, H. (1998). Reflective journals and portfolios: learning through assessment. *Assessment & evaluation in higher education* 23/4, 415-422.