



5-2010

Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in an Informal Community of Practice

Shalane Balfour Navorska

University of Tennessee - Knoxville, shalanebalfour@gmail.com

Recommended Citation

Navorska, Shalane Balfour, "Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in an Informal Community of Practice." PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2010.

https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/729

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Trace: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shalane Balfour Navorska entitled "Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in an Informal Community of Practice." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Educational Psychology and Research.

Trena M. Paulus, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

John M. Peters, Michael L. Morris, Mary F. Ziegler

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shalane Balfour Navorska entitled "Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in an Informal Community of Practice." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Educational Psychology and Research.

Trena Paulus, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

John M. Peters

Mary F. Ziegler

Michael L. Morris

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in an Informal
Community of Practice**

A Dissertation for the
Doctor of Philosophy Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shalane Balfour Navorska
May 2010

Copyright © 2010 by Shalane Balfour Navorska
All rights reserved.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my mentor and friend,

Dr. Kimberly Barnett Gibson,

who encouraged me early in my academic pursuits and

whose support made a profound impact on my life.

*You have to accept whatever comes and the only important thing is that you meet it with
courage and with the best you have to give. ~Eleanor Roosevelt*

Acknowledgements

I deeply recognize the amount of time and attention my family sacrificed so that I could pursue my goals. In relationship with my husband, David, and our children, my being a student is all they have ever known of me. For Thatcher, my dear son, “that paper” is finally finished. Your love and patience has been great.

To the members of the WWM Group who so willingly said “Yes.”

To Dr. Trena Paulus, my advisor, who demonstrated great patience and wisdom in guiding me through this process. She always knew the right words to say in letting me know I was not alone.

To Dr. John Peters, for creating a learning environment that will forever change the way I interact in the world. I am proud to call you colleague and friend.

To Dr. Mary Ziegler and Dr. Michael Lane Morris, for their contributions in shaping this study and supporting me in the process.

To my friends Don Creekmore and Dr. David Duncan, for their endless hours of assistance in helping me shape my understanding of collaborative learning. Their demonstration of collaborative learning as a way of being continues to inspire me.

To Christine Adams for her friendship and support.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify indicators of three different types of teaching and learning used within an informal community of practice. Peters and Armstrong's (1998) article, *Collaborative learning: People laboring together to construct knowledge*, served as the basis for this case study, which expanded upon the types of teaching and learning as a framework for understanding practitioners' interactions within communities of practice (CoP). No other research has comparatively examined these three types of teaching and learning, or examined the types of teaching and learning as a framework for understanding interactions within CoPs.

Eight members of a CoP group participated in this study over a 10-week period. Data sources consisted of audio taped meetings, discussion board posts, and field notes. Through typological and discourse analysis of the transcripts, five indicators of teaching and learning were identified: engagement, assumptions, influence, questions, and mode of discourse. Each indicator displayed different characteristics across each of the three types of teaching and learning.

The results suggest how the types of teaching and learning can be used as a framework for understanding group interactions within CoPs. The indicators provide a practical method for practitioners to identify language behaviors that contribute to these interactions. By identifying these indicators, the researcher contends that practitioners can facilitate themselves and their CoPs with better intention and purpose.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	10
Chapter 3: Methods	26
Chapter 4: Findings	44
Chapter 5: Discussion	119
Chapter 6: Implications, Directions for Further Research, Researcher Reflections and Conclusion	142
References	155
Appendices	164
Vita	192

List of Tables

Table 1. WWM Group Participants	29
Table 2. Description of Group Meeting Data	31
Table 3. Phases and Steps of Data Analysis	35
Table 4. Indicator Definitions	51
Table 5. Engagement Characteristics	52
Table 6. Handling Assumption Characteristics	68
Table 7. Influence Characteristics	85
Table 8. Questioning Methods Characteristics	96
Table 9. Mode of Discourse Characteristics	106
Table 10. TTL Indicators	120
Table 11. Major Findings on TTL Indicators	138

Chapter One: Introduction

My Communities of Practice

My professional practice

Currently I work as an organizational development consultant for an entity that employs approximately 1,000 people. This organization faces drastic changes in the next five years, as almost half of the employees are, or will be, eligible for retirement. Such a loss of personnel affects all the employees, but most drastically the new employees entering the organization. In addition to attrition issues, the employee groups are separated both geographically and organizationally, where they do not frequently create opportunities to communicate problems, best practices, or business strategies to each other. Therefore, these separate groups within the organization mainly work independently. These issues present an entirely different problem in terms of consistency, effectiveness, and innovation across the organization. As it stands, I work with a team determining ways to manage and create knowledge pertaining to employee practice. I help create and organize communities of practice with various groups of practitioners as one way to address any knowledge management and knowledge creation issues the practitioners of these groups face and deem important for resolving.

We Want More group

Since beginning my studies at the University of Tennessee in the collaborative learning doctoral program, I have sought my own way of being-in-the-world with more intention. In this search, I attended a training class in Knoxville, Tennessee, which I will call the “Discovery Courses” for the purposes of this study. The training I attended is through an international non-profit educational charity providing experiential development learning programs that focus on

skills and practices for helping people take action toward personal areas of growth. I took an initial course in August 2003 and since that time have taken several advanced courses. This training employed experiential learning exercises in self-discovery, primarily uncovering the assumptions and values I held. The courses taught me how some of my assumptions and beliefs were influencing my decisions and choices that were contrary to how I wanted live my life. This experience was helpful as a way to see myself from another perspective and add to my experience within the collaborative learning program.

After attending Discovery Courses, “enrichment groups” form to continue working on the processes learned. These enrichment groups typically last six weeks and follow a prescribed curriculum for continued learning. After attending a few different courses, I encountered several individuals who wanted an enrichment group that was not limited to a particular course or regimented, predetermined format. We wanted to go beyond individual processing toward an intention of building relationships, community and group learning that utilized materials and sources beyond those offered in the Discovery Courses. We also did not want to limit ourselves to a group that had a prescribed duration.

Due to this personal motivation, in July 2005, I helped form such a group with eight members. The one requirement for joining the group was that each member must have taken the introductory and at least one advanced Discovery Course. From the beginning, the group remained open to anyone meeting this requirement. As time progressed, our group sought to live more purposefully by continually aligning our actions with our intentions.

When the group formed in July 2005, we started out calling ourselves the “I Want More Group.” At that time, our focus was on individual experiences and supporting that person in

making individual changes in their lives. About a year later, we changed our name to the “We Want More” (WWM) group. For us, this change emphasized our intentions of focusing on group learning as well as individual learning. The topic still evolved from an individual’s lived experience, however, it expanded out to the group as a whole. This shift allowed us to see individual experiences as a topic around which group members could jointly construct meaning. However, the focus of the meetings typically remained on that of an individual and his or her experiences. This allowed the group to create both individual and joint knowledge, feeding back to the individual group member, other individuals within the group, and the group as a whole. Such as it was, both the group as a whole and individuals within the group changed throughout the process of being together, each affecting the other.

Each member held a different view of why the group was important in our respective lives, but we held the shared goal of viewing it as a way of supporting desired changes and creating more in our lives. At the same time, the answer for each of us was slightly different on what that “more” looked like. We all sought the desire for more connection, relationship, growth, authenticity, and perspective. Even with our stated intentions and our name change, we continually struggled with how to make the transition from *individual* processing and learning to *group* interaction and learning while still concentrating on our purpose of creating change within our lives. With my experience in the teaching and learning typologies (Peters & Armstrong, 1998), I shared some aspects of this framework early on within the group. Later, as we continued to struggle, we jointly decided to pursue further understanding of our group interactions within the types of teaching and learning. Peters and Armstrong (1998) explain the types of teaching and learning (TTL) in part through the relationship between teacher and student. For the purpose

of this study, these types are a framework for understanding the various forms of teaching and learning by situating the third type of teaching and learning, Type 3, as collaborative learning (Peters and Armstrong, 1998).

The WWM group, and the other communities of practice with which I engage as a consultant, exist outside of a classroom structure, and, therefore, do not center on the teacher/student relationship. Instead, there exists a peer relationship among the group members. This study examines how the types of teaching and learning may apply to group interactions outside of a formal classroom environment where none of the members hold a formal role as a group leader or facilitator.

Purpose of the Study

Throughout my work with the TTL and collaborative learning, I found myself sometimes struggling to identify the differences between the three TTL within my own interactions. This experience occurred with interactions in both my consulting practice and the WWM group. Therefore, when translating the TTL into situations in which I was involved, I struggled to point to specific differences between the TTL in a way that could be understood and made more accessible to practitioners. I found that within the WWM group in particular, we were at times frustrated in our attempts to fulfill our intention of engaging in Type 3. My own frustration would mount as I found it difficult to identify the types of teaching and learning in which our group engaged. I felt that by recognizing different types of interactions through the TTL, we might increase our awareness and help us work toward fulfilling our intentions.

Therefore, for me, conducting this study had two purposes. First, through an action research approach, I, along with the other members of the WWM group, sought awareness as to

how we interact as a group. We believed that understanding how the three TTL manifested themselves in our group would help us be aware of our actions. From this awareness, we could recognize how we were engaging one another and intentionally choose how to facilitate ourselves going forward. As an intact community of practice, we embarked on this research to examine our interactions and grow from the resultant knowledge.

The second purpose translates directly to my practice as an organizational development consultant. I wanted to understand how the types of teaching and learning manifest themselves in groups outside a formal classroom and without a formal teacher or facilitator, as these situations pattern my real life practice. Within both contexts, the WWM group and my consulting business, I see opportunities to engage in different types of teaching and learning. However, as a member of various communities of practice, I am not always positioned as a formal facilitator. I believe that by providing a framework for understanding how groups interact within the TTL, we, as practitioners within communities of practice, can find ways to facilitate ourselves with intention. Before we can do that though, we would benefit from a typology of interactions that constitute each type of teaching and learning. Such a typology could provide the individual practitioner with the tools and ability to recognize ways by which individuals and groups contribute to any given discourse. This typology could further help practitioners bring awareness to group interactions and hence provide clearer options for changes that would affect that discourse. By clearly identifying some of these indicators within a typology, practitioners may better be able to influence the interactions with intention. This recognition of both individual and group contributions to the conversations could result in making corrections to unintended behaviors that influence the group interaction. Such an awareness has the potential to redefine knowledge

from information to be shared and managed to something that is created jointly among participants. Whether building upon mentor/novice relationships, sharing information across organizational divisions, or engaging in innovative practices, identifying such group intention and developing a structure for achieving these goals through group interaction would improve both my practice and my involvement in CoPs.

Philosophical Foundations and Beliefs

My personal motivation for conducting this study grew out of the importance the WWM group had in my life, my daily practice, and my professional practice. My beliefs, as discussed below, are what kept me continually engaged within this community of practice and provided the rationale for this study.

My rationale for this study aligned with my belief concerning social constructionism, as well as my ontological and epistemological beliefs. Adhering to a paradigm of constructionism, as related to my ontological perspective, signifies that meaning is socially constructed. This does not translate into relativism, but into the belief that as individuals we have choices concerning our actions and interaction with others. Constructionism differs from constructivism, a cognitive theory introduced by Piaget in 1967. Since Piaget coined that term, constructivism has come to be considered as knowledge created by individuals within a social context. This differs from constructionism, in which people jointly create shared meaning as it relates to the context (Vygotsky, 1978). Some forms of “reality” may be formed as local and specifically constructed realities within a context, as everything has a context, or a background, in which it evolves. Whether it be the meaning of an object or the beliefs and values a culture creates, all are formed with language used in everyday life (Wittgenstein, 1958) and, therefore, are socially constructed.

Within myself, I try to recognize, question, and examine my own judgments and assumptions for gaining perspective on reality. I also try to recognize that other people's interpretation and meaning of reality may have several different perspectives. From the paradigm of social constructionism, seeking out these multiple views is critical to understanding our shared social reality (Searle, 1995) and how I join others in our interactions. By combining multiple perspectives that occur in our primary and secondary socialization to the world in which we live (Berger & Luckmann, 1966), we formulate some concepts of objective reality. From there, we create and negotiate reality within a context. As a social constructionist, I believe we must not take our perspective of reality for granted. For me, this means reminding myself that my sense of reality is many times not the same as others, and that to move forward together we must continually negotiate what is "real" for our community of practice. Therefore, I practice continually questioning my own judgments and assumptions, as well as increasing my own awareness of multiple perspectives. From this paradigm, action research provides a logical approach to situate myself within my own life and to examine what is occurring within my own contexts and situations.

I also adhere to epistemological beliefs within constructionism. These beliefs allow for multiple ways of knowing; therefore, it is critical not to assume how or what people "should" know. We come to know about the world and ourselves in the world through our engagement in particular discourses. As part of our social interactions, regardless of our position, we always have the opportunity for teaching and learning. This leads to Peters and Armstrong's (1998) types of teaching and learning as a framework for examining interactions within communities of practice of which I am involved. Although the model for Peters and Armstrong's types of

teaching and learning are situated within the context of a classroom, I frame it within peer-oriented groups, such as those with which I am involved in my practice. Each of the three types of teaching and learning, as discussed further in Chapter 2, present themselves within different human interactions. For me, the intent of this study is to see how those types manifest themselves in a particular context in which I am involved.

My Role as Researcher

In this study, my role was that of a participant researcher. I was a full member of the WWM group, which I was also studying as a researcher. Herr and Anderson (2005) have defined this researcher positionality as an “insider with other insiders,” (p. 31) which derived from the tradition of feminist consciousness raising groups, inquiry groups, and study groups (Herr & Anderson, 2005). Such positionality involved the relationship between other participants and the researcher. The researcher’s position falls on a continuum somewhere between inside researcher to outside researcher in relation to those involved in the study. The intention of doing research as an insider with other insiders, as I was with this study, was effecting change from within the group rather than imposing change from outside (Herr & Anderson, 2005). Herr and Anderson view all these positions as contributing to the knowledge base, with this type of positionality contributing to group transformation.

As action research, our intent was to create understanding around how we functioned as a group and then consciously choose our actions going forward. Therefore, I did not facilitate the group any more or less than I normally would have. Each member of the group filled the role of facilitator when necessary to move the group interactions along. The group members took on different responsibilities for organizing and holding the meetings, however, there was not a

formal leader or facilitator. This fact did not change just for this study. Since I was fully involved, and had been for three years, my own interactions influenced our evolution as a group, just as every other member's actions had. After this research concluded, I remained fully involved with the members of this group, minus the additional role as formal researcher.

Summary

In Chapter 2, I will discuss the literature related to this study as it pertains to the typologies of teaching and learning and Communities of Practice (CoP) theory. In Chapter 3, I will outline the research methods, including the research design and procedures used for my data collection and data analysis. From there, I present my findings in Chapter 4 and answer my research question. Chapter 5 discusses how those indicators relate to other research, as well as presents the implications of my study and directions for further research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This literature review is divided into three major sections. First, I examine the literature related to knowledge management and communities of practice theory as a larger field within which types of teaching and learning (TTL) may play a role. Second, I review the three types of teaching and learning within Peters and Armstrong's (1998) model, which serve as the foundation for this study. Third, I propose a connection between communities of practice (CoP) theory and types of teaching and learning, arguing that types of teaching and learning can help us understand ways of being within communities of practice.

Knowledge Management and Communities of Practice

Knowledge Management is defined here as the process by which people develop and manage knowledge within organizations (Wenger, 2002). Knowledge management goes beyond "information" which can be documented and made explicit. It concerns the experiences of people, not as a thing, but looking at the tacit aspect of knowledge as the most valuable commodity (Wenger, 2002). Communities of practice (CoPs) theory looks specifically at the social structure in which organizations work to foster learning, develop competencies and manage knowledge (Wenger, 2002, p. 11) in a way that supports the living and ever-evolving nature of knowledge with practitioners.

Deriving from the field of knowledge management, Wenger, in his book *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity* (1998), describes CoPs as a social learning theory tied to learning organizations and informal learning communities in which we all participate. Learning derives from the context in which it is experienced. The book *Cultivating Communities of Practice* (Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder, 2002) continues with the premise of situated

learning, but concentrates more specifically on concepts within the field of knowledge management. Throughout the communities of practice literature, knowledge management is viewed as information to be shared among individuals within organized groups or organizations, rather than knowledge created by the group itself.

Wenger et al. (2002) further define CoPs as “groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (p. 4). Although most of the literature frames CoPs as a form of knowledge management, especially as that knowledge pertains to organizational learning and management, CoP theory can also be used to understand formal or informal networks (Fisher & Bennion, 2005) and make sense of informal small group learning (Gongla & Rizzuto, 2001). Within such learning frameworks, the participants are not only learners, but also teachers. In CoPs, the context develops around the participants’ practice in which all group members teach and learn to varying degrees. To date, no empirical studies have yet explored how the concept of teaching and learning develops in CoP groups, nor does the literature examine different approaches to knowledge within CoPs, besides that of managing information as a form of knowledge management. Although Wenger (1998) touches upon CoPs as a “good context to explore radically new insights” and a “privileged locus for the creation of knowledge” (p. 214), he still treats knowledge creation as something an individual does within a social context. He does not distinguish how groups might approach knowing or knowledge creation as an opportunity for both individual and group learning. As a result, the CoP literature treats the creation of knowledge, embedded in a social constructionist epistemology, as a mere side effect of group interactions that happens with individuals (Wenger, 1998; Wenger, et al., 2002).

Therefore, knowledge creation is not treated as something that can be jointly constructed within groups.

Looking more broadly, the CoP research deals primarily with practitioners situated within the context of organizational management and organizational learning. For example, Garavan, Carbery, and Murphy (2007) conducted a qualitative study that examined the strategies used by four formal facilitators, called CoP managers, within intentionally created CoPs. The CoPs examined were used for organizational learning and knowledge management purposes. The researchers explored strategies used by the CoP managers who set up the environment and learning structure implementing various methods for group interaction. The research methods employed were observations of CoP meetings, interviews of CoP managers, and document analysis. The CoP managers facilitated group meetings to “activate and stimulate dialogue,” “initiate discussion and debate” and “practice collaboration” (p. 39) by facilitating various approaches such as presentation, discussion, brainstorming, and “group work” (p. 40). The research findings in Garavan et al.’s study identified these facilitation strategies as resulting in negotiated meaning, built trust toward facilitating collaboration, and managed power dynamics (p. 41). Even though Garavan et al. identify various facilitation techniques, they do not really distinguish between techniques and outcomes. They do not elucidate the differences between these types of interactions, thus treating ideas such as “collaboration” and “negotiated meaning” in generic terms. Thus, individual and group knowledge construction blends and group knowledge construction is not seen as something different. Also, within these CoPs, the groups depended upon a formal facilitator, the CoP manager, to lead them through processes and group

interactions. Therefore, the teaching and learning strategies employed in these groups relied mainly on the facilitator-participant relationship.

Most articles written about CoPs derive from the support of CoPs as a means to manage knowledge within an organization, but does not broach on the differences between knowledge management and knowledge creation. The existing literature on CoPs include literature which supports the concept and implementation of CoPs (Garavan, et al., 2007; Gongla & Rizzuto, 2001; Spencer, Rushton, Rumizen, & McDermott, 2003; Wenger, 1998; Wenger, et al., 2002; Wenger & Snyder, 2000). However, there is an ongoing debate within the literature on CoP group formality and whether they should derive from a management ideation or evolve from a loosely structured, self-selected, and internally facilitated group. The research by Thompson (2005) supports the latter in which his empirical research suggests, “that attempts to control group interaction by introducing too much structure are likely to result in the demise of the community itself” (p. 151). As an outside researcher, Thompson sought to “deepen our theoretical understanding of the interrelationship between organizational structure and the epistemic activity of members of communities of practice” (p. 151). Thompson studied a group of approximately 40 CoP members within a worldwide information technology hardware and service organization. He employed first-hand observations, supplemented by documents and written artifacts, as well as unstructured interviews of 10 CoP members. These interviews concentrated on group identification, motivation, participation, and interrelationships with the wider organization as well as the shifts in each of these areas. Thompson analyzed his data with a thematic analysis and comparative analysis to Wenger’s work on CoPs. His findings suggested methods for developing successful and ongoing informal CoPs within an organization. However,

he stopped short of examining the inner workings of the CoP groups as to their actual group interactions, and the ways in which knowledge was approached. Although Thompson supported a loosely structured CoP, he did not address the actual structure or facilitation used, and how those interactions may differ. As with most studies on CoPs, Thompson's research concentrated on the CoPs relationship with and within the larger organization. He did not detail the actual inner workings of CoPs, such as how they are managed by group members within group meetings. Although Thompson explained the "epistemic components" (p. 157) within the CoP he studied, he concentrated on individually created components within a group environment and on cooperative learning methods.

Little has been written specifically on communities of practice within informal group settings, or as it relates to different aspects of adult education or informal learning groups. Only one study, by Janson, Howard, and Schoenberger-Orgad (2004), discusses the formation of CoPs in an informal group. They examined the reflective experiences of eight PhD students within a supportive peer community in New Zealand. Participants responded to four open-ended questions, and the responses were analyzed for common themes as well as diverging experiences and expectations. The findings expanded Wenger's model making it more conducive to the participants' particular context within a university setting. Janson et al. (2004) also concentrated on the group's experiences of forming and sustaining a CoP. However, the researchers did not examine these specific types of interactions or group engagement. Although Janson et al. studied CoPs and expanded the literature as to the context in which those CoPs occur, there remains a lack of research on the specific types and outcomes of interactions that occur within group

settings. Without such literature, there remains a gap in understanding how to best structure group interactions for CoPs.

Spencer, Rushton, Rumizen, and McDermott (2003) claim that the success and value of communities of practice “within the corporate world and government are well documented” (p. 25). However, they also concede, “there is little documentation of the conscious application of a communities of practice methodology” (p. 25). This methodology translates to purposeful methods by which people interact within such groups. One problem in presenting a particular methodology for communities of practice includes limiting the methods by which people engage one another, and therefore the resulting product of those interactions. Therefore, any useful framework for communities of practice requires flexibility for groups to engage based on their purpose and need. This does not limit the groups to one particular method, but allows opportunities to look at group interactions through some framework. The next section describes one particular model of teaching and learning which could be used to describe interactions within communities of practice.

Types of Teaching and Learning

Peters and Armstrong’s 1998 article, *Collaborative Learning: People Laboring Together to Construct Knowledge* outlines three proposed types of teaching and learning. These types of teaching and learning (TTL) provide a framework for understanding learning interactions. Although Peters and Armstrong concentrate on formal learning environments such as classrooms, the typology has applications beyond educational settings and into other formal and informal group settings. Next, the three types of teaching and learning are described.

Type one teaching and learning (T1).

Type One teaching and learning (T1) primarily uses the lecture mode as a way to teach by transmission and learn with reception (Peters & Armstrong, 1998). In this TTL, the teacher is seen as the authority, and “the students do not participate in the selection of content, nor do they control the nature of the relationship between themselves and the teacher” (p. 78). The teacher sets the expectations and decides the subject matter to be covered, which usually is influenced (if not determined) by institutional directive. In this style of academic setting, the students must “accept the relationship set by the teacher or they choose not to participate in it” (p. 78). This relationship follows the structure inherent in lectures in which the flow of information is from teacher to students. The teacher is seen “as authority, knowledge as a commodity, and the learner as an empty or near empty vessel” (Peters and Armstrong, 1998, p. 79). The students have little, if any, interaction with other students; therefore, the focus is on individual learning facilitated by the teacher.

Type two teaching and learning (T2).

Type Two teaching and learning (T2) uses discussion as the primary mode of teaching by transmission and learning by sharing. Discussion is used normally for sharing information or persuading others, and individuals typically advocate a position rather than inquire into meaning. In doing so, discussion leads to defending commonly held assumptions rather than embracing other possibilities. Other teaching strategies (such as cooperative learning, guided discussion, and active learning tools) may be employed in T2. These strategies emphasize students sharing their own experiences. For T2, the “role of the teacher is to transmit information and to enable students to transmit information to one another and sometimes to the teacher” (Peters &

Armstrong, p. 79). Students can have more interaction using this strategy than in T1, but still only in the sense of interpreting the subject matter set forth by the teacher. This strategy leaves the teacher as the authority and “primary source of information, but not the sole source. The student is sometimes both a learner and a teacher, transmitting information as well as receiving it” (Peters & Armstrong, p. 79). Although the students have more interaction with other students, the focus is still on individual learning chiefly facilitated and directed by the teacher.

Type three teaching and learning (T3)¹.

According to Peters and Armstrong, T3 is more than generic small group learning. As it stands, “present models of cooperative education and experiential learning do not go far enough in terms of their emphasis on the joint construction of new knowledge that leads to both group and individual learning” (Peters and Armstrong, 1998, p 80).

In T1 and T2, the teacher is seen as the primary source of knowledge, and knowledge is seen primarily as information to be shared. This is appreciably different from T3, in which all participants, including the teacher, join the group with their experiences. Practical theories and new knowledge develop out of those participant experiences. Peters and Armstrong (1998) emphasize new knowledge construction as the aim of engaging in T3, with dialogue being the “principle mode of discourse” (p. 79). Unlike discussion, dialogue concentrates on using inquiry to understand and learn (Brookfield & Preskill, 1999; Eitington, 2002). “Inquiry is about asking questions and holding an attitude of curiosity, opening the door for insights” (Ellinor & Gerard, 1998, p. 111). The emphasis in dialogue is to examine assumptions, listen with intent, and speak

¹ *The majority of the literature refers to T3 as collaborative learning. For the purposes of this study, T3 is viewed only as it pertains to the larger structure of TTL, therefore not referred to as collaborative learning.*

without judgment in attempts to understand multiple perspectives and ways of knowing.

Dialogue is not about advocating a position or winning an argument (Isaacs, 1999; Eitington, 2002).

Sustaining dialogue for long periods presents a challenge; therefore, other modes of interaction may be utilized in attempts to bring a group back to actual dialogue. This is where either the teacher or the student can serve as a facilitator, unlike in T1 and T2 where the teacher serves as the only teacher and/or facilitator. That facilitation can come from the formal “teacher” or any of the participants. The teacher may have special skills or understanding of how to facilitate the group in a way conducive to T3. However, others in the group are expected to also learn how to facilitate. Facilitating in this way keeps the focus off the teacher as the primary source of knowledge and focuses on what is happening within the group. This is important to explain for this study since there is no one facilitator or teacher within the WWM group. All group members are seen as teachers and students at all times. While this structure aligns more with T3, this does not guarantee that all interactions are of a T3 nature. A major purpose of this study is to use TTL as an organizing framework for interactions that take place not in the classroom but in other environments.

The classroom structure in T3 is, in theory, more democratic in nature, meaning that social equality and respect of others’ experience is vital. The teacher cannot be an expert in other people’s experiences; therefore, everyone within the group is an expert in terms of their contributions to dialogue within the T3 experience. Rather than the teacher being the primary source of information, as in T1 and T2, all participants both transmit and receive information in T3. Therefore, instead of individual learning only, the focus is on both individual and group

learning. The different TTL provide an initial framework for understanding how groups interact. Although this TTL model evolved out of teacher/student interactions, it can provide a good framework for understanding different sorts of group interactions, even those without a teacher or formal facilitator. This study will build upon this framework by illustrating indicators used to engage in, as well as delineate between, the three TTL.

Studies on Types of Teaching and Learning

Empirical studies on Peters and Armstrong's (1998) types of teaching and learning theory using all three types are sparse. Thus far, the research done on TTL concentrated on T3, or some aspect of T3, while being embedded in the TTL framework. To date, 24 dissertations have been completed at the University of Tennessee which primarily focused on T3 or aspects related to T3, without a comparative analysis of the types (Alderton, 2000; Armstrong, 1999; Brickey, 2001; Collins, 2001; Cotter, 2001; Crosse, 2001; Dillivan, 2004; Duncan, 2009; Fazio, 2003; Gaskin, 2007; Gray, 2008; Merrill, 2003; Muth, 2004; Naujock, 2002; Osbourne, 2003; Portwood, 1999; Ragland, 2005; Randolph, 2006; Roberts, 2004; Roberts, 2005; Stulberg, 2004; Tissue, 1999; Torres, 2008; and Williams, 2004). The majority of these studies looked at the experiences of participants and/or that of the researcher. These studies have primarily used an ethnographic or phenomenological analysis approach resulting in themes around T3. Only one of these previous studies compared the three types of teaching and learning (Alderton, 2000), while a few other dissertations addressed some aspects of the TTL structure as part of their studies (Fazio, 2003; Gaskin, 2007; Gray, 2008; Merrill, 2003). However, none set out to compare or contrast the TTL. Rather, these studies positioned T1 and T2 as precursors to engaging in T3. These studies are reviewed next.

Alderton (2000) conducted an ethnographic-phenomenology study using data from ethnographic observations, structured interviews, and observers. His study explored the experiences of participants in a nontraditional class as it pertained to fostering dialogue and learning the T3 process. Alderton used outside raters to determine the TTL among 108 episodes. The criteria for determining the TTL concentrated on the interactions of the teacher/student relationship. Alderton's findings showed no consensus among the raters on whether the class engaged in T3. He did not include a discussion of the three specific TTL beyond its relationship to dialogue and the teacher/student relationship in knowledge creation. Alderton claimed that a group can engage in dialogue without engaging in T3, yet a group cannot engage in T3 without using dialogue (p. 121). This is relevant to the present study because he does not distinguish between other ways class participants interact beyond dialogue. Since groups do not always engage in dialogue, understanding how various types of group interactions contribute to the larger structure of TTL can help understand the inner workings of group dynamics and how each TTL evolves. Just concentrating on T3 neglects the true dynamics of any group since group interactions vary and span all three TTL, even when a group's intent is that of T3. Therefore looking at one TTL over the other two neglects to examine the true nature of group interactions and how all types of TTL can be useful in accomplishing a group's intention. Positioning T3 as the goal of group interactions, without examining its interrelationship with the other types, denies the process which groups go through in their interactions. In addition, none of these studies examine each TTL or explore possible interdependencies or relationships among the TTL. Instead, these studies concentrate on T3.

Other dissertations tangentially discussed their findings within the TTL framework. For example, Fazio (2003) incorporated T1 and T2 methods to facilitate farmers' engagement in T3 as they discussed alternative agricultural practices. Fazio intentionally set up his research environment for participants to take part in all three TTL with each meeting. His findings reported participants' experiences of the three types separately as well as for the overall meeting framework. Fazio's findings concentrated on the participants' experience, which validated Peters and Armstrong (1998) theories, as discussed earlier. However, Fazio did not compare the TTL to one another or discuss what happened within all three TTL.

In another example, Merrill's (2003) research was set in a classroom environment in which she was the instructor. Merrill performed an action research study using phenomenological/semi-structured interviews, field notes, and researcher journaling with inductive qualitative data analysis methods to explore students' experience of T3 in her courses. Like Fazio, Merrill incorporated T1 and T2 as an introduction and segued into T3 (p. 39), but did not seek to study or compare each of the three types. In her reflections on her research, Merrill states that T3 "proved to be a viable learning strategy for my information technology course when combined with Type I and II Teaching/Learning" (p. 122), and briefly acknowledged that each type provided some benefit. She further recognized that structuring the course where each type was utilized independently, and in isolation, of the other two provided little benefit from the participants' perspective. She learned to use the type called for in the moment rather than excluding any one type (p. 124). Merrill's analysis and reflection did not concentrate on the use of all three TTL since her focus was on T3. This again demonstrates the lack of systematic

comparison of the TTL in research studies done to date. Like Fazio (2003) and Merrill (2003), Gray (2008) used all three TTL to set up her study, but concentrated her research on T3.

In addition to these studies, Gordon (2003) wrote a master's thesis on cultural change initiatives within a healthcare organization. She reflected upon and posed different benefits for the TTL, such as T2 and T3 being the most beneficial in creating cultural change. However, she stated, "This was not considered an empirical research study; it was, rather, a recording of my personal experiences, reflections" (p. v). As there was no data collected or analyzed in this thesis, Gordon relied upon her reflections to acknowledge that there was a lack of time and opportunity to engage fully in each TTL.

Gaskin (2007) studied a behavioral health team using levelising, an aspect of T3, as a quality improvement tool. She discussed her role and engagement in the TTL as it related to how she positioned herself within this team. As evidence of this, she discussed her role in facilitating the meetings. This provided a limited view and position on identifying the TTL in which she engaged. However, Gaskin was not using the TTL model as a structure to report her findings since her focus was to examine how levelising manifested itself within her research. Gray (2008) reported on "collaborative learning activities" and the three types of teaching and learning in her dissertation study. However, she did not divulge what those activities looked like or how the three TTL manifested themselves within her classroom.

The empirical studies into TTL thus far have intentionally created environments for fostering or leading up to T3 interactions, sometimes, as demonstrated earlier, using the other two TTL as a segue and introduction to engaging in T3 (e.g., Fazio, 2003; Merrill, 2003; Gray, 2008). Previous studies have relied on participants' experiences as data for determining which

types of teaching and learning occurred. Researchers and practitioners new to TTL may ask how one can determine which type of TTL they are engaging in at particular times. In much of the previous work, the researchers also facilitated the interactions they studied, and presumably educated their research participants on the TTL. What is not discussed in these studies is how this was accomplished, what was said, or how the researchers defined the TTL to their participants. In addition, these researchers did not specifically identify when their participants were engaging in T3 as opposed to T1 and T2; rather, the focus was on participant engagement in T3 and their reflections on those experiences. Further research is needed into how groups interact within the TTL framework, not only using the three TTL in comparison to one another, but also looking at the framework as a whole for understanding group interactions. In addition, the previous research on, and related to, the TTL look at the participants' experiences. Missing in the literature is the examination of the experience from a researcher's perspective through discourse analysis, looking not just at T3, but at different types of interactions within the TTL framework.

Types of Teaching and Learning as a Way to Understand Communities of Practice

Vavasseur and MacGregor (2008) describe communities of practice as requiring “the creation of a network where the tone is welcoming and relaxed. Furthermore, engaging (practitioners) in activities that facilitate both individual and group learning and reflection encourages (practitioners) to assume leadership roles and to value one another's expertise” (p. 520). Furthermore, Vavasseur and MacGregor (2008) recognize expertise as something shared among all members within CoPs, just at different levels based on the type of interaction. Vavasseur and MacGregor suggest that learning is more effective in collaborative environments,

especially when dealing with one's practice (Wenger & Snyder, 2000; Vavasseur & MacGregor, 2008). However, these authors stop there in explaining the differences between various types of group engagement. Because the literature on CoPs does not treat joint knowledge construction, as explained in T3, as something unique from individual knowledge construction, there exists an opportunity to elucidate differences in CoPs. This is where the TTL framework can provide insight into interactions that take place within communities of practice, and structure for identifying such differences.

Peters and Gray (2007) suggest a relationship between the TTL model and CoPs, highlighting the concept of practitioner's experience being central to both. Their discussion centers on higher education classrooms, yet extrapolates related theories to management theory and organizational learning. They are the first to make this direct connection within the TTL and propose that the experience within a classroom setting would inevitably carry over to practice. However, inside or outside the classroom, the literature still does not explicitly define a framework for understanding group interactions and the behaviors and indicators for explaining those group interactions.

Rather than creating communities of practice only within higher education environments, it may be fruitful to examine practitioners' interactions in an existing community of practice in informal learning environments and/or contexts outside classrooms. As it stands, no studies have formally examined all three types of teaching and learning from a community of practice perspective. Although an argument could be made that prior TTL research indirectly involved a type of CoP, since the researchers studied groups involved in their practice. In addition, no studies have yet identified indicators of the three TTLs in practice. Such findings could inform

how TTL might be used in informal groups, or CoPs, that do not have a formal facilitators. This study bridges the gap in the literature by providing indicators across all three types of teaching and learning within a community of practice.

Chapter Three: Research Methods

Introduction

This chapter describes the qualitative methods used to answer the one overarching question guiding this study: What are the indicators of the types of teaching and learning in the We Want More community of practice? The chapter describes the research design and procedures, including participants, data collection, data analysis and validation strategies.

Research Design and Procedures

To answer my research question, I used an action research approach with case study as the organizing structure for data collection and analysis. I chose Stake's (1995) approach to case studies as a qualitative tradition of inquiry and approach to research design. This case study considers the We Want More (WWM) group's meetings and interactions to be a bounded system.

Action research.

I am situated within a community of practice who together were looking for ways to improve the group. As a participant researcher, I used an action research approach with case study as the organizing structure for data collection and analysis. Reason and Bradbury (2001) define the purpose of action research as a way "to produce practical knowledge that is useful to people in the everyday conduct of their lives" (p. 2). As a practical approach to research, action research answers questions people have within and about their own situation. For me, the implications for this are broad as it involves my personal and professional practices within different communities of practice in which I am a member and not a facilitator. During my involvement with the collaborative learning program, there was always a focus on how theory

and practice intertwined. However, the learning and theories involved in understanding the TTL partially derived from the teacher/student relationship within adult education settings (Peters and Armstrong, 1998). My own practice does not involve settings with formal teacher/student relationships. I wanted to define these types of teaching and learning in a way more aligned with those outside the classroom environment and broaden the framework to understand more about group interactions within CoPs.

As a group, the WWM members first sought to examine our group interactions in effort to understand how the TTL played out naturally without facilitation. Our hope was that through this process we could develop more awareness of our interactions within the TTL framework and could subsequently make intentional decisions and changes on how to go forward. I intentionally did not want to impose a way of being or facilitate the group without demonstrating how we already interacted and how those interactions aligned within the TTL. This study would establish a baseline for all members of the group, including myself, to recognize how we engaged in the three types of teaching and learning within our own context, as an informal, ever-evolving CoP. From there we could then decide with awareness and intention on how to go forward.

Participants.

The “We Want More” discussion group started meeting on a weekly basis in July 2005. Eight members had met regularly since November 2006. Data collection began in August 2007 and ended in October 2007. We generally met once a week for three hours on Thursday evenings starting at 5:30 pm.

The composition of this group consisted seven females and one male. The group included members with diverse professional backgrounds and experiences, as well as socio-economic,

marital, and educational status. The only common ground among the group members was the experience of taking Discovery Courses. Table 1: WWM Group Participants includes information about the participants for reference.

I received approval to collect data from the University of Tennessee's Office of Research in June 2007. Subsequently, all WWM group members voluntarily consented to participate in this study. The consent form can be found in Appendix A: Participant Consent Form.

Data sources.

This study includes three sources of data. The data sources are in the form of observational data: audio-recorded group meetings, field notes, and an internet discussion board (IDB). Stake (1995) identifies observation as a typical data collection procedure within qualitative research and a valuable technique to capture the complexity of a case study.

Audio taped meetings.

Eight meetings, each lasting three hours, were recorded. Based on my experience with the group, it seemed to take three meetings to work through a particular topic. Therefore, I approached the data collection with the intention of completing at least two cycles of this process. Eight meetings seemed ample time for capturing the dynamics of the group and providing a clear picture of this particular case (Stake, 1995). I asked one of the group members to assist me by reminding me to change tapes during the meetings. This helped me concentrate on both taking field notes and participating during the meetings. When logistically possible, the tape recorder stayed in the middle of the group for all members to see. I transcribed recordings of the first three meetings within three days. The last five meetings were transcribed within two weeks.

Table 1

WWM Group Participants

Participant Name	Approximate Age	Marital Status	Sex	Occupation	Episodes in Attendance
Susan	Mid 30's	Single	F	Business Owner	T1-E1; T1-E2; T2-E1; T2-E2; T3-E1; T3-E2
Lisa	Late 30's	Married	F	Management in Non-Profit	T1-E2; T3-E2
Beth	Mid 50's	Married	F	Business Owner	T1-E1; T1-E2; T2-E1; T2-E2; T3-E1
Jane	Mid 50's	Single	F	Attorney	T1-E2; T2-E1; T2-E2
Nicole	Late 60's	Single	F	Retired	T3-E2
Hank	Early 40's	Married	M	Property Management	T1-E1; T2-E1; T3-E1; T3-E2
Ann	Mid 40's	Married	F	Management in Non-Profit	T1-E1; T2-E1; T2-E2; T3-E1; T3-E2
Maya	Mid 50's	Married	F	Business Owner	T1-E1; T1-E2; T2-E1; T3-E1; T3-E2

After transcribing, I placed the transcripts in an Excel spreadsheet and notified the members of the group that they were available for their review, if they so chose. Some members chose to read the transcripts while others did not.²

Table 2 describes the organization of the 24 hours of recorded meetings. During the ten-week recording period, two weeks were skipped. One week the group did not meet at all (August 30, 2007) due to scheduling conflicts. The other week (September 14, 2007) the group met in a different environment that was not conducive to recording. Most meetings had two hours transcribed, with one meeting having one hour transcribed and two meetings with three hours transcribed. In total, there were 17 of the 24 hours transcribed. Those hours not transcribed were primarily due to technical difficulties with the recording equipment.

The six episodes³ selected for detailed analysis are included in the last column of Table 2. To maintain chronological order, the episodes are labeled by the type of teaching and learning (T1, T2 or T3) and episode number (E1 or E2). This label does not rank the episodes in any way. For example, “T1-E1” stands for the first episode of Type One teaching and learning to occur in the data and be analyzed in depth. The data analysis section contains a further explanation of episode selection.

Field notes.

Field notes contain non-verbal and other meaningful interactions that constitute “discourse in the broadest sense” (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 63). During each meeting, I documented my observations through field notes, while participating as fully as possible, to

² Details on the involvement of the group members in the study is outlined in the section on validity strategies at the end of this chapter.

³ Throughout the study I refer to the larger chunks of text as “episodes” and to specific interactions within these episodes as “excerpts” (see Wood & Kroger, 2000, p 184-5).

Table 2

*Description of Group Meeting Data.*⁴

Meeting Number	Meeting Date	Total Hours Recorded	Hours Transcribed	Coded as	Episodes Selected for Analysis
Meeting 1	08-02-07	3	1	0802.1	T3-E1
			2	0802.2	T2-E1
			3	0802.3	
Meeting 2	08-09-07	3	2	0809.2	
			3	0809.3	
Meeting 3	08-16-07	3	1	0816.1	T3-E2
			2	0816.2	
Meeting 4	08-23-07	3	2	0823.2	
			3	0823.3	
Meeting 5	09-06-07	3	2	0906.2	T2-E2
Meeting 6	09-20-07	3	1	0920.1	
			2	0920.2	T1-E1
			3	0920.3	
Meeting 7	09-27-07	3	1	0927.1	
			2	0927.2	T1-E2
Meeting 8	10-04-07	3	1	1004.1	
			3	1004.3	

⁴ The tapes used for recording were 120-minute tapes. Therefore, each tape captured 60 minutes or one hour of audio per side. Each hour of recording was labeled by date and transcribed hour. For example 1004.2 stands for October 4, second hour of the transcription (10 – October, 02 – Second day of month, .2 – second hour). All meetings happened in 2007. This date format allowed for the chronological storage of all information and data, thus providing easier recall and organization.

capture what the audio recordings did not. I followed Stake's (1995) suggestion of limiting my field notes to a few pertinent aspects of the meetings related to my research question. These notes included non-verbal communication, movement within the group, context, and moments that stood out during the meetings.

Immediately after each meeting, I supplemented my field notes with my own reflections and interpretations (Mason, 2002) of the group meetings. More specifically, I used Huberman and Miles' (1994) approach of writing margin notes and reflective passages during the data collection phase of research. I asked one other group member, Ann, to take notes during the meetings. She and I then discussed our observations and reflected on the significance of the field notes to the study. With the intention of making the interactions and research as transparent as possible, these discussions were conducted openly within the group meetings or on the IDB.

Internet discussion board.

Typically, information posted on the IDB served as a precursor for what occurred during the meetings. The WWM group used the IDB to continue dialogue, debrief, or follow-up on issues or ideas that surfaced during prior meetings. This asynchronous format included reflections, discussions, and questions that provided some insight and context for the group. An example of those entries is included in Appendix B: Internet Discussion Board Example.

For this study, I downloaded all IDB posts which occurred week prior to the first recorded meeting until one week following the last recorded meeting. IDB data were downloaded to an Excel spreadsheet. The IDB transcripts provided context for what occurred during the group meetings and data for the thick descriptions of each episode as presented in Chapter 4.

Pilot study.

Before beginning my research, I conducted a pilot study of the data collection methods. The pilot study included tape recording an entire meeting with the WWM group. I transcribed approximately one hour of the meeting for further analysis to identify any potential issues or problems. From this analysis, methods were developed for addressing problems before the actual study. The pilot study informed my approach to handling logistics, taking field notes, and transcribing the data.

Data Analysis

Thick description of the case.

According to Stake (1995), the first analysis in a case study involves establishing a thick, rich description of the case. This description was written based on the transcripts from recorded meetings, field notes, and IDB transcripts. Field notes helped provide further context for and description of the selected episodes. Field notes included information such as who was present in the meetings, how people entered the group space, how they were sitting, significant gestures or non-verbal communication exchanged, what was happening as I changed the audiotapes and when silence occurred. This data contributed to writing the thick description of the episodes by elucidating moments in the transcripts where verbal statements were not enough to provide context and meaning. The IDB transcripts provided further contextual information about what happened before and after the group meetings, illuminating some aspects of the episodes that the audiotape transcripts did not capture. All of the data were used to create a rich description of the episodes used for this case study.

Analysis and coding procedures.

Two qualitative approaches were used to analyze the data sources of this case study: a typological approach (Hatch, 2002), for which the types of teaching and learning served as the typology, and a discourse analysis approach (Wood & Kroger, 2000). The analysis process was iterative and inductive, following Stake's (1995) recommendation to go through several cycles of reflection and Wood and Kroger's (2000) recommendation to allow the details of the analysis to emerge. Wood and Kroger advise: "There are so many aspects to discourse that even when you think you know what you want to look at, you must be prepared to change your mind when you hear or see the data" (p. 87). I next outline in detail the steps of the analysis process as they emerged.

Three phases of data analysis.

The data analysis consisted of three distinct phases. The first phase was episode selection through an initial holistic analysis. The second phase identified indicators by analyzing these selected episodes in detail. In the third phase, I developed the final indicators through an iterative analysis process. I engaged in validation strategies to warrant my claims throughout the process.

Table 3: Phases and Steps of Data Analysis outline the process.

Phase one: initial holistic analysis – episode selection.

The first phase in the data analysis included seven steps within an overall holistic analysis of the data. First, I read all the transcripts without making notes. Second, I related the text to the typologies (Hatch, 2002) by reading through all the transcripts and color coding entries related to the types of teaching and learning typology (Peters & Armstrong, 1998). I categorized and color-coded all the transcripts based on three modes of discourse: monologue (Type 1), discussion (T2)

Table 3

Phases and Steps of Data Analysis

Phase One: Initial Holistic Analysis – Episode Selection
Step 1: Initial reading
Step 2: Color-code typologies
Step 3: Overall impressions
Step 4: Typology summary sheet
Step 5: Adjust color-coding
Step 6: Identify patterns and themes
Step 7: Select episodes
Phase Two: Episode Analysis – Indicator Identification
Step 1: Episode review
Step 2: Search for non-examples
Step 3: Analyze episodes based on indicators
Step 4: Review indicators across episodes
Step 5: Choose two of the three episodes for each of type of teaching and learning
Phase Three: Indicator Analysis – Iterative Development
Step 1: Indicator adjustment
Step 2: Episode and indicator verification
Step 3: Provide context from IDB
Step 4: Select excerpts
Step 5: Verification of indicators

and dialogue (Type 3). Approximately a third of the transcripts did not reveal an obvious typology, but fell somewhere between either T1 and T2 or T2 and T3. This approach helped me discern my initial hunches about typologies in the data without doing a line-by-line microanalysis of all the transcripts.

Third, I thoroughly read the transcripts again and, as suggested by Wood & Kroger (2000), recorded my initial impressions. This included areas that stood out for me as they related to the types of teaching and learning and any indications of these areas. Fourth, I read each of the entries by the different color codes and recorded main ideas on a summary sheet. This approach, suggested by Hatch (2002), provided the basis for the selection of episodes and started the list of indicators for the next phase.

The fifth step involved adjusting the initial holistic labeling of the episodes as Type 1, Type 2, or Type 3. This step involved reading the transcripts line-by-line and analyzing the data more closely. During this step, I categorized initially ambiguous data to one of the three typologies. The initial modes of discourse used in step 2 were not sufficient to categorize the data at this point. Other factors, based on the line-by-line analysis, were relied upon to further categorize the episodes within the typology.

In step six, I followed Hatch's (2002) suggestion to look for patterns and themes within the typologies. This allowed for expanding the initial list of indicators (found in Appendix C: Initial Indicators) based on the summary sheet compiled in step four. This step also clarified which data excerpts had similar patterns or relationships based on the typologies. I compared the list of indicators to the numerous episodes within the data to determine common occurrences of

those indicators. This later helped in choosing a limited number of episodes to describe the indicators.

In step seven, I selected episodes representative of each type of teaching and learning (TTL). This process involved reading through the specific color-coded transcripts while comparing episodes within each typology. One criterion for inclusion was that the episode must have at least 30 exchanges, or turns, taken by members of the group. I selected episodes with several different speakers, because these episodes would better illustrate interactions between individuals. The process resulted in nine distinct episodes: three for each TTL. Due to the research question: What are the indicators of the types of teaching and learning in the WWM CoP?, many of the indicators that resulted in this analysis could not be fully understood outside of a richer description of the context. Therefore, I determined that episodes would be used to provide that context rather than pulling examples of the indicators from several different excerpts across episodes. Limiting the data to a few episodes illustrated the indicators more thoroughly, rather than peripherally highlighting a wide variety of indicators that were not present in each TTL.

In summary, this first phase involved a holistic analysis of the data, which resulted in identifying three specific episodes for each of the three types of teaching and learning. These episodes then underwent further in-depth analysis in phase two.

Phase two: episode analysis - indicator identification.

Phase Two involved five steps. In the first step, I read each episode more thoroughly, making notes on a line-by-line basis of the text. Then I reviewed observations from my field notes for the corresponding episodes and made further notes on the indicators.

During step two, I read all the transcribed data not used to search for non-examples of indicators (Hatch, 2002). This step helped to further identify indicators consistent across the data and eliminate those that showed inconsistencies.

In step three, I analyzed the episodes based on the initial list of indicators developed for my dissertation proposal. This chart is located in Appendix C: Initial Indicators. I went through each chosen episode and looked for each of these indicators. During this process, I made notes as to which indicators were present and made further notes as to how they were developed and used within the episodes.

In step four, I reviewed the indicators across the three TTL. This process involved comparing characteristics of the three TTL and identifying indicators that were present across each type. During this step, I looked at each episode in light of each indicator and made notes on my analysis. This step resulted in a refined list of indicators by eliminating those indicators not represented within the nine episodes.

Finally, in step five I chose two of the three episodes within each TTL for further analysis in phase 3. During this phase of data analysis, it was clear that analysis of two episodes reached saturation point and analysis of the third episode within each TTL did not significantly add to the indicators. The selected six episodes are described thoroughly in Chapter 4, providing support and evidence for the five indicators in each TTL.

Thus, phase two involved a more thorough analysis of the episodes and development of the indicators. This phase also enabled narrowing of the data set. By defining episodes representative of the TTL, a clearer definition of the indicators emerged in phase three of the analysis process.

Phase Three: Indicator Analysis - Iterative Development.

The third and last phase of the data analysis involved five steps to identify and develop the final indicators. In this phase, I looked for relationships among the indicators (Hatch, 2002). I compared and contrasted each of the indicators with one another (Huberman & Miles, 1994) in order to broaden and refine the definitions. During this process, it was determined that the data were not strong enough to support some indicators and these were eliminated.

To verify the episodes and indicators chosen, in the second step I went back and reviewed the entire set of transcripts to see if other episodes in the data included more indicators. I verified that no episodes were representative of more or different indicators and so the six episodes were kept.

During the third step, I reviewed the IDB transcripts for context of the group interactions and a few changes were made to the indicators as a result. In step four, I selected excerpts from transcripts that supported the indicators (Hatch, 2002). The fifth and final step in this phase served to verify the interpretation and definition of the indicators. This process included obtaining feedback from two separate groups: WWM group members and two outside content experts. This validation process is described next.

Validity Strategies

Trustworthiness and authenticity.

Trustworthiness within qualitative research is akin to what other research designs call validity (Herr & Anderson, 2005). I worked to establish the trustworthiness of findings in this qualitative case study through five procedures:

1. prolonged engagement and persistent observation,

2. organized data set,
3. a rich, thick description,
4. member checking, and
5. content validity.

Engagement and observation.

My membership and continued participation in the WWM group constituted prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field as a means for “building trust with (other) participants, learning the culture, and checking for misinformation that stems from distortions” (Creswell, 1998, p. 201; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Johnson & Waterfield, 2004) that I as the researcher may have introduced. This group worked a great deal on building trust with one another over the time we were together, but more importantly, we created our own culture of which I was a part.

Data organization.

Because of the immense amount of data gathered, I followed Merriam’s (1988) suggestions for organization by establishing a systematic method for understanding interactions and relationships within the WWM group as related to the TTL. This organization for gathering and analyzing the data ensures that procedures were executed carefully and would lead to logical findings based on the evidence. Because of this, I merged all the data into a cohesive format that included a chronological account, thus eliminating redundancies and stating pertinent parts of the sourced data clearly. This organized data set leads to establishing a case for supported interpretations and reliable and sound data analysis (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Thick description.

The rich, thick description provided in Chapter 4 serves to provide enough detail so readers can determine transferability (Stake, 1995). In qualitative research, transferability means the extent to which the results can be generalized and transferred to other contexts.

Member checking.

Stake (1995), Johnson and Waterfield (2004), Creswell (2003), and Lincoln and Guba (1985) all suggest conducting member checks after data collection as well as the interpretation and coding of data. Member checks, as described by Stake (1995), involve “presenting draft materials to actors for confirmation and further illumination” (p. 115). I provided to the group members all the transcribed data from the audiotapes as well as my research writings throughout the process. Members were presented the opportunity to provide feedback pertaining to “the accuracy and credibility of the account” (Creswell, 2003, p. 203) that I presented as a researcher.

I initially made the first meeting’s transcripts available to the group as soon as they were typed. At this time, I explained features of the transcripts such as broken speech, grammatical errors, and back channeling and how these are typical of our spoken language (as suggested by Wood and Kroger, 2000). Some members expressed frustration in reading the transcripts because of what they perceived as their unclear communication style. This gave the group an opportunity to discuss the differences between verbal communication and written transcripts.

In three other instances, I offered the group members the typed transcripts. First, I sent the typed transcribed episodes to group members via electronic mail, without my own interpretation or notes. This occurred when the audiotapes from all the meetings were

transcribed. Three members read portions of the transcripts and made general comments as to the content.

Next, once I selected the nine episodes for further analysis (Phase One, Step Seven), I sent the episodes to group members who agreed to read them and provide feedback in the manner of their choice. I asked them to reflect on their impressions of what was occurring in the episodes and to note what stood out in the episodes regarding behavior, language, etc. Three group members asked for the transcripts. One person provided comments as to specific excerpts and exchanges on a line-by-line basis, while the other two provided their general impressions on each episode. During the final phase of the data analysis, I provided the group my final write up on the six final episodes. I sent the transcripts to all group members through electronic mail. I received some detailed comments and feedback, as well as questions from one group member. All the responses were sent directly to me through electronic mail.

I read and reviewed the feedback I received. This feedback provided additional meaning to the group interactions. This provided an opportunity to question my interpretation of the data and provided additional perspectives on what had transpired within the episodes. Overall, the feedback from the group members verified my interpretations.

Content validity.

Next, I sent the final indicators and their descriptions to two fellow doctoral cohort members for content validity. They reviewed the indicators at different points in the analysis and provided feedback. I intentionally did not provide data excerpts with the indicators. My intention was to have these individuals inquire into my meaning and use of particular language on the final indicators. They did not have access to the transcribed data, as I desired to have the indicators

make sense independently of the supporting excerpts for content validity. In my discussion of the indicators, this process and the resulting feedback provided clarity and consistency across the TTL.

Chapter Four: Findings

This chapter presents the findings for my research question: What are the indicators of the types of teaching and learning in the WWM CoP? First, there is a thick description of each of the six episodes selected for intensive analysis. Second, the TTL indicators are presented with their definition and characteristics. Finally, each indicator is illustrated further using excerpts from the episodes.

Episodes

All the WWM group meetings occurred on Thursday evenings from 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. in a group member's home, more specifically a living room or den. All members sat where they felt comfortable, as long as everyone could clearly hear one another and make eye contact at all times. This seating always took on a circle or oval shape configuration.

Group members brought food and beverages to each meeting, which were located on a table nearby or in the middle of the group. At the beginning of the meetings, group members spent about 30 minutes eating and engaging in small talk. Throughout the meetings, people got up to refresh their food or drinks. To minimize interruptions, the person hosting the meeting usually turned off their home telephone ringer or did not answer the telephone if it rang. There were no breaks during the meetings and everyone turned off their mobile telephones and other electronic devices. These aspects represent some actions the group took to create an inviting and comfortable space.

Throughout the two years of meetings prior to data collection, the group had developed several formal and informal commitments. Periodically, the commitments were adjusted to meet

the group's present needs and purposes. For example, some basic agreements among the group during the period of this study were that members would:

1. Post specifics about events in their lives on the IDB between meetings.
2. Do personal reflections between meetings.
3. Commit to being present every week as a priority.
4. Call or arrange to meet with another group member for needed support between meetings.

The episodes used for the findings of this study totaled six, two for each TTL. Some of the same excerpts are used to demonstrate different characteristics across the five indicators.

Type one teaching and learning episodes.

Type one-episode one (T1-E1).

This episode occurred on September 20, 2007, at Susan's home. Those present included Susan, Beth, Hank, Ann, and Maya. Jane showed up later in the evening. The episode centered on Beth's narrative of a decision she and her husband made involving the termination of an employee. Beth had been dissatisfied with this employees' performance and had shared as much on several other occasions during the data collection. In this episode, Beth shared her ability to overcome her anxieties about firing an employee.

The episode started with Beth stating a request to share an employee issue. However, her request met some resistance as Ann and Maya attempted to divert the conversation to Hank. Throughout the episodes analyzed for this study, Beth's interactions appeared as avenues for expressing her feelings around work. However, Beth had not posted such experiences on the IDB, a commitment all other group members upheld. On numerous occasions, Beth voiced that

she did not have the time to post to the IDB. However, a couple of other times during the study, Beth said she would rather take time to share the events of her life through a telephone conversation or face-to-face communication. Not that telephone conversations or further face-to-face communication was discouraged, but not posting on the IDB went against the group's commitments and became a recurring theme for group discussion throughout the study, especially after this episode.

During this particular episode, some group members wanted to hear from Hank since he tended to be one of the quieter members. As shown in the data, he usually only shared after being invited to speak. Immediately before this episode, Susan abruptly ended an experience she shared, and then expressed the desire to segue into something else. Beth requested time to share, which is where the episode begins. A couple of other members requested instead to hear from Hank, both on the IDB and earlier in the evening, and Beth did not attend to the request. As soon as this episode concluded, both Maya and Ann returned to ask Hank about the course he attended.

This episode provides one example of how the IDB served as a continual method of interaction among group members, many times providing a focus for discourse, as well as further information and context. The group attempted to persuade Beth to commit to a shared group dynamic of posting on the IDB as a means to enhance her communication within the group. Typically, such narratives, as that presented by Beth in this episode, were shared on the IDB and not during the face-to-face meetings. However, since Beth did not post to the IDB, her stories and narratives were shared in person. The complete transcript for this episode is in Appendix D: Transcripts of Episode T1-E1.

Type one-episode two (T1-E2).

This episode also occurred at Beth's house on September 27, 2007. Group members present included Beth, Jane, Susan, Lisa, and Maya. Jane shared her accomplishments and learning through her volunteer work on a local committee. Although several turns were taken, limited interaction occurred between the group members. Throughout the data collection, when Jane spoke, her narratives unfolded slowly, taking more time to tell her story. This episode demonstrated the politeness exhibited by the group in allowing her the space to do so. Rather than deepening the context of Jane's share, the group politely respected Jane's desire to share her experiences in this manner.

What stood out most about this episode was the amount of speaking Jane did around a subject. Throughout the research period, Jane did not speak a great deal during the group meetings. However, when Jane did speak, it involved a decision she made or a story about a recent event. Jane did not exhibit a struggle with personal issues and did not seek feedback or input from other group members. As shown in this episode, Jane did not invite other perspectives, which limited the exchanges within the group. This limited interaction partially contributed to Jane's speaking uninterrupted. The transcript for this episode is located in Appendix E: Transcripts of Episode T1-E2.

Type two teaching and learning episodes.

Type two-episode one (T2-E1).

This episode took place on August 2, 2007, at Beth's house. Those present included Beth, Susan, Jane, Ann, Hank, and Maya. Directly before this episode, Ann described her new

responsibilities at work. During this episode, the conversation centered on Ann's frustrations with work.

A high level of energy presented itself in this interaction, demonstrated by interruptions, speech rate, and number of turns. Throughout the episode, Ann spoke quickly and appeared to deflect focus away from herself by calling attention to other group member's facial expressions and non-verbal communication. The rest of the group allowed Ann to do so with little resistance. The complete transcript for this episode is in Appendix F: Transcripts of Episode T2-E1.

Type two-episode two (T2-E2).

This episode occurred at Beth's house on September 6, 2007. Those in attendance included Beth, Susan, Ann, and Jane. The episode began with Ann connecting her political beliefs to another member's recollection of growing up in the segregated south and then stated her position on "corporate welfare." Then Susan questioned Ann's meaning of corporate welfare as an opportunity to defer to her own meaning. The conversation changed focus several times throughout the episode. This conversation involved several short turns between group members. As with the T2-E1 episode, members spoke quickly and interrupted one another, demonstrating a high energy level. The transcript for this episode can be found in Appendix G: Transcripts of Episode T2-E2.

Type three teaching and learning episodes.

Type three-episode one (T3-E1).

This episode occurred on September 20, 2007, at Susan's home. Those present included Susan, Beth, Hank, Ann, and Maya. Hank was present, however, he did not speak during the exchanges within this episode.

The episode involved Susan sharing her thoughts and feelings concerning relationships. Group members focused on Susan's experience by asking questions as well as challenging her assumptions. At the beginning of the episode, the pace of the group slowed drastically, which demonstrated a contemplative level of involvement and attention. Throughout the episode, others in the group related to Susan's situation, sharing their own experiences. This episode may be indicative of the deeper relationship within the group, and the familiarity they have come to share over the course of two years. The entire transcript for this episode is located in Appendix H: Transcripts of Episode T3-E1.

Type three-episode two (T3-E2).

The last episode occurred on August 16, 2007, at Nicole's house within the first hour of meeting. Those present included Nicole, Susan, Lisa, Hank, Ann, and Maya. Beth and Jane were not present during this episode.

Preceding this episode, a discussion ensued concerning a Discovery Course Nicole and Lisa recently attended. As stated in the transcripts, Nicole appeared to the other group members as being "hard on herself" about her own expectations and actions pertaining to her relationship with her children. Immediately before this episode, Nicole stated that working through these issues with the group helped her see herself better.

The episode began with surfacing a discrepancy between how Nicole perceived herself and how others saw her. As Nicole opened herself to other possible perspectives and requested support from the group, she modeled how to express perceived deficiencies. She also invited others to notice any underlying assumptions in her statements. She asked for help in clarifying intended action steps for which she might take responsibility. This led to other group members

asking for clarification of meaning, thus deepening the interaction. Through Nicole's trust and willingness to take responsibility, she opened the episode to discourse around awareness and transformation. The transcript for this episode is in Appendix I: Transcripts of Episode T3-E2.

Indicators

Five indicators emerged from the analysis: engagement, assumptions, influence, questioning, and mode of discourse. I define each of the five indicators as they appear in each type of teaching and learning (see Table 4: Indicator Definitions). Although these indicators are represented in a table, they are interrelated and not discrete. For the sake of simplicity, the characteristics of the individual indicators are charted and explained separately. Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 illustrate the links between the indicators more fully. Through these interdependencies the TTL can be understood. No one indicator works in isolation to define any one TTL.

Engagement

The first indicator is engagement. Connection and intensity had a symbiotic relationship within the engagement indicator. Connection denoted how people act in relation to one another while intensity referred to the level of action. The characteristics of this indicator are included in Table 5: Engagement Characteristics.

Two areas comprised the engagement indicator. First, the overall level of connection among group members that considered how the group members related to one another. The second consideration transcended the verbal communication into the non-verbal cues such as rate, tone, and force of speech, referred to as intensity. Intensity also considered the group's overall energy level, demonstrated by physical movement and other body language. Next, excerpts from each type are used to illustrate the characteristics of the engagement indicator.

Table 4

Indicator Definitions

Indicator	Definition
Engagement	Level and type of action within a group. Inclusive term of how people act or interact with others (connection) and the level of action that goes into those interactions (intensity).
Assumptions	Examining and managing stated assumptions. These assumptions may include values, opinions, judgments, beliefs, theories, and ideas, made through statements, questions or other speech acts.
Influence	Handling and regarding other perspectives, as well as persuading others to act or do something, including openness to listening and considering other ideas or viewpoints.
Questioning	Use of questions to make statements, inquire, and express judgments.
Mode of Discourse	Narrative, discussion, and/or dialogue as ways to verbally and non-verbally communicate.

Engagement - Type I.

When the group engaged in T1, members sometimes disengaged or disconnected from the interaction. While the primary speakers (Beth in T1-E1 and Jane in T1-E2) had a slightly higher forcefulness and rate at which they spoke during these episodes, the rest of the group exhibited a low intensity. Overall, the group did not allow for silence in T1 episodes. Both episodes also include non-verbal cues that show a lack of connection. Group members appeared

Table 5

Engagement Characteristics

Engagement		
Definition: inclusive term of how people act or interact and emotionally connect with others (connection) and the level of action that goes into those interactions (intensity).		
Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low connection with low group intensity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium connection with high group intensity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High connection with low group intensity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher forcefulness and rate of speech by main speaker • Overall slow rate of speech and energy level with group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rush through explanations or turns • Speech is fast overall • Louder volume 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slower pace and tempo of interaction for all group members • Rate of speech is slower, more deliberate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some interruptions • Short verbal responses, quick and close-ended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many interruptions • Quick and brief exchanges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few to no interruptions • Lots of silence and pauses for reflection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No pauses and silence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No pauses and silence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High use of silence, pauses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low group awareness • Disengage or disconnect from the interaction • Fidgeting • Agitation • Reduced eye contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medium group awareness • Anxiety displayed • Hurried to find agreement • Short-term concentration on person speaking • Sporadic eye contact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High group awareness • Active listening demonstrated through posture and body language • Calm and relaxed space • Intense eye contact

not to notice themselves and others in the interactions, as demonstrated by reduced eye contact and fidgeting. Although the members showed respect for the speakers by allowing those individuals the opportunity to tell their stories, there was a lack of demonstrated empathy or concern. In both T1 episodes, the lack of group interaction allowed the main speaker to tell her story without much interruption.

Engagement T1-E1.

The episode started by providing a great deal of context in these first ten turns, setting the stage for the bulk of the episode:

L1⁵ (Beth): I want to share with you something that happened.

L2 (Maya): Yeah. Well, **we** were on the relationships course, so I went that way.

[Motions to Hank while entire group looks to him] I wanted to hear about the relationships course from Hank

L3 (Beth): Yeah, **I** want to tell you about a relationship...

L4 (Hank): *[Interruption]* Is that why you pointed at me?

L5 (Ann): Yeah, yeah, I want to hear it...*[says to Hank enthusiastically]*

L6 (Beth): *[Interruption]* -- at work, and that we, you know, I had talked to y'all about Marie, and agonizing all of that. And we had to terminate her.

L7 (Ann): Huh? *[Looking at Hank, says dismissively to Beth and quickly glances at Beth, then again to Hank]*

L8 (Susan): And we haven't heard **anything** since then. *[Says to Beth]*

L9 (Ann): Because **you** haven't posted.

⁵ When quoting excerpts, I include the line number (e.g., L38 is Line 38) followed by the speaker's name in parentheses.

L10 (Beth): Because I've been overwhelmed, which seems to be a perpetual state these last months. So yeah, overwhelmed and that we did terminate her. She was out for that whole week leading up to -- well, after Labor Day. We talked to her on Thursday or Friday.

In this T1 episode, the main speaker, Beth, concentrated on her own issues and focused on her story without attending to other members' verbal request and non-verbal cues. In the segue to recounting her story, Beth did not attend to other group members. This appeared to send the message to the rest of the group that Beth was determined to share her story. Prior to this episode, Maya and Ann mentioned their desire to hear from Hank. Also prior to the meeting, the group discussed and asked Hank about the relationship course on the IDB. Beth's statements in L1 and L3 emphasize the "I," as she asked the group to be heard. In L2, Maya made a case for hearing from Hank, but Beth kept speaking. Even when Ann weighed in and stated her preference, Beth interrupted her to begin telling her story. In response, Ann provided a negative reaction as to the direction of the discourse.

Throughout this episode, Ann provided short verbal responses, which carried a tone that could be interpreted as irritation and disapproval, which is evidenced most clearly in L9. Ann did not ask for explanations as to why Beth did not post on the IDB, as this had become a recurring issue within the group. Ann's statement rejected Beth's opportunity to share on two levels. First, Ann wanted to hear from Hank. Second, Ann made a statement against Beth's non-compliance with posting to the board. Although Beth agreed to this commitment when entering the group, she did not take responsibility for violating the agreement as shown in L10. Her previous actions of not writing on or reading the IDB contributed to disconnected involvement with the other

group members. As a result, Beth used the group as a forum for recounting stories that the remainder of the group members usually did through the IDB. This contributed to what could be seen as hostile engagement, as some group members passively challenged her without really engaging with her on a level that sought more than information.

Before L10, the group, specifically Ann and Maya, demonstrated excitement to hear from Hank. Ann displayed a sharp tone with Beth to dissuade her from sharing (L7 and L9). After L10, the group's tone shifted to being marginally attentive as they allowed Beth to speak. The entire group, including Beth, slowed its rate of speech and energy level. Still though, Ann's tone and language toward Beth was dismissive. Even later during Line 21, Ann's words appeared to acknowledge and support Beth; however, Ann stated them with a slightly disapproving tone:

L21 (Ann): A joint decision, that a move and a positive step, yeah.

During this statement, Ann made a hand gesture and head movement that indicated she wanted to move on, hurrying Beth. She stated "yeah" that dismissed Beth's actions. During this episode, nobody addressed the evident conflict.

All statements and questions Maya asked within the episode were quick and close-ended, which demonstrated a low level of connection within the interaction. On the surface, group members acted as if they are trying to engage Beth, but they did not go beyond the point of asking for information. Hearing some of Beth's story earlier, Susan answered for Beth on a couple occasions. This served to hurry Beth along in her storytelling. Shortly after this episode concluded, Ann abruptly returned to Hank, persuading him to share his experience. Such actions demonstrate a lack of interest in Beth's story and little attention to the relationship. When the group's attempts to take the interaction in another direction failed, they still exhibited some

politeness in allowing Beth to continue. However, nobody ever acknowledged the group's initial disregard for the relationship with Beth. The engagement appeared as hostile toward Beth and disconnected between the group members.

Engagement T1-E2.

In this episode, there was little engagement. People appeared to listen politely to Jane by providing verbal acknowledgement. This shows in the transcripts as “mm,” “mm-hmm,” or “yeah” and comprised over a third of the turns taken in this episode. Jane spoke the majority of the time, and while she did, the group did not fully engage and listen. Finally, at the end of the episode, Beth abruptly changed the subject.

Limited interaction existed between group members, evident mostly by the lack of eye contact between group members. In addition, people were getting up, moving around, and fidgeting in their seats. One group member got up to use the restroom, while everyone seemed to attend more to getting food placed in the middle of the group. Such non-verbal cues provided an opportunity for the WWM group to look beyond the verbal exchanges and pay attention to the non-verbal communication within the group. When non-verbal communication was not addressed by the group members, the interactions seemed to focus on the words being stated and not how the group was connecting.

At one point, Lisa leaned forward as if to interject, yet stopped without interrupting Jane. After Jane or others did not acknowledge Lisa's movements, she sat back again and appeared to be quietly listening. Nobody attended to that movement by going back to Lisa and inviting her to share, which demonstrated the group's low engagement. During the member checking process,

the group members reflected upon this interaction. Like the previous T1 episode, relationships were not attended to within the group contributing to a lack of connection.

Engagement - Type II

Both T2 episodes demonstrated a higher level of intensity in the interaction. The rate of speech is faster and members interrupt one another more frequently. Each T2 episode included moments where people attempted to connect to others in the group. However, this connection suffered due to the quick speed of the interaction. There were no pauses or silence in these episodes. Although there was more eye contact in the T2 episodes than in T1, the connection between group members did not sustain itself. Emotions were not attended to, especially what appeared to be frustration and agitation displayed in both T2 episodes. As in T1, the group attended to verbal statements, without calling attention to or acknowledging non-verbal communication. By not attending to this communication between group members, the group did not display a great deal of connection.

Engagement T2-E1.

In this episode, the group's primary goal was to resolve Ann's difficult work situation. The group attempted to persuade Ann through problem solving, jumping around to different areas involving her work. Ann rushed through explaining her situation and exhibited a high level of intensity and anxiety, which the group followed. When questioned, Ann quickly provided answers:

L13 (Ann): Well, George, we have a facilities manager for all 18 company buildings. And what I know of him is...I'll do the stuff myself.

L14 (Maya): Why?

L15 (Ann): Because he never gets around to it.

L16 (Maya): And why would that be?

L17 (Ann): Because there's always a disaster at one of the other buildings. . There is always some kind of disaster in this dark hole that we call the residential home.

Ann's answers missed an opportunity to look more closely at the reason behind the question. The purpose of Maya statement therefore was not revealed. The "why" questions, in and of themselves, only seemed to seek further information. Although, the questions themselves seemed to appear as hostile to Ann, where Ann responded by defending her position. Subsequently, Ann answered these questions as if Maya was seeking information and facts. Through member checking, Ann later revealed that her responses lacked critical reflection and offered quick responses because she did not want to be under the "microscope." In addition, in an extensive episode later in the data, Ann revealed that she avoided engagement and did not necessarily seek to gain perspective. Seeking only answers (rather than understanding) seemed to result in disconnected group communication. Ironically, such disconnect was one of the same issues Ann shared about concerning her communication with co-workers which led into this episode.

L39 (Susan): You got something right there in your face. *[Says to Ann]*

L40 (Maya): So, I say you need those relative priorities more than you need a job description. Clearly.

L41 (Ann): Certainly, certainly.

L42 (Susan): *[Interruption]* Can I go back to something that you started this out with? I'm just kind of wondering with all this, what you want to do other than understanding your emotions or...

L43 (Ann): *[Interruption]* What do you mean? You mean the emotions or

L44 (Susan): *[Interruption]* going back to the emotion thing...

In this excerpt, Susan attempted to get away from the group's problem-solving based on the non-verbal expressions exhibited by Ann, and due to an earlier conversation she had with Ann. Susan did call attention to and address Ann's non-verbal communication. However, with all the interruptions, there was a short-term concentration on the individual speaking at that particular moment, and not what was transpiring non-verbally with the rest of the group.

During this episode, the group engaged primarily in the topic and secondarily in the what was happening with Ann. Because the group cared about Ann, they focused on helping her through the anxieties and frustrations she had concerning her work. Susan attempted to ask Ann what she wanted from the group as support for addressing her work situation, other than understanding her emotions. However, Ann did not appear to address her problems directly in this episode, but instead deflected attention away from herself.

Engagement T2-E2.

During the T2-E2 episode, the group members exhibited a medium level of connection, as the level actually varies throughout the episode. In this episode, the primary goal between most members of the group was to advocate a position. By doing so, they did not always attend to the non-verbal communication. A higher level of intensity existed, which created misunderstandings within the interactions. This disconnect was demonstrated when Beth attempted to inquire and encountered only brief responses.

L25 (Beth): Does Wal-Mart really and truly not pay health insurance for their employees?

L26 (Susan): Well, what most big companies have done and we did this at [my old company] too is you bring people in, you, you do not employ them full-time.

L27 (Ann): Right.

L28 (Susan): So that way you don't have to give them the benefit.

L29 (Ann): Right.

L30 (Susan): You really use people as expendable.

L31 (Ann): They're expendable widgets, yeah.

L32 (Susan): Yeah and, and, um, so you don't have to pay them, but you're still getting the production –

Ann and Susan did not respond to Beth's subtle challenges as to whether their beliefs were grounded in fact. Most of what was said in this episode exhibited beliefs, biases and opinions. During this interaction, little attention was paid to the non-verbal communication. When Beth questioned such assertions, Susan and Ann sought agreement and attempted to persuade Beth with their own beliefs. Nobody stopped to discuss the questions posed, which created a missed opportunity for uncovering deeper understanding and attend to the relationship. Ann and Susan tried to assert influence by focusing on their own perspective and by doing so, the group missed opportunity for discovery. These missed opportunities are demonstrated through the many interruptions that occur:

L3 (Ann): okay. For example...

L4 (Susan): *[Interruption]* You mean the welfare of the, of the...

L5 (Beth): *[Interruption]* All the population.

Susan did not allow Ann to share an illustration. Then Beth continued speaking without allowing Susan to take a turn. The overall group did not attend to statements in this episode, as shown in the previous two excerpts.

The rate of speech for most group members increased as they tried to convey their point of view. In this episode in particular, the speech volume was louder and rate was faster than in all the other episodes. The two main participants, Ann and Susan, exhibited what appeared as agitation bordering on anger at different points as they presented their arguments.

Engagement - Type III.

Within T3, group members exhibited a higher level of connection as they attended to one another verbally and non-verbally throughout the episode. These qualities allowed emotions to surface safely and without what appeared to be the agitation and frustration demonstrated in T2 episodes. The pace of the interaction slowed as group members' paused to allow one another the opportunity for reflection through silence. This slower pace lent itself to a lower intensity, as group members appeared more calm and relaxed than in T1 and T2 episodes. There were few interruptions and overlaps in speaking as well as more eye contact. In both T3 episodes, group members actively listened to one another and appeared more aware of what was unfolding between them as a group. Group members turned their bodies to face one another or leaned toward the speaker, which physically demonstrated active listening.

Engagement T3-E1.

In this episode, group members involved themselves in what Susan said and shared their perspectives. The intensity and tone of the interaction was softer and more peaceful, as people attended to what was transpiring. Susan's facial expressions, as well as the emotions revealed by

her words and non-verbal communication, contributed to this connection. Everyone physically involved themselves in the interaction as evidenced by direct eye contact and body posture. One member leaned forward, while a couple of others physically positioned themselves to face Susan. Another member waited to use the restroom until after this episode. Even while sharing a more “emotional” moment, the group demonstrated a relaxed atmosphere, displayed by laughter throughout the episode.

The group interactions unfolded more slowly in this episode with significantly fewer interruptions than found in T1 and T2. Group members demonstrated concern for Susan and her situation through what appeared as empathy in their facial expressions, head nods and other non-verbal cues. Group members also relied on the history of their interactions with Susan, pulling from their previous experiences. The group shared their perspective based on that deeper relationship and not just what was presented in this episode. Following is one out of several excerpts demonstrating the group’s experience of Susan:

L16 (Susan): Okay, in my family of origin and I’m thinking a lot to a very formative time with my grandfather where everything was very conditional.

L17 (Ann): I don’t see you do that with Riley. I don’t see you do that with us.

L18 (Susan): No, and I don’t feel like that’s how I am with the relationships that I have in my life.

Based on Ann’s experience with Susan and her son Riley, Ann corrected Susan’s statement. This statement pulled from more than statements made in the moment, but drew from the knowledge Ann had gained in her experience with Susan. There were several excerpts throughout the

episode where group members challenged Susan by providing perspective, support, and feedback:

L65 (Susan): Mm-hmm. And you know it is so amazing that how having this group and having that support to let you even look into it and go further. I can't do that by myself. You know, I just don't see myself as being capable of uncovering a lot of that.

L66 (Beth): And you are, with help from your friends and your full feeling. You know you were so concerned last week about not being able to feel and there's all kinds of feeling about you. It's clear as you're sitting here tonight and as I've seen you since you've come into the group, all kinds of feeling. All kinds of feeling.

In this turn, Beth provided positive affirmation to Susan, calling attention to Susan's previously stated belief that she did not demonstrate feeling and emotion. By stating such, Beth pulled from previous experiences and attended to her relationship with Susan.

This episode also demonstrated a heightened sense of awareness through verbal and non-verbal communication. For example, in Line 3, Ann noticed Susan's non-verbal cues and inquires into what is happening:

L3 (Ann): And there's three, there's about three different levels right there. Tell us...what's that? [*To Susan*]

This provided an excerpt of how Ann tuned into Susan's non-verbal communication and asks Susan to share what was happening. Ann was careful not to assume what those facial expressions meant, just that she noticed some different emotion and inquired into what she saw.

The difference for Ann in this episode, rather than in some of the other episodes, was that her response was calmer and more controlled. In T1 and T2, she called greater attention to her

reaction through more dramatic non-verbal gestures and facial expressions, as demonstrated more clearly in T1-E1 and T2-E2. In this instance, Ann verbally acknowledged her notice of Susan's facial expressions, as well as non-verbally pointing and shifting her body. However, nobody went back to question Ann's meaning about her comment of "there's about three different levels right there," and Ann did not explain what she means during member checking.

Engagement T3-E2.

In episode T3-E2, as with the previous episode, the members exhibited a high level of engagement. The tone was similar to that of T3-E1 as members shared laughter, even when involved in a serious topic. A slower tempo and calmness in speech allowed for reflection and silence.

One member addressed the safety factor of the group, which appears to demonstrated the emotional support, trust, and security group members experience while attending to one another:

L10 (Lisa): Because you are safe in here and you have done that in here. *[short pause]*
You do ask what you want. You did it last night, you asked questions when you had them. You do offer support as we go around. But I think that's the key that you just hit on, when I'm safe that also goes with...

Lisa listened attentively and then pulled together Nicole's statements to present as a different perspective. Here Lisa felt safe enough to correct Nicole gently while sharing her own experiences with Nicole. This exhibited respect for Nicole's beliefs while providing another perspective.

In another excerpt, Maya extended compassion and support to Nicole:

L55 (Maya): I would have one other reaction that is I have to do these things. And please don't beat yourself up over this. You're gonna go do the best you can possibly do.

Both excerpts provided insight to the sense of safety and trust exhibited in the group. Members correcting each other further evidenced this safety and trust. Although basic sense of safety and trust usually existed within the group, only when engaging in T3 did members more fully display such characteristics. During this episode, a high level of connection equated to being able to safely and gently correct another's statements in a way that was not only heard, but also attended to in building relationships between group members.

Summary of Engagement.

In summary, engagement set the stage for understanding how the group members interacted with one another. Most of this indicator's characteristics derived from non-verbal communication such as rate of speech, interruptions, and eye contact. These aspects fed into and provided two main characteristics of engagement: connection and intensity. As mentioned at the beginning of this section, these two characteristics had a highly symbiotic relationship within the engagement indicator.

The first characteristic of engagement was the level of connection within the group interactions and relationships. These levels of connection referred to aspects such as how much the group members paid attention to one another, attended to non-verbal communication, listened, maintained eye contact, and participated in the discourse. In other words, engagement referred to the overall connection between individuals in the group, and the group as a whole.

The second characteristic of engagement was the intensity level. Intensity referred to the overall group energy level, including rate of speech, body movement, emotional display, and

other non-verbal cues. Intensity could have been categorized as being low, medium, or high; however, the three Types ended up being either low or high intensity with nothing falling clearly in-between in these particular episodes. In T1 and T3, there was an overall calmness to the group as members spoke more slowly and controlled emotions. However, there was a starkly different quality to the intensity demonstrated in T1 and T3, discussed further in Chapter 5. For the high intensity episodes in T2, there was a higher sense of excitement and forcefulness of speech in the episodes as members appeared more agitated and animated.

The intention of both connection and intensity was to look at these characteristics across a continuum in order to describe how they presented themselves in each type. This resulted in ranking these characteristics as low, medium, or high. As the episodes demonstrated, the level of connection increased from T1 being low, T2 being medium, to T3 being high. However, the level of intensity represented more of a bell curve, peaking with T2 being high and T1 and T3 being lower intensity, although of a different quality based on the relationship between intensity and connection. The interdependent relationship between these two characteristics of engagement is discussed further in Chapter 5. Next is the second indicator of the TTL, assumptions.

Assumptions.

This indicator addressed how group members handle assumptions. These assumptions may include values, opinions, judgments, beliefs, theories, and ideas made through statements, questions, or other speech acts. Table 6: Handling Assumption Characteristics provided a side-by-side explanation of aspects related to each of the three types as they relate to assumptions.

Assumptions presented here appeared to be viewed by individuals and within the group as factual or another source of information. This section covers the different characteristics of assumptions, including excerpts from each type to illustrate those characteristics.

Assumptions - Type I.

In T1 episodes, group members did not explicitly address assumptions in their conversation. Assumptions appeared to be treated as fact and information, therefore, needed no examination or perspective. The issue of not addressing assumptions was later discussed with a few group members during member checking. Here it was recognized that they consciously choose not to suspend or challenge assumptions and instead allowed the member who was speaking to tell her story. The purpose of these interactions seemed to lie in allowing the individuals to tell their stories from their own perspectives, unfiltered and unchallenged. The speaker served as the expert in his or her own life.

When recounting an experience during T1 episodes, group members could expect to share their perspective without challenge or question as to the accuracy of statements. This especially happened when the recounted events had a limited expression of opinions or beliefs and concentrated on what was felt or experienced.

Assumptions T1-E1.

In the first episode, Beth assumed that other group members want to hear from her, but she ignores their attempts to hear from Hank.

L1 (Beth): I want to share with you something that happened.

Table 6

Assumptions Characteristics

Assumptions		
Definition: how the group examines and manages assumptions and different perspectives.		
Assumptions in this context include values, opinions, judgments, beliefs, theories and ideas.		
Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignore or passively address assumptions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Go unaddressed; while attempts to address are not attended to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at assumptions as one perspective and able to reframe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions stated as fact, needing no examination • Intention of interaction is to hear only one perspective • Allows speaker to tell story unchallenged not to examine assumptions or share perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface and address when challenges own position, readily accept other assumptions when supports own position • Challenge assumptions as method for problem-solving • Certain conviction of statements, believing true and unwilling to examine • Little reflection or time for consideration due to fast pace of interactions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat assumptions as perspectives on an experience rather than fact • Balance conflict that allows questioning of assumptions while not losing individual perspective • Base challenges on own experience and relationship • Members open to sharing and recognizing own assumptions • Provide time and space to examine • Increased comfort level between group members

L2 (Maya): Yeah. Well, **we** were on the relationships course, so I went that way.

[Motions to Hank while entire group looks to him] I wanted to hear about the relationships course from Hank

L3 (Beth): Yeah, **I** want to tell you about a relationship...

L4 (Hank): *[Interruption]* Is that why you pointed at me?

L5 (Ann): Yeah, yeah, I want to hear it...*[says to Hank enthusiastically]*

L6 (Beth): *[Interruption]* -- at work, and that we, you know, I had talked to y'all about Marie, and agonizing all of that. And we had to terminate her.

L7 (Ann): Huh? *[Looking at Hank, says dismissively to Beth and quickly glances at Beth, then again to Hank]*

L8 (Susan): And we haven't heard **anything** since then. *[Says to Beth]*

L9 (Ann): Because **you** haven't posted.

L10 (Beth): Because I've been overwhelmed, which seems to be a perpetual state these last months. So yeah, overwhelmed and that we did terminate her. She was out for that whole week leading up to -- well, after Labor Day. We talked to her on Thursday or Friday.

Since this episode primarily involved Beth recounting her recent experience, what she said after L9 were treated as factual. All the questions asked were not to address assumptions, but to gain further information and clarification. If any assumptions were addressed in this episode after L9, they evolved from Maya trying to clarify for understanding. Rather than making assumptions about the actual events in Beth's story, Maya checked to make sure her understanding was accurate.

Assumptions T1-E2.

In this episode, no one noticed or called attention to assumptions made by Jane. This was demonstrated by the following excerpt:

L29 (Jane): Which was so radical from like there being—excuse me there not being any opportunity at work and other situations where they pick people for an agenda or political reasons. And you know there's never any growth or anything of impact so I just gravitated towards what worked for me.

Here Jane talks about why she did not volunteer for projects at work, as she believed that “they pick people for an agenda or political reasons.” Nobody challenged this statement even though the group members likely did not all share this assumption. In the two years everyone had been meeting with Jane prior to this point, she had been recognized as a good resource with needed skills for volunteer functions inside and outside of her work.

The one time anyone addressed Jane's use of language to express her value judgment, it was done passively and with a humorous tone.

L45 (Jane): You know we've got like the former judge and a couple of other people that got—I wasn't able to be there yesterday with that big kick-off at the mall but between the core group, they got the Mayor, Mr. Smith that stupid new sheriff and somebody else.

L46 (Lisa): As opposed to the stupid old sheriff?

L47 (Jane): Yeah. His stupid replacement. Yeah but that core group you know *[unintelligible]* phone calls and saying you know either knowing them, working with them but it wasn't like being at a distance and having to write a letter and getting on the calendar. It was you ought to be over there. So and so has contacted so and so and this

would be good and it just all worked out so well, you know for that and I don't know. It's just a...

Lisa asked the question in jest, however, when Jane did not respond to it as an assumption, nobody followed up. In other situations, the group addressed this kind of statement through a more assertive challenge.

Throughout the episode, Jane shared a great deal of information, yet the group did not verify or ask for clarification, as happened in T1-E1. Therefore, group members assumed what Jane said was factual or they choose not to challenge her. In return, Jane did not check for understanding with other group members. During the member checking process, some group members acknowledged hearing assumptions from Jane that they intentionally chose not to address, while other assumptions were not noticed due to a lack of active listening. As one member stated, after reading this episode, "it is easier to allow Jane to tell her entire story in her own way. Some of it I don't understand, but I don't think my understanding is the goal."

In T1, the purpose was for the speaker to share his or her story, not necessarily for absolute understanding or shared meaning. This provided an opportunity to build trust and relationships through listening and story telling. The interactions involved the group allowing someone to tell his or her story unfiltered and to recount events as seen from his or her individual perspective. Many times T1 interactions allowed the group to move into T2 and T3. The individual's story then evolved into the topic and focus of the interaction where the importance of the facts decreased and the interaction between group members took a higher importance.

In this episode, the group allowed Jane to talk, even though some statements were recognized as beliefs that could be unfounded. By not calling attention to these type statements

within T1 resulted in Jane telling her story as she saw it, without interruption. The intention with this type of interaction was to hear only one perspective - not necessarily for the speaker to learn anything new from other members. Anything new learned could have evolved out of the storytelling process itself and through reflection.

Assumptions - Type II.

During T2 episodes the group members peripherally drew attention to assumptions primarily as a way to advocate an idea or position. The group members more readily challenged and questioned assumptions when there was disagreement among viewpoints. However, the group did not attend to assumptions when agreement existed. In this, group members failed to examine their own assumptions while looking for support of their assertions. Therefore, assumptions typically went unaddressed as people engaged with their own viewpoint. The intent here was not to share meaning, but to express one's assumptions even if those assumptions were recognized as such.

Both T2 episodes lacked focus as the interaction changes direction. This created difficulty for going in depth, as different people appeared to have a different focus. Suspending assumptions in a group was a joint process, so when one person resisted, those assumptions remained unexamined (at least for the time being). The episodes in T2 moved along so quickly that there was not much time to reflect on what was happening or the statements being made.

Assumptions T2-E1.

In this episode, members did not attend to the attempts of others to surface assumptions. The group looked to hear Ann's perspective and expressed their own perspective on how she

solved continual work problems. Although the group did try to engage Ann, the interaction remained a discussion where individual perspectives and “facts” were exchanged.

In the following excerpt, Maya questioned Ann twice on why she made such an assumption. However, the challenge was slight and nobody followed up on Ann’s indirect response:

L13 (Ann): Well, George, we have a facilities manager for all 18 company buildings. And what I know of him is...I’ll do the stuff myself.

L14 (Maya): Why?

L15 (Ann): Because he never gets around to it.

L16 (Maya): And why would that be?

L17 (Ann): Because there’s always a disaster at one of the other buildings. . There is always some kind of disaster in this dark hole that we call the residential home.

L18 (Hank): Plus there are 18 other buildings for him to be in.

L19 (Ann): Right.

L20 (Maya): One can argue whether 18 is a few too many buildings for one person.

L21 (Hank): I’m already thinking...

L22 (Ann): [*Interruption*] And that’s the other kind of thing, so they even become programs over facilities. One of it is that we want you to write grants for two-hundred-thousand in the negative. I mean this is a significant chunk of change. We close the programs that we’re thinking that we can close, however then they say here go solve this problem. That’s what I’m saying, I’m getting conflicting pictures. So, make it the grant writing and go.

Maya attempted to uncover some assumptions by gathering further information. However, Ann changed the course of questioning. This happened several times throughout the episode. She shifted focus in order to control the interaction. Maya tried to gather enough information to understand and make sense of the situation in attempts to then solve Ann's problem. There were different intentions at work as Ann changed focus and Maya attempted to follow.

Group members entered this interaction with Ann with the desire to help Ann resolve her work situation, especially since Ann approached the topic as seeking answers. However, Ann ended up not seeking resolution and subsequently rejected other suggestions. Ann was confident about herself and her role at work. She did not understand why her and her employees were experiencing disconnection in their relationships.

L23 (Maya): I would just say, it's not so much that you need a job description, but you need, in my opinion, there needs to be some type of strategy discussion so you understand relative priorities.

Maya offered advice several times in the episode. This advice addressed the surface issue that Ann divulged, but it did not get at the real problem under the surface. The group tried to obtain information from Ann to illustrate a point, but Ann did not elaborate even though she verbally acknowledged disconnect with her work and employees. In efforts to examine assumptions, this episode provided a good example of how it cannot be successful without being a joint process.

Throughout the episode, Ann appeared to agree with what was being stated by saying, "right" and "yeah," and then she changed direction several times on her actual issue. Seeking and finding agreement also allowed Ann to move quickly through the discussion without having to go in depth. Without the depth, the group did not have the opportunity to suspend and examine

assumptions. Therefore, agreement kept the focus away from intentionally concentrating on one area.

Ann expressed what appeared as frustration or impatience in this episode and the group leaned toward honoring those feelings by not challenging or questioning her contribution. Therefore, statements were taken at face value. By doing so, the group missed an opportunity to explore possibilities for change. On the other hand, the group members did not empathize much with Ann. Maya worked hard to understand Ann's perspective in efforts to problem-solve and ease Ann's seeming frustration. The source of Ann's frustrations were not uncovered and nobody stopped to recognize this problem until an episode later the next week further addressed and shed light on Ann's continuing struggle.

Assumptions T2-E2.

In the second episode, attempts to challenge assumptions were unsuccessful. This episode provided a good example of how addressing assumptions was a joint process. When only one person was interested in suspending the assumptions, they were not addressed adequately. Attempts to address the assumptions either turned into support for a stated assumption, or argued and then dismissed. Then the person challenged failed to examine her own assumptions critically as Ann and Susan did in this episode. Also demonstrated in this episode is the process whereby handling or surfacing assumptions crossed into "challenging" assumptions. That shift occurred when calling attention to assumptions was used as an attempt to state a different perspective, thereby challenging the previous statement. Beth's questions in this episode sometimes served as an opportunity to present a different idea rather than to surface an assumption underlying the previous statement.

Beth did make an effort to examine what was being said, but her attempts were largely ignored, as they seemed to not align or support Ann and Susan's perspective. The episode started with a discussion about corporate welfare and progressed to corporate America. The focus then changed to imports and finally to education. As the topic changed quickly, both Susan and Ann appeared to believe they were discussing the same topic. Not until reviewing the transcripts did Susan and Ann realize they were discussing different topics.

In Line 2, does Susan ask what Ann means by a particular term:

L2 (Susan): What do you mean by corporate welfare?

This was the only time Susan asked for clarification. Susan rushed through Ann's response only to find a word or trigger in which to focus, so her intention was not to challenge an assumption, but provide a polite segue into her own argument. Susan did not follow up on the answer or actually let an answer develop. Instead, the group looked for agreement. She used the opportunity to justify making her own argument rather than examining Ann's meaning and developing shared meaning. By not listening to Ann's point, Susan assumed she and Ann were talking about the same thing. In essence, they were building parallel arguments and not attending to each other's meaning.

Beth tried questioning statements made by Ann and Susan on several occasions, which attempted to suspend assumptions. However, Ann and Susan only provided quick answers to Beth's questions, not stopping long enough to question themselves or the accuracy of their statements. When Ann and Susan responded to Beth's questions, they did not take the opportunity to suspend their own assumptions. Ann and Susan made statements with conviction,

confident that their statements were true. Ann and Susan worked to convince the other two members, but also sought agreement with one another.

Later, Beth attempted to question some assumptions. By this time, other members paid little attention to her questions and did not slow down to examine them. The answers to Beth's questions remained at the surface, never truly getting to the question's intent.

L25 (Beth): Does Walmart really and truly not pay health insurance for their employees?

L26 (Susan): Well, what most big companies have done and we did this at [my old company] too is you bring people in, you, you do not employ them full-time.

L27 (Ann): Right.

L28 (Susan): So that way you don't have to give them the benefit.

Here Beth asked a question, recognizing there was an assumption being made by Susan. Susan did not recognize her assumption, but answered it as if she was educating Beth. Ann just agreed, confirming Susan's point. Nobody answered Beth's question and the interaction continued based on an assumption. Examining the assumption was not the intent of the group, so it was dropped. Susan and Ann's purpose appeared as an attempt to persuade others and express their own viewpoint.

Later in L42, Beth did bring it up again; politely still challenging Susan and Ann's assertion:

L42 (Beth): Yeah. I'm just surprised that Wal-Mart doesn't pay insurance though.

L43 (Ann): One of the things that we have with –

L44 (Susan): *[Interruption]* The management. They do for management.

Ann at first did not respond to Beth's challenge, but Susan addressed Beth's question as if it were fact. Then Ann supported Susan's claims. During the member checking of the transcripts, Susan recognized her statements in this episode as a belief. This uncertainty was not surfaced or acknowledged during the episode, as Susan's intent was to make a point and support her argument.

Assumptions - Type III.

In T3, group members examined assumptions more closely through dialogue. In the course of noticing assumptions, group members shared data or examples to help with the process rather than treating the assumptions as factual. A person's story was seen as a perspective on that experience which can be reframed.

Within T3, the group was not necessarily seeking agreement. They balanced conflict in a way that allowed the examination of assumptions while not losing the individual perspective. There appeared to be a balance in these episodes between advocating one's own perspective and inquiring into other perspectives; that is, group members were able to do both.

Assumptions T3-E1.

As demonstrated in this episode, Beth questioned an assumption made by Susan. This called attention to her own experiences with Susan. Group members themselves tried to point to their own assumptions, going forward in the interaction by calling attention to the fact that they have biases and opinions:

L38 (Ann): We could get lots of validation from... What I would point out for you is there's more in that...when you were taking her back to the moment, taking her back to the, there's a whole lot here in my opinion, for you to learn, more than the fact that you

were able to let it go, where we see, I would say most of that is unconscious habit, the pattern. And the telling phrase is "I want to be right"

In contributing to the group, the WWM group members more easily recognized that they brought their own biases to the interaction by stating things such as "in my opinion." Later, Maya said in L44, "which I would say," before leading into her point. Hedging and mitigation strategies such as this recognized and tempered the assumption made by taking responsibility for it as one person's perspective, rather than yet another unquestioned assumption. Maya emphasized the "I" in her statement and did not generalize.

Again, the group recalled their experience through their own involvement with Susan to call into question issues or concerns Susan surfaced. When individual group members were open to hearing other perspectives, such as sharing of alternate perceptions of stated assumptions, allowed the group to develop an understanding of how individual assumptions contributed to their socially constructed relationships. If individuals were not open to other perspectives, it closed down the connection in the relationship. Engaging in T3 and managing assumptions in this way allowed for group members to contribute to deeper understanding and connection with one another.

Here the group challenged Susan's assumptions by sharing their own experience and involvement with her:

L9 (Susan): It's, it's, ya know, can't...is that possible? Maybe not trusting it in a sense. Or in my family, the way we do things, we get pissed off and we don't talk...for a long time and we just forget about it.

L10 (Ann): Let me course correct you...in your birth family. In your family now, you do not do that.

L11 (Susan): Uh, I'm thinking like my, with, well, with my grandfather

L12 (Ann): I'm asking you to redefine that

L13 (Susan): With my mom and my brother

L14 [*Unintelligible*]

L15 (Maya): In your childhood family of origin

L16 (Susan): Okay, in my family of origin and I'm thinking a lot to a very formative time with my grandfather where everything was very conditional.

L17 (Ann): I don't see you do that with Riley. I don't see you do that with us.

L18 (Susan): No, and I don't feel like that's how I am with the relationships that I have in my life.

Several times throughout this excerpt, Ann pushed Susan to see her assumptions. Ann stuck with it by carefully sharing her perspective through examples and suggestion to help Susan's awareness of how her view of her past affects her current relationships. In this episode, such awareness required that the group stay on topic. Susan offered excuses and resistance at first because of the limited perspective she had of herself. The group's unwillingness to change focus allowed Susan to reflect on her various relationships and see that her own beliefs of herself did not align with how others saw her. Calling attention to different perspectives by suspending assumptions allowed T3 to evolve within the group.

Assumptions T3-E2.

In this episode, the group attempted to suspend assumptions. The group's increased comfort level contributed to the ability to question and manage assumptions, as shown in the following instance:

L1 (Maya): Subconsciously you knew what you wanted to say, but you froze in fear about saying it?

L2 (Ann): And you beat yourself up the next day. *[long pause]*

L3 (Nicole): Well, that's not what I think happens Maya.

L4 (Maya): Well, I've not been present, so I *[unintelligible]* don't know.

Maya checked for understanding on her own assumptions about Nicole's statement through questioning. Nicole immediately corrected Maya's underlying assumption within the question. This ability to correct Maya's assumption came from a relationship based on trust, just as Maya's question itself was based on trust. In T3, rather than holding on to assumptions, the group was more apt to verify their beliefs or judgments through questioning.

This process of checking out assumptions, as seen throughout this episode, allowed the group to share meaning and deepen the relationship by better understanding one another. For the process of uncovering assumptions to unfold, the group exhibited patience and active listening. This was evidenced by allowing silence, reflection, as well as the persistence and pursuit of understanding. The group displayed the ability to admit when they are wrong and take responsibility for correcting those misunderstandings. This evolved only when the group intently focused on one idea or concept.

In the next excerpt, Nicole noticed and reflected on her own assumption:

L17 (Nicole): And before the Discovery Courses and the loss [*unintelligible*] after that, certainly not on the night that we left there [*laughs*], pretty consistently it was, um, reaction instead of response to everything. And I would want to say something and maybe I knew what to say and maybe I didn't, but the assumption was real quick in the mindtalk, the assumption was, I'm going to sound stupid and, and they won't want to be around me, and um, just all that stuff that comes up when we get down to those core beliefs, so that's what comes up when I, when you hear me lumping it all together and saying never and I can't and being afraid and just the atmosphere in this room and just saying these things out loud and coming up with a damn creative idea [*laughter*]. I mean it's just like, yeah. [*long pause*] So, so, by next Thursday I will have the sheet finished and share the action steps and, and any that can be broken down that would be great to get suggestions. Any that are not clear, I would love to have help with clarifying... [*pause*] um, and I don't know right now what the other needs might be.

Here, Nicole talked through and reflected on an assumption she stated previously. Through T3 dialogue, a deeper understanding unfolded for Nicole, and enabled her to examine some of her own assumptions. Having this insight into how Nicole processed judgments and beliefs about herself deepened the relationship within the group. Being provided with time and space allowed Nicole to connect her beliefs with her actions. By verbalizing this, she learned about herself and taught the group.

Summary of Assumptions.

In summary, assumptions deal with how the group did or did not handle stated or implied assumptions. The WWM group dealt with assumptions differently in each TTL. In T1, the group

ignored or chose not to address assumptions. This showed as beneficial in allowing for narratives to be shared.

In T2, group members drew attention to other's assumptions as a means to gain agreement or state a perspective. In this type, non-agreement resulted in the rejection of attempts to address assumptions, as merely calling attention to assumptions was not enough. However, calling attention to assumptions led the way to sharing different perspectives and work toward problem solving.

In T3, assumptions were addressed more freely—both individually and collectively. However, this data shows that handling assumptions is a reciprocal and joint process, whose success depends upon the group, as found in T3.

Influence.

This third indicator involved the group members' stance on influence. Influence considers how group members responded to other perspectives and persuaded others to act or do something. This included how people signal that they are listening and considering other ideas or viewpoints. Table 7: Influence Characteristics provides points taken from the excerpts related to each type. Next, excerpts from each type are used to illustrate Influence characteristics.

Influence - Type I.

In T1, participants did not necessarily seek to be influenced or to influence others beyond the story being presented. This did not mean that the speech one used could not be persuasive, just that persuasion did not seem to be the primary intent. In T1, members did not seek out other interpretations or viewpoints. Instead, individuals presented their individual perspective or story. This was evidenced partially by allowing group members to share without questioning or

challenging assumptions, as discussed in the last indicator. Rather than seeking new perspectives, the speaker only communicated his or her story. Group members encouraged the storytelling by passively listening. Other group members intentionally did not seek to persuade the speaker.

In the T1 episodes, questions were asked to help the individual start or continue telling her or his story. Influence in this regard played out similar to assumptions, where statements were accepted at face value and questions asked only to clarify details of others' experiences. Because of this, influence was not directly asserted.

Influence T1-E1.

As shown previously in the beginning of this episode, the group tried to persuade Beth to allow Hank to speak. Beth was not open to being persuaded, but instead stayed with her intent of sharing her story. The group eventually complied with her, but reluctantly.

L1 (Beth): I want to share with you something that happened.

L2 (Maya): Yeah. Well, **we** were on the relationships course, so I went that way.

[Motions to Hank while entire group looks to him] I wanted to hear about the relationships course from Hank

L3 (Beth): Yeah, I want to tell you about a relationship...

L4 (Hank): *[Interruption]* Is that why you pointed at me?

L5 (Ann): Yeah, yeah, I want to hear it...*[says to Hank enthusiastically]*

L6 (Beth): *[Interruption]* -- at work, and that we, you know, I had talked to y'all about Marie, and agonizing all of that. And we had to terminate her.

Table 7

Influence Characteristics

Influence		
Definition: how people regard other perspectives, as well as persuade others to act or do something. How open people are to considering other ideas and viewpoints.		
Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on hearing narrative, not in being influenced or influencing others • Attempts at influence may be rejected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on influencing others, not to be influenced • Open to influence, mainly for support of own beliefs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on opportunities to create a new perspective or frame; see own view as only one perspective • Desire to be influenced • Willingness to reframe own position
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not seek to persuade speaker or necessarily be persuaded by their narrative • Ignore conflict 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignore other's influence and avoid conflict • Seek agreement and not perspective • Initiate conflict by advocating a different position 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embrace conflict • Make room for multiple perspectives • Reach understanding by challenging other perspectives

L7 (Ann): Huh? [*Looking at Hank, says dismissively to Beth and quickly glances at Beth, then again to Hank*]

L8 (Susan): And we haven't heard **anything** since then. [*Says to Beth*]

L9 (Ann): Because **you** haven't posted.

L10 (Beth): Because I've been overwhelmed, which seems to be a perpetual state these last months. So yeah, overwhelmed and that we did terminate her. She was out for that whole week leading up to -- well, after Labor Day. We talked to her on Thursday or Friday.

Conflicting bids for the floor were resolved quickly by allowing one individual to hold the floor. The group complied with Beth's request. Beth did not demonstrate being influenced by statements pertaining to her non-compliance with the group agreements.

In Line 8, Susan's statement served to show that communication was poor; therefore, it was difficult to keep up with what was going on with Beth. This was an ongoing argument subtly expressed in previous conversations. Ann agreed with Susan's intent and contributed to what Susan did not verbalize. Beth rejected their perspective by providing reasons for her actions. As a result, Beth was not influenced to discuss it at length, but moved forward with her intent to share her experience. Susan and Ann abandoned their attempts to persuade Beth and chose to listen.

Influence T1-E2.

In this episode, little opportunity existed for others to share as Jane spoke the majority of the time. When Susan tried to acknowledge her and share a perspective, even a positive one, Jane subtly ignores the acknowledgement and continued her story.

L14 (Susan): Looking for that creativity. It sounds like a...

L15 (Beth): *[Interruption]* Yeah.

L16 (Susan): Being willing to explore different things.

L17 (Jane): Yeah, so.

L18 (Susan): I always admired you. You're always so involved in all these...

L19 (Jane): *[Interruption]* Well, it came about through I don't know. But it didn't come about from just trying to, sorta, it was like what can do of value with my time.

Jane did not acknowledge others attempt to recognize her in L17, but Susan persisted. However, Jane still did not acknowledge the compliment.

Throughout this episode, the other group members allowed Jane the opportunity to share her experience without interruption. This was evidenced by numerous "mm-hmm," as well as the lack of questions and turns taken by other members.

Influence - Type II.

The purpose of people's interactions in T2 episodes primarily focused on influencing others, not necessarily opening one's self to be influenced. In T1, group members were not interested so much in persuading others through argument, but only in telling his or her story. However, in T2 group members sought to exert influence over others. If perspective was sought and listening occurred, the purpose appeared to be that of bolstering one's own viewpoint and position. In both T2 episodes, group members seemed most open to influence when it supported a currently held belief or assumption. Some members may have been open to being influenced, but without seeking mutual understanding, the influence of one person dominated the interaction.

Influence T2-E1.

In the first episode for T2, Ann made a move to complain, and in doing so, she did not open herself to other viewpoints. In several excerpts, the language used appears as an affirmative.

L49 (Ann): Right, right.

By making such statements through the discourse, Ann signaled that she was listening and responding to others. However, such moves from Ann appeared to gloss over what others presented. When asked a question, Ann tended not to answer the question directly. Responding with “Right” and “Yeah” occurred only when it supported her current claims. This left the group talking around issues and trying different ways to engage Ann. As a result, and shown in several other episodes, this resulted in the group trying to address Ann’s problems when that may not have been the goal of all the group members. Ann did not appear in these contexts as being open to other perspectives, but instead appeared to close herself to hearing other perspectives that could have lead to Ann taking different actions.

In this statement, Ann demonstrated her own way of being and lack of openness to change or influence:

L48 (Maya): Here is the conflict you cause with some of your social workers, they hear you make that statement and here they watch you close a case. That is a cognitive dissonance.

L49 (Ann): Right, right.

L50 (Maya): You tell me these people have human dignity and you just you want me to close the case on them.

L51 (Ann): Right.

L52 (Maya): It just doesn't compute.

L53 (Ann): And I don't have that cognitive dissonance. So, it's about that projection of how I am in the world in a way that I don't feel, that's where I use the word conviction. I don't feel like I need to explain. I don't need to explain, this is how it is for me and this is how I go forward and this is how I process.

This excerpt demonstrated Ann accepting or rejecting what people say. Many times throughout the episode, Ann initially made a move to agree, but then changed focus by offering more information or moving the conversation in a new direction. In this episode, Ann did not fully listen to others' perspectives. Instead, Ann made moves to persuade others to see her situation as she saw it. Ann presented her experience as a way to seek support for her position, not to seek additional perspective.

Influence T2-E2.

In T2-E2, the episode started out with Ann advocating a position. Some questions asked at the beginning did not result in increased understanding and shared meaning. Susan used the opportunity to share her own perspective and appeared to agree with Ann. However, throughout the first 21 exchanges, Susan and Ann were talking about different ideas. Ann spoke about corporate welfare in the sense of the government providing breaks for large corporations, while Susan spoke about disadvantages of corporate monopolies. Both individuals had their own viewpoint and, although they seem in agreement, sought to build up their own perspective. The discourse went down an unintended path as both Susan and Ann advocated different positions on different topics. Once Susan heard "Walmart," her own biases surface, and no one responded to

her rising level of demonstrated agitation and intensity. Although Susan asked Ann for clarification in the beginning, she was not fully listening for understanding. Susan ended up linking her own beliefs to what she believed Ann was saying. Not until later, with Beth, were these stated assumptions questioned:

L25 (Beth): Does Wal-Mart really and truly not pay health insurance for their employees?

Beth asked these questions several times throughout the episode. She did not lose sight that her questions remained unanswered. Beth appeared open to influence with her line of questioning and open to other perspectives. However, Susan and Ann continually attempted to exert influence over Beth by making statements without noticing or questioning their own underlying assumptions. Beth tried to suspend the argument before she declared her own perspective. When Beth did not get a response to her bid to introduce other frames of reference, she stated her own position and briefly tried to persuade others. When this proved unsuccessful, Beth changed the subject.

Influence - Type III.

In TIII, members of the group appeared to seek opportunities to expand or create a new perspective or frame, therefore, desire to be influenced by others. At times, this surpassed a mere willingness to be influenced, as members curiously and purposefully sought other viewpoints. However, as discussed in the previous indicator, assumptions, this influence was not void of conflict. The struggle to find balance between seeking those perspectives and maintaining one's position provided an opportunity for all group member's perspectives and frames to change.

Influence T3-E1.

In this episode, Susan shared her story in which she consciously realized that how she viewed her experience was only a matter of perspective. Susan was open to reframing her recent experience based on others' responses as to how they experience her.

L11 (Susan): Uh, I'm thinking like my, with, well, with my grandfather

L12 (Ann): I'm asking you to redefine that

L13 (Susan): With my mom and my brother

L14 [*Unintelligible*]

L15 (Maya): In your childhood family of origin

L16 (Susan): Okay, in my family of origin and I'm thinking a lot to a very formative time with my grandfather where everything was very conditional.

These various perspectives helped Susan look at her situation differently and, therefore, take different actions in her life. Susan's willingness to be influenced moved beyond being open to other perspectives. She desired other perspectives to enhance her understanding. This happened in the moment of the interaction through their dialogue.

Here Ann provided another perspective based on her own experience:

L21 (Ann): That goes back and proves my point about when we were taught it. I think you and I had that conversation. [*says looking to Maya*]

L22 (Maya): Yeah

L23 (Ann): It was never modeled, it was never taught, it was never safe, it was never comfortable to have emotions and be vulnerable and **know** that you're loved through that. So there's something...

Throughout the episode, Ann and Maya sought understanding while trying to influence Susan. This influence evolved from within the relationship and their history to create other perspectives. In some ways, Susan tried to influence others by presenting her position, so the interaction was not without conflict. From there, the group built on their own relationship and experiences with one another. What made the interactions with T3 possible in this instance was Susan's desire to hear other perspectives and reframe her own position.

Influence T3-E2.

This episode provided an illustration of Nicole's openness and desire to be influenced. Although difficult to capture it all through the discourse, Nicole's body language included her leaning forward as she intentionally engaged everyone through deliberate eye contact. Her eyes were wide as she looks to the rest of the group members with curiosity. She stayed with the interaction throughout the episode, and challenged what others were saying when she did not agree. However, here Nicole's words reflected how other's perspectives contributed to her insight:

L17 (Nicole): And before the Discovery Courses and the loss [*unintelligible*] after that, certainly not on the night that we left there [*laughs*], pretty consistently it was, um, reaction instead of response to everything. And I would want to say something and maybe I knew what to say and maybe I didn't, but the assumption was real quick in the mindtalk, the assumption was, I'm going to sound stupid and, and they won't want to be around me, and um, just all that stuff that comes up when we get down to those core beliefs, so that's what comes up when I, when you hear me lumping it all together and saying never and I can't and being afraid and just the atmosphere in this room and just

saying these things out loud and coming up with a damn creative idea *[laughter]*. I mean it's just like, yeah. *[long pause]* So, so, by next Thursday I will have the sheet finished and share the action steps and, and any that can be broken down that would be great to get suggestions. Any that are not clear, I would love to have help with clarifying...*[pause]* um, and I don't know right now what the other needs might be.

Nicole presented a balance between taking responsibility for her own actions while exhibiting humility in knowing that she could not see herself fully without other perspectives. She desired and sought that influence, which also demonstrated a certain level of trust. This trust was not blind, as Nicole held both her knowing of herself and what feels right with hearing how others know and experience her. Here, Lisa tried to persuade Nicole to see another perspective:

L10 (Lisa): Because you are safe in here and you have done that in here. *[short pause]* You do ask what you want. You did it last night, you asked questions when you had them. You do offer support as we go around. But I think that's the key that you just hit on, when I'm safe that also goes with...

L11 (Nicole): Exactly

L12 (Lisa): Maya's question...

L13 (Nicole): Exactly

L14 (Lisa): Frozen in fear. When you've been frozen in fear you don't experience yourself in this way.

L15 (Nicole): Right *[short pause]*

L16 (Lisa): This sacred space *[long pause]*

Lisa's words did not come across as pushy or forceful, but gentle and considerate. Lisa used her experiences with Nicole to demonstrate how Nicole's beliefs about herself were not aligned with her actions. This type of influence provided an opportunity to influence another person through her own intent and desire to change.

Summary of Influence.

In summary, the influence indicator dealt with how much group members either tried to exert influence or accept others' influence. In T1 episodes, few attempts were made to influence other group members. Any attempts made, whether positive or negative, were rejected quickly.

During the T2 episodes, group members sought to exert their individual influence and did not appear open to other perspectives unless they aligned with previously held assumptions. The T2 episodes provided an opportunity for several group members to attempt persuasion, and find multiple approaches for problem solving. However, the attempts to solve problems as shown in T2 were rejected by the individual in which the context centered. When individuals were not open to reflecting upon and accepting other perspectives through challenging their own assumptions, influence rarely occurred.

In T3, group members generally sought multiple perspectives and desired to be influenced in their thinking. This desire to be influenced presented itself by the group sharing and seeking out multiple perspectives.

Questioning.

The fourth indicator attended to both purpose and method with which group members used questions. Questioning is discussed in the previous three indicators and seeks to accomplish different intentions within engagement, assumptions, and influence. Questioning expands upon that basis and is further used to make statements, clarify meaning and seek understanding. Table 8: Questioning Characteristics provides a side-by-side explanation of aspects related to each of the three types as they relate to questioning methods.

Here a question's meaning derived from both the person asking the question and the person to whom the question was asked. Therefore, how the question was asked does not always directly communicate meaning or reflect the questioner's intent. The person answering the question contributes to the question's meaning. Table 8: Questioning Characteristics provides the aspects related to this indicator within the three types.

The next section provides excerpts from each type that further demonstrates these characteristics.

Questioning – Type I.

In T1, both episodes contained few questions. The questions asked were closed-ended and sought to attain clarification or information on the topic. Since a speaker's experience was presented without challenge, few questions were needed in this type unless it was to clarify information.

Table 8

Questioning Characteristics

Questioning		
Definition: purpose and way group uses questions as speech acts. Look at questioner, and person being questioned.		
Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed-ended • Seek information or clarification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closed-ended • Seek clarification and information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open-ended • Connect insights and inquire into meaning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to segue away from topic • Few questions used • Speaker holds context and weighs validity of questions • Speaker dismisses questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to make a statement or support a point of view • Use superficial questions to keep discussion moving • Attempts to use questions for suspending assumptions is ignored or not attended to by person being asked • Avoid answering questions • Used to challenge; right vs. wrong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Used to inquire into speakers own practice and practice of others • Used introspectively to examine own actions • Used to explore and expand perspective • Inquiry is not always in form of questions, approach interaction with curiosity • Use non-verbal communication and silence for inquiry

Questioning T1-E1.

This episode included few questions, with most serving to gather information and enable the speaker to share a narrative. The following excerpt provided the majority of the questions used in this episode:

L26 (Maya): A blank check?

L27 (Beth): Signed.

L28 (Maya): A company check?

L29 (Beth): Mmmmm. It was a --

L30 (Maya): *[Interruption]* A customer check?

L31 (Beth): -- a customer check dated June the 29th, and in the memo it was for home and auto insurance.

All these questions, as well as the others in the episode, were directed to Beth. She was seen as holding the context and answers for her story. The closed-ended questions served to verify information and hasten Beth's story along.

Questioning T1-E2.

There were only two questions in this episode, both of which were used toward the end of the episode. This episode provided an opportunity for Jane's narrative with the group allowing her to share without interruption.

The first question, asked in a humorous tone, but more passively, called attention to a judgment made by Jane:

L46 (Lisa): As opposed to the stupid old sheriff?

This question brought attention to Jane's use of the word "stupid" to describe the sheriff. If Jane had not dismissed the statement, it could have served to help Jane suspend judgment. However, because Jane responded to the question as if it was meant to gather clarification and information, the implicit assumption challenge was not taken up. Lisa made a slight giggle and opened her eyes wider, while another group member slightly shook her head after Jane says "stupid." Because of this, more than one person acknowledged Jane's words in the moment, but did not pursue her meaning.

The second question, also a closed-ended question, served to change subjects:

L48 (Beth): *[Interruption]* Mary P. was on TV last night. Did you see her?

The question provided a segue away from Jane's narrative. By this time, the group had become increasingly fidgety and impatient. Because the rest of the group was not fully listening or involved in Jane's story, they saw an opportunity to move away from it. The lack of questions in this episode demonstrated a lack of engagement. Once Jane's story seemed to be finished, out of respect for Jane, the group politely transitioned away from her. There were no conclusion drawn, nor did anyone check with Jane to see if she was finished. Jane, unaware of the shift, responded to the last question as if it were intended for her, even though Beth looked around the room at other group members.

Questioning – Type II.

The questions identified within T2 fell between those questioning methods used in T1 and T3. On one end of the spectrum, in T1 questions either were not used at all or were used to gather information. On the other end of the spectrum, in T3, questions were used to suspend assumptions, provide clarification, and contribute to dialogue. In the T2 episodes, questions fell

closer to those found in T1. Most of the questions were closed-ended and supported an argument or position while challenging another's position. The primary speakers in these episodes held the context, therefore positioning them to accept or reject questions and answers.

Questioning T2-E1.

In T2-E1, since the discussion revolved around Ann's work situation, she responded to the questions posed and determined when those answers were sufficient:

L13 (Ann): Well, George, we have a facilities manager for all 18 company buildings.

And what I know of him is...I'll do the stuff myself.

L14 (Maya): Why?

L15 (Ann): Because he never gets around to it.

L16 (Maya): And why would that be?

L17 (Ann): Because there's always a disaster at one of the other buildings. . There is always some kind of disaster in this dark hole that we call the residential home.

Maya's questions in L14 and L16 probed for clarity, while the second, in L16, posed a possible challenge to Ann's assertion. Ann did not take up Maya's move to analyze and challenge her responses. Rather, Ann continued to reinforce her earlier position. Therefore, the question did not serve its intended purpose to help Ann suspend her assumptions.

The potential for deeper discussion was present; however, no one challenged Ann's answers further. These instances missed an opportunity for the group to inquire into the questions' intent. The groups' failure to observe and call attention to what occurred within the group kept the interaction at a T2 level.

Questioning T2-E2.

The group mainly asked one type of question in this episode. The questions asked sought clarification to support an argument. The first few questions from Susan request clarification:

L13 (Susan): So we're sacrificing our welfare to big business and corporations?

L14 (Ann): Right, right, right. Because it's after that, it's after that, the idea is the ratio use to be one to six. For every dollar that a corporation will spend, it will go through the community six times. So, one dollar at from Walmart, you know, where they pay their employees, that employee then will turn that in the community up to six times. They will pay their dentist. They will pay their doctor. They will pay the grocery store. They will pay and then those people then, it ripples out. So, on an economic basis, it makes sense to have that corporate welfare because the impact on the community is a multiplied factor.

L15 (Susan): Uh-huh.

L16 (Ann): Okay? So, what I think doesn't get talked about is in this country what opportunity costs we have lost to get that business. To, to, to get Walmart come into a town like Jefferson City and all the local pharmacies close, the local grocery stores close, uh, you know.

L17 (Susan): You shut down a ton of businesses.

L18 (Ann): You shut down a ton.

L19 (Susan): You start paying people and they can't make a living off of it.

L20 (Ann): Right. And then they don't have any insurance, so they don't tax the community. This is what I'm talking about.

L21 (Susan): That's why I don't like Walmart.

Susan made a move with this question to join the argument. Susan had her opinions already formed about what she thought she heard. She did not appear to actively listen to Ann's position on the issue, and further verified this through member checking. Questioning Ann served as an opportunity for Susan to enter the argument with her own stance.

Later, Beth asks:

L52 (Beth): The communities have folded down and they don't have options on other places to work?

However, other members did not stop long enough to examine the arguments made. Beth's back-to-back questions were closed-ended and segued into Ann and Susan supporting each of their own beliefs. On one level, Beth questioned Ann and Susan's assumptions. Yet on another level, Beth set the groundwork to share her own perspective. In this episode nobody stopped to examine the validity of statements made or inquire into the questions asked. With the use of closed-ended questions, Susan and Ann found this as a way to further support for their beliefs, and like in T1, as if the questioner were just seeking information.

Later Beth's questions supported her own beliefs, which conflicted with Ann and Susan's. If the closed-ended questions Beth posed earlier would have been explored beyond just what was asked, this may have come to the forefront sooner. As such, the interaction remained in T2.

Questioning – Type III.

In this third type of teaching and learning, the questioning involved inquiring into the speaker's own practice and the practice of others. In these instances, questions went beyond

gathering information to making statements and judgments. The questions attended to interactions within the group. Such inquiry elicited dialogue and further interaction, helping make connections between various perspectives. Throughout the two T3 episodes, group members posed few actual questions. Instead, the group members inquired by using statements that implied curiosity and the desire to reframe experiences through reflection.

Questioning T3-E1.

Group members asked few questions in this episode; however, the use of silence allowed the episode to unfold as group members explored how unconscious behaviors manifested themselves in relationships. This exploration of behaviors served as the content of the interactions during this episode. A couple of open-ended questions arose in the beginning that demonstrated a sense of curiosity and expressed concern. Interactions took on a tone that conveyed openness and sought understanding rather than merely requesting information. Ann started with questions that sought reasons for those emotions which were demonstrated by Susan:

L3 (Ann): And there's three, there's about three different levels right there. Tell us...what's that? *[To Susan]*

Ann first noticed facial expressions and inquired into those. Recognizing and questioning emotions within the group provided an opportunity to explore meaning safely. Many times inquiry started by one member noticing emotions displayed through non-verbal communication, then called attention to those emotions through inquiry. This type of inquiry demonstrated a sense of compassion and concern, which strengthened the group involvement when not resisted.

This kind of environment conveyed a sense of safety where people could explore and examine their vulnerabilities.

Another instance occurred where members supported one another by directly requesting another member to change a frame or perspective:

L12 (Ann): I'm asking you to redefine that

L13 (Susan): With my mom and my brother

Although this was a statement and not a question, it served as a question and challenge to Susan. The statement posed the possibility of there being another perspective without imposing a specific solution or result. What unfolded allowed the group members to reflect on their own lives as others shared their experiences.

In some instances, questions conveyed reflection, where the speaker attempted to examine her own actions critically:

L45 (Susan): Mm-hmm. You know and part of, part of, my fear right now is that if some of this is unconscious, what am I may be doing with Riley?

Throughout this episode, Susan inquired into her own actions by talking through her experiences. With the help of the group, she examined those actions and gained perspective on how she acts in the world.

Questioning T3-E2.

This episode displayed the group's curiosity in exploring other perspectives. Prior to the meeting, via the IDB Nicole requested time to address her issue with the group. She specifically solicited support in gaining insight. As such, the exchange between group members was an open inquiry to examine and question Nicole's stance. Included in the following excerpts are a couple

of instances where Maya summarized Nicole's words and verified for shared meaning through questions:

L25 (Maya): The way I listen to that and hear it is...if you already were the person who could do it then you would have done it. *[pause]* Right? *[Susan has pensive look]*

L26 (Ann): Right. *[Nicole nods]*

L27 (Maya): So, the fact that you haven't done it, it is nearly impossible to do it as you are today?

L28 (Nicole): Yeah

L29 (Maya): Then you must first change something in order to be able to do it?

In this excerpt, Maya sought clarity by summarizing her understanding of Nicole's statements. Maya shared with the group her insights, not as opinion, but as possibility through connecting what Nicole said with what Maya knows within their own involvement and association. During this moment, some other group members' facial expressions showed a puzzled look that seemed to express curiosity and concern for Nicole. Therefore, Maya's statements and questions benefited not just Nicole's understanding, but also that of the group.

Nicole and Maya's exchange was relaxed, nonthreatening, and open. However, the interaction did provide a challenge to the group for allowing the situation to unfold through questioning. This episode again found the presence of curiosity as earlier discussed in the engagement indicator. In addition, this episode provides Nicole with a better understanding of her perspective as she acknowledged in the episode (L17), while the group created one more connection in their relationship with Nicole by understanding her better.

Summary of Questioning.

In summary, the questioning indicator shows how the WWM group members used questions in their interactions. In T1 episodes, questions were used primarily to seek information or clarification from the speaker. In T2, questions were also used to seek information and clarification; however, they were also used as an attempt to challenge assumptions and perspective. In the T2 episodes, questions were also used in attempts to exert influence and challenge assumptions, but with little success. Even in T3, few questions were used, yet the interactions were more open. Questions came about through non-verbal communication and silence as an opportunity for inquiry into previous actions. For example, if a group member was curious about the statements of another person, rather than asking a question out loud, that member might indicate the curiosity with a slight turn of the head and an inquisitive, but pointed look, followed by silence. The group also used statements rather than questions to encourage reflection.

Mode of discourse.

The final indicator, mode of discourse, refers to how the WWM group members communicated with one another. The three modes of discourse identified are narrative (type 1), discussion (type 2), and dialogue (type 3). This indicator comes last because characteristics of the other four indicators contribute to it, illustrating the interdependency between the indicators. Table 9: Mode of Discourse Characteristics provides points taken from the excerpts related to each type as it pertains to aspects of discourse.

The next section provides excerpts from each type used to illustrate the characteristics of Mode of Discourse.

Table 9

Mode of Discourse Characteristics

Mode of Discourse		
Definition: how group members verbally and non-verbally communicate within group meetings.		
Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion • May lean toward debate; assertion of viewpoints 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centers around one person and one person only • Serve as segue to T2 and T3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus on problem solving or obtaining results • Present an argument • Seek agreement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus is on group interaction with topic as secondary • Seek shared meaning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual determines context of interaction and legitimacy of statements and questions • Used as opportunity to inform others • Statements and questions primarily directed toward speaker 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual determines context of interaction and legitimacy of statements and questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group determines context and legitimacy of statements • Connect actions with intentions • Build upon individual contribution toward group learning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive listening • Ignore or do not address non-verbal communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Passive and active listening • Do not always attend to non-verbal communication • Lots of interruption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active listening • Attend to non-verbal communication • Laughter, ease

Mode of discourse - Type I.

In Type 1, one person's story or narrative dominated in which the individual experience sat at the center of the interaction. Other group members deferred to that individual with questions and comments. The narrative was not an equal give and take interaction, but centered around one person and one person only in these episodes. The primary focus involved sharing an individual perspective. With narratives, the group did not fully engage in the interaction. The two T1 episodes differed regarding the number and length of exchanges.

In the data, T1 episodes served as a precursor to T2 and T3 episodes. Allowing individuals to tell their story provided a segue into other modes of discourse. The other four episodes in T2 and T3 were preceded by a mode of discourse similar to that of T1.

Mode of discourse T1-E1.

This episode read as a disjointed conversation based on the length and number of turns taken by group members. Even though the group did yield the floor to Beth in the beginning of the episode, they continued to demonstrate resistance by not showing much interest in her story. After it had been determined that the group was not going to hear from Hank, Maya's folded her hands in her lap and her facial expressions demonstrated her resignation to the situation. Susan, although sitting directly next to Beth, faced forward, fiddling with objects surrounding her. All this demonstrated more than the words used and turns taken. This episode is a narrative interspersed with questions posed to Beth. Also, Beth's response to questions and other statements presented themselves as if they are an interruption to her story.

In essence, the episode consisted of Beth telling her story with people asking questions for clarification. The interaction was not between or among the other group members. Starting

with Line 8, members directed most questions and statements to Beth. Even when other group members spoke, Beth determined the accuracy of their statements and controlled the flow of interaction as well as the context:

L11 (Maya): She planned to be out, or she was...

L12 (Susan): *[Interruption]* No, she was sick. *[To Maya]*

L13 (Beth): She really was sick. She was beginning to get a little bit sick the Friday before Labor Day. Was that afternoon? It was Thursday afternoon when I got that email.

No it wasn't.

In this exchange, Susan answered Maya's question for Beth; however, Beth verified the legitimacy of the statement. In addition, Susan answered for Beth in L12 in an attempt to hurry the story along, especially since she had already heard Beth's story before the group meeting. Ann's body was turned from Beth and she mainly looked in Hank's direction or down toward her lap. Ann then turned her head only when speaking to Beth directly. This demonstrated the lack of actively listening. There also appeared to be a great deal of speaking "to" Beth rather than "with" her in this episode.

Mode of discourse T1-E2.

This episode read more like a monologue than the first. Jane dominated the episode by taking the most and longest turns and did not invite other contributions. Other group members took short turns and exchanges, and thus said little overall. The group directed all statements toward Jane. Most of the turns taken by other members consisted of verbal "Mmm", also known as back-channeling. This back-channeling served to allow Jane to hold the floor, however, based on the intonation and lack of eye contact, it did not demonstrate engagement. Instead, the back-

channeling served to present the listeners as cooperative and polite, but not active participants in the discourse.

Just like in episode T1-E1, when other group members contributed, the main speaker (in this instance Jane) took control of the response to other's statements and questions. In most instances, Jane barely acknowledged those statements, as Lines 13 and 17 below demonstrate:

L12 (Susan): Well someone's not pushing an agenda or

L13 (Jane): *[Interruption]* Right mm-hmm.

L14 (Susan): Looking for that creativity. It sounds like a

L15 (Beth): *[Interruption]* Yeah.

L16 (Susan): Being willing to explore different things.

L17 (Jane): Yeah, so.

L18 (Susan): I always admired you. You're always so involved in all these

L19 (Jane): *[Interruption]* Well it came about through I don't know. But it didn't come about from just trying to, sorta, it was like what can do of value with my time.

These eight turns include most of the interaction in the episode. Lines 13 and 17 illustrate how Jane maintained control of the conversation, even when receiving acknowledgement. She focused on continuing her story rather than yielding the floor to others. Her efforts to tell her story, without accepting bids for the floor to respond to her, demonstrated the narrative aspects of this episode that bordered on monological discourse. If it were not for the back-channeling, the episode would have read more like a monologue. In this sense, monologues can also be narratives where an individual is telling his or her own story.

However, in these episodes, actual monologues did not occur due to the involvement of multiple group members.

Mode of discourse - Type II.

In T2 episodes, discussion served as the mode of discourse. Group members used this mode to move beyond narratives, but with the goal of persuading others or advocating a position. Within T2, there may be multiple speakers and not just one main contributor as demonstrated in the T1 episodes.

Although debate would also fall under T2, the two episodes chosen for analysis are not necessarily debates. The discourse in T2-E1 is a discussion, while T2-E2 presented arguments as discussion that lean toward debate. In T2, the discourse involved asserting one's beliefs and opinions without moments and exchanges of critical reflection. More people were involved in the discourse than found in a narrative. Interruptions and little active listening were also characteristics of this mode of discourse.

Mode of discourse T2-E1.

This episode's involved a discussion, where members provided advice to Ann about her work situation. Questions were used to gather facts, and, in this case, Ann rather than the group, controlled the flow of information. Additionally, Ann did not share or explore the full context with others in the group. Throughout this episode, Ann accepted and rejected the ideas and solutions posed. She was positioned to veto or ratify other ideas, which displayed how Ann determined the context in this episode. This leaves other members attempting to figure out Ann's perspective in order to offer advice. As demonstrated in the following excerpt, Ann verifies the accuracy or validity of others' contributions from her perspective:

L23 (Maya): I would just say, it's not so much that you need a job description, but you need, in my opinion, there needs to be some type of strategy discussion so you understand relative priorities.

L24 (Ann): Oh, that's a good word. I can say that.

Here, Ann accepted another perspective that supports her own position. Throughout the episode, Ann provided affirmative responses to other group member's input. However, never once in this episode did anyone stop to see if this problem solving was even what Ann needed or wanted. In L23, Maya acknowledged that she was sharing her opinion, without pushing her perspective onto Ann. This aspect showed how the episode leaned toward a discussion rather than a debate. The group shared different ideas to try to influence Ann, but not push her. Most members entered into and came out of the interaction with their own perspectives seemingly unchanged. Although Ann did gain a new tactic for handling her work situation, it did not alter her underlying stance and view of her situation.

Mode of discourse T2-E2.

The discussion in this episode played on the edge of a debate. Ann and Susan advocated a position, and although Beth started out asking questions, she eventually expressed her own position. Each person held their beliefs and did not openly examine their assumptions, even when challenged. Everyone maintained their own meaning through their own experiences. Statements were expressed as fact with little opening for inquiry or interpretation:

L19 (Susan): You start paying people and they can't make a living off of it.

L20 (Ann): Right. And then they don't have any insurance, so they don't tax the community. This is what I'm talking about.

L21 (Susan): That's why I don't like Walmart.

In this excerpt, Susan considered one idea while Ann discussed another. This turn in the discourse allowed both people to present a case for their separate arguments. Without verifying statements and perspectives, the argument continued, as Ann and Susan believed they are discussing the same idea and building a joint case for their perspective.

Mode of discourse - Type III.

The mode of discourse for T3 is dialogue. Here the group members jointly determined the context and mode of interaction. Different members shared their perspectives and experiences, building upon the context toward a shared meaning. Within the WWM group, the topic for dialogue focused on an individual's experience, and the dialogue centered on the group's experience of that individual. This helped move the discourse beyond the individual being the only one to determine the context and perspective.

Engagement, assumptions, influence, and questioning all factored into characterizing the modes of discourse. Each of the T3 indicators exhibited traits that support dialogue as a larger structure and mode of discourse, as was the case for each of the Types for mode of discourse. Here dialogue was different from a narrative and discussion in that there were few interruptions. The group respectfully listened and engaged, as demonstrated through body language, fewer interruptions and a gentle tone that appeared as respectful of the speaker. In this dialogue, the group allowed for silence and the opportunity for critical reflection.

Mode of Discourse T3-E1.

In this episode, the discourse revolved around Susan's experience. Her willingness to hear and seek other perspectives allowed the group to engage in dialogue around that experience as a topic. Through the episode, the group builds upon their understanding of the situation to create a new and joint understanding of Susan and their relationship with her.

One aspect of this episode's dialogue involved other members sharing their own experiences, which created further connections to Susan. Here Ann disclosed a previous interaction she had with Maya.

L21 (Ann): That goes back and proves my point about when we were taught it. I think you and I had that conversation. *[says looking to Maya]*

L22 (Maya): Yeah

L23 (Ann): It was never modeled, it was never taught, it was never safe, it was never comfortable to have emotions and be vulnerable and **know** that you're loved through that. So there's something...

Even though the dialogue came back around to Susan's experience, the group reached beyond that experience by sharing their own experiences. The dialogue became a tapestry of experiences where group members contributed to the individual and collective experience. Shared meaning was created through this dialogue, and thus presented a different perspective for not only Susan, but for the entire group.

Later Ann recalled something she had spoken about in a previous meeting regarding her relationship with her parents:

L40 (Ann): It had to be. Your lives sometimes could depend on that. You're your family relationships, you had to, had to call. And I speak from experience as I had to call. And I speak from experience and I just played it out two weeks ago with my parents. There's that, there's that [*Unintelligible*] of positioning and family that I learned and assumed so well. And I wanted to bring it over back to me because...

L41 (Maya): [*Interruption*] Right, When you literally fall back into it, a few weeks ago you became really really conscious of that.

These excerpts demonstrated how the topic was enriched and supported through other people's sharing of related experiences. Other members brought themselves into the interaction for individual learning while the group built on and learned from the collective experience. The pace of this episode was slow and deliberate, which demonstrated the respect for the interaction, members, and experiences.

Through reflection, Beth entered the dialogue with a previous experience she had with Susan that unfolded about a year earlier within the group meetings:

L33 (Beth): It's the same thing when you and your family would retreat into yourself and then not ever talk about it again. It's a way of dealing with him that you shared with us. It's a way of "don't come close to me, don't talk to me..."

Through such group experiences, the knowing from within their relationship grew, allowing dialogue to unfold. The group members did not quiz Susan about an exact moment, nor did they look for further information to make a point. The details used to recount that experience were not as important as the relationship itself. The dialogue centered on engaging in relationships in general, not just Susan's relationship. The group shared the context on how to make unconscious

patterns more conscious and learnable in relationships inside and outside the group. The interaction provided for individual and group learning.

Mode of Discourse T3-E2.

Like in the previous episode, the group members shared the context of their experience of and with Nicole. The pace of this interaction, like T3-E1, was slow and relaxed. The group used silence and reflection that respected the dialogue and contribution of each member.

Before the episode began, Nicole finished sharing an experience that contributed to the focus of the interaction, which continued through L7:

L1 (Maya): Subconsciously you knew what you wanted to say, but you froze in fear about saying it?

L2 (Ann): And you beat yourself up the next day. *[long pause]*

L3 (Nicole): Well, that's not what I think happens Maya.

L4 (Maya): Well, I've not been present, so I *[unintelligible]* don't know.

L5 (Nicole): I'm the Myers-Briggs, first of all I'm introvert, second of all I'm a Myers-Briggs type that has to go off and go and process things mentally, so I...*[long pause]*

L6 (Maya): Okay

L7 (Nicole): No, I don't think of what to say at the time. That's very unusual unless I feel very very safe. *[pause]*

L8 (Maya): Well, and that's why *[laughter]*

L9 *[unintelligible]*

L10 (Lisa): Because you are safe in here and you have done that in here. *[short pause]*

You do ask what you want. You did it last night, you asked questions when you had

them. You do offer support as we go around. But I think that's the key that you just hit on, when I'm safe that also goes with...

L11 (Nicole): Exactly

L12 (Lisa): Maya's question...

L13 (Nicole): Exactly

L14 (Lisa): Frozen in fear. When you've been frozen in fear you don't experience yourself in this way.

The topic transitioned from the facts of Nicole's specific experience to how Nicole experienced herself and how others experienced her. The group members checked for understanding as another way to look at themselves individually and as a group.

Lines 7 through 10 addressed the safety and trust that had developed within the relationships and relational responsibility of the group. Pulling from the other indicators, dialogue created a highly engaged environment where the group actively listened. People were not talking over one another by interrupting. Instead, the group members used silence as a way to respect the individual contribution, build upon that contribution, and reflect on the contribution to dialogue. By doing these things, the dialogue builds and made way for new understandings.

The way group members spoke with one another in this episode demonstrated other relational aspects of dialogue, such as respect and authenticity.

L32 *[laughter. Ann and Maya look at each other smiling][Silence]*

L33 (Nicole): That's not kind.

L34 (Susan): What? *[long pause]* You know, I would say, I would say...*[laughter]*
what...what's not kind?

L35 (Nicole): They're looking at each other and laughing Susan.

L36 [*laughter*]

L37 (Ann): You know, it's just...

L38 (Nicole): [*Interruption*] and I love it [*laughter*]

Several things appeared to happen in this interaction. Although Susan started speaking before L32, Maya and Ann looked at each other to communicate non-verbally about what Nicole stated previously. By sharing their experience of Nicole, the group challenged how Nicole experienced herself. Nicole's experience of that moment surfaced a belief Nicole had about herself. This unfolded in a relaxed and playful manner, which later contributed to some specific insights and actions by Nicole. In addition, Susan focused on Nicole, but did not lose touch with what happened within the group just so she could make her point. Susan stopped to ask what was happening and what she missed. Here, the group provided everyone respect by allowing everyone to speak and have the floor when asked.

Summary of Mode of Discourse.

The last indicator, mode of discourse served as an initial framework for categorizing the episodes, with the other indicators closely tied to developing each type of discourse. T1 episodes involved narratives where one member of the group dominated the discourse. The function of this type of discourse seemed to be for an individual to tell their story. In T2, the groups' interactions aligned with discussion and debate. Group members took more turns in T2 than in T1, yet more interruptions occurred in this type than the other two. Group members sought to be heard and share their individual perspectives. In T3, the discourse was dialogical, where the group was able to move beyond individual perspectives into developing shared meaning.

Summary

In summary, this chapter presented the findings for the research question: What are the indicators of the types of teaching and learning in the WWM CoP? Through analysis, I identified five indicators evolving from six episodes based on the teaching and learning typology. Those indicators are engagement, assumptions, influence, questioning, and mode of discourse. The next chapter, I discuss my findings, conclusions, and implications for my practice and further research.

Chapter Five: Discussion

The findings of this study add to our understanding of all three types of teaching and learning (TTL). Previous research on the Peters and Armstrong's (1998) TTL framework has not yet examined differences between the types. Rather, previous work has focused on T3. Even those studies mentioning the use of all three types (Alderton, 2000; Fazio, 2003; Gaskin, 2007) do not discuss differences, similarities or characteristics found therein. For example, Fazio (2003) reported that a speaker's willingness "to allow the group to participate" (p. 111) resulted in the different TTL. He also claimed that dominating group members resulted in T1 interactions. However, Fazio did not examine the three different TTL or indicators related to each.

Five indicators emerged from the data analysis: engagement, assumptions, influence, questioning, and mode of discourse. Table 10: TTL Indicators represents some basic characteristics of these indicators. Even though the indicators are discussed here separately, there is an interdependent relationship among the them. Therefore, the discussion of each indicator often references the others.

Each TTL has its own unique characteristics that need to be explored before looking at possible interrelationships between the indicators. By not examining all three TTL, we neglect to understand the differences and benefits each TTL may have for participants. Using the TTL as a larger framework in which to understand practitioners' interactions within communities of practice (CoP) can provide a structure for elucidating how certain behaviors and characteristics may contribute to specific TTL.

Table 10

TTL Indicators

Indicators	Type I	Type II	Type III
Engagement	Low connection, low group intensity	Medium connection, high group intensity	High connection, low group intensity
Assumptions	Not addressed; Treated as fact or information	Marginally addressed; primarily suspended to support a position; Attempts to examine are discouraged	More closely examined; use as opportunity to create shared meaning; Increased awareness of own assumptions
Influence	Individuals do not seek perspective; Limited interest in being influenced or influencing beyond gaining information about another's experience	Individuals interested in influencing others, not necessarily to be influenced or persuaded; Seek only agreeing perspectives	Individuals within group desire to be influenced, possess curiosity and seek opportunity to expand or create new perspectives or frames
Questioning	Close-ended; used to seek clarification or further information	Close-ended; used to challenge another's position	Open-ended, inquiry into practice; requests for reflection on perspective; verification of shared meaning
Mode of discourse	Narrative	Discussion	Dialogue

To understand any one of the three TTL better, the findings suggest that we should look at the indicators and their characteristics independently as well as collectively across each of the TTL. Previous studies have contributed to a large body of literature on T3, yet T3 is only part of the framework and only a snapshot of what occurs within interactions. These previous studies on T3 have often examined only T3 (see chapter 2) rather than an equal treatment of all group interactions, including T1 and T2. This study identified five indicators within interactions that fell within each of the three types. While other studies have identified similar indicators, they were only discussed as they pertained to T3. Following is a discussion of the five indicators.

Final indicators.

First, each indicator is discussed briefly with a focus on identifying highlights as it relates to the TTL. Second, indicators are discussed in terms of previous findings. Third, each indicator is discussed in terms of its greater significance to our understanding of TTL. Then, following the discussion of the indicators is the larger connection to the CoP literature.

Engagement.

Engagement is defined as level of action within a group, and further defined by connection and intensity working together. The “connection” referred to how group members interacted, and in the findings increased from T1 (low), to T2 (medium), to T3 (high). The “intensity” referred to the level of action, energy, and emotion that went into those interactions. The findings showed that the intensity level was low with T1 and T3, while being higher at T2.

What is important to note here is that the low intensity, and therefore overall engagement, in T1 was markedly different from the intensity and engagement found in T3. In T1, the primary speaker tended to speak faster and with more force. The rest of the group members were quieter

and more reserved, however they also showed signs of agitation and fidgeting while filling in the gaps that excluded opportunities for silence. These aspects of T1's low intensity, joined with the low group connection between members resulted in an overall low engagement. What appears to have happened in T1 is that group members wanted to be respectful toward individual speakers, but repressed their agitation and impatience. In T2, these moments of agitation and impatience were expressed more freely, therefore contributing to a high intensity. In T3, the intensity was different yet again, as there did not seem to be the desire to interrupt or the need to be heard. The low intensity demonstrated a relaxed and calm environment that was not present in the other two TTL. There seemed to be an overall interest in hearing from other members and not the immediate need to speak. Therefore, T3's high connection mixed with a low intensity, provided a highly engaged interaction.

Previous studies related to the TTL framework have also identified engagement as an indicator, but only as it applies to T3. For example, Armstrong (1999) studied two collaborative learning classes in which he used ethnographic observations and interviews to develop three themes describing the process of collaborative learning (T3): group process, learning process and group facilitation. Using participant descriptions for the learning process theme, Armstrong described engagement within T3 as something that "requires participants to become involved in, and responsible for, their own learning in ways not usually required in traditional learning situations" (p. 83). This is the only mention of engagement in the study.

In Alderton's (2000) study, while discussing his theme of "personal relationship and respect," reported that, "During those periods when the group experienced dialogue (T3), participants described it as a special atmosphere in which there was a connection, feeling, an

energy, and sense of being in balance with others in the group” (p. 109). Alderton mentioned connection and energy as if they were exclusive to T3, but did not further define the meaning he attributed to this indicator or how it played out differently in the other two TTL.

Torres’ (2008) phenomenological study examined the levelising process of Appreciative Inquiry practitioners engaged in collaborative learning (T3) in an online forum about organizational design. Torres findings related to the participants’ experiences revealed six themes. One theme in particular directly related to engagement Torres called “Exhilarating, Energizing, Meaningful, Enriching Interaction.” In explaining the participant responses related to their experience, Torres wrote:

Exhilaration and a sense of increasing energy surfaced in the dialogues themselves. It showed up in the flurry of responses, depth of engagement, in the tone and timbre of conversation, in the intense back and forth of the dialogue, and in the richness of the information that was shared over a three to seven-day period (p. 68).

Without examining levels of engagement when not operating within T3, comparing engagement between the three different types and/or making claims about engagement levels proves difficult. Torres description of engagement differs from the findings of this study in that such “flurry” and increased energy happened with T2 but not in T1 or T3. In an earlier theme she called “Participation,” Torres noted the obvious disengagement of participants in the online process. Because her study only looked at the interaction through a T3 frame, it is unclear as to whether what she calls engagement may have been just another form of participation in T1 or T2.

Without providing a frame for explaining the differences of engagement, extrapolating comparisons between Alderton (2000) and Torres (2008) studies makes comparisons difficult.

This study suggests that understanding engagement within all three TTL could provide a broader link for practitioners. Engagement can be found within each of the three TTL, if we define engagement as going beyond a synonym for interaction. Defining engagement was demonstrated in the findings through understanding characteristics such as “connection” between group member interaction and “intensity” of those interactions. The engagement changes with the TTL, but all types of engagement are important in understanding the larger structure of group interactions within CoPs.

Understanding what engagement looks like in all TTL can build appreciation for the inner workings of group interactions and the purposes for different kinds of engagement. How participants respond to other indicators such as assumptions, influence, and questioning can help to determine how the group’s engagement transitions to, or moves in and out of, the various TTL.

Assumptions.

The second indicator in the findings, assumptions, examined how group members managed beliefs, values, judgments, opinions, or the like, as they engaged in the group. In some instances, individuals and the group ignored stated or implied assumptions while engaged in T1. This allowed individuals to share information or tell a story without the feel of being judged or challenged. This disengagement from identifying, addressing or challenging assumptions in T1 was beneficial to the process since it created an opportunity for group members to tell their stories and for the group to further examine the information shared at a later time. The

information that was shared in T1 providing the context for later episodes. However, the interactions within the group flowed in and out of each of the TTL. Therefore, it could be said that any and all interactions built upon one another for providing content and focus for any of the given TTL. The findings highlighted that T1 was not the opportune time to call attention to such assumptions.

In T2, assumptions were only questioned when it presented an opportunity to support an individual's perspective. This provided an opportunity for different viewpoints to be shared and for individuals to express their assumptions to see where there was alignment or disconnect. The benefit of this was that everyone had an opportunity to state their viewpoints and be heard. Examining assumptions for creating change in action was not the point during these episodes, instead expressing various viewpoints helped the group see where there were agreements and disagreements in frames of reference. These moments were probably the most frustrating for the WWM group, and where the group primarily operated. Sometimes people just wanted to present their argument and hear other's positions without examining the underlying assumptions contributing to such positions.

The episodes in T2 illustrated how addressing assumptions is a joint process, where the person questioning an assumption and the person being questioned must work together through the perceived disconnect. If they do not work through the conflict of addressing the assumption, the matter continues unresolved for the group. In addition, addressing assumptions in T2 demonstrated an opportunity to use that process for presenting another perspective and essentially challenging another's assertions.

During T3, individuals themselves or other members of the group addressed assumptions more freely as a joint process, even when those assumptions were in direct conflict with different members' positions. As the group slowed down in their engagement, they took the time to call attention to assumptions. However, just calling attention to stated assumptions was not enough. The process required those individuals whose assumptions were being challenged to be open to considering other perspectives. The process went beyond awareness to resolving the discrepancies between the perspectives, thus leading to a change in belief or behavior.

Throughout all three TTL, there was a history to how assumptions were viewed and affected the WWM group. Sometimes the group's disconnecting in terms of engagement allowed for individual stories (T1) to unfold and provide context for further interaction.. I had never considered how the lack of addressing assumptions could be beneficial until I considered the history of the WWM group. Due to our training with the Discovery Courses, we were quick to notice judgments and assumptions, then question and challenge those assumptions. In order for the group to allow a story to unfold without interference, the group evolved into appearing to disconnect from the group during these instances. What appeared as a lack of dealing with assumptions was an opportunity for group members to provide the groundwork for other types of engagement regarding those assumptions. Historically, when group members were quick to question stated assumptions, it caused a great deal of frustration because nobody could get through their own story, using their own words. Almost everything was challenged and questioned, therefore appeared as judgment rather than what Isaacs (1999) "suspending judgments" for examination. "Judgments shut down conversations and send creative thinking into hiding" (Ellinor & Gerard, 1998, p. 66). By disconnecting from the relationship in a sense,

and removing one's own judgments on another's assumptions, it allowed an individual to tell their own story and then move forward. In our situation, there existed a long-standing relationship and emotional connection between the group members, therefore the group adapted to such situations by appearing to disconnect from the interaction, setting aside questions and resisting a desire to either influence or address assumptions in that particular moment. Questions, in these instances, were used as a method of seeking clarity and further information and not to challenge or judge.

Because of all this, the WWM group moved away from our pursuit of questioning to avoid sounding judgmental or hostile. We seemed to enter "politeness" mode for fear that attempts to surface assumptions would be viewed as combative rather than supportive. Occasionally, we needed a reminder that examining our assumptions was the crux of making changes in our lives. Acknowledging those unnoticed patterns and taken for granted habits were a key for making conscious choices toward change for us, both individually and as a group. We just needed to be mindful of the instances on when to examine assumptions and not to necessarily let them go completely. Our ability to address assumptions increased across the types. For T1, assumptions were not addressed. In T2, assumptions were addressed only as a means for gaining support for an individual perspective. In T3, assumptions were explored more openly as a way of gaining multiple perspectives.

As for the previous studies on the TTL, assumptions are referred to a great deal throughout, especially as assumptions related to levelising. For example, in her study, Gaskin (2007) facilitated a group for her work that looked at behavioral health organization examining quality improvement issues. She discussed assumptions as they related to levelising and

reflective practice, tying into the seminal work and theories related to levelising (Peters & Ragland, 2005). She stated, “Reflective practice is a process of identifying assumptions associated with practice, theorizing about how these assumptions are associated with practice, and acting on the practice on the basis of the theory” (p. 4). She later discussed exploring and examining assumptions as a way to make informed choices.

Duncan (2009) also examines assumptions as they relate to levelising and reflective practice within his role as an executive coach. He uses the same basic model of levelising, of which assumptions are a critical part. He does link the examination of assumptions as crucial to taking different actions toward clients’ goals.

Torres (2008) stated in reference to the commonality of holding assumptions and the benefit of addressing those assumptions:

One such assumption was uncovered...my assumption that we would begin with shared understanding regarding *design* and *destiny*. It turned out we each held this same assumption without realizing it until we came face to face with conflicting meanings. Each of us was surprised to discover that others did not share their understanding of AI, *design*, *destiny*, or the purpose of our practice. Despite the fact that a common focus in our work is the challenge of creating shared meaning, we did not think to question our own frames. (p. 99).

However, all three studies, Gaskin (2007), Torres (2008), and Duncan (2009) connect their discussions of assumptions to reflective practice, an aspect of T3, and not to the TTL overall. They position surfacing and addressing assumptions as the goal in every interaction. The present study’s findings suggest that looking at assumptions and how those assumptions are handled

across the three TTL could be beneficial for practitioners. Both addressing and not addressing assumptions have their purposes, and sometimes the conflict that can result in prematurely addressing assumptions is not productive.

Even within episodes identified as T3, the WWM group did not always question or challenge verbalized assumptions. There were plenty of missed opportunities to surface hidden context and develop shared meaning. However, in order for our group to go through an exchange in any of the types, there had to be some assumptions that were not addressed, as noted in the findings. If we were to fully address every assumption stated, it would ultimately halt communication. Instead we ended up looking for larger meaning, assuming we knew what someone was stating until we could not reconcile what we understood the person to mean. There were some things that we needed to take for granted. This, we assumed that we shared meaning, until it came to a point that we had to question or suspend assumptions in efforts to take meaningful action. This provides a good example of why all three TTL are needed within group interactions, providing value to one's story being told (as in T1), arguments being made (as in T2) or engaging in dialogue (as in T3). It is clear that not every assumption can be addressed in any of the individual TTL, however, the level at which those assumptions are addressed plays a role in the type of interaction that occurs.

Influence.

The "assumption" indicator is closely tied to how the WWM group dealt with influence. In T1, when assumptions were not addressed, the opportunity to exert or accept influence did not present itself, as what was shared within the group was treated as information or fact. When we either did not or chose not to address assumptions, we were not seeking to change our individual

perspectives and accept influence (a characteristic of T1). Simply, there was not room for influence to happen as a mutual process among a group's members. The discourse was unbalanced, but persuasion was not the intent of the interactions in T1.

In T2, both assumptions and influence indicators were used to build a case for someone supporting their own position. Assumptions were only pursued when individuals sought to persuade other group members, not as a way to examine one's own position and potentially be influenced by another perspective. The influence had to be fairly strong or already align with another's position to be accepted in T2. In T2, influence is unbalanced as group members seek more to influence others rather than be influenced. This does not mean that group members were not open to influence in T2, but that perspective or persuasion needed to align with already held assumptions. This created little opportunity for a joint process of examining multiple perspectives, as the group members dominating the discussion only allowed in agreeing perspectives. Therefore, in the T2 episodes, the WWM group had a tendency toward advocating previously held assumptions and only sought answers toward problem-solving that agreed with those unexamined assumptions. As such, any attempt, even unknowingly, to assert influence over others, did not work toward resolving issues.

The episodes in T2 correspond with the majority of the data collected - group interactions primarily fell in the realm of T2. During these T2 episodes, there was a preponderance of group members attempting to assert themselves, without really listening to what others were saying and/or to the assumptions being challenged. I believe this was one factor that kept the group out of T3. This also played out in T1 episodes, where group members withdrew their influence to keep from stopping communication, or put the speaker on the defensive without providing the

opportunity to fully telling his or her story. The influence exhibited by group members in T1 episodes were to support and encourage the speaker rather than using it to persuade.

In T3, group members sought to be influenced through addressing assumptions and seeking multiple perspectives. A certain curiosity to gain insight existed when individuals or the group examined their lives more thoroughly in T3.

The avoidance or rejection of influence in T1 served as an opportunity for a narrative to run its course and as a springboard for T2 and T3. By not hearing other perspectives and sharing information allowed the group members to present a case for further problem-solving or decision making that could later lead to T2 or T3. How the group then handled that shared information and the individuals' story determined what direction the engagement followed. If that experience was used as a way to exert influence and seek only agreement, the interaction went to T2. The individual seemed dug in to their individual perspectives and did not seek out influence from others unless it fell along the lines of previously held assumptions. This could provide an opportunity for problem solving if the groups' perspectives align and not a great deal of influence needs to be exerted. However, for T3 episodes, if the information shared in a T1 episode was seen as an opportunity for better understanding an experience, then group members were not only open to other's influence, but sought it out in their quest for gaining multiple perspectives, which directly challenged assumptions.

Influence is not addressed in the previous research on the TTL, other than that discussed by Peters and Armstrong (1998) as it relates to the teacher/student relationship. Within the CoP literature, influence concentrates on the organizational pressures and influence from entities outside of the CoP (e.g., Wenger, 1998; Garavan, et al., 2007).

Argyris and Schön (1996) introduced the concept of “balancing advocacy and inquiry” as a way of explaining an individuals’ ability to listen and accept other perspectives. Isaacs (1999) draws upon this concept in his book *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together*. The willingness to consider other ideas and be influenced “means encouraging others to challenge our views” (p. 188). These findings support this alignment between examining assumptions and influence, suggesting that acknowledging the ways we approach other’s influence within the TTL provides an opportunity for seeing how we position ourselves in a group. Limiting our curiosity and desire to hear other perspectives limits the ability to create new understanding, shared meaning, and knowledge, as suggested by Isaacs (1999). This limitation does not present a problem when a group merely exchanges information or only seeks to debate a topic and surface various perspectives. However, if a group’s purpose lies in group learning and knowledge creation, then such a situation requires a certain desire for seeking out various perspectives, and to possibly be influenced by another person’s position in order to create new perspectives within a group. This desire surpasses mere willingness to listen. Possessing “willingness” lacks the curiosity necessary for building what I see as passion for learning, creating and growing.

Questioning.

Questioning methods used within the WWM group fell into three categories. Questioning in T1 sought information or clarification. Such questions kept focus on the main speaker and reduced communication from others. In T2, questioning sought agreement or challenged another’s position. When questions were interpreted as a challenge, the person being questioned tended to respond in a defensive manner. This also hampered communication, yet the questions many times were essentially ignored. Each person shared their perspectives then moved on with

the interaction in the T2 findings. In T3, the questions went beyond seeking information and advocating a position. Questions were used as a method to handle assumptions and share other perspectives. However, the act of not asking questions could be highlighted as well. The lack of questions in each of the types actually proved beneficial when what resulted was a story to be told (T1), an argument to be expressed (T2), or reflection to happen through silence (T3).

The majority of the studies related to T3 discuss questioning or inquiry in some fashion. For example, Armstrong (1999) found that the participants in his study viewed questioning as being unique to T3. However, he later discusses how questions can hinder dialogue when participants merely request information. Armstrong's claims then position dialogue and T3 as the goal of his study without addressing the types of questions in T1 and T2.

The three studies on levelising (Gaskin, 2007; Torres, 2008; and Duncan, 2009) examine the use of questions in depth. For example, Duncan discusses how questions served as the primary tool in his practice as a coach, and were used in his study to promote reflection and test assumptions (p. 28). He further cites his use of different types of questions such as probing, action, stimulus, and conceptual clarification questions (pp. 112 – 113). These were “provided to elicit openings, generate possibilities, develop plans, preview outcomes, and inspire action” (p. 28). His findings provide a further link between the indicators of questioning and assumptions. Although none of these studies on levelising look at the types of questions used within the framework of the TTL, Duncan's (2009) findings on how questions brought about various results and actions provides a direction for extending the indicators within the TTL. Meanwhile, the present study provides some understanding of the different uses of questions across the different TTL.

Mode of discourse.

The last indicator discussed in the findings was mode of discourse. How the group approached questioning, assumptions, influence and engagement all contributed to whether the discourse was categorized as narrative (T1), discussion (T2), or dialogue (T3).

Peters and Armstrong (1998) draw heavily upon modes of discourse as a way to distinguish between the TTL, pulling from the interaction of the teacher-student relationship. This study sought to discover how the TTL framework might translate outside the classroom into an informal CoP, such as the WWM group. In a classroom, the categories for discourse include lecture (T1), discussion (T2), and dialogue (T3) (Peters and Armstrong, 1998). In this study, the modes of discourse were found to be narrative (T1), discussion (T2), and dialogue (T3).

The narrative (T1) mode of discourse is described as when one person is telling a story and recounting their experience. These narratives were found to be the basis for further interaction. Narrative discourse may be similar to critical incidents used in Peters (1991) work in reflective practice. Sometimes this mode can provide a jumping off point for the group to move into other modes of discourse. In fact, the four episodes in both T2 and T3 were preceded by a mode of discourse similar to that found in T1. However, the narrative did not always lead to discussion or dialogue, but also could serve as a means of building relationships and group cohesion. Many times though, such stories from T1 were recalled later to make connections to current actions in T2 and T3 episodes. Narrative modes allowed group members to build the relationships through keeping everyone informed of significant events. Sometimes those narratives were experiences resulting from taking action related to working through an issue with

the group. This is what happened in T1-E1 which Beth. Also, in both T3 episodes the group pulled from previous narratives to illustrate a perspective.

The discussion mode (T2) included a wider range of characteristics. Discussion was found to be a verbal exchange of views or ideas. The WWM group primarily interacted in a discussion mode of discourse throughout the study. One of the group's stated purposes was to take action on issues related to our respective lives. Because of this purpose, we spent much of our time attempting to solve problems and decide on solutions in a relatively efficient manner. However, for the WWM group, there was somewhat of a disconnect in the communication during T2 episodes. Either people had differing agendas that were not discussed (as in T2-E1), or they were not listening for what was being said beyond points they felt would support their own stance (both T2 episodes).

Many times, narratives provided a means to set up the problem, while the discussion fulfilled the "need for action and immediate decisions" (Ellinor & Gerard, 1998). Sometimes the group was at cross-purposes, as in T2-E1, where Ann was not looking to continue telling her story (T1) or explore options (T3), but quickly sought agreement and resolution. The high energy, as discussed in engagement, seemed to contribute to the group quickly moving through a topic as a means of coming to some conclusion. Discussion allowed the group an opportunity to efficiently share multiple aspects and positions on a topic, and then come to some action.

As for dialogue in T3, the WWM group did not engage in much dialogue during the period of data collection. There were some situations prior to the data collection and even during the pilot study where the group engaged in very memorable dialogical interactions. However, out of the three modes of discourse, dialogue was the least frequent in the data.

The dialogue mode (T3) is only one characteristic of one indicator found in this study, yet it is the most researched aspect within the TTL literature. Isaacs (1999) defines dialogue as being “about a shared inquiry, a way of thinking and reflecting together” (p. 9). He touts dialogue as critical for transformation, creativity and collaboration across various fields of study such as business, education, and science and in all types of situations. Ellinor and Gerard (1998) compare discussion and dialogue, recognizing a purpose for each, but with a preference for and focus on the latter, and without much attention to narratives.

Previous studies on TTL often created groups specifically for the purpose of engaging in dialogue through collaborative learning, therefore researched their findings only as it related to T3 (e.g., Alderton, 2000; Torres, 2007) to the exclusion of T1 and T2. The benefits of dialogue (in T3) are well documented in literature. However, previous studies have not explicitly considered the value of the other modes of discourse, or how the three modes might relate to one another. For example, Alderton (2000) studied two classes designed to engage in dialogue. At the conclusion of the classes, he asked both participants and outside raters to identify which of three TTL they believed the classes engaged. Responses from both the participants and observers varied as to how often they felt dialogue had occurred. Alderton does point out that dialogue is not exclusive to T3, but stops short to explain how dialogue plays out in the other two types.

The literature on dialogue is vast, as many studies and theorists tout the benefits of dialogue. Dialogue requires members to develop respect and trust with one another while exposing underlying assumptions and exploring alternate perspectives (Peters and Armstrong, 1998; Bohm, 1996; Ellinor & Gerard, 1998). In doing so, members can show their authentic selves by employing truth-telling through genuine inquiry and reflection (Gadamer, 1989). Most

importantly, “dialogue occupies a central position” (Park, 2001, p. 81) in creating a social space. It is in this space where members can share meaning through experiences and ideas in a way that creates knowledge about how to act differently in the world.

This study supports such claims in the literature and expands upon the benefits of dialogue by juxtaposing it to other modes of discourse. By recognizing the characteristics within each mode of discourse as well as the importance for accomplishing each TTL, practitioners can work toward productively contributing and facilitating their group’s interactions within CoPs. This stance can change the way practitioners interact within groups, cutting down on the frustration that happens when dialogue does not occur. Seeing each mode of discourse, and therefore each TTL as having a role within CoP, provides an opportunity for CoP to evolve.

This study’s major findings related to the indicators across all three TTL are demonstrated in Table 11: Major Findings on TTL Indicators. Each indicator presented characteristics not yet discussed in the literature regarding CoPs or, as previously shown, throughout the literature on the TTL.

Table 11

Major Findings on TTL Indicators

Indicator	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Engagement	Low connection and low intensity equated to lowest engagement	Highest intensity presented	High connection with low intensity equated to highest engagement
Assumptions	Not addressed as means of expression before addressing in T2 and T3	Questioned only to express different viewpoints from that initially stated	Examined in order to create change
Influence	T1 ignores influence	T2 seeking to influence others	T3 seeking to be influenced
Questioning	Used to seek information	Used to advocate and challenge	Explore assumptions and share multiple perspectives
	Lack of questions allows for narrative	Lack of questions allows for arguments	Lack of questions enables quiet reflection
Mode of Discourse	Narrative	Discussion provides for efficient problem solving	Dialogue

Communities of practice.

Just as previous research using the TTL framework has focused on T3, CoP literature also mentions benefits and characteristics similar to that found in T3. For example, Wenger (1998) states, “Membership in a community of practice is...a matter of mutual engagement. That is what defines the community” (p. 75). In their study of CoP managers, Garavan, et al. (2007) emphasize that relationships of mutual engagement work toward building the trust, respect and

openness necessary for enabling a collaborative environment. They also state that adopting a collaborative leadership style, encouraging the voicing of insights, and “shedding previously held assumptions” (p. 37) all work toward helping CoP members to think creatively and combine multiple insights. Concepts such as mutual engagement, shared meaning, collaboration, trust, and assumptions are mentioned throughout much of the literature on CoPs (e.g., Wenger, et al., 2002; Garavan, et al, 2007).

However, there is little discussion of a methodology or framework for examining interactions within CoP meetings. As discussed in Chapter 2, a framework is tangentially suggested by identifying discussion, debate, and dialogue as ways groups engage (Garavan, Carbery, & Murphy, 2007, p. 39), however, it is not further defined or developed. Besides the benefits mentioned, the literature on developing and sustaining CoPs focus exclusively on the organizational structure that supports creating the CoPs. This falls outside of the actual moments of interaction between practitioners. From there, the benefits for engaging CoPs are discussed, but the methods for developing those group interactions are not referenced.

The TTL framework is one way that practitioners can better understand the interactions that occur among members of a CoP, and, further, a way to help members intentionally participating in those interactions. As a practitioner involved in various CoPs, I have found myself frustrated with group interactions where the purpose for some group interactions and participation were not evident. Without looking at those interactions through a framework, I did not always see the benefit of other’s contributions, such as narratives or debates. Those types of interactions seemed at cross-purposes with the group’s intent. Without recognizing those

indicators (and their characteristics) within a larger framework, I missed the opportunity of seeing the value in the overall group process.

As demonstrated in the findings of this study, not all CoP operate within T3 at all times. By understanding group interactions through the indicators and their specific characteristics, practitioners participating and/or facilitating in CoPs could benefit in several ways. First, practitioners can better recognize group dynamics and appreciate the differences each TTL holds for a group. Understanding the fluidity of group interactions relating to the TTL, and that no one TTL can be sustained indefinitely, creates an appreciation for what each TTL has to offer a group. Second, practitioners within CoPs can work within a group with more attention on individual and group behaviors that contribute to entering into and out of a particular TTL. This might be able to help practitioners notice how behaviors and actions work toward creating different results. The framework may also provide practitioners with an awareness and understanding of the various indicators as a way to cultivate those interactions in the moment. Since there is no descriptive way to understanding all the characteristics of the types within CoPs in an easily understood structure, the TTL can serve as a framework for understanding and describing the complex interactions within CoPs and among its members.

Previous studies on CoPs overwhelmingly support the concept of situated learning groups and propose various methods by which to structure, support, and perpetuate successful them (Wenger, 1998; Wenger & Snyder, 2000; Wenger, et al., 2002). The literature has focused on how CoPs are situated within the larger organization and how to best manage that relationship. The literature also focuses on the support and regulation of CoPs by the larger organization or management in regards to expectations for the group. However, little discussion exists on how

groups might facilitate actual meetings or how the group participants interact. Even the theoretical discussion around cultivating CoPs omits how that might be best structured. The closest description comes from Garavan, Carbery, and Murphy (2007), yet they only mention CoP managers' approach in broad terms such as using presentation, discussion, brainstorming, and group work. There has been little to no discussion of how these approaches are defined or what they specifically look like within CoPs.

Kerno (2008) has suggested that practitioners engaged in collaborative environments such as communities of practice present a more productive and efficient way of addressing knowledge management. Spencer, Rushton, Rumizen, and McDermott (2003) contend that communities of practice success and value “within the corporate world and government is well documented.” They further suggested that communities of practice are “successful in increasing knowledge, improving practice and connecting people.” However, they also concede that “there is little documentation of the conscious application of a communities of practice methodology” (p. 25). In addition to this, the literature does not distinguish between knowledge management as information to be shared and knowledge creation as jointly constructed knowledge through group interaction. Terms such as collaboration and knowledge are treated as generic terms, but are aligned more with T2 than T3.

This is where I believe TTL can provide a framework for describing those interactions within CoP as shown in Table 10: TTL Indicators. Since there is purpose and usefulness for each of the three TTL, practitioners would be best served to align their purposes with their group interactions if they understand the indicators related to these types.

Chapter Six: Implications, Directions for Further Research, Reflections and Conclusions

This chapter consists of four sections. First, this chapter suggests implications of the study for practice. Second, recommendations for further research are outlined. Third, researcher reflections are presented, and finally conclusions are drawn.

Implications for practice

This section discusses the implications of this study as they apply to practice related to types of teaching and learning and communities of practice. Implications to practice include three changes I plan to make in my own practice resulting from this study, and is extended to implications for other practitioners in the form of recommendations.

Describing TTL framework.

My practice.

In my practice creating and cultivating organizational CoPs, I would further develop a table such as Table 10: TTL Indicators to share the TTL framework with participants. This is different from my previous actions as a facilitator in which I felt the need to only explain T3 and facilitate T3 in efforts of jointly constructing knowledge. Many times, I found myself frustrated when the groups did not sustain engagement in T3, as it took going through the process of this study to learn an appreciation for each type. Previously, I did not always examine how T1 and T2 could help the group accomplish stated goals. As a result, I will be more apt to experiment with different facilitation processes and techniques that allow for different TTL within a particular group.

Other practitioners.

For other practitioners, I would suggest developing an appreciation for the TTL, as well as implementing a flexible framework for facilitating and/or participating in CoPs involving all three TTL. I would further suggest paying attention to indicators of these different TTL, and recognizing other indicators that result directly from that individual group, as all groups have their own distinct identity and method of operation.

For those practitioners already involved in the creation, facilitation, or participation of CoPs, using these indicators as a way for identifying the types can also serve toward building a better appreciation of T3 as it applies to innovation and knowledge creation. All interactions within groups are not the same, and just because individuals are involved in a CoP does not mean that the CoP interactions include all three types. Highlighting this difference within CoPs through the TTL framework can work toward making organizations more competitive in terms of knowledge creation and innovation.

Aligning purpose and interaction.

My practice.

Future involvement in both social and organizational CoPs, such as that of the WWM group and those in my professional practice, would include some discussion with other participants that moved beyond the purpose of the group and into the process for fulfilling that purpose. I would help facilitate dialogue about expectations relating to both process and content of the group. This exchange would then provide me an opportunity to pay attention to how our interactions, and indicators of such, aligned with our intentions based on some of the findings presented here. For example, providing a debriefing with participants after a meeting could

provide some reflection on group interactions. This could provide the opportunity for highlighting some actions taken by group members as shown in the indicators. From this, noting the benefits of what evolved from that moment could demonstrate how the characteristics of the indicators played out while developing an appreciation of how the TTL can frame the group's interactions.

Because I plan to have a discussion with the CoP groups on the TTL, I would then periodically check back with other members as to their experience to see if the different types of interactions are meeting their expectations. Based on that feedback, I would work with the group to make adjustments accordingly, which might result to changes in the facilitation, their interactions with the group, or the expectations set forth.

Other practitioners.

For other practitioners, I would suggest establishing and communicating the group's purpose and intent. Then, examine group interactions and find opportunities to support different TTL based on the stated purpose. This can happen by frequently looking for indicators of the TTL and recognizing all three TTL when they are appropriate for a given group. However, such facilitation also requires an appreciation for group evolution, as the interactions themselves or the purpose may change over time. Therefore, as a facilitator or group member, remain open to adjusting both the process and purpose as needed since certain dynamics may change.

Self-awareness.

My practice.

For those groups in which I am not a leader or facilitator, I would attend to my own behaviors and actions within the group more closely. The indicators are some things to be aware

of in terms of one's own interactions. Personally, I plan to listen more and reflect on how my own actions contribute to the dynamics of the group.

Other practitioners.

I would also suggest that other practitioners learn how to facilitate the TTL within a CoP by developing awareness and skill in both areas. This is a much more difficult recommendation to make as I believe developing those areas is a continual practice and not a mastery.

Understanding the characteristics of each indicator can help practitioners understand what keeps a group in one type over another. This can contribute to facilitating a group in and out of different modes of discourse more easily. However, I would caution not to influence a group's interactions too strongly without considering a purpose for each interaction based on the TTL and subsequent indicators.

Recommendations for Further Research

Suggestions for further research include identifying transition points between the TTL, examining the advantages and disadvantages of the TTL, connecting fields of research, facilitating CoP groups identifying the elements, and expanding the indicators.

Transition between the types.

The purpose of this study was to analyze group interactions for indicators of the three types of teaching and learning. However, I found that group interactions continually flowed between the TTL and, as a result, was sometimes difficult to distinguish. Future research may want to take a holistic look at group interactions from a TTL framework, looking more closely at how group interactions transitioned between the Types.

Examine advantages and limitations.

Identifying the limitations and drawbacks of the different TTL is another area for further study. Since previous studies have concentrated on studying T3, there is opportunity for expanding the associated challenges and limitations across all three types.. Comparing and contrasting the results of engaging in different TTL within CoPs could also provide practitioners with ways to help facilitate their own CoPs. By comparatively analyzing the drawbacks and limitations, as well as advantages and benefits, of each TTL, practitioners can participate in their own CoPs with better developed methods for fulfilling the group's intention and purpose.

Connect fields of research.

Another area to focus research involves using the TTL model as a framework for further analyzing group interactions. This research includes further tying the TTL model to other fields of research such as human resource development, organizational development, and knowledge management. Comparing models of group interaction across various fields of study may provide multiple areas through which the TTL model could provide a more practical means for understanding teamwork, collaboration, and other like modes of group interaction.

In addition, a universal term could be developed to better describe such group interactions that connotes more than teaching and learning. For many people, the ideas of teaching and learning still model a traditional lecture style format. Groups within a business context, for instance, might not view themselves in a teaching and learning environment while interacting in groups. Therefore, framing group interactions in different terms could provide a stronger connection between language used to describe the group interactions with how group members perceive their own interactions.

Facilitation decisions.

Another area for potential research is examining how CoPs without a formal facilitator use various facilitation techniques to engage in each of the three TTL, and how those results relate to or expand the indicators found in this study. This could also be extended to a comparative study using the TTL framework to examine group interactions with a formal facilitator and without a formal facilitator. Examining how individuals within highly functioning groups take on facilitation roles without positioning themselves as a formal group facilitator and without dominating the group might be particularly interesting.

Identify the elements.

The literature on T3, as it is seen within the structure of TTL, results primarily from Peters and Armstrong's (1998) seminal work on TTL. Most of the literature evolving from this framework involves collaborative learning (CL) as one of the various forms of teaching and learning, best aligned with T3. Within CL, certain elements have been defined: dialogical space, cycles of action and reflection, ways of knowing, and focus on construction (Peters, 2002). Examining group interactions regarding each of these four elements within and across the TTL might provide practical understanding of group interactions relating to the TTL framework overall. Such research may also provide a better understanding for practitioners as to how those elements present themselves within their own CoP.

This study sought to illustrate the indicators of all three TTL, rather than reversing the approach and examining how specifically pre-determined indicators, elements or characteristics showed up in the WWM group's interactions. The same data set could be used for examining

how Peter's (2002) four elements presented themselves in the WWM group, but as a different research study with different methods for approaching the data.

Expand the indicators.

Several studies have been done on the experience of participants as it pertains specifically to T3, and these studies have resulted in various themes (e.g., Collins, 2001; Cotter, 2001; Crosse, 2001; Dillivan, 2004; Fazio, 2003; Gaskin, 2007; Gray, 2008; Merrill, 2003; Muth, 2004; Naujock, 2002; Osbourne, 2003; Roberts, 2004; Roberts, 2005; Stulberg, 2004; Tissue, 1999; and Torres, 2008.) However, this is the first study that attempts to define characteristics or indicators of group interactions within the TTL framework. Although dozens of indicators could be pointed to within the TTL as a mere guidelines, as not all of the indicators will necessarily be present at once. Paying more attention to the mechanics of group interactions, and the processes through which groups engage, as well as how those indicators play out in relation to one another, may help facilitate more intentional group interactions. This opens the possibility for verifying and expanding the TTL indicators through additional research.

The nature and purpose of a group will likely affect the TTL indicators which are present in the interactions. Further research should be done with groups who are operating with different purposes, goals, and characteristics (such as size.) This would expand our understanding in this area by providing data for comparison, validating previous work, and extending the TTL framework in a variety of contexts. Such research could also provide guidelines for understanding group interactions within CoPs without necessarily providing a prescriptive method for interaction. Since groups vary based on their participants, purpose, processes, and the like, comparing various groups with one another and finding common themes may provide

guidelines for using CoPs as a way to accomplish a group's goal. However, again, since groups vary, developing universal methods for interaction in CoPs would discount the unique qualities and capabilities provided with individual groups.

Researcher Reflections

Due to the emergent nature of qualitative research, researcher reflections assist in “facilitating understanding of both the phenomenon under study and the research process itself” (Watt, 2007, p. 82). The following reflections address some of the issues I faced during the research, and my perspectives of those issues at the conclusion of this study. These reflections include views on the WWM group, being a participant researcher, facilitation, transitioning outside the classroom, and group focus and intention.

WWM group.

The WWM group's intention was not necessarily to create new group knowledge, but to focus on individual knowledge in which group learning could transpire. The individual's story and situation remained at the center of our group and therefore strongly affected the way we interacted. This likely impacted how we interacted with each other, perhaps even limiting the amount of time we spent in T3. The opportunity for creating group knowledge remained in our relationships with one another and around the areas transpiring from an individual's experience. We were always mindful of going back to that individual and centering it on providing a jointly constructed path for action in which only an individual could choose to actualize. Those moments for group action, reflection and joint knowledge construction centered on the group's engagement with one another, once again, leading back to honoring and respecting the individual within the group, thus helping with those individual paths of transformation.

At the conclusion of the data collection, yet before the conclusion of the analysis, the WWM group chose to engage more in T3 with intention. As a group, we were working through methods for actualizing that goal when the group disbanded due to competing time issues for some members. In those few months of working together with our new focus, It seemed to me that we needed to make a more drastic shift away from the individual as our focus in efforts of more effectively engaging in T3. The individual could not always be our focus for knowledge construction. I believe finding another common focus for the group would have helped us succeed in this path, and if not succeed, it would have been an interesting journey.

Being a participant researcher.

Playing dual roles, as both a member of the group and researcher, is common in action research, but the experience presented some limitations and challenges to carrying out the study. First, even though it was a group decision to pursue this study, I had specialized, insider knowledge of the TTL. During the pilot study and toward the beginning of the data collection, some group members attempted to position me as an expert. Therefore, at those times I found it necessary to step out of the participant role and into that of researcher. One area I needed to strongly reinforce with the group was that the study's purpose involved examining our group interactions as they naturally unfolded. This meant that I was not to be positioned as an expert on the TTL since that was not the focus of our group. These actions helped the group to understand that "getting it wrong" was not possible. Our interactions were as they were, we had no need to change how we interacted just because we were now involved in a research study.

At the beginning of the study, the use of the recording equipment seemed invasive. The group was aware of the equipment, and I felt that I needed to reinforce, again, the purpose of the

study. Because of the highly personal nature of the group interactions, I made sure to continually reinforce that the study was not to analyze the individuals of the group, but to look at our interactions and discourse within the TTL framework. Therefore, what we said was not as important as how we said it, and I emphasized that our conversations would be analyzed from that frame. In addition, during the audio-taped meetings individuals from time to time mentioned their concern about the confidentiality of what they were saying. During these instances, I again stepped into the role of researcher to reassure them that their words would remain confidential.

Another area in which being both a member of the group and researcher presented challenges was during the analysis of the data. I found myself struggling with looking at the data in a way that acknowledged and remained aware of my own judgments and emotions. After being with this group for over three years, analyzing the data was difficult due to my close relationships with the other participants. As an inside researcher, I had beliefs and biases as to interactions that influenced the interpretations of the data. I continually had to bracket those judgments and approach the data multiple times. Member checking helped in this process, as did extensive editing and feedback from my committee and peers.

Facilitation.

Throughout my experience with the collaborative learning program, I struggled with understanding how facilitation worked best with a group of peers, such as in my experience within most CoPs. I was not always comfortable positioning myself as a facilitator or having others take on that role. I believed, and still do believe, that with some understanding of group dynamics and processes, all the members can jointly facilitate the group.

We intentionally set up the WWM group without a formal facilitator and struggled with attempts to identify a group leader at the group's inception. Few people in the group had experienced working in groups without a formal group leader. Eventually, however, this structure worked well for us, as most group members played some role in facilitating the group as warranted.

Group focus and intention.

Related to the facilitation role within groups is a larger question – can a group create a T3 experience without a facilitator? I went into this study believing that group members “knew” what to do and how to act to bring about all three TTL. However, my findings have shown that for particular intentions to be realized within a group, at least in an effective and efficient manner, that focus needs to center on group intention and group process. I do not believe that people instinctively know how to act within groups, but can readily learn. Therefore keeping awareness around group intention can help focus a group. So, if knowledge construction is a group's intention, then being mindful of this intention becomes paramount for actualizing such an endeavor. I believe being aware of the indicators for the TTL, as this study started to identify, can also help toward awareness of content and process. I chose to hold out hope that engaging in all three TTL does not have to entail a formal education in the field or a long-term formal facilitator for bringing it about, although, as discussed earlier, there is a great deal of opportunity for more research in this area.

Transitioning outside the classroom.

One area that surprised me as a researcher was how closely the findings in this study paralleled that of Peters and Armstrong's framework within a classroom. Outside a classroom

environment and into a social milieu, I originally believed the dynamics would have changed more. I thought that as a social group, outside of the constraints of a formal institution that we would have a better chance at engaging more in T3. I also believed democracy and equality were inherently difficult in a classroom where ultimately institutional obligations and responsibilities position the teacher as the expert and the person with the power. I found, however, that even in a social setting, with a group of peers, there were still responsibilities, power struggles and positioning (Harré & van Langenhove, 1999) that influence conversation - the most basic of human interactions.

As a result of having conducted this study, I contend that all groups should continually examine any obligations, responsibilities, intentions, or the like, to identify and be aware of power dynamics that may influence the group's interactions. For the WWM group, conflicting intentions affected the group interactions over time, both negatively and positively. These were often assumptions that went unexamined, yet continued to influence the group's discourse.

Conclusion

The highlights of my findings are as follows. Five indicators emerged from the analysis of conversational data from the WWM community of practice: engagement, assumptions, influence, questioning, and mode of discourse. Each of the five indicators presented different characteristics in each of the three TTL. The types of teaching and learning can provide a structure for understanding group interactions within CoP. Each TTL resulted in different benefits for group interaction. In general, the findings of this study are consistent with the related research, namely Peters and Armstrong's (1998) seminal article on TTL and the subsequent studies that have resulted from that framework. However, this study demonstrates a connection

between CoPs and TTL that has not been explicitly made through previous research. The majority of the studies related to aspects of the TTL were situated within the researcher's practice and within small groups, however, they were not equated to or recognized as CoPs. I recognize that this shift in perspective could easily be expanded to include many of these previous research groups as CoPs. What I find to be of particular interest is the shift of looking at these CoPs through the framework of the TTL to better understand group interactions. Joining together the research and literature on CoPs with that of TTL provides ample opportunity of informing both fields.

As an action research study, this process provided a significant impact on my appreciation for the TTL within various structures - something that applies to my own professional practice. The awareness of the value each TTL plays in relationship to the group process and to the other TTL has already proven significant.

References

- Alderton, S. L. (2000). *Dialogue: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 9996329).
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Armstrong, J. L. (1999). *Collaborative learning: A study of two classes* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 9959293).
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue*. London: Routledge.
- Brickey, R. E. (2001). *Roles, relationships, and thought: Using collaborative action research to improve facilitator practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3022707).
- Collins, G. L. (2001). *Mediated and collaborative learning for students with learning disabilities: "This is about life, it's about the rules of life"* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3022713).
- Cotter, M. S. (2001). *Conversations in the zone: Collaborative learning in the counselor/student relationship* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3010312).
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Crosse, D. M. (2001). *I never thought about thinking: Experiences of participants in a reflective learning group* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3010313).
- Dillivan, K. D. (2004). *Knowledge construction in graduate education: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3126875).
- Duncan, D. T. (2009). *The executive coach and clients in reflective practice: Levelising as a special case*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Eitington, J. E. (4th Ed). (2002). *The Winning Trainer*. Boston: Butterworth Heinemann.
- Ellinor, L., & Gerard, G. (1998). *Dialogue: Rediscover the transforming power of conversation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fazio, R. A. (2003). *Collaborative learning among farmers as an approach to alternative agricultural education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3119281).
- Fisher, L., & Bennion, L. (2005). Organizational implications of the future development of technical communication: Fostering communities of practice in the workplace. *Technical Communication*, 52(3).
- Gadamer, H. G. (1989). *Truth and method* (2nd Rev. ed.; J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). New York: Crossroad.

- Garavan, T. N., Carbery, R., & Murphy, E. (2007). Managing intentionally created communities of practice for knowledge sourcing across organizational boundaries: Insights on the role of the CoP manager. *The Learning Organization: The International Journal of Knowledge and Organizational Learning Management*, 14(1), 34-49.
- Gaskin, D. L. (2007). *Levelising as a quality management tool* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UTK Electronic Library database. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Gongla, P., & Rizzuto, C. R. (2001). Evolving communities of practice: IBM global services experience. *IBM Systems Journal*, 40(4).
- Gordon, S. (2002). *Creating changes in organizational culture: The role of three types of teaching and learning* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from UTK Electronic Library database. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Gray, A. J. (2008). *Composition classroom narratives of teaching and learning* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UTK Electronic Library database. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Harré, R., & van Langenhove, L. (Eds.). (1999). *Positioning theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hatch, A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in educational settings*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Herr, K., & Anderson, G. L. (2005). *The action research dissertation: A guide for students and faculty*. London: Sage Publications.

- Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428-444). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Isaacs, W. (1999). *Dialogue and the art of thinking together*. New York: Doubleday.
- Janson, A, Howard, L., & Schoenberger-Orgad, M. (2004). The odyssey of Ph.D. students becoming a community of practice. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 67(2), 168-181.
- Johnson, R., & Waterfield, J. (2004). Making Words Count: The Value of Qualitative Research. *Physiotherapy Research International*, 9(3), 121–31.
- Kerno, Jr., S. J. (2008). Limitations of communities of practice: A consideration of unresolved issues and difficulties in the approach. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(1), 69-78.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merrill, M. J. (2003). *Together we know more than we know we know: Collaborative learning with information technology students* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3092825).
- Muth, A. B. (2004). *Opportunities for Deer Lodge, Tennessee: Community development and land stewardship by a collaborative learning community group* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3148304).

- Naujock, K. J. (2002). *Collaborative learning in a high technological start up business*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3075559).
- Osbourne, M. N. (2003). *Without a vision the people perish: Introducing collaborative learning to community service leaders in southern Appalachia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3092827).
- Park, P. (2001). *Knowledge and participatory research*. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 81-90). London: Sage Publications.
- Peters, J. M., & Armstrong, J. L. (1998). *Collaborative learning: People laboring together to construct knowledge*. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 79, 75-85.
- Peters, J. M., & Gray, A. (2005). A solitary act one cannot do alone: The self-directed, collaborative learner. *International Journal of Self-directed Learning*, 2(2), 12-23.
- Peters, J., M. & Gray, A. (2007). *Closing the theory-practice split: Students and professors as co-constructors of knowledge*. Paper presented at the June 2007 Organizational Studies Conference, Crete, Greece.
- Peters, J. M., & Ragland, B. B. (2005). Levelising: Multiple ways of knowing in practice. *International Conference on Post-Compulsory Education and Training*.
- Peters, J. M. (1991). Strategies for reflective practice in professional development for educators of adults. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 51, 89-96.

- Peters, J. M. (2002). *Combining reflective practice and formal inquiry: An action research model*. Paper presented at the 10th Annual International Conference on Post-Secondary Education and Training, Brisbane, Australia.
- Portwood, M. M. (1999). *The experience of students in a collaborative learning classroom* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 9959311).
- Ragland, B. B. (2005). *Razor wire cuts both ways: Teaching inside a juvenile institution* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3180916).
- Randolph, L. M. (2006). *A social constructionist approach to the facilitation of professional development among community college faculty* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3214421).
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Roberts, D. W. (2004). *"Just through talking": A collaborative learning approach for human resource change agents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3130176).
- Roberts, G. P. (2005). *The experience of participants in an online collaborative learning environment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3180919).
- Searle, J. R. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. New York: Free Press.

- Spencer, K. L., Rushton, C. H., Rumizen, M. C., & McDermott, R. (2003). Sustaining change with communities of practice. *KM Review*, 6(1), 24-27
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. London: Sage.
- Stulberg, D. B. (2004). *People centered law: Bringing life back to lawyer-client relations through collaborative lawyering* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3130184).
- Thompson, M. (2005). Structural and epistemic parameters in communities of practice. *Organizational Science*, 16(2), 151-164.
- Tissue, L. J. (1999). *Facilitating dialogue and decision-making in a family business* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 9959322).
- Torres, C. B. (2008). *Levelising: A collaborative learning practice for strength-based organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UTK Electronic Library database. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Vavasseur, C. B., & MacGregor, S. K. (2008). Extending Content-Focused professional development through online communities of practice. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 40(4), 517-536.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner & E. Souberman, Eds and Trans.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Watt, D. (2007). On becoming a qualitative researcher: The value of reflexivity. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(1), 82-101. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR12-1/watt.pdf>

- Wenger, E. C. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. C., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Wenger, E. C., & Snyder, W. M. (2000). Communities of practice: The organizational frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, 78, 139-145.
- Williams, L. B. (2004). *Mapping a journey to change: Teachers and facilitator learning together* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Digital Dissertations database. (UMI No. 3177272).
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical investigations*. New York: Macmillan.
- Wood, L. A., & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. London: Sage.

Appendices

Appendix A: Participant Consent Form

Office of Research Research Compliance Services

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Identifying Types of Teaching and Learning in a Discussion Group

INTRODUCTION

You are invited to voluntarily participate in a research project. The purpose of this study is to examine how these three types of teaching and learning evolve through language use and interactions within the “We Want More” discussion group. Furthermore, the objective will be to describe what occurs in this discussion group by identifying the indicators for the different types of teaching and learning. The following question will guide this investigation: What are the indicators of the types of teaching and learning in this discussion group?

The practical results of this study will provide an opportunity for group members to make a conscious choice on how to interact as a group. In addition, such research will contribute to the literature on collaborative learning, action research and discourse analysis pertaining to these areas.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS' INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY

There will be eight consecutive Thursday night meetings of the group which I will audio-tape record. Within three days of each meeting, I will transcribe the recordings into text and make them available to the group.

During each of the eight meetings, I will document my observations through field notes while participating within the meetings. I will take notes to capture what the audio recordings may not be able to represent, such as non-verbals, movement within the group, the context, etc. The group as a whole will select one additional member to take field notes. I will collaborate with this group member to refine such observances and define what the field notes entail. I want someone to capture what is occurring between me and other members since I will also be participating in the group. This additional perspective should further aid in identifying non-verbal interactions and cues, beyond what is captured in the audio recordings. Therefore, one other person besides myself will be taking notes at any of the eight meetings.

I will gather the Internet Discussion Board text one week prior to the first meeting through one week following the last meeting. All postings will remain available online for analysis and as historical text as needed.

RISKS

The purpose and content of the meeting is confidential, but not potentially harmful. However, to avoid any risk, all real names will be replaced with pseudonyms to protect the identity of all participants. Research strategies and results will openly be shared at your request.

BENEFITS

Study results may lead to a better understanding of the types of teaching and learning and provides the group an opportunity to consciously recognize and choose how they want to interact within such groups.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Data will be stored securely in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher's home. Upon completion of the researcher's doctoral dissertation or by May 2010, whichever comes first, all audiotapes will be destroyed. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link participants to the study.

It is understood that all information shared in this research study, including the audio-taped recordings, internet discussion board, transcripts and field notes are shared on good faith that all information will remain strictly confidential. I understand I have a responsibility to honor this confidentiality agreement and hereby agree not to share any information with anyone except the researcher, other research participants, and her doctoral chair.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,) you may contact the researcher, Shalane Balfour, at 155 High Point Lane, Oak Ridge, TN 37830, or 865-483-6008. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, contact University of Tennessee Research Compliance Services of the Office of Research at (865) 974-3466.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at anytime. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be destroyed.

CONSENT

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

REFUSAL

I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I choose **not** to participate in this study; however, I will abide by the request for confidentiality.

Participant's signature _____ Date _____

Investigator's signature _____ Date _____

Appendix B: Internet Discussion Board Example

Name	Date	Time	Post
Lisa	8/19/2007	9:44 PM	Silence is golden.
Hank	8/20/2007	1:09 PM	<p>I worked most all of the weekend since Lisa was away. An example of me seeing the things that need to be done right now, and no one who is around (supposed to be around because they are on the clock) to take care of these customer issues as they pop up. Acknowledgement to myself of noticing when I piss my personal authority away and don't get to the things I wanted to do.</p> <p>No news on the new position yet, but I did call Al this morning and left him a voice mail.</p> <p>Jay, the manager here at (Warbler's Marina), terminated a employee this morning, and asked for my involvement/support while doing the firing. I understand his reasons, but I also see the unfairness to the employee and myself. Anger from the employee(understandable) and tense nervousness for all(me anyway) and the opportunity for me one more time to remind this person that every moment life has a gift, have your anger, acknowledge that yes this happened, and now what are you going to do with it.</p> <p>That's all.</p>
Nicole	8/20/2007	2:37 PM	How sharp and powerful you are, Hank, to notice and decide on new choices for the next time. HooRah!
Ann	8/20/2007	6:25 PM	<p>Hank: Opportunities open up when you do. To manage others, I find that I need to be aware of what needs to be done and in what timeframe. Seems in this weekend's encounters you got to see both sides.</p> <p>Now, this is advice therefore choose what you wish from it. You appear to be encountering from professional staff what I call "creep". They've all heard that you're going to get the job and start acting like you already have the job. To which you responded because you have the work ethic. NOTICE nowhere in here did we talk about pay.</p> <p>It is because of just this action that my husband tells me I make \$.98 per hour. All the stuff I do extra. It's also what makes me a great employee. The balance in somewhere in between.</p>
Maya	8/20/2007	8:46 PM	Anyone willing to host this week?.
Nicole	8/21/2007	3:32 PM	I don't mind hosting. Is anyone besides Jane going to be absent?
Ann	8/21/2007	7:26 PM	Nicole-I will be there.

Name	Date	Time	Post
Ann	8/21/2007	8:49 PM	<p>venting here: I'm all a jangle. Even more frustrating change. We are in hard hard course correcting and I'm humming over the pay scale. Once upon a time I was at a board meeting where we were asked if our pay would be a living wage. Today, I'm not sure. We are creating/shutting down/improvising as we go along and I see people being treated differently who are already doing a similar job. I called the behavior and started a familiar argument about justice.</p> <p>Here is my struggle. I believe that the only way to change it is to hang in and be a part of the solution. However, it's certainly not happening on my time frame.</p> <p>I think that I was even more accurate than I knew when back in June I stated that by October my "position" would look so different that I didn't want to worry about it. <u>This evolution is Definitely happening.</u></p>
Susan	8/21/2007	11:37 PM	<p>I just got back in town, lots of stuff to catch up with. There has been a great deal of activity on the board...so good to see.</p> <p>I will be at your house Nicole, thank you so much for hosting.</p> <p>Ann, there are more questions about your posts than anything. I find I get caught up in the story and trying not to. What really struck me though is you saying, "it's certainly not happening on my time frame." Familiar pattern? I find my own patience is much less in reality than what I believed it to be. What do you want for yourself, in your situation right now? What are you going for?</p> <p>Weekend meeting and staying with Justin's parents was pleasant and at the same time, draining. I found myself feeling stressed by the stuff I left behind (here at home) toward the end of the trip, feeling anxious to get back. Traveling with kids definitely tests that patience factor. I think we all did well for such a long drive. I found that I felt very comfortable around everyone and got to just be me. They were so loving and Riley LOVED all the attention. Always someone to play with and get love from. Warmed my heart to see him so happy.</p> <p>I notice on several posts, Ann and Hank at least, that it sounds like some anger...possibly around unmet expectations. Maybe I'm just projecting. Hmm, don't know. To tired to fully analyze right now. :)</p> <p>One last thing. Read Carol's e-mail and I echo Maya and Nicole's earlier sentiments. Nothing in that e-mail hit as an expectation for me. Just sounds like she was just noticing what was so for her and silence was not how she wanted to be with it. I don't know what communication there was/has been from Julia. Yes Lisa, silence is golden. Seems there might be the problem for me, as I have always preferred silver! :)</p>
Jane	8/22/2007	6:25 AM	<p>As you know, I will not be at group tonight. Going to DC late this afternoon for a class tomorrow and Fri. morning. Will be back Fri. evening. Did not re-read Carol's email to see what I missed. Susan, what is silver like (interactive or chaos)?</p>

Name	Date	Time	Post
Susan	8/22/2007	10:00 AM	Good question Jane. Whether it be interactive or chaos I have seen it as something, anything. I am working on being more comfortable with silence. Sorry you will be gone. Safe travels.
Ann	8/22/2007	10:19 PM	<p>Hi all, I am just home from work and had my first apt at 7am. Many life shocks and decisions and discussions around judgments alllll day. However, the most e-pwiff-any moment was around a "how you do life" comment shared about Ronald. Oh my, oh my. Yes, some of this IS how I have a pattern of doing life. AND some of it isn't. YEA for me in noticing. I also got to watch the second phase of workers absorb the change and see their excitement distilled during a marathon day of start up. hmmm, many many places for points of realignment of my spirit.</p> <p>I was so upset that I called one of my young friends and had her meet me for drinks. Her response: "oh my God. It must be bad, You don't drink." Hopefully, I will have this processed and/or bracketed enough to participate fully at group tomorrow.</p>
Hank	8/23/2007	11:39 AM	<p>Nicole, I will be there tonight, thank you for hosting.</p> <p>Susan, no anger there, but yes, some expectations. Several weeks ago I went in and gave them a \$ amount I wanted. Not demanding, but just saying this is what I want. To date, there has been no answer or any more talk of it. I see the lesson for me to step past fear and say, what's up, this is what I asked for, do you have a answer for me. The expectation is for them to have had an answer, regardless of it being here's what you asked for plus some to fuck off we can't believe you had the nerve to whatever. Just an answer, that's all.</p> <p>See you tonight.</p>

Appendix C: Initial Indicators

Indicator	Type I	Type II	Type III
Assumptions	Not surfaced or addressed through questioning	If surfaced through questioning, usually not addressed with group or attached to current practice	Surfaced and addressed individually or through questioning, with individuals and group about current practice
Inquiry	Inquiry into topic being presented	Inquiry into what is presented within group	Inquiry into own and others practice, interactions, dialogue and relationships
Reflection	No real reflection that surfaces unless used as a story or narrative, reflecting-on-action that happened in the past; Reflection is individual	Reflection is individual and if shared with the group as a “past” reflection-on with “learning” to follow	Reflection shared with group, surfaced and discussed, can be individual or group; reflections tied to conscious choices for future actions
Handling of multiple perspectives	No argument; just presentation and advocating a position; multiple perspectives not allowed	Debate, argument, where multiple members advocate one position while challenging others	Inquiry into divergent perspectives; seek shared meaning and mutual understanding (does not equate to agreement)
Phatic Speech	Not encouraged from “leader” of group	Not encouraged by “leader” or members as not aligned with agenda	Encouraged by members of the group as to build relationships
Speech patterns	No pauses for reflection since no real discussion; More unconscious and automatic behaviors in group	No pauses for reflection, usually little silence since group members want to share or advocate a position; Unintentional reflection unless used as learning point	Pauses in discourse to “think”, consider, or reflect; Reflection tied to future action, both individual and group, makes more intentional on process; More conscious being and noticing
Eye Contact	With main person talking	When doing group work; between members interacting	All group members should have at any given time
Space	Space only attended to for physical comfort, not in terms if people feel safe to participate	Space only attended to for physical comfort, attend to ability to participate, but not concerned with safety	Space attended to for physical comfort and for group to feel safe to explore and expose their beliefs, ideas, etc.
Attention/Focus	No attention paid to what happens between group members	Attention/focus really only on sustaining discussion, keeping what is happening between members at a cooperative state for individual learning	Focus on what is happening between the group members and within the group; Attend to process and what is being constructed

Appendix D: Transcripts of Episode T1-E1

1	Beth	I want to share with you something that happened.
2	Maya	Yeah. Well, we were on the relationships course, so I went that way. <i>[Motions to Hank while entire group looks to him]</i> I wanted to hear about the relationships course from Hank
3	Beth	Yeah, I want to tell you about a relationship...
4	Hank	<i>[Interruption]</i> Is that why you pointed at me?
5	Ann	Yeah, yeah, I want to hear it... <i>[says to Hank enthusiastically]</i>
6	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> -- at work, and that we, you know, I had talked to y'all about Marie, and agonizing all of that. And we had to terminate her.
7	Ann	Huh? <i>[Looking at Hank, says dismissively to Beth and quickly glances at Beth, then again to Hank]</i>
8	Susan	And we haven't heard anything since then. <i>[Says to Beth]</i>
9	Ann	Because you haven't posted.
10	Beth	Because I've been overwhelmed, which seems to be a perpetual state these last months. So yeah, overwhelmed and that we did terminate her. She was out for that whole week leading up to -- well, after Labor Day. We talked to her on Thursday or Friday.
11	Maya	She planned to be out, or she was...
12	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> No, she was sick. <i>[To Maya]</i>
13	Beth	She really was sick. She was beginning to get a little bit sick the Friday before Labor Day. Was that afternoon? It was Thursday afternoon when I got that email. No it wasn't.
14	Ann	I don't remember it. <i>[Ann looking down at lap]</i>
15	Beth	Okay, I can't remember the exact date either, but at any point she was sick. Monday we were off for Labor Day, Tuesday she called in all croaky and sick and left a message on the machine. On Wednesday she called in still sick, she'd been to the doctor Tuesday and was on antibiotics and things. On Thursday and Friday she didn't call in, but Johnny called her and -- because we found a check dated the end of June, told you about that.
16	Ann	Mm-hmm.
17	Beth	And so on Monday, we spent the weekend going through her desk and getting all of her personal stuff separated out from our business stuff, and --
18	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> So you made the decision?
19	Beth	We did. We did. We made that decision...
20	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> A joint decision.
21	Ann	A joint decision, that a move and a positive step, yeah.
22	Beth	Yeah.
23	Maya	Well, I didn't know what the June check -- that must be the week I missed.
24	Hank	Hmm, I didn't either.

25	Beth	Found a check on her desk dated June the 29th. It was a blank check.
26	Maya	A blank check?
27	Beth	Signed.
28	Maya	A company check?
29	Beth	Mmmmm. It was a --
30	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> A customer check?
31	Beth	-- a customer check dated June the 29th, and in the memo it was for home and auto insurance.
32	Susan	She was shopping for it.
33	Beth	And it was signed. She was sending out quotes to different places. And so I found it and I gave it to Johnny, and he called her at home. And she said that she had shopped at a couple of places and she had one more she wanted to shop. Well, this was September --
34	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> Yeah, that's --
35	Beth	-- the 4th, and the 5th, 6th, whatever day it was when we found it.
36	Maya	That's two plus one.
37	Beth	Yeah, and this is after finding that email to our underwriter for the check that was dated May the 18th that was still there in our office. So she came in on Monday, and on Friday I interviewed a girl that Emily, our new employee, had worked with in the past, and we hired her to start on Monday. So she came in at noon Monday, but at 8:30, after Marie got there, we just called her back in Johnny's office and told her that we had just come to the decision that it was time to let her go. And so --

Appendix E: Transcripts of Episode T1-E2

1	Jane	Yeah and she's inclusive about whoever wants to—whoever has an idea come on. You know come on to the committee. She got started early, a few months ago. This thing is for January so we started late spring, early summer. This is the second you know we have a lot of ideas and she did some work on them. And back then they asked for some—they've always been trying to get some entry into the official program in January, the official Martin Luther King commemorative program for [our] County area and I said well I'll ask the guy in my office who is a member of the commission. And I followed up the next day with my email to him and his response to me and I emailed it to her and the two key people and they actually followed up on it and they're in. And nobody's been able to do that in all these years. Or nobody's wanted to and it's like all I had to do was –
2	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> Ask.
3	Jane	- ask about it. But more importantly just follow-up promptly and give it to them. And that kind of commitment and sincerity where they followed up.
4	Maya	Mm-hmm.
5	Jane	And they've already met and had conversations and have been welcome in. The agenda isn't finished and it's like what's been, you know, preventing you know all these years what's been preventing people other than I guess fear and maybe not the contact but either when they did finally do a contact just to say I'd done it with the committee you know it was half I don't know but I don't know. Everything is just clicking. I can see from tonight there's no formula, they are creative ideas and I have some other contacts on things that were brought up tonight. Or at least some avenues of getting them in touch with some information or people. It just feels good. I don't know if you know maybe I've chosen the right thing, something that does work or fit for me.
6	Lisa	Mm-hmm.
7	Jane	Because of something that I value in it and something that I have to give. But you know it was just good to go to a real productive situation instead of oh I'm here.
8	Maya	Because of all this obligation
9	Jane	Yeah but and that comes on the tails of the big read stuff. Because I was thinking of tonight emailing Linda and Mary and saying I caught your enthusiasm and I'm applying that kind of enthusiasm to this committee now. I don't know. It's part of the thinking out of the box and its part of sort of approaching something without the pre-determined ideas or parameters. It's sort of not intentionally going in to change things but just being open to what comes up and not thinking

		there is a reason for it to be quashed.
10	Maya	Mm-hmm.
11	Jane	You know which is different from my majority time.
12	Susan	Well someone's not pushing an agenda or
13	Jane	<i>[Interruption]</i> Right mm-hmm.
14	Susan	Looking for that creativity. It sounds like a
15	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> Yeah.
16	Susan	Being willing to explore different things.
17	Jane	Yeah, so.
18	Susan	I always admired you. You're always so involved in all these
19	Jane	<i>[Interruption]</i> Well, it came about through I don't know. But it didn't come about from just trying to, sorta, it was like what can do of value with my time.
20	Susan	Mm-hmm.
21	Jane	These and those people or these and those men or that relationship you know was a waste of my time. Or hemming and hawing about it and then clinging to it.
22	Susan	Mm-hmm.
23	Jane	When I should just get involved in things that work.
24	Susan	Mm.
25	Jane	I mean in terms of knowing the people or the interactions work. I'm not trying to make it work.
26	Maya	Mm-hmm, right.
27	Jane	And also following up on I guess things that I liked or believed in.
28	Beth	Mm-hmm.
29	Jane	Which was so radical from like there being—excuse me there not being any opportunity at work and other situations where they pick people for an agenda or political reasons. And you know there's never any growth or anything of impact so I just gravitated towards what worked for me.
30	Beth	Mm.
31	Jane	And stuck with it, you know.
32	Beth	Mm.
33	Jane	And there had been different women involved in this program or a couple of related ones but I guess you would say I found like minds or my niche because—
34	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> Mm-hmm.
35	Jane	- they're the kind of people that—its' been good to be around and.
36	Susan	Mm.
37	Jane	You know and there's been some—everything is not honky dory like been through two episodes of getting rid of like some executive directors and some –
38	Susan	Mm.
39	Jane	- like some you know agendas with the board members –

40	Beth	Mm-hmm.
41	Jane	- and some things but in terms of everyone being at least—I guess 90% on the same level of being able to somehow participate and I wanted to say transgress—I don't know if that's the right word but just I don't want to say process but -
42	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> It sounds like there is a consistent objective. You all kind of want the same thing and you're open to getting there in different ways.
43	Jane	Yeah, yeah. Because there are different personalities, different backgrounds, different things to give. You know as long as I've been around I know the distinct—like the areas like who the PR people are and who have the good ideas and who don't do anything or who the good—we've branched off into now we have the—we were missing some areas.
44	Maya	Mm.
45	Jane	You know we've got like the former judge and a couple of other people that got—I wasn't able to be there yesterday with that big kick-off at the mall but between the core group, they got the Mayor, Mr. Nesbit, that stupid new sheriff and somebody else.
46	Lisa	As opposed to the stupid old sheriff?
47	Jane	Yeah. His stupid replacement. Yeah but that core group you know <i>[unintelligible]</i> phone calls and saying you know either knowing them, working with them but it wasn't like being at a distance and having to write a letter and getting on the calendar. It was you ought to be over there. So and so has contacted so and so and this would be good and it just all worked out so well, you know for that and I don't know. It's just a...
48	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> Mary P. was on TV last night. Did you see her?
49	Jane	I fell asleep because I started watching the 6 o'clock news.

Appendix F: Transcripts of Episode T2-E1

1	Maya	You're grand poobah of the building. That's what I just heard you say.
2	Ann	Right, and that's where
3	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> I thought you were just becoming landlord and taking
4	Hank	<i>[Interruption]</i> And having a new office
5	Ann	Yeah, yeah
6	Maya	You are not overseeing...
7	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> You are not doing social work skills, but social workers count
8	Maya	If you have to go deal with [Program B] and how they deal with the facility, you are the Grand-Poobah, the big man on campus.
9	Susan	And looking at it is...
10	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> They're interested in you because they know you will make the decisions
11	Susan	Not so much what we've been attaching to the maintenance of it, but the management
12	Maya	I have a slightly different perspective. You still need to get someone who's going to handle all the contractor stuff.
13	Ann	Well, George, we have a facilities manager for all 18 company buildings. And what I know of him is...I'll do the stuff myself.
14	Maya	Why?
15	Ann	Because he never gets around to it.
16	Maya	And why would that be?
17	Ann	Because there's always a disaster at one of the other buildings. . There is always some kind of disaster in this dark hole that we call the residential home.
18	Hank	Plus there are 18 other buildings for him to be in.
19	Ann	Right.
20	Maya	One can argue whether 18 is a few too many buildings for one person.
21	Hank	I'm already thinking...
22	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> And that's the other kind of thing, so they even become programs over facilities. One of it is that we want you to write grants for two-hundred-thousand in the negative. I mean this is a significant chunk of change. We close the programs that we're thinking that we can close, however then they say here go solve this problem. That's what I'm saying, I'm getting conflicting pictures. So, make it the grant writing and go.
23	Maya	I would just say, it's not so much that you need a job description, but you need, in my opinion, there needs to be some type of strategy discussion so you understand relative priorities.
24	Ann	Oh, that's a good word. I can say that.
25	Hank	At this point are you believing you're overwhelmed?

26	Ann	Not yet.
27	Hank	Okay
28	Maya	Is the fear there?
29	Ann	Giving what I know about myself, if I'm given the backing and the authority to do it, it'll happen.
30	Hank	K
31	Beth	You're feeling the lack of support going forward.
32	Ann	If they start whining I am out of there.
33	Maya	You know they are two-hundred-thousand dollars short, so you would like to get confirmation that grant writing is a very high priority and if you put your emphasis on that and something else slips they're not going to come back and ping you because you've had the discussion that says the number one priority is grant writing. They can't all be number one priorities.
34	Ann	A strategy conversation...
35	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> about relative priorities.
36	Susan	Yeah because the squeaky wheel might not necessarily get the...
37	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> Otherwise the squeaky wheel gets the oil.
38	Ann	Hmm
39	Susan	You got something right there in your face. <i>[Says to Ann]</i>
40	Maya	So, I say you need those relative priorities more than you need a job description. Clearly.
41	Ann	Certainly, certainly.
42	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> Can I go back to something that you started this out with? I'm just kind of wondering with all this, what you want to do other than understanding your emotions or...
43	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> What do you mean? You mean the emotions or
44	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> going back to the emotion thing...
45	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> Well that was the conversation that I had with [Maya] and it's (we look at Maya and she shakes her head no) (laughter), [the other Maya], because I had a conversation with, Terrance always thinks it's you I'm talking about as well...it's about, it turned out to not to be about feeling my emotions, it turned out about to be more in the last conversation she and I had, more along the lines about, and that's where I think I posted on the board not in that solve-it, fix-it as I immediately go to triaging, but in an action mode, balancing how I can interact with people, but being piece. One of the phrases that I look at in my head as a model is Mother Theresa's comment about human beings. Not that I'm Mother Theresa, not that I'm ever going to be that, but wherever you are, that person in front of you is valued.
46	Maya	Well, just
47	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> Well simply because they're human beings.
48	Maya	Here is the conflict you cause with some of your social workers, they hear you make that statement and here they watch you close a case.

		That is a cognitive dissonance.
49	Ann	Right, right.
50	Maya	You tell me these people have human dignity and you just you want me to close the case on them.
51	Ann	Right.
52	Maya	It just doesn't compute.
53	Ann	And I don't have that cognitive dissonance. So, it's about that projection of how I am in the world in a way that I don't feel, that's where I use the word conviction. I don't feel like I need to explain. I don't need to explain, this is how it is for me and this is how I go forward and this is how I process.
54	Maya	And you could do that if you worked in a vacuum.
55	Ann	Exactly. Here's the piece that's working on
56		<i>[Unintelligible]</i>
57	Maya	Here's the nuts and bolts of it...
58	Susan	He's over here giggling.
59	Hank	Sorry.
60	Ann	But it's true...
61	Maya	You are a supervisor, you are a manager.
62	Ann	And my attitude can position me so far out that's there's never a <i>[Unintelligible]</i> point. It's very very hard to go back and predict those relationships when someone has made a judgment and positioned me so far out. Ricco in particular, one of my employees now has me so on a pedestal he doesn't see the real person. So much so that everyone around him has given him the feedback as have myself that I don't know who you are talking about, but that is not Ann. And he's not capable of course correcting, so what I've done is distanced myself even more from him.
63	Maya	And that is no different than you looking at a case and saying, hey <i>[unintelligible]</i> look at this case.
64	Ann	Exactly. Exactly.
65	Maya	Then I would ask you, do you have the right people on the bus?
66	Ann	With him no, that's a decision that isn't going to be course corrected because he's the guy in the wheelchair that was secluded and this is the first job he's had in five years...
67	Maya	Does he actually work for you?
68	Ann	No, I've done solved that one.
69	Maya	Okay.
70	Ann	That's done. He's out of my office. I mean before we were in the same office and I moved him out of the office, he's now going to be working with Frank. No
71	Maya	Okay
72	Ann	Solved, solved.

73	Maya	He may need ten years if this is his first job. He's going to need a lot of experience before he's going to collect the same knowledge and understanding that you've got.
74	Ann	Right, well one of the things that Susan, right back to what you're bringing back up to my conscious is going right back to your comment about what I'm being told about Katrina and not just model and me saying I don't understand it. One of it is because I own these innate skills. I own them. They are intrinsically a part of how I engage. I dismiss them.
75	Maya	Well you don't get how other people don't get them.
76	Ann	Right Yep
77	Maya	You don't understand why they don't understand
78	Ann	Right, right, so that's what I really want, that right there is what I would really like to figure out, a different pattern of engagement. I don't have to understand.
79	Maya	No, you just have to know that not everybody knows what you know.
80	Ann	Right, without presenting it in a such way that they feel discounted. I know it is their own dramas, however I have to work with them.
81	Maya	Mm-huh

Appendix G: Transcripts of Episode T2-E2

1	Ann	You grew up being segregated. You know, there is a culture, a cultural component here of why [our mayor] got elected mayor instead of [the opponent]. You know, that has to do with that internalized oppression; needs to be a man, needs to be this, needs not to be a woman. There's, so, I won't go down that soap box. The other thing that we in this country don't talk about is corporate welfare, not individualized welfare, corporate welfare: subsidized taxes, property breaks, you know, the top 1% of the people with the money in the nation pay less than 10% of the taxes. I don't remember. I don't have those facts right off the top of my head. And I'm not a socialist. Let me primmest this that I'm not talking about Marxist politics. I'm not talking about Socialism. I'm talking about Laissez Faire. Um, you know, how we do life. You know, let the market bear what it will bear. I'm talking about protectionism. I'm talking about corporate welfare. I'm talking about coffee breaks.
2	Susan	What do you mean by corporate welfare?
3	Ann	Okay. For example...
4	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> You mean the welfare of the, of the...
5	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> All the population...
6	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> It's where we sacrifice what, it actually has a definite, a defined term in economics, uh, but what I'm talking about is how-
7	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> I would pay give a, I would pay more taxes if I knew healthcare was paid for, for every child.
8	Ann	Sure, but we do is, if, when we wanted that Nissan plant in Tennessee in Spring Hill down there and they wanted to bring it in. What they did was sacrifice the community base. They gave them, I used to have, I used to have all of this in my mind, but I don't have it, like they gave them a tax break for 10 years.
9	Susan	Uh-huh.
10	Ann	They are the biggest number one employer in that area in that community and they are not paying into the county tax base. All right. So, who, who bears that is the people living in the community.
11	Susan	Uh-huh.
12	Ann	That's corporate welfare.
13	Susan	So we're sacrificing our welfare to big business and corporations?
14	Ann	Right, right, right. Because it's after that, it's after that, the idea is the ratio use to be one to six. For every dollar that a corporation will spend, it will go through the community six times. So, one dollar at from Walmart, you know, where they pay their employees, that employee then will turn that in the community up to six times. They will pay their dentist. They will pay their doctor. They will pay the grocery store. They will pay and then those people then, it ripples out. So, on an economic basis, it makes sense to have that corporate welfare because

		the impact on the community is a multiplied factor.
15	Susan	Uh-huh.
16	Ann	Okay? So, what I think doesn't get talked about is in this country what opportunity costs we have lost to get that business. To, to, to get Walmart come into a town like Jefferson City and all the local pharmacies close, the local grocery stores close, uh, you know.
17	Susan	You shut down a ton of businesses.
18	Ann	You shut down a ton.
19	Susan	You start paying people and they can't make a living off of it.
20	Ann	Right. And then they don't have any insurance, so they don't tax the community. This is what I'm talking about.
21	Susan	That's why I don't like Walmart.
22	Ann	Well, you used that as an example, but this is what I really think of is the South Park. I don't know if you all are, watch South Park at all. The South Park did a really beautiful session, you know, one little cartoon about an evil demon who runs a Walmart. Anyway, it was so funny. It really, really did a good job of expressing all of this. And that's what I'm talking about. So, instead of having a, a staple-based in Jefferson City where the owner of a local pharmacy also is a deacon at the local church, you know, also is a part of – I'm making this up. I don't know if he was a deacon. Just, just this kind of stuff. What you have is, um, an absentee landlord, you know. Little Rock, Arkansas runs the store making decisions about that where Joe at the pharmacy might have paid his employees \$10 an hour, health benefits. Walmart now employs 50 people to his one. None of them have health insurance.
23	Susan	None of them make living where they can...
24	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> Right, right.
25	Beth	Does Walmart really and truly not pay health insurance for their employees?
26	Susan	Well, what most big companies have done and we did this at [my old company] too is you bring people in, you, you do not employ them full-time.
27	Ann	Right.
28	Susan	So that way you don't have to give them the benefit.
29	Ann	Right.
30	Susan	You really use people as expendable.
31	Ann	They're expendable widgets, yeah.
32	Susan	Yeah and, and, um, so you don't have to pay them, but you're still getting the production –
33	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> Uh-huh.
34	Susan	<i>[Overlap]</i> ...off of them.
35	Beth	Right, right, right.
36	Susan	But, I mean we pay better than most places, but Walmart, I mean they don't pay a living wage so here's this person having to work, you know

		30, 32, less than 40 hours, but they are going to have to go work another job just to make ends meet. So, they're essentially working two jobs. They'll work up to like 38 hours usually...
37	Beth	Uh-huh.
38	Susan	You know, so they're not full-time.
39	Beth	Uh-huh.
40	Susan	But then making seven dollars an hour.
41	Ann	Uh-huh.
42	Beth	Yeah. I'm just surprised that Walmart doesn't pay insurance though.
43	Ann	One of the things that we have with –
44	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> The management. They do for management.
45	Ann	They do for management. You have to be there with silver boot. There's this policy, <i>[unintelligible]</i> policy of how you get so many hours. More, Tennessee employs more people who are on TennCare in the state government than any other employer in the, in the state.
46	Beth	The State of Tennessee?
47	Ann	The State of Tennessee–
48	Beth	Their employees are on TennCare?
49	Ann	Yes. Nationally, there is a class action lawsuit against Walmart. In the nation, there is a class action lawsuit because of the fact of what she's talking about. They work, the employers, the employees 25 to 30 maximum 32 hours. Don't have to pay them benefits.
50	Beth	I understand. I had that.
51	Ann	The communities, yeah.
52	Beth	The communities have folded down and they don't have options on other places to work?
53	Ann	Right. That's one.
54	Beth	Is that the argument?
55	Ann	And number two there is no health care for these employees.
56	Beth	But there's no healthcare because they don't have health insurance.
57	Ann	Right.
58	Beth	So, they're, they're needing to be on [state care], but what I'm wondering is why are they not working somewhere else where they can make more money –
59	Ann	Those jobs don't exist.
60	Beth	Or somewhere have insurance.
61	Ann	They don't exist anymore. Because they've shut down the pharmacy. They've shut down the grocery store that might have been unionized even.
62	Jane	The independent cards.
63	Ann	The independent stores, all of those.
64	Beth	So many independent, but there are other places to work. You don't have to work at Walmart is what I'm saying. There are other places to

		work out there. Walmart is not ruling the whole world. Uh, you know. So, it's a choice of whether or not you work at Walmart.
65	Susan	I don't know what I missed. There's a lot of...
66	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> They are the biggest employer on the planet.
67	Susan	Well, a lot of people a lot of times Walmart comes in –
68	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> That's true.
69	Susan	It closes cities down.
70	Beth	But it's not the only one.
71	Susan	It's going to close down. People just can't compete.
72	Ann	Right.
73	Susan	Because the bulk that Walmart does, you just can't compete.
74	Beth	Yeah. I know some people who have been hurt by, you know, by that as well.
75		<i>[Unintelligible]</i>
76	Beth	But I mean how are you going to, you know, you can't control that. It's a natural progression of, it's, it's been like that since the very first automobile was produced by hand. Next came mechanization, next came the big plant, next came the big –
77	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> What happens when we become a country of just consumerism though?
78	Beth	Well, we -
79	Jane	<i>[Interruption]</i> But then the global economy. All this crap in China and Mexico that's killing us.
80	Beth	Right.
81	Jane	You know, how can you stop –
82	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> Yeah. You know.
83	Susan	I mean we just want to buy, but you know, but we can't afford to pay factory workers because nobody wants to pay for it when we can get it so much cheaper from China.
84	Beth	Yeah.
85	Susan	You know and so, I mean it's just a cycle. I mean I really do wonder. I mean we, we educate these people and then we export them back. You know. And they go back and they take that knowledge and everything with them and here, their own country that are having, you know, better scientific and –
86	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> Sure.
87	Susan	Than we.
88	Beth	Sure.
89	Ann	And –
90	Beth	<i>[Interruption]</i> As a matter of fact, that, if I can change –

Appendix H: Transcripts of Episode T3-E1

1	Maya	That thwarts the piss off.
2	Susan	It did. <i>[Starts to cry]</i>
3	Ann	And there's three, there's about three different levels right there. Tell us...what's that? <i>[To Susan]</i>
4	Susan	It's the idea of being loved even when I'm being a bitch.
5	Beth	The idea of what?
6	Susan	Being loved even when I'm being a bitch.
7	Ann	What's the tears about?
8		<i>[Unintelligible]</i>
9	Susan	It's, it's, ya know, can't...is that possible? Maybe not trusting it in a sense. Or in my family, the way we do things, we get pissed off and we don't talk...for a long time and we just forget about it.
10	Ann	Let me course correct you...in your birth family. In your family now, you do not do that.
11	Susan	Uh, I'm thinking like my, with, well, with my grandfather
12	Ann	I'm asking you to redefine that
13	Susan	With my mom and my brother
14		<i>[Unintelligible]</i>
15	Maya	In your childhood family of origin
16	Susan	Okay, in my family of origin and I'm thinking a lot to a very formative time with my grandfather where everything was very conditional.
17	Ann	I don't see you do that with Riley. I don't see you do that with us.
18	Susan	No, and I don't feel like that's how I am with the relationships that I have in my life.
19	Ann	Right. But I'm asking you...
20	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> But you have to, you have to ya know understand that most of the men that I've had that with is everything's been conditional
21	Ann	That goes back and proves my point about when we were taught it. I think you and I had that conversation. <i>[says looking to Maya]</i>
22	Maya	Yeah
23	Ann	It was never modeled, it was never taught, it was never safe, it was never comfortable to have emotions and be vulnerable and know that you're loved through that. So there's something...
24	Susan	<i>[Interruption]</i> His little thing, I might not like some of the things that you do, but I love you anyway. <i>[Susan laughs and sniffs]</i> I remember my mom telling me that and I kind of, I knew my mom loved me, but for me it was um, even with Ben and my ex-husband, and other relationships I had with men, my grandfather, not so much my dad because we just didn't have a relationship very much, he would do some things and it was just a withdrawal of any affection, love
25	Ann	Just what you described with Justin.

26	Susan	Mmm...
27	Ann	Write that down...
28	Susan	Oh no, we don't need to write that down...
29		<i>[Laughter]</i>
30	Susan	Cause I got it on tape.
31		<i>[Laughter]</i>
32	Ann	Take one
33	Beth	It's the same thing when you and your family would retreat into yourself and then not ever talk about it again. It's a way of dealing with him that you shared with us. It's a way of "don't come close to me, don't talk to me..."
34		<i>[Unintelligible]</i>
35	Maya	It's shows that you unconsciously accumulated as a child.
36	Susan	So maybe that was a lot more unconscious.
37	Beth	I do the same thing.
38	Ann	We could get lots of validation from... What I would point out for you is there's more in that...when you were taking her back to the moment, taking her back to the, there's a whole lot here in my opinion, for you to learn, more than the fact that you were able to let it go, where we see, I would say most of that is unconscious habit, the pattern. And the telling phrase is "I want to be right"
39	Susan	Justin even points that out to me, is..."how important is it for you to be right?"
40	Ann	It had to be. Your lives sometimes could depend on that. You're your family relationships, you had to, had to call. And I speak from experience as I had to call. And I speak from experience and I just played it out two weeks ago with my parents. There's that, there's that <i>[Unintelligible]</i> of positioning and family that I learned and assumed so well. And I wanted to bring it over back to me because...
41	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> Right, When you literally fall back into it, a few weeks ago you became really really conscious of that.
42	Ann	Yes, yes. All I wanted to do was point out for you in the language of what you're saying how unconscious that pattern is. That I also want to say that you never had it modeled.
43	Susan	And, and, going back to your question. I do have a lot <i>[laughs]</i> of growth too.
44	Maya	But it boils down to unlearned becoming conscious. Which I would say you are working on. And once you're conscious, then unlearning some habits. And the growth edge is restoring a new way to be. A different way to be or consciously choosing which way to be.
45	Susan	Mm-hmm. You know and part of, part of, my fear right now is that if some of this is unconscious, what am I may be doing with Riley?
46	Maya	That's a good question.
47	Ann	You're doing the best you can.

48	Maya	Because <i>[Overlap]</i>
49	Beth	<i>[Overlap]</i> You're doing the best you can.
50	Maya	I'll tell you the one thing I heard you say.
51	Susan	But I want to be conscious of...
52	Maya	And I think Lisa was around and caught you in it was that Lisa and Riley came in and you were crying and you immediately shut it off because you didn't want Riley to see you that way. He's going to learn from that that he shouldn't express when he's sad or he shouldn't cry because people don't want to be around you when you are that way. You want to present this image of being the perfect mom. You want to be right.
53	Susan	You had that.
54	Maya	You bet. Absolutely. It takes one to know one.
55	Susan	I mean that's...
56	Ann	However, what I can say to you in my experience of working with a lot variety is what you're learning now; it means that you will never treat Riley that way again. And I feel like I need to say that.
57	Susan	And I appreciate it because that's and that's in my fear of what have I been doing and one thing that I'm pretty good at is not beating myself up too much about it, I just try to correct the behavior and move on and go okay. That was then, this is now and I am going to do the best I can NOW with this information. Part of me is a little fearful of maybe uncovering some of that... that you know if I had been doing that with him. And I think in some ways and that was a good example and I think in some ways I have. That, sometimes I can correct that I have cried in front of him since, cause I am like "okay," but what am I maybe, because, it's just not crying
58	Maya	Right, it's not just crying. Crying happens to be the one thing I have heard you talk about.
59	Susan	Mm-hmm. Yeah. What is it that I maybe you know, not um, you know the one thing that, that becomes very conscious like every time I go pick up my son and see him or when I come home and I see him is to have a smile on my face and be happy to see him. You know, that's a conscious choice. You know, those type of things that I want him to know that I'm excited to see him, every time I see him. So, and it's (starts crying) funny because Justin did say to me once, he goes, "sometimes it would be nice if you greeted me like you do Riley."
60		<i>[Laughter]</i>
61	Ann	And it is the truest statement that I think you have heard from him. And you are capable of that. Mm-hmm. And that's your homework.
62		<i>[Long Pause] [Laughter]</i>
63	Susan	There's a reason this man's in my life. I'll tell you
64	Ann	And you're in his.
65	Susan	Mm-hmm. And you know it is so amazing that how having this group

		and having that support to let you even look into it and go further. I can't do that by myself. You know, I just don't see myself as being capable of uncovering a lot of that.
66	Beth	And you are, with help from your friends and your full feeling. You know you were so concerned last week about not being able to feel and there's all kinds of feeling about you. It's clear as you're sitting here tonight and as I've seen you since you've come into the group, all kinds of feeling. All kinds of feeling.
67	Ann	Right.
68	Susan	I've progressed. <i>[laughs] [group laughs]</i>
69	Beth	And just that awareness of, of knowing how you use, whatever it is that you use to cut it off, is just to me, you know, giving that daunting ah you know within yourself that oh, this is what I do.

Appendix I: Transcripts of Episode T3-E2

1	Maya	Subconsciously you knew what you wanted to say, but you froze in fear about saying it?
2	Ann	And you beat yourself up the next day. <i>[long pause]</i>
3	Nicole	Well, that's not what I think happens Maya.
4	Maya	Well, I've not been present, so I <i>[unintelligible]</i> don't know.
5	Nicole	I'm the Myers-Briggs, first of all I'm introvert, second of all I'm a Myers-Briggs type that has to go off and go and process things mentally, so I... <i>[long pause]</i>
6	Maya	Okay
7	Nicole	No, I don't think of what to say at the time. That's very unusual unless I feel very very safe. <i>[pause]</i>
8	Maya	Well, and that's why <i>[laughter]</i>
9		<i>[unintelligible]</i>
10	Lisa	Because you are safe in here and you have done that in here. <i>[short pause]</i> You do ask what you want. You did it last night, you asked questions when you had them. You do offer support as we go around. But I think that's the key that you just hit on, when I'm safe that also goes with...
11	Nicole	Exactly
12	Lisa	Maya's question...
13	Nicole	Exactly
14	Lisa	Frozen in fear. When you've been frozen in fear you don't experience yourself in this way.
15	Nicole	Right <i>[short pause]</i>
16	Lisa	This sacred space <i>[long pause]</i>
17	Nicole	And before the Discovery Courses and the loss <i>[unintelligible]</i> after that, certainly not on the night that we left there <i>[laughs]</i> , pretty consistently it was, um, reaction instead of response to everything. And I would want to say something and maybe I knew what to say and maybe I didn't, but the assumption was real quick in the mindtalk, the assumption was, I'm going to sound stupid and, and they won't want to be around me, and um, just all that stuff that comes up when we get down to those core beliefs, so that's what comes up when I, when you hear me lumping it all together and saying never and I can't and being afraid and just the atmosphere in this room and just saying these things out loud and coming up with a damn creative idea <i>[laughter]</i> . I mean it's just like, yeah. <i>[long pause]</i> So, so, by next Thursday I will have the sheet finished and share the action steps and, and any that can be broken down that would be great to get suggestions. Any that are not clear, I would love to have help with clarifying... <i>[pause]</i> um, and I don't know right now what the other needs might be.
18	Ann	So, one of the support pieces that you're going to put in there is bringing

		it back to the group next Thursday? <i>[pause]</i>
19	Nicole	Yeah <i>[says grinning] [pause]</i>
20	Ann	So, what do you take away from, and I don't know if this is collaborative learning or not, using this example, but what went around the room, was from where you stated your intention, I want to do this, we got down to, is its fear, we got down to its ownership. We got down to that you're doing it already that's creative. That's an upholding piece that I, for me, this group brings us forward and the opportunity to keep bringing myself forward and bringing myself and one of the things that I took the most reaction on is that near impossible phrase. Nothing's impossible if I choose it.
21	Nicole	I'm just quoting John.
22	Ann	No, no, but I'm saying that's for my reaction went in and... <i>[pause]</i>
23	Maya	Well, I think, I think the context, not being there...
24	Ann	<i>[Interruption]</i> Not being there, so that's...
25	Maya	The way I listen to that and hear it is...if you already were the person who could do it then you would have done it. <i>[pause]</i> Right? <i>[Susan has pensive look]</i>
26	Ann	Right. <i>[Nicole nods]</i>
27	Maya	So, the fact that you haven't done it, it is nearly impossible to do it as you are today?
28	Nicole	Yeah
29	Maya	Then you must first change something in order to be able to do it?
30	Ann	Right, right <i>[Nicole's nodding]</i>
31	Nicole	Because this is the language and inexperience with language, my inexperience with skilled language in relationships, in communication, in being authentic in what I say, the analogy for me, the last couple of days has been like, if, if this paper tells me that I have to, I have to meet with you and speak French tomorrow, that's pretty impossible. So if I'm being asked to speak a language that I don't have experience with, that's what this is about. <i>[long pause]</i>
32		<i>[laughter. Ann and Maya look at each other smiling][Silence]</i>
33	Nicole	That's not kind.
34	Susan	What? <i>[long pause]</i> You know, I would say, I would say... <i>[laughter]</i> what...what's not kind?
35	Nicole	They're looking at each other and laughing Susan.
36		<i>[laughter]</i>
37	Ann	You know, it's just...
38	Nicole	<i>[Interruption]</i> and I love it <i>[laughter]</i>
39	Susan	As you're saying that, as I hear it or the way I, some things may be a major transition, a transformation if you will, to get to
40	Maya	<i>[Interruption]</i> Good point
41	Susan	That point, but some things may just be an awareness or... <i>[pause]</i>
42	Maya	But, if you were already aware then you could do it?

43	Susan	Yes, so, so, it can be, in that awareness is a transformation. I think, I think the way we look at transformation is all this global major thing, and maybe it changes a bit of the core of who we are, but it doesn't have to be this wholesale change.
44	Maya	I think though, Nicole, don't let me put words in your mouth. I do think, just based on some conversations that you and I have had, that you've got [so many] years of being a certain way and so, for Nicole, this is as challenging as having to learn French.
45	Nicole	Thank you. Bingo.
46	Ann	Yes. Yes. <i>[head nodding]</i>
47	Nicole	Maya spent three hours at my house before I went to that course, because there were certain things that I had to write in preparation or some, or understand even myself and I just...it was a foreign language.
48	Maya	Yeah, so I... <i>[pause]</i> so while we sit here and say Nicole, this is not such a big deal, you've already done it with Lisa and now you've done it with Kyle, so what's the big deal of doing it with Alex, you know it's got to be in Nicole's context, this is a big deal
49	Susan	And I'm not trying, my comment was not to diminish it, I'm taking it actually out for her and looking at it more at a global, global thing is that some things, even that awareness can be a major transformation
50	Maya	Sure
51	Susan	And a major shift, I mean sometimes we can point to those moments and go, got it, right there and whatever instigated that is not always that lifeshock or that moment, or [so many] years or whatever it is that led up to that moment that that was maybe the, you know, the click, the light switch went on <i>[pause]</i>
52	Nicole	Yeah, yeah
53	Susan	But, um, even actualizing that transformation goes beyond just the awareness. <i>[long pause]</i>
54	Nicole	Right <i>[pause]</i>
55	Maya	I would have one other reaction that is I have to do these things. And please don't beat yourself up over this. You're gonna go do the best you can possibly do.
56	Susan	And I'd say you are aware enough of your intentions and what it is if you don't, you're going to reflect on that and course correct and take another route until you get what it is you're after
57	Nicole	Yeah. I'm not sure what that might look like. I don't know what you're thinking of when you say take another route.
58	Maya	Don't know
59	Susan	Don't know because what we're saying is... <i>[pause]</i>
60	Maya	It doesn't have to be perfect.
61	Nicole	And that's an experiment in being a new person.

Vita

Shalane Balfour Navorska is president and owner of BN Consulting. She works as an organizational development, training and development, and business continuity consultant.

Shalane has fifteen years of experience in the areas of faculty development, adult education, organizational development, and professional development, with five of those years working in business continuity and disaster recovery.

Shalane moved from San Antonio, Texas to Knoxville, Tennessee in 1999. She holds a bachelor's degree in Speech Communication from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas; a master's degree in Adult Education from Tusculum College in Knoxville, Tennessee; and a doctoral degree in Educational Psychology and Research from The University of Tennessee in Knoxville. She lives in Knoxville, Tennessee with her husband David and their children, Thatcher, Isaac, and Dalane.