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Abstract

This practitioner-based research reports on the development and assessment of a transdisciplinary pedagogical model for the learning sciences. The theoretical underpinnings of Poetics of the [Selves]© draw from three domains of knowledge: (1) mindfulness, (2) positive psychology, and (3) contemporary performance. The approach is designed to create positive self-transformation in participants as a result of engaging them in a sequence of activities that require different modes of reflection. The model was tested in two settings: a collaborative learning space, and a university classroom. The sample from the first workshop included individuals from the general public, and middle and high-school foreign language teachers comprised the second workshop. The data sources that underwent analysis included audio-visual documentation from each workshop. This qualitative study employed the principles and methods of Interactional Ethnography and critical discourse analysis to construct two telling cases of Poetics of the [Selves]©. Analytic results from both workshops suggest that Poetics of the [Selves]© has the potential to enhance self-awareness and increase positive affect toward others. Moreover, the results of the second workshop showed its potential value in foreign language classrooms as it promoted authentic content connections, built rapport, and reinforced knowledge by activating different modes of learning in participants.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

I am an arts practitioner. I am also a theorist who explores what occurs at the intersection of contemporary art practices and psychological well-being. In this research, I drew upon the principles and methods from the fields of art and wellbeing to develop a transdisciplinary, pedagogical approach for the learning sciences. This dissertation serves as a report on the theoretical development and assessment of a transdisciplinary, pedagogical approach I named Poetics of the [Selves]. In addition to being an artist and scholar with a diverse practice, I have evolved within and across Eastern and Western contexts. As such, I will begin this report by sharing my personal history to provide context for how I arrived at the development of Poetics of the [Selves].

My Story

My experience of growing up in two different cultures led me to develop a greater sensitivity about how one’s identity is created through a range of external and internal factors. I was born in the United States into an Asian and Caucasian American family. My father is first-generation Chinese-Thai and was born in Thailand, while my mother is of English descent and was born in Flint, Michigan. She had a deep interest in Eastern thought and had a long-standing practice in Transcendental Meditation (TM). When I was 11 years old, she introduced me to TM, and I began a practice that consisted of two 20-minute sessions per day. TM was founded by Maharshi Mahesh Yogi and based on Vedic notions of pure consciousness (Bonshek, Bonshek, & Fergusson, 2007). Maharshi specifically considers the following three principles in the structure of knowledge: Rishi (subject/knower), Devata (the process of knowing), and Chhandas (the object/known and their relationship) (Bonshek et al., 2007). The practice of TM is believed to strengthen
mental and physical functioning, foster personal development, and lead practitioners to experience a higher state of consciousness.

When I was eight years old, I began traveling to Bangsaphon Noi, Thailand. My grandparents and the majority of my extended family resided in the small village of Bang Saphon Noi, which has many beautiful temples and monks who walked barefoot down the gravel roads each morning to collect rice. In the summer I spent time observing the Buddhist rituals of the monks, explored the temples, listened to the chanting, and closely examined the artifacts throughout the temples. In time, I began to develop a strong spirituality that was influenced by both a practice in meditation and exposure to Buddhist beliefs and customs.

From September through early May, I attended a public school in St. Louis, Missouri and continued my own path of spirituality that consisted of readings, meditation, and prayer. I became accustomed to translating the customs and beliefs associated with Eastern religion and philosophy in ways that made sense on an individual level. Very similar to navigating two cultures, I realized I was able to translate certain aspects of Eastern and Western religious principles in a way that made sense to me.

As an adult, I pursued a graduate degree that would allow me to deepen my critical thinking. I initially studied how the performing arts impact psychological wellbeing. I was particularly interested in the K-12 performing arts of dance and theater. However, my outlook and knowledge of performance broadened during the summer of 2012 when my application to work with the esteemed performance artist Marina Abramović, at the Summer Sessions at Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) PS1 in New York was accepted. I recognized the intersection of my spiritual path with performance
during my time at PS1. During the Summer School Session, Abramović and her two assistants taught us techniques to help empty our minds and develop ideas for creating artwork. Many of the methods consisted of practices borrowed or adapted from Eastern religious practices (e.g., chanting, repetition) that promote self-awareness.

Upon returning to St. Louis after the Summer Sessions, I began to focus my review of the literature on mindfulness and the arts. I began exploring methods associated with mindfulness and combined them with various performance and artistic methods that encouraged participants to engage in introspection. To continue my studies in contemporary performance, I supplemented my scholarly work at the University of Missouri – St. Louis with residency work at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago (SAIC). In summer 2013, I attended the Abandoned Practices residency (Prague, Czech Republic) as a visiting student and worked closely with the contemporary performance practitioners Lin Hixson, Matthew Goulish, and Mark Jeffery. It was an insightful and rigorous three weeks that involved creating written, performance, and visual work. An SAIC graduate advisor happened to be facilitating the course and encouraged me to consider applying to their graduate program. Soon after the residency, I serendipitously learned that the School of the Art Institute of Chicago was starting a low-residency MFA program in summer 2014.

Upon being accepted into the MFA program at SAIC, I decided to pursue a practitioner-scholar route that would enable me to create contemporary art as experiential investigations of my theoretical inquiries about the relationship between self-awareness and art. This path has supported and influenced my development as a practitioner-scholar. As I reflect back on my journey to how I arrived at my dissertation topic, I can see how I
have been working on what the science writer Steven Johnson (2010) refers to as “slow hunches” as I pieced together the experiences that have led me to synthesize these theoretical traditions and practices into a transdisciplinary pedagogical approach. Johnson’s views on how knowledge is developed relates to my journey in that it resulted in the theoretical framework of PO[S]∞. Johnson describes the history of cultural progress as a story in which the individual explores a palace by entering one door which leads to the next door (Burkeman, 2010).

My current practice involves translating the intangible aspects of meditation and self-awareness into perceptible forms that are accessible and malleable for both the participant and the audience. The primary goal of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is to provide others with a tool to guide them into a deeper understanding of their self, and then to serve as a guide to translate their self into authentic outcomes in the medium of performance.

Throughout my graduate career at the University of Missouri – St. Louis, I was introduced to the literature and empirical research in character education, positive psychology, and social-emotional learning. I spent approximately three years assisting on a systematic review of methods and strategies that are implemented in K-12 settings that strive to improve character. The broad scope of the methods, strategies, and programs have nuances, but ultimately all of them aim to improve psychological functioning at the individual and collective level.

My interest in positive psychology developed after the character education scholar, Dr. Marvin Berkowitz, introduced me to Dr. James Pawelski, the Director of Education and Senior Scholar at the Positive Psychology Center at University of

Pennsylvania (PENN). We both shared a passion and curiosity for exploring connections between the humanities and positive psychology. The realm of positive psychology interested me more than character education or social-emotional learning because I discovered scholars such as Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, who studied the role of flow in the artistic and creative process. Flow is a subjective state that people experience when they are intensely involved in the “experiential involvement in moment-to-moment activity” (Csikszentmihalyi, Abuhamdeh, & Nakamura, 2014, p. 230). I also became familiar with Ellen Langer’s work, which involves mindfulness and its role in positive psychology.

**Transdisciplinary connections.**

As I reflected upon my personal experiences in self-awareness and contemporary performance, I began to see a bridge between my path as a practitioner-scholar and the field of positive psychology. My familiarity with contemporary performance and the literature on psychological wellbeing created a platform for me to develop and experiment with practices from both areas. This aspect of my journey is what I consider the “unknown” as I could not predict how the theoretical framework and prototypes would be received. The realm of the unknown refers to the assemblage of the theoretical framework evolved from a combination of my identities, knowledges, and practices associated with mindfulness, positive psychology, and performance.

To help navigate the complexity of the unknown nature of this work, I draw on Interactional Ethnography (Bridges & Green, 2017) as an epistemology in order to examine the two prototypes I developed and tested in two different settings. Dr. Judith Green is the director of the Center for Education Research on Literacies, Learning and Inquiry in Networking Communities at the University of California – Santa Barbara. In
this research, my approach toward data analysis was influenced by her writings on Interactional Ethnography. Interactional Ethnography is a methodological approach that observes events in the moment and across events and contexts to gain insights of the cumulative and consequential nature of interactions, the chains of learning events, and text (Bridges & Greene, 2017). The application of IE methods allowed me to understand how meaning and knowledge were constructed in the two prototypes. In this research, I present two telling cases of PO[S]∞. This is what I consider returning to the known. I move from the known, which refers to my identities and contexts, to the unknown, which was the theoretical assemblage across disciplines, back to the known again by applying principles and methods from Interactional Ethnography.

**The Unknown: Poetics of the [Selves]∞.**

My scholarship and experience in the fields of mindfulness, positive psychology, and performance informed the development of PO[S]∞. As a practitioner, my interest in transdisciplinarity influenced my desire to create PO[S]∞, enact it, and examine the approach. The theoretical framework of PO[S]∞ is transdisciplinary, which theoretical physicist, Basarab Nicolescu, writes, “concerns that which is at once between the disciplines, across the different disciplines, and beyond all discipline. Its goal is the understanding of the present world, of which one of the imperatives is the unity of knowledge” (Nicolescu, 2002, p. 44). One example of a scholar who engages in a transdisciplinary practice is the American sociobiologist, E. O. Wilson. He suggests that a balanced intellectual perspective is only attainable through seeking the unity of knowledge, or consilience, across disciplines (1999). Transdisciplinary thinking and approaches to developing theory have led to notable contributions in various domains of
knowledge by researchers such as E. O. Wilson and the British mathematician and
logician, Alan Turing, whose research led to new areas later named as cognitive science
and artificial intelligence (Cooper & Leeuwen, 2013). Along similar lines, I seek to
develop and test a theory that has potential usefulness for the learning sciences that draws
from different fields of knowledge. By importing and asking questions about the
interrelations and outcomes of the principles and practices from mindfulness, positive
psychology, and performance, there may be new entry points and knowledge that arise
that may create new entry points for scholarly exploration.

I adopted a transdisciplinary approach as I developed the theoretical framework of
POS∞. It is comprised of a principles and practices that draw from the fields of
mindfulness, positive psychology, and performance. The assemblage of different
theoretical traditions and practices allow for a transmutation to occur, in which the
original structure and rules of understanding yield to new ways of creating and
understanding the knowledge generation process. This aspect of the research is what I
consider the unknown.

The ontological self.

The transdisciplinary, experiential pedagogical approach of PO[S]∞ also has
ontological implications. According to the interdisciplinary artist and ontology
practitioner, Marita Bolles, (2017) there are four modes of being: 1) Being of Being; 2)
Automatic Being; 3) Created Being; and, 4) Phenomenology of Being. Being of Being
refers to the fundamental nature of our existence that can be accessed through practices
such as meditation. Automatic Being is related to a reptilian survival mechanism that is
constructed through experience. Created Being occurs when the individual experiences
an awareness “to puncture the insularity of the Automatic Being” (Bolles, 2017, p. 3). Phenomenology of Being includes the other domains and refers to the accumulated effect of one’s self on others and the world (Bolles, 2017).

Poetics of the [Selves]∞ attempts to engage with Created and Automatic Being in order to affect an individual’s Phenomenological Experience as Being. The design of PO[S]∞ strives to activate notions of Created Being (Bolles, 2017) by encouraging the individual to notice both their essential nature and the psychological construction they have co-constructed in the moment and over time. Following this, Automatic Being is illuminated as actions become creatively available (Bolles, 2017). The developed self can then engage with experiences and others less from a reactionary or fear-based (Automated Being) perspective, but from an aware, open frame of reference. By engaging in this transdisciplinary practice, new insights and intra-personal understandings may develop as a result of one engaging in various modes of reflection and observation.

Chapter Summary

Due to abiding by dissertation writing conventions this research may seem linear and straight-forward. However, in reality, the construction of the theoretical framework occurred organically through a series of personal life events. Likewise, the data analysis was abductive, iterative, and ambiguous at times. This dissertation attempts to provide a concise report on the development and assessment of the transdisciplinary, pedagogical approach of PO[S]∞.

The first chapter described my journey as an artist and scholar as the known, the unknown, and a return to the known. I shared my personal story and discussed how my
life experiences shaped my view of the world. My multi-faceted background and interests have resulted in the generation of a transdisciplinary, pedagogical approach for the learning sciences. The following chapter will discuss the nature of practitioner-based research and also include a purposive review of the empirical and/or conceptual literature associated with PO[S].
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

This chapter is organized into two parts. The first part describes my position as a practitioner-researcher and discusses how my role influenced the development of the approach. The second section provides a conceptual review of the literature of the three fields that influenced the development of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. This part consists of subsections that include (1) mindfulness, (2) positive psychology, and (3) performance. Within each of these domains, I provide further detail about the specific theories and practices that were imported and adapted for Poetics of the [Selves]∞. The second part discusses, in detail, how each of these fields informs the theory and practices that comprise the approach. Last, this chapter includes a brief overview of the sociocultural theory of Lev Vygotsky that served as an explanatory theory, and it describes the nature of practitioner-based research.

Practitioner-Based Research

This study can be considered “practitioner or teacher research” in which I am the teacher/practitioner that undertakes a systematic and intentional inquiry into a phenomenon. Teacher research is systematic in the way it collects and organizes recorded information, documents experiences, and creates some type of written record (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Teacher research consists of two overarching categories known as empirical and conceptual (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). The empirical area of teacher research refers to the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data collected from a teacher’s own classroom (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Conceptual research refers to the theoretical work and analysis of ideas (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993). Inquiry not only supports the cyclical nature of practitioner research but also “promotes
curiosity, reflection, and problematization as general approaches to practice” (Herrera, 2008, p. 353). It is important to note here that inquiry as stance is not the same as reflection. Practitioner-based research also attempts to generate synergy and balance between reflection as it unpacks structures and practices. Teachers then examine questions that are revealed from reflection (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 2009; Lawton-Sticklor & Bodamer, 2016).

The practitioner-research that composes this study addresses two primary strands of work in my practice as a studio artist. As an arts educator, it is important that I cultivate and nurture a combination of imagination, practical application, and sensitivity. I have also been compelled to explore the role of the arts in psychological wellbeing. Throughout my early graduate career, I explored intersections between various psychological constructs that were assessed in arts contexts and evaluated in empirical studies, where the impact of artistic methods on psychological outcomes were studied. The driving force behind these studies (aside from those associated with art therapy) was often financially driven and/or linked to educational reform.

The seemingly parallel paths of working on graduate work in educational psychology, while also actively engaging with discourses and practices in contemporary art, resulted in a multi-dimensional perspective on how I think about the values related to being an artist, the creation of studio art, and in the continuation of my scholarly work related to the arts and their role in experiential learning and psychological wellbeing. Scholars of practitioner-based research, Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993), list many benefits for teachers. These include them becoming theorists in which they are able to articulate their intentions, test assumptions, and discover connections with their practice.
Teachers’ self-perceptions as writers and educators may also be transformed. Additionally, they increase their use of resources, develop networks, and become more engaged on professional levels. Moreover, educators provide the profession with valuable resources because they are allowed to observe phenomena closely over long durations. This may result in teachers gaining unique insights and knowledge. Teachers may also become critical and responsive readers of current research, are more likely to critically think about other research, are more capable of identifying useless trends, and are more assertive in curricular assessment, methods and materials. Another benefit of practitioner-based research includes the ability to examine writing and learning, and share their research without high financial costs (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1993).

My practice is comprised of a studio work and a scholarly practice that involves developing new theories and methods that broaden the current base of knowledge and practices of contemporary art. Both areas of my practice are informed through practitioner-research principles and methods. The studio aspect, which consists of the theoretical and material processes involved in creating artistic work, is intrinsically dependent on my capacity to be aware of subtleties, to move between the micro and macro, to work inductively and deductively, to understand the complexities of rationality and other complex psychological processes, and to transform that into form/material. Moreover, my identity as an artist must remain adaptive and resilient to the internal and external challenges and pressures of their own psychology, the art market, and other factors.

The development of Poetics of the [Selves]™, and an opportunity to research its components, allowed me to learn how the method may be incorporated into my artistic
practice. Through the development of self-awareness and an awareness of others, the adaptable nature of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ lends itself to strengthening social/emotional resiliency of the artist. The opening exercises may increase mindfulness which is linked to creative processes), generate content through exploratory writing, and assist in composition (frozen postures and Alleyways). It can also be adapted to work through the lens of critical theory (e.g., Marxist, Feminist, etc.) and be employed in interventionist ways to address political issues that are often addressed in contemporary art. Critical theory evolved from Plato’s *Apology*, in which the Greek philosopher, Socrates, questioned conventional knowledge (Bronner, 2011). It also seeks to reveal the hidden purposes of other theories and practices (Bronner, 2011). In Western civilization, critical theory often challenges ideas and practices related to exploitation, repression and alienation (Bronner, 2011).

On a theoretical level, conducting research on a new method that draws from multiple disciplines or domains is a reflection of the nature of contemporary art. There are multiple art markets, ideologies, and practices. In art and other fields, there is a blurring of boundaries, cross-pollination, and integration of different ideas and practices. Poetics of the [Selves]∞ reflects this current state of contemporary art as it combines practices of mindfulness, writing, and performance. This has applications in artistic contexts as well as a multitude of others that could benefit from knowledge creation. In this sense, the practitioner-based research at the foundation of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is an interior perspective that illuminates potential ways that students and teachers may together construct knowledge.
While this may have broader implications for educators and provide new insights related to experiential learning, this study may yield insights that address common issues that arise in my personal studio practice. For instance, this research may provide useful insights on how certain activities and/or the method as a whole can address problem-solving in my artistic practice. Through a mindful, intuitive, and embodied awareness, along with autobiographical compositions, the method may address various stages of creative problem-solving. According to the creativity scholar, Wallas (1926), there are four stages of creative problem-solving: preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification. Each of these processes benefit from a deep level of reflection, making, and studying and may benefit from increasing sensitivity and awareness before engaging in the artistic process.

Poetics of the [Selves]∞ will explore the inter-relationship, cross-application, and hybridization of composition and modes of awareness. As I conduct the research, I will interpret it through my lens, which is shaped by my personal history, interests, and my studio practice, which experiments with mindfulness, writing, and performance as strategies to explore the phenomenon of subjectivity.

Sociocultural theory provides an explanatory framework to describe how Poetics of the [Selves]∞ creates opportunities for individuals to construct new meaning and generate knowledge. This initial research of the method will not go into great detail about how it may be implemented and assessed as a formal curriculum. However, sociocultural theory is intended to offer an explanatory framework for the field of education to understand how the components of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ may operate within educational contexts.
Furthermore, the field of contemporary performance offers opportunities to broaden current theories and practices in the field of experiential learning. A transdisciplinary approach was taken in the development of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ which considers how contemporary performance practices can be theorized and adapted in order to promote learning through experiential means. More specifically, I integrate aspects of a contemporary performance practice, Viewpoints (Overlie, 2016), into Poetics of the [Selves]∞. As discussed earlier in the chapter, this performance practice is multi-layered and may hold the potential for self-transformation from both a theoretical and practical rationale. In the development of Poetics of the [Selves]∞, I explicitly activate and explore the Viewpoints of space, shape, time, and story.

In the naming of the method, Poetics of the [Selves]∞, I attempt to reflect the transdisciplinary nature of this approach. The term poetics has historically been associated with literary contexts (Fienberg, 2002) and often refers to poetic as a systematic examination of literature (Olsen, 1976). The literary tradition of structuralist poetics views texts as ‘phenomena’ (p. 338) that may undergo analysis (Olsen, 1976). In this research, I employed the term “poetics” to reference a multimodal exploration of the phenomenon of the self. The bracketed selves and lemniscate symbol denote the multiplicity of the self that is illuminated throughout Poetics of the [Selves]∞. The “multiplying” of the “self” implies there are multiple interpretations, understandings, and truths about one and others.

Philosophical and psychological notions of what constitutes the “self” have been discussed for millennia. In this research, the self is considered and engaged on a variety of levels. The development of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ also considers how identity is a
construction based on our perceptions of our lived experiences. It also examines how an integrated approach that draws from mindfulness, writing, and performance practices may provide a new lens to consider the ontology of the self and considers its implications for psychological wellbeing.

**Mindfulness**

The first theoretical approach of the approach is mindfulness. The definition of mindfulness poses challenges because it refers to a variety of methods and processes. Moreover, the word “mindful” may take on different meanings that depend on the context and discipline of study. The same term often refers to different methods and processes (Hayes & Wilson, 2003). Mindfulness may be thought of “as a technique, sometimes a more general method or collection of techniques, sometimes as a psychological process that can produce outcomes, and sometimes as an outcome in and of itself” (Hayes & Wilson, 2003, p. 161). Mindfulness is now examined in a variety of psychological subfields including Gestalt, Humanism, existential phenomena, cognitive behaviorism, neuroscience, and positive psychology (Rupert, 2015). The phenomenon of mindfulness was initially described in Buddhist literature over 2,000 years ago and regarded as a type of mental training in the form of mindfulness meditation (Rupert, 2015).

The mindfulness practices described in Asian Buddhist traditions often relate to increasing experiential awareness (Bishop et al., 2004; Brown & Ryan, 2003; Kerr, Sacchet, Lazar, Moore, & Jones, 2013). By refining awareness, it is thought to help an individual develop the capacity to experience a heightened sensitivity to sensations, emotions, and thoughts that are experienced in the moment. The development of an experiential awareness may mitigate judgment and reactivity, which leads to the
improvement of psychological wellbeing (Baer, 2003; Bishop et al., 2004; Kerr et al., 2013).

Scholars tell us there are similarities between Western views and Eastern views of mindfulness (Stanley, 2012b). Western views of mindfulness are associated with the work of William James (Stanley, 2012b). The conceptions of mindfulness found in early Buddhist literature are also seen as a style of experiential inquiry and share similarities with William James’ early introspectionist method. Contemporary scholar, Stanley (2012a), points out that both Buddhist and James’ methods of mindfulness involve a first-person experiential inquiry that includes observational distancing. On a temporal level, the practice of mindfulness invites one to become in touch with his/her/their experience. Although it involves coming closer to one’s experience, it also involves dissolving identification with the experience as self through the lens of I, me, or mine. On an experiential level, the individual may feel two contrasting emotions at the same time, as they feel an intimate experience yet also distance themselves from attachment to a “self”. Both mindfulness and James’ notions of introspection have a paradoxical quality of distance (Stanley, 2012a).

Throughout the course of the 20th century and today, mindfulness has often been examined due to a growing interest in researching consciousness as a phenomenon. There is also an emphasis on accepting the sensations that arise in one’s consciousness (Bishop et al., 2004; Brown et al., 2015). Consciousness includes a synthesis of awareness and attention. Awareness allows one to monitor the inner and outer environment, whereas attention involves focusing on certain aspects for various intervals of time (Brown & Ryan, 2003). While attention and awareness are parts of normal functioning, they are also
facets of mindfulness. An enhanced attentive state and awareness of the present are often the outcomes of a mindful practice (Brown & Ryan, 2003).

The psychological competency of “awareness” is often associated with mindfulness as an outcome from practicing mindfulness techniques, or is sometimes synonymous with the term mindful (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Sometimes, one may be considered mindful if he/she/they exhibit a heightened awareness. Awareness potentially supports self-regulation (Brown & Ryan, 2003), and it can be described as an openness and acceptance of what occurs at that very moment which cultivates an awareness that helps the individual prevent blocking or manipulating what is happening (Brown et al., 2015).

In addition to cultivating awareness, a mindfulness practice also includes the regulation of attention, somatic awareness, affect regulation, and a change in self-perception (Brown et al., 2015; Hölzel et al., 2011). In other words, some of the methods (e.g., meditation, body scan, etc.) associated with mindfulness may influence how an individual directs his/her/their awareness, develops a greater sensitivity to physical sensations in the body, strengthens the ability to control one’s emotions, and alters self-perception.

An enhanced awareness or mindful attentiveness may also foster prosocial behavior. Although the theoretical and empirical research on mindfulness is continually expanding, associated psychological constructs including attention, awareness, and a focus on the present moment may assist individuals in considering another person’s perspective and promoting feelings of concern for others (Stanley, 2012a). These aspects of empathy may be supported by mindfulness practices that influence individuals to take
a nonjudgmental and present-moment stance and awareness toward intra-personal
emotions (Stanley, 2012a).

Mindfulness is also the foundation of several therapeutic practices and may
integrate somatic methods including yoga or tai-chi (Murata-Soraci, 2014). Mindfulness
methods are implemented in clinical settings in an attempt to improve problem behavior.
Mindfulness researchers Brown et al. (2015) point out the phenomenon is considered
from cognitive-behavioral models including Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy
(MBCT) (Segal, Williams, & Teasdale, 2002), Metacognitive Therapy (Fisher & Wells,
2009; Wells, 2000), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (Hayes, Strosahl, & Wilson,
1999), and Dialectical Behavior Therapy (Linehan, 1993).

Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT) and Mindfulness-Based Stress
Reduction (MBSR) are considered standardized forms of mindfulness meditation practice
and have been implemented in randomized controlled trials (Fjorback, Arendt, Ørnbøl,
Fink, & Walach, 2011; Kerr et al., 2013). Both programs involve a two-month
instructional format that involves focused meditative techniques. These somatic methods
include a body scan, sitting meditation, and mindful yoga, and are intended to help
individuals develop a mindful, accepting, and present state (Kerr et al., 2013). MBSR was
developed by Kabat-Zinn in 1979 and was originally known as the Stress Reduction and
Relaxation program (Murata-Soraci, 2014). It is the most commonly cited mindfulness
training program, and it was designed to reduce stress and improve physical well-being in
those who had chronic illness (Murata-Soraci, 2014). One of the methods developed and
employed in MBSR is known as the body scan, which lasts approximately 45 minutes
and guides participants through a sequence of attention shifting throughout the body.
while the individual is lying down with eyes closed. During the body scan, a facilitator verbally guides participants to increase their awareness to sensations throughout the body. There is also a sitting meditation version, in which the participants sit in a relaxed posture with their eyes closed and focus their attention on breathing (Murata-Soraci, 2014).

Mindfulness as a domain is also associated with field of positive psychology due to its role in potentially improving wellbeing. One of the subfields of positive psychology that informed the development of PO[S]∞ is mindfulness. The increasing interest in mindfulness in the United States is due to its associations with eudaimonic wellbeing (Ballenger, 2009). A eudaimonic approach to wellbeing emphasizes meaning, self-realization, and depends on the degree to which the individual is fully functioning (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In contemporary social sciences, mindfulness is defined in similar ways as in earlier Asian traditions. It involves guiding one’s attention with minimal effort, withholding judgment, and attempting to embrace the present moment (Brown et al., 2015; Kabat-Zinn, 1994).

**Positive Psychology**

The second facet of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is grounded psychology, specifically the sub-field of positive psychology. The field of positive psychology emerged after World War II and focused on healing individuals instead of referencing the disease model of human functioning (Snyder & Lopez, 2009). Positive psychology is a term that encompasses “the study of positive emotions, positive character traits, and enabling institutions” (Seligman, M. E., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C., 2005, p. 410). In this field, an individual’s positive experiences are considered in the past, present, and
future tense. In the past, the focus is on wellbeing, contentment, and overall satisfaction. In the present, the emphasis is on happiness and flow experiences, and future time perspective includes emotions such as hope and optimism (Snyder & Lopez, 2009).

In addition to distinguishing wellbeing throughout time, positive psychology has three nodes (Compton, 2005). The first is the subjective node, which encompasses things like positive experiences and states across past, present, and future (e.g., happiness, optimism, wellbeing). The second node is at the individual level and includes characteristics such as talent, wisdom, love, courage, and creativity. The third node is at the group level and refers to positive institutions, citizenship, and communities (e.g., altruism, tolerance, work ethic) (Compton, 2005). In positive psychology, researchers create interventions that attempt to understand strategies and methods that promote wellbeing. Psychological phenomena associated with positive psychology include creativity, gratitude, optimism, hope, flow, mindfulness, and resilience (Snyder and Lopez, 2009). Within these areas, interventions are implemented to examine the impact of certain activities and methods on these phenomena.

Research suggests that both artistic activities and positive psychology interventions contribute to psychological wellbeing (National Endowment for the Arts, 2011; Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012); however, there are no interventions that integrate contemporary performance methods with positive psychology. Thus far, the impact of the arts on wellbeing has primarily focused on how students’ engagement in the visual and performing arts (dance, music, theater) has enhanced wellbeing and academic performance (National Endowment for the Arts, 2011). There is no research on the role of contemporary performance practices in positive psychology. While the impact of the
arts has been assessed in various contexts, there is a need for research that examines how artistic activities can promote wellbeing.

**Savoring.**

Savoring is related to gratitude and defined as “the capacity to attend to, appreciate and enhance the positive experiences in one’s life” (Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011, p.164). The psychological phenomenon of savoring emphasizes the meaning of process versus outcome and requires people to slow their usual pace in order to invite mindful awareness of their environments, feelings, and experiences (Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011).

According to savoring scholars, Bryant and Veroff (2007), there are different types of strategies related to reflect 10 basic dimensions of savoring. These reflect various combinations of thoughts and behaviors and are used to enhance savoring (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). The dimensions include sharing with others, memory building, self-congratulation, sensory-perceptual sharpening, comparing, absorption, behavioral expressions, temporal awareness, counting blessings, and kill-joy thinking (Bryant & Veroff, 2007; Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011). Sharing with others is a social-behavioral approach that extraverts are more likely to use. This strategy refers to pursuing others to share experiences with. Memory building is a technique of savoring that involves individuals searching, noticing, and highlighting qualities of positive experiences they find gratifying. For instance, an individual may actively try to remember images for future recall by taking ‘mental photographs,’ (p. 93) to enable them to reminisce about the meaningful event with others (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Self-congratulation is ‘cognitive basking’ (p. 94) and happens often as a response to personal accomplishments
Sensory-perceptual sharpening involves concentrating on specific stimuli in a situation and minimizing attention on others in order to hone one’s senses through effortful attentiveness. Comparing involves noticing differences in one’s own emotions with what others may be feeling. It also consists of differentiating one’s present situation with comparable previous time, or with what one envisioned the event would be like (Bryant & Veroff, 2007). Absorption refers to allowing oneself to become completely immersed and involved in the moment, which promotes relaxation and presence. According to Bryant and Veroff (2007), this savoring style closely resembles Csikszentmihalyi’s notion of optimal flow experience without the conscious self-awareness and loss of a sense of person, place, and time. It is somewhat of an “experiential immersion” (p. 95) approach to savoring (Bryant Veroff, 2007). Behavioral expression refers to generating sounds of gratefulness (e.g., laughing, giggling). Unlike cognitive savoring strategies, the representation of an external physical demonstration of internal affect consists of an individual expressing an energetic response of extreme joy, enthusiasm, and interest. Temporal awareness involves a conscious understanding of the course of time. With this type of savoring response, people remind themselves of the temporality of the moment. They may purposely remind themselves that their positive experiences are transitory and value savoring the present moment. Counting blessings involves the individual identifying what one feels grateful for, pinpointing the source of the blessing, and then contemplating the connection between the gratitude and perceived source (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Kill-joy thinking is unique in that it differs from the other nine dimensions of savoring and involves the person reminding oneself of other places
they should be and how engaging in other things could result in an even more positive experience (Bryant & Veroff, 2007).

In the field of positive psychology, researchers have presented empirical research on mindfulness and savoring. Both of these phenomena are operationalized through the development and assessment of various techniques that improve psychological wellbeing and are considered positive psychology interventions. Sin and Lyubomirsky (2009) define positive psychology interventions as “treatment methods or intentional activities that aim to cultivate positive feelings, behaviors, or cognitions” (p. 468). In their article, they note various examples of different types of interventions including “writing gratitude letters, practicing optimistic thinking, replaying positive experiences, and socializing” (p. 468). Moreover, Hefferon and Boniwell (2011) found interventions that involved gratitude, savoring, and positive reminiscence were accepted and validated in positive psychology.

**Performance**

Performance in the artistic sense encompasses a long history and a wide range of styles, techniques, and methods. According to the contemporary performance scholar, Laura Cull (2013), performance can be considered through the lens of performance theorist Richard Schechner’s broad spectrum, which includes a continuum of human actions that range from play, to enactment of social roles, to the media. It also encompasses cultural norms (e.g., attending mass, religious celebrations, rites of passage) and a self-conscious activity in which the individual emphasizes something through doing. Further, performance can be used as a method to study any phenomena and may be studied as a set of practices, events, and behaviors (Cull, 2013).
Performance itself has long been a method for understanding human behavior and the systems that construct behavior. In the 1980s, performance transitioned from serving as a model for studying human behavior towards a paradigm for knowledge itself. Bleeker, Sherman, and Nedelkopoulou (2015) list J. L. Austin and Judith Butler as influential scholars in the fields of performativity. Austin’s speech act theory expanded on notions of performance by pointing out the importance of using performance in language to challenge and label phenomena. Butler confirmed how performance embodies symbolic systems and demonstrates how these systems construct and form bodies and their behavior through acts of doing and knowing.

**Active aesthetic.**

In performance practitioner Experience Bryon’s (2018) work, which originates in the literature on contemporary performance, she discusses a dynamic non-linear approach she calls an *active aesthetic*. The active aesthetic refers to actively exploring various ways of knowing to see what is occurring at the boundaries of the disciplines to contribute an additional layer of complexity. Performance from the perspective of the active aesthetic attempts to develop an inter/transdisciplinary connection through drawing from different realms of knowledge. Bryon (2018) argues the active aesthetic assists us in watching and seizing the act of understanding ways of knowing in a *middle space*. This space is where she believes knowledge transpires as an act of practicing (Bryon, 2018).

The phenomenon of self-stories considered through an active aesthetic emphasizes the complex layers that lead to one’s understanding of the psychosocial self. The psychosocial self is constructed through stories and provides a sense of belonging and identity in society (Snyder & Lopez, 2009, p. 3). The way in which people tell
themselves stories about material aspects such as achievements, possession, money, and other “surface” aspects, enables one to begin to perceive him/her/themselves at a factual or material level. These self-stories may create and reinforce an ignorance about the value of immaterial aspects of the self. Self-stories that focus on surface or material aspects neglect stories of an individual’s emotion, desires, and other possible unconscious elements of the self that construct their psychological reality.

Bryon (2018) considers how self-stories might be activated to generate new meaning and knowledge. The activity of storying is an example of the active aesthetic. In considering how the psychosocial self is constructed on self-stories, the author discusses how these narratives manifest through a process called “storying”. Bryon (2018) points out that transformation occurs in the active field, which is the space between the performer and observer. The middle field is where the story manifests in space and time, as the story is given affect, image, words, and sensations (Bryon, 2018). It is a site that is responsive and experiential that allows for new knowledge to emerge through process and experience (Bryon, 2018).

**Viewpoints.**

Viewpoints may be considered a post-dramatic theater method or system developed by Mary Overlie in the 1970s during her professorship at New York University in the Experimental Theater Wing (Overlie, 2016). She developed an approach to generating dance improvisation in time and space by exploring space, shape, time, emotion, movement, and story (Bogart & Landau, 2004). The development of the Viewpoints occurred during a cultural shift in America in the 1960s, also known as the Judson Era, and many artists including Robert Rauschenberg, Jasper Johns, John Cage,
Yvonne Rainer, Trisha Brown, Steve Paxton, and others began critical lines of inquiry into their training and approach to creating artistic work (Bogart & Landau, 2004). The Judson Era refers to a time in the early 1960s when a group of artists used a local church, the Judson Memorial Church, that offered open workshops. The meetings resulted in participants challenging traditional principles and practices of choreography (MoMA, 2018). For example, performances were held in non-traditional spaces, improvisation became very common, and often game-like structures and tasks were used to develop work (Bogart & Landau, 2004).

Wendell Beavers, a seasoned practitioner and scholar of Viewpoints, notes that Mary Overlie created the Viewpoints by naming the principles and practices that were explored during the Judson era (W. Beavers, personal communication, March 28, 2018). Mary Overlie’s conceptualization and practice of the Viewpoints was underway before she formally named and defined each phenomenon (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 18, 2018). Moreover, Overlie’s participation with the improvisational dance group, The Natural History of the American Dancer, served as one of the events where she began putting them into practice (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 18, 2018). Artists were exploring how the Viewpoints could be applied to compositional aspects such as viewing performance or creating work (W. Beavers, personal communication, March 28, 2018). Today, Viewpoints is taught as part of the performance programming at Naropa University in Boulder, Colorado. Beavers adds that, as a movement, Viewpoints is primarily taught by graduates who attended the Experimental Wing of performance at New York University and Naropa University’s

Jamie McKittrick is mentee and former student of Wendell Beavers and graduate of the contemporary performance program at Naropa University. She is a pedagogue at various universities throughout the United States, and her approach and understanding of Viewpoints was shaped by her training with Beavers. McKittrick describes Viewpoints as a living practice that allows infinite possibilities to open themselves to the performer. As a pedagogy, the nature of is one of transmission because it is a living practice that continually changes (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018). According to McKittrick (personal communication, April 12, 2018), Viewpoints as a vehicle that enables the performer-artist to exercise agency over the phenomena of performance. In doing this, he/she/they are offered a way to re-organize the elements of performance in a way that defies traditional structures and systems (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018). She also points out that Viewpoints is a practice of making art, not art itself (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018; Overlie, 2006). It can also be considered its own laboratory intended to serve as a place for experimentation (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018).

Another one of McKittrick’s influences, and a collaborator of Overlie’s in the group The Natural History of the American Dancer, was the American dancer, and practicing Buddhist, Barbara Dilley (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 18, 2018). She is often associated with Contemplative Dance (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018). In 1974, Dilley began teaching performance at Naropa University. During this time, Dilley began importing Buddhist meditation into the
classroom (Dilley, 2016). During her graduate studies at Naropa University, Dilley taught in the contemporary performance department (she is now retired). In Dilley’s most recent publication, *At This Very Moment* (2016), she discusses the composition process of dance movement improvisation. Dilley incorporates what are known as the Four Postures of Mindfulness into the composition process. These movements are sitting, standing, walking, and lying down. The performer begins with “ordinary gestures,” and upon developing a movement vocabulary, he/she/they transition to compositional explorations that include various methods and approaches. The compositional activities promote improvisational engagement with the Viewpoints (J. McKittrick, personal communication, March 23, 2018).

Bryon’s (2018) active aesthetic could be engaged through various performance methods, including Mary Overlie’s Viewpoints system. Both Bryon and Overlie value learning through conscious bodily activity that invites the awareness and creation of additional knowledge(s). This research theorizes and develops an approach that creates an opportunity for participants to engage in an active aesthetic through the employment of Viewpoints. The Viewpoints approach to performance was supplemented with diverse performance techniques, including experimental dancer and performer Steve Paxton’s Contact Improvisation, the Allan Wayne technique, the movement artist and researcher Bonnie Cohen’s body-mind centering approach, and the educator Jean Hamilton’s floor barre work (Overlie, 2006).

The Six Viewpoints consists of a theory and practice that is based on two interrelated matrices (Overlie, 2016). One matrix is practical and integrates the tools and materials from the physical and formal structure of theater. There is also a conceptual,
philosophical journey concerned that is addressed through notions of laboratories. The practical matrix integrates six elements of performance including Space, Shape, Time, Emotion, Movement, and Story (SSTEMS). The philosophical underpinnings of Viewpoints consist of nine “laboratories” that serve as mental tools to examine phenomena on a deeper level.

Matrix 1 (SSTEMS).

The first matrix of Viewpoints is concerned with the tools and materials from the physical and formal structure of theater (Overlie, 2016).

The first element of the SSTEMS matrix is Space. This element of performance refers to the blocking, physical placement of furniture, and other physical features of the environment (e.g., doors and windows, spatial alignment of actors) (Overlie, 2016). Wendell Beavers associates the element of space with the acknowledgement of relative location that exposes several dynamic relationships. The nature of these relationships involve person to person, the person to within the space, the development of languages of amongst and between individuals (i.e., “near space”), the connection to architectural frame and aspects of the bounded space (i.e., “far space”), and finding oneself in the universe beyond the bounded space (i.e., “infinite space”) (Beavers, 2015).

The second element of the SSTEMS matrix is Shape. This consists of “geometry, costumes, gestures, and the shape of the actors’ bodies and of the objects on stage” (Overlie, 2016, p. 84). The basic practice of Shape involves the performer transitioning into a shape with their body and holding the shape until the next performer creates their own. With Shape, the emphasis is less on “quality” and more on enabling prolonged observation to reveal insights. It is the observation of the shapes that carries the
information and influence of this practice (Overlie, 2016). Beavers (2015) expands upon Overlie’s (2016) description of shape suggesting it serves as an aesthetic, psychophysical, or narrative activity. Moreover, it refers to the visual aspect of oneself and others, which includes the environment (Beavers, 2015).

The third element of the SSTEMS matrix is Time. The vocabulary associated with time includes automatic and calculated rhythm, duration, tempo, speed and impulse. Time contains “punctuation, pattern, impulse, repetition, legato, pizzicato, lyrical rhythm, and a myriad of unnamed qualities of movement” (Overlie, 2016, p. 84). In order to locate time, it is necessary to study it outside of prescribed systems. In order for individuals to connect with time as a pure material, it requires one to acknowledge that it has been reified and codified (Overlie, 2006).

Beavers (2015) addresses the viewpoint of time by asking the inquiry of when, followed by questions related to speed (How fast? How slow?) and physical dimension (How long? How short?). Posing these questions enables the individual to recognize the interrelations among the phenomena that may be understood as “time”. Moreover, McKittrick (who trained in Viewpoints with Beavers) emphasizes the viewpoint of time as containing an essential question: When am I? McKittrick (personal communication, April 18, 2018) adds that the Viewpoint of time also overlaps with space, as one considers his/her/their location in relation to “others”. The deconstructionist approach to performance that Viewpoints allows for enables the performer-artist to engage with each Viewpoint of performance on an individual level or in relation to other Viewpoints. The six Viewpoints may be understood as individual phenomena or in their interrelations. Also, McKittrick points out that the Viewpoints may simultaneously exist and overlap.
with one another (McKittrick, personal communication, April 18, 2018). McKittrick (personal communication, April 12, 2018) notes that the concept of “others” includes humans and beyond (e.g., objects, materials, etc.).

As an individual is engaged with time as a pure material and disconnected from space or logic, it guides the body. Furthermore, one can explore the language of time as duration, which may transform common notions of time into a phenomenon that exists independently and communicates on its own terms. The Viewpoint of Time is also examined through practices that involve repetition. The action of repetition enables the individual to appreciate the variation and subtle shift in communication. Another practice associated with time is patterning. This involves one reaching compositional control and impulse, resulting in the performer developing a deep understanding of the interrelations of response and timing (Overlie, 2006).

The fourth element of the SSTEMS matrix is Emotion. This Viewpoint refers to “presence, anger, laughter, pensiveness, empathy, alienation, romance, pity, fear, anticipation, etc.” (Overlie, 2016, p. 84). The straightforward practice to engage with this material as a pure and independent part of performance is called Presence Work. This entails performers sitting on chairs as they allow their “thoughts, breathing, movements, feelings and even physical sensations of biofeedback to remain active in their awareness” (Overlie, 2006, p. 19). Additionally, the performers will gaze directly into the eyes of their audience, and then shift their eyes as they look away. Presence Work intends to free a passageway for individuals to encounter emotion on an intra- and interpersonal level (Overlie, 2006). In this Viewpoint, the definition of emotion expands to enable the performer to understand that multiple emotions exist that remain unnamed. Moreover, the
practices associated with this Viewpoint emphasize that everything that exists has a presence and the ability to communicate (Overlie, 2006). Beavers (2015) views emotion as a “feeling dimension that is not connected to storyline of any kind, including a psychological storyline” (Beavers, 2015, slide 9). Emotion may also be conceived as the energy that arises organically as a result of the individual engaging in the other viewpoints (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018).

The fifth element of the SSTEMS matrix is Movement. This Viewpoint consists of “falling, walking, running, blood pumping, breath, suspension, contraction, impact, etc.” (Overlie, 2016, p. 84). Movement is easier to identify than any of the other materials due to it being the most immediate and concrete medium (Overlie, 2006, p. 21). In order to examine the Viewpoint of Movement, it requires the performer to isolate it from time, space, and shape. The properties of movement can be emphasized as the body becomes more aware of internal and external energies of movement (Overlie, 2006). The primary Viewpoints practice for pure movement guides the individual to discover movement by moving from pure sensation in the body. Through this simple practice, they will cultivate understanding of the basic properties of movement (Overlie, 2016). Movement is considered “kinesthetic sensation” by Beavers (2015). He writes that it involves a mindfulness of one’s body which includes the following sensations: breath, heartbeat, weight, gravity, momentum, contact with environment through touch, compression of supporting surface, suspension from supporting surface, balance, and falling and rising (no page number). Beavers (2015) also describes kinesthetic sensation as a “sensation of being and the sensation of moving” (no page number). Movement, also considered kinesthetic movement, exists across the gamut of movement, referring to the smallest of
physical sensations to broad physical movements (Beavers, 2016; J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018).

The sixth and last material of the SSTEMS matrix is Story. This Viewpoint contains “logic, order and progression of information, memory, projection, conclusions, allusions, truth, lies, associations, influences, power, weakness, reification, un-reification, construction, and deconstruction” (Overlie 2016, p. 84). Story is fundamentally a constellation of information that often consists of logic. Story and logic are processes of ordering and prioritizing information, which Overlie associates with hierarchical action to comply with traditional standards. When performers attempt to locate the material of story, it is necessary for them to try to gain an experiential understanding of the nature of pure logic. Furthermore, it is important that performers acknowledge abstraction as a story despite it not having a traditional structure that consists of a beginning, middle, and end (Overlie, 2006). Individuals may examine common objects (e.g., refrigerators, mailboxes) to isolate the element of story. This allows them to understand that everything possesses some sort of story and possesses a history (Overlie, 2006).

Beavers (2016) understands and teaches story as the viewpoint that contains associations and mental contents that evolve from perception and experience of the physical world (includes viewpoints of kinesthesia, shape/line, space, and time). Beavers (2016) also describes story as an image that unfolds. McKittrick (2018) adds that time is not required for the progression of images. Moreover, she describes story as “a series of images that progress” as the individual may view “a static picture and see a series of images that progress, but it is not over time” (April 12, 2018, personal communication). McKittrick (personal communication, April 12, 2018) adds that Beavers’ notion of
“coherence” is particularly relevant for the Viewpoint of story; however, it exists in all Viewpoints. Coherence usually arises from the performers’ abilities to listen and sense what is necessary for the practice (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 18, 2018). Coherence also exists when one is working with other Viewpoints, relates to the connection among phenomena, and asks what is happening in Viewpoints practice that seems connected with other phenomena (J. McKittrick, April 18, 2018, personal communication).

**Matrix 2 (The Bridge).**

The second matrix of Viewpoints is called The Bridge. Overlie (2016) says The Bridge creates a double helix with the six materials by initiating discussions that grow beyond the material structure of performance. The Bridge allows for “particalization” to occur. Overlie (2016) believes that particalization allows for deconstruction and reintegration of the materials (SSTEMS). She also refers to the process as an “interrogation technique” (Overlie, 2016). Overlie suggests that particalization creates opportunities for useful insights and enables performers to integrate the physical integration with the SSTEMS also known as materials (Overlie, 2016). The idea and image of a double helix is presented in Overlie’s approach in which engagement with the six materials extend beyond the material level of performance (Overlie 2016).

The Bridge aims to assists performers in the following ways (Overlie, 2016, p. 68):

- “Discuss the process and results of microscopic examination”
- “Examine the philosophies that continue to influence performer and audience interaction”
“Review the accumulated effects of the Viewpoints’ interrogation of the materials”

The Bridge consists of nine laboratories that present philosophical concepts that allow one to deconstruct, and then reconstruct, performance (Overlie, 2016). Each laboratory attempts to provide helpful insights that enable the performer to experience a “unique sense of physical integration with the materials” (Overlie, 2016, p. 67). Additionally, Overlie (2016) points out that the nine laboratories begin by tracing the origins of the Six Viewpoints and progress to a conclusion that “draws a circle around the entire study” (p. 67). McKittrick (personal communication, April 12, 2018) explains that the laboratories assist the individual in framing and organizing phenomena that arise during his/her/their Viewpoints practice, and they allow one to continue to critically engage with the Viewpoints. Additionally, McKittrick suggests that the laboratories may potentially serve as a bridge between the performer-artist and the development of a personal aesthetic (personal communication, April 18, 2018).

Overlie views the artist as a phenomenologist and places process and experience at the forefront of her approach. Her distilled approach to examining the six materials of performance through theoretical lenses she calls “laboratories” may be seen as phenomenological tools to examine performance through experiential means. The nine laboratories are: 1) News of a Difference, 2) Deconstruction, 3) The Horizontal, 4) Postmodernism, 5) Reification, 6) the Piano, 7) the Matrix, 8) Doing the Unnecessary, and 9) the Original Anarchist (Overlie, 2016, 2016).

The first laboratory is called News of a Difference (NOD) and serves as a lens to view the subsequent laboratories through. Its primary aim is to enable the performer to
notice changes in growing levels of subtlety (Overlie, 2016). “Students should understand this laboratory contains a guide for their practice. Repeated practices in Space, Shape, Time, Emotion, Movement and Story should be monitored to make sure that the materials are being interrogated on a highly detailed level” (Overlie, 2016, p. 70).

This laboratory developed as a result of Overlie’s long-standing practice in meditation. The author writes the purpose of meditation is to refine conscious awareness, and this tenet influenced the development of NOD. NOD, a term borrowed from transcendental meditation refers to noticing difference on finer and finer levels of the structure you are investigating” (Overlie, 2016, p. 71).

For Overlie, this laboratory led to the discovery of “nonhierarchical structure” which ultimately transformed the idea of a binary relationship between the performer and audience into one where the performer acts as both the performer and audience. This laboratory proposes a philosophy that emerged from Overlie’s meditation practice that began in the 1960s. Her practice in Transcendental Meditation refined her conscious awareness, which she also applied to her studio practice. Overlie’s “refined” engagement resulted in the subtle deconstruction of performance and the discovery of a nonhierarchical structure that viewed the observers and performers as equals. This laboratory increases performers’ awareness and contemplative states of being throughout their physical, mental, emotional, vocal, and visual training. For instance, the physical moving training involves cultivating fine levels of perception in performers by understanding their bodies on a skeletal and muscular level. To employ this theoretical device to the practice of working with the materials (SSTEMS), she suggests the performer isolate one area and focus on a subject to allow a deeper level of perception to
occur. Similarly, she suggests the performer spend “as much time as the subject demands” (Overlie, 2016, p. 72). In order to engage in performance training with a refined state of awareness, Overlie suggests activities that involve isolation and focus on individual objects or phenomena, slowing down, and allowing oneself to spend enough time with the phenomena in order to see change (Overlie, 2016). In summary, The Bridge laboratory suggests that by training the performer toward a more contemplative and aware state, he/she/they will develop a more acute level of focus and insight in the use of the materials (SSTEMS).

The second laboratory is named the Deconstruction Laboratory. The purpose of this laboratory is to assist the performer in understanding the subtle distinctions among the materials (SSTEMS). This laboratory is a continuation of the focus that is developed in the NOD laboratory. The difference is that the performer begins comparing and contrasting the materials (SSTEMS) of Viewpoints. For instance, a student might be asked to understand the differences in time and movement. Overlie (2016) points out that both materials involve elements of kinetics and sensation; however, the origin of movement is sensation, whereas, the material of time evolves from an impulse that is “precognitive sensation” (p. 75). She suggests performers closely examine each material through improvisational investigations until one can clearly see the differences and characteristics of each material. The interaction between NOD and the Deconstruction laboratory is articulated by Overlie (2016) as “a great precision of focus, on a level of News of a Difference, deconstruction was used to split the atom” (p. 78). The overall approach of this laboratory involves gaining an understanding of the contrasts that arise from the act of deconstructing performance into its basic elements. She believes the
Deconstruction Laboratory emphasizes the characteristics and nature of each material and challenges the performer to understand more complex levels of engagement with each one.

The third laboratory is called the Horizontal Laboratory and refers to nonhierarchical composition. The term nonhierarchical suggest there is no preferential point of view. Overlie (2016) believes the construction of hierarchy includes assumptions that are limiting (e.g. pressure to be correct, etc.). Overlie (2016) suggests performers take an experimental stance and use multiple resources when developing performance. The juxtaposition of the materials (SSTEMS) in improvisation leads to an “equal mixture of choice and chance” (Overlie, 2016, p. 79).

Traditional theater languages, which Overlie also refers to as the SSTEMS, are organized in a hierarchical order. The goal of the Horizontal Laboratory is to decompose the hierarchical arrangement in order to allow profound new philosophical perspectives to reveal themselves. Instead of viewing the SSTEMS in a hierarchical manner, she suggests these languages are understood as connected, interdependent, and supportive of one another (Overlie, 2006).

As performers work within the Horizontal Laboratory, they may develop the competency to differentiate materials as they view the structure of the work from an improvisational view, as well as when they experiment with combining materials. This stage in the progression of the Viewpoints practice slowly develops the basis for creative freedom that is rooted in locating momentary hierarchical structures through reflection and participation (Overlie, 2006).
The Horizontal Laboratory has its origins in nonhierarchical structure, which refers to notions of impartiality. Overlie (2016) suggests that after deconstructing the SSTEMS, one may begin to consider a nonhierarchical approach to performance. This laboratory puts forth the philosophical idea that frees one of assumptions about structure. The concept of the Horizontal fosters an open and experiential environment that enables the performer to expand his/her/their experience. It is intended to alleviate the pressure to be correct or original and results in new connections between the performer and the SSTEMS. This laboratory requires the performer be trained and able to access higher levels of awareness and insight. Overlie (2016) likens the Horizontal experience to one receiving an IKEA furniture order without assemblage instructions. By not having the instructions, the various pieces could be assembled in any order, and one would be able to study each of the objects of the entire structure.

The fourth laboratory is the Postmodernism Laboratory. This laboratory provides the philosophic foundation and core of the double helix that connects the Bridge with the SSTEMS. The first three laboratories aim to create a foundation for the Postmodernism Laboratory. This laboratory emphasizes the value of the individual as both observer and participant. Postmodernism acknowledges multiple dialogues and truths that emerge through experience and contemplation. Postmodernism offers a dialogue in which many truths can be entertained at one time (Overlie, 2006). In the Viewpoints practice, Overlie emphasizes there is no correct way, and through the philosophical tenets of postmodernism, the individual discovers there are a multitude of ways or interpretations and understandings of the SSTEMS. She argues the materials (SSTEMS) allow for the practical study of postmodernism. More specifically, the nonhierarchical principles of the
Deconstruction Laboratory and the Horizontal Laboratory are salient elements of Postmodernism. This laboratory developed during the 1970s and 1980s as artists took a nonhierarchical approach toward art-making. Some of these artists in dance include Barbara Dilley, Trisha Brown, Lucinda Childs, and Steve Paxton. These artists’ works illustrated a nonhierarchical approach and often incorporated walking, running, skipping, and mathematically complex movement. The dancer’s identity was broadened to that of an artist instead of simply a performer. Dance, along with other disciplines began examining movement and processes associated with perception (Overlie, 2016).

In summary, Overlie view of the Postmodernism Laboratory serves as the philosophic foundation of the SSTEMS. The previous laboratories leading up to this laboratory have certain characteristics and principles that align with postmodernist beliefs.

The fifth laboratory is named the Reification Laboratory. This laboratory aims to strengthen the performer’s reflection on creativity and foster communication and language. The Reification Laboratory refers to the transmutation of language to share new ideas. She emphasizes the importance of artists finding their own processes and encourages them to explore the unknown in order to discover new things to later share and communicate with others (Overlie, 2016).

This laboratory explains reification as something that it is not and cannot be used for competitive gain, or as a competitive tool. Overlie (2016) believes the primary function of the Reification Laboratory encompasses the creative and problem-solving process. She suggests that it allows for new insights and knowledge to be revealed to the performer.
In *Manifesto for Reification*, Overlie (2013) refers this laboratory as a site that is unable to be possessed. The Reification Laboratory is not self-contained or everlasting, and it does not function in a success or failure system. This laboratory is not a place that welcomes the beginning or ending of a struggle (Overlie, 2013). Instead, Overlie (2013) suggests it provides a place for the performer to construct valuable knowledge.

This results in the mind becoming flexible, and allows for it to consider a multitude of several outcomes simultaneously. This can be associated with problem-solving processes and involves taking action within a dialogue instead of within hierarchical structures. Through the examination of reification it becomes clear that actions and solutions can be developed in dialogue (Overlie, 2013).

The sixth laboratory is called the Piano Laboratory and concerns itself with the interaction between the artist and audience. It offers the performer a lens to examine the SSTEMS through an exploration of the audience instead of the stage and performance. Overlie (2016) suggests the performers view the audience as containing the SSTEMS that may be played by the artist throughout the performance. Moreover, by the performer’s interrogation of the SSTEMS in the audience, he/she/they are able to potentially examine their own intentions. Overall this laboratory or philosophical lens enables the audience to become a vital part of the creative process throughout the performance. A common exercise associated with this laboratory is called Presence Practice and involves the performer sitting in front of the class, allowing the students to gaze at them, and sometimes even looking directly into their eyes.

The seventh laboratory is named the Matrix Laboratory. This laboratory is generated from the physical natural phenomena of the materials. This laboratory contains
the physical natural phenomena of the SSTEMS and develops from a performance practice that focuses on one material at a time. An ongoing Viewpoints practice is thought to foster the performer’s awareness of the following: visual impact, temporal play, shape options, kinetics, presence, audience, narrative, and the philosophical roots. Each of the materials contains sub-properties that create new perceptions, and advanced students often draw from inter-relationships with space and shape; space and time; space and emotion; space and movement; space and story; shape and space; shape and time; shape and emotion; shape and movement; shape and story (Overlie, 2016).

The eighth laboratory is known as the Doing the Unnecessary Laboratory. This laboratory provides a creative self-assurance and grows out of the performer’s engagement in the previous laboratories in the Bridge. This philosophical approach asks the performer to “interfere with the ordinary” (Overlie, 2016, p. 110) when engaging in automatic actions such as working or speaking. The performer’s physical self is allowed to tap into its knowledge without inhibitions and is not limited by contemplation, perspective, or reflection (Overlie, 2016).

This laboratory offers the performer a creative self-affirmation and challenges them to explore failure and to interfere with automatic actions such as pedestrian action (e.g., walking, exiting, running, standing, etc.) and speaking (Overlie, 2016). In doing this, the individual’s confidence increases as a result of celebrating a joy of interrupted purpose (Overlie, 2016). This laboratory also assists the performer in engaging with the un-reified phenomena (Overlie, 2016).

The ninth laboratory, The Original Anarchist, is the final lens in the Bridge. Overlie’s (2016) conception of an anarchist is one that is “directly connected with nature
and needs no outside rules as guides in order to function as a positive part of the whole” (p. 124). McKittrick (personal communication, April 12, 2018) views the Original Anarchist laboratory as being not only about the self, but related to how one engages and senses others. Moreover, it is described as the integration of internal and external life and about practicing choice (J. McKittrick, personal communication, April 12, 2018).

Despite the performer following the directions of certain activities associated with the Viewpoints practice, the individual develops a direct relationship and understanding of each of the SSTEMS and the Laboratories. This results in one gaining a deep understanding of “gravity, sensation, the central nervous system, logic, form, geometry, etc.” (Overlie, 2016, p. 124). The ongoing practice in Viewpoints intends to increase confidence, clarity, independence, and cooperation in the performer.

In the context of theater, the original anarchist laboratory refers to how the training eventually results in the actors becoming fluent in reading themselves on mental, emotional, and physical levels as they strengthen skills with SSTEMS. Ultimately, this results in one broadening personal communication processes and enables one to understand what the right action is and how to listen with humility and clarity (Overlie, 2006).

Through engaging in a phenomenological investigation of performance, one may also encounter and explore phenomena that are associated with affect and psychology. These could include, but not be limited to, the following: “perception, thought, memory, imagination, emotion, desire, and volition to bodily awareness, embodied action, and social activity, including linguistic activity” (Overlie, 2016, p. 67). When considering the Viewpoints through the lens of the active aesthetic, one might ask how Overlie’s
approach to performance training may be suitable to integrate and merge with different disciplines in order to generate additional complex meaning and understandings.

In the development of a performance-based approach like Poetics of the [Selves]$^\infty$ that is primarily intended for the learning sciences, it is necessary to consider it through the language and theoretical orientations that exist in the field of education. In the realm of contemporary performance, practices such as the active aesthetic and Viewpoints emphasize process; however, in the learning sciences, there are also pedagogical approaches that place process at the core of the teaching and learning process. The import and adaption of the performance components for the prototypes of PO[S]$^\infty$ in this research originated from McKittrick’s interpretations and understanding of the Viewpoints practice. Her formal training at Naropa University with Wendell Beavers and Barbara Dilley, coupled with her ongoing practice, influenced the discussions and training she provided this researcher.

**Sociocultural Theory of L. S. Vygotsky**

Lev Semenovich Vygotsky (1896-1934) was a seminal Russian psychologist who is known for his sociocultural theory (Moll, 1990). Vygotsky’s thinking and writing was built upon Marxian foundations that claimed that to understand the person, one was initially required to understand the social relations that surround the person (Wertsch, 1985). Sociocultural approaches to educational practices were introduced and formalized by Vygotsky and his colleagues in Russia throughout the 1920s and 1930s (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Sociocultural approaches operate on the assumption that human activities occur in cultural contexts, are mediated by language (and other symbol systems), and are best examined in their historical evolution (John-Steiner & Mahn,
1996). Social-constructionist perspectives related to learning are associated with Vygotsky because they do the following (see Figure 1, for social-constructionist pedagogical terms): 1) view knowledge as constantly transforming and being constructed with others; 2) view the student as a being who co-constructs and negotiates meanings with others; and 3) view the “self” as a member of the collective who is also a sense-maker and problem-solver (Wink & Putney, 2002). Figure 1 shows a list of social-constructionist pedagogical terms (see Figure 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Changing body of knowledge, mutually constructed with others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Collaborative construction of socially/culturally defined knowledge and values. Through socially and culturally constructed opportunities, tying to students’ experience. In collaboration with others through the social/cultural setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Co-construct knowledge with students by sharing expertise and understanding (actuator of learning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Collective and individual development through collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of teacher</td>
<td>Mediator, mentor, actuator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of peers</td>
<td>Assume part of knowledge construction, contribute to definition of knowledge, help define opportunities for learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of student</td>
<td>Active co-construction with others and self-negotiating meaning. Cogenerator, co-constructor, reformulator. Active thinker, explainer, interpreter, inquirer, active social participator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student view of self</td>
<td>Sense-maker, problem solver, socially appropriate member of collective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of learning</td>
<td>Process of inquiry, socially competent participation in collective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of school</td>
<td>Create new knowledge, learn strategies to continue learning. Prepare individuals as social members with expanding repertoires of appropriate ways of interacting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Social-constructionist pedagogical terms. Adapted from “A Vision of Vygotsky,” by J.Wink and L. G. Putney, 2002, pp. 33-34, Boston: Allyn and Bacon*

**Mind in society.**

*Mind in Society* (1978) is a book and concept presented by Vygotsky. It explains his sociocultural perspectives on the relations between the self and society. Wertsch (1991) emphasized three major themes in Vygotsky’s research that explain the interdependent nature between the individual and social processes in the generation of knowledge. These are revisited and summarized by John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) as (1) social sources on development, (2) semiotic mediation, and (3) genetic analysis. Human development begins with the reliance on caregivers, thus, the developing being depends on a collection
of transmitted experiences of others (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The individual develops understanding by participating in activities with others. This results in one synthesizing the influences that influence his/her/their learning. As a result of working collaboratively, the individual internalizes the impact of working together. This supports the development of valuable strategies and knowledge (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The second theme that demonstrates the interdependency between the individual and social interaction is semiotic mediation. It plays a vital role in knowledge construction (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The social-constructionist view of semiotic mediation involves utilizing signs or symbols to enhance one’s actions. Through this process, individuals develop associations that transform the sign into a symbol. The process of mediation is part of semiotics and refers to how signs create meaning. Semiotic mediation involves the use and purpose of signs or the process where signs transform into symbols (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000; Wink & Putney, 2002). The third theme that emphasizes the sociality of the knowledge-generation process is genetic analysis (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). In *Mind and Society* (1978), Vygotsky developed his theoretical framework by focusing on the origins and history of genetic analysis. Vygotsky specifically focused on their interconnectedness (John-Steiner and Mahn, 1996). He discusses the importance of examining the process, not the product, of human development and emphasized that “to study something historically means to study it in the process of change” (Vygotsky, 1978, pp. 64-65). To conduct psychological analysis, Vygotsky (1978) suggests the following points: 1) process analysis is more valuable and preferable than object analysis, 2) psychological analysis should be explanatory instead of descriptive, and, 3) developmental analysis returns to its origins and rearranges all the points in the being’s
development. In summary, Vygotsky’s three tenets (social sources of development, semiotic mediation, and genetic analysis) informed his sociocultural framework which assisted him in developing the concept of internalization (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).

**Dialectics.**

Vygotsky’s methodological approach contained a theoretical and psychological level (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). From a theoretical stance, he studied complicated systems in the process of transformation by employing dialectical logic to learn about the interrelations of the system’s components (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). On a psychological level, Vygotsky selected research methods that allowed him to account for the dynamics of process that reflect his theoretical perspective (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Moreover, his two-part methodological approach was used to examine and describe the process of internalization (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996).

In *Visions of Vygotsky* (2002), Wink and Putney include Van der Veer and Valsiner’s (1991) description of a dialectic as “a juxtaposition of opposing directions of thought to achieve synthesis. In dialectical synthesis two opposite ideas are united in a continuous whole” (p. 149). Vygotsky attempted to apply the philosopher Hegel’s notion of dialectics to psychology and used the metaphor of water to explain his perspectives on pedagogy, learning, and the development process within a sociocultural context (Wink & Putney, 2002). Vygotsky (1986) suggests that when water is separated into its parts (two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen) it changes on a qualitative level. Additionally, for one to understand how the properties of water extinguish fire, one should consider the synthesis and union of its separate parts. This relates to the theme (and book title), mind in society, as Vygotsky argues that there cannot be a separation between the individual
and the context. In order to conceive of either, it requires considering the unification of the person and the contextual factors (social, cultural, historical, and political). This allows for an understanding of the dialectical relationship between the self and society (Vygotsky, 1986; Wink & Putney, 2002). In *Thought and Language* (1986), Vygotsky employs his notion of dialectical synthesis to examine verbal thought. He believed the dialectical nature of knowledge, which contained thought and speech, influenced verbal thought. Figure 2 below shows Vygotsky’s venn diagram that shows how the dialectical synthesis of thought and speech create verbal thought (see Figure 2).

![Venn Diagram of Verbal Thought](image)

*Figure 2. Vygotsky’s venn diagram of verbal thought. Adapted from “A Vision of Vygotsky” by J. Wink and L. G. Putney, 2002, p. xxv, Boston: Allyn and Bacon*

**Internalization.**

Internalization can be understood as a representational activity. It is a process that happens as a social practice and simultaneously occurs in the human mind (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Additionally, the notion of internalization suggests that human minds are integrated with cultural, historical, social, and material processes (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). The idea of internalization allowed Vygotsky to suggest that the transformation of
communicative language into inner speech enables it to evolve into verbal thinking (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Vygotsky, 1986). Vygotsky’s beliefs on mental development attempted to dissolve binary thinking that viewed the individual and society as separate entities. Instead, Vygotsky (1978) suggested that people were formed through the society’s activities via the process of, which involves the following series of transformations:

1. “An operation that initially represents an external activity is reconstructed and begins to occur internally”;
2. “An interpersonal process is transformed into an intrapersonal one”;
3. “The transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one is the result of a long series of developmental events” (pp. 56-57).

**Zone of proximal development.**

In support of Vygotsky’s genetic law of development, he presented the construct of the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Wertsch, 1991). He describes the ZPD as having “functions that have yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic stage” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87). Vygotsy refers to the unripened functions as ‘bud’ or ‘flowers’ of development (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 87).

Four stages of the ZPD include the four stages (Moll, 1990). The first stage is characterized by an environment where performance is assisted my more capable peers. Before developing into self-sufficient individuals, people need the help of adults or more capable others. The second stage occurs when the child can perform a task without relying on the help of others. In Vygotsky’s writings, he examines the phenomenon of
self-directed speech and notes that, when a child attains this stage, it marks the transition of a competency through the ZPD. The third stage involves the process of performance being developed, automatized, and fossilized (Moll, 1990). During this stage, the child leaves the ZPD and performance and he/she/they are able to smoothly execute and integrate tasks. The reliance of the assistance on the adult or self-regulating self is not required anymore. The fourth stage contains cycles of ZPD in which the recurrence of activity through the ZPD enables the individual to develop new capacities (Moll, 1990).

Vygotsky’s ZPD was related to the process of internalization. Both the ZPD and internalization are connected to the genetic law of cultural development in his writings (Wertsch, 1985). Internalization is a process in which certain aspects and patterns of activity that were enacted on an external plane are executed on an internal plane (Wertsch, 1985). External activities are considered semiotically mediated social processes (Wertsch, 1985). To understand the process of mediation, it is first necessary to understand how Vygotsky views the sign. He said the purpose of the sign was to “act as an instrument of psychological activity in a manner analogous to the role of a tool in labor” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 52). The process of mediation is associated with semiotics and specifically relates to how the “psychological signs” create meaning (Lee & Smargorinsky, 2000).

Vygotsky (1978) defines the zone of proximal development (ZPD) as ‘the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers’ (p. 86). The underlying belief of ZPD is that psychological development and instruction are rooted in social processes
(Palinscar, 2005). Vygotsky argued that, in order to realize the connection between development and learning, one must be able to differentiate between the actual level of development and the potential level of development. The actual level of development indicates what a child can demonstrate alone or execute independently, whereas, potential levels of development refer to what students can accomplish with assistance. The latter developmental phase is associated with the ZPD and is believed to be a more dynamic and relative marker of mental development than the actual level of development (Palinscar, 2005).

Vygotsky points out the importance of being able to distinguish between empirical knowledge and theoretical knowledge, as well as understanding how one acquires and develops different types of knowledge (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005). The nature of empirical knowledge considers differences and similarities among phenomena developed through observation and comparison. For instance, the phenomena may be hierarchically organized by formal traits (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005). Psychology scholars Cheyne and Tarulli’s (2005) description of an empirical epistemological procedure involves isolation of the individual object in order to observe, compare, categorize, and remember the phenomena.

In contrast, theoretical knowledge refers to a connected and networked system of phenomena instead of the individual phenomenon. The acquiring of theoretical knowledge develops insights about the origins, relations, and dynamics of the phenomenon (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005). Instead of isolating the phenomena, the acquiring of theoretical knowledge concerns itself with an epistemological procedure that allows one to observe the transmutation of the object. Through reconstructing the object relative
to other objects, the relations are illuminated (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005). This approach may be characterized as experiential and experimental in that the learner explores relations and changes through physically altering the world and visualizing changes (Cheyne & Tarulli, 2005).

**Scaffolding.**

Scaffolding is often viewed through Vygotskian theories of learning due to his argument that learning and cognitive development have origins in culture and society. Additionally, learning is a social, dynamic, and interactive process (Hammonds & Gibbons, 2005). The activity of scaffolding is often associated with collaborative learning; however, it has been noted in research that the notion of self-scaffolding may be useful to consider how this could occur on an intrapersonal level (Fani & Ghaemi, 2011).

The structure of a scaffold is associated with building. During construction, a scaffold “is present around” the building’s exterior until the building is strong enough to support itself (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Similar to a building needing additional support until it reaches a developmental point, educators need to provide support to help individuals reach new understandings, new ideas, and new competencies (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005).

Hammonds and Gibbons (2005) outline three main features of scaffolding: 1) extending understanding, 2) temporary support, and 3) macro and micro focuses. The first aspect attempts to elaborate upon understanding by offering the necessary assistance to enable individuals to execute tasks and develop knowledge that they could not acquire on their own. Scaffolding goes beyond practitioner support and includes assistance that enables individuals to work independently, understanding how to think, what to think,
and realize how they may apply their knowledge and competencies in a variety of contexts. The second feature, temporary support, refers to the ephemeral nature of scaffolding. The intention is to assist the learner in completing tasks independently. As the individual becomes more self-sufficient, the teacher gradually lessens the support he/she/they initially provided the learner. The third aspect of scaffolding is the role of macro and micro focuses. The activity of scaffolding can be considered in its role in curricula and programs, as well as how the teacher selects and sequences pedagogical activities (Hammonds & Gibbons, 2005).

**Consequential progressions.**

Consequential progressions are linkages in activities that are academically and socially consequential within and across past, current, and implicated future events. Consequential progressions may demonstrate how knowledge has the potential to become more dense and complex (Wink & Putney, 2002). When individuals converse with one another, their current dialogue is believed to have evolved from past texts. The interaction is considered a negotiated production because it consists of an implicated future and intertextual past (Wink & Putney, 2002). The intertextual past refers to previous interactions with others in which the individuals have developed and integrated verbal, aural, oral, and written texts, with jointly created mutual meanings (Wink & Putney, 2002).

Margaret Brooks is an arts practitioner and researcher who examined the act of drawing through a Vygotskian lens in the classroom. Brooks discusses how drawing fosters higher mental functions and engages learners in consequential progressions of knowledge development in a kindergarten and first grade classroom (2009). Vygotsky
listed four criteria that enable one to differentiate between elementary and higher mental functions. The first one involves the transition of control from the environment which allows for voluntary regulation (Wertsch, 1985). This characteristic points out that higher mental processes, unlike elementary cognitive processes, are subject to self-regulation. The second criterion is “the emergence of conscious realization of mental processes” (Wertsch, 1985, p. 25). These include voluntary attention and logical memory. The third criterion is “the social origins and social nature of higher mental functions” (Wertsch, 1985, p. 25). Vygotsky was interested in how the social interaction in pairs and small groups resulted in higher mental functioning. The fourth criterion is “the use of signs to mediate higher mental functions” (Wertsch, 1985, p. 25). “Voluntary control, conscious realization, and the social nature of higher mental processes all presuppose the existence of psychological tools, or signs, that can be used to control one’s own and others’ activity” (Wertsch, 1985, pp. 26-27).

In summary, the idea of consequential progressions occurs through the zone of proximal development. It is suggested that knowledge becomes dense and complex from the individual cycling through linked activities. When an individual engages in linked activities, one’s experiences are consequential as he/she/they relate to the knowledge one attains and what one may accomplish (Putney, Green, & Dixon, 2000).

Poetics of the [Selves]∞

Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is a transdisciplinary, experiential pedagogical method that evolved out of my dual practice as an arts practitioner and researcher in the learning sciences. It is a practice that draws from different disciplines to develop an approach to knowledge generation through creating an awareness of the construction of the self. In
the following section, I describe the activities that I have imported and adapted from the fields of mindfulness, positive psychology, and performance.

**Body scan.**

The first component of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is a body scan. A body scan is associated with mindfulness meditation, which has been practiced for centuries (Kerr et al., 2013). This activity aims to help the participant focus on the present moment and encourages sensitivity to sensations, emotions, and thoughts that arise in the mind. The individual is urged to let go of judgment or reactivity. The activity is adapted from Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR), which is a standardized type of mindfulness meditation practice that is presented in an 8-week curriculum and includes the following meditative techniques: body scan, sitting meditation, and mindful yoga. Each technique aims to foster non-judgmental awareness of the present moment (Kerr et al., 2013). During a body scan, individuals direct a relaxed attentive focus on 32 different parts of their bodies, sequentially, for approximately forty minutes (Hedegaard, 2005, p. 242). Practitioners learn how to regulate their attention even when concentrating on uncomfortable sensations and develop an awareness of familiar body sensations’ change and fluctuation from moment to moment (Kerr et al., 2013).

The prompts in Poetics of the [Selves]∞ for the body scan activity are adapted from *Learning to Breathe* (Broderick, 2013), an empirically researched mindfulness curriculum developed for clinical and non-clinical populations (See Appendix B). It draws from MBSR (Kabat-Zinn, 2003) practices that offer methods for confronting, exploring, and alleviating suffering in the body and mind. The mindfulness methods include guided instruction in mindfulness meditation practices, gentle stretching and
mindful yoga, group dialogue and discussions aimed at enhancing awareness in everyday life, individually tailored instruction, and occasional home assignments. These methods and exercises are employed in both non-clinical and clinical populations and aim to help prevent and resolve negative psychological outcomes.

In Poetics of the [Selves], the facilitator guides the participants through a body scan as the opening activity with the aim of increasing relaxation and preparing the participants by assisting them in connecting to their inner thoughts and physical sensations. The activity uses guided breath work, verbal prompts that ask participants to be attentive to internal bodily and affective sensations, and involves them sitting with eyes closed. This abbreviated version of the body scan lasts approximately ten minutes and aims to begin to help the participant become more aware of the body-mind connection. Poetics of the [Selves] opens with a solo mindfulness activity to perceptually prime them for the subsequent writing activity. Opening with a mindful method may also increase the likelihood of regulating self-perception, which may enable them to engage in perspective-taking more effectively. After completion of the body scan, they may be more relaxed and have reached a greater internal awareness which may allow them to engage on a deeper level in the recollection, perspective-taking, and writing.

**Autobiographical Writing.**

The second activity in Poetics of the [Selves] is the writing activity that immediately follows the body scan and asks participants to consider a meaningful experience. They are invited to write in whatever form they would like (e.g., jotting notes, sentences, essay form, experimental prose) about their memory from three
different perspectives. The first perspective is the “objective” which focuses on the “material” aspects of the memory. These are image-based memories and thoughts. The second perspective is the “subjective” and refers to the emotions and inner thoughts and feelings the individual experienced. The third perspective asks the individual to reflect on any aspect of their memory that stimulates curiosity. For instance, the participant may write about aspects of the experience that could have happened, alternative choices, outcomes, and other what-if scenarios. The participants will have five minutes to write from each perspective for a total duration of the writing component of fifteen minutes.

This writing activity is a strategy associated with the psychological mechanism of savoring, in which the individuals potentially experience higher levels of positive affect as a result of appreciating and critically thinking about a meaningful experience. This is an adaptation and broadening of the savoring strategy of memory-building (Hefferon & Boniwell, 2011). Instead of consciously taking mental pictures of the present, they are asked to recall a mental picture and examine it from different angles. This activity may sharpen perception due to participants focusing on certain stimuli and ignoring others (Bryant & Veroff, 2007).

The intermediate and micro levels of savoring are operationalized by guiding the participants through writing from three perspectives. According to Bryant and Veroff (2007), intermediate savoring follows a sequence of mental or physical operations that unfolds over time and transforms a positive stimulus, outcome, or event into positive feelings to which a person then attends and savors. Savoring processes involve noticing and attending to something positive, interpreting and responding cognitively or behaviorally to this
stimulus (with savoring responses or strategies), experiencing positive emotional reactions as a consequence, attending to these positive feelings in an appreciate way, and often repeating this sequence of operations iteratively over time in a dynamic transactional process (pp. 13-14).

Microlevel savoring involves a precise, concrete thought or behavior that an individual engages with in reaction to a positive stimulus or event. These cognitive or behavioral reactions influence the impact of positive events on positive emotions by intensifying or reducing the intensity or duration of positive feelings. The responses to savoring are operational mechanisms of the savoring process. For instance, the savoring process of basking involves explicit cognitive savoring responses that include self-congratulation about how impressed others may be with one’s personal accomplishments (Bryant & Veroff, 2007).

Expressive writing may be considered a “delivery system” for the psychological mechanism known as savoring. Expressive writing, as well as autobiographical texts discussed below, stem from the concept in positive psychology of autobiographical writing, also known as personal writing. Autobiographical writing is employed in interventions because it is associated with increasing self-reflection, which is known to foster positive emotion and improve one’s psychological outlook. In Wall’s (2008) article on writing ethnographies, she mentions that Clough (1998) believes the “writing imagination deconstructs the unity of the autobiographical self” (p. 41). The personal narrative often emphasizes the potential for human agency and transformation through re-storying or re-telling, while illuminating the complex interrelations between identity and experience (Langellier, 1999).
Expressive writing may also strengthen underlying psychological mechanisms that lead to positive emotions. McAdams (2001) speculates that expressive writing strengthens individuals’ identity. His life story model of identity is related to narrative therapies which now include “life scripts, self-narratives, story schemas, story grammars, personal myths, personal event memories, self-defining memories, nuclear scenes, gendered narratives, narrative coherence, and narrative complexity” (p. 101). The life story model of identity suggests that people in modern day society are continuously constructing internalized and changing narratives of the self (McAdams, 2001).

The transition from a mindfulness body scan to an activity that promotes savoring was designed to prepare individuals to access and retrieve more meaning and knowledge from recalling a life experience. The body scan asks the individual to welcome any incoming or internal sensations, whereas an activity like guided reflection on certain topic or thought (e.g., savoring) is slightly different. The body scan and writing element may both increase awareness and lead to a more mindful psychological state, yet the writing extends the perceptual priming that may occur in the body scan to include a semantic priming (e.g., translating mental image into language) that prepares them for the performance stage of Poetics of the [Selves]°.

**Performance warm-up.**

The third component of Poetics of the [Selves]° is the performance warm-up that is associated with Viewpoints (Overlie, 2016). The Viewpoints practices known as “Walking and Standing in Space” and “Zen Garden” are adapted by the facilitator as individuals are guided throughout a sequence of basic movements and gazes. The performance warm-up as a pedagogical stage involves a sequence of basic movements
(i.e., walking, standing, running, sitting) and a variety of different gazes that are prompted by the facilitator. This warm-up can range in time, depending on the context, and plays an important role as it provides the bridge between the first two non-performance activities with body-based work. There is a shift from little bodily movement with a primary emphasis on cognitive awareness to a one that involves somatic processes.

**Walking and stopping in space.**

During this time, verbal prompts aim to increase intra- and interpersonal awareness on affective and physical levels. Both practices are associated with the space Viewpoint. In the Walking and Stopping in Space practice, participants walk and stop to explore their surroundings. They slowly develop familiarity and competence with moving throughout space through changing perspectives by walking and stopping. Participants notice their spatial placement in relationship to the walls of the room and to other individuals. They also investigate the dimensions of the floor space, distance between the walls, the distance between others, and the visual angles and placement of others. As participants explore the space, they may begin to understand space through feet and inches. Through the use of their body, participants will be encouraged to tap into somatic awareness in order to perceive intra- and interpersonal relationships. During this practice, the participants will not introduce movements beyond walking, and the group (including facilitator) may engage in a dialogue throughout the practice (Overlie, 2016). The limited movements of walking and standing in space are intended to be a simple performance activity that emphasizes the subtleties of space as well as the interrelationship of the participant’s whole being and surroundings. According to Overlie (2016), this practice
may result in creating a ‘spatial dialogue’ (p. 146) that also develops peripheral vision and a greater awareness of the other participants.

Zen garden.

The Zen Garden practice builds upon movements in Walking and Stopping in Space as the facilitator introduces walking, stopping, standing, sitting and lying down. By broadening the performance vocabulary and leading participants through a greater range of basic movements, there may be a greater awareness of the alternation of simple shapes and their respective spatial relationships (Overlie, 2016). In addition to potentially teaching the participant to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between body and space, this practice may also foster greater awareness. For instance, the exercises may assist the participants with developing a greater competency for exploring spatial and visual form.

In summary, the performance warm-up component draws from Overlie’s (2016) Viewpoints practices that are associated with the space Viewpoint. The warm-up may be any adaptation of these two practices as the facilitator sees fit that are compatible with the setting. Regardless of the site, the facilitator should also offer prompts and engage in thoughtful dialogue to foster participants’ awareness of self, others, and the surrounding space. This portion of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ may increase a mindful awareness through the combination of staying mentally present while moving through time and space. In addition, the savoring strategies of behavioral expression and temporal awareness are also activated as the participants move throughout the space and alternate modes of interacting and being with oneself and others.

Frozen postures (a).
The fourth component of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is referred to as “frozen postures”. Upon the completion of the performance warm-up, the participants will shift from the group performance activity to explore the Viewpoints of Shape and Story on an individual basis. They will be asked to revisit the writing they generated earlier in the workshop to guide the development of their frozen postures. A frozen posture, also referred to as a “static image”, is ultimately a bodily gesture the participant holds for a certain amount of time. In Poetics of the [Selves]∞, the purpose of asking participants to use their writing as a source of inspiration is for them to advance their experience of mindfulness and savoring to one that involves somatic processes. During this time, participants are given 2-3 minutes to develop three postures that are literal or abstract interpretations of the three written perspectives (i.e., objective, subjective, possibilities).

Frozen Images is associated with the “Solo Shape” and “Multidimensional Stories” practices of Viewpoints. This activity engages the participants in the Viewpoints of Shape and Story. This component imports aspects of the “solo shape” practice and “multidimensional stories”. In this practice, the participant focuses his/her/their attention on their body and does not have a predetermined posture in mind. This practice involves studying the body through observation of symmetry, asymmetry, curved and bent shape, and relationships of one part of the body to the other. The facilitator informs participants they are simply performing their memory (i.e., posture) for themselves.

Through experimenting with how the various written perspectives influence participants’ development of three frozen postures, they are also drawing from the Viewpoint practice known as Multidimensional Stories. They construct a story using the exploratory process of contemplating their memory, coupled with bodily movement, as
they work on each step of the process. The exploratory process of constructing three frozen postures inspired by their writing engages them in finding connections between language and spatial patterns and composing a logic structure that uses unusual time or linear thinking. Moreover, this activity layers with their “script” which contains varying modes of perception. Similar to Overlie’s (2016) Multidimensional Stories, participants may benefit from an immersive experience that offers multi-dimensional logic and proposes the notion of multiple understandings that there is more than one way to tell a story. The participants will ultimately create three different frozen postures separately and then combine the pieces into one composition that will be enacted in the Alleyways activity.

**Frozen postures (b).**

The fifth component of Poetics of the [Selv[e(s)]∞ involves teaching and learning one another’s frozen postures. After participants develop three frozen postures inspired by their three texts, the group is split into pairs and/or trios. Then, each sub-group is directed to perform their three postures for their partner(s) and learn the other(s). The time frame for this activity is less than five minutes and intended to allow sufficient time for each person to learn the physical enactments. Conversation related to each person’s story is not shared, and the focus is on allowing the other person to teach and watch their frozen postures performed by others.

This teaching and learning element of frozen postures may allow for meaning-making to occur as individuals observe others perform their gestures that are associated with a meaningful recollection. This may lead to additional contemplation on their
memory and regarding who they are presently. Upon finishing this element, the pairs and trios transition to the collaborative performance activity known as Alleyways.

**Alleyways.**

The sixth component of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is Alleyways. This activity involves creating corridors that enable each participant to embody their own space in the room. This component involves each pair or trio taking turns to simultaneously perform each respective group member’s frozen postures for a set amount of time. The simple movements that were introduced during the performance warm-up activity will be incorporated in any manner the participant prefers as they enact the memory in their alleyway. Alleyways explores the Viewpoints of Space, Shape, Story, and Time through the incorporating aspects of the following practices: Zen Garden, Corridors, Moving Shapes, Repetition, and Group Story Improvisation.

Alleyways is associated with both Overlie’s and American dancer and performance artist, Barbara Dilley’s, performance work. In Dilley’s book, *This Very Moment: Thinking, Teaching, Dancing* (2015), she refers to the activity as a “Trio on Parallel Corridor Maps of Space”. She asks performers to envision parallel corridors going from one wall to the other. The three people stand alongside one wall with each having their own corridor. Similar to Dilley’s corridors, the facilitator asks participants to take an exploratory walk to the end of the corridor, turn, and come back. In Poetics of the [Selves]∞, participants are asked to incorporate the movements introduced during the performance warm-up and to insert their three frozen postures in any manner they wish. In Dilley’s Corridors activity, she asks performers to implement five moves that include standing, walking, turning, arm gestures, and crawling.
In Overlie’s (2016) manual, the Corridors activity is described in a similar way, but with more of an emphasis on the theoretical underpinnings. The corridors can run upstage or downstage, stage left to stage right, and movement vocabulary is unrestricted in this practice as performers work to form visual, temporal and spatial dialogues. The advantage of this practice is that it accelerates highly complex compositional investigation through the use of spatial dialogue (Overlie, 2016).

As participants are encouraged to move throughout their respective corridors, they engage in the Viewpoints practice known as “Moving Shapes”. According to Overlie (2016), this activity can elicit feelings of frustration due to one feeling they cannot move or did not do so “correctly”. However, it is very educational in that it enables the shape (i.e., frozen posture) to determine the participant’s movements throughout space. The benefit to allowing the body to invite the mind to examine uncomfortable feelings and thoughts may stimulate growth and deeper reflection within the participants.

Group Story Improvisation is another Viewpoint practice that exists within the Alleyways performance activity. It starts with participants following a storyline at the same time and progresses to use a story as a kind of point of departure that encourages the story to comprise any material, to transform at any time, go in any direction, end, or evolve. In the Group Story Improvisation, the performers allow the story to take its own direction, relinquishing their control over a certain outcome. Simultaneously, others’ solo stories are enacted in the same space and performers are encouraged to focus on their own into any other story. Similar to Overlie’s practice, in the Poetics of the [Selves] adaptation of Corridors, the facilitator reminds the participants not to get distracted or confused by the logical progression of the story. In other words, participants are
encouraged to explore their own, and their group member’s, three frozen images in any order they prefer, with the integration of the movements introduced during the performance warm-up activity. The benefits of this activity include developing a story through the acts of concentration, individuation, and independence, while also increasing tolerance and the ability to function in a multidimensional environment that contains others’ experiences (Overlie, 2016).

The Viewpoint of time is explored through the practice of repetition. It involves generating a gesture, blend of movements, or text that one repeats. This practice also creates a set of conditions that emphasize subtle and gradual shifts with timing. The repeated movements or text enable the individual to notice subtle to dramatic shifts in time. The participant may become more sensitive to how the duration of time is shortened or lengthened, which may stimulate new insights into different notions of time. The advantage of exploring time through somatic means is that it allows the individual to experience time in a way that reveals the subtlety and nuance of the phenomenon, which may influence how the individual views one’s self (Overlie, 2016).

In Alleyways, the practice of repetition occurs during the Alleyways activity. Each group takes turns enacting one of the member’s gestures as they move throughout their own corridor. The three frozen postures of each member are performed simultaneously, with the performer’s own timing and choice of how they prefer to integrate the movements introduced in the performance warm-up activity. The performance activities adapted and imported into PO[SELVE[S]]∞ were primarily intended to engage the participants in the Viewpoints materials of space, shape, time, and story (see Table 1).

Table 1
Viewpoints Practices Adapted and Imported into PO[S]∞

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedagogical Component</th>
<th>Viewpoints Practice</th>
<th>Viewpoints Material (SSTEMS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm-Up</td>
<td>Walking and Standing in Space</td>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zen Garden</td>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen Postures</td>
<td>Solo Shape</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multidimensional Stories</td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Zen Garden</td>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridors</td>
<td>Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moving Shapes</td>
<td>Shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Story Improvisation</td>
<td>Story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Corridors is a practice in Barbara Dilley’s book, This Very Moment (2016)

In summary, the performance-based components of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ that follow the body scan and writing activities are intended to create a multi-sensory and experiential event that promotes inter- and intrapersonal growth in participants. Building upon the mindfulness and savoring aspects of the Poetics of the [Selves]∞ method, a phenomenological approach toward performance or the performativity of phenomenology illuminates how integration into Poetics of the [Selves]∞ may serve as an effective vehicle to deepen the impact of the approach on the participant’s experience. Similar to engaging in activities that assist the individual in various forms of contemplation of the self through developing varying degrees of awareness, integrating performance provides another avenue for self-exploration. The individual begins with the opening and receptive modes of awareness (i.e., mindfulness), then transitions to a more focused mode of awareness through writing (i.e., savoring), and then moves into activities that ask them to embody and explore stories and their being through performance. This approach to
performance is an active aesthetic in that it is dynamic, process-oriented, and transdisciplinary as it interacts with practices outside of the field of contemporary performance practices.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter I discussed practitioner-research and explained how it influenced the methodological choices that guided the analysis. I also explained how my role as a practitioner-researcher influenced the development of the method and described each component of the method. Next, I present a review of the literature that guided the conceptual framework of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. The conceptual framework is transdisciplinary in nature as it imports practices and theorizes on dynamics between psychology and performance. More specifically, the theoretical rationale and practices adapted for Poetics of the [Selves]∞ are linked to empirical literature on mindfulness, savoring, and contemporary performance practices. Sociocultural theory was also discussed due to the nature of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ being a process-based pedagogical practice that promotes knowledge generation. The goal of this literature review was to illuminate areas of theoretical and practical interest that were relevant to the development of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. These will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three.

**Chapter 3: Methods**

In this chapter I discuss the methodological approaches I employed to conceive of this study, data collection methodologies, and how to examine the data records resulting in the findings. This chapter is organized into five sections. The first explains how my
identity as an artist-practitioner influenced and informed the development of an experiential pedagogical method I named Poetics of the [Selves]. It also explains how I shift from the role of practitioner-researcher to researcher-practitioner. The second section discusses the cyclical nature of the research process. The third section explains the research site and participants in this study. The fourth section describes the data collection processes. The analytical procedures were guided by the theoretical and methodological processes associated with Interactional Ethnography (Green & Wallat, 1981; Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2003; Green, Skukauskaite, & Baker, 2012; Greene & Bloome, 1997) and critical discourse analysis (Gee, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c). The fifth section discusses the levels of analysis the data underwent.

My Role

This practitioner-based dissertation addresses two areas of my practice. My work has a dual focus that consists of a studio practice and a scholarly practice. The studio dimension of my practice entails the mental and physical work of creating artistic output in the forms of painting, performance, and sculpture. The theoretical and material processes involved in creating artistic work are intrinsically dependent on the individual artist’s capacity to be aware of subtleties, to move between the micro and macro, to work inductively and deductively, and to understand the complexities of rationality and other psychological processes that immaterial phenomena and philosophies form. Poetics of the [Selves] may help artists foster intra- and interpersonal awareness and mindfulness, which may nurture creativity.

As a scholar, my research interests in positive psychology, pro-social behavior, and social-emotional competencies are influenced by the innate qualities that operate in
my studio practice. My curiosity about the interrelations and integration of studio art practices and psychology sometimes manifests in art objects, psycho-aesthetic theories, or curriculum ideas. I often apply theoretical principles and methods from psychology that result in transdisciplinary approaches to creating artwork and developing potentially useful theories and methods for the field of educational psychology. My earlier graduate work consisted of reviewing the literature to understand the role and positions of art-making within the field of educational psychology. Much of the empirical literature is related to studio art and psychological wellbeing; the majority of the literature I reviewed was associated with clinical practices (e.g., expressive arts, arts therapies) or aimed to foster social-emotional or cognitive development in K-12 public schools.

I became interested in developing a method that merged my experience and appreciation for mindfulness, contemporary art, and psychological wellbeing. Poetics of the [Selves]∞ was informed by a combination of personal experience and empirical literature associated with psychological wellbeing from an educational perspective. In other words, this transdisciplinary method aims to incorporate contemporary art practices with theories and methods that support social-emotional and cognitive growth. Moreover, Poetics of the [Selves]∞ was designed to offer a flexible and responsive approach that can adapt to a non-traditional setting (e.g., artist’s studio) or formal K-12 settings. This method may potentially broaden the current base of knowledge and practices in contemporary art, but can also be adapted for K-12 settings to foster psychological wellbeing and learning connections.
**Interactional ethnographic approach.**

My role as a practitioner-researcher led me to adopt an Interactional Ethnographic (IE) approach. As Susan Bridges and Judith Green (n.d.) point out, the learning sciences are an interdisciplinary field, and IE examines the situated nature of learning in a wide range of disciplinary contexts. Both the learning sciences and IE recognize the connection between the social and the cognitive and study learning processes to understand how people develop knowledge. Similar to IE, the learning sciences also have a concern in various levels of analysis. Moreover, IE assesses events in the moment, and throughout events and context, to gain understandings of the cumulative and consequential types of interactions, the sequences of learning events, and texts (Bridges & Green, n.d.).

The theoretical choices and structures of IE originated in the intersection of anthropology, sociolinguistics, and work in ethnomethodology. An IE theoretical framework guides the analyst’s decisions about how to develop cycles of analyses. At the core of IE is the *telling case*, which is a detailed presentation of ethnographic data relating to some sequence of events from which the researcher intends to develop some theoretical inference (Mitchell, 1984). A theoretical inference is made about something we have not previously known, and the event can relate to any level of social organization (e.g., community, a family, a whole society) (Bridges & Green, n.d.). Every case study is a report of a certain structure of events in which a set of individuals have been engaged in a distinct situation (Bridges & Green, n.d.; Mitchell, 1984).

The central questions that guide IE as an epistemological approach examine how, and in what ways, within and across times, events, and relationships among people,
Poetics of the [Selves] allows participants to shape and constitute learning opportunities within the group. A researcher will study how the social, cultural, linguistic/discursive, and knowledge-based conceptual systems construct openings for meaning-making and knowledge-generation (Bridges & Green, n.d.). An additional set of questions allows the researcher to take a closer look or “zoom-in” with the data analysis as they ask who can say (read or write) or do what, in what ways, under what conditions, and, when (across times) and where (locations). In order to answer these inquiries, the researcher will examine material resources that may include past texts, artifacts, and personal insights as they question the goals, outcomes, and subsequent knowledge generation for the individuals being examined (Bridges & Green, n.d.). In order to build connections, the IE researcher collects data and carries out analyses on various existing cultural information, and, if applicable, connects aspects of additional cultures with similar data to develop an account of cultural phenomena. This enables the researcher to create an archival system for locating linked and relevant cultural records. The IE approach helps the researcher examine and understand the relationships between events and cultural practices (Bridges & Green, n.d.).

Interactional ethnography is a multi-faceted and theoretically guided approach. It seeks to develop evidence of learning for both the individual and the group. IE also offers a way of empirically mapping and graphically illustrating the course of actions and several levels of analytic scale across times, events, and durations and formations of participants (Bridges & Green, n.d.). A logic-of-inquiry makes visible the cyclical analyses of IE as it demonstrates the iterative, recursive, and abductive approach to studying the data. It is a non-linear logic of inquiry that represents the course of activities
and multiple levels of analytic scale throughout time. It ultimately constructs a telling case (Bridges & Green, n.d.).

The social scientist, Michael Agar (1994) applied IE to research in classroom settings and emphasized the importance of locating rich points as anchors of analysis (Bridges & Green, n.d.). Agar believes that culture is relational and dynamic and not associated with one group or location (Skukauskaitė, 2017). He introduced the concept of languacultures, which examines historical, linguistic, social, and other elements of daily life that individuals employ to construct and share meanings (Skukauskaitė, 2017). Rich points enable the researcher to make connections among languaculture and discourse (Skukauskaitė, 2017). Agar suggests there are points where the researcher asks what is happening in the data. This often occurs when there appears to be a clash of cultures. The researcher then traces the paths of the events and works backward to understand how it came into being. The language of the group is examined because Agar (1994) believes that language and culture are symbiotic. Bridges and Green (n.d.) add that language enables individuals to speak culture and that reveals it to the other who is reading and interpreting (Bridges & Green, n.d.).

Judith Green’s view of IE aligns with Agar’s view of ethnography as a philosophy of research instead of a method (Green, Dixon, & Zaharlick, 2003). In this view, an ethnographer uses abductive reasoning to identify and develop explanations for pieces of cultural knowledge requiring deeper investigation (i.e., aspects of cultural knowledge to which the ethnographer cannot readily assign meaning). The exploration incorporates unexpected phenomena, differing points of view between him/her/Them and the members
of the insider group, and an iterative, recursive process to reveal cultural practices, historical information, and emic knowledge (Green et al., 2012).

Interactional Ethnography as explained by Green et al. (2012) also draws from The American linguistic anthropologist, Shirley B. Heath’s (1982) work, addresses ethnocentrism, identifying boundaries, and building connections. Regarding issues of ethnocentrism, it relates to “bracketing” the ethnographer’s perspective so that it does not alter the voice of the studied culture or layer it with outsider expectations. Heath’s methods of addressing ethnocentrism are valuable because they attempt to prevent the researcher from projecting his/her/their personal values onto others. The approach includes employing the language (e.g., colloquialisms) of the insider members to examine relationships, events, and norms. Interpretation involves exploring how members interact with each other within the context of the group’s knowledge and practices (Green et al., 2012; Heath, 1982).

To identify the boundaries, an ethnographer decides upon the entry point of examination (the “event”), the boundaries of this event, and then contextualizes it based upon the insider members’ construction of events within the local culture (Green et al., 2012; Heath, 1982). All this is done while recording every artifact, viewpoint, and method employed during the observation process (Green et al., 2012; Heath, 1982).

**Interactional ethnography and PO[S]∞.**

The theoretical and methodological tradition of IE enabled me to gain insights and understand how Poetics of the [Selves]∞ may create opportunities for intra- and interpersonal growth. By adopting an IE research position, I was able to examine how meanings are constructed throughout the activities and the inter-relations of those
meanings with the various activities that comprise the method in total. The design and methodology of this study calls for the examination of the ongoing interactions among the group, as well as consideration of how participants reconcile meanings through these interactions. I examined how connections were discussed and acted out, and I considered how which actions were visible may relate to understanding the significance of Poetics of the [Selves]. I used a guiding question to lead the study through an iterative process, which led to additional questions related to the context being analyzed.

From an ethnographic perspective, I studied the development of what can be argued as a potential group culture, and using a sociolinguistic approach, I analyzed individual components of a group’s culture (e.g., meaning, relationships, events, and other content). The ethnographic approach allowed me to investigate both patterns that emerged when individuals interacted with each other in a shared setting or event, as well as how those interactive relationships created a group culture (Goodenough, 1981; Kantor, Green, Bradley, & Lin, 1992; Spradley, 1980). The sociolinguistic perspective was complementary, because it provided an approach for studying micro-level interactions (e.g., words, grammar, visual cues between individuals) within a group (Gumperz, 1994; Gumperz & Cook-Gumperz, 2006; Kyratzis & Green, 1997).

In this study, I adopt an Interactional Ethnographic perspective and apply specific ethnographic methods and tools. These methods include immersing myself at the site as a participant-observer, the examination of field notes, and the analysis of audio-visual data. This information will enable my analysis to yield insights that will lead to the development of, and evaluation and hypotheses about, Poetics of the [Selves].
To examine how the approach and its components influence psychological wellbeing and offer potential classroom learning connections based upon participants’ perspectives, it was necessary to adopt the IE approach. In doing this, I was able to examine the phenomena under study from different perspectives throughout the workshops by adjusting my participant-observer role across pilot workshops. This approach enabled me to develop an understanding of how patterns of behavior and structures shape possibilities for Poetics of the [Selves]∞.

**Discourse analysis.**

To conduct the study of language, I drew on discourse analysis methods. Discourse analysis is defined as an approach that attempts to discover how certain versions of the world, society, and/or events are created through language by examining speech and writing (Elliot, Fairweather, Olsen, & Pampaka, 2016). This practice argues that language constructs “social reality” and helps to reveal the process by which it does so.

Discourse analysis arose from the traditions of social constructionism, which is a term for a range of new theories about culture and society. The social constructionist scholar, Ken Gergen, believes that human beings reach an understanding of one’s self and the world as a result of being historically and culturally situated among others (1995). Moreover, Gergen suggests that the significance of language develops out of the way it operates among individuals (1995). Carol Dixon is another scholar who draws from social constructionist philosophy. Dixon’s research focuses on the processes and activities that create literate communities. Her approach toward discourse analysis
combines cultural anthropology ethnographic perspectives with discourse analysis in classrooms (“The Gevirtz School” n.d., para. 3)

The social constructionist researchers Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) summarize and present Burr (1995) and Gergen’s (1995) premises about social constructionism that apply to discourse analysis. The first assumption is that our knowledge of the world is not an objective truth. Instead, it is only available to us through categories. Therefore, our knowledge and representations of the world are not reflections of reality, but are products of our means of categorizing the world. The second assumption views knowledge as a product that is historical and culturally specific, and situated among people. The social world includes knowledge, identities and social relations, and is developed through discourse (Jorgenson & Phillips, 2002). The third assumption is associated with the connection between knowledge and social processes, and suggests that individuals develop shared truths through interaction with each other. The fourth assumption relates to the relationship between knowledge and social action. This premise is predicated upon the notion that a groups’ perception of the shared world inevitably considers certain actions necessary or unimaginable. In summary, Burr (1995) and Gergen (1985) suggest the construction of a social reality includes the construction of knowledge and truth that have social consequences (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

In this research, I applied the critical discourse analytic tools and methods that were developed by James Gee (2011c), who was influenced by perspectives in cognitive psychology, social discourse, and anthropological theories on American linguistics and narratives (Rogers, 2011). Gee’s theory and methods in discourse analysis consist of
seven building tasks and six tools of inquiry, which are used to investigate the ways language constructs the reality of a culture (Rogers, 2011).

The building tasks include:

- **Significance**: how language is used to influence the significance of things
- **Practices (Activities)**: how language is used in certain practices (activities)
- **Identities**: how language is being used to construct identities; how language enables the speaker/writer in creating his/her/their identity
- **Relationships**: how language illuminates the relationship(s) it is attempting to enact with others
- **Politics (distribution of social goods)**: how language communicates a point of view on social goods
- **Connections**: how language positions one thing as important or irrelevant to another
- **Sign systems and knowledge**: how language is enacted to privilege or disprivilege different modes, or claims, of knowledge and belief

The six tools of inquiry include situated meanings, social language, figured worlds, intertextuality, Big “D” discourses, and Big “C” conversations.

- Situated meanings: the particular meanings words and phrases communicate in contexts of use
- Social language: encompasses all varieties or styles of speaking and writing that are associated to socially situated identities
• Figured world: refers to a theory, story, model, or image of a simplified world and suggests what is considered “normal” or socially acceptable about individuals, activities, things, or exchanges

• Intertextuality: when words refer to other written or spoken texts

• Big “D” Discourse: social languages that are styles of language used to generate certain socially situated identities and activities (practices) that are applicable to those identities

• Big “C” Conversation: refers to deliberations in society or within social groups (e.g., smoking, abortion, or school reform) that large groups of individuals acknowledge

By employing Gee’s (2011c) discourse analysis methods, I aimed to discover what the participants meant when they responded in certain ways. In the analysis of the data set, I explored the transcripts for patterns in and across statements as I located distinctive conversational depictions of reality. I combined an IE approach with discourse analysis to guide the data analysis in this research. More specifically, the analytical framework developed through Gee’s (2011c) approach to discourse analysis allowed me to zoom in on rich points in the data set.

Guided by the Interactional Ethnography approach, I examined the following question and corresponding sub-questions:

1. What is Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?

Sub-Questions:
2. What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]? In what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?

3. In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves] afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?

4. What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves] enable in the participants?

Study Design

I analyzed two events: workshop one and workshop two. I present and discuss the findings for workshop one in chapter four and the findings for workshop two in chapter five. I analyzed these events in three complimentary ways using three different levels of analyses. The first phase involved a macro-analysis that accounted for the entire event through the constructions of structuration maps paired with a running record that explains the procedural detail of each workshop. The second phase of analysis involved a meso-level examination of sub-events within each of the workshops that yielded insights into the research questions. The third phase of examination consisted of micro-analysis that employed discourse analysis tools and methods. These tools were used to gain a deeper understanding of the sub-events in the meso-level analysis. The culminating phase of analysis involved a contrastive analysis between the three levels of analysis for both workshops.

The two key events that underwent three levels of analyses included two workshops where the researcher implemented the method, Poetics of the [Selves], in a workshop format. Both events took place on the south campus of University of Missouri – St. Louis. I examined the differences of each in greater depth in chapters four and five.
As mentioned earlier, the analysis of the workshops occurred at scales of evaluation. The approach of studying the workshops using different perspectives enabled me to engage in a cyclical, non-linear approach to examining the data. I adopted a logic-of-inquiry stance to analyzing the data to assist in navigating the multiple levels of analysis. Figure 3 shows how I used the data to explore research questions and arrive at mini-narratives from the microanalysis (see Figure 3). In workshop one I sought to analyze data that would assist me in learning about the epistemological and pedagogical base of PO[S]∞, as well as further theorize about the framework. This approach to data analysis was guided by a central question and sub-questions that were examined on multiple analytic scales. Moreover, the dynamic and reflexive approach to data analysis involved representing data, analyzing events, and ultimately arriving at a part-to-whole analysis that also included analyzing discourse on a micro level.
**Overarching Question**
What is Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?

**Cycle 1**
Posing Questions Initiating Workshop 1

- What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞? And in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?
- In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?
- What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves]∞ enable in the participants?

a. Analyzing Stanza 1: Back to Childhood  
b. Analyzing Stanza 2: Powerful Connections  
c. Analyzing Stanza 3: Fear of Collision  
d. Analyzing Stanza 4: Meaningful Gestures  
e. Analyzing Stanza 5: Others’ Stories  
f. Analyzing Stanza 6: Self-Imposed Limits  
g. Analyzing Stanza 7: My Story

**Representing Data:** Produced transcripts in message unit of video record data of workshop 1.  
Creation of event map in order to identify patterns of interaction in workshop 1.

**Representing Data:** Produced map of physical space of workshop 1.

**Analyzing Events:** Reviewed transcript and sub-events to identify what meaning making experiences are evidenced among participants.

**Figure 3.** Representation of the first phase of logic-of-inquiry.

In the second phase of the logic-of-inquiry process, the same research questions guided the data analysis; however, the nature of the second workshop differed from workshop one. The second “cycle” of analysis is presented in Figure 4 and illustrates how I treated the data set which involved representing data, examining data from different analytic angles, and included mini-narratives (see Figure 4). I studied the data set on a macro-, meso-, and micro-level and further theorized about PO[S]∞ and its role in classrooms. Moreover, the first phase of the logic-of-inquiry allowed me to approach the analysis of workshop two data with additional insights about how the pedagogical components worked together and on an individual basis.
Positing New Focusing Questions

Cycle 2

- What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]? And in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?
- In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves] afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?
- What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves] enable in the participants?
- What are potential applications of Poetics of the [Selves] for foreign language educators in classrooms?

h. Analyzing Stanza 8: FL Applications
i. Analyzing Stanza 9: Sharing Memories
j. Analyzing Stanza 10: My Story
k. Analyzing Stanza 11: Performing Story
l. Analyzing Stanza 12: Audience-Performer Relations
m. Analyzing Stanza 13: Teacher-Student Connections
n. Analyzing Stanza 14: Empathy Building
o. Analyzing Stanza 15: Lack of Student Awareness
p. Analyzing Stanza 16: Empathetic Connections via Culture
q. Analyzing Stanza 17: Get to Know Each Other

Representing Data: Produced transcripts in message unit of video record data of Workshop 1. Creation of event map in order to identify patterns of interaction in workshop 2.

Representing Data: Produced map of physical space of workshop 2.

Analyzing Events: Reviewed transcript and sub-events to identify what meaning making experiences are evidenced among participants.

Figure 4. Representation of the second phase of logic-of-inquiry.

The three approaches of analysis allowed for the construction of a telling case for each workshop. The macro-, meso-, and mico-analysis of the transcript enabled me to present the data and develop theoretical inferences about the research questions. The telling cases presented in chapters four and five will make visible the logic-in-use of each analysis. In presenting the analyses, I demonstrated how grounded accounts of factors led to the differences in observed activities in each workshop and were necessary to build a more comprehensive theoretical understanding. Chapters four and five present telling
cases for each workshop. In constructing the telling cases, I considered the research questions as I conducted a macro-, meso-, and micro-analysis on the data set and identified rich points (see Table 2). In chapter five, a comparative-analysis is presented that considers similarities and differences across the two key events: workshops one and two.

Table 2

Rich Points and Analysis Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rich Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I think it took me back to childhood. It’s like being able to kind-of just let go. It’s kind-of like a playful [inaudible]...It’s not heavy or – I’m in class a lot and we talk about a lot of...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Analyzed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What is Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?</td>
<td>Macro: Construction of events maps at different levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the structure of PO[S]∞? And in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?</td>
<td>Meso: Transcription of dialogue in sub-events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In what ways do the practices of PO[S]∞ afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?</td>
<td>Micro: Critical discourse analysis methods (Gee, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does PO[S]∞ approach position the participants to interact with and learn from each other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does PO[S]∞ enable in the participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop One

The first pilot workshop was open to the general public, and the second workshop was implemented in a foreign language graduate classroom. Although data collection occurred across two pilot workshops and sites, the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ remained the same. The main differentiating factor was the duration of time for the
activities. Throughout the data collection stage, I acquired data through video
documentation of the workshops, as well as post-workshop interviews or discussion.

Dr. Córdova was the gate-keeper for workshop one. He is an educator in the
College of Education that specializes in teaching and learning processes. His role in
workshop one involved allowing access and space for workshop one to be held at the Ed Collabitat. Dr. Córdova also provided an introduction of my research to the participants. His participation in the workshop activities included the body scan.

Jamie McKittrick was the performance facilitator in workshop one. Jamie
received her MFA in the contemporary performance program at Naropa University in
Boulder, Colorado. She trained in Viewpoints with the seasoned practitioner and scholar,
Wendell Beavers. She currently teaches a variety of performance classes that range from
beginning to advanced courses at the University of Missouri - St. Louis, Webster
University, and Muhlenberg College.

In the weeks preceding workshop one, she provided Viewpoints training to this
researcher in a series of workshops that enabled her to activate and apply her scholarship
in Viewpoints. In tandem with the preparatory training sessions, Jamie and Alena
discussed potential ways to incorporate Viewpoints into the approach. Jamie’s role during
workshop one included implementation of the performance warm-up, frozen postures,
collaborative teaching component of the frozen postures, and the Alleyways activities.
Additionally, she facilitated group dialogue throughout the performance activities.

Research site and participants.

The Ed Collabitat is an education center located on the university’s south campus.
The center was established in 2015 as an environment for intentional collaboration
(“What is Ed Collabitat,” n.d.) and offers programs intended to cultivate new ways of thinking for educators and organizations. The Ed Collabitat offers career development advice and specialized certification programs ("What is Ed Collabitat," n.d.). Geographic proximity and access, practical concerns (including cost), and compatibility with the organization’s aim to enhance innovative, creative thinking made it a natural space to enact Poetics of the [Selves]°. Moreover, Dr. Córdova was a director at the center, and he assisted in scheduling, allowed access to the space itself, and allowed for the first workshop to be held after general operating hours.

*Figure 5. Representation of the space for workshop one.*

The first workshop was offered on June 8th, 2016 from 6:30-8:30 pm and took place in the central area of the Ed Collabitat. The building itself is a mid-century modern glass and metal building with high ceilings and minimal enclosures (e.g., cubicles and enclosures for meetings). The central area offered maximum space for the workshop and also provided rolling tables, stools and chairs, and rolling white-boards. The open space in the middle of the room measured approximately forty by thirty feet.
Figure 6 shows the flyer that was posted in local coffee shops and universities to recruit participants in the first sample (see Figure 6). I also used other methods of recruitment, including word-of-mouth and e-vites. I began recruitment efforts approximately one month before the workshop, and a total of six participants confirmed and attended the event. Dr. Córdova participated in the opening activity (body scan), and five of the six participants engaged in all of the workshop activities.
In order to protect privacy, I assigned participants pseudonyms. The participants in workshop one expressed an interest and/or practice in the arts and wellbeing during the ranged in age from the 20s to 50s+ (see Table 3).
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isabella</td>
<td>20-30 yrs</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Graduate counseling student at UMSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>25-35 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Creative writing graduate student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>50-60 yrs</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Alumni development associate for arts and design college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>30-40 yrs</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Fashion and food blogger for local publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>40-50 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Graphic design educator and corporate wellness coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection.

Participant observation.

In workshop one I implemented the body scan and writing components of Poetics of the [Selves]°. During this time, I relied on the video camera documentation and later jotted down impressions and notes about the participants. After implementing the body scan and writing activity, Jamie introduced herself again and provided an overview of the performance warm-up. She facilitated the remaining workshop activities. During this time, I sat at the table situated between the video cameras and wrote notes on a piece of paper. These notes included my impression of how the participants were interacting and how they responded to Jamie’s verbal prompts.
Video documentation.

I relied on the video documentation to capture data during the body scan and writing activity. These activities had limited dialogue due to their nature, therefore video documentation provided an opportunity to examine the body language of the group and me and the group. It also allowed for the observation of my behavior as an educator (e.g., verbal prompts, voice, etc.)

Post-workshop interviews.

The post-workshop interviews lasted approximately 30 minutes and were held in a closed-off area of the Ed Collabitat, adjacent to the main space. The semi-structured interviews collected participants’ impressions of the entire workshop and requested additional thoughts on the verbal prompts and the memory they chose. Due to the focus of the interviews, I did not include them in the analysis. However, in the future, the data may be analyzed to yield insights about other aspects of Poetics of the [Selves]∞.

Workshop Two

The research site for the second pilot workshop was Dr. Córdova’s foreign language learning class that took place in a classroom housed within the Ed Collabitat building. He assisted in the facilitation of the workshop by integrating it into a class session near the end of the Fall 2016 semester. The class was comprised of five graduate students who were graduating in 2017 with certificates/degrees in K-12 foreign language (FL) instruction. The course name was Foreign Language Methods, EDUC 4589 and it occurred from September – December 2016 from 5 pm – 7 pm, one day per week. The class was a foreign language methods course that prepares future foreign language and secondary language teachers. It contained students at the undergraduate and graduate
level. All participants were females who lived and taught in St. Louis and greater St. Louis area public schools. They were current foreign language educators at the middle or high school level.

**Research site and participants.**

In Figure 7, I show a visual representation of the space for workshop one (see Figure 7). The classroom was an approximately 500 square foot, square-shaped, enclosed layout that consisted of a few long tables, chairs, and rolling white boards. The amount of space (20 by 15 feet) allowed for the workshop activities was significantly less than the main area in the Ed Collabitat.

![Figure 7. Representation of the space for workshop two.](image)

The second pilot workshop was slightly tailored to accommodate a shortened timeframe and examine potential applications for K-12 foreign language learning environments. The class consisted of five female participants that ranged in age from approximately 20 to 60 years of age and were currently teaching foreign language in a
middle- or high-school classroom (See Table 4). All participants signed consent waivers that allowed for the collection and analysis of data.

Table 4

*Participant Demographics for Workshop 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>30-40 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Córdova</td>
<td>40-50 yrs</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>College of Education Professor and course teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>20-30 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>20-30 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>50-60 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>20-30 yrs</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Foreign Language Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection.**

*Participant observation.* My role varied slightly between the first and second pilot workshops. During the first pilot workshop, I was the facilitator for the opening mindfulness activity, and then adopted a more passive, observer role for the remainder of the workshop. In the second pilot workshop, I was the primary facilitator for the entire workshop. Due to implementing all components of the workshop, I documented my impressions, questions, and observations after the completion of the activities. During the activities, the video camera documented the dialogue and interaction of the group. Dr.
Córdova opened the workshop with a brief introduction to my work, and then I provided an overview of Poetics of the [Selves].

**Video documentation.**

For the second workshop, I set up one camera in the corner of the classroom. This is because the smaller space allowed for sufficient coverage with one camera, and two cameras would have potentially been a larger distraction to the participants. The video camera(s) began recording before the introduction and continued to record until the end of the collaborative performance or the post-workshop discussion.

**Post-workshop discussion.**

Upon completion of the performance phase, Dr. Córdova led an informal group discussion that generated dialogue around the participants’ experiences and potential FL classroom content connections. This discussion was open in format, and he framed the discussion by providing an overview of Poetics of the [Selves]. He added some observations and points of reflection about how foreign language educators might use some, or all, of the components of Poetics of the [Selves] to enhance the learning of foreign language. The discussion lasted approximately 30 minutes, and data collection consisted of the video camera documentation and my field notes. By holding space in a less formal and group format with the second sample, I was able to allow a leading expert in foreign language learning (Dr. Córdova) guide the discussion as he deemed fit. Moreover, due to the rapport the group had developed over the Fall semester, a discussion may have generated more ideas related to foreign language application in K-12 classrooms.
Cycles of Analyses and Telling Cases

Each of the workshops generated data that underwent analytic cycles that resulted in the construction of a telling case (Mitchell, 1984). A telling case is constructed through a multi-phased analysis that examines a specific event or individual. In order to construct the telling case, the researcher examined the data from each workshop from three perspectives. These perspectives include a macro-, meso-, and micro-lens. Each workshop underwent the same analytic process.

Macro-analysis.

The macro-analysis is intended to offer a broad overview of each workshop. It consists of a structuration map followed by procedural detail. This is accomplished by breaking down the workshop into its separate components and presenting them in a structuration map. This is followed by examining the implementation and procedures for each workshop. Figure 8 shows how a structuration map breaks the event into components, which aids in the identification of segments or meaning units that provide insight into the research questions (see Figure 8).

Video cameras were set-up in the space to capture audio and video data. They also enabled me to capture movement; however, they were somewhat limiting, because the viewing angle did not capture the entire group’s interaction for the duration of the workshop. To address this weakness, I paid close attention to the audio collected and also considered my written notes to produce a more complete ethnographic record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants arrive. Sign consent forms. Find a place to set their belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6:15-6:30</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alena, Dr. Córdova, and Jamie introduce themselves. Participants introduce themselves and share their occupation, relevant interests, and why they are attending the workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6:40-6:50</td>
<td>Body Scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mindfulness activity. Participants sit on stools, Alena guides them through the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6:55-7:00</td>
<td>Recall a Positive Memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants pick up a piece of blank paper and pencil, sit at one of the tables in the space. Alena guides participants through a recollection of a memory by offering prompts and questions that ask them to consider sensory aspects of a positive life experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7:00-7:15</td>
<td>Autobiographical Writing Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants asked to write about the experience from three different perspectives: 1) objective, 2) subjective, and 3) “neutral” / “curious” / “possibilities”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7:20-7:40</td>
<td>Performance Warm-Up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie leads participants through walking, standing, stillness, etc. in the space. As the group moves, and throughout the warm-up, Jamie has dialogue with the participants about their experience and impressions of the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7:45-7:50</td>
<td>Three Postures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie introduces the activity by providing an example of her postures based on a memory. Participants are given 1 minute and 20 seconds to develop 3 postures based on their memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7:51-7:55</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants are asked to form a duo and trio. Then have 1 minute and 20 seconds to teach one another their memories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8:00-8:35</td>
<td>Alleyway Memory Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jamie introduces Alleyways and integrates postures into the activity. The trio performance first, and the three participants re-enact one participant’s postures in the alleyways. Participants also incorporate movements (i.e., walking, standing, stillness) into the alleyway memory activity. The duo and Jamie observe the process. The performance or “ending” happens naturally without specific directions given by Jamie. The duo is asked what moments they remembered from the performance. The performing trio is asked how they felt about the experience. The duo performs in the same manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8:40-9:00</td>
<td>End/Post-Workshop Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants are thanked by Jamie and Alena. Alena requests brief one-on-one interviews with each participant. Three participants stayed for the interview. One emailed their answers. One did not stay or send an email response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8. Example of a structuration map*
The video documentation allowed for the development of structuration maps that provided an overview of the time spent on each component in both workshops. The structuration maps enabled for the analysis of the implementation and a better understanding of the inter-relations among the components of Poetics of the [Selves]. Furthermore, a structuration map for each workshop allowed for a cross-analysis of implementation components between the workshops.

**Meso-analysis.**

The second cycle of analysis zoomed in to examine the data through a lens that located additional meaning in the data set. The macro-analysis was followed by a meso analysis. In this analytic cycle, I transcribed the audio-video documentation, identified rich points that then guided a thematic analysis of the transcript, and closely examined the associated sub-events. I also examined the structure of each pedagogical component more closely, which assisted in theorization about the relations between the structure of Poetics of the [Selves] and the participants’ experience. Essentially, by locating the rich point, I was then able to trace back to see which activity influenced the manifestation of the rich point.

I reviewed the video recording and used Microsoft Word to type the language captured from each participant. Following the recording of interviews and conversations, I transcribed the experiences. I listened and watched the video documentation as I typed dialogue from all parties. This resulted in a record I could later use in the analysis stage. I transcribed all of the participants’ statements and questions as well as my side of the conversation, including the questions I asked. I also included information that indicated
certain emphases on the tone and volume of statements that related to the guiding research questions.

The meso-analysis included an initial review of the transcript where I documented impressions, themes, and questions that provided potential insights to the research questions. This process involved examining the conversation for larger themes and observed meanings that each participant expressed throughout all components of Poetics of the [Selves]�, as well as a consideration of the entire experience.

As I analyzed the record, I identified salient themes and questions that emerged from examination of the text and notes. I then identified key themes that reappeared in phrases and ideas throughout the record. I created a list of items that were potentially vital themes and continued to add to it as I became aware of additional phrases or ideas that repeated throughout examination of the record and video documentation.

This allowed me to develop the analytical framework that I refined and built as I moved forward with the data analysis in workshop two. As I identified key themes in the data set, I indicated any key questions or problems I wanted to examine more closely. I also examined my field notes against the audio-visual record to check for affirmation of certain themes and ideas and points of divergence. The field notes consisted of a mixture of direct quotations and the substance of what all participants (including Jamie and Dr. Córdova) said or did, as well as my own comments and impressions. The field notes also consisted of a reflective component that recorded my feelings, reactions, and speculations.

The list of possible categories was intentionally unedited during the initial review of the transcript. Some of the categories were, in the end, not as useful for the
organization and development of ethnographic record, but the researcher made that
decision at a later stage. The data analysis stage was iterative and emergent, and I sought
to identify the most salient or recurrent points and themes that seem to have emerged
from the research. I then added the most significant themes to the list of initial categories.

Next, I identified important moments or experiences that can be conceptualized as
rich points (Agar, 1984) that allowed me to discover particularly influential points in the
research that supported a greater understanding of the findings. These research moments
were influential because they allowed me to perceive more complexity. They took the
form of conversations and interviews, or direct experiences in my participant-observer
roles. Ultimately, these moments were developed and addressed the research questions.

Figure 9 shows how I reviewed the transcript sections that were associated with
the sub-events of interest, identified points rich points in the dialogue, and emerged with
themes (see Figure 9). The refinement of analysis by examining stanzas that contained
rich points allowed for a stronger thematic analysis of the data. This enabled me to
further interrogate the data for information that addressed the research questions. This
stage of analysis applied Gee’s (2011c) Seven Building Tasks, which illustrate how
individuals construct their worlds through language. I reviewed the transcript and focused
tightly on the sub-events that contained the rich points. I examined the transcript to gain
an understanding of “how language builds significance, practices, identities,
relationships, politics, and connections” (Gee 2011c, p. 202).

I viewed each of these as a rich point that speakers and writers take on when they
speak or write beyond giving information or informing people. In fact, in most cases we
give information (inform) so as to engage in one or more of these building tasks. Both
speakers (writers) and listeners (readers) build, since listeners (readers) have to follow the speaker’s (writer’s) guidance to build what they want the listener (reader) to build (Gee 2011c, p. 202).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Rich Points</th>
<th>Stanza Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Warm-Up  | It took me back.  
Kind-of like kids.  
A playful thing. | Back to Childhood |
|          | Getting really close.  
I remember that moment.  
I smiled and laughed. | Powerful Connections |
|          | I don't want to get in the way.  
Afraid of imposing.  
Mental limitations. | Fear of Collision |
| Alleyways| Generosity means a lot.  
A remarkable moment.  
She was open-handed. | Meaningful Gestures |
|          | Wanting to express it the right way.  
The pressure of performing.  
I want to project and perfect. | Others’ Stories |
|          | The limitations we place on ourselves.  
There are rules.  
My personal barriers to connecting with others. | Self-Imposed Limits |
|          | Performing yourself is more comfortable. | My Story |

*Figure 9. Example of thematic analysis using Gee’s seven building tasks*

This cycle of analysis also included examining the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]© more closely. This involved looking for patterns across and within each pedagogical element. I deconstructed each pedagogical move to its most basic parts. Upon completing the analysis of the rich point (i.e., stanza) I focused on the pedagogical activities that were associated with the rich points. These included the performance warm-up and Alleyways for workshop one, and the Alleyways and post-workshop activities for workshop two.
Upon identifying the activities that assisted in exploring the research questions, I revisited the refined analysis of activities as I considered the themes that emerged from the rich points. This allowed for additional theorizing about the relationship between the pedagogical element and the participants’ experience.

The purpose of the meso-analysis was to zoom-in on specific components and dialogue that had a higher likelihood of providing insights and answers to the research questions. The first cycle of analysis presented a break-down and description of the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and the meso-analysis provided a deeper examination of the structuration map through the identification of patterns within and across the pedagogical moves. This cycle of analysis also involved the transcription of the data, thematic analysis of the transcription, and the identification of rich points.

**Micro-analysis.**

In the micro-analysis, the stanzas associated with the sub-events that contained rich points in the dialogue underwent additional analyses that applied Gee’s (2011) critical discourse analysis methods. In the meso-analytic cycle, the transcription of dialogue from each workshop was organized into stanzas that illustrated rich points that were analyzed via Gee’s (2011c) seven building tasks. The final cycle of analyses involved deepening the stanza analyses to probe the stanzas with Gee’s (2011c) theoretical tools. These include the following six areas where I examined the stanza for additional information: situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations. This involved extending the meso-analysis of stanzas, which involved examining the stanzas with the building task tool (i.e., significance, practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, sign systems
and knowledge) to include the tools of inquiry to ask questions about each building task. Gee (2011c) writes that an ‘ideal’ discourse analysis would have a total of 42 questions, meaning there are six questions (i.e., tools of inquiry) to ask about seven things (i.e., building tasks). However, Gee (2011c) points out that actual analyses usually develop on a part of the large picture. In the micro-analyses, the stanzas were revisited and the following questions were asked:

- “Significance: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to build relevance or significance for things and people in context?”
- “Practices/Activities: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to enact a practice (activity) or practices (activities) in context?”
- “Identities: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to enact and depict identities (socially significant kinds of people)?”
- “Relationships: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to build and sustain (or change or destroy) social relationships?”
- “Politics: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to create, distribute, or withhold social goods or to construe particular distributions of social goods as ‘good’ or ‘acceptable’ or not?”
• “Connections: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to make things and people connected or relevant to each other or irrelevant to or disconnected from each other?”

• “Sign Systems and Knowledge: How are situated meanings, social languages, figured worlds, intertextuality, Discourses, and Conversations being used to privilege or dis privilege different sign systems (language, social languages, other sorts of symbol systems) and ways of knowing?” (pp. 121-122)

The purpose of the micro-analyses was to provide a closer examination of rich points. By applying Gee’s (2011c) theoretical tools of discourse analysis, I was able to discover additional meaning within the stanza that provided insight and potential answers to the research questions. The telling case of each workshop is presented at the end of the analytic chapters and is constructed through the evidence found in the multi-tiered analytic approach. By engaging in a non-linear, iterative, and progressively more concentrated analysis of the data set, I was able to create a telling case for each workshop that addresses the research questions.

**Contrastive Analysis**

The contrastive-analysis took place after the data for each workshop was examined on a macro-, mid-, and micro-level. This analysis considered the similarities and differences among and across sub-events of Poetics of the [Selves]. Upon locating areas of similarity and difference, I asked what that potentially means and why. The purpose of the contrastive-analysis is to observe the most salient and “universal” themes in the data.
Macro-contrastive analysis.

The macro-contrastive analysis observed differences and similarities in the structure and procedural detail of both workshops (See Table 5). The structuration maps were examined, and I noted the differences in the duration of each component, the setting, and the implementation and delivery of the activities. In chapter 5, I explain in greater detail how these differences may have created a different participant experience. The difference in the sample selection also influenced how I further theorized about the value and impact of Poetics of the [Selves]°.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Workshop 1</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Workshop 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Participants arrive. Sign consent forms. Find a place to set their belongings</td>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>Participants arrive. Sign consent forms. Find a place to set their belongings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Alena, Dr. Córdova, and Jamie introduce themselves. Participants introduce themselves and share their occupation, interests, and why they are attending the workshop.</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova introduces Alena and provides an overview of her work and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Body Scan Mindfulness activity. Participants sit on stools. Alena guides them through the process.</td>
<td>7 min</td>
<td>Body Scan Mindfulness activity. Participants sit on chairs. Alena guides them through the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Writing Participants pick up a piece of paper and pencil and sit at a table.</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Writing Participants pick up a piece of paper and pencil and sit at a table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alena guides them through the recollection of a positive life experience. Explore from 3 perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alena guides them through the recollection of a positive life experience associated with language they are teaching. Explore from 3 perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meso-contrastive analysis.

The meso-contrastive analysis included an examination of the structural differences between the workshops and sub-events to further discover how the two
prototypes of PO[S]∞ operated (see Table 6). In workshop one, the activities that underwent this analytic cycle included the performance warm-up and Alleyways. In workshop two, I examined the Alleyways and post-workshop discussion data to address the research questions. Since workshops one and two were intentionally different in the selection of sample (which resulted in offering diverse perspectives on how Poetics of the [Selves]∞ may be implemented to result in meaning-making experience), I consider those differences in the contrastive analysis. In workshop one, the sub-event of the performance warm-up took more than twice as many minutes than in workshop two. While both workshops included a meso-analyses of the Alleyways, how the participants responded may have been influenced by their experience in the preceding activity of the performance warm-up. The results are discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example of Meso-contrastive Analysis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Workshop 1</td>
<td>Duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Warm-Up: Jamie leads participants through</td>
<td>Performance Warm-Up: Alena leads participants through</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
walking, standing, stillness, etc. in the space. As the group moves, and throughout the warm-up, Jamie has dialogue with the participants about their experience and impressions of the activities.

Three postures: Jamie introduces the activity by providing an example of her postures associated with a memory. Participants are initially given 1 min and 20 sec to develop 3 postures inspired by their memory.

Collaboration: Participants are asked to form a duo and trio. They are initially given 1 min and 20 sec to teach one another their postures.

Alleyways: Jamie introduces activity and asks them to integrate postures with basic movements (e.g., walking, stillness, etc.) from performance warm-up. The duo and Jamie observe the trio's performance. Performance ends when trio decides to stop moving without Jamie’s verbal prompt.

Three postures: Alena introduces the activity by providing an example of her postures associated with a memory. Participants are initially given 1 min and 20 sec to develop 3 postures inspired by their memory.

Collaboration: Participants are asked to form trios. They are initially given 1 min and 20 sec to teach one another their postures.

Alleyways: Alena introduces activity and asks them to integrate basic movement (e.g., walking, stillness, etc.) from performance warm-up. The two trios alternate performing and observing.

Micro-contrastive analysis. The micro-contrastive analysis involved the examination of the stanza analyses of both workshops (see Table 7). The critical discourse analysis methods of Gee (2011c) were used the same way across workshops and selected sub-events. In this cycle of analysis, I examined the stanza analyses of both workshops and further theorized about how the participants’ experiences were shaped by the differences in the workshops. I also go on to explore themes that seem to be shared by participants of both workshops.

Table 7

Example of Micro-contrastive Analysis
Validity and Reliability of Research

I addressed validity and reliability issues through triangulation and admission of personal biases. Triangulation corroborates evidence from various individuals, forms of data (e.g., fieldnotes and audiovisual data), or data collection methods (Creswell, 2012). Triangulation in this study consisted of comparing fieldnotes, post-workshop interviews/discussion, and the audiovisual transcription. My personal biases include my studio practice in performance and visual art outside of this research, and a long-standing practice and familiarity in mindfulness practices. Potential limitations included a lack of teaching experience, as well a lack of expertise in the Viewpoints methods.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I discussed the methodological considerations and methods employed to carry out the research. I adopted an Interactional Ethnography (IE) approach that involved a logic-in-use cyclical process of examining the data through multiple
perspectives and analytic cycles. The macro-, meso-, and micro-analyses supported the construction of a telling case for each workshop in chapters four and five. In this chapter, I also provided information about the analytic procedures, setting, participants, and a general description of the data collection and analysis procedures I adopted and used throughout the study. Finally, in this chapter I discussed the research methodology employed and a characterization of the study’s design. The following chapter discusses the analytic results for the first workshop.

Chapter 4: Analytic Results for Workshop One

In this chapter, I present the analysis I developed after examining workshop one of Poetics of the [Selves]^®. On June 8, 2016, I examined and utilized the overarching research question and sub-questions to guide the analytic processes. The analysis of
workshop 1 results in a telling case (Mitchell, 1984). It can be constructed as a telling case as this is the first time the phenomenon Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is a focus of research. Moreover, although there is research literature available in the fields of positive psychology and performance, the analytic processes presented here produce new knowledge in the fields of performance and positive psychology. This research yields new insights on the under-theorized and under-examined Poetics of the [Selves]∞.

The data collected for this workshop included video documentation and one-on-one interviews (see Table 8). However, due to the nature of the research questions, I focused on analyzing the video documentation of the workshop activities.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Amount of Data Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Captured verbal and/or visual data for most of the workshop activities.</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview protocol with open-ended questions about the participants’ impressions of the workshop.</td>
<td>3 verbal responses, 1 email response, and 1 partial email response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This telling case was constructed through the activity of analyzing the data from macro-, meso-, and micro-lenses. As discussed in the previous chapter, the data set is analyzed via three scales of evaluation. The first scale of analysis examines the structure and procedural detail. It allows for the manifestations, substance, and boundaries of the pedagogical components and sequence of implementation to be understood, and also involves an examination of the structuration map for the entire Poetics of the [Selves]∞ workshop. It is then followed by additional procedural detail for its main components.
The second scale of analysis examines sub-events associated with rich points that were found in the transcript, and it allows the ways the practices of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ creates opportunities for participants to co-construct meaning to be understood. This scale occurs at the meso-level and involves a close examination of two sub-events of interest: the performance warm-up and Alleyways performance component. In this second level, I delve deeper into the activities and transcript of audio-visual data to discover salient themes that surfaced through language during these sub-events. The last, third scale of analysis involves the application of Gee’s (2011c) critical discourse analytic methods to the stanzas that contained the rich points found in the transcript. It allows for the phenomenon of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ to be understood on a deeper level as I probe the language to better understand what consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning the approach enables in participants. At this scale, the data undergoes an in-depth examination of dialogue that occurred at rich points within the two sub-events. I considered the format of the workshop, procedural details, and salient themes that bubbled up from conversation among the group. Further, I employed critical discourse analysis methods (Gee, 2011c) to gain understanding of the meanings constructed among participants and/or the facilitator(s) during the performance warm-up and the Alleyways performance component. The micro-analysis results are presented in the form of seven narratives that emerged from the critical discourse analysis of stanzas identified during the meso-analysis.

Therefore, in summary, the telling case constructed here moves from the macro to gain understanding of the structure, to the next scale of meso to theorize about rich points and sub-events, concluding with the final layer of analysis, a micro examination of
dialogue that allows us to understand how meaning is co-constructed and to further theorize about the approach. This part-to-whole relationship accounts for the holistic and participatory nature of the event. Therefore, to understand the origins and impact of one part, it must be held accountable for how it is related to the other parts.

Figure 10 shows the logic-of-inquiry for workshop that was used to guide the analysis through different cycles (macro, meso, and micro) and resulted in the development of seven narratives that evolved from the two subevents of interest (see Figure 10). The first three “stories” were constructed from evidence from the performance warm-up. The remaining four “stories” were developed from analyses of the Alleyways performance. Each mini-narrative follows its associated stanza.

Guiding Research Question:

- What is Poetics of the [Selves]°, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?

The subsequent analyses conducted on this “event” will take a closer examination to reveal meanings that answer the sub-questions:

- What is the structure of the PO[S]°? In what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?

- In what ways do the practices of PO[S]° afford participants opportunities to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?

- What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does PO[S]° enable in the participants?
Overarching Question
What is Poetics of the [Selves]? and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?

Cycle 1
Posing Questions Initiating Workshop 1

- What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]? In what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?
- In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves] afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?
- What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves] enable in the participants?

Analyzing Stanza 1: Back to Childhood
Analyzing Stanza 2: Powerful Connections
Analyzing Stanza 3: Fear of Collision
Analyzing Stanza 4: Meaningful Gestures
Analyzing Stanza 5: Others’ Stories
Analyzing Stanza 6: Self-Imposed Limits
Analyzing Stanza 7: My Story

Representing Data: Produced transcripts in message unit of video record data of Workshop 1. Creation of event map in order to identify patterns of interaction in workshop 1.

Representing Data: Produced map of physical space of workshop 1.

Analyzing Events: Reviewed transcript and sub-events to identify what meaning making experiences are evidenced among participants.

Figure 10. Representation of the logic-of-inquiry for workshop 1.

Role of Researcher

The first pilot workshop was co-taught by the researcher and a performance art instructor, Jamie McKittrick. This researcher’s role in the preliminary research and training for the pilot took the form of an apprenticeship where she learned some of the fundamental practices of Viewpoints in a small group setting prior to the first workshop.

My role as participant-observer shifted in both workshops. In workshop one, I led the participants through the opening body scan activity and autobiographical writing exercise. I then shifted from practitioner to researcher upon the completion of the writing component. At that time, Jamie McKittrick introduced herself and began the performance
warm-up component. Following the warm-up, she provided a brief overview of the collaborative performance activities of the frozen postures and Alleyways. The video camera allowed for the researcher to focus on engaging with the participants. Upon completion of the writing component, the researcher took field notes that consisted of personal impressions and questions that arose from observing individual and group interaction. The researcher also paid special note to how Jamie taught the performance warm-up and Alleyways.

**Telling Case**

Here, I present the telling case, constructed from the examination of the data records. The telling cases are based on research from an ethnographic perspective of the first workshop of Poetics of the [Selves]°, an experiential pedagogical method. The approach included mindfulness, savoring, and contemporary performance activities that were adapted and presented in a sequence that was designed to maximize the potential psychological mechanisms that were associated with each one. The transdisciplinary approach to developing a rationale and method for a new pedagogical method has resulted in considering new ways to promote wellbeing, and it has potential implications for a number of fields.

**Macro-Analysis**

The macro-analysis required examination of the video documentation of workshop one to create a structuration map. Figure 11 shows a structuration map that presents an overview of the event and its subcomponents (see Figure 11). The purpose of
presenting a structuration map for each workshop is to allow for a part-to-whole analysis of PO[S]∞. The development of the structuration map involved time-stamping the video record, as well as summarizing the main elements and activities of the workshop. This enabled me to review the structure and implementation of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ at a broader, structural level, before zooming-in to selected sub-events associated with rich points found in the transcript. The structuration map is followed by the procedural detail of the pedagogical activities. The practical aspects of each component are described, but also include a theorizing about the activities included in Poetics of the [Selves]∞.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration (seconds/minutes)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Participants arrive. Sign consent forms. Find a place to set their belonging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Alena, Dr. Córdova, and Jamie introduce themselves. Participants introduce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Body Scan | 10 min | Body Scan
Mindfulness activity.
Participants sit on stools,
Alena guides them through
the process.

Writing | 20 min | Autobiographical writing.
Participants pick up a piece
of blank paper and pencil, sit
at one of the tables in the
space. Alena guides
participants through a
recollection of a memory (5
min) by offering prompts and
questions that ask them to
consider sensory aspects of
a positive life experience.
They write from three
different perspectives: 1) an
objective, 2) subjective, and
3) a “curious”/”possibilities”.

Performance Warm-Up | 20 min | Jamie leads participants
through walking, standing,
stillness, etc. in the space.
As the group moves and
throughout the warm-up
Jamie has dialogue with the
participants about their
experience and impressions
of the activities.

Frozen Postures (a) | 5 min | Jamie introduces the activity
by providing an example of
her postures based on a
memory. Participants are
given 1 minute and 20
seconds to develop 3
postures based on their
memory.

Frozen Postures (b) | 5 min | Collaborative performance.
Participants are asked to
form a duo and trio. Then
they have 1 minute and 20
seconds to teach one
another their memories.

Alleyways | 5 min | Collaborative performance.
Jamie introduces Alleyways
and integrates postures into
the activity. The trio
performance first, and the
three participants re-enact
postures in the alleyways.
Participants also incorporate
movements (i.e., walking, standing, stillness) into the alleyway memory activity. The duo and Jamie observe the process. The performance or “ending” happens naturally without specific directions given by Jamie. The duo is asked what moments they remembered from the performance. The performing trio is asked how they felt about the experience. The duo performs in the same manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Workshop Interviews</th>
<th>20 min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants are thanked by Jamie and Alena. Alena requests brief one-on-one interviews with each participant. Three participants stayed for the interview. One emailed their answers. One did not stay or send an email response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Figure 11. Structuration map of workshop one_

**Introductions.**

The participants arrived about 15 minutes early. Alena greeted them in the front area of the Ed Collabitat and explained the consent forms to each one. At approximately 6:15 pm, the group gathered in the main area and stood in a circular shape. Dr. Córdova, Jamie, and Alena provided an introduction and background. The video documentation did not capture all of the audio due to the distance from the camera to the group. However, Alena’s introduction was relatively short compared to the others. Jamie’s introduction was partially captured and she shared her background.

Dr. Córdova’s introduction lasted about three minutes. During his introduction, he expressed delight in being a part of Alena’s study and emphasized the need to develop pedagogical methods that foster creativity, exploration, and understanding. After Dr.
Córdova spoke, the participants introduced themselves. Olivia was a trained Duncan dancer, MFA-PH.D (in dance history), and was in her 60s. Ava was an UMSL professor of graphic design, worked in the field of corporate wellness, and was also interested in creativity. She was in her 40s to 50s. Isabella was an UMSL masters counseling student in her 20s. She expressed interest in exploring new types of therapy and ways to “open people up”. She was also interested in the role of creativity in the healing process. Sophia was a fashion blogger for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch who was interested/engaged in creative writing and new experiences. Mia worked in the alumni department of Washington University with a focus on developing relations with MFA alumni in California. Emma was a counselor interested in creativity. This diverse group of participants may offer valuable insights that relate to studio art, writing, performing arts, therapeutic practices, and the liberal arts. Each participant’s experience in her respective field will yield different perspectives and insights into how PO[S] may benefit creativity, personal growth, and knowledge generation.

Body scan.

The body scan lasted about 6 to 7 minutes. As explained in chapter three, the body scan guides the participant through a series of verbal prompts that ask the participant to focus on their breath as they focus their awareness on the internal states of the body and mind. Upon wrapping up introductions, I invited them to find a place to sit where the stools were slightly off to the side of the room. They were approximately one foot apart, and participants made their way over. The stools had a low back, and the participants sat up straight and placed their hands clasped or opened on their laps. Olivia sat on the floor.
This researcher et them know they could close their eyes or soften their gaze. I directed them to start with two to three deep breaths, listen and follow my directions as best they could, and to stay awake and alert. As I guided them through the body scan, I walked behind them as I read from my script in a slow and melodic way. I asked them to become aware of the breath going in and out of the body and encouraged an awareness of their breath and other sensations as I began at their feet and moved all the way up the body. Upon the end of the body scan – and in their own timing – I instructed the group to take a few deep breaths, bring their attention back to the group, and to open their eyes. They slowly opened their eyes within 30 seconds to 1 minute. This researcher then let them know they would be transitioning to the writing exercise.

By choosing to begin the workshop with an opening mindfulness activity, the participants seemed to reach a point of relaxation. As I was guiding them through breathing and encouraging them to increase their awareness and accept any mental, physical, or emotional sensation that arose, the participants’ movements shifted. The breathing seemed to slow and their postures as they sat became much less rigid. Upon the closing of the body scan, the group took one to two minutes to slowly open their eyes.

Based on these observations, it can be theorized that the body scan may increase participants’ self-awareness and prepare them to engage in a more directed reflective activity, such as the writing activity. Through having the group engage in an activity that encourages an open-awareness of psychosomatic sensations, they may be able to experience the savoring mechanisms that are targeted through the writing activity in a more powerful way. At that time, I informed them that they would transition to the writing component of the method.
Autobiographical writing.

The writing component lasted approximately 18 minutes. Similar to the body scan, the writing activity acted as a way to engage the participants in discursively examining their life experience through the mechanical process of writing. In this case the writing became a generative inquiry tool to examine their recollection of the visual, affective, and imaginative aspects of their memory. I invited participants to pick up a piece of blank paper and a pencil from the table and make themselves comfortable anywhere in the main space, as long as they could hear my voice. I also suggested they situate themselves near a table or surface to place their paper on. The desks and chairs were pushed to the side and the participants found places to sit that were relatively distant from each other. I then invited them to recall any positive event in their life (regardless of duration – ‘one second or one year’). Then, they were to use the first 5 minutes to jot down anything that came to mind and to try to not censor or judge themselves. This researcher asked them to focus on the “objective” or “concrete” things like color, smells, etc. about the experience. I let them know that they were not focusing on their feelings at the moment. As the time approached 5 minutes, I gave a 30 second warning and asked them to wrap up the last thought or sentence. Then I outlined that, for the next 5 minutes, the group was going to consider a “subjective” perspective and write about any feelings they experienced or emotional aspects that are associated with the memory. This researcher then gave a 30 second warning similar to the first one – as they approached the five minutes mark. I then asked them to consider a “what-if” perspective that asked them to explore “what-if” scenarios or possibilities. Again, I gave them 5 minutes with a 30
second warning. At that point, this researcher’s role changed from a facilitator to a researcher as Jamie took over.

This writing component of the method asks the participant to consider a positive memory (i.e., life experience) from three different perspectives. Similar to the opening mindfulness activity of the body scan, the group engaged in an act of reflection and introspection as they were asked to contemplate previous experience. Unlike the body scan, the writing component created an opportunity for the participants to use language to explore sensations and other elements of their experience. In the body scan, the prompts were used to relax and increase psycho-somatic awareness in the participant. The writing exercise, on the other hand, engaged the participants in cognitive and affective processes that relate to recalling a meaningful life event. Instead of asking the participant to welcome any thoughts that arose from tuning into the present state of the physical or mental self, the writing exercise asked individuals to selectively recall an event from the past. In other words, the body scan focused more on the present, and the writing exercise asked the participant to explore the past in the present. Through having the individuals exert mental and emotional energy from various points of view, they may have experienced a more critical self-awareness. The guided writing activity served as a mechanism that was intended to promote savoring. Through the prolonged visualization and reflection, participants’ have had a greater chance to experience gratitude and other positive affect related to the recollection of the positive memory. Upon completing the writing activity, the group transitioned to the performance stage, which consisted of a warm-up and Alleyways activity. Both were adapted from the Viewpoints practice.

**Performance warm-up.**
The performance warm-up was led by Jamie and consisted of a series of basic movements (i.e., walking, standing, stillness, running) coupled with verbal prompts that encouraged intra- and inter-personal awareness. Jamie and the participants gathered in the central area of the Ed Collabitat. The activity lasted approximately 20 minutes. Upon the close of the warm-up, Jaime facilitated dialogue among the group to gather their impressions of the experience. This activity is the first sub-event that underwent deeper analysis in the meso- and micro-level analyses, and it will be discussed in greater detail in those sections.

The performance warm-up consisted of Jamie guiding the group through basic physical movement, drawing awareness to each person’s current mental and physical states, and emphasizing an awareness of the other participants. This differed from the body scan, because the participants were physically moving their bodies for most of the time, unless they chose to stand. The warm-up engaged the participants by asking them to move throughout the space and explore surrounding phenomena instead of sitting down with eyes closed and only focusing on internal states. This activity emphasized the movement/performance element, which led them to engage with themselves and others in a different way. In the body scan, there was a sequential element as the exercise started at the feet and worked its way upward, throughout the body. Alternatively, the activities involved in the performance warm-up involved a less bottom-up approach and asked each person to shift among different types of gazes and interaction with the others. The body scan and the performance warm-up both aimed to develop awareness in the participants. The body scan is designed to foster an intra-personal awareness through breath and mental concentration on the body. The performance warm-up expanded on intra-personal
awareness to encourage inter-personal awareness by taking participants through a series of physical exercises coupled with prompts that alternated between focusing attention on the inner and outer states of being. The prompts and gazes that engaged participants in an intra-personal awareness included Jamie directing them to “check-in” with themselves mentally and to accept whatever emotion or energy they were experiencing. The types of gaze included soft focus, in which the participant was aware of her movements and surroundings without focusing on one object. This was also described as an inner-focus. Engagement among the participants was also encouraged through various gazes, such as the “social” or direct-looking, Doorways, and chance encounters that occurred due to the performers working in a shared space.

The performance warm-up followed the writing exercise. In the writing exercise, the participant reflected on a meaningful life event and explored it through cognitive recall from three perspectives. It involves translation from a mental image or memory into language in five minute intervals from an objective, subjective, and open-ended point of view. This activity served as a bridge from the body scan, which focused on building an intra-personal awareness through a focus on embracing the present through breath and guided focus on the physical body, to one that required one to mentally recall and translate a life event through text. This was followed by the performance warm-up, which was intended to prepare the individual to translate the text-based writing into an embodied form (i.e., frozen postures). Both the body scan and the performance warm-up were intended to prepare the participant for the act of translation. The performance warm-up also required that participants engage with each other, which may increase familiarity
and establish bonding before the group is asked to collaborate in the teaching of the frozen postures.

**Frozen postures (a).**

After the performance warm-up, the participants used performative means to translate their text translations into a physical realm of embodiment. Up until this point, they had engaged in a mindfulness preparatory activity which aimed to prepare them for a more meaningful and lucid experience of the writing exercise. This was followed by translating their memory into text from different perspectives. Participants then engaged in a performance warm-up that attempted to prepare them for the remaining performance activities by introducing them to the basic physical movements they would later integrate. This also served to strengthen intra- and inter-personal awareness that would increase the chances of them creating meaningful performance work. The development of three frozen postures required the individual to reflect back to the three written texts and translate the experience from the cognitive or immaterial realm into a material or physical world. This act of translation from the realm of thought to one of bodily action or “embodiment” may activate new layers of meaning, resulting in a deeper understanding that yields new knowledge.

Jamie asked the group to recall their positive memories and the text translations. She asked them to take a moment for themselves, to find their own space and to recall – what images popped up for them. She said they could sit or walk, however the memory worked for them. After approximately one to two minutes, Jamie let the group know they would have 2 minutes and 20 seconds to come up with three postures or frozen images or “statues” – that represented aspects of the memory. She gave the group a personal
example and let them know that by “doing” the gestures, it would help them find gestures. One of the participants opted out of this and the remaining activities due to emotional distress. Instead she observed and offered feedback to Alena during the post-workshop interviews. Jamie let participants know when they had about 1 minute left. Mia expressed having difficulty finding a third one, and Jamie asked if she wanted more time. Mia said that it was okay and Jamie let her know the group would be breaking into groups and maybe her partner could help.

**Frozen postures (b).**

The collaboration activity immediately followed the frozen postures segment and involved the group splitting into pairs or trios. Then, each participant taught her three frozen postures to her partner(s). This resulted in everyone teaching their frozen postures to the partners as well as learning the physical embodiment of another’s story. Teaching one another a posture and then performing the learned posture back to its source was a way of discursively constructing a form. The source or originator created a form that was then intended to be interpreted or “read” by a partner, and in the process of interpretation, meaning was re-constructed and reshaped. This particular approach to meaning-making suggests that experiences and messages are reconstructed through engaging with others. Questions regarding the ownership of the newly constructed meanings may arise.

Since there were five participants from this point on, there was one trio and one pair (Mia and Sophia). Jamie informed them that everyone would teach their fellow collaborators their postures so they could be performed back to them. She gave them 2 minutes and 20 seconds (the same amount of time to develop them on a solo basis). Jamie informed the participants that the frozen postures could be abstract or literal. All
performance activities occurred in the central performance area. Jamie set her alarm, which then went off in 2 minutes and 20 seconds, but the collaborative teaching activity continued and lasted about five minutes. Jamie walked up to each group to observe, check-in, and offer help if needed. After each group learned one another’s postures, Jamie transitioned to the Alleyways performance activity.

**Alleyways.**

Following the collaborative teaching of the frozen postures, the Alleyways performance activity required participants to take turns performing each group member’s (including their own) frozen postures. The basic movements that were introduced and practiced during the performance warm-up phase were integrated into the performance of the three movements of each participant. The performing group was instructed to combine walking, running, stillness, or standing with the selected person’s three frozen gestures in any order they preferred. This resulted in the group member’s performing each of their own interpretations of one individual’s frozen postures. The integration of basic movements between the performance of each frozen posture created three moving interpretations of the frozen posture in time and space. This added complexity and created additional layers of meaning and curiosity throughout the performers and the observing group. At times, there were moments when the performers would unexpectedly embody the same posture at the same time in different locations in their respective Alleyway. There seemed to be a variety of meaningful moments that intentionally and unintentionally occurred among the performing participants. They made conscious decisions related to when and how to incorporate the basic movements like walking, stillness, or standing. On a subconscious and unintentional level, the participants would
decide when to stop performing the sequence (i.e., Jamie did not give them a specific
time to stop performing) and imposed limitations on the levels of engagement they could
have with one another (e.g., eye contact, talking, etc.).

Up until this point, the participants engaged in a sequence of activities that
involved relaxing breath and body connection, autobiographical interpretations through
creating written texts, basic physical movements with solo and group interaction,
translating the three written texts into physical embodied “texts,” collaborative teaching
and learning other’s texts, and performing one group member’s embodied texts as a
group. While each of these activities may involve adding complexity and deepening
meaning due to the multiple interpretations and co-constructing knowledge, each
pedagogical move has its uniqueness and implications for the following activity.

The frozen postures activity engaged the participants in learning each other’s
three embodied interpretations of texts. This could also be considered a secondary
translation. The activity asked each participant to perform her own frozen postures for her
partner(s) and also involved her watching her partner(s) perform them back. This act of
co-constructing the source person’s initial interpretation of the life event may lead future
participants to grapple with aspects of their experience or subjectivity in the present. On
the other end, the person learning someone else’s frozen postures was required to put
another’s subjectivity before their “own” selfless act. In addition to learning another’s
postures that originated from another’s life experience, the individual performing
another’s gestures may be reminded of something of her past or present. This process of
co-constructing meaning may result in valuable insights about the psychology of both
individuals.
The performance activity of Alleyways consisted of the participants breaking into a duo and trio and lasted approximately 35 minutes. The duo and trio took turns performing each other’s memories (i.e., postures) in an “alleyway” created by moving rolling whiteboards to create partitions in the main area. After each performance of the participant’s postures ended, Jaime facilitated dialogue among and between the duo and trio. This activity is the second sub-event that underwent deeper analysis in the meso- and micro-level analyses and will be discussed in greater detail in those sections.

**Post-workshop interviews.**

Jamie and Alena thanked the group for their participation and enthusiasm, and Alena invited able and willing participants to sit with her for a 5-10 minute interview about their impressions. The interview included questions that were designed to gather initial impressions about the implementation and general psychological responses to the experience of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. Due to time limitations, the data collected was incomplete (not all participants could stay) and it is not included in the data analysis for this study.

**Conclusion.**

The macro-analysis examined the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ and theorized how each element affected the subsequent activities. Additionally, the structuration map allowed for the consideration of the impact of duration on each component, which is also useful for a contrastive analysis for the second workshop. By opening the workshop with the body scan, the participants engaged in breath work and internal focus that aimed to relax and make them more attune to affective and physical sensations. The activity aimed to establish a psychological and physical foundation that
could be characterized as relaxed, open, and aware. If this state was achieved through the body scan, they may have been prepared to clearly recall and engage in translating a meaningful experience into language due to a heightened internal awareness. Moreover, the writing activity from three perspectives required them to explore their perceptions, and the body scan may have served as a priming activity that consciously or subconsciously influenced a response to the writing component. The generation of three written texts based on an objective, subjective, and “open” perspective required the participant to translate the mental representation into language. This semantic translation could be the beginning of the process of translating the experience into multiple interpretations through language and exploring perceptions. This activity was followed by the performance stage of Poetics of the [Selves]. This included a warm-up, construction of three frozen postures, and Alleyways performance. The performance element was preceded by activities that potentially increased an intra-personal awareness of psychological and bodily sensations and a meaningful, influential event in their life. The transition to an embodied form, also considered an experiential form, served as a further translation of their source reflection on a meaningful experience. Through a somatic translation of three texts into three embodiments, the individuals may have experienced another layer of meaning and self-knowledge. The performance warm-up attempted to prepare the participants for working with the body in time and space. The gaze shifting and alternations of basic movement throughout the space was accompanied with prompts that asked each person to remain internally aware and present. This aspect of the performance warm-up was another method of increasing awareness, but expanded upon the body scan, in which they were sedentary and focused on breath and mental
contemplation. The performance warm-up involved those things, but also broadened the activity to exercise gaze, engagement with others, and physical movement throughout the space. As they broke into pairs or trios to teach and learn one another’s frozen postures, they engaged in telling and re-telling their recollection or story. By watching their own “story” be performed, they may have contemplated the memory and/or experienced new insights and meaning through witnessing it in another body. As the individual learned someone else’s gestures, they may have experienced curiosity, self-reflection, and other unknown subjective responses that created new meaning and knowledge. Finally, the Alleyways performance created an experiential construction that possessed multiple layers of meaning for both the performing group and the observers. On the individual, performer level, each person experienced what it felt like to be watched as they performed their own gestures, as well as the emotions and thoughts that arose when they performed another’s gestures. These embodiments were further developed into multiple translations or stories that incorporated the basic movements from the performance warm-up. This enabled the performer and observer to develop some linearity, which is a core element of stories which further developed meaning in all participants.

**Meso-Analysis**

The guiding research question throughout the layers of examination sought to develop an understanding of the epistemological and pedagogical base of Poetics of the [Selves]. The macro-analysis provided an overview, “big picture” understanding of Poetics of the [Selves]. The findings in the initial analysis yield insights related to the structure of the pedagogical moves and examined the ways the cycles of activity engaged participants. The meso-analysis identifies the salient features of Poetics of the [Selves].
to allow for examination of the data that will allow insights around which practices of the approach afforded participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning. A meso-analysis examines events identified in the data records and explores them further. The events that undergo additional analysis are “sub-events”. These sub-events contain rich points that enable the researcher to develop more knowledge about the research questions. Following the meso-analysis, the two sub-events will undergo a more in-depth analysis to yield additional findings that relate to the consequential outcomes for meaning-making and leaning.

In workshop one, my decision to select the two sub-events of the performance warm-up and Alleyways was determined after examining the data set for areas where there was dialogue among the participants. Due to the relatively long duration of the performance warm-up, there was a larger data set to examine. Both the performance warm-up and Alleyways potentially involved the most complex areas to evaluate. The questions posed by the teacher requested salient impressions from the participants during and/or after each activity. The broader sample of “educators” influenced my decision to focus on the responses to the teacher’s questions around open, yet meaningful, moments and interactions that resonated with the participants.

**Sub-event 1: performance warm-up.**

The first sub-event was the performance warm-up. This was selected for analysis because of the large amount of data available, the dialogue generated from Jamie’s prompts, and the interaction among participants aligned with the objectives of the research questions. Additionally, the performance warm-up was of interest because it involved basic bodily movement and asked participants to continue with an internal
awareness while broadening it to include movement. This was valuable information, as the performance warm-up prepared individuals for the entire performance phase of the method. It is the foundation that integrates the inner-awareness introduced in the body scan, yet it expands to engage the participant simultaneously in developing an outer-awareness by moving through space and time with others. The examination of the performance warm-up allows for theorizing and drawing conclusions in order to answer the research questions.

The second sub-event that underwent a meso-analysis was Alleyways. This activity occurs in the performance stages immediately following the collaborative small group (pair or trio) activity where participants teach and learn the gestures of their partner(s). Alleyways was another activity that generated data that included rich dialogue and interaction, while also relating to the research sub-questions. This sub-event particularly provided data that related to questions around the consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning, as well as additional insights about how it positioned participants to interact and learn from each other.

In this section I offer a detailed structuration map of each sub-event (followed by additional procedural detail), further theorize about the Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and share themes that were illuminated through language during these activities. Figure 12 shows the sequence and duration of the gazes and performance activities in the performance warm-up (see Figure 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-event</th>
<th>Duration (seconds/minute)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Walk Space and Internal Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Social-Direct Looking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Structuration map of sub-event one for workshop one

Jamie’s role transitioned from observer to teacher after the writing exercise. She led the performance activities and drew from her training in Viewpoints to engage the participants in the warm-up component of Poetics of the [Selves]°. The performance warm-up took place in the square shaped space that was created by pushing the desks and stools to the outer perimeter. Jamie asked the group if they were ready to start moving
and let them know they were going to jump right in as she walked at a moderate pace in a quasi-circular pattern. As she spoke, the participants appeared to listen, and also somewhat follow her, at a slower walking pace. Jamie let them know they were first going to “map” the space and she also said they were always allowed to break the rules—stating that begging for forgiveness is better than asking for permission. As the group’s pace and comfort level of walking throughout the space seemed to increase, Jamie said that walking could be a way of checking in with oneself. She then led them through a series of different gazes as they explored bodily movement as well. Throughout the warm-up, Jamie would use verbal prompts to encourage presence in the group by asking them to notice solid or positive space, the distance between and among the group, and the effects of gravity on the body. She also let them know all of the movements were available to them (i.e., walking, standing, running). She checked in with the group about the warm-up and asked them about the experience that they had, including any moments that resonated with them. She then moved onto a focus on shape, showing and discussing as she walked, interlocked her hands, and made a few gestures. She said that one is always engaged with the materials of performance, and it was a matter of adjusting their attention to various elements (e.g., time, space, shape, etc.).

Each of the activities within the warm-up asked participants to activate a distinct type of awareness that ranged from an internal focus to an outward, social gaze. The alternation among the various types of looking and awareness encouraged the participants to acclimate to various types of awareness, possibly broadening and strengthening participants’ overall awareness of self and others.
To examine how the Viewpoints warm-up fostered awareness of self and others, I revisited the transcript to consider the physical and verbal responses to Jamie’s prompts and actions during the warm-up stage. During this time, participants were given a brief introduction to the Viewpoints practice, and Jamie led them in a group performance methods that involved basic movement such as walking, standing, and modes of looking. Throughout this stage, the group was encouraged to listen to their bodies, thoughts, and emotions, all while engaged in variations of basic movement for the duration of the warm-up.

The feedback provided by two participants informed the second sub-analysis that examined how the Viewpoints warm-up activities impacted intra and inter-personal awareness. The discussion that followed the warm-up activity includes participants’ feedback that suggests a connection with self and others. More specifically, the warm-up evoked positive affect including spontaneity, joy, and defenselessness within the participant. There were also times when participants felt others’ energy or made bodily contact that resulted in creating an emotional awareness, and potentially a bond, among them. There was also evidence that the activities created a sense of doubt, as Ava expressed a fear of colliding with the other bodies in the space. The same participant seemed to have learned to trust her instincts and physical responses upon completing the warm-up.

I predicted the performance warm-up component of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ would create opportunities for participants to connect with themselves and others in emotional and physical ways. As I reviewed the transcript, I remained open and sensitive
to certain aspects of the dialogue that were potentially related to the emotional and physical connections on an intra- and interpersonal level in the group.

As described in chapter three, the audiovisual data was transcribed and reviewed during the meso-analysis. My prior assumptions regarding the warm-up and Alleyways performance, as well as the initial reading of my field notes and the transcript, examined dialogue that could be associated with these beliefs. I reviewed the transcript sections for the warm-up and Alleyways activities by identifying and extracting themes and topics that were related to my prior assumptions. The open coding of the data set involved reviewing the transcript sections to inductively identify rich points that could be associated with my predictions of the warm-up performance components fostering emotional and physical connections on an individual and group level. In Figure 13, I show the process of investigating a sub-event by locating rich points and arriving at themes (see Figure 13). The rich points were then transformed into themes by employing Gee’s (2011) discourse analysis tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Rich Points</th>
<th>Stanza Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm-Up</td>
<td>It took me back. Kind-of like kids. A playful thing.</td>
<td>Back to Childhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting really close. I remember that moment. I smiled and laughed.</td>
<td>Powerful Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don't want to get in the way. Afraid of imposing. Mental limitations.</td>
<td>Fear of Collision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 13. Rich points in sub-event one for workshop one*
Sub-Event 2: Alleyways

The second sub-event of interest in workshop one was the Alleyways performance activity. In this Figure 14, I display a more detailed structuration map of the sub-event. During this activity, participants took turns performing one another’s memories in front of an observing group (Figure 14). I predicted that participants would develop empathy and authentic connections with others as a result of literally “walking in someone else’s shoes”. Moreover, I was also interested in exploring how the Alleyways performance affected the observing group. While my prior assumptions were rather broad, I believed that both the performing group and the observing group would experience feelings of empathy.

The Alleyways data set provided insight into the participants’ emotions and thoughts, which allowed for initial conclusions to be drawn about the impact of the Alleyways performance component of Poetics of the [Selves]*. The transcript was reviewed for certain dialogue that had associations with social-emotional learning competencies. The main themes that emerged during the sub-analysis involved participants learning about self-imposed limitations and assumptions, the value of universal associations of certain gestures, harmonious relations among disparate parts (i.e., individuals), fostering empathy for others, and engagement in non-linear thinking.
Figure 14. Structuration map of sub-event two for workshop one

Upon the closing of the collaborative learning of frozen postures, Jamie asked the group to meet in the middle of the room and pointed out the three rolling white boards at one end of the room. She walked over and described that the whiteboards were the alleyways. Jamie said they were “containers”. The boards were about 4 feet distance from one another. She walked back and forth between one pair and said that they were her containers, walked down the space in a straight line, like a corridor with invisible walls that extend from the white boards, and said that this was the space available to group members all the way to the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-event</th>
<th>Duration (seconds/minutes)</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 sec</td>
<td>JM splits group into a pair (Mia and Sophia) and trio (Emma, Ava, and Isabella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 min</td>
<td>Members of each group learn collaborators’ postures / JM assists pair in developing postures (off-camera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 min</td>
<td>JM checks in with each group / group gathers in central area and JM explains and moves throughout the Alleyways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 sec</td>
<td>Trio volunteers to go first / JM creates a third alleyway with a whiteboard / perform Emma’s postures first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>JM and pair sit as observers facing trio / JM asks them to walk up and down their alleyways toward where the observers are sitting (off-camera)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>JM invites them to continue walking, sitting, or standing as they incorporate the gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>JM asks observing pair what moments resonated with them / suggests describes objectively then subjectively / JM points out a moment that resonated with her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>JM asks trio for their thoughts / Isabella responds / Ava responds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 min</td>
<td>Perform next participant’s story (Isabella’s) / JM suggests taking a moment to remember the next postures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 min 10 sec</td>
<td>Trio stops performing / JM asks trio how it went / Isabella responds / Ava responds / JM asks observing pair their thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a (documentation unavailable)</td>
<td>Sophia and Mia offer objective and subjective interpretations of the gestures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jamie then let the group know they would have 2 minutes of working together in pairs or trios, and asked the trio whose “story” would be performed, meaning whose gestures will be performed. They decided to use Isabella’s gestures. Jamie then brought in the basic movements from the warm-up and let them know that running, walking, standing, and sitting were okay to integrate and encouraged them to use them however they wanted with the gestures. Also, the postures did not need to be performed in any certain order and to use them however they wanted.

The trio began by walking the space as Jamie guided them – to first walk their personal space and to feel what it was like to be close to the observers who were seated in front of the long table. Jamie encouraged them to begin by walking and then to incorporate the gestures whenever they wanted to. About 2 minutes after the trio enacted Emma’s story – they came to a “natural” ending. Jamie concluded by asking the observers if anything stuck out to them and if they could objectively describe it. She suggested starting with an objective description (i.e., provided example by doing a gesture and then describing it) and then moved to the subjective interpretation. The discussion lasted approximately 2 minutes with the observing group. In the meantime, the performing trio listened to their responses as they stood between the white boards. Jamie stood between the performers and seated observers as she spoke to them. After asking their thoughts on the observing participants, she shifted her focus to the performing group and requested their thoughts about the experience. As participants offered responses, Jamie emphasized aspects of what they were saying which seemed to offer deeper contemplation for the group.
The meso-analysis examined the sub-event of Alleyways in greater depth by reviewing the data for rich points throughout the participant’s dialogue during the Alleyways activity. In Figure 15, I show the rich points and stanza themes that emerged from analyzing the dialogue that occurred during the sub-events (see Figure 15). The detailed structuration map allowed me to draw connections between the activities and the dialogue, as I examined the data record for rich points. Upon identifying rich points, I was able to realize themes that emerged in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Rich Points</th>
<th>Stanza Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Generosity means a lot. A remarkable moment. She was open-handed.</td>
<td>Meaningful Gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Wanting to express it the right way. The pressure of performing. I want to project and perfect.</td>
<td>Others’ Stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>The limitations we place on ourselves. There are rules. My personal barriers to connecting with others.</td>
<td>Self-Imposed Limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Performing yourself is more comfortable.</td>
<td>My Story</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 15. Rich points in sub-event two for workshop one*

**Micro-Analysis**

The primary themes revealed in the meso-analysis provided a framework to consider specific dialogue associated with each sub-event. The micro-analysis provides a closer examination and interpretation of the moment-to-moment dialogue associated with each of the participants in the table. As mentioned in chapter three, the meso-analysis is intended to take a close look at specific sub-events. The micro-analysis involves a more rigorous application of Gee’s (2011b) tools for each theme listed in the table. In this
section I report ethnographic observations that were collected throughout the micro-analyses of specific stanzas. Stanzas are “clumps of tone units that deal with a unitary topic or perspective and appear to be planned together” (Gee, 2011, p. 118). The micro-analyses were informed by the content analyses, resulting in the initial analytic procedures. I applied the ethnographic method of identifying rich points and Gee’s methods of critical discourse analysis to select and conduct the micro-analysis of stanzas.

The seven stanzas below are from the transcription from of video documentation of the workshop.

**Stanza 1: Back to Childhood.**

154 I think it took me back to my childhood
155 It’s like being able to kind-of just let go
156 It’s kind-of like a playful [inaudible]…
157 it’s not very heavy or –
158 I’m in class a lot and we talk about a lot of heavy stuff –
159 so I guess we just kind-of had an opportunity to just walk around,
160 kind-of play –
161 we were walking through the positive and negative spaces,
162 we were doing the thing out of the corner of our eyes.
163 (inaudible) – kind-of like kids, like play around …
164 so I think that’s where the laughter came from ----
165 I don’t know – I almost wanted to cry too

In this context, the performance warm-up consists of basic movements (i.e., sitting, standing, stillness, walking) and takes the participant through a variety of gaze shifting and physical and mental awareness prompts. The participants are encouraged to be intuitive about moving throughout the space, with an emphasis on finding “doorways” or “blank spaces” to explore.

In *Back to Childhood*, the participant, Isabella, uses words like, “playful”, “laughter”, and “cry” to describe the experience, and immediately indicates a return to
childhood, saying, “I think it took me back to childhood.” She then goes on to explain, “It’s like being able to kind-of just let go,” suggesting that a sense of release arose from her return to childhood. She compares that experience with her current course load at UMSL, where she is studying to become a therapist, implying a lightness in contrast to her work. In line 157, she states, “It’s not very heavy or…” and then, “I’m in class a lot and we talk about a lot of heavy stuff.”

As Isabella discusses her experience within *Back to Childhood* further, the word “play” emerges as both a verb and a noun. Further, the activities that resonated with her were mentioned between instances of the word “play.” For example, in line 159 she states, “so I guess we just kind-of had an opportunity to just walk around, kind-of play…” and then later she goes on to say, “-- kind of like kids, play around…” thus establishing her role, and the groups’ role, as kids. After the first instance of the word play, she describes the act of playing more specifically in the following statements: “we were walking through the positive and negative spaces,” and “we were doing the thing out of the corners of our eyes.” Together, these may evoke memories of playing hide-and-seek, which involves similar movements. She concluded, “I think this is where the laughter came from ---.” Conversely, she followed this statement with, “I don’t know -- I almost wanted to cry too.” Thus, in this stanza, the participant’s image of childhood is represented by play and emotional expression. This is significant because activities and emotions associated with play may be valuable to open with in Poetics of the [Selves]∞ in order to foster a vital emotion within the participant. Through fostering a genuine emotional connection that is associated with childhood, the participant’s psychological
mechanisms of defense may be neutralized, which could potentially prepare them to form new bonds with other individuals.

Isabella’s experience represents an expression of gratitude for connections with childhood, where she places significant value upon establishing authentic emotional connections. By contrasting it with the heaviness of her current cognitive demands, it appears that the warm-up offers her a mental and emotional release. In conclusion, the experience: a) takes her back to childhood, b) creates an emotional connection as a result of physical activity, c) establishes a group bond (we) similar to kids (non-judgmental, etc.) upon engaging in physical activity in the space together (with an emphasis on walking), and d) an intense and inexplicable personal expression of emotion.

**Stanza 2: Powerful Connections.**

178 I remember going up and getting really close to Emma
179 and having our arms touch
180 and then Emma smiling
181 and giggling
182 and then moving away
183 so that’s about it.
184 (Jamie) so can you remember any moments…Yea…
185 can you describe objectively what it – like ‘we walked together’
186 Very powerful

In *Powerful Connections*, participants focus on meaning-making through physical closeness and touch, rather than on individual performance activities. Specifically, the moments that resonate with the participant, Ava, involve physical closeness resulting in touch (i.e., bumping arms) and walking together. In lines 178 and 179, Ava says, “I remember going up and getting really close to Emma / and having our arms touch”. The word “touch” in this context refers to initial physical contact with a stranger during the performance warm-up. Being physically engaged in the same things made meaning for
both participants, especially after a moment of bodily contact between them. Once that
contact ended, the details of the activities become less distinct. However, additional
meaning is prompted when Ava is questioned further about the experience. In line 184,
Jamie asks, “…and so can you remember any moments” and then again in line 185,
“Yea… can you describe objectively what it – like ‘we walked together’”. In response to
this question, Ava says, “Very powerful –”. A response to “yea… how close was she?” is
not audible, but the word “powerful” references a connection to another participant that
happened when walking together. They were most likely near each other, which indicates
the psychosocial connection reinforced by proximity to another being.

The most pertinent activities in Powerful Connections involved Ava being close
to, as well as walking with, other participants. The use of the word “powerful” points to a
non-physical affect that occurs due to the interaction of walking together during
performance warm-up. This affect is possibly psychological or emotional. Thus, all
meaning in Powerful Connections was made through interaction between participants.

**Stanza 3: Fear of Collision.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>fear of colliding…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>we were kind-of walking around we were hesitant like we didn’t want to get in your way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Even though it was free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>there were still those mental (inaudible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Fear of Collision, Isabella immediately uses the term “fear of colliding” where
“colliding” refers to physically bumping into another or others unintentionally as the
group moves throughout the space. Isabella’s experience of the performance warm-up
activity, which intended to lead to intra and interpersonal connections, generated a fear of
colliding, getting in others’ way, and the recognition of mental habits that may instill
doubt or insecurity about interactions with others. Further, in her interaction with others, Isabella is insecure. Although she is told she can, and possibly wants to, feel liberated and free to move throughout the space with strangers, she is more concerned with protecting others’ space. In line 198, she says, “we were kind-of walking around we were hesitant like we didn’t want to get in your way”. A simplified model of strangers’ interaction, it is as if Isabella is speaking or thinking both for herself and the other participants, by referencing the group as “we” and then following it with “didn’t want to get in your way”. In line 200, she acknowledges, “Even though it was free”. “Free” in this context references her understanding of the purpose of the activities. It may reference the freedom, given by the teacher, to explore and move throughout the space in any of the given ways.

While the entire line is inaudible, Isabella seems to indicate mental blocks within the space when she says, “there were still those mental”. Potential connections with strangers appear to be missed due to assumptions and insecurities about imposing on others’ space. Consequently, her identity could be potentially stifled by mental assumptions related to how she thinks others’ operate in space and time with her.

**Stanza 4: Meaningful Gestures.**

412 Did you guys see anything (asking audience – duo) was there anything that
413 STUCK out to you? Any moments that you saw and you were like ohhh.
414
415 The 3rd gesture was kind-of remarkable.
416
417 yeaaaaaa. Can you – describe it objectively? Like what did it look like?
418
419 Like a giving

In *Meaningful Gestures*, significance lies in a gesture (in this case, performers opening their arms and hands) that the participant, Mia, associates with a prosocial
behavior a positive and meaningful exchange between individuals. In lines 412 and 413, participants are asked, “Did you guys see anything was there anything that STUCK / out to you? Any moments that you saw and you were like ohhh.” The response from Mia referenced the above gesture during the group performance activity: “The third gesture was kind-of remarkable.” In this context, the word “remarkable” may describe an emotionally or psychologically charged moment that resulted because of the group dynamic and repetition of the gesture. In line 417, she is asked: “yeaaaaaa. Can you – describe it objectively? Like what did it look like?” to which Mia responds, “Like a giving?” In this context, “giving” refers to the meaning that may be implied through physical activity or embodiment of the emotion. Though Mia then states “I don’t know” and laughs, the participants concluded that the gesture was associated with generosity. This implied act can be linked to compassion and other positive emotions.

*Meaningful Gestures* may create opportunities for others to learn about individuals’ world views, assumptions, etc. by examining how they interpret the meaning created through performed gestures. In this case, the world view of generosity may be associated with American culture and others where moving a hand and arm open and outward relates to giving.

**Stanza 5: Others’ Stories.**

448 It was weird
449 tell me why (walking towards them) I don’t know – why was it weird?
450 uhhh.. It was like, because I’m knowing that nobody else but us know what we’re doing. I
451 think that that made it even weirder. Because for me it’s like – I kind-of want to
452 express it the best way that I can – because for some reason I want you to
453 understand it the way that Emma meant it.
454 So I think that just being on display like this, then I’m trying to put on this
SHOW,
I want to project (or perfect?) your STORY (to Emma). You know, I don’t know.

In *Others’ Stories*, participants are asked to perform another participant’s story or memory. Initially, Isabella says of the experience, “It was weird” as she laughed along with the other participant, whose memory she performed. In response to further probing from Jamie (“tell me why. I don’t know – why was it weird?”) Isabella explains in lines 452-455, “uhhh… it was like, because I’m knowing that nobody else but us know what we’re doing. I think that that made it even weirder. Because for me it’s like – I kind-of want to express it the best way that I can – because for some reason I want you to understand it in the way that Emma meant it…” Isabella articulates her desire to express Emma’s story the “best way” possible. She wants to stay true to her partner’s first-hand experience. In lines 456–458, she continues, “So I think that just being on display like this, then I’m trying to put on this SHOW, I want to project (or perfect?) your STORY. You know, I don’t know.” In these lines, project/perfect is referring to performing the other’s story, and “show” is a desire to perform.

The desire to tell another’s story in a respectful and true way indicates Isabella has developed care and compassion for her partner. *Others’ Stories* seems to illustrate the connections made between performer and subject through the language used to describe Isabella’s desire to perform her partner’s memory.

**Stanza 6: Self-Imposed Limits.**

I also didn’t like that we didn’t get to interact.
I guess we were but –
it would have been nice to at least look at each other.
I guess we could have…
There are two relationships that appear to be evidenced in *Self-Imposed Limits*. The first one relates to how the participant, Ava, engages with others—particularly those she doesn’t know. The text may illuminate a missed opportunity to make meaning with others due to self-imposed or societally imposed limitations. The second and simultaneous relationship is intrapersonal. The model of a simplified world may relate to uncertainty when it comes to engaging with others. This is evidenced through the nature and sequence of Ava’s statements. In line 475, she says, “I also didn’t like that we didn’t get to interact.” This is followed by: “I guess we were but —” and in line 477 she says, “it would have been nice to at least look at each other” and follows up with “I guess we could have”. This contradictory self-talk may suggest feelings of doubt related to engaging with others. “Interact” in this context most likely referenced non-verbal body language (e.g., eye contact) throughout the group alleyway performance.

Using emotional language and expressing a negative reaction (“didn’t like”) when discussing the invisible rule of not being able to interact suggests that Ava prefers to engage. However, she catches herself in an assumption. It seems as though she is negatively impacted by a missed opportunity for a meaningful connection with others. She realizes she may be responsible for following self-imposed and unnecessary limitations.

The alleyway group performance, in which Ava performs, has implications for her as the performer as well as the audience in meaning-making opportunities. In the case of being the performer, she may be re-enacting learned behaviors of how to engage with strangers. Upon reflection, she becomes more aware of how she engages and does not engage with others.
Self-Imposed Limits suggests there are missed connections with others due to self-imposed limitations or by subscribing to social norms that do not support unity with others. Awareness of the consequences of these limitations may lead to more meaningful engagement with strangers.

Stanza 7: My Story.

It was easier when it was my story. interestinggggg. something about it – I don’t know – it was just EASIER.

In My Story, each participant creates gestures inspired by a written reflective activity. The gestures are not accompanied by text or an explanation, so “story” refers to 1-3 minute physical actions or frozen postures taught in a group context to strangers. Due to the nature of the writing prompts, each person’s story is likely associated with a personal and positive emotional experience.

In reference to the performer enacting the gestures they created versus performing on other’s postures, Isabella states: “It was easier when it was my story.” “Easier” could allude to a few different things. Since Alleyways is a group performance activity, it may relate to stage fright or self-conscious feelings that occur while performing in front of others. It could also imply that Isabella is more comfortable knowing the details and context, as opposed to simply being open to engaging in a physical activity. A simplified model might relate to Isabella’s own life experience. Saying one’s own story is easier could allude to the energetic output being greater when you put yourself/yourself/their self (perform) into another’s story or world.
Although Isabella cannot articulate how or why it is easier when performing her own story versus performing another’s narrative, there is significance given to her experience. In line 521, she says again, “Something about it – I don’t know – it was just EASIER.” This may relate to a new, unfamiliar awareness she experienced, which may have potential meaning-making value because it creates an awareness of psychological shifts that occur when considering others.

Enacting one’s story versus another’s story generates different psychological responses. Two relationships are implicated -- self and other, and self and self (intrapersonal). In this case, the intrapersonal relationship seemed easier and may have been preferred by the participant. This has implications that building relationships with others may feel somewhat strained. Based on the text, Isabella may have not performed before or been in a position where she favors the mental aspects over the physical. Perhaps she feels she needed more information.

This collaborative performance activity, where group members are performing their own stories, as well as the stories of others, has many outcomes. Given the context and design of PO[S]∞, it is an experiential learning method that aims to offer useful insights to the self and others. Connections with others may require a different sort of emotional/psychological energy.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter I presented the results across three scales of resolution of the first workshop. The purpose of the initial implementation of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ was to gain an understanding of the epistemological and pedagogical base of the approach. In addition to being able to further theorize about the philosophical implications of Poetics
of the [Selves]∞, I selected two sub-events to further analyze on a meso- and micro-level. The analysis of the performance warm-up suggested that participants created emotional connections that seemed to dissolve barriers within and among the individuals, that physical closeness and engagement with others creates a bond within a group, and that they also discovered internalizations of social norms and barriers they placed upon themselves. The Alleyways activity created curiosity about others’ stories, developed empathy, and revealed self-imposed limitations. The findings of the initial workshop suggest that Poetics of the [Selves]∞ has potential to impact one’s perception of themselves and influence interpersonal relations.

The data results were viewed through a Vygotskian interpretive framework which helped me understand how knowledge and meaning was co-constructed on an individual and collective level. Human activities are mediated by language; however, in PO[S]∞ the body and gesture are signs that allow for mediation to occur on an intra- and interpersonal level. I examined the sub-events through a Vygotskian lens to gain an understanding of how the construction of knowledge reflected aspects of his sociocultural theory. In Figure 16 I show each of the sub-events corresponds with a Vygotskian theme, principle, and/or practice (see Figure 16).
Figure 16. Vygotskian principles and themes in workshop one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Researcher comments</th>
<th>Vygotskian Constructs/Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body scan</td>
<td>● Focus on the individual</td>
<td>● Mind in Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Intrapersonal focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Emphasis on the present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>● Revisiting and restructuring the individual’s memory from past to present</td>
<td>● Mind in Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Facilitator prompts</td>
<td>● Scaffolding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance warm-up</td>
<td>● Activated intra- and inter-personal modes of engagement</td>
<td>● Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Facilitator prompts</td>
<td>● Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Facilitator moved throughout space with participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Prepared individuals to engage in subsequent performance activities</td>
<td>● Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen postures (a)</td>
<td>● Transformed written texts to physical embodiment on an individual level</td>
<td>● Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Facilitator modeled activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Facilitator prompts</td>
<td>● Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Performance warm-up prepared individuals to physically engage on an intra- and</td>
<td>● Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interpersonal level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen postures (b)</td>
<td>● Performed one another memories</td>
<td>● Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Pairs and trios assisted each other</td>
<td>● Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Performance warm-up and frozen postures (a) prepared individuals to physically</td>
<td>● Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>engage and share memories on an interpersonal level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>● Focus on collective</td>
<td>● Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Focus on the interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Previous performance activities increased familiarity and ease of</td>
<td>● Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>performing in front of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Integration of pedestrian movements (walking, standing, running, stillness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to link the frozen postures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The construct of consequential progressions suggests that the linkages between activities are academically and socially consequential within and across past, current and implicated future events. The sequence of activities is intended to create opportunities to engage the individual in a deeper and more meaningful way as they progress through the pedagogical stages. The source of the PO[S]∞ is the individual experience which is examined on an intrapersonal and solo level before asking the participant to engage on a performative level. As the participant progresses through the pedagogical activities, the methods of how he/she/they engage with the recollection shifts from the intrapersonal to interpersonal, and alternates between the two, thereby allowing more dense and complex knowledge to emerge from the source experience. In Figure 17, I illustrate the process of consequential progressions throughout the PO[S]∞ approach (see Figure 17).

![Diagram showing the process of consequential progressions for PO[S]∞.](image)

Figure 17. Consequential progressions for PO[S]∞.

The participants closely examined a personal memory from three perspectives. While the first two challenged the person to describe and re-live aspects (subject and objective — which mark a moment in history — Vygotsky points out that all human
development is intertwined with the cultural, historical, etc. moments), the third perspective asked them to consider alternate outcomes or actions etc. they could have taken. Each of these writing perspectives relates to Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory. First, the self is historically constructed and through asking a person to extend and engage their inner thoughts about a personal moment in their own history, the individual is engaged with reconstructing perceptions of one’s lived experience within a set of sociocultural conditions. Although that may not be the explicit purpose of offering the writing prompts, it contains undercurrents of Vygotksy’s ideas of mind in society, or the individual and the collective. Moreover, the pedagogical nature and approach of the writing exercise, to be reflective and contemplate one’s personal experience and examine it from different perspectives as they mentally re-play and reconstruct it in their mind, relates to Vygotsky’s ideas of interconnectedness. He emphasized that “to study something historically means to study it in the process of change”. The third writing prompt also extends this as the facilitator asks the individual to reconstruct the experience and consider alternate outcomes or actions.

Along this line of thinking, Vygotsky’s ZPD may be relevant in considering how meaning is created for the participant. He believes that knowledge can be latent and in an embryonic stage (1978). Perhaps extending; his and considering one’s inactive thoughts/memories as those “seeds” that are waiting to blossom, the writing prompt creates an opportunity for them to expand upon their current understanding. Scaffolding took place during this written activity as the facilitator offered prompts that attempted to relieve pressure to perform to certain standards that may be integrated from school and other institutions. The individual could write in fragments or sentence or in other ways
they seemed most fit. The goal was not to critique and the pressure was not to share the writing. Effective scaffolding needs to tailored to the needs of the individual and adjusted to what they may accomplish (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). In the workshop, the written prompts were flexible, allowing the learner to write in a manner that was comfortable for them and enabled them to best articulate their reconstruction of their experience.

The first stage, known as “assisted performance”, involves the learner receiving assistance from the facilitator or more capable peers (Thompson, 2013, p. 257). During the performance warm-up Jamie gave prompts to participants as she moved throughout the space at her own rate. The performance warm-up expanded upon the intra-personal solitary mindfulness activity (body scan) by extending the awareness activities to include engaging with others and moving throughout space. At this time, the psychological construct of awareness may have begun to emerge in participants. However, during this initial stage of the ZPD, the participants needed assistance and other stimuli (e.g., peer interaction) to advance to the next stage. Jamie also played the role of teacher and served to help mediate the performance activities. Regarding scaffolding, in the performance warm-up, the facilitator specifically asked them to circulate and move throughout the space in a way that was comfortable and felt intuitive.

During the frozen postures (b) the participants engaged in the first phase and second phases of the ZPD. The pairs and trios had an opportunity to teach and learn one another’s frozen postures or “stories”. Jamie also played less of a role in the teaching and learning of the frozen postures, which is characteristic of the second phase of the ZPD. At this stage, Thompson (2013) writes that performance is not yet completely developed but the cognitive activity begins to shift from the teacher to the learner. As participants
performed their three enactments that were mediated from a language based text to a language of the body each person had to practice performing their gestures. Doing this allowed for the individual to reinforce the somatically mediated version of their memory, which possibly assisted in the internalization of one’s understanding of the three language-based written texts. Moreover, as participants observed their stories being enacted from their partner(s), the one teaching had an opportunity to engage in scaffolding (Hammonds & Gibbons, 2005). Each person alternated in extending understanding by helping direct their partner(s) in learning each frozen posture.

The third stage of the ZPD is reached when the individual is able to perform tasks smoothly and independently (Thompson, 2013). In the sequence of the activities, one of the purposes of the performance warm-up was to not only introduce the pedestrian movements, it was also incorporated early on to allow the individuals to practice engaging their full bodies and to interact with others. Moreover, the nature of Viewpoints is to also incorporate the intra- and interpersonal forms of mental and somatic awareness (McKittrick, 2018), by asking the group to alternate from inner to outer (or inner or more “social”) gazes, and integrated activities that directed participants to become aware of the space and the others moving throughout it. The warm-up also intended to familiarize and build confidence when entering the following activity, which involved the mediation from the individual’s written texts to embodied form that involved generating a physical enactment of each writing. The performance warm-up also intended to offer information the participants would later draw from during Alleyways as the pedestrian movements served as connectors of each person’s movements, resulting in them authoring another’s story and allowing others to author and reconstruct their story through others’
perspectives. The fourth stage of the ZPD is attained when the individual participates in the recurrence of ZPD cycles to help the individual develop new capacities (Thompson, 2013). This final stage of PO[S]∞ may not have been reached due to the one to 3 hour duration of PO[S]∞. The participants involved were introduced to many of the activities for the first time and it was their first time engaging in a transdisciplinary assemblage and approach of these three areas.

Another point that Vygotsky discusses is the difference between empirical knowledge and theoretical knowledge. In the Alleyways activity, the empirical knowledge referred to the differences and similarities of phenomena which could include the actual physical bodies and movements of the participants. As Cheyne & Tarulli (2005) point out, it involves the “isolation of the individual object to observe, compare, categorize, and remember the phenomena. Theoretical knowledge is described as developing insights about the origins, relations, and dynamics of the phenomenon and not isolating it. Instead, one is encouraged to focus on the transmutation of the object. In PO[S]∞, the Alleyways allows the individuals to engage in building empirical and theoretical knowledge about the self (a sense-maker and member of the collective).
Chapter 5: Analytic Results for Workshop Two

In this chapter, I present the analytic results for the second workshop of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. I examine November 29, 2016 as the date of the key event and allow the overarching research question and sub-questions to guide the analyses. I examined the data from workshop two to answer the research questions and to explore potential implications for foreign language classrooms:

Guiding Research Question:

1. What is Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?

The subsequent analyses conducted on this “event” will take a closer examination to reveal meanings that answer the sub-questions:

2. What is the structure of the PO[S]∞? And in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?

3. In what ways do the practices of PO[S]∞ afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?

4. What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does PO[S]∞ enable in the participants?

5. What are potential applications of PO[S]∞ for foreign language educators in classrooms?

Paralleling the analyses of workshop one, the second workshop is also constructed as a “telling case” (Mitchell, 1984) that is constructed through the multi-phase approach of analysis. The data set for the second workshop was examined through the same three lenses; however, the sub events examined in this workshop include the subevents of the
Alleyways performance activity and the post workshop discussion. The nature of the data set for workshop two differed from that of workshop one (see Table 9). In workshop one, data was collected from participants about their experiences in relation to PO[S]∞. In workshop two, the feedback provided involved the participants’ impressions of the POS and potential uses and implication in middle- and high-school foreign language classrooms.

Table 9

*Data Set for Workshop Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Amount of Data Received (80 min video)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways Workshop Discussion</td>
<td>Throughout the alleyways activity the group shared impressions related to adapting PO[S]∞ for the FL classroom.</td>
<td>Approximately 5-7 minutes of dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Workshop Discussion</td>
<td>After the workshop was complete, the group discussed connections, implications, and challenges for adapting PO[S]∞ to a FL classroom.</td>
<td>20 minutes of dialogue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first five stanza analyses were constructed from evidence from the Alleyways performance activity. The second set of analyses were developed from analyses of the post-workshop discussion.

While the overarching question and sub questions remain the same, the shift from a more general sample to one of a foreign language educators class yielded different insights that are potentially applicable to traditional K-12 foreign language learning contexts. This chapter aims to expand upon the preliminary and exploratory research conducted in workshop one. In Figure 18, I show how the logic-of-inquiry was used to
guide the analysis of the second workshop and involved examining the data set from representing data and analyzing it from three levels of analysis, which resulted in additional mini-narratives (see Figure 18). This enabled me to examine the data with additional insights gained from the first workshop. The analysis of data collected from the second workshop yielded new insights on the under-theorized and under-examined Poetics of the [Selves]∞ and considers its implications for K-12 foreign language educators. The presentation and discussion of the analytic results is the same as chapter four; however, I also provide a contrastive analysis that examines the variations between the two workshops and consider how the research questions are addressed in both workshops.
Positing New Focusing Questions

Cycle 2

- What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]? And in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?
- In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves] afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What is the nature of this meaning?
- What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves] enable in the participants?
- What are potential applications of Poetics of the [Selves] for FL educators in classrooms?

Analyzing Stanza 8: FL Applications
Analyzing Stanza 9: Sharing Memories
Analyzing Stanza 10: The Outsider
Analyzing Stanza 11: Performing Story
Analyzing Stanza 12: Audience-Performer Relations
Analyzing Stanza 13: Teacher-Student Connections
Analyzing Stanza 14: Empathy Building
Analyzing Stanza 15: Lack of Student Awareness
Analyzing Stanza 16: Empathetic Connections via Culture
Analyzing Stanza 17: Get to Know Each Other

Representing Data: Produced transcripts in message unit of video record data of Workshop

Creation of event map in order to identify patterns of interaction in workshop 2.

Representing Data: Produced map of physical space of workshop 2.

Analyzing Events: Reviewed transcript and sub-events to identify what meaning making experiences are evidenced among participants.

Figure 18. Representation of the logic-of-inquiry for workshop two.

Role of Researcher

The second workshop was taught by this researcher. My role in the second workshop consisted of me implementing each component of the method from the Body Scan to the Alleyways performance activity. The workshop concluded with a discussion that was initiated by Dr. Córdova. During the discussion, my role shifted from teacher to researcher, as I wrote field notes and continued recording the discussion. Due to this
researcher’s role as the facilitator for the implementation of Poetics of the [Selves]°, the data collected and analyzed was captured with a video-camera.

As a researcher, the shift in my role had implications. Contrary to my previous role as apprentice to Jamie (as examined in chapter four) in this context now with foreign language methods students, I was now implementing all of the components of PO[S]° with participants who were foreign language methods students. My role as the teacher now included teaching the performance stage, which consisted of the performance warm-up, frozen postures, and Alleyways. Moreover, the discussion and prompts that I introduced throughout the performance stage varied due to my limited training in the Viewpoints practice. While my experience in performance art as a studio practice informed the development and integration of contemporary practices, incorporating them and teaching K-12 foreign language educators was something new.

During the post-workshop discussion, I positioned myself as a researcher of Poetics of the [Selves]° and placed less emphasis on my studio practice. This enabled me to conduct the research in a way the participants seemed to be more comfortable with, as they were not practicing artists. Last, my shifting role in the second workshop provided an opportunity to experience teaching the approach I developed. This resulted in me offering verbal prompts and increased interaction with the participants, which influenced perceptions of myself as a teacher.

**Telling Case.**

In this section, I present a telling case, based on the three stages of analyses of the data set. I adopted an ethnographic stance as I collected and analyzed the data from the second workshop of Poetics of the [Selves]°, an transdisciplinary pedagogical approach.
The activities of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ aim to guide participants to be more mindful about their bodies, themselves, and each other. In addition to encouraging intra- and interpersonal awareness, the participants of workshop two may also learn how to connect aspects of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ to classroom content. In constructing this telling case, I emphasize the value of developing an educational method that fosters the wellbeing of the individual through a sequence of activities that enhance intra- and inter-personal awareness. Furthermore, the findings of workshop two offer potential applications for K-12 foreign language educators.

**Macro-Analysis**

The macro-analysis of the second workshop adopted the same approach that was used for workshop one. The overall pedagogical structure and the separate components were deconstructed to allow for additional understanding on how each one operates on its own and in relation to the other activities. In Figure 19 I show a durational breakdown of the sub-events of workshop two (see Figure 19). The second workshop had shorter durations for the performance-warm-up and Alleyways activities. Also, workshop two included a debriefing session that was facilitated by the instructor and researcher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Duration (seconds/minutes)</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrival</td>
<td>10 min</td>
<td>Participants arrive. Sign consent forms. Find a place to set their belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>6 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova introduces Alena and the students. Alena provides a verbal overview of the activities in PO[S]**.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Scan</td>
<td>7 min</td>
<td>Mindfulness activity. Participants sit on stools, Alena guides them through the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Participants pick up a piece of blank paper and pencil, sit at one of the tables in the space. Alena guides participants through a recollection of a memory by offering prompts and questions that ask them to consider sensory aspects of a Positive life experience. They write from three different perspectives: 1) objective, 2) subjective, and 3) a “neutral”/“curious”/“possibilities”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Warm-Up</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Alena leads participants through walking, standing, stillness, etc. in the space. Consists of eight 30 second intervals of shifting awareness as group moved throughout the space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen Postures (A)</td>
<td>5 min</td>
<td>Alena introduces the activity by providing an example of her postures based on a memory. Participants are given 1 minute and 20 seconds to develop 3 postures based on their memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen Postures (B)</td>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Participants are asked to form a duo and trio. Then have 1 minute and 20 seconds to teach one another their memories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Alena introduces Alleyways and integrates postures into the activity. Participants also incorporate movements (i.e., walking, standing, stillness) into the alleyway memory activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Workshop Discussion</td>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova and Alena facilitate a discussion about participants’ experience. Discuss connections to foreign language classrooms, implications, and challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Structuration map of workshop two.

**Introductions.** The introductions lasted approximately 6 minutes and took place in the classroom. The participants, Dr. Córdova, and this researcher were seated in a loose open circular arrangement that enabled them to take on a more casual conversational approach. Dr. Córdova sat to the left of me and was equidistant between the first participant and I. He introduced me, briefly shared my interests, and talked about
my practice as a performance artist. He mentioned that I am an artist, an art educator, and was also working on my PhD. Dr. Córdova went on to say that this researcher developed a particular methodology and pedagogy called Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and he let them know he understood they may initially not see the connection between the method and their FL teaching practice. He followed his comment by letting them know the method intended to guide learners to be more mindful about their bodies, themselves, each other. He also proposed the possibility of the participants learning about how to connect that with content. He described PO[S]∞ as a pedagogy that would inform their developing expertise in foreign language teaching. As an insider and leader of the group, he provided an entry point to examine the impact of PO[S]∞ on his students. The participants were all ‘experts’ in the field of teaching foreign language; however, he reminded them that at the end of the day, they are working with ‘human beings’. He continued to prepare participants and informed them that it was the second time the method was being taught, but it was the first time I was doing it with educators.

Dr. Córdova let the group know that I would guide them through the process, which would take about 60 minutes. He also mentioned they would learn about Poetics of the [Selves]∞ and hopefully learn something about themselves in the process. He ended the opening dialogue by letting them know that after the activities, there would be a group discussion that would be included in my dissertation research. Dr. Córdova’s introduction let the participants know that I was conducting research and completing a practice-based dissertation about a pedagogical method. He also expressed the longer-term goal of mine, which includes implementing it in gallery settings and using it to consider new instructional approaches.
This researcher informed them that during the first ten minutes I would guide them through a mindfulness exercise known as a body scan. I also added that it was sometimes used in yoga or therapeutic settings. I then explained they would transition to a brief writing exercise from three perspectives based on their language of choice’s culture and a personal experience. I briefly described the transition to the performance phase of PO[S]∞ and informed them the type of movement we would engage in would be fairly simple (e.g., walking, standing, etc.). Dr. Córdova let them know it would not be the common forms of theater-based performance methods. This researcher then let them know they would form a trio (motioning to “Madison”, “Anna”, & “Ashley”) and a pair (motioning to “Charlotte” & “Ella”) to generate with three frozen postures that related to their three written reflections. I then described the collaborative teaching and learning of each group’s frozen postures (“story”) and encouraged them to not take things too seriously or try to analyze their decisions on what sort of movements and postures they would create. I explained how the groups would take turns performing each participant’s story simultaneously and encouraged them to ask me any questions and to voice any concerns. Dr. Córdova suggested the participants consider how aspects of the activities might be incorporated into their classrooms.

**Body scan.**

After I provided the overview of activities, I informed the group they could remain seated in their chairs for the first activity. Dr. Córdova also participated in the body scan. The participants sat in their chairs with backs fairly straight, and legs crossed or directly on the floor. Their hands were clasped or set on their laps. This researcher used the same body scan prompts as the first workshop. The participants closed their eyes
as I guided them through the exercise. Due to a time constraint, my tempo was slightly faster than workshop one. I also stayed in one spot (off-camera) in front of the group on the other side of the room as I guided them through the exercise. The body scan lasted approximately five minutes. Upon the close of the exercise, I transitioned (30-45 seconds) them to the writing activity.

**Autobiographical writing.**

The writing exercise lasted approximately fifteen minutes. This researcher placed blank sheets of paper and pencils on desks that were pushed to the outer perimeter of the room. Although the exact placement was not captured on the video camera due to the size of the room being smaller, the arrangement and placement of paper offered participants more space to write and collect their thoughts. Two of the group members remained seated in the same chairs they started out in and set their papers and writing tools on a long table (about 5’). They focused their attention on my prompts (the others were out of camera view).

For the first writing perspective, I requested that the participants recall a time in their lives when they were in the environment, the country, institution, or location (including the United States) when they were exposed to the language they were now teaching. I asked them to consider the “objective aspects” which could have included smells, shapes, colors, and material aspects of the culture that resonated with them. I informed them they had 5 minutes to write from that perspective, and that it was acceptable to jot down notes about any physical objective properties of a meaningful experience. I timed the writing exercise and asked them to finish about 20 seconds before the 5 minutes was up.
I then introduced the second writing perspective and described it as one that was “subjective” and was associated with emotions they experienced or witnessed. This researcher also said it could be the overall social-emotional climate of that particular place they were reminiscing about. The writers had 5 minutes and I asked them to finish up their writing as I gave them a 45 second warning before five minutes.

The third perspective was introduced and I asked them to explore ‘potential or possibilities’ of the experience. More specifically, I asked them to consider potential outcomes of actions that could have happened with different decisions. I also let them know that it could also be something they were more curious or intrigued by. I continued to ask the group to jot down questions that came to mind. During the explanation of this perspective, the participants held their gaze longer, which may have indicated a deeper reflection on their part. I reminded them they also had 5 minutes to complete their writing. Upon the close of the three writing perspectives, I asked the participants to review each one and circle one sentence or fragment from each perspective.

**Performance warm-up.**

The performance-warm-up component lasted about 6 minutes. This researcher let the group know they would be engaged in a shortened version due to time constraints. Before transitioning to the warm-up, I asked them to revisit their three pieces of writing and the sentence/fragment they notated. This lasted about one and a half minutes. Then, as I began walking throughout the room, participants stood up and followed me as I mentioned we were going to start by exploring and mapping out the space by walking. Dr. Córdova also began circulating throughout the space. As the entire group was walking, I asked the participants if anyone had done any performance work in the past.
Ella said she participated in choir for a year. The group was smiling and engaged with one another. This may have been due to them developing a rapport throughout the semester. As we walked throughout the space, I guided them through a social and more direct gaze and encouraged them to “check-in” with themselves to see how they were feeling, breathing, and walking that day. As I guided them through the in-between and peripheral gaze exercises, the performers slowed their pace.

**Frozen postures (a).**

After the abbreviated version of the performance warm-up, Alena transitioned the group into the frozen postures activity. This lasted approximately 5 to 6 minutes and included my instructions. At that point, the group had stopped walking throughout the space, and everyone was standing in the middle of the room. This researcher explained frozen postures and asked them to recall the memory to generate an action that was associated with it. It also let them know it could be a literal or abstract interpretation of the action, and it also included gestural and facial expressions. I asked them to spend time trying to create a gesture without too much concern with whether it linked to the language used in their writing. This researcher reminded them that the activity was about physical embodiment and let them have approximately two minutes to review the writing and locate the language they circled. I asked them to allow the circled text to guide their physical exploration of the memory. I also suggested that they review it as they walked throughout the space. As the participants walked around the room, some of them began to create shapes somewhat minimally. Some stopped momentarily to create a frozen posture.
I let them know the first two minutes should be spent on developing a posture for the first written perspective, and also reminded them at that point, they should try to focus on performing the gesture for themselves; the next step would involve teaching it to their group members. The group slowly stopped moving throughout the space, and some of them placed their hands on their hips while assuming positions that may have indicated they were contemplating the writing pieces as they developed the frozen postures in their minds instead of physically embodying them. As I noticed this, I let them know taking that approach was also acceptable.

**Frozen postures (b).** After developing the frozen postures, the group transitioned to the collaborative teaching and learning element. I suggested the participants break into one pair and one trio. At that point Dr. Córdova offered support as he circulated throughout the room and participated in learning and performing the gestures. I spent approximately three minutes clarifying the instructions for the pair. More specifically, they were unsure about whether to share the memory with each other or to only learn the frozen postures. I reminded them that this only consisted of learning one another’s physical gestures. Dr. Córdova jumped in and compared it to the game of Charades. He then performed one of the individual’s postures with them. Upon both individuals teaching each other the postures, the pair then reviewed one another’s gestures.

The macro-analysis provided a broad overview of the structure, and implementation detail, of PO[S]∞. In this setting, the workshop was adapted to fit within a shorter timeframe, which influenced the duration of the performance warm-up activity. The mindfulness, writing activity, frozen postures, and collaborative teaching-learning components were implemented in the same amount of time as in workshop one. Through
closer examination of the pedagogical components, the participants engaged in meaning-making through activating different modes of knowledge sharing and reflection on their current knowledge and experience related to their foreign language. By opening with a mindful activity that aimed to relax and foster a receptive and aware state of mind, participants transitioned to the savoring activity associated with positive psychology of savoring. The participants transitioned their open mindful state to one of recollection, perspective-taking, and transforming mental imagery and emotions into language. The performance warm-up briefly introduced Viewpoints to the group and engaged them in the basic movements of sitting, walking, standing, and stillness. It also involved shifting gazes and asked them to shift mental perspectives and maintain an awareness. During the frozen postures collaborative teaching and learning activity, participants expressed interest in learning the story that informed their partners’ gestures.

The subsequent meso-analysis focused on two sub-events of interest due to the collaborative nature and amount of useful dialogue related to personal insights and classroom implications for PO[S]∞. Thus far, the participants engaged in meaning-making through the modes of self-reflection, auto-biographical writing, and enacting the autobiographical writing through physical movement in a solo and collaborative way.

Alleyways.

After the group completed the frozen postures (b) activity, the duos and trio transitioned to the Alleyways activity. In workshop two, the activity included the same process; however, the duration of this pedagogical component was shortened to allow time for a post-workshop discussion. The small groups alternated performing one another’s memories in the “Alleyways” and Dr. Córdova provided thoughts related to
how this activity could be adapted for foreign language classrooms. The following meso-
analysis examines this sub-event and provides greater detail on the pedagogical aspects of
this component and the way the participants engaged with one another. Thus far, the
participants engaged in meaning-making through the modes of self-reflection, auto-
biographical writing, and enacting the autobiographical writing through performance
methods on an individual and group level.

Post-workshop discussion.

The second workshop included a post-workshop discussion that was facilitated by
Dr. Córdova and I. Four of the student participants (Ashley, Charlotte, Ella, and
Madison) engaged in the dialogue. The topics that were discussed included the student
participants’ impressions of their experiences, and thoughts on the potential uses of
PO[S]∞ in foreign language classrooms. The data collected during the post-workshop
underwent a meso- and micro-analysis and examined in greater depth in the subsequent
analysis sections.

Conclusion.

The macro-analysis of the second workshop examined the structure of Poetics of
the [Selves]∞ and theorized how each pedagogical activity influenced the succeeding
component. The second workshop involved shortening the duration of the performance
warm-up and the Alleyways activities to allow time for a post-workshop discussion. By
doing this, the student participants may have had different experiences in the subsequent
activities. The performance warm-up activity aims to familiarize the participants with the
terminology and movement that is later called on in the Alleyways performance activity.
By adapting this to fit a shorter time frame, participants may not have been as familiar
and comfortable with integrating the Viewpoints performance movements (e.g., walking, sitting, stillness, etc.) into the succeeding performance activities. The body scan was the pedagogical component that remained the most consistent in duration and verbal prompts. This activity may have had a similar influence on participants in workshop two and potentially increased intra-personal awareness. Following the body scan, the student-participants engaged in the autobiographical writing component. The writing prompts were adapted to compliment the subject matter of the classroom (i.e. foreign language). The student-participants translated a meaningful life experience that was associated with the culture of the language he/she/they were currently teaching. The frozen postures (a) and frozen postures (b) activities lasted approximately the same amount of time as in workshop one, however, the shortening of the performance warm-up may have impacted the ease of guiding participants through the development of the frozen postures. The Alleyways activity was set up the same way as in workshop one except that it occurred in a smaller space. This may have impacted the comfort level and perception of both the performing and observing student participants. In the meso-analysis and micro-analysis the Alleyways activity and post-workshop discussion are examined in greater depth.

**Meso-Analysis**

The meso-analysis of the second workshop involves examining specific sub-events within the workshop. The first sub-event was the Alleyways activity, and the second sub-event was the post-workshop discussion. I chose these sub-events to investigate how the research questions associated with PO[S]∞ were experienced by educators. The analysis of Alleyways provided insight into how the pedagogical component impacted their subjectivity, and it also allowed for discussion about classroom
and content implications during the post-workshop discussion. The analysis of the post-workshop discussion spurred conversation about the educators’ personal experience of PO[S]∞ and also allowed for further discussion related to implementation and implications of PO[S]∞ within foreign language middle- and high-school classrooms. In this section I presented a more detailed structuration map of each sub-event followed by additional procedural detail. I also went on to share themes that were illuminated through language during these activities.

Due to adapting the workshop for Dr. Córdova’s class, the performance warm-up was significantly shorter than in workshop 1 and resulted in less discussion than anticipated. Therefore, I decided to exclude a meso- and micro-level of analysis on the performance warm-up. The purposeful sample of foreign language educators in workshop two influenced my decision to examine the post-workshop discussion that was facilitated by Dr. Córdova. The questions and comments posed by Dr. Córdova during the post-workshop discussion asked participants to reflect on and share their impressions related to how PO[S]∞ may be used in primary foreign language classrooms.

**Sub-event 1: Alleyways.**

The first sub-event that underwent a meso-analysis was Alleyways. In Figure 20, I present a detailed structuration map that accounts for the duration and sequence of events within the sub-event of Alleyways (see Figure 20). The detailed structuration map of the sub-event allowed me to further investigate and theorize about how meaning was constructed and address the research questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Duration (seconds/minutes)</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>35 sec</td>
<td>Alena explains Alleyways / Adjusts rolling white boards / Provides brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alena provided instructions and clarification of Alleyways / Breaks participants into 1 pair (Madison and Anna) and 1 trio (Charlotte, Ella, and Ashley)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>Madison and Anna perform Madison’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>Alena asks Madison and Anna to share thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Anna and Madison perform Anna’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 min</td>
<td>Alena asks observers for thoughts / Anna discusses story associated with gestures / Anna leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Alena asks Madison to share her story associated with gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 sec</td>
<td>Transitioned to trio performance / Alena adjusted white boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 sec</td>
<td>Trio reviews each other’s postures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>Alena addresses trio’s questions about performance direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Trio performs Ashley’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Alena asks performers’ thoughts on performing the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Trio performed Ella’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 sec</td>
<td>Alena requests observers’ thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Trio performs Charlotte’s story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Alena facilitates discussion between trio and observers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 20. Structuration map of sub-event one for workshop two*

The duration of Alena’s overview of Alleyways lasted approximately 45 seconds. She explained Alleyways as a Viewpoints practice that was adapted from the theater world. Alena emphasized that an understanding of, or a practice in, theater was unnecessary, and she named the six materials (SSTEMS) of the Viewpoints practice. As she talked to the participants, she adjusted the rolling white boards to mark the space in preparation for Alleyways. After adjusting two of the whiteboards, Alena described each Alleyway as a “capsule” or “mapped-out space”. The next two to three minutes were spent providing additional clarification to the participants.

Alena recommended the pair (Anna and Madison) perform first and positioned them on either side of the white board as she moved the two whiteboards to form one partition. Alena let them know to not feel obligated to do things in a certain order or simultaneously, and she emphasized that the enactment of each frozen posture could be
performed on their own time and in their own way. Alena then suggested trying to incorporate the three frozen postures as they moved throughout the Alleyways.

Madison’s memory was performed first by Anna and Madison for approximately 40 seconds. As the pair moved throughout the Alleyway, Anna smiled and would often watch Madison as they were performed the gestures. Anna was the first one to return to the beginning of the Alleyways activity and stop performing. Shortly thereafter, Madison made her way back to the “beginning” of the Alleyway and stopped performing. The trio, Dr. Córdova, and this researcher clapped, and I added that it seemed like a natural ending. I then proceeded to ask for feedback from the Anna and Madison, which lasted approximately 20 seconds. I emphasized the activity was a shortened version and was curious about how it felt for the performing pair. Anna said she enjoyed ‘mixing it up’ and that she was trying to relate to Madison.

Then, the pair performed Anna’s story (i.e., frozen postures). The Alleyways performance activity invited participants to engage in one another’s experience through physical embodiment at the group level. The sequence of pedagogical activities began with the individual’s experience and aimed to increase self-awareness through the solitary activities of the body scan, writing, and creation of frozen postures. As the group performed Anna’s postures and integrated the movements, from the performance warm-up, each frozen posture became linked through bodily activity, therefore creating continuity, which is a characteristic of story. Anna performed for slightly longer (50 seconds). As I was suggesting they begin performing in the next 10 seconds, Anna took the initiative and began performing in her Alleyways. This time, I noticed that she was not looking at Madison, unlike when she was performing Madison’s postures. After about
ten seconds of Anna performing, Madison began performing Anna’s. After they stopped
performing they returned to standing position at the beginning of their Alleyways, and the
observing group clapped. The feedback from this performance lasted about 4 minutes. I
asked if there were any moments that resonated to the observing participants (out of
camera). They responded by pointing out what they interpreted as a gesture that might be
associated with frustration or sadness. Dr. Córdova then made a connection between
PO[S]* to the foreign language classroom as he suggested that students try physically
embodying an idea and then use foreign language to discuss what they witnessed in the
tableau.

This researcher asked the pair to share their memories. Anna had reminisced
about a recent trip to Paris where she completed an internship and lived in a studio. She
remarked that her three postures evolved from a feeling of ‘exhilaration’, ‘total
contentment’, and also a feeling of ‘loneliness’. Anna then shared that she had reflected
on a moment where she could have been more engaged and talkative. She also said there
was a wide range of emotions on the trip. This may have indicated that, regardless of the
three written perspectives, the emotional reaction or subjective aspects of the memory
took precedence.

Madison’s memory consisted of an experience from when she was in middle
school. In her first posture, she sat on a chair with a ‘terrified’ feeling because she did not
speak Spanish. Her second posture involved the confidence she developed after she
learned Spanish. The last frozen posture was inspired by a quote she included in her
written text. She had asked permission from her mother to dye her blonde hair darker in
order to avoid bringing attention to herself. She added that the generation of her frozen
postures was inspired by a combination of the emotional and visual aspects of her experiences.

The trio’s performance lasted approximately 6 minutes. The group requested a moment to review each other’s postures, and Ashley, who was situated on stage left, asked if they could begin with Charlotte (far right) and work their way over. After about a minute of reviewing each other’s gestures as this researcher answered questions, the trio was ready to begin. They each rolled a chair to their respective alleyway. They also asked if they could get up, and I reminded them they may choose to stand, sit, walk, and lie down and were supposed to integrate the postures in-between those movements.

They performed Charlotte’s memory for one minute. The Alleyways activity differed from the solitary activities that preceded it. The interaction and dialogue that occurred during Alleyways may have activated different types of responses and provided new opportunities for insights in participants. The theoretical framework aimed to improve psychological wellbeing through fostering intra- and interpersonal awareness. During Alleyways, it appeared that certain participants believed they sought approval from the facilitator. Ashley began moving and glanced over, seemingly looking for reassurance that she was doing it “correctly”. Ella then asked if they were supposed to ‘walk around’. The trio giggled on and off throughout the Alleyways performance. Upon one nearing one minute, they stopped as they reached the whiteboards and I shared my observation that it seemed like a natural ending. I then requested feedback from Charlotte and asked her how it felt to perform her own story. Charlotte responded with a brief statement saying it ‘took her back’. I then asked the other Ashley and Ella how it felt to perform Charlotte’s memory. Ella replied that it felt ‘kind-of silly’. Ashley then remarked
that it was somewhat challenging because they did not know her story and had to ‘guess it’. Her response may have implied that she was interested in learning more about her story.

The trio then performed the Ella’s Frozen postures, which lasted approximately thirty seconds. I asked the observers for their thoughts and impressions. Dr. Córdova mentioned one gesture that resonated reminded him of a ‘Karate Kid’ moment as he moved his body to re-enact the gesture.

Ashley’s frozen postures were performed for approximately one minute. Ella then asked her about the third posture. As the trio concluded the Alleyways performance, I shared a personal impression that related to a feeling of contemplation during a moment when they performed the same posture simultaneously.

As part of the meso-analysis of the first subevent (Alleyways), I also reviewed the transcript and detailed structuration map to develop a table that employed Gee’s (2011b) seven building tasks to understand how meaning was being constructed during the sub-event and to guide the identification of rich points. This involved reviewing the transcript multiple times and jotting down my impressions. I also noted salient words and phrases used by the participants. I then reviewed rich points to develop an over-arching theme. In the micro-analyses I approached the data set again through the lens of the primary themes and rich points as I conducted a close analyses of conversation that offered insights related to the research questions. In Figure 21, I show the rich points and stanza themes that emerged from applying Gee’s (2011b) seven building tasks to analyze the discourse (see Figure 21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Rich Points</th>
<th>Stanza Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsing your written reflection. Using language to name.</td>
<td>Foreign Language Applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 21. Rich points in sub-event one for workshop two

Sub-event 2: post-workshop discussion.

The second sub-event that was examined at the meso-level, was the post-workshop discussion. During the discussion, the teacher, the participants, and I discussed the personal impressions of the participants and potential implications for PO[S]∞ in educational settings, with an emphasis on middle- and high-school foreign language classrooms. In Figure 22 I provide a detailed structuration map that shows how the interactions and sequence of interaction unfolded during the post-workshop discussion (see Figure 22).
### Post-Workshop Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>Transition to debrief / Dr. Córdova asks if he can participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova opens discussion / recaps the nature of the approach / poses questions to group about students' potential reception of activities and learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 min</td>
<td>Charlotte responds / discusses recognition of her passion for learning FL in some of her students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova responds to Charlotte / discusses his observations of a previous assignment documented by video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova recaps the PO[S]∞ process and activities / asks for additional thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Ashley responds / there is not enough movement and collaboration in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova discusses pressure of learning FL / considers how play could lessen stress and pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 sec</td>
<td>Charlotte responds / students’ struggle with enacting cultural aspects of FL / students seem to lack awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 sec</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova discusses how Ella captured her students’ attention with a previous assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 sec</td>
<td>Ella discusses her experience teaching a “culture day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova makes refers to an article about a cross-cultural experience of a Finnish teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Ella adds additional comment about the students’ reaction to the “culture day” activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 min</td>
<td>Dr. Córdova asks Alena for thoughts related to educators / Alena offers potential uses for PO[S]∞ in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 min</td>
<td>Alena asks group about usefulness of PO[S]∞ in K-12 / (Ella) participants discusses adapting it for elementary, middle, and high / (Ashley) learning partner’s stories / (Dr. Córdova) rehearsing FL / (Madison) implementation of PO[S]∞ throughout school year / (Dr. Córdova) discusses experiential approaches to acquiring and creating knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 22. Structuration map of sub-event two for workshop two**

The second workshop concluded with a group discussion that was led by Dr. Córdova. The conversation lasted approximately 20 minutes and took place in the same room. The individuals who were present for the discussion included Dr. Córdova, this researcher, Ashley, Charlotte, Ella, and Madison. The video camera recorded the dialogue, which was transcribed for analysis. The detailed structuration map above provides a topical breakdown of the discussion. The following content delves into notable areas of the dialogue that may offer additional insights into the research questions.

Upon the end of the Alleyways performance activity, Dr. Córdova and I positioned our chairs in a circular shape in the middle of the room. The participants then rolled their chairs over and we began the discussion. Dr. Córdova opened the dialogue by...
stating that current school curriculum often does not include ‘descriptive’ or ‘emotional’ aspects. He seemed to be referring to curriculum and academic expectations that do not value the overall development of the individual. Ashley responded to his initial thoughts by discussing her choice of memory for the ‘what-if’ or ‘wonder’ perspective in the recall and writing exercise. She discussed how the reflection on her initial excitement in French class enabled her to identify with students who might share the same excitement about learning French in her classroom. Ashley’s response to Dr. Córdova suggested there was a lack of acknowledging an emotional dimension in the classroom. Ashley went on to suggest that the writing component of PO[S]∞ may increase teachers’ sensitivity of students’ needs.

Dr. Córdova reminded the group of the sequential order of events in PO[S]∞ and asked them if they saw any aspects of the activities implemented in classrooms. Charlotte responded by saying that she does not believe performance happens often enough and uses the term ‘acting’ and the activity of ‘forming small groups in different corners’ to specify what she is considering performance. It seems that she defines performance through a theater and educator lens, which suggests that classrooms neglect experiential and small-group or collaborative learning opportunities. Following her insights regarding an absence of performance, Dr. Córdova talks about the intimidation of learning a new language and shares an early memory of learning German. He follows that with posing a question to himself and the group about how ‘play’ among students might lessen feelings of intimidation and may also serve to develop empathy among students. Per earlier analyses and dialogue (workshop one), the activity and ideas of “play” may arise during
the performance components of PO[S]°, possibly suggesting a usefulness for the method in foreign language classrooms.

Ashley expands on his thoughts related to students’ experience of fear by sharing an experience in her classroom of sophomores and juniors. She had requested that her students pretend they were dining in a French restaurant and asked them to order and interact in French. After expressing her disappointment in the students’ lack of willingness to participate, she talks about ‘awareness’ in her sophomore and junior students and points out the difference between students’ respectfully completing tasks and what seemed to be a more authentic passion for learning. This exchange may indicate an opportunity for PO[S]° to increase inter- and intra-personal awareness in classrooms. As noted earlier by Dr. Córdova, school curriculum lacks an inclusion of the emotional. Through asking students to participate in a reflection on a personal event that links to content, the students may develop a more authentic connection with the content. Moreover, the lack of awareness that Ashley mentioned may be addressed through the mindfulness and performance components of PO[S]°.

Following Ashley’s response, Dr. Córdova looked at Ella and discusses how she was successful in fostering engagement (‘breaking the bubble’) from her foreign language students. Ella shared the details of the activity. It was a culture lesson and she asked students to write down five words they associated with death. She notes the students were taken aback and unsure of what to do and how to respond. Ella mentioned she repeated the assignment until they completed the assignment. This observation leads me to believe that PO[S]° can potentially be used to connect with students in a more authentic way. More specifically, the writing component of PO[S]° could be slightly
adjusted depending on the teacher’s aims and integrated into the content of a foreign language classroom.

This researcher then requested any thoughts around how to potentially adapt it for different student populations. Ella responds by contemplating how different grade levels may receive the method and says elementary students would most likely be very excited to participate because of ‘their nature’. She believed that middle school students may be ‘too cool’, and ended by saying high-schoolers would probably be engaged but would need to ‘warm-up’. Her response may suggest that PO[S]∞ could be a useful method for classroom if it were adjusted to the psychosocial development of the students. Moreover, if PO[S]∞ were to be implemented in traditional classrooms, the duration, frequency, and overall implementation may need to occur over a longer span of time (e.g., days, week, academic semester) in order to effectively engage students.

Ashley then asked if the longer version of PO[S]∞ involves learning their partners’ stories. Dr. Córdova extended her line of thought by posing a question about how the method could offer opportunities for students to observe two things in foreign language classrooms. The first activity would relate to students’ practicing reading and writing skills if they were to read their stories in the language of study as other students named and described what they witnessed. The second insight relates to students realizing how much can be missed in translation. This part of the discussion may suggest that PO[S]∞ had potential to serve as a valuable tool for foreign language teachers because it connects to content through rehearsing the language via reading and writing, while also reminding students to think more critically because translation may not tell the whole story.
The topic of learning one’s stories continued to be discussed as Ashley shared that it was challenging to ‘get into her shoes’ as she referred to learning Madison’s frozen postures. This is notable because the current way PO[S]∞ is implemented may stimulate more critical reflection for the observing students during the Alleyways performance. Based on earlier analyses (workshop one), the observing group offered potential story lines that were triggered from watching the performing group simultaneously perform one’s memory. The performers may be more concerned with telling the story “correctly” or feeling silly if they are performing the gestures without understanding part of the narrative that prompted their generation. Dr. Córdova presented the metaphor of ‘walking in someone else’s shoes’ in response to Ashley and related it to empathy-building. His comment and second mention of empathy-building may suggest that PO[S]∞ has a dual purpose of encouraging compassion and curiosity about others’ stories while also connecting to learning foreign language through practicing and performing the language of study.

Madison then shared her thoughts, which were about how the level of rapport in the classroom would affect the engagement and outcomes of PO[S]∞. She specifically emphasized the importance of the teacher being able to model it for the students and talked about how students need to trust and be comfortable with the teacher. This aspect of the discussion led me to conclude that PO[S]∞ could potentially serve as a tool to assess classroom climate, specifically levels of trust and positive affect between the students and teacher. PO[S]∞ may also serve as a unique way to open the academic year because it would allow students to bring in their own experience and get to know each
other. Furthermore, teachers could potentially adapt the written prompts to create opportunities for the students and teacher to establish a closer bond.

In Figure 23, I include the rich points and stanza themes that were revealed during the meso-analysis of the post-workshop discussion (see Figure 23). I examined the data for rich points that evolved into themes in the data that related to the research questions and concerns. Themes of awareness and empathy were identified in the data set.

In the micro-analysis stage I take a closer examination of the themes that guided the emergent findings and related questions summarized in the meso-analysis of the Alleyways performance and post-workshop discussion. This involved zooming-in on specific dialogue that offered rich points relating to the research questions. The micro-analysis involved a more rigorous application of Gee’s (2011c) tools for each theme listed in the table. In this section I share ethnographic observations that were collected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Rich Points</th>
<th>Stanza Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-Workshop</td>
<td>Identifying with my students. That used to be me.</td>
<td>Teacher-Student Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Positive projections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What it’s like to be her.</td>
<td>Empathy Building Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I want to teach you what I know.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a typical game.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most students do not realize.</td>
<td>Lack of Student Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect doesn’t equal a genuine passion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An intra- and interpersonal disconnection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-Analysis</td>
<td>It is actually rehearsal in FL.</td>
<td>Empathetic Connections Through Rehearsing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let’s practice then perform.</td>
<td>Culture and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To stand in your shoes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The role of timing.</td>
<td>Get to Know Each Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fostering group cohesion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Varying levels of rapport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 23. Rich points in sub-event two for workshop two*
during the micro-analyses of specific stanzas and also report them in narrative form. I engaged in the same process of identifying rich points and applied Gee’s methods of critical discourse analysis to select and conduct the micro-analysis of stanzas. The micro-analyses were informed by the content analyses results in the initial analytic procedures. I applied the ethnographic method of identifying rich points and Gee’s methods of critical discourse analysis to select and conduct the micro-analysis of stanzas.

The ten stanzas below are taken from the transcription of the audio component of video documentation of workshop two.

**Stanza 8: Foreign Language Applications.**

289 Dr. Córdova, can you think of any questions that may relate to foreign language learning?
290 That IS interesting!... (agreeing with us hand on hip)
291 Yea, as you teach students for example to learn something, and instead, rather than using language,
293 have it acted out,
294 and then those of us that are observing – then using the language to say “estada fru stada” (pointing at performers) – “she’s frustrated”.
297 Or “seta cu telo” – “she touched her hair”.
298 Does that make sense?
299 So as soon as they start practicing their language use by watching the tableau there’s that piece of it as well.

In *Foreign Language Applications*, the participant, Dr. Córdova, is asked if he can “think of any questions that may relate to foreign language learning”. In this context, “learning” refers to the teaching and learning processes that occur in a K-12 foreign language learning classroom. There may be an emphasis on potential applications for middle and high school students, due to the current grade levels the participants are teaching. One participant states in response to the question, with hand on hip, “That IS
interesting!” Dr. Córdova, a seasoned educator and researcher in teaching/learning processes (with an emphasis on foreign language), suggests a learning method in response: “Yea, as you teach students for example to learn something, and instead, / rather than using language, / have it acted out” (lines 293-295). The phrase “acted out” in this context refers to the embodiment of the meaning that is inherent in the foreign language the students are learning. These two words refer to a non-verbal, physical/gestural bodily movement. Dr. Córdova’s experience as an educator interested in creative, authentic modes of learning may influence his connections and suggestions related to physical embodiment and the rehearsal of language.

In lines 296 – 297, he suggests, “and then those of us that are observing - / then using the language to say ‘estada fru stada’ (pointing at performers) – ‘she’s frustrated’.” The phrase “using the language to say” refers to the performance component of PO[S]∞ Alleyways, where performers use gestures to represent aspects of their written reflections. The phrase suggests observers (students) would use language to name and/or describe the bodily gesture and meanings implied by the performers. Dr. Córdova continues with examples, “Or ‘seta cu telo’ – ‘she touched her hair’.” His ethnicity may influence his decision to offer an example in Spanish. He asks, in line 299, “Does that make sense?” Dr. Córdova’s vocation as an educational researcher likely influences his tendency to look for unique ways to introduce and/or reinforce language learning. He explains his idea further, “So as soon as they start practicing their language use by watching the tableau” (line 300). The phrases “practicing language use” while “watching the tableau” and their position in the stanza (following ideas for PO[S]∞) suggests that the simultaneity of observation and practicing has potential reinforcements for learning.
“They” in this context refers to the students being taught by the participants in the group. His relationship to the students seems to be one of encouragement, and it is focused on teaching his students how to implement this adapted version of the performance component.

PO[S]$^{∞}$ is a compositional tool that creates openings and new understandings that illuminate how Big “D” Discourse is connected to language. In this sense, Dr. Córdova’s suggestion to enact, and then name, using language means students can potentially unearth deeper meanings of how reality and identity is constructed while also practicing language. This creates a greater awareness of the learning process, one that considers culture and its role in constructing experience.

In line 301, Dr. Córdova says, “there’s that piece of it as well.” Suggesting that the enactment of gestures be followed by a group discussion (mainly stemming from the observing students), where the movements are named or described in the foreign language, may suggest that PO[S]$^{∞}$ has useful implications for teaching foreign language in an experiential way (performative). This may serve as a precursor to the actual speaking and practice of the foreign language. The thought process that occurs when the observing students watch and draw conclusions about the activity/story most likely engages them in a more critical way. They are exercising thought processes of inference and conclusion, then linking those to finding the vocabulary to describe the actions. This could make the learning and practicing of the foreign language more deeply impactful due to the additional cognitive effort required.

**Stanza 9: Sharing Memories.**

304 And if you could talk a little bit about your experience,
305 the memory that you – that you wrote about
(lifts hands) well this one was about exhilaration. I was really happy to be where I was and it was just total contentment. And then the second segment was feeling of loneliness even within the exhilarating environment. The third one was when I thought I should have been talking more and engaged I was in Paris. I’ve been to Paris many, many times. But last summer I stayed in a studio, I worked for a company … it was just so many emotions in that trip. That was me.

In *Sharing Memories*, the participant, Anna, offered a subjective description (i.e., emotional interpretation) of the three gestures she created, which are based on written prompts possibly intending a strong emotional link. In lines 304 and 305, Anna is asked to describe the activity: “And if you could talk a little bit about your experience, / the memory that you wrote about”. Interestingly, she uses the word “exhilarating” twice in reference to the experience that inspired the gestures. The first time it’s used (line 307) she follows it with the words happy and content (308): “(lifts hands up) well this one was about exhilaration. / I was really happy to be where I was and it was just total contentment.” The second time (line 309), it was used as an adjective: “And then the second segment was feeling of loneliness even within the exhilarating environment.” In this case “exhilarant” describes the environment, but uses the word “loneliness” to describe her feeling. The reason for the loneliness seems to be explained in line 310: “The third one was when I thought I should have been talking more and engaging more…” Anna indicates she believes she should have been more engaged in the “exhilarant” environment, as “I was in Paris” and “I’ve been to Paris many many times” (lines 311 and 312). These lines could imply that, despite being in a positive environment, she recalls some regret related to not being more engaged. She then explains in line 313, “But
last summer I stayed in a studio, I worked for a company …” The language suggests that there were potentially more connections and meaning that could have been made if she had made different decisions.

It is interesting to note that the three perspectives (objective, subjective, potential) lead Anna to contemplate on various emotional aspects. She begins with a feeling of exhilaration, followed by loneliness, and then regret. Anna concludes, in line 315, “It was just so many emotions on that trip”. The significance is related to how she engaged in the experience and environment. As she states in the final line, “That was me.” Reflection of her experience in the foreign language country becomes very personal as she revisits the experience and considers it through different perspectives, which she then embodies. Due to Anna’s consideration of how she could have been more engaged in Paris, she may be more aware of her decisions the next time she is presented with a similar opportunity.

Thus, Sharing Memories indicates the PO[S]∞ practice of gestures and associated stories may provide opportunities for deeper contemplation that leads to transformation.

**Stanza 10: The Outsider.**

324 What was your memory? What was you?
325 Mexico City…
326 and I talked about when I was in middle school so I was younger.
328 Mine were –
329 I sat sitting down in the chair hiding when I was first there I was like so terrified
330 and didn’t speak Spanish.
331 So I was really shy.
332 And my second one, was when I learned Spanish I felt all confident,
333 and then the third one,
334 I put a quote on the last prompt, I remember
335 I asked my mom if I could dye my hair when I we were there,
336 because everyone notices the blondes –
337 the Americans -
338 so I wondered what would happen if I dyed my hair.
339 Would they still notice that I wasn’t from here. So that was like a huge thing.
340  Mine were like emotions and visual.

In Stanza 10: The Outsider, the practice of adjusting language and appearance to assimilate to a culture different from one’s own seems to be fundamental to the participant’s story. Madison’s social identity is of an earlier self in Mexico City: “and I talked about when I was in middle school so I was younger.” The word “mine” in line 328 (“Mine were –”) refers to the memory/personal experience that drove the story and gestures. Madison’s first two experiences focus on her internal emotions, triggered by her lack of a shared language and her outsider identity. This challenge is described in lines 329-330 as fear: “I sat sitting down in the chair hiding when I was first there I was like so terrified and didn’t / speak Spanish.” She follows this with “So I was really shy” (line 331) and “my second one, was when I learned Spanish I felt all confident” (332). Adjectives like “shy” and “confident” implicate engagement with others.

The third recollection references pieces of a conversation Madison had with her mother related to her appearance as an outsider. Her description here is slightly more detailed and focuses on appearance expectations, whereas the first two concentrate on the way language capabilities impacted her emotions toward herself. In lines 334-336, “I put a quote on the last prompt, I remember I asked my mom if I could dye my hair when I we / were there, / because everyone notices the blondes –”. The word “notices” is used in a way that indicates the locals of Mexico City would recognize her as an “outsider”. She says “everyone notices the blondes – the Americans” (lines 336-337). Her identity was clearly one of a recognizable American. She explains, “so I wondered what would happen if I dyed my hair” (line 338) and “would they still notice that I wasn’t from here” (line 339) and “So that was like a huge thing” (line 340). Through considering her
recollections, it seems Madison feels she needed to look like the people from that culture to be more comfortable. People notice others that look physically different, which may lead to a negative experience for the individual who looks different.

Overall, the first and third recollections are associated with feelings of not belonging due to language and appearance. The last sentence “mine were like emotions and visual” may reference the first two (emotions primarily) and visual may reference the last one (based on her outer appearance). The relevancy of the gestures and recollections in meaning-making/knowledge-forming may have implications for dialogue around cultural stereotypes, assimilation and fitting into other cultures, etc. For foreign language classrooms, the issue of confidence when learning a language may need to be addressed early in the learning process.

**Stanza 11: Performing My Story.**

418 How does it feel to perform your own story?
419 It brings you back. It takes you back
420 and how did it feel to perform her postures?
421 Kinda silly (laughter)
422 I thought it – I don’t know,
423 like I don’t know her entire story
424 but we can kind-of guess it a little bit

In *Performing My Story*, I am trying to understand the emotional experiences the participant felt during the Alleyways performance when performing her own memory. In line 418, “perform your own story” refers to the development of three postures based on a positive memory related to the country’s language they are teaching. “Perform” in this sense refers to the enactment/embodiment of the three postures they created or others’
postures that evolved from the reflection and writing activities. It also refers to how they incorporated the basic movements (walking, standing, running, sitting) that were emphasized in the Viewpoints warm-up with the three gestures. “Story” in this context refers to a memory the participant is recalling. In a way, it is an abbreviated story or abstracted story, because the individual has to decide on three postures that are significantly related to the memory. “Postures” in line 422 “how did it feel to perform her postures”) refer to bodily gestures or tableaus that the author creates, and include three bodily images.

In response to how it feels to perform her own story, Ella says, “It brings you back. It takes you back” (line 420). This may reference a return to the moment in time (including emotions, thoughts, etc.) as well as back to an earlier developmental stage. Ella doesn’t expand on how it felt to perform her story other than it shuttling her back in time for a moment. I then attempt to learn how she felt when performing another’s gestures. She responds, with laughter: “Kinda silly” (line 424). This perhaps refers to the randomness of the gestures due to her not knowing her story, which she mentions later, in line 427, “like I don’t know her entire story” followed by “but we can kind-of guess it a little bit.” She may have experienced she feelings related to curiosity. Learning aspects of the story may have provided meaning and understanding, which would have mitigated the “silly” feeling.

Through the current design of PO[S]∞, the participants are required to learn others’ postures, without questioning the meaning of the gestures. This could build suspense, but may also make the participants feel awkward (embarrassed, silly, etc.). They are doing the exercise without thought. In the first pilot, one participant said it was
easier to perform their story and was concerned about ‘getting it right’ when performing other’s gestures. Previously, Dr. Córdova suggested the observation layered with the naming/discussion immediately after could have positive learning implications.

Ella is an adult and currently a foreign language teacher. Her vocation, general age, and attendance in a foreign language methods class may suggest the activities are not developmentally appropriate. The other is depicted as an ordinary person, and although she knows this person, she still felt silly. By describing her emotions as “kind-of silly” when performing another’s postures due to not knowing the whole story, it may imply that having little to no narrative information or context to consider the physical actions is uncomfortable. It also may suggest that the awkwardness is due to performing random actions in front of an audience.

A majority of the lines in this stanza relate to sharing impressions about performing another’s memory. This could imply that the participant did not have a strong reaction to performing her own memory and/or did not feel comfortable discussing it. The performance of one’s own gestures evokes feelings of reminiscence. The performance of someone else’s gestures is something that could be further examined.

**Stanza 12: Audience-Performer Connections.**

485 (Alena) were you reading a map?
486 I thought it was very interesting how it was very contemplative
487 and there were a few moments when you guys were all in sync.
488
489 (Dr. Córdova) and I connected with that.
490 Immediately I had to run back into 1990 as
491 I was in a special collection reading a book by Fontana and struggling –
492 reading it all in German – just doing that and then feeling the –
493 how are we going to compete with these German speakers thing? I remember.
494 It just took me back to something like that.
In *Audience-Performer Connections*, integrated actions (the performed gestures of reading) by performers enables observers to draw upon personal experiences. This leads observers to infer meaning from the performed story, resulting in observer thinking and, in this case, giving language to the observer’s identity. In this stanza, Alena used the words “contemplative” and “in sync” when responding about performers’ stories. In line 485, Alena asked, “Were you reading a map?” and followed this immediately with her observations: “I thought it was very interesting how it was very contemplative / and there were a few moments when you guys were all in sync” (lines 486-487). The contemplative aspect of the performance evokes self-reflection in the observer. “Contemplative” in this context may be related to feelings of thoughtfulness within the observer during the alleyways performance. Contemplation may also be associated with unity of mind-body when considered through the lens of mindfulness; therefore, there could have been a sense of unity among the performers as they performed simultaneously. “In sync” in this stanza refers to the notion of harmony and unity. In addition, my use of the word “contemplative” may reveal my identity as one who is familiar with mindfulness and more attune to modes of self-awareness.

My observations are followed by Dr. Córdova saying, “and I connected with that” (line 489). This may imply that the contemplative/in sync aspect of alleyways created a meaning-making opportunity for the other observing students as well. In lines 490-493, he explains, “Immediately I had to run back into 1990 as I was in a special collection reading a book by / Fontana and struggling - / reading it all in German - / just doing that and then feeling the – “. In this stanza, Dr. Córdova reveals that he may have experienced a sense of struggle and other feelings related to insecurity during his initial exposure to
German language. He then shares the experience of thinking, “how are we going to compete with these German speakers’ thing? / I remember. / It just took me back to something like that” (493-494). Use of the concept “compete” may imply that Dr. Córdova holds certain models or stories true about German native speakers. It is possible that he experienced a sense of competition, challenge, and difficulty when thinking about the German culture.

The Audience-Performer Connections activity seems to illuminate and open thinking and conversation that relate to Big “D” Discourse. By watching the performers perform a set of movements that lead to thought about reading a map, Dr. Córdova is reminded of a personal experience of reading a book (reading being the action/activity) in Germany. His recollection evokes memories of feelings related to challenge and difficulty learning the German language. Ultimately, a few connections are being made in this activity. One is with me and the performers when I notice they were in-sync and this evoked contemplative feelings. Another is made when Dr. Córdova relates the performed gesture to his personal memory of the experience he had when encountering German language for the first time.

Stanza 13: Teacher-Student Connections.

523 (Ashley) For me, my memory was the first day of French I.
524 It was my first day of high school. It was my very first class.
525 And so like reading the text book – I was probably the only excited one in there.
526 But that was my “what-if”,
527 what if I hadn’t been so excited? Would I have stopped learning French after 2 years?
529 Or would French be as big a part of my life as it is now?
530
531 (Dr. Córdova) Interesting
532
533 (Ashley) And so now when I’m in a classroom,
534 I can kind-of see some students
that are like me, that are just so excited to be in French class and learning French.

One of the very first things I did this semester was I showed them these were French I kids, they didn’t understand very much if at all.

But they were some kids that were just like ‘o my gosh that was so cool listening to French.

And that was me.

And so I hope that they have that same memory as I do in French class.

*Teacher-Student Connections* illuminates a meaning-making/bonding experience between the teacher and students. This stanza arises from a PO[S]∞ writing exercise, possibly from the perspective of “what-if”. Ashley, a French teacher, reflects upon a memory: “For me, my memory was the first day of French I” (line 523). This leads her to share how she identifies with students who are excited about learning French, as she was in high school. She reflects, “I was probably the only excited one in there” (line 525) and “what if I hadn’t been so excited? / Would I have stopped learning French after 2 years? / Or would French be as big a part of my life as it is now?” (lines 527-529). Ashley was reminded of her excitement about learning French when observing the pleasure from her students as they watched the movie in French. In line 534-535, she says, “I can kind-of see some students that are like me” and in lines 540-541, she says, “And that was me. / And so I hope that they have that same memory as I do in French class”. She identifies with the students through her use of “me” and “I” (lines 525, 535, and 540). She indicates that she hopes they are “like” her in relation to their experience. She also sees herself in them – a younger self. One model Ashley may subscribe to is a belief in her ability to identify and predict her students’ interest in French when they behave similarly to her – or ways she perceives as similar.

In *Teacher-Student Connections*, Ashley describes an opening class activity where she is able to gauge students’ interests. This implies she may be able to gauge
students who are less interested and design learning opportunities around students of various levels of engagement. In line 538, she explains, “But they were some kids that were just like ‘o my gosh that was so cool listening to French’.” The use of “so cool” references her students’ initial impressions of how French sounded when they watched the movie with subtitles. Her use of the word cool, a slang word often used by middle and high-schoolers, possibly implies that the students genuinely enjoyed hearing it. The significance was given to her emotionally bonding or developing an empathy or interest in how her students feel about French because of her own experience. Due to a positive experience in French, she wants to foster and cultivate the same appreciation in her students. She was encouraged when she noticed students seemed to be very excited: “They are just so excited to be in French class and learning French” (line 535).

In this stanza, the teacher-student relationship is emphasized. In particular, the projection of positive aspects of Ashley and her experience onto her students may have positive implications for how she approaches teaching (in her attitude and assumptions, for example). This may have implications for other teachers as they share best practices that are related to student-teacher interaction. It also creates empathetic connections between teachers and students, which is of relevance to PO[S]∞.

**Stanza 14: Empathy Building Opportunities.**

584 (Dr. Córdova) I just wonder as educators
585 where you see aspects of those areas played out or not enough played out
586 in what we do in schools with kids?
587 How often do they have an opportunity to teach each other what they know?
588 How often do they perform for someone else in an empathic way
589 that let’s someone else be with that?
590 I just kind-of wonder about that.
591
592 (Charlotte) I think in general the performance on their behalf does not happen enough.
So for them to get up and even play Simon Says, at least my class would be completely in shock. If they play Simon Says, but actually moving around the classroom and maybe forming groups in different corners or getting more into this acting, I think there’s not enough of that.

*Empathy Building Opportunities* is about how empathetic performance both is and is not incorporated in current classrooms. Dr. Córdova, who trains educators, opens the stanza by stating, “I just wonder as educators / where you see aspects of those areas played out or not enough played out / in what we do in schools with kids?” (lines 584-586). The use of “I wonder” is an attempt to engage in an open conversation with the participants about how PO[S]∞, or elements of PO[S]∞, may be incorporated in schools. He posed a question to the group: “How often do they have an opportunity to teach each other what they know?” (line 587). Then he asks, more specifically: “How often do they perform for someone else in an empathic way / then lets someone else BE with that?” (lines 588-589). Dr. Córdova’s line of questioning emphasizes his desire to encourage the students to think about the current teaching practices and consider them from an empathetic perspective.

The participant, Charlotte, responds: “I think in general the performance on THEIR behalf does not happen enough” (line 592). “Performance” may refer to the physical embodiment that takes place in the classroom. This could also imply moving around the classroom versus sitting at desks. In line 593, Charlotte associates performance with the children’s game Simon Says, which is not a typical game played in classrooms: “So for them to get up and even play Simon Says”. Her reference to this game may relate to her profession with teaching children. If she were teaching a theater class, the word “performance” would perhaps relate to theater instead of play. In line 594,
she says, “at least my class would be completely in shock”. Her model image of a school classroom seems to be one that does not incorporate a lot of physical or theater- or play-like activities. Charlotte mentions that performance does not happen enough in the classroom again at the end of the stanza: “I think there’s not enough of that” (line 598). This is in reference to her statement about how “If they play Simon Says, but actually moving around the classroom / and maybe forming groups in different corners / or getting more into this ACTING – ” (lines 595-597).

*Empathy Building Opportunities* posits the question of how often students have an opportunity to perform their knowledge, experiences, and share themselves. The response is that the performing does not happen enough in classrooms. This is an implication that there may be missed opportunities due to students not incorporating performance (like PO[S]) into the class.

**Stanza 15: Lack of Student Awareness.**

642 (Ashley) so these were sophomores and juniors
643 and that goes to another comment that I wanted to make
644 was that I don’t think kids have that AWARENESS.
645 I don’t know about you guys – because you’re all at Ritenour right?
646
647 (Ella) yes
648
649 (Madison) Pattonville
650 (Ashley) Okay
651 So I don’t know about at your schools
652 but now the kids just kind-of come in and they listen.
653 My kids are pretty respectful.
654 They’ll do what I ask them to
655 but they’re not super into it for the most part.
656 Or they’re just like ‘okay, I can conjugate an ER verb’

The overall organization and sequence of meaning in *Lack of Student Awareness* suggests students may be deficient in a trait that is necessary for them to meaningfully
engage in aspects of PO[S]. This is followed by the intimation that students are respectful (for listening to orders), but concludes that there is a lack of interest among students. The stanza opens with Ashley stating about sophomores and juniors: “…I don’t think kids have that AWARENESS” (line 644). The word “awareness” is used in this context by Ashley when describing her students’ psychological state or trait. Saying that the “kids” may not have the “awareness” may suggest they have an underdeveloped sense of self or capability for establishing empathetic or genuine understanding of themselves and others. The word “awareness” is referenced in the post-workshop discussion and may likely be linked to notions of awareness related to mindfulness, mind-body connection, and/or an intra- and interpersonal awareness.

A model of a respectful high school classroom environment may appear to be one where the students do what the teacher asks. In lines 651-652, Ashley explains, “So I don’t know about at your schools / but now the kids just kind-of come in and they listen” and in lines 653-654 she says, “My kids are pretty respectful. / They’ll do what I ask them to”. However, Ashley also implies that displays of respect from students toward teachers do not indicate a genuine passion or interest from the students in learning foreign language: “but they’re not super into it for the most part” (line 655). This part of Ashley’s response indicates a potential model of learning that considers formalities such as fulfilling a requested task from the teacher and listening as insufficient ways to engage students. She provides an example of a classroom activity in foreign language that the students engage in: “Or they’re just like, ‘okay, I can conjugate an ER verb’” (line 656). Through the language used, the teacher’s role seems almost invisible aside from delivering classroom tasks, and the students’ identities seem to be disengaged from the
full learning experience. However, Ashley offers insight to potential deficiencies and opportunities for improving students’ wellbeing and learning experiences.

This stanza may illuminate debates in society that relate to the roles of teachers and the expectations they have for students. On a larger level, it may point out that the educational institutional systems reinforce behavioral norms that are conducive to authentic learning and responses from students. The conversation is relevant in this context because one of the goals of the research is to gain an understanding of how PO[S]∞ can be implemented in classrooms to generate more meaningful learning experiences and create authentic connections between students and teachers. The example of learning in a quasi-robotic way implies there may be a benefit to exploring different ways of teaching content.

**Stanza 16: Rehearsing Culture and Language.**

774  (Dr. Córdova) but it’s almost like,
775  the metaphor that comes to mind is almost like
776  someone gives you a pair of shoes to wear and you’re wearing them.
777  Then it’s kind-of awkward.
778  But they’ve never actually shown you the process they use to make those shoes
779  and why they fit a certain way and let you realize –
780  oh this is why it’s feeling this way –
781  so it’s empathy building
782  but in foreign language what it does is rehearsal.
783  It’s practicing (inaudible) and then performing it.
784  Which is interesting.

In *Rehearsing Culture and Language*, Dr. Córdova presents a model or image of a world that links embodiment and empathy. He compares Alleyways and shared memory gestures to the metaphor of walking in another’s shoes, suggesting that doing that will generate empathetic feelings. The stanza begins with: “but it’s almost like, / the metaphor that comes to mind is almost like / someone gives you a pair of shoes to wear and you’re
wearing them” (lines 774-776). This reference to the metaphor of walking in someone else’s shoes refers to striving to consider another’s perspective. He goes on to describe how wearing the shoes, while “kind-of awkward” (line 777), leads to learning “the process they use to make those shoes” (line 778) and “why they fit a certain way and let you realize -- / oh this is why it’s feeling this way – ” (lines 778-780). Dr. Córdova suggests this process is “empathy building” (line 781). Then in line 782, he says, “BUT in foreign language what it DOES is rehearsal”. “Rehearsal” in this context refers to a non-performance notion of performance. In foreign language, it references an enactment and naming (practicing vocabulary) in a foreign language classroom.

*Empathetic Connections Through Rehearsing Culture and Language* contains two areas of significance. Dr. Córdova begins with a reflection on the alleyways and frozen postures and points to opportunities for creating empathetic connections. The other area of significance is the potential use of PO[S]∞ for content connection in foreign language classrooms (lines 782-783). Dr. Córdova suggests the PO[S]∞ aspect of performing others’ gestures has the capacity to foster empathy. He also suggests the performed gesture component has potential usefulness to teaching and learning foreign language through “rehearsal”. Thus, there are potential connections that can be cultivated through the PO[S]∞ performance component that relate to empathy and learning content.

**Stanza 17: Getting to Know Each Other**

788 (Madison) I would wonder how to use it in the classroom
789 because if you do it in the beginning to get them to know each other
790 or if you do it at the end when they already know each other,
791 because you might get some more deeper answers.

In *Getting to Know Each Other*, the participant, Madison, may have a world view that assumes the amount of time needed for people to gain a comfort and openness with
Getting to Know Each Other concludes with line 791: “because you might get some more deeper answers”. Madison uses “deeper answers” in reference to the meaning-making and learning outcomes (not overly specific). “Answers” in this context may reference the individual stories that inspire the frozen postures. She references the dialogue generation that results from PO[S]∞ when she talks about the timing and its relation to attaining “deeper answers,” which could also be considered more meaningful conversation. Madison, in considering how the closeness and level of rapport influences the reception and activities of PO[S]∞, operates with the assumption that “deeper” answers are more valuable in a way. This could also be used as an icebreaker.

Contrastive Analysis

PO[S]∞ is structured within an interactive workshop format where participants engage in performance-based mindfulness activities, including the following: a body scan, writing from three perspectives, performance warm-up, and frozen postures. This research developed two different prototypes in two different settings. The two completed workshops included the same activities, and in each, a facilitator introduced participants to activities and offered guidance throughout. The differences between the two workshops may have affected the level of engagement among participants, as well as the
transformative impact of the experience upon them. In Figure 24, I list the differences between workshop one and workshop two (Figure 24).

Workshop one acquired participants through a non-traditional academic invitation—a flyer emphasizing mindfulness and creativity as it applied to potential participants’ practices. The wording of the invitation allowed for a broad interpretation of the term practice, ranging from interest to full-time vocation. It also presented the workshop as consisting of three main components: 1) guided visualization, 2) autobiographical writing, and 3) contemporary performance. Each element was followed with a statement emphasizing the role of imagination, exploring meaningful experiences, and using performance methods to “foster creativity and yield new insights”. The way PO[S]∞ was advertised may have influenced the type of participants that decided to participate in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workshop 1</th>
<th>Workshop 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Time: 6:30 – 8:30 pm</td>
<td>Time: 3:30 – 5:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 24. Overview of workshops.

Workshop one, a slightly longer workshop than the second one (by 1 hour), was a non-academic event that provided more time for introductions and the performance-based activities and dialogue throughout the experience. While the structure and cycles of activity remained the same across both events, the amount of time available to spend on each element influenced the facilitators’ and participants’ experiences. It may be worth noting the importance of considering context in regard to the introductions, duration of the performance warm-up, and the set-up for the Alleyway activities. For instance, non-arts practitioners or individuals who are not familiar with process-based or performance-based activities may benefit from a longer performance warm-up and explanation of Alleyways, including examples provided by the facilitator.

Another difference worth noting is the level of training the facilitator possessed. In workshop one, Jamie McKittrick guided the group through a series of gazes, slowly
introduced activities that emphasized an awareness of positive space, and ended with a synthesis of all activities as the group moved throughout the space. As she guided the participants through the warm-up, she offered prompts that engaged the participants in self-reflection and also a greater awareness of others and the space. In workshop two, the facilitator was less experienced as a teacher, which may have influenced the experience and outcome of the experience for participants. This difference is described further below.

Developing the frozen postures across workshops was similar except for differences in the verbal prompts. The frozen postures element lasted approximately 5 minutes in each workshop, and participants of both workshops were initially given 1 minute and 30 seconds to develop three postures based on their writing. In both workshops, two participants requested clarification of what was expected. In workshop one, Jamie explained using the term “interpretation”, whereas, in workshop two, I asked them to re-enact an “action”. In both workshops, facilitators let participants know the action could be as literal or abstract as they chose. The collaborative teaching and learning of frozen postures lasted approximately the same amount of time (3 to 4 minutes), and in both workshops, the facilitator offered them two minutes and 20 seconds to teach the postures only. In both workshops, participants went over the allotted time, which may be a consideration for future implementations of PO[S]. Also, during the second workshop, the pairs were unsure if they were supposed to share the actual experience with their partner. This may have indicated a lack of clear direction on the facilitator’s part and/or an interest in learning more about their collaborator’s story. During this time, Dr. Córdova also assisted and checked-in and enacted some of the gestures with the pair.
This is a consideration – the role of an assistant who has an established rapport with the group may offer additional clarification and ease when participants are unsure or uncomfortable during certain performance activities. In workshop one, Jamie was the main facilitator, while in workshop two, I facilitated with support from Dr. Córdova.

Regarding how the cycles of activities in workshop one engaged the participants versus workshop two, the setting may have influenced how the activities were received. In workshop one, the main area of the Ed Collabitat was a spacious and naturally-lit room which allowed for more performance space, more distance between participants during the writing exercise, and a view of nature. Alternatively, the second workshop offered about one-fourth of the space as workshop one, had no windows or view to the outside, and had lower ceilings. This required the participants to share writing spaces and use less space to move throughout the performance activities. Thus, compared to workshop one, the overall physical proximity among all individuals was tighter, which may have influenced a more intimate conversation and interaction among the group members.

In workshop two, I acquired participants through the assistance of Dr. Córdova. He arranged for the workshop to be offered during one of his foreign language graduate courses through the College of Education. The process for presenting the context and background of PO[S]∞ differed from workshop one. Instead of creating a flyer and attempting to reach a wider pool of participants, the five participants were already enrolled in his course. As he introduced me, he also provided context for his students by explaining my background as an artist and scholar. He additionally suggested they attempt to use the workshop as an opportunity to learn and/or generate new ideas and methods to connect students to foreign language content.
Another point of contrast between workshop one and workshop two is that in the second workshop, I implemented all activities, in less time, and with less experience as a teacher. While I have taught experiential, art-based workshops in gallery settings, my training in Viewpoints consisted of approximately four to five workshops with Jamie in Spring 2016. It was my first attempt at guiding a group of individuals through the Viewpoints and other theater-based activities (e.g., frozen postures). My newness as a facilitator and the shortened timeframe for the performance warm-up may not have prepared or engaged the second sample to the same degree as in workshop one. This most likely influenced the frozen postures and Alleyways performance activities. It may have also limited the level of rapport developed.

The writing prompts offered were essentially the same in workshops one and two, with the exception of asking the participants of the second workshop to recall an experience that related to the language or culture they were teaching. The exploration of three perspectives and duration (5 minutes for each point of view) remained the same. Another slight difference was that I asked workshop two participants to revisit each writing and circle a fragment or sentence they may want to explore later in the workshop. This approach was a slightly more directive one than in workshop one, where we asked individuals to recall any positive memory they wished to explore during the session. The written prompts may have significant influence on the meaning-making process because a majority of the method is a mental and physical engagement and reflection of participant’s writing.

The PO[S] approach requires and inspires reflection upon one’s own experiences, as well as others, to construct meaning, knowledge, and transformative
experiences together. Both workshops followed a similar format, incorporating the same activities, with slight differences in presentation and timing. In particular, introductions may have played an important role in establishing rapport between participants and facilitators, which may have also influenced the extent to which participants co-constructed meaning through the following activities.

The disparity of time spent on activities between the two workshops is significant. The introductions (workshop one: 15 minutes; workshop two: 6 minutes), performance warm-up (workshop one: 30 minutes; workshop two: 5 minutes), and Alleyways performance (workshop two: 35 minutes; workshop two: 6 minutes) were notably longer, which may have contributed to differing outcomes in meaning construction.

In workshop one, the initial introductions began with me introducing Dr. Córdova and Jamie McKittrick. The six participants then took turns introducing themselves by name, vocation, and the aspect that most interested them about PO[S]∞. The responses from participants revolved around personal and professional practices and/or interests in creativity, wellbeing (e.g., counseling), writing, the fine arts, and art education. By taking 15 minutes to introduce facilitators (Jamie and I) and Dr. Córdova, and learning about some overlapping interests as the participants shared their interests, we may have developed a rapport through discovering similar interests in creative processes and wellbeing. During the introductions, it was clear that my artistic practice and scholarly interests aligned with some of the participants’ experiences and preferences, which may have established positive affect or generated a feeling of familiarity that influenced the subsequent activities.
Overall, the Alleyways activity seemed to generate meaning and knowledge through inference and projection of one’s own meaningful experiences, which could be associated with the frozen postures being performed. Another meaningful layer could also relate to the observers noticing poignant moments that involved a graceful movement, simultaneous moves, and an overall aesthetic appreciation of the group enacting their interpretations in a shared space at the same time. The meaning being made could relate to themes such as unity and coherence, which are ideas that relate to psychological constructs found in Positive psychology literature.

In workshop two, Dr. Córdova had an established rapport as the students’ professor since the workshop was offered near the end of the Fall 2016 semester. Unlike in workshop one, Dr. Córdova took the lead in introducing my role and reason for implementing the second workshop in their class, and there were no formal introductions made by the students before the workshop. Instead, I met them briefly as they entered the classroom and signed the consent forms. In this context, the participants seemed to identify with their vocations as foreign language educators. I later learned that none of them had worked in theater-based performance methods. This may have influenced their view of me and created more distance between the group and I compared to workshop one.

Perhaps, in part, as a result of this change in rapport, meaning-making and knowledge generation occurred differently in workshop two. Additionally, the focus seemed to be more on collecting impressions that could be further explored in future research for K-12 foreign language classrooms. The information collected throughout the performance phase of the workshop was limited due to time constraints, whereas the
post-workshop discussion offered more of a rich analysis that included both personal impressions and potential ways to adapt POS for foreign language classrooms. In this sense, workshop two had a different intention that was communicated from the beginning and resulted in a different meaning-making and knowledge generation. The teacher-participants and Dr. Córdova were considering how PO[S]° could be used for meaning-making and knowledge generation for students and their teachers. While there was some dialogue about the participants’ memories, which was related to their chosen memory of an experience with the language they teach, much of the conversation and themes that emerged related to how aspects of PO[S]° could be adapted and implemented in the classroom to promote positive affect and meaningful connections between a students’ personal experience with content.

In PO[S]°, participants engage in activities that may activate different levels of awareness and engagement with others. While the opening mindfulness Body Scan aims to develop an intra-personal awareness, it may play a role in “opening” oneself to others. This might happen as a result of the individual focusing on controlling breath, tapping into energies within the body, and achieving a more balanced state. The writing exercise may also subtly influence later interaction and learning experiences because it takes the participant to a deeper level of self-reflection on a positive moment in their lives. In doing so, the individuals may experience an overall shift in mood, and a positive affect could lead them to being more open to engaging with others. The performance warm-up component explicitly asked participants to get used to transitioning focus and interaction (both psychologically and physically) within the group. This is the first activity that explicitly asked the group to interact and aim to learn from one another. We also invited
participants to learn from each other on a more abstract level by feeling their body in space moving with others.

The frozen postures activity calls on the individual to delve into his/her/their writing to generate the forms. It is unclear how the generation of forms would lead to engagement and learning from others; however, the short teach-back session where the group is split into smaller groups (e.g., pairs, trios) allows for interaction and knowledge generation. It is interesting to note that the current structure of PO[SELVE[S]∞ and its implementation offer a 2 to 3 minute timeframe to teach the bodily gestures to one another, without including any context around the story/memory that informed the frozen postures. Future research and workshop structures might experiment with incorporating aspects of sharing one another’s stories as the postures are taught to each other. This could provide an additional opportunity for interaction and learning within small groups.

The Alleyways performance activity may provide opportunities for learning to occur in multiple ways. As each participant takes turns performing others’ frozen postures, they may activate social-emotional competencies such as empathy, and positive psychological constructs such as curiosity about one another’s story. Similar to the frozen posture teach-back, the Alleyways activity could be adapted and extended to allow for more dialogue throughout the activity. This would invite the performing and observing group to learn more about one another’s personal experiences, potentially resulting in greater rapport with one another.

In workshop one, the duration of the performance warm-up and the Alleyways was significantly longer than in the second workshop. This allowed for more iterations and additional Viewpoints exercises adaptations for the performance warm-up segment.
It also gave more time for the facilitator, Jamie, to educate, guide, and moderate a dialogue among the group about each of their experiences throughout and after the activities (e.g., gaze shifting, finding “doorways”, etc.). This positioned group members to learn from one another. The facilitator asked each person to share his/her/their thoughts with the group and, based on the analyses, they experienced feelings of joy, emotional expression, play, and suggested moments of bonding as a result of participating in physical activity in the same space. Distance from each other, simultaneous movements such as walking together, and other moments were illuminated through participants’ responses. It seems certain activities led to meaning-making throughout the group, without incorporating language. The longer duration of the performance warm-up allowed for the participants to both engage physically (through Viewpoints activities) and dialogically (through facilitated discussions), which may have created additional opportunities for learning about oneself and others through a deeper reflection on their experiences.

The Alleyways performance component lasted a little longer in workshop one than in workshop two. Participants performed the memories for longer intervals, which may have been due to factors such as the room size being larger and a longer warm-up period. Meaning-making and learning occurred during the Alleyways experience in three or more potential ways. The most salient ways that occur to me include the simultaneous performance of another’s memory through one’s own interpretation. This also includes the performer’s peripheral or direct gaze at the other performers throughout the Alleyways activity. While it is difficult to assess exactly what type of content is being learned in the initial workshop, it seems apparent that there was meaning being made
through the examination of the facilitated dialogue by Jamie. She specifically asked for moments that resonated with both the observing and performing group.

In workshop two, the interaction and learning occurred in a different context, which influenced the participants’ experiences. Specifically, the time was compressed to meet classroom guidelines and the participants had already spent the semester working together. Furthermore, Dr. Córdova arranged for me to implement it as part of his curriculum—as a guest practitioner-researcher. This positioned the method differently than in workshop one. Instead of participants approaching the workshop from a purely exploratory perspective on their own accord, the workshop two sample was directed to be open but to also consider how to potentially implement aspects of PO[S]∞ in the foreign language classroom. Therefore, the meaning-making and learning occurred with the backdrop of a pedagogical stance.

The components that remained the same in terms of duration of implementation included the body scan, writing component, frozen postures, and collaborative teaching of postures. The duration of the performance warm-up and Alleyways was more of a differentiator. The meaning-making and learning may have been limited compared to workshop one because of the shortened performance warm-up. The participants transitioned from the writing component to the warm-up as usual; however, they did not experience as many iterations of gaze shifting and did not participate in finding positive space, doorways, or the same amount of reflective dialogue throughout and after the activity. This may have led to feelings of unease when I asked them to return to their writing to generate frozen postures. It may have also not prepared them as well to incorporate the basic movements with the postures during the Alleyways activity.
Overall, the performance warm-up seems to be an important element in preparing the participants to meaningfully engage throughout the performance phase of the method. The participants had more questions that asked for clarification around expectations for how and when to perform throughout the Alleyways. My role as a new performance facilitator incorporating Viewpoints for the first time may have also resulted in less reflective dialogue, direction, and smooth transitioning of the group throughout the performance activities and dialogue.

PO[S]∞ has the potential to foster greater self-awareness, understanding of others’ perspectives, and a connection with others (bonding) as an outcome of meaning-making and learning. The method activates reflection in a group setting, which may create an opportunity for co-constructed knowledge and meaningful engagement otherwise unavailable (e.g., in a classroom or other group setting). The exercises are designed to first generate a deeper level of self-reflection individually, which then may create a greater sense of openness and mindfulness toward others as participants become more relaxed, self-aware, and positive.

In workshop one, the facilitator incorporated Viewpoints to guide participants through the performance warm-up, enabling an honest dialogue during and after their experiences. During this time, participants were encouraged to share their full range of feelings associated with the experience. Because of the lengthy duration of the performance warm-up in workshop one, the dialogue, as well as the physical activities within close proximity to one another (and without language), promoted bonding and shared meaning.
In workshop two, less time was allotted for the activities and meaning-making, and its outcomes were related to pedagogy within foreign language classrooms. It is also notable to mention that the writing prompts were slightly different between workshops, where in workshop two, I asked participants to reflect on and write about an early experience in or related to the culture associated with the language they taught. Another element that was unique to the second workshop was that after the three writing perspectives were complete, participants were asked to circle a fragment or sentence from each writing that they would later refer to in order to help generate the frozen postures. The goal was to help the participants avoid becoming overwhelmed regarding which aspect of each writing to focus on, due to time constraints. It is possible that the bonding and positive emotions seen in Workshop 1 may also arise when the workshop two sample begin incorporating the PO[S]∞ approach in their foreign language classrooms.

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed the analytic findings from the second workshop. The sub-events that underwent the most rigorous analysis were Alleyways and the post-workshop discussion. The results of this workshop provide additional insight about the potential usefulness of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ for foreign language educators and classrooms. Based on the findings of workshop one, the approach creates opportunities for emotional connections and personal transformation. The data collected and analyzed from this workshop provided insights through a current foreign language teacher’s perspective. The analysis of the Alleyways activity suggests that the creation and performance of one’s gestures in relation to their foreign language offers opportunities for students and teachers to consider the role that culture plays in shaping their perceptions of themselves and
others. It also potentially increases critical thinking around how culture constructs their experience. Further, as observers watched others perform their stories, the gestures triggered personal contemplation on their experiences in their foreign language or cultural experiences. The post-workshop discussion suggests Poetics of the [Selves] creates empathetic connections between teachers and students, points to the deficiency of experiential, meaning-making opportunities in the classroom, and reveals the norms that are put forth by the institution of education (and therefore internalized by students and teachers. Additionally, Poetics of the [Selves] may also improve learning outcomes in students by creating ways to “rehearse” the language, therefore reaching another layer of meaning. In addition to potentially supplementing the typical classroom lesson plan, the approach may also be used to gain insight into classroom climate (i.e., overall mood, rapport, trust).

Aspects of interpretation included in the summary of chapter four may differ, as the analytic results of the first workshop allowed for the initial understanding of the theoretical framework of PO[S]. In this prototype, the prompts were tailored to attempt to address relevant aspects of the learner’s experience that could serve as the basis or starting point for integration into foreign language classrooms.

The format of this workshop was adjusted to fit within the timeframe of the graduate class. By shortening the performance warm-up and Alleyways activities, the reception and experience of PO[S] shifted. As a result of the performance warm-up being shortened, there was less time to introduce, engage, and assist the participants through the gaze-shifts, pedestrian movements, and other activities (Doorways, Gravity). As noted in the results of the first workshop, the participants engage in intra-and inter-
personal modes of performance during the warm-up. There was less time for the teacher to provide scaffolding to students. This, in turn, may have influenced how the individuals operated within their respective zones of proximal development.

According to Hammond and Gibbons (2005), “Learners are more likely to be successful when tasks are broken down into achievable parts”. One might view the performance warm-up as teaching the basic parts before putting the whole together - with the whole being the Alleyways. Thus, the learning and co-constructed knowledge that took place in the subsequent performance activities, as well as the Alleyways, participants may have had less time, therefore a higher likelihood of the learning process not being as effective. “(if) the instruction is too difficult, or pitched too high, the learner is likely either to be frustrated or tune out” (Hammond and Gibbons, 2005, p. 13).

In regards to scaffolding and the zone of proximal development, the student may have more success with new tasks when they are placed into routines and formats that are already familiar to him/her/them (Hammonds & Gibbons, 2005). When creating versions of PO[S]∞ for classrooms, it may improve the experience and teaching-learning processes if the teacher imports certain elements of PO[S]∞ into current practices and curriculum. Another aspect that relates to scaffolding and the ZPD is the significance of assessing current knowledge and skills to understand how best to introduce the components of PO[S]∞. For instance, students who are new to performance may benefit from a longer introduction and engagement of the performative activities.

The process of internalization (Vygotsky, 1978) is also relevant when considering the role of PO[S]∞ in the classroom. By students’ engagement in content, which is a positive experience in relation to a culture other than their own, they are provided with an
opportunity to connect with the language and foreign language subject matter in a more meaningful way. Mediating the personal and cultural experience into language, and then into performative means, creates opportunities for internalization to occur. As Moll (1990) points out, internalization occurs in a series of transformations that involve reconstructing an external activity that occurs internally; that first begins between two people and then occurs within the individual. Also, adaptation of PO[S]∞ for the classroom may experiment with integrating discussion, and dialogue to assist or scaffold the student to a deeper understanding.

Another implication for foreign language classroom is the cultural aspect that PO[S]∞ may address. By asking students to reflect on personal experiences that are related to the culture of the language they are teaching, we are asking them to locate themselves in a socio-cultural moment in time, and contemplate how their identity was shaped, and to explore that moment in time. Students would have an opportunity to perform, deconstruct, and reconstruct a meaningful moment in time that is linked to cultural context. Along similar lines, the individual and collective experience and the teaching of tolerance, compassion and empathy addresses universal values of humanity. In Figure 25, I show the data findings that, when interpreted through the a social-constructionist Vygotskian lens, offer insights and implications for learners and teachers in foreign language classrooms (see Figure 25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Event</th>
<th>Researcher comments</th>
<th>Vygotskian Constructs/Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Body scan | ● Focus on the individual  
● Intrapersonal focus  
● Emphasis on the present | ● Mind in society |
<p>| Writing   | ● Revisiting and restructuring the individual's memory with an emphasis on the cultural context, from past to present | ● Mind in society |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Facilitator prompts</th>
<th>Scaffolding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heightened intra-personal awareness and receptiveness from previous activity (body scan)</td>
<td>Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance warm-up</td>
<td>Activated intra- and inter-personal modes of engagement</td>
<td>Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator prompts</td>
<td>Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator moved throughout space with participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared individuals to engage in subsequent performance activities</td>
<td>Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen postures (a)</td>
<td>Transformed written texts to physical embodiment on an individual level</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supported engagement with cultural experiences through embodiment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator modeled activity</td>
<td>Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance warm-up prepared individuals to physically engage on an intra- and interpersonal level</td>
<td>Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frozen postures (b)</td>
<td>Performed one another memories</td>
<td>Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pairs and trios assisted each other</td>
<td>Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for teacher and learners to rehearse/practice the foreign language by asking them to name the performed actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance warm-up and frozen postures (a) prepared individuals to physically engage and share memories on an interpersonal level</td>
<td>Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleyways</td>
<td>Focus on collective</td>
<td>Mind in society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus on the interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity for teacher and learners to take turn describing the actions in the foreign language</td>
<td>Scaffolding and ZPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previous performance activities increased familiarity and ease of performing in front of others</td>
<td>Consequential progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration of pedestrian movements (walking, standing, running, stillness) to link the frozen postures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 25. Vygotskian implications for K-12 foreign language educators*

**Chapter 6: Discussion**

The research study reported in this dissertation involved the development and exploration of two prototypes of a transdisciplinary approach for the learning sciences.
This research drew from the fields of: (1) mindfulness, (2) positive psychology, and (3) contemporary performance. These areas formed the conceptual framework of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ which was developed into a workshop format and implemented in two different contexts. In addition to these domains of knowledge, sociocultural philosophy paired with epistemological and methodological perspectives from Interactional Ethnography informed the methodology of the study. The process of integrating these domains with the explanatory theories of sociocultural philosophy and discourse analysis supported the development, implementation, and assessment of two prototypes of Poetics of the [Selves]∞. From an Interactional Ethnographic perspective, “rich points” (Agar, 1994) identified and examined in the data records allowed for the construction of telling cases. Also, discourse analysis methods afforded the means for the exploration of language as a social practice. I examined the ways in which the discursive choices the participants produced contributed to the constitutive nature of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ in two enacted forms.

An Interactional Ethnographic approach “examines events in the moment and across events and contexts to embrace the cumulative consequential nature of the chains of learning events, interactions, and texts” (Bridges and Green, n.d.). Bridges and Green (n.d.) have argued that IE is not only an approach or method, but a powerful epistemology of sense-making from a dynamic exchange among the researcher, the data records, and the conceptual and methodological approaches developed and employed to guide the data analyses. I constructed a logic-in-use model to make visible the dynamic analytic procedures that Interactional Ethnographic perspective enabled me to take. Furthermore, the logic-of-inquiry enabled me to construct telling cases (Mitchell, 1984)
to make theoretical inferences about Poetics of the [Selves]∞. A logic-of-inquiry model situates the dynamic process of data analysis as a reflexive human activity. The reflexive data analysis involved a generative cycle of observing, interpreting and sense-making. Additionally, central questions that guide Interactional Ethnography as an epistemological perspective attend to and account for the role that linguistic or discursive phenomena play in the co-construction of what came to count as Poetics of the [Selves]∞. Gee (2011c) argues that, “in language, there are important connections among saying (informing), doing (action), and being (identity)” (p. 2). Hence, the analysis of language illuminates how people discursively co-construct social worlds, and communicate and interpret meanings, in and through situated social practices. In this study, as discussed in chapter three, I employed the use Gee’s theoretical devices and building tasks (Gee, 2011c).

Additionally, I incorporated a logic-of-inquiry approach to the data analysis coupled with Gee’s discourse analysis methods in answering a set of research questions. I began this research with the guiding question: What is Poetics of the [Selves]∞, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base? In workshop one, the initial questions I asked in my logic-of-inquiry approach included: What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞? In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning? What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves]∞ enable in the participants? In the analysis of the telling case for workshop two, I asked the same questions with an additional inquiry: What are potential applications of PO[S]∞ in foreign language
classrooms? In this chapter, I will discuss my interpretations, limitations, and future directions for research.

**Research Question 1: What is Poetics of the [Selves]$^\infty$, and what is its epistemological and pedagogical base?**

PO[S]$^\infty$ serves as an epistemological and pedagogical tool. The approach invites the participants to draw on their lived experiences to provide the entry point for critical reflection. The epistemological dimensions of PO[S]$^\infty$ involve self-study through contemplation on one’s actions and thoughts around personal experiences. The pedagogical base of PO[S]$^\infty$ engages the teacher and students in a sequence of teaching and learning activities that foster social-emotional competencies and content connections.

The category of learning theories that PO[S]$^\infty$ could be associated with is known as experiential learning (Beard, 2010; Kolb, 1984). In summary, experiential learning is a tradition of education that values process-based learning. The term process-based as it relates to PO[S]$^\infty$ involves mindfulness, writing, and contemporary performance activities. Experiential learning as activated in the pedagogical method of PO[S]$^\infty$ relates to the epistemological tradition of interpretivism, which suggests that knowledge is not uniform or identical between individuals. Instead, it is created at the level of the individual and exists in many structured interpretations (“UCD Dublin,” n.d.). PO[S]$^\infty$ enacts this theory through an activity that emphasizes exploration of a participant’s positive memory by engaging them in a guided written reflection from three perspectives. This demonstrates the notion of multifarious knowledge and acknowledges that an experience holds more than one meaning or truth. Interpretivism suggests that reason extends the foundation of understanding by considering the accessible information and
constructing a personal interpretation (“UCD Dublin,” n.d.). This characteristic also aligns with the PO[S]∞ approach by engaging participants in a learning activity. Moreover, interpretivist epistemology emphasizes a personal interpretation and suggests truth depends on the knower’s frame of reference. It is not necessarily concerned about whether knowledge is true in the absolute sense (“UCD Dublin,” n.d.). The PO[S]∞ approach is aligned with these ideas and was constructed to encourage participants to acknowledge multiple truths and realities within their own lives and with others. They have an opportunity to explore three perspectives, with one explicitly asking them to consider the event from an entirely different point of view (i.e., “what-if” perspective). Additionally, the collaborative teaching of the frozen postures in small groups and the Alleyways performance allow participants to embody others’ stories. In this respect, others’ stories through the lens of interpretivist epistemology can be considered others’ “truths”.

As discussed in chapter two, the nature of PO[S]∞ emphasizes a process-based approach to learning and proposes that knowledge is generated through transformative experience. However, the analyses of PO[S]∞ presented in this research are also related to a feminist pedagogical framework. A feminist pedagogy is a theory about teaching and learning processes that engage the individual in a continuous reflective process that enables us to engage with others to address and potentially dismantle destructive hatreds such as sexism, racism, and classism (Shrewsbury, 1987).

The analyses revealed that when individuals engaged in practices that fostered a contemplative mental state, they tended to become more curious about others’ experiences. By opening the enacted prototype of PO[S]∞ opened with an individual-
based mindfulness method such as the body scan, participants may have a greater chance of increasing self-awareness. The reflective written exercise may enable the classroom to become a transformative site that helps students reconnect with their past while envisioning a positive future. The collaborative teaching and learning of one another’s stories through physical embodiment enables individuals to build upon their personal experience and to also consider thinking about one’s own and the other’s experience in different modes. More specifically, the method seems to align with Shrewsbury’s (1987) perspective of a feminist pedagogical framework. She suggests that critical thinking is a reflective process rooted in everyday experiences. It requires that we reveal assumptions through continuous questioning as we explore diverse experiences (Shrewsbury, 1987).

Additionally, PO[S]∞ shares characteristics with Bryon’s (2018) notions of an active aesthetic. Similar to an active aesthetic, PO[S]∞ is a pedagogical approach that sees synergies instead of conflict between scientific or other disciplinary modes and values a concentration on each discipline for its knowledge. Bryon (2018) calls this accumulative process of gathering knowledge and meaning “an activity of knowledging” (p. 18).

Moreover, the notion of emergence, a term found in the human and physical science is also relevant to PO[S]∞. The act of knowledging and emergence focus on the collective properties that arise from the properties of its part (Bryon, 2018). In this case, the disciplines of mindfulness, psychology, and performance may be considered three different systems.

**Research Question 2: What is the structure of Poetics of the [Selves]∞ and in what ways do its cycles of activity engage the participants?**
The logic-of-inquiry approach to data analysis revealed how the cycles of activities engaged participants and led to the development of meaning-making. The structure of the approach allowed the individual to consider their lived experience as the foundation, which then influences how one contemplates and engages with others to generate new intra- and interpersonal knowledge. More specifically, it revealed patterns of activity and meaning as a result of the participant engaging in the sequence of activities. Throughout PO[S]∞, individuals participated in a variety of activities that activated different modes of engagement, teaching, and learning.

The structure of the approach may be broken into two stages: non-performative and performative. In this context, performative refers to activities that physically engage an individual on a solo or collaborative level. The first stage includes the body scan and writing activity, and the subsequent activities are considered “performative” and comprise the second stage. There are six cycles of activity in PO[S]∞: 1) body scan, 2) autobiographical writing, 3) performance warm-up, 4) frozen postures (a), 5) frozen postures (b), and 6) Alleyways. Each cycle of activity mentally and/or physically engages the participant in a different way. It is also notable that the sequence and implementation of all activities influenced the participants’ experience.

The non-performative stage of PO[S]∞ includes the body scan and autobiographical writing activities. The body scan allowed the individuals to relax and connect with their mental and physical state through a mindfulness method. The writing activity asked them to interpret a positive experience from a mental recollection into language. The participant “authored” their experience from an objective, subjective, and “what-if” perspective. The autobiographical writing permits the participant to reflect on
how they engaged in their lived experience. It also operationalizes philosophical ideas related to denying there is one absolute truth. As a result of the participants authoring from different perspectives, one of which is “potentials/what-ifs”, they acquired new self-knowledge by thinking through different scenarios. The analysis revealed that writing from a perspective that allowed for unmaterialized outcomes led to transformational contemplation of one’s actions. Future studies may examine the influential role of extending the duration of the opening mindfulness method to assess how it impacts the recollection and writing process.

The performative stage of the approach included the performance warm-up, frozen postures (a, b), and Alleyways. The performance warm-up led to participants experiencing a range emotions and thoughts. Feelings of exhilaration, relief, and joy were encountered as participants engaged in physical movement and exercises throughout the space. Sometimes participants also experienced fear of not understanding or trusting the physical movements and flow of bodies throughout the space. Ultimately, this cycle of activity elicited positive affect from participants and encouraged somatic trust within participants and throughout the group. The transition from the solo non-performative cycles of activity to a performative, group mode of engagement during the performance warm-up seemed to provide the group with an opportunity to become aware of their present thoughts and feelings. Future research could potentially examine how the sequence of cycles influenced one another. In this study, the participants alternated and activated different modes of attention. Each cycle of activity activated awareness slightly differently through differences in levels of engagement (solo/collaborative), the nature of engagement (non-performative/performative), and time perspective (present/past/future).
The body scan engaged the participant on a solo, non-performative basis that brought their attention to present physical, mental, and emotional sensations. The autobiographical writing exercise engaged participants on a solo, non-performative level. However, unlike the opening activity, participants focused their attention on recalling a past experience. The performance warm-up aimed to increase an awareness of the present similar to the opening mindfulness method; however, this cycle of activity was collaborative and performative. As participants engaged in time and space, and interacted in various ways with one another, they experienced a range of emotions associated with positive affect (e.g., joy, play) and some concerns with imposing on others’ personal space.

The frozen postures (a) cycle of activity was solo, performative, and challenged them to generate an embodied, present form that was drawn from their past experience. This seemed to pose some confusion and hesitation in participants, and future studies could examine this pedagogical element in greater depth. A majority of participants physically recreated a literal moment from their memory for two of the three postures that were linked to the objective and subjective perspective writings. The third posture assumed a more thematic and abstract (e.g., “wonder”) approach when participants generated an embodied form linked to their “what-if” writing. In this study, the “what-if” perspective seemed to generate the most dialogue and critical thinking that potentially lead to positive self-transformation in participants. The reflective autobiographical writing exercise positioned the participant as an observer of their own actions, which resulted in the activation of an inner awareness which enabled them to view their lives and selves in a new way.
The frozen postures (b) was collaborative, performative, and focused on creating connections from the past to the present as participants imported the embodied forms linked to a memory into present time. The partners and trios experienced feelings of curiosity and developed rapport as they alternated in teaching and learning each group member’s frozen postures.

The Alleyways activity was collaborative, performative, and imported the past experiences into the present. However, the nature of this cycle of activity differed from frozen postures (b). Although both shared certain characteristics, in Alleyways, participants incorporated the basic physical movements (e.g., walking, standing, sitting, stillness) to link the three frozen postures for each group member. This seemed to allow the co-authorship of one’s story because the participant decided when and how to incorporate the basic movements to link another’s three frozen postures. Furthermore, the simultaneous performance of each pair or trio’s stories allowed for the co-authorship to multiply across the performing group. In other words, each performing participant was actually performing the co-constructed version of one’s story. Therefore, one could say that six stories emerged from the initial point of the individual’s experience. Another notable aspect of this cycle of activity involves the dynamics between the performing group and the observing group. In this study, this activity seemed to engage the entire group in three ways. First, the performing group felt a sense of unity due to sharing the experience of performing for an audience. The performing participants also learned about certain self-imposed limitations related to levels of interacting with their partners. Second, the observing group seemed to experience aesthetic pleasure as a result of the simultaneous performance of one’s memory. They “audience” also seemed to enjoy
speculating what the story might be, which spurred a discussion among the entire group, that led to both the performing group and observing group to sharing their stories. Another element that fostered a sharing of stories occurred when observing individuals would point out times and gestures that resonated with them and led to them guessing what the individuals was enacting.

Research Question 3: In what ways do the practices of Poetics of the [Selves]\(\circ\) afford participants the opportunity to co-construct meaning, and what is the nature of this meaning?

PO[S]\(\circ\) creates opportunities for participants to co-construct meaning on intra- and interpersonal levels. The term *co-construction* may be defined as, "the joint creation of a form, interpretation, stance, action, activity, identity, institution, skill, ideology, emotion, or other culturally meaningful reality" (Jacoby & Ochs, 1995, p. 171).

Moreover, co-construction includes interactional process, coordination, collaboration, and cooperation (Jacoby and Ochs, 1995). In this research, I suggest that each component of PO[S]\(\circ\) has an interactional nature, on an individual and/or collaborative level. Lev Vygotsky, an influential scholar in social-constructionist theory, emphasized the role of oral language in co-constructing thought (Vygotsky, 1962). Similarly, in PO[S]\(\circ\), I propose that performance is a form of language. Following, Vygotsky’s line of thought, I believe that performance-based activities may contribute to the development of thought and meaning. He also believed that the co-construction of intra- and interpersonal knowledge was mediated by cultural artifacts (Vygotsky, 1987). I consider the recollection of a personal experience a sort of cultural artifact that allows for mediation and learning to occur on an intra- and interpersonal level.
First, the body scan presents an opportunity to engage participants in the act of “reading” their body. In other words, participants are offered prompts by the facilitator that ask them to become aware of the physical and mental sensations that exist within their body. In this activity, I consider the body a type of artifact that has the ability to be read and engaged with in a way that allows participants to co-construct intra-personal knowledge. The interaction between the individual’s mental processes and bodily sensation, coupled with the prompts offered by the facilitator, may result in a meaning-making experience for the individual where they emerge with additional insights and knowledge about their present state of being.

The remaining activities in PO[S]∞, draw from each person’s recollection of a personal experience. Following the body scan, the individuals are asked to write about a life event from three different perspectives. Along similar lines, the participants activate mental and physical processes that revolve around their recollection of a personal experience. In this case, the co-construction of meaning and knowledge develop as a result of the participant considering different points of view as they recall the subjective, objective, and potential aspects of their experience. The interactions in this activity also occur on the individual level; however, the writing activity engages their minds in the recollection of a memory instead of explicitly cultivating an awareness of the present-moment. Vygotsky (1978) underlined the dialectical nature of learning and argued that development was a dynamic activity that occurs in a socio-, cultural- and historical context. In the writing activity, the dialectical and dynamic exchange occur within the individual through a reflection on their identity and experience at a moment in time. The co-construction of meaning is a result of the individual recalling their memory, which is
in itself a reflection of the construction of the self that developed in a socio-, cultural-, and historical context.

In the performative stage of PO[S]^∞, participants engage in solo and collaborative performance. Thus far, the cultural artifacts that mediate the co-construction of knowledge and meaning include the body and the three autobiographical writing pieces. The remaining pedagogical components co-construct knowledge through performative activities. These include the performance warm-up, frozen postures (a, b), and Alleyways.

The performance warm-up co-constructed meaning by having participants physically interact with each other in present space and time. This activity also generated meaning through verbal prompts given by the facilitator, as well as the dialogue that occurred throughout the activity. The nature of meaning that was constructed during this pedagogical activity was collaborative, performative and emphasized the present moment. As the facilitator and the participants moved throughout the space together, they engaged in a series of gaze shifts and other physically interactive movements. The co-construction of meaning in this activity occurred within the individuals as they became aware of their physical behavior via interaction with the other participants. Participants were asked to become aware of themselves and others as they moved throughout the space. The nature of this knowledge seemed to be dynamic and enlightening, as participants’ emotions and their decisions revealed themselves in a more direct way throughout this stage.

The co-construction of meaning also occurred as the facilitator guided the dialogue and moved throughout the space with the participants. Throughout the performance activities, the teacher asked the individuals for impressions, thoughts, and
feelings that they encountered throughout the different activities during the performance warm-up. The dialogue revealed that participants discovered unnecessary assumptions and fears that limited their engagement with other participants.

In the frozen postures (a) component, the participants experienced a dialogic exchange within themselves that required them to decide how to generate a physical enactment that was inspired or associated from their written reflections. As the group recalled and sometimes read their written recollections, they made choices on how they wanted to enact certain aspects of the essence of each perspective. This activity allowed for the co-construction of knowledge and meaning to occur on the individual-level; however, artifacts that mediated meaning during this activity included the written reflections. In this case the nature of the co-constructed knowledge was somatic due to participants having to physically embody aspects of their autobiographical writing.

The collaborative frozen postures (b) activity co-constructed meaning by allowing participants to witness their “story” being performed by another individual, as well as in learning and performing another’s story. In this research, the frozen postures serve as a proxy for a story. The co-construction of knowledge in frozen postures (b) was collaborative in nature, as the group was split into pairs and trios. The co-constructed meaning that was generated was also somatic, as the participants were directed to focus on teaching the physical enactments to their partners without discussing the story.

The findings of this study suggest that frozen postures (b) fostered curiosity and empathy in participants. Through working together to teach and learn an individual’s story without learning the background, participants were required to be receptive and willing to participate in the re-performance of another’s story. The frozen postures (b)
activity required them to alternate their positions as teachers and learners. Participants had to accept someone else requesting that they physically perform a gesture without understanding the context or “sub-text”.

In the Alleyways activity, the co-construction of knowledge and meaning arose out of multiple levels of mediation. The performing group engaged with the observing group, which allowed for personal insights to occur as a result of being watched and performing in front of others. The members of the performing group arrived at meaning and knowledge through their personal engagement with each of the somatic cultural artifacts (i.e., frozen postures). The simultaneous performance of a member’s three frozen postures required each group member to decide when and how they wanted to tell the story. Between frozen postures, each performing participant had to make a personal decision on how to incorporate the basic physical movements that were rehearsed during the performance warm-up (walking, standing, stillness, running). The co-construction of meaning and knowledge occurred out of each performer transforming each person’s three frozen postures into a “story” through the integration of walking, sitting, standing, running, and stillness. The nature of this meaning might be described as selfless, transformative and insightful, and aesthetically-minded. By extending the act of walking in someone else’s shoes, the feeling of empathy may be reinforced. The findings suggest that PO[S]\textsuperscript{∞} may activate self-stories that can be shared that generate new meaning and knowledge (Byron, 2018).

Mindfully observing the performing group’s individual identities enacting the same story created an opportunity to become aware of the universality of affect, despite physical differences. The aesthetic and psychological juxtaposition seemed to elicit
feelings associated with awe. As the performing group enacted each member’s story, the observing group noticed similarities and differences among the performing group. The notable differences included the performer’s physical appearance and how each one decided to incorporate the walking, standing, stillness, and sitting into the performance. Another observed difference included the timing and duration that each performer engaged in the postures and “linking” actions (i.e., walking, standing, stillness, and sitting). There were also similarities that included moments when performers enacted the same the frozen posture at the same moment from a different point in the respective Alleyway. During those times, the observers seemed to experience a fulfilling aesthetic moment, potentially due to the “coherence” among different bodies. The repetition, familiarity, and ease in which the frozen postures were linked also provided a sense of rhythm, which may have elicited contemplative feelings.

In addition to differences and similarities, the observers were also reminded of personal experiences. The notion of middle-space (Bryon, 2018) seems to be demonstrated during Alleyways. The type of knowledge that transpires in the observing participant is a result of watching another’s knowledge performed and can be considered dialogic. The co-construction of this knowledge began with the performer’s enactment, which was then inferred from the observer, and illuminated and mined for additional meaning through the facilitation of discussion. During the Alleyways activity, the observers also associated certain gestures with positive behavior. The Alleyways activity could allow for participants to discover others’ world views, assumptions, etc. by their interpretations. In this case, PO[S] allowed for the identification, thus, reinforcement of
a gesture associated with generosity. Additional research could assess how PO[S]® may spur constructive discussion related to character and values.

The co-construction of meaning that led to empathetic responses occurred as a result of performing someone else’s story. Participants felt that it was easier to perform their own story, but when they performed another’s story, they felt compelled to perform it to the best of their ability. The desire to tell another’s story in a respectful and true way may indicate that participants developed care and compassion for their partners. The idea of an audience may have also raised energy levels, which impacted the participants’ yearning to provide a high-quality performance of another’s story. As Stanley (2012a) noted, engaging in practices that increase mindfulness may promote feelings of concern and empathy for others.

**Research Question 4: What consequential outcomes for meaning-making and learning does Poetics of the [Selves]® enable in the participants?**

This approach teaches participants a systematic and fluid approach to acquire more meaning and knowledge about their life experiences. Through activating different types of awareness, contemplation, and embodiment in a sequential manner, participants may achieve greater insight that influences positive self-transformation. Moreover, by exploring a personal experience from different perspectives and modes (e.g., non/performative), individuals create new knowledges that are somewhat unpredictable. These new knowledges enable additional self-learning in participants.

The performance warm-up created an opportunity for participants to bring an awareness and sensitivity to their internal states during the body scan, critically reflect on a life experience from three perspectives in the writing activity, and engage in
performance that aimed to increase internal awareness of their psychological states, embrace them, and to engage in basic physical movement (e.g., walking, running, stillness) and activities (e.g., Doorways, Gravity). The discourse suggests that the performance warm-up enables the participants to reconnect in a light-hearted, and childlike or playful way, and it also evoked emotions that included crying and laughter. This implies there may be potential outcomes and learning from the performance warm-up that involve some sort-of nourishment and “break” from the stress of work or school concerns. The activity may provide insight into the individual in a way that makes them realize they are very stressed and/or would benefit from taking time out to take care of themselves.

In the writing activity of PO[S]^∞, potential outcomes for meaning-making and learning relate to the critical reflection of possible outcomes impacting how they engage in the present and future. It may also create opportunities for individuals to become more aware of their behaviors, thus impacting how they engage in the present and future events. The third writing prompt explored alternative outcomes and encouraged participants to reflect and write about the unknowns or possibilities of their experience. It also prompted the participant to think about what she could have done differently that may have led to positive outcomes.

PO[S]^∞ also has implications for intrapersonal meaning-making and learning that relate to cultural stereotypes and how the participant handles assimilating into another culture. In this study, analyses suggest that topics around assimilation into the dominant culture and feelings of alienation emerged throughout the cultural written prompts of the second workshop. The relevancy of the gestures and recollections in meaning-making or
knowledge-forming may have implications for dialogue around cultural stereotypes, assimilation, and fitting into other cultures, etc. For foreign language classrooms, the issue of confidence when learning a language may need to be addressed early in the learning process.

PO[S]$^\infty$ also creates opportunities for intra-personal growth and learning to occur, because PO[S]$^\infty$ reveals certain internalized fears and limitations to participants. During the performance warm-up, there were times when participants expressed fear and concern around physically sharing the same space with others. The performance warm-up may illuminate potential connections with strangers that are neglected due to assumptions and insecurities related to imposing on others’ space. Additional research could implement a pre- and post-workshop evaluation to see if PO[S]$^\infty$ mitigates harmful mental assumptions and self-doubt. Similarly, PO[S]$^\infty$ may illuminate how society’s social norms influence self-perceptions and influence how individuals approach others. This study reinforces the fact that personal assumptions and biases may lead to avoidance of others.

**Limitations of This Study**

While an Interactional Ethnographic approach applied to the learning sciences examines *how* people learn, in addition to the situated nature of the discursive co-construction of meaning-making that unfolds in learning environments, two workshops did not provide adequate data to realize how PO[S]$^\infty$ functions in generalizable and scaled-out contexts. My theoretical curiosity resulted in me creating a transdisciplinary approach for learning. Despite having limited formal training in mindfulness and Viewpoints, I incorporate principles and methods from both fields. Another limitation of this study involved my limited teaching experience of mindfulness methods and
Viewpoint practices. Due to having limited training in Viewpoints, it was challenging to smoothly transition the participants to the performance warm-up. An additional drawback included having less time to acclimate participants to the performance stage of \text{PO[S]} in the second workshop. This was due to \text{PO[S]} being offered in a college classroom which had a shorter time-frame unlike the first workshop. Last, the time limitations for this study prevented me from conducting further analyses on how the verbal prompts influenced the reception of each pedagogical component.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This research presented the theoretical framework for a transdisciplinary, pedagogical approach for the learning sciences. Due to time limitations, two prototypes were developed and tested in two different settings. My goal for this research was to spur critical thought around how the approach can expand current educational theory and practices. I am a practitioner and also a theorist. This initial research on \text{PO[S]} does not intend to provide a standardized curriculum for educators. However, I attempted to conceptually develop a model that has valuable implications for public education.

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2002), a comprehensive educational policy in the United States, made it more challenging to incorporate creative and critical thinking in the classroom by instituting standardized testing (Dee & Jacob, 2010). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (2015) is a more recent version of NCLB (2002). Pedagogical approaches that emphasize the whole child and value their personal experience may be reactivated to combat destructive society issues and the high-stakes practices associated with NCLB. This research argues for an explicit understanding of the value of active knowledge construction that values the individual experience of every
student. Poetics of the [Selves]∞ is an approach that generates knowledge through intentional and reflexive retrospection of our past experiences. It aims to do this through a series of pedagogical steps that ultimately intend to leads to foster a intra- and interpersonal awareness. This, in turn, improves prosocial behavior.

Educational institutions, including public K-12 schools, colleges, and universities, have an obligation and responsibility to educate the whole individual and prepare them to live an ethical and virtuous life, in addition to their professional studies. There is little research that merges the theories and practices of mindfulness, psychology, and performance to develop an approach to explore the ontology of the self and its pedagogical implications for K-12 classrooms. I wanted to broaden the foundation of teaching and learning processes by incorporating practices that originated in the areas of contemporary performance, mindfulness, and positive psychology.

In educational settings, teachers might consider PO[S]∞ as a stand-alone approach to meaning and knowledge generation, or may benefit from contemplating and experimenting with certain components of the approach. Some questions that practitioners could ask include:

- When you begin a class, where and how do you provide opportunities for students to engage in an activity that encourages them to become aware of physical and emotional sensations?

- When you attempt connect students’ previous experience and knowledge, when and how do you invite them to tap into their memories?
When introducing a new concept, how might you encourage students to draw from moments in their life where they have exhibited character strengths such as grit and perseverance?

How do you engage learners by providing opportunities to demonstrate their conceptual understanding in a physical form?

Additional prototypes of this approach that are tailored to offer transformational thinking around various topics (e.g., academic subjects, character strengths) might want to consider consulting scholars in specified areas in a planning workshop. In the preliminary planning of future prototypes, attention should be given to the wording of the written prompts, as the writing serves as a critical point of reflection that manifests in different modes throughout PO[S]°. Moreover, the facilitator(s) will implement the mindfulness and performance activities more effectively if they have formal training and an on-going practice in mindfulness and Viewpoints. If the educator(s) are unfamiliar with mindfulness and Viewpoints practices, they may want to seek assistance from seasoned practitioners to ensure proper implementation of the methods and practices of each area.

Future research might experiment with different verbal prompts that are offered for the autobiographical writing exercise. In this research, the verbal prompts aligned with practices associated with savoring and content connections. Additional prototypes could develop verbal prompts and questions that focus on a different aspect of their life experience. The writing prompts can potentially be tailored to promote a critical reflection on any topic the individual has experience in his/her/their life.
The theoretical framework could be finalized into a series of workshops or curricula that may be implemented in additional settings. These settings might include unconventional settings (e.g., art galleries) and conventional learning settings (e.g., classroom). Based on the results of this research, PO[S]∞ has a likely chance of creating meaningful learning connections between the participant and content, providing a valuable pedagogical “tool” for educators from a variety of fields not limited to the arts or language. Additional research could also explore how shifting the duration of the components influences the meaning-making process and learning outcomes for participants. In addition to presenting opportunities for PO[S]∞ to potentially bolster teaching and learning processes, the approach may also be considered through the lens of critical theory (e.g., Foucault), which investigates the reproduction of dominance in society.

PO[S]∞ is an active aesthetic (Bryon, 2018) that creates opportunities for people to actively explore thoughtful insights as one engages with disciplinary boundaries to develop knowledge and complexity. The theoretical framework and pedagogical elements may provide an approach that leads individuals to positive self-transformation due to critical and active reflections on the self. Moreover, through a process that requires one to reflect on their actions and to also consider others’ life experiences, it operationalizes an ‘epistemological pluralism’ (Healy, 2003, 2004) as it may potentially reconceptualize knowledge and reconfigure the power relations within it. In other words, this approach is an active process that illuminates and reveals the dynamic, constructive, and embodied aspects of knowledge. Throughout the process of making knowledge construction visible,
participants may also understand how perceptions are created and dissolved throughout a multi-layered and multi-modal process of reflecting on their lived experience.

Future research of the Poetics of the [Selves]® should continue the exploration of how this transdisciplinary pedagogical approach may be used to foster positive psychological wellbeing and to create meaningful learning connections to classroom content. Additional research could potentially examine various adaptations of the approach that alter the pedagogical activities. For example, the performance-based activities (i.e., warm-up, frozen posture activities, and Alleyways) could occur for longer amounts of time. Another adaptation of Poetics of the [Selves]® could involve experimenting with different verbal prompts during the autobiographical writing exercise to explore how they influence the subsequent activities and affect the participant’s overall experience. The role of discussion throughout the implementation of Poetics of the [Selves]® could also be more closely examined to learn how the timing and nature of the discussion influence psychological transformation in the participants. Moreover, another prototype could be implemented and assessed in a variety of contexts beyond the classroom. For instance, clinical populations including trauma victims, individuals battling depression, or populations suffering from a lack of empathy and compassion may benefit from engaging in Poetics of the [Selves]®. Future research could also experiment with different research methodologies that integrate quantitative assessments that examine specific psychological constructs associated with positive psychology (e.g., creativity, gratitude, hope).

This approach attempts to address and integrate individual subjectivity into learning practices to foster psychological wellbeing. The overarching goal of Poetics of
the [Selves]$^{\infty}$ is to activate greater awareness within the individual. By providing a transdisciplinary pedagogical and epistemological approach that fosters meaning-making and knowledge generation, individuals may arrive at new insights and knowledge that allow them to view their selves and life in new ways.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent Form

Research Study Title: POETICS OF THE SELF

Purpose of the Study: To discover how an experiential art method that involves memory, writing, and performance influences participants’ sense of self and potentially improves psychological wellbeing.

The information participants share include:

- Written responses generated during the workshop and general comments after the workshop
- Audio-visual material
- Interviews

Benefits of this Study: By participating in this study participants discover how involvement in an interdisciplinary method influences one’s ideas of self (e.g., self-concept, identity) and potentially influences one’s psychological wellbeing.

Confidentiality: If participants do not want to participate in the study, they do not have to participate in the interview and their participation will not be included in data analysis. Being in this study is up to you, and no one will be upset if you don’t want to participate or if you change your mind later and want to stop. I will do everything to protect your privacy and your data will be stored to protect your confidentiality. I will store the data in a password-protected computer, and permanently delete it in 3 years. Your identity will not be directly revealed in any publication or presentation that may result from this study. I will use the data to
draw conclusions about the impact of the method. I will publish the findings in my dissertation and potentially peer-reviewed journals.

Contact information: Participants can ask any questions that you have about the study. If individuals have a question later they did not think of now, participants can call me at (314) 779-4680. If participants agree to participate in this study, they can still disagree about sharing the data (video documentation and writings). Then I will not use the data.
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Body Scan Prompts

Sit with your back straight but not stiff, with both feet on the floor, and your hands comfortably in your lap.

Close your eyes if that’s comfortable for you.

Listen to and follow my instructions as best as you can. Try to stay awake and alert.

Remember to breathe completely and let the breath flow freely into and out of the body.

When you notice your mind wandering, as it will, gently bring it back to focus on the instructions.

Now become aware of your belly rising as the breath moves into your body and falling as the breath moves out of your body...not controlling the breath in any way, just letting it find its own rhythm,

...feeling your body sink deeper into the chair/mat on each out-breath.

And now on the next in-breath, direct your attention all the way down through your body to the soles of both feet.

...becoming aware of your toes, the arches of your feet, the place where the heels meet the floor,

...noticing any feelings in your feet, imagining that you can breathe right into your feet: first into your right foot and now breathing into
your left foot,...and on each out-breath, letting go of any tiredness, any
tension, right from the soles of both feet.

[pause]

Now gathering up your attention, moving it away from the feet, and
focusing your attention on your legs,

...notice any feelings in your legs, being aware of the skin, the bones,
the muscles,

...perhaps the pulsation of circulation,

...perhaps warmth or coolness.

Now, notice the contact your legs make with the chair/mat, allowing
your attention to explore any feelings in this part of your body.

And on the next in-breath, use your attention to direct your breath all
the way down your entire leg, and next, breathe down your entire
right leg.

Now, direct the breath down both legs, breathing in relaxation and
breathing out any tiredness, any tension.

Remember that whenever you find your mind wandering, just let go of
the thoughts as gently as you can, and come back to focus your
attention once again on your body.

[pause]

So now move your full attention to your lower back...just observing
any feelings in this part of your body...
...perhaps tightness...perhaps tingling...aching...any feelings at all. And allow your attention to move slowly up your back...
...all the way up your spine...so that each vertebra...aware of the muscles...aware of the skin on your back...
...aware of the contact with the chair/mat...And on the next breath, breathing into the whole back area...
...allowing the muscles to ease and release with each breath...letting go of any tiredness or fatigue...and breathing openness and relaxation into the entire back.

[pause]

Moving your attention to your belly,
...feel the movement of the abdomen as it rises and falls with each breath...and take a deep breath in...allowing the abdomen to really expand on the in-breath...and then release, breathing out, and noticing the feeling of the abdomen deflating

[pause]

Moving your attention up to the chest area...be aware of the heart, the lungs...aware of the movement of the chest, perhaps aware of the heart beating.

Breathe into the chest and abdomen, breathing in new energy and letting go of any tiredness or tension.

[pause]
Now gathering your attention again and focusing it on both arms and hands, let your attention come to rest on the fingertips of both hands... aware of sensations of tingling and air touching the fingertips, possibly feeling moisture of dryness...awareness of the sides of the fingers...the knuckles...the palms of the hands...the tops of the hands.

[pause]

Now move your attention up to your arms, allowing it to settle on your shoulders...notice the muscles here, really exploring any sensations in the shoulders... perhaps burning...tightness...tension...heaviness...or lightness. Just breathe deeply into the shoulders...releasing any concerns and allowing your shoulders to completely soften...

[pause]

Next draw your attention to your head area. Notice any feelings at the top of your head...your forehead...your eyes...your nose...your cheeks and mouth...your jaw...your neck...

As best you can, notice any and all feelings in this area of your face and head...Then letting the next breath fill this entire region of your body...

Breathe in new energy and relaxation...breathe out any tightness, any tension...any fatigue

[pause]
Now opening up your awareness...see if you can feel your breath
moving easily through your whole body as you lie here...noticing how
the breath moves freely and easily from your feet to the top of your
head. [pause]

As we conclude this practice, be fully aware of your body as a whole:
complete, strong, at ease...
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Workshop One: Writing Prompts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Writing Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>-recall a positive experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-could be any moment throughout your life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-duration of event is irrelevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-jot down any notes or impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-sensory information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-concrete aspects of the experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-what it looks like in your memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjective</strong></td>
<td>-feelings that you and/or others experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-any emotional associations with the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imaginative</strong></td>
<td>-imagination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-any questions you have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-any what-if moments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

**Workshop One: Interview Questions**

- Please describe the memory you decided to explore.
- What did or didn’t you enjoy about the writing exercise?
- Were the writing prompts clear and easy to respond to? Did certain prompts elicit more of a response than others? Which ones?
- Please explain how you felt about using performance methods to explore your writing.
- What aspects of the performance component did you like the most and least?
- Please share any insights, questions, or concerns this experience raised for you that relate to self-awareness of who you are today and any new understandings of who you are.
Appendix E

Workshop One: Transcript

Alena: I invite you to recall a positive experience. It can be any moment in your life. It could be one second, it could have been a year, it doesn’t really matter – just something that resonates with you. And for the first 5 minutes, I would like you to jot down anything that comes to mind. Try not to judge yourself. I will let you know when the 5 minutes is up. With this exercise it is about the objective things – so any sensory information, concrete things that you notice about the experience. We’re not necessarily focusing on our feelings at this moment. Just what it looks like in your memory.

In the next 30 seconds or so, try to finish up your last thought or your last sentence.

Okay, so this time we’re going to have about 5 minutes to write from another perspective. This perspective is the subjective, so the feelings that you experienced or the other experienced. Any type of emotional things that you can recall that are associated with the memory. Okay, let’s try to wrap up in the next few seconds and we’ll move onto the last perspective in writing. Now for the last 5 minutes I’d like you to ask yourself to consider an interesting point of view. It’s the point of view where you have possibilities out there, you have questions about this experience – maybe what ifs. It could be something as simple as the time, the person, the space, the lighting, the temperature, it could be anything. So, this will be the last 5 minutes and then we’ll transition into performance. For the next 15 to 30 seconds, try to write any final closing thoughts or anything really that you would like to put on the paper and then we’re going to transition to Jamie. And you can just leave your paper and pencils wherever they are.
Jamie: How is everyone? Is everyone ready to get and start moving a little?
yea – come on up ….we’re just going to jump right in - and we’re just going to start by – let’s map the space that we’re working in. So, if you just want to walk with me, we’re just going to – you can just see how we have this awesome square naturally from the way that we pushed the furniture back. So let’s just say that this is kind-of the area that we are working in. I will always allow you to break the rules if it is the best thing that you have to do in that moment – I feel that begging forgiveness is better than asking permission.
Yea – so this is the space that we’re going to work in. So let’s start just for yourself. Just walking through the space. This is just for you. Just walking. It’s a way for you to check-in. You’ve been able to now check-in in stillness….noticing how your breath is right now. You don’t have to change it, you don’t have to judge it, you don’t have to do anything about it. Just notice it. Is it coming in low and deep. Is it coming in above your belly button? In your ribcage? Is it coming in your chest? Is it maybe only making it to your throat? Again, you don’t have to change anything. Notice what your internal meter is like today. Are you moving slow? Are you moving fast? Again, you don’t have to change it. Just notice it. This is internal focus. For yourself. Good – and let’s go ahead and bring our eyes up and hit the other end of the spectrum and be more social. We are just going to keep walking….so that’s where we actually see each other – we are in the space together. We have some direct looking, and we can see each other and we’re normal people, we’re not weirdo performers walking through space. I think that can sometimes happen – we can – Hello! we can actually see each other. It’s direct looking, it’s a social thing. It’s a very different way of being together. Social – direct looking. Not
internal right? Okay, let’s go back to internal – just feel what that difference is. Just continue to walk, but now we’re back in that internal state. Feeling what has changed from being in your social life…. And bring it back up to social, direct looking. Notice if you prefer one over the other. It doesn’t mean anything, just notice and back to internal and, direct looking. Now continue walking for yourself. This is just like the base. This is the drone underneath the walk for yourself. But find a place in the middle where you’re not making any kind-of direct eye contact – it’s a little softer, but it isn’t internal – it kinds of leans to a 360 over and around your attention. Where you know where everything is. But you don’t look directly at it. Where you can feel your self moving through the space. Within the world of performance training that I come from, we call it soft focus and…. If you’ve heard of that before see if you can let go of any past assumptions about what that might mean. Can you really actually ask yourself again what this means to have some sort of sensing of 360? Of being in the space with everyone? If you haven’t done it before - awesome – what do you think that means? That in-between space? Great and let’s go back to direct looking and internal and soft focus – the middle space and try peripheral looking. So you are looking directly at things but out of the corners of your eyes. Just feel the difference between that and soft focus. That’s a different type of focus, a different sort of attention. So peripheral vision. Can you start by trying to keep one person in the room. The same person in the room in your peripheral vision as you walk through the space. How about 2? How about 3? 4? Try 4? Let’s see Yea, and really try…. and let that go back to soft focus. It’s a different attention…. Soft focus… 360…. Internal – let’s find internal
So we have these different types of eye foci to play with here. We have direct looking, internal focus, soft focus, and a peripheral vision. And they are now available for you to play with as we continue walking through the space. And as you use these different types of focus see if you can notice the solid space, or the positive space – where we are right now – we are mostly bodies right? And the negative space or the empty space…. Begin to look for the empty space between the bodies. We’re gonna just call them doorways for right now – doorways, windows – if you (inaudible) … through as many doorways as possible…. Can you find the doorways? …. At any point you can move back into stillness. The question of when starts to come up. When do I walk? When do I stop? …. And it’s already starting to happen. For how long? For how long will I walk? For how long I will stand? That is something that you can play with. And it already starting to happen? How near and how far? How close can I get? And one of my mentors-teachers – says think of it like a puppy touch – when puppies run in a group together they can stay close to each other without knocking anyone over – they run in herds – it’s an offer to come closer. You have to wait to hear the person accept before coming close. Can you find the puppy touch of near? as you explore how close and how far, continue to listen to the others in the space. And asking yourself now, where does space need me? When does space need me? For how long. And as you’re moving through space, notice there is gravity at work here…and your body has weight to it, that gravity works on. Walking is just a series of falls and catches. That’s how we learn to walk – that’s why we fall down all the time. It’s a series of falls and catches. We begin to remember what that was. So when you move you’re allowed to let gravity to work on you and create a momentum You can always come back to (inaudible). You can always come back to (inaudible).
You can always come back to (inaudible). They’re all there for you.

: laughin’ then I want to cry.

Jamie: Within the Viewpoints practice basically it’s taking the phenomenon of performance and events that happen and deconstructing it. So we have space, we have time, those are the two things we’ve primarily worked with. We have shape, our bodies just do shape in general. We have kinesthetic response right? Which is (inaudible). And then we have emotion – which comes up, and then we have story – like not necessarily narrative. I mean stories as a series of images or sounds. Now we will come to stillness and from this place, using direct looking I want you to find the next place that you want to move… the next place that needs you to be there. Now from this stillness place, I’m going to count 3-2-1. When I get to 1 you’re going to go right to that place, and you’ll have 3 seconds to get there – I’ll say 1-2-3. Great – and then we’ll do it again. So, find your place. 3-2-1 go 1-2-3. Again look directly – 3-2-1 go … 1-2-3

I’m going to say 3-2-1 when I get to 1 you’re not going to know where you end up -3-2-1 1-2-3- again, again, again (holds the 2) 3. You start to allow yourself to be influenced by others. … 3-2-1 go…1---2---3. Now find your spot. 3-2-1 go. 1-2-3 stop….Now when I say 3-2-1 you don’t know where you’re going to end up. So… 3-2-1 go, 1---222—3. See where we are? Again, 3-2-1, 1-2-3. 3-2-1, 1-2-3. 3-2-1, 1-2-3. Okay, take a look around, seeing where we are. You start to allow yourself to be influenced by others. If someone’s doing something that you want to do – go ahead and do it. If someone goes somewhere that looks like somewhere you want to go – go ahead and do it. It’s all available to us.
We have running, walking, standing. All of the different ways of focusing our attention with our eyes. Positive and negative space. For how long? When?

And in about 20 seconds we will find a way to end together, but make sure it’s the ending you want. Make sure it’s where you think you should be. So, tell me about any experiences you had… you start, you can start wherever.

P6: It was weird…

Jamie: Yea – tell me about that. Why?

P6: I think it took me back to my childhood. It’s like being able to kind-of just let-go…. It’s kind-of like a playful [inaudible]… it’s not very heavy or – I’m in class a lot and we talk about a lot of heavy stuff – so I guess we just kind-of had an opportunity to just walk around, kind-of play – we were walking through the positive and negative spaces, we were doing the thing out of the corner of our eyes. (inaudible) – kind-of like kids, like play-around … so I think that’s where the laughter came from ---- I don’t know – I almost wanted to cry too

Jamie: Yea

P6: So maybe the missing being able to do that. Kind of like a reality – like you need to get back to the back –

Jamie: Yea - …. Laughter and crying are very close to each other. I think, in my experience… yea, yea, yea, yea….. What else happened? Are there any moments in there that you can recall?

P5: I remember going up and getting really close to P2 and having our arms touch and then P2 smiling and giggling and then moving away – so that’s about it.
Jamie: uhh.. and so can you remember any moments

(inaudible)

Jamie: Yea…can you describe objectively what it – like ‘we walked together’

P5: Very powerful (referencing P2) –

Jamie: yea… how close was she?

P5: (inaudible)

Jamie: Yea, hmmm-mmm, yea, yea… other moments like that?

P6: fear of colliding…we were kind-of walking around we were hesitant like we didn’t want to get in your way. Even though it was free – there were still those mental

(inaudible)

Jamie: Sure… did you run into anyone? Nooo, did anyone run into anyone? No, we’re pretty smart – our bodies are real smart so like – even thinking about internal focus, when I think things would be more likely to collide they still don’t… So, yea, but I understand that. Totally – yes – I understand that. You guys are all really smart - For real – that’s like an amazing thing to not run into each other. We had to fit in the space together. And nobody collided. And to be honest in doing this work usually people don’t… anything else?

(inaudible)

Jamie: Yea

P2: I really liked (inaudible) – motions with her hands toward her eyes and out toward the space.

Jamie: Yea
Jamie: Yea, so that’s a good thing to bring up. So like then, within this work my offer is – how do we deal with what is actually happening. And how do we live in this present moment? So for you, it sounds like you were uncomfortable with the rate at which I was moving. Now for me, today – that’s where my internal thought, my internal mirror was there. Ya know? So if I am doing what I’m trying to offer here – that’s just how I was moving, but you have the opportunity to – just like – you can always choose to tune it out – that’s totally an option – Let’s tune this out. But what I would also offer – this practice – Viewpoints is a practice of saying yes. And it doesn’t mean doing all the things that everyone else is doing. Even that’s not necessarily being on the same page. But to say – yes – that is (inaudible) is happening right now and maybe what I need to do is to move more slowly and to the periphery – maybe what I need to do is find stillness but we are still in relation to each other…. It’s about coherence. It’s about relation. Yea… Yea.

Jamie: and what an awesome experience to have to begin to look at those two minds, right? The minds of doing – where we’re doing the things – walking, standing, running. And that mind that is noticing (motioning with her hand above her head) that we are walking, running, standing (giggles) and noticing all the other things going on.

P2: inaudible

Jamie: Not at this point, at this point it can be taught – so that’s shape. Things we start to talk about. How (twists her arms downward and interlocks finger – emulating a participant’s body language during the warm-up) this is a shape. Right? And this is also a practice in which all is equal – there’s no like – saying this is one thing to be privileged over the other. It’s about noticing what is happening. Then through noticing and practicing together we can then make effective choices. For example, for you – you might
be like ‘I am interested in this’ (Jamie clamps her hands emphasizing the shape). Then we have the opportunity to play with shape. Or maybe you’re more interested in having a more open stance (widens her arms and takes a step back). What if we all walk around with our arms open? But that could come from the internal focus. Maybe – so I’m trying to create a space where we can meet each other exactly where we are. And begin working from there. So that’s exactly the right thing that we could actually progress to. Which we will soon.

P5: There was so much walking that I didn’t know what to do with my (swings her arms).

Jamie: Sure! What you did was exactly the right thing… and that’s like -

P5: inaudible (moving around)

Jamie: And there is space for that. There is space for that discomfort. And that will happen sometimes. And sometimes it will be kind of like doodoledooo and sometimes it will be like I have to be somewhere in this area. Or sometimes, it will be like (inaudible, moving her arms) jump and… dance, and do all these things at once. But it’s all available.

P2: (inaudible) so if it’s shape – then what are we calling it? (inaudible)

Jamie: Here’s the thing (Jamie cups her hands around her mouth and says) It’s all always happening. It’s all always happening. But what we just did, what I would say is that we’re working in space, right? It’s a way – we start in space. By just walking we don’t have to worry about where our arms go. I’m not asking you to repeat a very particular thing. Then it becomes about repeating a very particular thing – putting on the body that I am demonstrating right? Whereas if we’re just walking – we all know how to walk in here. We all know how to come to stillness. Yea?
So we have that as a base, now what we’re able to do is to begin to experience and notice the space that is happening around us. The empty space between the body. The positive space of the bodies. What are the boundaries? May I push those boundaries? I saw a bunch of you pushing those – yea – awesome. How can I push those boundaries? What is that circle over there (pointing) so that now hopefully having a base line of simple movement, pedestrian movement, we are then able to explore some other things that we haven’t necessarily thought about before. And the same thing with eye focus, right? Just a different way to notice what our habits are. Are we someone that’s pretty direct all the time? That we don’t take enough time internally? We start to practice what that is – can we feel that 360? Can we notice that there is a difference – for me – I’m doing a lot of training of performance – sometimes there confusion over soft focus and peripheral vision. Okay? And all of a sudden soft focus becomes really hard and directed (giggles). So yea? We’re swimmin’ in that stream. This is the stream we’re swimming in. So yea, that is not a bad or weird experience to have. I’ve HAD that experience where I’m like I have arms (giggle and moves arms), I am walking, what is this. But, then, for me – it’s about the next question. So… and then what (moves arms and giggles)?

Jamie: so I want to move into Alleyways. Which is just another container – like walking was a container for us just like the other stuff – this is just now a spatial container so we can start to explore shape. And we’re going to do that – Jamie begins moving the rolling partitions.
And I want you to actually think back – and Alena I’m going to JUMP – okay? Right to the postures – just so you know for your notes. See you haven’t forgotten your positive memories? What I would like you to do is take a moment for yourself, find your own space, and I want you to just take like a minute to recall for yourself. And when your recalling… can you recall images that pop up for you very specifically? Okay? Yea – so go ahead and take like a minute – do you need to sit, do you need to walk – however memory works for you. Now in 2 minutes and 20 seconds can you come up with 3 postures or three frozen images or three statues… however it will help you think about – that represent portions of that memory – so for me when I was working with Alena earlier – my positive memory was like – this moment when I realized ‘Oh – I want to be a dancer and performer and I was like 3 at Disney World – and I ended up (inaudible) motioned funnily and dance impersonating someone at Disney World saying they’re going to make a song for her… so when I think of that, I have the IMAGE – I was really into the drummer – I was – I continued to point at him what I was up there… and then there was a lot of butt wiggling – so I had this – and then when I finished I took a big bow because why not (giggles) and this (extends arms upward and outward above her head) –so – I have these 3 images – so this is what I mean by frozen postures. Yea? Take some time – for you! And I would say probably doing them for yourself will help you find them. You have 1 minute left.. go ahead and come to an end. Does everybody have their 3 statues or images? Great, Yes?

P4: I got two I think

Jamie: you got two?
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P4: Still trying to find a 3rd

Jamie: Do you need more time?

P4: It will come to me – I hope so

Jamie: I’m going to put you in partners – so maybe your partner can help you too.

Alright great?

So can you (talking to group) partner up and their will be one trio. No?

P2: I can’t – I can’t do it….

Jamie: Oh… okay. Alright. That’s fine…. So a partnership and a trio. So what I’d love for you to do, is I would love for you to teach to your fellow collaborators or your other collaborator – Your postures. So you’re going to teach them that – so they can perform them back to you. So I’m going to give you --- what do you think? Another 2 minutes and 20 seconds to do that? To teach it?

Jamie: and if you need more time I’ll give you more – and then maybe Debra can help you brainstorm. (giggles) that’s allowed…so great? Cool? Go ahead – get crackin…. so what I would like to do now is (inaudible) walks towards partitions – so again, this is just a container, this is a place so that I don’t have to worry about while I’m working. Where am I allowed to be?! Where am I supposed to be? It’s really clear (giggles) My container is from here to here (as she walks from one wall to the other) and all the way to this table (walks down alleyway) Okay? Yea? Cool (nodding) And everything that’s in it is what is available. And when we have a trio we’ll go on the outside and I’ll pull up another one. So we’re going to start and it’s going to be like 2 minutes each – we’re going to start by working together okay? Working together in pairs or in trios… and then P(n/a) do you want to (inaudible) you’re welcome to join them – okay.
So then what we’re going to do – using running, walking, standing, you already know that right? You know how to run. You know how to walk. You know how to stand. You can sit if you want to (nodding) – okay? If you want to sit you’re allowed to sit. So we have running-walking- standing. And then… which one wants to go first? Who wants to be brave and go first? You can go? (trio) okay, great…We’re going to choose – everyone is going to get a chance. Which story are we going with? So, what I mean by that is whose gestures – that’s all we’re using. Yea? We’ll go with P3?

So now, we have those 3 gestures running, walking, standing, and sitting. Okay? So, you can use them however you want. So let’s go find our spot – so find your alleyway.

P6: So all of us have an alley?

Jamie: yep – so come on over – so we’re going to be well wisher audience members and come sit over here so we can see. Right? We’re going to actually get to see what happens.

So – can you do me a favor (sitting on a chair and motioning to the trio toward herself) – I just want you to walk down what your personal space is – yea yea good – so you can learn – yea – yea! Great… Feel what it is to be this close to us – yea… good – awesome – so that’s your space. And in that space I would offer you to just start with the walking, and standing. Let’s start with walking. Okay, and now look everywhere that’s available to you: is the walking, the standing, the stillness, sitting? And then the three different gestures that were P3. And you can do any of these things whenever you want.

P5: When do we stop?

Jamie: When you’re ready to stop you can – right? Great! Beautiful.
Did you guys see anything was there anything that stuck out to you? Any moments that you saw and you were like oh.

P4: The third gesture was kind-of remarkable.

Jamie: Yea. Can you – describe it objectively? Like what did it look like?

P4: Like a giving? I don’t know

Jamie: Yea – I love that – so sometimes – yea – I just want to figure out subjective versus objective – so that’s like a beautiful subjective – sometimes I think by doing that we can find our way to the objective. And I’m just asking for objective because then we can get on the same language and then we can learn – so the ‘giving gesture’ (reperforms it) – yea totally the giving gesture. So if you were to describe the – it would be so my right hand is out straight

P4: hmm-mmm

Jamie: My hand is open but kind-of curved at the wrist and my left hand is closer to my chest and my arm is bent and my palm is face up and open. And I bend down and I’m looking – I don’t know where they were looking – I didn’t catch that - so like – yes I would agree with that. There was kind-of this awesome moment – where P3 you were down here doing this (then runs over to P6’ alley) and You were doing THIS. Then Gretchen (P5) you were right here doing this. I was like OHOHH – that little moment – that was just something that I remember. Anything else that you remember?

P1: The openhanded gesture (inaudible)

Jamie: yea– it’s super generous. Super generous to do that – absolutely yea. Great how was it for you guys?

P6: It was weird
Jamie: tell me why I don’t know – why was it weird?

P6: It was like, because I’m knowing that nobody else but us know what we’re doing. I think that that made it even weirder. Because for me it’s like – I kind-of want to express it the best way that I can – because for some reason I want you to understand it the way that P3 meant it. So I think that just being on display like this, then I’m trying to put on this show, I want to project (or perfect?) your story (to P3). You know, I don’t know.

Jamie: Those gaps in communication. Exist. Yea, and then how do we acknowledge that they’re there…. How do we close those gaps – do we want to close them? When do we want to close them? Would it be useful to widen those gaps? Those are all really wonderful thing to (inaudible) Does that make sense? Like?

P6: Hmm hmmm (nods yes)

Jamie: asking P5 – I think you were right knowing it was over? How did you KNOW? Because that’s part of what this is? How do we know the when? How do we come to an agreement? How did you know?

P5: I felt like if we would have kept doing it that it would have lost its power.

Jamie: Yea…You get that sense you get that little impulse inside of you where you’re like – the moment has passed. Right? So how do you begin to cultivate that? (inaudible) so you can all do it together? or so that (inaudible)

P5: I also didn’t like that we didn’t get to interact. I guess we were but – it would have been nice to at least look at each other. I guess we could have…

Jamie: yea – you could have! Yea - so the only thing you have to do is –

P5: stay in (motioning to alley)
Jamie: yea – yea-yea – exactly - so maybe the next time you do this you can experiment with that – yea – it’s those limitations that we put on ourselves – right? We’re like they’re the rules – wait a minute – are those the rules? Anything else? Great

Jamie: Next artist/person? Yea? If you need a moment to recall and again, take from what you did – this is something – like we continue to build on. If there’s something you have a question about – ask it by doing it. And it might not work the way you want it to. You can always start again. You are always allowed to do that – ‘well that didn’t work’

P6: Do we have to do it in order?

Jamie: no you don’t have to…. this is perfect now –

Jamie: now you could choose to do it in order – that’s something you could decide compositionally but you don’t have to do it right now – unless you want to. … beautiful

Jamie: sure – I’m going to pause right there – did you feel that end (asking P3). Did you guys see that ending? Yea – so again we’re beginning to find our way – you’re like a felt that all the way down there – and then you’re like did I feel that?

P6: It was easier when it was my story.

Jamie: Interesting.

P6: something about it – I don’t know – it was just easier.

Jamie: Sure – you don’t have to answer that but sure (inaudible) (Looking at P5) did you make eye contact?

P5: I did but she didn’t see me

Jamie: sure and that’s not nothing

P3: And I did too but she didn’t see me
Jamie: What did you guys see? Any moments that you saw that stuck out to you? Now I’m going to ask about story. And what made you think of that?

p4: (inaudible) the crying and the holding

Jamie: sure- sure awesome yea – how about you – what type of – and it might be totally different.

P1: I got the impression that (inaudible) – like the first time in heels or something like that –

Jamie: uh-huh… I didn’t know what she was holding – at first she had kind-of cradled it but (inaudible) a baby… an object – and then everyone got very emotional and wiped their tears – because it went from teetering from being happy to sad (inaudible) – I wasn’t quite sure what happened between that. And then I assumed it happened someway to the way they were being cradled. So we’re already kind-of making these subjective connections on what’s happening and it’s like yea –there’s potential in there – so now we’re like feeding back in (inaudible) awesome – how can I move even closer to what I’m after? Or – awesome, I like [video recording ends].
Appendix F

**Workshop Two: Writing Prompts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Writing Prompts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>- environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sensations, smells, shapes, colors, aspects of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- jot notes, thoughts, impressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>- feelings you experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- overall social-emotional climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- any subjective elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>- possibilities or potentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- if you could return to that moment in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- what aspect of the experience would be intrigued by?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Workshop Two: Transcript

Ralph: She’s developed a particular methodology and a pedagogy called Poetics of the Self – and although you may think at the beginning – what is Poetics – what does this have anything to do with foreign language instruction. What the pedagogy is – is about how to guide learners to be much more mindful about their bodies, themselves, each other. And also learn, a little bit, about how to connect that with content. All of you are going to become content experts – an expert in your field of foreign language. But in the end of it, what you’re actually working with are human beings that many times, in many cases, just need someone to guide them to be much more present. So this approach that she’s developed called Poetics of the Self, she is doing her second workshop today with practicing educators like you. And you’re on the other side of the spectrum – you’re in the beginning phase of your careers. She did one in the spring with seasoned practitioners who are all actually in the arts. You are not only in the beginning part, but your formal focus in K-12 education. And so, what she is going to be doing with us today is – is guiding us through this process, which will take about 60 minutes, and we’ll learn about Poetics of the Self and hopefully learn something about ourselves in that process. And then the last bit of time, she will guide us through a short interview to get our reflections because she’s actually writing her dissertation. So the work that she’s doing with us is practice-based, it’s using a technique with other learners, and studying its effect. The hope down the road is that the pedagogy – Poetics of the Self – can be used in traditional gallery settings, or can be used as a tool for thinking about instructional approaches in a traditional classroom. That’s what we’re trying to do here.
Alena: So I will give you a brief overview of the components and then we should get started. For the first ten minutes or so, I will guide you through a mindfulness activity called a Body Scan. It’s quite common and you may have done one in yoga classes or in a therapy setting. And then we’re going to be transitioning to a brief writing exercise where we write from three perspectives based on your experience in your foreign language’s culture – environment – any personal experience you’ve had there. From that point we’re going to then transition to a performance warm-up. Today we’re going to be focusing on pedestrian movement – sitting, standing, walking – that kind-of thing. It’s not acting, it’s the basic elements of performance. And then we’re going to get into a trio and maybe a pair and come up with three postures or static images that arise from your experiences that you wrote about. And then we’ll have time for a little co-performance, where the trio will teach one another each other’s postures – you’ll have two minutes to do so – it’s nothing to overanalyze, just whatever comes to your mind, then the trio will perform the static images for us and then the pair will do the same and we will watch.

Ralph: And also while you’re being guided through the exercises, think about how I could modify this for my class. How could I use this approach or representing and interpreting the next time I’m teaching x, y, and z.

Alena (prompt 1): I’d love for you guys to think back to a time of your life when you were in this environment where you exposed to the language you will be teaching. Think back to the objective aspects – sensations, smells, shapes, colors, aspects of culture you absorbed – what resonated with you. This will be about 5 minutes. It can just be jotted notes. Any physical, objective details of a meaningful experience. Wrap up in the next 20 seconds or so. The next writing piece is from a different perspective – this is about the
subjective – about the feelings you experienced or maybe witnessed during this experience. It could be the overall climate – the social-emotional climate of that particular place – that you’re reminiscing about. Just any subjective elements that come to your mind. And the final perspective I want you to explore is what I call possibilities or potentials, if you could return to that moment in time, what aspect of that experience would you be intrigued by. Before we transition to the performance element, if you could just look at your writing – you have three pieces now – and look at the first one and underline, circle or notate one sentence that is very vivid to you or that resonates the most. And then do the same thing for the second and the third pieces too. Since one participant has to leave earlier, I want to do a kind-of abbreviated, just shorten it by a little bit so you can participate in most everything. So we’re going to get up and map out the space. Just kind-of walk the space and explore what we have to work with here. So this is our material – this open or negative space. The first is a social, more direct gaze, so as we walk through the space, just make eye contact with others. Let’s try going more internal with our focus now. Continue walking. Ask yourself – check-in with yourself – where are you today. Let’s switching to social-direct looking again. Let’s try to find that in-between space where you’re not looking at any one thing or person and you’re just feeling the space as you’re walking….. be aware of your breath as you walk. Now practice peripheral vision. Try to see using the corners of your eyes…how many people can you see from the left side, and how many people can you see from the right.

Let’s move back to direct looking again

Soft focus that in-between
P1: is anyone cold (seems slightly interruptive) a couple people quickly respond then quite again

Alena: Usually this performance has many variation and we could really get into this but since we’re a little short on time, I want to move straight into the activity I call Frozen Postures. There are many names for this, but basically – let’s say I have a memory of sledding down Forest Park, so I think what kind-of action was I making, and it could be some adaptation of that posture – it’s just from our memory. It could be this --, me tying my shoes, it could be a facial expression. Anything kind-of gestural. We’re not going to be using language at this moment – this is more about the body based on your writing. So take a couple minutes and return to your writing piece. The part that you circled – have that maybe guide your experimentation of the posture. I’m here to help in anyway too. So you guys have your first posture? Let’s try to move on to coming up with a tableaux or frozen image of the second writing that you did. I will give you guys about a minute and a half or so.

P2: Can we use a chair?

Alena: props are okay to use as long as you don’t have to leave the classroom. Does everyone have a second image in their mind? You have about 20 seconds are so to get something in your mind. Does everyone have a second image in their mind? Now the last one, try to base that on one of the questions or one of the ideas that you had as you were writing about those potentials or possibilities from your experience in that culture. One more image.
(1, 2, 3) stand equidistant apart, leaning on one side, clasped hands, looking up… About 30 more seconds… okay, how’s everyone doing? okay, since you’re leaving early, why don’t we find you a pair. Find your one person you’re working with and a trio and I’ll give you guys a few minutes to teach each other the postures

P3: Do you want her to guess what I’m doing?

Alena: That could potentially happen but we’re not going to have a lot of dialogue about what each posture is…. I would focus more on teaching her the three postures and then teaching yours.

Alena: We’re going to do something called Alleyways. Alleyways is part of the Viewpoints practice so this is adapted from the theatre world.…. these in a way are a kind of capsule or a mapped-out space. Who wants to go first? We’re going to take turns performing each other’s memory

P3: I will go first

Alena: BOTH are performing your memory

P3: Oh!

Alena: and Before we do that let’s walk the space, walk the alleyway (walked toward audience, had to ask them to move back b/c small space), and then go. And you’re not obligated to do things simultaneously this is kind-of on your own rhythm. Try incorporating these three postures any way you want as you walk down the alleyway. And then turn and return…. Just explore how it feels to do these three postures of somebody else’s, and your own.
Alena: That seems like a natural ending….I know this is a shortened version but I’m curious about how you felt.

P3: Performing? I liked mixing it up, I thought that was good, mixing it up like that. Trying to relate to Emily really was what I was trying to do.

Ralph: Are we now going to see P4 teach us –

Alena: let’s start in the next 10 seconds or so. awesome. What did you guys see? Did anything pop out at you? Any particular moments.

P1: pretty similar

P5: they both had like a frustrating (muffled) … or sad or

P1: yeah…

Ralph: and then the 3rd one

Alena: Ralph, can you think of any questions that may relate to foreign language learning?

Ralph: That is interesting!

Ralph: Yea, as you teach students for example to learn something, and instead, rather than using language, have it acted out, and then those of us that are observing – then using the language to say “estada fru stada” – “she’s frustrated”. Or “seta cu telo” – “she touched her hair”. Does that make sense? So as soon as they start practicing their language use by watching the tableau there’s that piece of it as well.

Alena: And if you could talk a little bit about your experience, the memory that you – that you wrote about
P1: well this one was about exhilaration. I was really happy to be where I was and it was just total contentment. And then the second segment was feeling of loneliness even within the exhilarant environment. The third one was when I thought I should have been talking more and engaging more… I was in Paris.

Alena: were you in a particular location?

P1: I’ve been to Paris many many times times. But last summer I stayed in a studio, I worked for a company … it was just so many emotions in that trip. That was me.

Alena: Thank you so much for sharing that

P1: yea, sure. It was fun!

Ralph: What was your memory? What was you?

P5: Mexico City… and I talked about when I was in middle school so I was younger. Mine were – I sat sitting down in the chair hiding when I was first there I was like so terrified and didn’t speak Spanish. So I was really shy. And my second one, was when I learned Spanish I felt all confident, and then the third one, I put a quote on the last prompt, I remember I asked my mom if I could dye my hair when I we were there, because everyone notices the blondes – the Americans - so I wondered what would happen if I dyed my hair. Would they still notice that I wasn’t from here. So that was like a huge thing. Mine were like emotions and visual.

Alena: interesting. thank you. Next performance -

Ralph: wider alleys

Alena: it’s up to the three of you – whose memory you are performing

P2: do you mind if we review first?

Alena: yes… have a couple moments to review.
P4: Can we go from P3 over?

Alena: clarifies and reminds: you can do basic movements – standing, sitting, walking, laying down – you want to integrate the postures in - It’s up to the three of you to decide whose memory we are performing first.

P1: Are we supposed to be walking around?

Alena: yeah

Alena: awesome – so that was a natural ending… how did it feel? How does it feel to perform your own story?

P5: It brings you back. It takes you back

Alena: and how did it feel to perform her postures?

P3: Kinda silly

P4: I thought it – I don’t know, like I don’t know her entire story but we can kind-of guess it a little bit

Alena: Yeah and I think that’s going to be eventually part of it. More discussion about the narrative and the actual experience that goes with it. For now though, if we could jump to your postures.

P5: I’m starting

Ralph: It’s really interesting because this moment (motions arms upward) this sort of Karate Kid moment (group giggles)

Trio discusses whether they smiled or not, and slight confusion over directions about facial expression (mainly from P1)
Alena: Okay, and the third…Were you reading a map? I thought it was very interesting how it was very contemplative and there were a few moments when you guys were all in sync.

Ralph: and I connected with that. Immediately I had to run back into 1990 as I was in a special collection reading a book by Fontana and struggling – reading it all in German – just doing that and then feeling the – how are we going to compete with these German speakers thing? I remember. It just took me back to something like that.

Alena: This is the debriefing now

Ralph: So here’s a question I have for you guys. You know, what’s really interesting to me as I was observing was a huge contrast between the three postures that you performed that are grounded in a physical experience that you had when you were learning the language. It’s a real-life context. And so you’re able to rely on something that really truly happened to you – you made it very vivid.

Ralph: Yet on the other hand, a lot of the time you spend in school with a lot of your students don’t actually have that experience. Does that make sense?

Ralph: so I just kind-of find an interesting disconnect – how vivid the descriptive, the emotional, and the what-if, of that thing you really experienced – and yet often in the school the curriculum isn’t often organized to create those experiences in kids.

Ralph: I wonder what the majority of your Spanish I kids would say if they were guided into something like that. What would they remember as exhilarating? What would they

P4: For me, my memory was the first day of French I. It was my first day of high school. It was my very first class. And so like reading the text book – I was probably the only excited one in there. But that was my “what-if”, what if I hadn’t been so excited? Would
I have stopped learning French after 2 years? Or would French be as big a part of my life as it is now?

Ralph: Interesting

P4: And so now when I’m in a classroom, I can kind-of see some students that are like me, that are just so excited to be in French class and learning French. One of the very first things I did this semester was I showed them (inaudible French title) with subtitles – these were French I kids, they didn’t understand very much if at all. But they were some kids that were just like ‘o my gosh that was so cool listening to French”. And that was me. And so I hope that they have that same memory as I do in French class

Alena: Was that your subjective one?

P4: For me, the wonder part of it was the excitement, the ‘this is so cool’, ‘I’m so excited’ for the next four years of learning French.

Alena: what about the first two memories?

P4: The reading the textbook, going through the beginnings, the ‘bonjour!’ ‘au revoir’ – We looked through the French names. I got to pick one. And then the ‘what if’ (motions chin resting in hands) was ‘what if I had been bored’

Ralph: what was your French name?

P4: Elizabeth

Ralph: that’s interesting. What’s really interesting is watching your video on the teaching channel and watching your video on conjugation – I saw – you recognizing that some kids need to connect emotionally to the ability to – so when you’re messing around with the ‘how is you today’ – you’re really getting them into the language. To recognized that it’s a living language which is kind-of interesting.
RC: So what other thoughts come to mind with this physical – remember how the whole thing happened. You made yourself present with the body scan through an exercise process. It’s almost meditative. Making yourself present. Then from there you went into the experiences of writing about in three different points of view an event. And then you went to demonstrating that physically that involved teaching someone, that involved someone learning what it is you were doing. Then the fourth piece was performing it to an audience. So there were aspects of being aware, there were aspects of – a domain of reading and writing – and then there was an aspect of teaching each other. There was an aspect of interpreting. I just wonder as educators where you see aspects of those areas played out or not enough played out in what we do in schools with kids? How often do they have an opportunity to teach each other what they know? How often do they perform for someone else in an *empathic way that let’s someone else BE with that? I just kind-of wonder about that.

P5: I think in general the performance on their behalf does not happen enough. So for them to get up and even play Simon Says – atleast my class would be completely in shock. If they play Simon Says, but actually moving around the classroom and maybe forming groups in different corners or getting more into this acting – I think there’s not enough of that.

Ralph: So it makes me wonder when that we make more that happen. And it makes me wonder – well I was lucky. The first foreign language courses I had to take – it was in Spanish and that was easy for me. But when I moved into German that was very scary because it’s perfection oriented. Atleast I – the pressure we put on ourselves. It has to be right the first time. And it’s so scary
P5: that’s the German attitude

Ralph: However, what if it had been different? What if we were to play together? That empathy would be developed - for me. Or would it be so afraid for not pronouncing the subjunctive in the right – the way we do it in German – I just – petrifies me. These independent clauses are very scary when you speak German – for non-native speakers because you have to remember where that stupid verb always comes at that one part at the end. And you don’t get better unless you practice.

Ralph: But when you’re performing it and it has to be perfect – you just use the easiest ones you remember.

P5: The last week I was in my classroom with the Level 2’s – they were learning about restaurants, and we were talking about restaurant vocabulary and I was at the end of the unit so I had them do speaking activities and I just wanted them to get up and move and these kids - you would think that I asked them to jump off a bridge. They were terrified. And they didn’t want to do it and I was just like get up and try to immerse yourself in the culture as much as you can in Arnold, MO. Just imagine you are in – I don’t care how well you do it – if you need to take your paper up with you, if you need to have pronunciations written down. You know, I don’t care, but in the end…some of them did okay, but I was just like ‘no – you guys just have to get into it!’ pretend you are French, pretend you are at a French restaurant. It is such a French thing to do this and this – and they were not having it. Which was unfortunate for them and I was a little disappointed because I would have like LOVED to have done that because I don’t think the kids move enough for one.

Alena: What grade do you teach?
P5: High school. 9-12. So these were sophomores and juniors and that goes to another comment that I wanted to make – was that I *don’t think kids have that AWARENESS. (looks at P2 and P1) I don’t know about you guys – because you’re all at Ritenour right?
P2: yes
P1: Pattonville
P4: Okay.
P5: So I don’t know about at your schools but now the kids just kind-of come in and they listen. My kids are pretty respectful. They’ll do what I ask them to but they’re not super into it for the most part. Or they’re just like ‘okay, I can conjugate an ER verb’
Ralph: But when you break the reality – like in your lesson (points to P1) – like you mention human sacrifices – it just broke their bubble – ‘like what do you mean?!’
P3: They were really excited. My culture lesson – they never have culture so at the beginning
Ralph: Imagine foreign language without culture
P3: They never have had a culture day and so the bell work was in English because it was in Spanish 1 Spanish 2. And I was like – write down 5 words you associate with death and they were like ‘I don’t understand what to do’ And I’m like ‘write down 5 words you associate with death’ and I said it in English and they were like ‘I don’t understand’ – because they’re so into like a regimented every day – they come in and they conjugate a verb for like their bell work, or they do this – they never actually have to like think.
Ralph: I’m going to send you this link to an article to an English paper called the Guardian. This teacher is Finnish – and Finland is highly autonomous. Teachers have a lot of independence and they do wonderful stuff. So what happens to a highly
accomplished Finnish teacher when she works in an American school? In southern states somewhere. And she describes this very process you’re talking about – how the joy that she felt first going into practicing in Finland, almost seems to not exist in what she has to do as a Foreign Language teacher. The love for collaborating is almost scary for her because collaboration for her in a new context – in an American school – involves “professional learning communities” (RC puts quotes with hands). With someone coming in several times to observe when the love being observed and having a conversation about something that they saw. Now that observation is solely connected to a checklist. And will you keep your job. so, what’s really interesting is to see a foreign language teacher from a different country put on American clothes – if you will – about teaching and what that does. And so they make the argument about how our high stakes testing culture has done severe damage to them.

Ralph: So imagine you in foreign language – you know – it’s not make it or break it for these kids – imagine what the math teachers are experiencing. Or the language-arts teachers where the curriculum is even more. So when you ask the kids to do something very different – ‘what do you mean associate something with death – that’s not – that’s not in the program’

P3: Yeah – they were just really confused but they were really excited about the - they just walked around and were like ‘what is that?’ and I was like who get them (inaudible) But they were all like engaged with it. It was really cool to see.

Ralph: Other thoughts Alena? This is the first time you are doing this with educators who are (inaudible) experts… Are they speaking differently from the way your artists (inaudible)?
Alena: A couple insights. And this is a much shortened version
Ralph: it’s like a 3 hour version
Alena: I know it’s a lot to ask people to – most people – to get into a performative mode. You mentioned that the kids were hesitant about performance… I think warming people up is really important. Also your comments about culture and the lack of teaching culture, I think this could be adapted to teach cultural aspects – like maybe they have a homework assignment about restaurants or about ceremonies or rituals and then they perform different elements from that for the class.
Ralph: hmmm.
Alena: and that spurs discussion. And also maybe if – the prejudice that happens among different cultures – I think that performing different stereotypes that we have and opening that up as more of a character ed discussion. But I think that’s really important right now. Do you think this is potentially useful for K-12? Would you say, or? Critical feedback is welcome to – because this is my second pilot and I’m interested in adapting this – working with different types of teachers and different parts of the population.
P3: Well I think the elementary school kids would really be into it just because the nature of elementary school kids. And then middle schoolers MIGHT be but they think they’re too cool for school. And then high school, probably, because a lot of high schoolers are goofy, but you have to warm them up to it. You can’t just walk in and be like ‘we’re going to go pretend like we’re going to skate or something’ they would be like (scoll on her face)
P5: I just have a question. In the longer version when we do the co-performing do we learn about our partner’s stories?
Alena: You have an opportunity but the thing is when you’re teaching each other the postures it’s really like 2 minutes 30 seconds. It’s intended to teach the gestures and then the discussion comes later.

Ralph: But I’m wondering based on your line of questions, I wonder what would happen because there’s two pieces right? There’s the preparation piece which is a lot of writing and making yourself present. And then there’s like a quick and dirty teaching each other your postures and then it’s always interesting to me – so what is the real story behind this quick and dirty that we only got to see?

Ralph: I wonder what we would learn by having the reader or the writer actually have the long piece of text and read whatever that is. That is for us – on two levels; one is practicing reading and writing but the other one is oh wow there is so much that got missed in the translation sometimes.

P5: I guess that was what I was trying to go for – because for P1 we were – (P3) were largely able to guess what you were going for. But without knowing – I guess for ME without knowing the story behind it – it was harder for me to get in her shoes. I was able to say ‘okay at some point in this she was curious (rubs her chin), you know, but – and we learned it in order. So we knew it was the objective, subjective, what-if piece. But then I know I switched it up walking in the alleyway and so for the audience it was probably harder to follow – you know was this (hand on chin) the objective or was it the what-if, or was it the subjective kind of thing. So that was my one thing is – it was still a useful exercise, but it was harder for me to really get in my partners’ shoes without at least having a – and I know it’s only supposed to be two and a half minutes
Ralph: but it’s almost like, the metaphor that comes to mind is almost like someone gives you a pair of shoes to wear and you’re wearing them. Then it’s kind-of awkward. But they’ve never actually shown you the process they use to make those shoes and why they fit a certain way and let you realize – oh this is why it’s feeling this way – so it’s empathy building but in foreign language what it does is rehearsal. It’s practicing (inaudible) and then performing it. Which is interesting.

P2: I would wonder how to use it in the classroom because if you do it in the beginning to get them to know each other or if you do it at the end when they already know each other, because you might get some more deeper answers. But I think it’s so interesting the teacher role and all that – like if you don’t have a good relationship with your students they’re not going to want to tell you how they feel. And there’s a huge thing to with our school. The students will do it maybe if they see you do it first. So like you as a teacher have to be so comfortable like maybe modeling it for them or like giving them, because if you just tell them ‘oh, talk about this then they might not want to, but if they see you do it… so, it’s a lot of the relationship I think. Like with the students and then with the teacher. In a foreign language yeah – but in an ELL classroom – that’s my other practicum – I don’t know how that would go because we took a whole class on hand signals and this (motions with right hand) is like, not appropriate a culture. So the hand signals, they might be totally offended and will be a disaster. Or, judging each other so that’s also kind-of interesting too. Just all the cultural difference, just how they would respond to that.

Alena: I think there are so many opportunities for cultural learning opportunities and exposure to cultural norms of other cultures. I think it’s a good tool – potentially – and
maybe you can try aspects of it to open up conversation and challenge one’s assumptions about these different cultures and languages.

Ralph: What’s really interesting for me, I guess. At the age that I am and how – I’ve been at this for 25-26 years. What’s really interesting to me is that those processes that you use, those pedagogical moves aren’t really new in a way to the field of education. But because we don’t see them happening we just see them as very foreign and strange. But what sort-of the real focus in the late 80s and early 90s, was experiential approaches to working with content. And experiential approaches to representing what you know about the content in a performance. Whether it’s performance like you did or performance-based problem-solving, or performance-based writing, but there’s always those elements of it. And now it’s like boop. It seems to have – it only certain places do you see some of that. But I think there’s a resurgence that’s going to happen. So I thank you guys for playing with us and allowing Alena to play with these ideas.