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Abstract

Columbus, Ohio is home to the second largest population of Somalis in the United States. Encounters between cultures such as the Somali community and the greater Columbus community necessitate a reviewing of the ways in which different communities collaborate to create educational community programming. This research project examines the planning and implementation of the Summer Arts Camp at the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance in the Global Mall on Morse Road, August 1-5, 2011 through a Deleuzian lens using community-based action research and autoethnographic research methods. There are three purposes of this study:

1. To explore the ways in which outsiders work with community organizations to develop educational programs meeting program goals;

2. To put Deleuzian concepts of encounter, smooth and striated space, territorialization, and sense and nonsense to work within the practice of community arts programs; and

3. To work collaboratively with the students, teachers and organization staff members.

Data was collected throughout the planning and implementation of the summer arts camp through participant observation, informal and semi-formal interviews, and artwork, then analyzed for points of encounter. Each of these points were further analyzed to identify the places where different common and good sense (in best practices) collide and
potentially create new sense within the context of the summer arts camp. These points include pre-planning, enrollment practices, scheduling, and collaboration within the planning and implementation process. New considerations of time, planning programs, and collaboration became central to the camp.

Considering community work in Deleuzian terms offers a new perspective. Rather than considering best practices in non-profit or educational settings, these practices are considered in terms of sense and nonsense. When one considers practice in terms of best, a vertical hierarchy is created, placing some agents and ways of operating above others. Instead of dominating practices, Deleuze offers a way to consider how each community creates their own sense, each considered nonsense when juxtaposed with another system of sense, ultimately necessitating the creation of a new system of practices collaboratively. This consideration places each agent in a horizontal rhizome, eliminating the hierarchy of practice and enabling collaborative practices.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Columbus, Ohio is home to the second largest population of Somalis in the United States. Encounters between cultures such as the Somali community and the greater Columbus community necessitate a reviewing of the ways in which different communities collaborate to create educational community programming. This research project examines the planning and implementation of the Summer Arts Camp at the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance in the Global Mall on Morse Road, August 1-5, 2011 through a Deleuzian lens using community-based action research and autoethnographic research methods.

The only thing I knew about the Somali community in Columbus when I began volunteering in the fall of 2010 at the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) was that it was large. I knew nothing about the Somali culture. As a tutor for the afterschool program, I began to learn about the culture, and more importantly about the particular Somali community that SWCA serves. As I became more involved with SWCA teaching arts programming for the afterschool program and writing grants, I began thinking about content. What do I teach my students? How do I teach them about their Somali heritage? Most importantly, how do I do this as an outsider? However, through a series of encounters with the community and my own practice, my focus shifted from content to process:
How do I, as an outsider, create programs with the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance that meet the goals for the youth programs?

Within this question, I focus on three purposes:

1. To explore the ways in which outsiders work with community organizations to develop educational programs meeting program goals;

2. To put Deleuzian concepts of encounter, smooth and striated space, territorialization, and sense and nonsense to work within the practice of community arts programs; and

3. To work collaboratively with the students, teachers and organization staff members.

Because I was so unfamiliar with the Somali community, I began utilizing Sara Lawrence Lightfoot’s (1983) portraiture methodology. I was attracted to this methodology because of its parallel to the artmaking process and the value and equalizing of insider and outsider voices. As I worked through this process, I began to engage the community in action research, collaboratively creating the summer arts camp and in the process re-examining the approach to program design for all parties involved. Using qualitative research methods and narrative accounts, I utilized my own observations and reflections, interviews with staff and teachers involved with the summer arts camp, and artwork created by camp participants.

The data is presented as a personal narrative, layering theory, reflection, observation, interview, and artmaking. This was an intentional move, not only to make the work accessible to practitioners, but also to be attentive to how stories are told.
many voices – the voices of my students, staff members, community members, and teachers – complicates the experience, and speaks more directly to the issues that arise when different communities, and different systems of thinking and acting, encounter each other. There are ethical issues of representation, with very real consequences to the organization and the community, as well as my relationship with them.

Autoethnography plays an important role in this. Because I am primarily looking at how I enter and work with this community, it was important to include personal reflections. While this study is very specific to my experience in this specific program, there are important lessons to be learned for others entering any community of difference. Recognizing and working with difference drastically changes the approach of practice, much like taking a Deleuzian perspective on my experiences altered the way I approached planning and teaching the summer arts camp.

This question also necessitates a theoretical framework that addresses the ontological, how we live, rather than what or how we know. Gilles Deleuze provides such an approach, and the language that he and Felix Guattari created disrupted my understanding of educational practice and community collaborations in much the same way that my experiences with the Somali community did while volunteering and working with SWCA.

As I continued to work with Deleuze and Guattari, the concepts seemed not only to describe what I was experiencing, but also provide direction in my approach to programming in that space. I understood the theory better through my practice, and my practice through theory. Lisett Olsson (2009) writes in her study, *Movement and*
Experimentation in young children’s learning: Deleuze and Guattari in early childhood education,

Since the study builds on the encounter in between examples from practice and theoretical concepts, the ambition has been to not apply the concepts to the practices. Rather, the concepts have been chosen on the basis of their functioning together with practices. (p. 30)

The concepts chosen for this study, in the same way have been so because of the ways in which they function together with practice. To me, that is the mark of a fitting and useful philosophy.

The remainder of this study is organized around the concept of the encounter. In Chapter 2, I establish the theoretical framework, defining first the Deleuzian concept of encounter. Then, three key encounter points are identified in both practice and theory. The theoretical concepts of territory, smooth and striated space, and sense and nonsense are then defined and discussed in relation to these points. These concepts provide the vocabulary for discussing and analyzing the planning and implementation of the summer arts camp.

Chapter 3 takes up the first encounter point, the Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of territory, and the process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization through a discussion of my encounters with the literature review. I did not want to write the type of literature review that I had read in other studies that generalized the Somali population in Columbus. I work with a specific community within the Somali population, and although general information provided a starting point, it was not complete. In addition, I review theories related to afterschool programs and models of community arts programs.
Chapter 4 establishes the methodology of this study through a discussion of the Deleuzian and Guattarian concept of smooth and striated space and an encounter with myself, the second encounter point. Community based action research and authoethnography are established as methodology, while the fundamental principle of action research – look, think, act – is complicated through a Deleuzian perspective.

Chapter 5 uses the Deleuzian concepts of sense and nonsense as analytical lens. After a description of the summer arts camp and collection of data, the ideas of best practices and collaboration are challenged through a look at the paradox of sense and the creation of new sense evident in the planning and implementation process, the final encounter point.

Chapter 6 concludes this paper with a discussion of the implications of a Deleuzian perspective when working with communities, focusing on entering the community, collaboration, and research. Recommendations are made to SWCA and the need for additional research to provide a strong theoretical and philosophical base for collaborative work in communities is also discussed.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

“Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental "encounter"” (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 139, original emphasis).

Introduction

I entered Deleuzian thought through an encounter. I began this project thinking in terms of content and classroom experience: What would I teach the Somali students? I was asked to integrate Somali arts and culture into the afterschool program and the question changed to, how do I teach them about their own culture as an outsider? With a shift from content to process, and the appearance of an insider/outsider perspective, a new vocabulary was needed. The words and ideas that I was used to would not work in a community where those same practices were challenged. The problem was not a matter of knowledge or content, but one of living, or in this case of practice. The writings of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995) and his collaborations with French psychoanalyst Felix Guattari (1930-1992) introduced a new language and methodology for considering the question of how one might live. Their unique ontological approach to philosophy operates within an open system and deals with creation rather than discovery, and difference rather than identity. This language has been used in educational research by authors such as Olsson (2009) and Semestky (2003; 2004; 2007). With words such as
encounter, smooth and striated space, deterritorialization, and nonsense, this new language helped me to understand the space I was in and challenge the ways that I entered, experienced, and worked with the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance.

Deleuze places encounter at the basis of this language, eliminating the hierarchical structure of and offering a different relationship between theory and practice. I will define encounter and identify encounter points that have redirected my research and practice, using additional Deleuzian and Guattarian concepts to add to the understanding. These concepts are:

- territory, deterritorialization, and reterritorialization
- smooth and striated space, and
- sense and nonsense.

In this chapter, I will continue to establish the theoretical framework of this study.

**Encounter**

Encounter is inevitable when working with communities. An encounter is not just with people, but also movements, ideas, events, entities. It is the relationship, or the thing that happens between, that is important. It is potential difference. Deleuze states:

An encounter is perhaps the same thing as a becoming, or nuptials…It is not one term which becomes the other, but each encounters the other, a single becoming which is not common to the two since they have nothing to do with one another, but which is between the two, which has its own direction, a bloc of becoming, an a-parallel evolution. (Deleuze & Parnet, 1977/1987, pp. 6-7)

However, it is the passage with which I began this chapter that remains most essential to encounter: “Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but a fundamental *encounter*” (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 139). Something – a person, an idea, an event – bears upon the senses and jolts us out of our norms, out of
our habits of thinking, out of our systems. It is something as felt as it is known. It
problematizes our thinking. This something is encounter. While not all experiences and
interactions are encounters, those that change our thinking are. And that is the purpose of
philosophy, for Deleuze – to think differently about the world in which we live.

While each of the above descriptions contributes shades of understanding, I have
understood encounter best as an event that initiates change. In other words, “an
encounter in which each pushes the other, draws it on to its line of flight in a combined
deterritorialization” (Deleuze & Parnet, 1977/1987, p. 44). An encounter initiates change
in both parties.

Encounter points provide a categorization for encounters surrounding my practice
within the Somali community. Derived from Olsson’s (2009) decisive points, encounter
points encompass significant collisions of theory and practice. Deleuze and Parnet
(1977/1987) write:

To encounter is to find, to capture, to steal, but there is no method for finding
other than a long preparation. Stealing is the opposite of plagiarizing, copying,
imitating, or doing like. Capture is always a double-capture, theft a double theft,
and it is that which creates not something mutual, but an asymmetrical block, an
a-parallel evolution, nuptials, always ‘outside’ and ‘between’. (pp. 6-7)

Encounter point as a categorization of encounter, initiates this a-parallel
evolution, double-capturing, affecting both theory and practice through encounters with
text, events, people and self. These encounter points are:

1. **Encounter of the literature.** There is a body of information surrounding the
   Somali community addressing issues such as migration, educational challenges,
   and population profiles. This knowledge helps to define the territory in which
   individuals working with the community act. Encounters with the community
deterritorialize the defined territory, establishing new relations between individuals, communities, and information.

2. **Encounter of the self.** Challenges to my sense of organization in practice and research smoothes these spaces. Ongoing processes of smoothing and striation necessitate a working in the middle, or emergent practices.

3. **Encounter of best practices.** In community education practice, there are series of best practices. These practices are established according to common sense of a particular group and are challenged through implementation within different communities with different common sense. Entering a new and different community requires recognition of the paradox of sense, a different conception of nonsense, and necessitates the creation of a new sense.

Each of these points corresponds to one of the concepts above listed. Each of these concepts will be discussed in the remainder of this chapter as they pertain to Deleuzian concepts and explored further in later chapters.

**Territory, Territorialization and Deterritorialization**

How could movements of deterritorialization and processes of reterritorialization not be relative, always connected, caught up in one another? The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of a wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp is nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid's reproductive apparatus. But it reterritorializes the orchid by transporting its pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome. It could be said that the orchid imitates the wasp, reproducing its image in a signifying fashion (mimesis, mimicry, lure, etc.). But this is true only on the level of the strata—a parallelism between two strata such that a plant organization on one imitates an animal organization on the other. At the same time, something else entirely is going on: not imitation at all but a capture of code, surplus value of code, an increase in valence, a veritable becoming, a becoming-wasp of the orchid and a becoming-orchid of the wasp. Each of these becomings brings about the deterritorialization of one term and the
reterritorialization of the other; the two becomings interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization ever further. There is neither imitation nor resemblance, only an exploding of two heterogeneous series on the line of flight composed by a common rhizome that can no longer be attributed to or subjugated by anything signifying. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10)

The processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization are inextricably entangled. Deterritorialization is a line of flight, a “coming undone,” the cutting edge of an assemblage. It is the movement “by which something escapes or departs from a given territory” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 508). Parr (2005) writes that deterritorialization is “always a complex process involving at least a deterritorializing element and a territory which is being left behind or reconstituted” (70) through the process of reterritorialization in which new territories are formed. Territory itself is mobile, localizable in time and place. It does not privilege, but rather encompasses change. It is always shifting and changing, “left behind or reconstituted” (Parr, 2005: 70). Their relationship is not oppositional, nor negative. Rather, “deterritorialization inheres in a territory as its transformative vector; hence, it is tied to the very possibility of change immanent to a given territory” (Parr, 2005: 67). The system of relations is nonlinear and nonfiliative.

The territory in which I work constantly shifts. When I began volunteering as an afterschool tutor for the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA), I entered the classroom with little knowledge about the Somali population. I read about the challenges of Somali students in American classrooms. There were issues of language, of culture, and of gender. These children were placed in school according to age, not ability, problematic when many of them grew up in refugee camps. The bottom-line, these were
refugees who needed help. Several months after I began volunteering at SWCA, a conversation with a fellow volunteer, a Somali man, worked to deterritorialize the territory I had established for myself. He told me quite vehemently that the kids at Global Mall were not the kids that needed tutoring. They had parents who were educated, who recognized the need and value of education. These kids came from middle to upper class homes, wealthy homes at least by Somali standards. He worked with kids who needed help, and they did not live around the Global Mall. Regardless of the actuality of his statements, they jolted my perception of the students and forced me to renegotiate their identities, abilities and needs. The territory had changed. This is the basis of encounter point one, encounter of the literature:

There is a body of information surrounding the Somali community addressing issues such as migration, educational challenges, and population profiles. This knowledge helps to define the territory in which individuals working with the community act. Encounters with the community deterritorialize the defined territory and reterritorialize it, establishing new relations between individuals, communities, and information.

In The Deleuze Dictionary, Parr (2005) writes “in philosophy, thought is deterritorialized by all that is outside of thought” (p. 67). Literature, research, theory is challenged by the world and by practice. The intricate relationship between deterritorialization and reterritorialization is present in the relation between theory and practice. Parr continues to write, “In this regard, it is not the question that is deterritorializing but the problem, because the question seeks an answer, whereas a
problem posits all that is unrecognizable or unknowable” (2005, p. 67). It is the problem that is troubled, not the question. In other words, the territory of the question.

The orchid and the wasp provide an illustration of what occurs when one works in community. They are entangled processes. The wasp does something more than reproduce the orchid. It captures the pollen and, while it helps the orchid reproduce, it turns this reproductive action into its own process of pollination. The act is deterritorialized and then reterritorialized, the territory constantly shifting from wasp to orchid, from orchid to wasp. It is “an exploding of two heterogeneous series on the line of flight composed by a common rhizome” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10).

Likewise, the individual may design particular educational programs in a particular way. The community uses them for their own purposes, deterritorializing the program and making it something else. This in turn becomes the new territory, which is subsequently disrupted by the individual. It is a double capture.

**Smooth and Striated Space**

I live in a striated world. My nature is to categorize, to organize, to alphabetize. Each day is structured with segments of time and activity. I allocate resources and demarcate spaces. The striation is homogeneous, repetitive, and fixed. Yet, disruptions smooth this organization throwing the carefully crafted system into chaos. However, according to Deleuze and Guattari while “progress is made by and in striated space…all becoming occurs in smooth space” (1987: 486). Both smooth and striated spaces are necessary and simultaneously present. It is important to determine the distinctions between them:
metric and nonmetric; extensive and qualitative; arborescent and rhizomatic; numerical and flat; dimensional and directional; of masses and of packs; of magnitude and of distance; of breaks and of frequency; striated and smooth. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 486)

Consider the Washington Monument. It is vertical. The surrounding space is organized to draw the eye upwards to a centered point. It dominates the landscape and fills the view. Striated space is concerned with points, subsequently subordinating the lines and paths between them. Now, consider the Vietnam Memorial. It is horizontal, stretching along the space. The experience of the memorial is not hierarchical, like the Washington Monument. Rather, it is viewed as a journey – reading the names, finding a name, walking along the monument and around the monument, beside the monument. Grass and stone. It is happened upon. “The points are subordinated to the trajectory…in smooth space, the line is therefore a vector, a direction and not a dimension or metric determination” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 486).

Similarly, a comparison between Global Mall and an American mall such as Easton Towne Center in Columbus, Ohio will demonstrate this point. The Global Mall, where the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance is located, sits between two stores in a strip mall on Morse Road. The sign for Global Mall blends in with the other signs dotting the overhang. You walk into the mall through a double set of glass doors, foggy with age and use, entering a space meant to be used by Somalis. Immigration services, computer repair, phone services, legal services, and social services are mixed in with clothing, household goods, groceries, and café. It is a maze of hallways, stores, and display racks. Goods are displayed, hanging from window frames and the top of the walls dividing each store. It is horizontal, directional, and rhizomatic. Things leave,
things appear. Suitcases line the hall during moving season, where one-week prior stacks of water bottles sat outside Halal Meats. Yet it is the communal aspect of the space, the network of relations, comings and goings, and the development of community that defines it.

On the other hand, Easton Towne Center is centered by the indoor mall and glass atrium. Streets of outdoor shops extend from either end. Major department stores anchor the corners. It is a grid of strictly material businesses. It is a space meant for consumers. The space is organized from the center. Roads, businesses, restaurants, all revolve around it. The center is important. Where Easton Towne Center could be considered embroidery, Global Mall is patchwork, an important illustration of smooth and striated space for Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987, p. 476). Patchwork is defined by a piece-by-piece construction; infinite, successive, and additive in nature. While embroidery is often complex, its variables and constants are still fixed with a central theme, or motif. In the same way, educational programs and research projects often focus on the points, the central theme or motif: goals, objectives, research questions. Activity is designed around these themes and methodology is chosen to work towards that focal point, leading to encounter point two:

**Encounter of the self.** Challenges to my sense of organization in practice and research smoothes these spaces. Ongoing processes of smoothing and striation necessitate a working in the middle, or emergent practices.

Recognizing smooth and striated space within practice and research is vital. Smooth space is precisely the space of the smallest deviation: therefore it has no homogeneity, except between infinitely proximate points, and the linking of
proximities is effected independently of any determined path. It is a space of contact, of small tactile or manual actions of contact, rather than a visual space like Euclid’s striated space. Smooth space is a field without conduits or channels. A field, a heterogeneous smooth space, is wedded to a very particularly type of multiplicity: nonmetric, acentered, rhizomatic multiplicities that occupy space without “counting” it and can “be explored only by legwork.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 371)

Smooth space then is the place where growth occurs, or as Deleuze and Guattari would say, becoming. This is the space of new ideas, new thought, new sense. Still, striation is needed. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) remind us that smooth and striated space exists only in mixture: “smooth space is constantly being translated, transverse into a striated space; striated space is constantly being reversed, returned to a smooth space” (p. 474). Neither is privileged.

Returning to the example of Global Mall. It was initially a smooth space for me. I walk in and am disorientated. It is not a mall as I know it. The language, the dress, the smells are all foreign to me, disrupting my sense of structure. However, the space, like any other, is eventually striated. I begin to recognize and determine systems of categorizing behaviors, learning the language, adapting my dress. And then it is disrupted again, and then smooth again. Conversely, the Global Mall is striated for those who belong. For the families who run the stores, Somali time is organized, hijabs and long dresses are the norm. I am the disruption. I am the smoother of space.

Nothing is ever done with: smooth space allows itself to be striated, and striated space reimparts a smooth space, with potentially very different values, scope, and signs. Perhaps we must say that all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 486) However, it is not simply smooth space that interests Deleuze and Guattari, but the struggle, the vibration between them. It is in this vibration that research and practice must operate and strive to remain – constantly negotiating “the forces at work within
space” that “continually striate it” and “develops other forces and emits new smooth spaces” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 500).

**Sense, Nonsense, and the Paradox of Sense**

There is a tension between two different series, or groups of different things. These two senses pull against each other, creating a paradox through which a new group, or sense, is established. My way and the Somali way provide such a paradox, pulling against each other to create a new series. It is not an opposition, but an a-parallel evolution. An overlap. The paradox of sense forms the basis of encounter point three:

**Encounter of best practices.** *In community education practice, there is a series of best practices. These best practices are established according to common sense of a particular group and are challenged through implementation within different communities with different common sense. Entering a new and different community requires recognition of the paradox between what is considered sense and nonsense, as well as the creation of new sense.*

Sense and nonsense are not opposites – nonsense, according to Deleuze, is not the lack of sense. It is not defined in the negative. Rather, “nonsense is that which has no sense, and that which, as such and as it enacts the donation of sense, is opposed to the absence of sense” (Deleuze, 1990: 71). It is the paradoxical element, belonging to no series or to both series simultaneously, continually moving between them. “This paradoxical element, the element that both is and is not of language, and is and is not of the world, is nonsense” (May, 2005: 106).
Sense is produced. “It is not something to discover, to restore, or to re-employ; it is something to produce by a new machinery” (Deleuze, 1990: 72). “It is what happens at the point at which language and the world meet. It is the happening, the event that arises when a particular proposition comes in contact with the world” (May, 2005: 100). Deleuze writes that sense does not exist outside of the proposition that expresses it, “it is nevertheless the attribute of states of affairs and not the attribute of the proposition. The event subsists in language, but happens to things” (Deleuze, 1990: 24). Sense is the relationship between proposition and the world. “It is exactly the boundary between propositions and things” (Deleuze, 1990: 22).

Common sense and good sense compose what Deleuze calls sense. They are stable identities, which serve to protect thought from nonsense. Good sense does this by affirming a single direction, a direction that minimizes differentiation and establishes norms. It orients time in a forward progression. “Common sense identifies and recognizes, no less than good sense foresees” (Deleuze, 1990: 78). Common sense establishes a particular way of doing things, good sense perceives them as best. Take for instance the assumptions made when scheduling a program. If an afterschool program is advertised as occurring from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m., I would assume that parents will drop their children off by 4:30 (and if not by 4:30, soon thereafter) and then pick them up around 6:30. Around and soon provide complications, but in this case, I would define them as 5 minutes before or after. The parents play a role, the children play a role, and the teacher plays a role. These were my expectations, my sense of time coming into the afterschool program at the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance. I arrived at 4 p.m.
my first day of volunteering as an afterschool tutor to be told that it does not start until 4:30, so go get a coffee or something. I arrived early, the children arrived late. 5:00 p.m. Some at 5:30 p.m. Some at 4:48 p.m. And then they left: 6:15 p.m. 6:30 p.m. 7:00 p.m. Early and late, on time. Times, I have come to discover, are culturally relative terms.

And yet, it is considered good and common sense. I might say, “It makes sense to arrive early or at least on time.” But then again I have been asked to distinguish on numerous occasions between “American time” and “Somali time.” These are two different series of sense.

Good sense and common sense force a choice between one direction over another. This creates a hierarchy, and assigns value. One way is better, one way is right. However, when they come together (bringing with them different directions), it creates a paradox, pointing in two directions at once. Two different senses coming together creates a paradox, circulating meaning between, subdividing into one another until both are present but indistinguishable in the other. It is not compromise, but paradox.

The role of nonsense is “to traverse the heterogeneous series, to make them resonate and converge, but also to ramify them and to introduce into each one of them multiple disjunctions. It is word=x and thing=x” (Deleuze, 1990: 66). Word and thing are both different and equal. Time means one thing to me and holds a completely different meaning to the Somali community. Furthermore, it exists in a completely different way for an altogether different community. Nonsense establishes relationships between word and thing, bringing them together to create a new sense, a paradox of sense. “Paradox involves the bringing together of disparate elements into a convergence
that neither reduces one to the other nor keeps them apart. This asymmetry between language and world points toward something deeper than sense, something Deleuze calls *nonsense*” (May, 2005: 104). The disparity between two senses points towards something behind sense, nonsense. And through nonsense, a new sense is created. The different concepts of time present in the SWCA afterschool program create a transient space. The way that activities are designed, how teachers organize their time and how students learn in the space creates a new sense, a “new line of becoming”. The power of the paradox is that sense always takes on both senses at once, or follows two directions at the same time (May, 2005: 77).

Deleuze uses the example of Lewis Carroll’s *Alice in Wonderland* to illustrate sense and nonsense. Alice enters Wonderland and loses all her good and common sense. Deleuze writes that “it is here [with the passion of paradox], however, that the gift of meaning occurs, in this region which precedes all good sense and all common sense.” (1990: 79). But in this loss, Alice is becoming-Alice.

Looking at practice as sense and nonsense, thinking about creating a new sense, rather than best practices, and working within the paradox; what are the implications of both approaches? The shift from defining nonsense as lacking sense to an asset-filled concept has important implications for asset-based approaches to community arts education. By creating room for nonsense, paradox, and different senses, we allow for the creation of a new sense, a way in which education can happen fully for all involved.
Deleuze in Practice and Research: A temporary conclusion

Each of these concepts – territory, smooth and striated space, sense and nonsense – leak. They overlap, they are folding. In the following chapters, each of these concepts will be put to work: territory with literature reviews; smooth and striated space with methodology; and sense and nonsense employed to analyze the summer arts camp planning and implementation process. However, it is important to remember that they are all intertwined, adding to one another.

As it is with these concepts, practice and research intertwine and overlap, adding to one another. Olsson (2009) writes about the encounter of theory and practice in her study, *Movement and Experimentation in Early Childhood Education*. Olsson worked with preschool teachers to develop a problem with the students; these problem-based projects described using Deleuzian concepts. Olsson chose concepts “on the basis of their functioning together with practices” (2009, p. 30). She describes this as “an encounter in between the theory and practice, where neither has the right to function as a highest organizing or defining principle” (Olsson, 2009, p. 98). Practice and theory experiment together in order to awaken something within each other, and bring forward something not yet known. This approach to research and practice rests on experimentation. Deleuze & Guattari (1968/1994) write, “To think is to experiment, but experimentation is always that which is in the process of coming about – the new, remarkable, and interesting that replace the appearance of truth and are more demanding than it is” (p. 11). This is the approach taken, an approach that provides a new consideration for the role of theory in practice. Olsson’s study provides a helpful model
for putting Deleuzian theory to work in practice, being careful not to privilege either. As the chapter began, I will end it. Neither theory or practice has a right dominate the other, rather an encounter between theory and practice produces lines of flight, new thoughts and new ways of doing things. “Something in the world forces us to think. This something is an object not of recognition but of a fundamental *encounter*” (Deleuze, 1968/1994, p. 139).
Chapter 3: Community Background, Encountering the Literature

Introduction

The literature review began as an academic exercise and became a point of encounter. An examination of my encounter of the literature will contextualize the community in which my research was conducted, as well as trouble the literature surrounding the Somali community and afterschool program models. As I began to work more closely with the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance, I realized that I needed to get to know the community in order to serve them better. I did this in two parallel efforts – through research of literature and through a project in portraiture. The result of these efforts was a redefining of the territory of practice, through the process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization.

Through a discussion of the Somali community and informal educational practices, I will address encounter point one. As a reminder:

**Encounter of the literature.** *There is a body of information surrounding the Somali community addressing issues such as migration, educational challenges, and population profiles. This knowledge helps to define the territory in which individuals working with the community act. Encounters with the community*
deterritorialize the defined territory and reterritorialize it, establishing new relations between individuals, communities, and information.

The concept of deterritorialization and reterritorialization are exemplified in several ways. First, a short description of the space in which I work, the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance establishes the territory. Following, a layered narrative composed of the original literature review, narrative writing taken from personal journals, and images created during the portraiture project illustrates the ways in which this territory was deterritorialized and reterritorialized for me personally. Then, a discussion of afterschool program models and community arts programs works with the process of deterritorialization to re-examine collaboration.

Somali Community Background
Columbus has the second largest population of Somalis in the United States. The majority of Somalis are Muslim. These two facts compose the only familiarity I had with the Somali community when I began working with them. Somalia is an African country with one of the most homogenous populations in Africa on the Horn of Africa, the religion primarily Sunni Muslim. Civil War broke out in 1991, displacing millions of their 8 million population throughout the world, many initially into refugee camps in Kenya and Ethiopia. This is the background found in several other studies conducted in the Columbus Somali community (Al-Huraibi, 2009; Carlson, 2004; Moore, 2007; Reed, 2003; Schrock, 2008; Tyree, 2010). While this basic profile is factual and establishes a
territory that outsiders enter, it was challenged, altered and deterritorialized through encounters in the specific community with whom I work.

Territory is localizable to a specific time and place. The Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) is located in and serves a particular segment of the Somali community, though I will be the first to admit that I am still learning what exactly this means. Established in 2001, the mission of the SWCA is to equip immigrants and refugees toward self-sufficiency, and to facilitate their becoming an integral part of the greater community (SWCA, 2011). SWCA offers social services to anyone who walks through the door mainly including case management and advocacy. In addition, SWCA offers educational programs for adults and youth ranging from health education to ESL and traffic safety. The youth programs are about ten percent of what the organization does, including summer camp and afterschool program. However, the youth programs contribute a substantial percentage of operating expenses (H. Siad, personal communication, August 19, 2011). This is just one issue of many challenging the organization. SWCA is located in the Global Mall, a Somali owned mall on Morse Road, northeast Columbus, and many of the youth participating in the afterschool program are children of business owners in the mall, or live nearby.

While territory is localizable, it is not fixed. Kylie Message (2005) writes in The Deleuze Dictionary that “the territory itself is a malleable site of passage. As an assemblage, it exists in a state of process whereby it continually passes into something else. However, it also maintains an internal organization” (p. 275). Message (2005)
continues to state that the territory is marked by movements. It is also important to note that

a territory does not simply hold back the process of deterritorialisation, nor does it provide it with an opposing or dichotomous term (Deleuze and Guattari contend that there is no need to leave the territory to follow a line of deterritorialisation). Neither does territory provide a base or originary term (home) from which deterritorialisation may occur. Instead, it is a constant accompaniment to (and even proponent facilitating) the lines of flight deterritorialisation proposes. (p. 275)

The description of the SWCA is not the home territory, from which deterritorialization happens. Rather, it is the middle. It is precisely because the territory is constantly shifting, that makes working with any community, let alone one that is so different, difficult. Difficult but filled with potential for lines of flight, new ideas, new practices, new sense.

**Portraiture, a beginning**

When I began to see the discrepancies between the profiles offered in literature reviews of studies done in the Somali community in Columbus and the Somali community populating the Global Mall, I utilized Lightfoot’s (1983) portraiture methodology as a way to frame my own exploration of the community. This research process mirrors the art making process of portraiture (the reason for my attraction to it): beginning with sketching the context (observations) and filling in the details (interviews), attentive to the aesthetic presentation of the narrative. It is quick and intuitive work. And it is not systematic, in the classical research sense. Lightfoot (1983) writes, “The observers agreed…that we would inevitably be taking great risks of interpretation; and
that our written pieces would reveal at least as much about the authors as they did about the school settings” (p. 12). Portraiture thus draws on autoethnography, an important element of my work. Rather than aiming towards an objective researcher, the artist/researcher becomes an integral part of the finished project. In addition, the portraiture method is dedicated to

holistic, complex, contextual descriptions of reality; with a belief that environments and processes should be examined from the outsider’s more distant perspective and the insider’s immediate, subjective view; that the truth lies in the integration of various perspectives rather than in the choice of one as dominant and “object” (Lightfoot, 1983, p. 13)

and be both generous, reveling many facets and strengths, as well as critical. The portrait is not concerned with theoretical frameworks or rigid perspectives, but rather utilizes current materials – maps, texts, and images that are grounded in the reality of the space. Spaces are always changing, just as people are, and portraits, or landscapes as I often refer to them, reflect that.

I began to diverge from portraiture as I realized that additional theory was needed and necessary to my work. Deleuze provided a theoretical framework, one that emerged as my work progressed and my problem emerged. However, the two methodologies are not incompatible. Both Deleuze and Lightfoot advocate working with and speaking with, rather than about or for, a community.

My portraiture process included literal sketches, observations and informal interviews. These are layered with the first literature review that I wrote. Upon finishing the first review, I realized that I had composed one that reflected those that I had
protested. It was generic and dry, offering only a factual profile rather than one that reflected the territory in which I was working. The literature review that follows is a layered account of my original review, my portraits and narrative accounts of the encounters challenging my preliminary research.

**Getting to Know the Somali Community, Defining the Territory**

There are an estimated 50,000 Somalis currently living in Columbus, though numbers range from 30,000 to 75,000. It is the second largest Somali population in the United States. After the fall of Siad Barre’s regime in 1991, the country slipped into anarchy, particularly in the south. Since then, nearly half of the population has been displaced both internally and internationally, fleeing to twenty-four different countries including the United States (Putman & Noor, 1993; SCAO, 2005).

I still think about that afternoon. It shook me out of myself, and set me into my place. I had been volunteering at the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance for a few months, coming in once or twice a week as a tutor for the afterschool program. I decided that I needed to get to know the community better if I was going to be able to start helping more with the kids. When I lived in France, I often painted or drew in the streets, in public parks, and those times opened a door to relationships with the French people more than anything else. People stopped to look and talk to me, asking about my work and then me and I them. So I started drawing and painting around the Global Mall.
Aisha found me drawing in the café. She was eating some ice cream, probably from McDonalds. The plastic cup, ribbed at the bottom, round at the top. She asked what I was doing and said she would finish her ice cream and come back. She left, walking to her grandma’s store, spoon in mouth. She must have finished it quickly, because she came right back, reaching for the pencil I held, aiming to add to my drawing. I intercepted her, giving her a blank piece of paper and a pencil.

“Why don’t you start your own.” I showed her what I was drawing.

“I can’t draw people.”

“Think about the shapes. Look and draw.”

I am not a good drawing teacher. I have given up trying to teach art. After all, I’m really not an art teacher. I’m not sure what exactly I am. I like to ask questions and I like to give the kids challenges – only using paper and scissors to draw, thinking about different ways to make things. But they do like to draw. Instead, I think about developing relationships with my kids, developing trust.
Within the United States, many Somalis were initially resettled into warmer climates such as Anaheim, California; Atlanta, Georgia; and Tucson, Arizona. However, refugees quickly migrated to northern cities such as Minneapolis, Columbus, and Lewiston, Maine for a variety of reasons including cost of living (Roble & Rutledge, 2008).

She ended up drawing a really fantastic man, capped, wearing glasses. He floated in the middle of the page, cockeyed. I’m not sure if she was looking at the cluster of elders sitting across the café, eyes fixed on the TV. He could have been any of those men. That TV always has the news playing. Sometimes I can understand, but mostly it is in Somali. My husband sometimes sits in the café studying while I am working, if we
are sharing rides. At first, he thought that it was in Arabic. Somali and Arabic share common greetings, sounds, and some words; overall different. Assaalmu Alaykum. Insha’Allah. Those are the same.

Dirios walked by as Aisha sat, chatting and drawing. Coffee in hand, “You should draw the elders.” They sit there, fixed. Sometimes commenting on the news. Often nodding, rarely changing position. Grave. The younger men come and go. But the elders - hats on head, suit coats, scarves, slacks - they sit, becoming part of the room. He may have been joking.

There is great difference between the Minneapolis and Columbus Somali communities. Many Somalis in Minneapolis came voluntarily to the United States before the start of the civil war in pursuit of educational or economic opportunities. In comparison, the Somali community in Columbus is relatively new, composed primarily of forced migrants fleeing the violence initiated by the outbreak of the civil war. Refugees began arriving in Columbus in 1994, but many have arrived more recently (Roble & Rutledge, 2008).

Dirios is always at the Global Mall. Whenever I ask him if he’ll be around tomorrow, or Tuesday, or Saturday, he always answers with a grin, “Of course. I live here.” Dirios came to Columbus in 2003 and just two weeks ago, he interviewed for citizenship. Before that, he lived in Sweden. And before that a refugee camp. Before that, Mogadishu. What do you say to someone who was forced to leave their home and has to switch their citizenship to another?
“Congratulations.”

He has his hands in all sorts of projects, from preserving the ethnography of Somalia, to translating and publishing folktales, to traffic safety education. Anything for the kids, to preserve the culture. Insha’Allah. God willing. I hear that often. Mostly from him.

“I’ll see you tomorrow.”

“Insha’Allah.”

“Let’s meet next week to talk about grants for the festival.”

“Insha’Allah.”

“I’m going to go make some copies.”

“Insha’Allah.”

“Have a good night.”

“Insha’Allah.”

It seems that every future statement requires it. To think about the experiences that he has lived through – civil war, refugee camps, his family living in Sweden – *Insha’Allah* makes sense. God willing.
Figure 2  Ruth Smith (2011) *Café Sketch* [pencil on paper]
Roble and Rutledge (2008) describe the Columbus Somali community as in the preparation stage of development, affecting political influence and the relationship between the Somali and greater Columbus communities. The authors state that despite the community advancements such as the development of non-profit service providers, the establishment of over 350 Somali-owned businesses and the hundreds of Somali students enrolled in higher education,

most Somali people in Columbus are still preparing to participate in American life…This means that Somali people in Columbus are struggling to learn the language and adjust to the culture of central Ohio, while mainstream Americans are still trying to decide how to respond to their new Somali neighbors. (Roble & Rutledge, 2008, p. 95)

I rarely include people in my drawings. I don’t like drawing them. And when I do, they are treated as part of the landscape, not subjects. Perhaps I objectify everything I look at, when I draw. Sometimes I think I am only interested in the ways that humans shape their landscape, the invisible forces. Removing them, so the only evidence is the space around them. The spaces between. Which is fitting, since that is what brought me to Global Mall in the first place. Putting myself in the middle. So when Dirios suggested drawing the elders, I thought, why not?

I began to draw one man I had often seen in the café. He had been sitting in an alcove, closer to my table, with two other men, but moved in front of the TV when the others left. I sketched his form. Getting frustrated at my inability to abandon the brainwork telling me to draw the fingers, the eyes, the features. No. I don’t like that. I don’t think like that. And it is a conflict of interest. I am interested in the way things go
together and drawing eyes or hands do not tell anything about that type of space, those relationships. Frustration.

Through those unfocused eyes, I hardly noticed a man behind my subject gesturing at me, waving. I nodded in hurried acknowledgement and continued drawing, moving around my figure. I saw him rise. Aisha sat next to me, chattering away telling me about the imaginary world she was creating around this man that she drew, grounding the floating man to some place. I continued to draw as the man approached. He came up behind me and started talking, agitatedly. I did not understand what he was saying. Accent or language, I don’t know which was the disconnect. He pointed at my drawing and told me to throw it away. I asked Aisha what he wanted.

“He wants you to throw away the drawing. He doesn’t want you drawing him.”

I tried to explain that I wasn’t drawing him, I was drawing the man in front of him. Seeing his agitation and quickly changing tactics, I told him that I would erase the figure. He was insistent. No. No. No. I began to erase.

“I can still see me. Throw it away.”

I kept erasing. Over and over. The lines disappeared. Only indents left. Paper rolling and lifting off the surface. No. Aisha began talking back to him in Somali. I asked her what was going on. I told her to stop. Don’t yell. It’s ok if he doesn’t want to be drawn. I won’t draw him. I erased. Apologized. He turned and walked away.
I packed up my things, feeling that I no longer belonged there. Leaving the café, I asked Aisha why he was so upset. Was it something to do with Islam? Making images? She said, “Some Somalis are mean.”

I said, “There are mean people everywhere.”

Figure 3  Ruth Smith (2011) *Erasure* [pencil on paper]

The past few years have seen an increase in studies focused on challenges specific to Somali immigrant and refugee students in the public school system. An overview of the educational needs of immigrants and refugees in general recognizes patterns of detriments to and strategies for the academic success of this population (Rotich, 2009; Short, 2002); one major problem being the placement of immigrant students according to
age rather than academic appropriateness (Hersi, 2004; Koch, 2007; Roble & Rutledge, 2008).

Nineteen youth, ages 4 to 13 attended the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance summer arts camp. One week, all day every day, lunch included. Two of the kids were African, the rest Somali. That is how they were identified - the African family.

On Wednesday, the first activity after the new kids caught up with their puppets (and everyone else played Apples to Apples on the floor) was to draw backgrounds for the scene that Dirios set up for the kids. Dirios has been working on a project in which he creates dioramas using animal figurines and a doll that he turned into Somali Barbie, named Baydan. Baydan introduces the kids to Somali culture, history and environment. Using the artifacts in his collection, the ethnography, and animal figures (of all proportions), Dirios arranges these scenes and photographs them, inserting text using Picassa. They are really quite beautiful. Very realistic looking, despite the erroneous proportion discrepancies between the dolls. Anyway, he set up a scene and put the animals and dolls out for the kids to arrange. And posed the kids behind the table in the scene. The kids then decided to work in pairs to make backgrounds. We offered them a chance to work individually, but the majority of the kids chose to work in pairs. They did such a great job – the older kids helping the younger ones, each contributing to the scene. I asked them to write in their journal ways that they helped their partner with the project. One student wrote, “Make me laugh, everything,” and others wrote things such as “decorate”, “mountains”, “rocks”. They put the images up as they finished and arranged
the animals and used their puppets to take pictures. They wrote stories on the back of their images.

- “Beautiful summer day. The sun was golden. Water was flowing and we decide to have fun. The waterfall was awesome. The mountains are nice. Birds chirp.”
- “Me and my family went to the water park! We had so much fun! We spaced each other. It was nice and amazing. We thought it will be here tomorrow and it was. I love it there. It was the best day ever!”
- “In the jungle there is a mighty lion that flies in the air. It likes to eat animals and there was a huge waterfall that goes through the grass. Birds fly through the air. The end.”

They work together. They understand collaboration. It is a part of their community. I think about collaborative art and those quilt murals come to mind, the ones that piece together individual squares with only a theme to tie it together. They may have worked on it together, but you can still separate the work. Collaboration the way my students do it is much more organic than individual components coming together. The older youth work with the younger ones. They teach each other, each becoming an expert in something. Some of the kids who had danced in the festival this year and last helped the newcomers learn the dance. And through their conversation, why they do it in addition to how they do it. They egg each other on, and comfort each other when hurt or sad. Maybe this isn’t anything unique, but for all the baggage I brought with me about the needs of these kids they have a lot more to teach me than I them.
Figure 4  Ruth Smith (2011) *Order* [digital photograph]
Studies have been conducted on the Somali refugee experience in Western education such as Good’s 1999 study of Somali refugee perceptions of factors impacting learning of children in high schools in Ottawa, Canada. Similar studies by Hersi (2004), Koch (2007), and Kruizenga (2010) explore various aspects of Somali students in the American education system. Research specific to the Somali community shows that Somali refugee students face unique challenges because of a lack of educational opportunities during the civil war in Somali and refugee camps as well as the cultural identity differences (Bigelow, 2010; Carlson, 2004; Good, 1999; Hersi, 2004; Kapteijns & Arman, 2004; Koch, 2007; Kruizenga, 2010). As Koch (2007) states:

These students were expected to explore their cultural/ethnic identity; deal with dislocation, loss and trauma; learn a new cultural system; learn a new language; and become academically successful within a few years despite the fact that many did not have parents or family members to support them and typically had little educational background. (p. 3)

The challenges listed (language, cultural/ethnic identity, cultural gaps, changes in family structure and support) are detailed in these reports. No research was found exploring the informal education occurring in community centers and its development and impact on Somali education and acculturation.
I thought all my students needed me. They came to the afterschool program with their homework, asking for help. After all, they are the immigrants, the refugees. They are Somali, bringing all the history, discord, and problems that are reported in the news and identified in research studies. Identity issues, cultural gaps, religious differences. Pirating. Famine. Anarchy. Religious fanaticism. Clan disputes. Refugee camps. A country struggling to maintain unity and to feed its people. How could these kids succeed without me?

Very well, it turns out. Most of my kids are enrolled in charter schools or Westerville schools, not Columbus City Schools like I had expected. Most of my kids were born in the U.S., or came here at such a young age that they don’t know anything
else. Most of my kids speak more English than Somali. Most of my kids know every
word and each dance move for the newest Justin Bieber song. The last day of summer
camp, one of the girls asked me to look up “Baby Baby” on YouTube so that she could
practice the lyrics of the last verse. Her puppet group was putting on a talent show, and
singing Justin Bieber via the sock puppet was her talent. The moment that music started,
all 19 kids dropped what they were doing, rushed over to the computer and started
singing along. As I looked around, the juxtaposition of the hijab clad girls singing Justin
Bieber squashed any remaining thoughts of a need-based approach to my work. It’s all
asset.

A few months prior, on a rainy afternoon during the kids’ spring break, I sat in the
classroom waiting to see if any kids would show up. Another volunteer, a Somali man,
came into the office to use to the computer. We got to talking, and I asked him what he
was doing. Here, he teaches English and technology at a local Columbus City School.
Or he was. The school that he was at closed at the end of the year.

“Those are the kids that need this program, not these kids. Those kids don’t speak
English well. Their parents don’t know. These kids, their parents were educated and
they know.”

What population am I serving? Sometimes it feels like I’m doing something
really good simply because I’m working with Somalis, but there are all kinds of Somalis.

The Somali Bantu (also called Jareer or Gosha) are a minority ethnic group in
Somalia. They primarily reside in southern Somalia, near the Juba and Shabelle
rivers, and are the descendants of people from various Bantu ethnic groups originating from what are modern-day Tanzania, Malawi and Mozambique who were sold into Somalia as part of the Arab slave trade in the 19th century. Bantus are ethnically, physically, and culturally distinct from Somalis, and have remained marginalized ever since their arrival in Somalia. (The Somali Bantu, n.d.)

“Somalis are Somalis.”

I asked Hawa what the difference was between Somali and Somali Bantu. There seemed to be a distinction between the Somali community around Sullivant Avenue, where my husband taught, and the community around Global Mall, where I did. She said, “Somalis are Somalis.”

It is ironic that we were so dreading moving to Columbus, Marc especially. There’s nothing in Columbus. North Carolina. Boston. There will be so many places to go, people to meet, Arabs to practice speaking. But in Columbus? Maybe students. I learned that Columbus had the second largest population of Somalis in the United States. And they are Muslim. And then Marc met Rasheed at Starbucks, who introduced him to USTogther and a job teaching citizenship classes to eligible immigrants, opening up communities of Iraqis, Somalis, Middle Easterners. Exactly what we were looking for.
But all Somalis are not the same. Some are mean, like Aisha said. And some are Bantu. Dirios and the Somali Unified Youth put together the Second Annual Somali Festival on July 1, the Somali independence day. I went. Marc went. Over 3,000 Somalis in Columbus went. It was an event to celebrate being Somali, and working to unify Somalis. Marc asked Ali, the young Bantu man that drove students to the citizenship classes and helped translate during class, if he went to the festival.

“Of course not.”

“Really? Why not?”
“I’m not welcome there.”

There are many ways that the literature, my experience, and my practice could be layered. Each of the encounters with the literature, the points of contention, of change, of challenge, had the potential for line of flight. And with each revisiting, a different understanding and change in action occurs. It was important to reexamine the territory in order to understand how to work in and with it. To continue looking at the original literature review, we move on to program models for afterschool programs, a discussion of collaborative art making and a review of programs that utilize collaborative art making. These models are juxtaposed with the concept of deterritorialization and reterritorialization through the example of the orchid and the wasp.

Afterschool and Community Arts Program Models and Theories

Afterschool Program Models, Theory, and Tracings

An additional aspect of the original literature review focused on program models for afterschool programs. The afterschool program is an important part of the services offered by SWCA. I chose to focus on afterschool programs, rather than summer camps, because of the academic focus of and the significance to the organization. Both programs share many characteristics and curriculum components. The consideration of these program models and educational theory allows for further examination of the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization, particularly with the example of the orchid and the wasp.
The orchid deterritorializes by forming an image, a tracing of a wasp; but the wasp reterritorializes on that image. The wasp is nevertheless deterritorialized, becoming a piece in the orchid's reproductive apparatus. But it reterritorializes the orchid by transporting its pollen. Wasp and orchid, as heterogeneous elements, form a rhizome. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10)

Deleuze and Guattari continue to discuss the ways in which the orchid both imitates and captures the code of the wasp. There is a parallel between imitation or reproduction and a capture or becoming.

Each of these becomings brings about the deterritorialization of one term and the reterritorialization of the other; the two becomings interlink and form relays in a circulation of intensities pushing the deterritorialization ever further. There is neither imitation nor resemblance, only an exploding of two heterogeneous series on the line of flight composed by a common rhizome that can no longer be attributed to or subjugated by anything signifying. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 10)

The wasp and orchid are irrevocably intertwined and create something new through the deterritorialization and subsequent reterritorialization. This relationship can be utilized to look at afterschool program models and community arts programs.

Afterschool program models and educational theory provide a foundation of attributes and structure for community programs. After school programs involve school-age children (ages 5 to 18) and “emphasize academic as well as “nonacademic activities” (Fashola, 2002, p. 7), seeking to help children make creative use of their free time. In addition, afterschool programs generally provide programming afterschool until 5:00 or 6:00 p.m., at a minimum of three days per week, serve a set group of students throughout the entire school year (Hall et al., 2003).

These classes provide children with opportunities to explore and develop skills, talents, and hobbies, and, alter, to show these skills to their parents and others.
Academic achievement, attendance, or other school-related outcomes may or may not be primary or secondary goals of these programs. (Fashola, 2002, p. 8)

Community-based afterschool programs, such as Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, 4-H, Boys and Girls Clubs of America, and the Boy and Girl Scouts of America, have a community focus and are housed in school or community buildings (Fashola, 2002: 54).

This is a limited view of community-based afterschool and youth programs based in cognitive development, not taking into consideration the complex relationships and educational impacts of the community and its spaces.

Other predominant existing program theories, such as developmental intentionality (Walker, 2006) and positivist youth development (Hall et al, 2003), also start from a developmental standpoint. Walker (2006) offers the theory of developmental intentionality as a framework for developing effective afterschool youth programs.

Described as a co-creation, these intentional youth programs

[meet] basic youth needs, [ground] learning in everyday community needs, [and involve youth in] having fun and making a difference: these are all good program practices driven by a shared ethos of inclusion, respect and commitment to building individual and community assets. (p. 83)

The theory of developmental intentionality believes that youth are “more likely to achieve desired developmental outcomes when actively engaged in their own learning and development,” when there is “a good fit between student and intentional supports” and opportunities,” and “high engagement” (Walker, 2006, p. 76). In this definition, intentionality is the intervention that stimulates engagement and strengthens the good fit. Based on a model in which engagement and good fit occurs in the space between the
ethos of youth development, the program, and the active, engaged youth, the philosophy of this model lies in the ethos of youth development, built on basic youth needs.

The Boston After-School for All Partnership (BASAP) compiled a report examining how afterschool programs can most effect youth development as well as academic achievement (Hall et al., 2003). This investigation included a literature review and case studies modeling positivist youth development theory. Positivist youth development is a process that prepares young people to meet the challenges of adolescence and adulthood through a coordinated progressive series of activities and experiences which help them to become socially, morally, emotionally, physically and cognitively competent. Effective programs address the broader development needs in contrast to deficit based models which focus solely on needs, viewing youth as resources, community-based, and focuses on attitudes, behaviors and skills. Synthesizing a list of characteristics of programs from other like reports, BASAP lists the fundamental tenants of afterschool programs, including points such as support through relationship, encouraging meaningful participation in activities, family connectedness, developing social competencies, and community involvement.

Cognitive development, developmental intentionality and positivist youth development each provide strategies for developing successful and effective afterschool programs. Each emphasizes community, meaningful engagement, and collaboration. However, the philosophical basis is neglected, allowing only a partial understanding of the potential of community-based and collaborative programs. Program models such as
YouthARTS (Americans for the Arts, 2003) utilize these theories and while the attributes seem to be effective and useful, this too does not address the fundamental philosophical underpinnings of community-based education. Providing models without discussion of the philosophical underpinnings encourages what Deleuze and Guattari (1980/1987) call tracings. They write:

Make a map, not a tracing. The orchid does not reproduce the tracing of the wasp; it forms a map with the wasp, in a rhizome. What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation in contact with the real. (p. 12)

While examples of successful programs provide useful and practical tips for planning after school and community arts programs, they do not accurately recall what occurs when programmers work in communities. Using these programs as guides, programmers often trace other programs. But consider the orchid and the wasp. The orchid does not simply recreate the tracing of the wasp. It forms a map. Something new, that is rooted in experimentation that is grounded in the real – the community space and practices. Development models prescribe the students, their cognitive and emotional development, and the way that programs should be designed to take those things into account. In addition, these particular afterschool program theories fundamentally assume that the youth served are at risk. Developmental intentionality and positivist youth development espouse an asset-based approach, yet participants remain grouped as at risk. This positions youth in a vertical hierarchy, rather than a horizontal rhizome, where the ideas and assets of each individual are able to connect and create new ideas, and grow.
The Wasp, the Orchid, and Collaboration in Community Art Programs

The wasp and the orchid each deterritorialize the other. They do not make tracings. This is an important consideration. Without philosophical grounding, utilizing program models turns quickly into a tracing, rather than becoming-program with the students and community. Considering programs as the orchid considers the wasp and considering the programming process as a process of deterritorialization and reterritorialization initiates a very different line of flight. Turning to community-based arts programs can offer additional examples for considering community programming which creates a map, not a tracing. These examples include those found in The Art of the Community (Marcus, Petsod & Skillman, 2006), Wendy Ewald (Ewald, 2000; Kistler, 2004), and the Musqueam educational programs at the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia (Baird, 2007). These programs focus on collaboration, which can be understood in the context of the orchid and the wasp.

To begin, a discussion of the role of collaboration in arts education is beneficial. In Making Art Together (Cooper & Sjostrom, 2006), collaboration is examined as a pedagogical approach to learning in the arts, as well as other disciplines; one that creates a democratic community within educational spaces. This is an easily accessible work, particularly for practitioners. It is a text that I first encountered at my first job at a children’s museum.

Operating under the assumption that “together we can create what we could never create alone” (p. 4), Cooper and Sjostrom (2006) present five principles of collaborative
art making that provide the framework for implementing this practice in the classroom. First, the teacher serves as master artist, providing leadership, setting guidelines, determining the space and the framework, and developing a visual literacy using art as a means of learning and exploration; overall, taking an asset-based approach. The second principle is to establish a framework in order to maximize the likelihood of success. Limitations provide freedom and address both the attitudinal and physical. This is the organizing principle. The next tenant is to work collaboratively throughout by voting, discussing, and practicing democracy. The classroom then becomes a “living laboratory in democratic process and collaboration” (Cooper & Sjostrom, 2006, p. 97). Drawing on the perspectives and techniques of contemporary art provides the fourth guideline. Following in the vein of Howard Gardner’s multiple intelligences, there is no one way to create art. Contemporary art shifts focus from the product to communication, concepts and ideas, providing provocative contexts in order to push views to see anew. Critical thinking becomes more important than technical skill. Finally, the fifth principle is to tie artwork to the larger world, whether through curricular goals or the medium of exploration. In the majority of project examples provided, this work is literally connected to the larger world – being physically large and displayed in public.

Collaboration is the fundamental principle of Making Art Together. Cooper and Sjostrom (2006) place collage as the basis of collaborative art making – each student creating part of the whole – and many of the example projects follow this lead. This is what Roberts refers to as collaborative assembly (Roberts, 2009, p. 16). It is project-based, and although Cooper and Sjostrom set up their writing to address the pedagogical
and philosophical basis of collaboration, the discussion is sidetracked to practical instructions for use. Collaborative art-making has initiated some change in approach to curriculum design, as touched on in Cooper and Sjostrom (2006), but ultimately *Making Art Together* fails to address the fundamental philosophical basis and implications of collaboration, offering instead a framework and ideas for implementing collaborative projects in the classroom.

I utilized Cooper and Sjostrom’s book as a resource for projects for the afterschool program at SWCA, but quickly learned that this type of collaboration does not work in the space. During the afterschool program, I designed a two-part activity that integrated collaboration and individual work. Utilizing the five organizing principles of collaborative art making laid out by Cooper and Sjostrom (2006), participants had an opportunity to work together as well as individually to create an approximately 4’ by 7’ mural representing what they think it means to be Somali. The first part involved students working together to paint a background, which I cut into individual squares. For the second part, students brainstormed ideas about what it means to be Somali and then each child drew one of the ideas onto a painted square using chalk or marker.

Several problems ensued, challenging Cooper and Sjostrom’s collaborative project model. While the kids were actively involved in brainstorming, a, “Hey! Don’t look! Don’t cheat!” game ensued. This was not as problematic as making the jump from written lists (which they enjoy making) to representational images. The image most commonly drawn was the Somali flag, being a readily recognizable symbol. In addition,
after a few minutes, the topic was lost and participants expressed feelings of boredom. The backgrounds produced a logistical issue - they were too dark to contrast against the dark drawings on top. Perhaps paint or collage would have worked better. Also, the staggered arrival of students makes it extremely difficult to facilitate activities, give instruction or involve all participants in the same manner. For example, two children who were new to this afterschool program entered about an hour into the session. They had missed the bulk of the brainstorming and while eager to participate, were not able to spend time thinking of ideas because the others were ready to move on. In addition, as more kids arrived, space became tight. For a set up that works well in the beginning with 6 children, it quickly turns chaotic and unorganized with ten, twelve or more. The culture of the space – the transient nature of the afterschool program classroom – is not conducive to this type of planning.

Reconsidering collaboration as the relationship between the orchid and the wasp and the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization grounds collaboration in a philosophy that promotes new ideas and creation, as well as a democratic community. The orchid and the wasp, first, are equals. There is no hierarchy. Each deterritorializes, and then reterritorializes, the other. Like the rhizome, this process is organized horizontally, an organization that promotes democracy in the classroom – one in which each contributes. Second, the orchid and the wasp allow for different ways of and reasons for doing things. The orchid is reproducing, the wasp is pollinating. Collaboration, according to Cooper and Sjostrom does not create in the same way. While each individual contributes to the end product, it is an end product – an oftentimes large
piece of work that does not allow for failure. The model set out by Cooper and Sjostrom is one that maximizes success. Orchid-wasp collaboration allows for failure, a failure that is oftentimes defined in the initiating territory. The difference, however, is that a new territory is formed. The collaborative mural project taken from the Cooper and Sjostrom book was a failure. However, throughout the project, both the students and I learned about each other and how to work together. I learned how to better design projects specifically for this space and these kids. The process of deterritorialization breaks down frameworks and creates new ones. Projects and model programs provide more insight into collaborative process in community-based arts programs. The photographer Wendy Ewald, *The Art of Community*, and the Musqueam program at the Museum of Anthropology in British Columbia provide such examples in a variety of community settings.

Artist Wendy Ewald (born 1953) has been collaborating with youth and community groups around the world for more than thirty years. By pairing her skills and abilities with “her students’ imaginations, encouraging them to use cameras to create individual self-portraits and portraits of their communities and to articulate their dreams and hopes while working with her in visual and verbal collaboration” (Kistler, 2004), Ewald redefines what it means to be artist and subject. From behind the camera and choosing subject matter to manipulating Ewald’s negatives, students co-created with Ewald in projects such as the Polaroid Project (New Brunswick, Canada, 1973), “Retrato de un Pueblo” (Colombia, 1986), and “Black Self/White Self” (Durham Public Schools, 1994). Often, Ewald acts simply as editor, only providing “the impetus, the framework,
the vehicle for the students’ ideas, expressions, and images” (Ewald, 2000: 8). Compare this to other photography classes in which children are taught “to take, develop, and print their own pictures,” a practice that few regard more than an “exercise in skill development and creative expression” (Ewald, 2000, p. 7). Ewald wanted to do more.

[She] wanted to challenge fundamental, categorical distinctions between art and documentary photography, between photographer and subject, child and adult. Her extend commitment amounted to a continuing collaborative exploration. (Ewald, 2000, p. 8)

This sharing of process creates a community in which children have the authority to choose their vision. While Ewald provides the medium and framework, acting as Cooper’s “master artist,” more than a product is created; shared histories, language, and culture are developed. The history created by the narratives and stories told through the images; the language formed through the medium, and the culture developed throughout the process of making together. Each of these things is unique to each learning community formed, changing with the participants and the place.

The case studies of arts programs serving immigrants found in The Art of Community (Marcus, Petsod & Skillman, 2006) also demonstrate the orchid-wasp approach to community arts programming. One project entitled “Our Voices” provides a space for women to gather, exchanging stories and creating performance pieces about their experiences coming to America. Creating a community based in the commonality of their “struggle to make a new life and their desire to share stories with new neighbors in central Pennsylvania” (Marcus, Petsod & Skillman, 2006, p. 26), they blend artistic sensibilities, oral history, and ethnographic perspectives, drawing out themes common to
all experiences, such as humor, acculturation, personal transformation, courage, motherhood, and the act of leaving everything behind. As a group, they developed their own language and definitions, determining aims and interests. Like Ewald’s projects, the programs of *The Art of the Community* also develop shared histories – connected by common themes – and develop communities of learning and art making. Creating a shared history is a mark of a shifting territory.

Jill Baird (2007) initiates a re-examination of collaboration in the museum. Working towards a post-colonial museum, Baird proposes and models the creation of a third space, two cultures coming together to create educational programming in a space of cultural crossroads at the Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia. She writes,

collaboration with the Muslim communities and with the Musqueam are local options – local not only in the sense of geographic, but local in the sense of a community speaking for itself, articulating their own interest and working towards creating ways that connect these interest with those of the Museum. (p. 135)

There are several important components of Baird’s program. First, the program design must be flexible in order to facilitate change in the cultural make-up of the community. Rather than imposing a set knowledge on the community, the knowledge of the museum changes with its context. Substitute orchid for museum, and community for wasp, and the analogy holds. In other words, deterritorialization. This leads to the second component – community and collaboration. In such a program, the community in which the museum is located defines the means as well as the content of education. Like the wasp redefining reproduction to pollination, traditional weavers work with the museum to
develop the content of the Musqueam program as well as determining pedagogy. The different mode of teaching becomes as educational as the content. It becomes as much about the process as the product and skills achieved. It subordinates the points to the line. Working with the community groups, rather than for, is an important distinction. Working with implies collaboration and works to break down the imposition of a fixed knowledge and the authority of the museum, leveling the playing field so to speak. It creates a horizontal relationship, rather than a vertical one. Individuals become resources for learning, pulling from the lives and experiences of the community. While these models can provide valuable examples of successful after school and community-arts programs, the entire process of program and curriculum design needs to be re-examined, as Baird suggests. Baird approaches this re-examination through a post-colonial lens. Deleuze and Guattari offer another means of understanding.

**Bringing Together the Personal and the Programs**

Not only have the processes of deterritorialization and reterritorialization been important as my personal territory has been challenged, but also for consideration of program models and collaboration. The relationships between information (including research, program models, and community profiles), individuals and communities are constantly shifting. Like territory, they are a site of passage. Reconsidering entering communities to acknowledge and embrace this shifting territory and the processes of deterritorialization launches a new approach to practice and collaboration; one that levels
hierarchies, and utilizes resources, connecting them, like a rhizome, allowing for new thoughts, new understandings, new practices, and new ways of doing things.
Chapter 4: Methodology: Encountering Myself

Introduction

In Chapter 3, the concepts of territory, deterritorialization and reterritorialization were put to work constructing the background of this study. In this chapter, the concepts of smooth and striated space are examined through an exploration of the relationship between theory and practice. From this relationship, methodology emerges, focusing on encounter point two:

**Encounter of the self.** Challenges to my sense of organization in practice and research smoothes these spaces. Ongoing processes of smoothing and striation necessitate a working in the middle, or emergent practices.

This study examines the planning and implementation of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) summer arts camp, which occurred August 1-5, 2011 at the Global Mall. I worked with two paid teachers, one volunteer teacher, and two organizational staff members to provide a one-week camp focusing on visual arts, dance, and theater for twenty-five Somali and East African youth. This study centers around the question:

*How do I, as an outsider, create programs in and for the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance that meet the goals for the youth programs?*
In addition, several sub-questions emerged throughout the study: How is collaboration at work and understood at SWCA? How might Deleuze provide a different approach to educational programming? How does practice affect my understanding of Deleuzian theory, and Deleuze my understanding of research?

A simple answer to my question is collaboration. Methodologically speaking, the question leads to two research focuses—autoethnography and community-based action research, in which collaboration is key. Through a discussion and application of methodology, the Deleuzian concept of smooth and striated space is put to work to complicate my understanding of action research.

**Smooth and Striated Space, Emergent Practices and Negotiating Methodologies**

Nothing is ever done with: smooth space allows itself to be striated, and striated space reimparts a smooth space, with potentially very different values, scope, and signs. Perhaps we must say that all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space. (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 486) Emergent practices are nothing new, but considering them in terms of smooth and striated space may allow for a better understanding of the necessity of working in the middle. The *Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry* defines emergent design as planning and conducting a field study in a way that allows for and anticipates changes to plans that are “attuned and responsive to the circumstances of the particular study” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 80). While the term emergent design may imply that this type of research arises unexpectedly, or that the researcher has no plan at the outset of the study, emergent analysis may be more appropriate, implying a circular relationship between design and process of fieldwork. In emergent analysis, it is the community in which the researcher is
working that defines the focus of the research as well as the way in which data is collected and analyzed.

Consider the case of the swimmer learning to swim:

Swimmers do not learn facts about the water and about their bodies and then apply them to the case at hand. The water and their bodies are swarms of differences. In order to navigate their bodies through the water they will need to acquire a skill: to “conjugate” their bodies with the water in such a way as to stay on its surface. This skill involves no memorization. It involves an immersion, a finding one’s way through things, coming through one’s body to understand what one is capable of in the water. There is no one way to do this, and different ways may lead to different kinds of success. There are also failures; water may be composed of difference, but not every path through those differences will keep one afloat. (May, 2005, p. 111)

The swimmer does not learn to swim in a prescribed, pre-designed way. Learning to swim requires immersion in the water, experimentation with the water. It requires getting to know the body and its relationship with the water. There are many different ways to learn to swim, and not all of these ways will lead to success.

Considering emergent research practices in this way – the researcher conducting research as a swimmer learns to swim – drastically alters the way that researchers involved in communities approach research. Immersion in the community, getting to know the community, and finding different ways of approaching learning to work and research in the community are all a part of “swimming.” The process of experimentation is the learning and the research. These are the lines or trajectories that are subordinated to points in striated spaces. However, the points of striated spaces mark the progress that is made. The swimmer learning to swim starts off not knowing how to swim. That is a point. And the point at which the swimmer is able to swim is another. In the same way, the researcher begins asking a question. A point. And at the end, the researcher has
some sort of answer. Another point. Striated space centralizes these points. Smooth space more than decentralizes these points; it is acentered, focusing on the lines, the trajectories, the relationships, and experimentation. “Perhaps we must say that all progress is made by and in striated space, but all becoming occurs in smooth space” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987: 486).

Adding Complexity to “Look, Act, Think”: The Rhizome, Vibrating Between Smooth and Striated Spaces

Community-based action research is a similar process to that of the swimmer learning to swim. Stringer (2007) describes community-based action research as “a collaborative approach to investigation that seeks to engage “subjects” as equals and full participants in the research process” (p. 10). One of the fundamental tenants of community-based action research is that it begins in the community, with problems specific to a particular group or organization. In the same vein, the purpose of the research is to work with the community in order that the community or organization better understands their position and the problems confronting them. In other words, “community-based action research provides a model for enacting local, action-oriented approaches to inquiry, applying small-scale theorizing to specific problems in specific situations” (Stringer, 2007, p. 10).

I framed this project as a community-based action research study. It was important first to get to know the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) as an organization, as well as the community it serves, and from this relationship identify a problem. For several months, I volunteered as a tutor for the afterschool program. I
began working with SWCA because of my interest in cultural intersections, in this case the ways in which the Somali community operates within the larger Columbus community. When an opportunity to incorporate arts activities into the afterschool program arose, I began developing curriculum. As the year progressed, the staff and I began thinking about summer activities. Each summer, SWCA offers a summer camp for the kids. Through conversations with the staff, I learned about the challenges facing the summer camp: funding, inadequate time to plan and secure teachers, among others. So, I offered to help. It was from this process that my study emerged.

As I began discussions with Hawa, the executive director of SWCA, about doing research at the summer camp, she stated that a program model and an arts curriculum were things that they really needed. I decided then to explore collaborative curriculum planning with the kids, hoping to serve both interests. I saw collaboration happening in the classroom during the afterschool program and within the community and wanted to explore ways of bringing it into the planning process. From this documentation, I planned to develop a program model that could be translated to other educational programs, including the afterschool program. Although SWCA did not receive funding for the full summer, we were able to offer a one-week camp to 25 students with the small grants I had secured. As the parameters of the camp changed, so did the focus of my study. While collaboration remained the focus in this study, through planning the camp, collaboration with the teachers and staff emerged as the primary focus shifting the content of the study from curriculum planning to program planning.
As preliminary planning for the camp progressed, the inclusion of young Somali adults became an important secondary goal of the camp. SWCA supports the Somali Unified Youth, a young adult group promoting unity among Somalis, and had recently involved them in the planning and implementation of the Second Annual Somali Festival. There were a number of planning and organizational challenges with the Festival, so providing another opportunity to mentor and provide professional development for these young adults would serve both individuals and the organization. I was particularly excited about hiring teaching artists from this group for the cultural insight and the experience with traditional Somali dance and theater, as well as the potential for collaboration in planning and teaching. This focus on collaboration also presented an opportunity to explore the role of the researcher and the community. I was heading this project as an outsider, but relying on insiders to make the program work.

Community-based action research levels the hierarchies often present between community and researcher. It places the community on the same plane as the researcher, each contributing knowledge and ideas in order to explore problems specific to particular situations, creating a smooth space rather than a striated one. The Deleuzian concept of the rhizome takes this further. As various agents participate in action research – researcher, community members, organizations, students, teachers – new lines of flight become possible. The rhizome is not a tree; there are no roots and no hierarchy. Rather, it is a web of interconnected points. “Any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987, p. 7).
This web-like, rhizomatic image varies slightly from the “look, think, act” spiral that often illustrates action research. In this model:

**Look** entails gathering information to build a preliminary picture of the situation, enabling the researcher to describe *who* is involved; *what* is happening; and *how*, *where*, and *when* events and activities occur. Information is acquired by observing participants, the context, and identifying factors influencing the issue to be investigated.

**Think** requires researchers to reflect on the emerging picture. It is essentially preliminary analysis of the situation that enables researchers to develop a clearer understanding of what is happening, how it is happening, and the stakeholding groups effected by or affecting the issue.

**Act** defines the actions emerging from reflection. It requires people to *plan* their next steps and *implement* appropriate activity. *Evaluation* of these steps requires another cycle of the look-think-act process. (Stringer, 2008, pp. 37-38)

While “look, think, act” is an important methodological feature, the concepts of the rhizome and smooth and striated space complicates and presents a different understanding of the experiences that researchers and practitioners experience in the field.

Consider two drawings collected during the observation process, both completed at the same place and of the same space. As described in Chapter 2, I employed portraiture as a way to immerse myself in the Global Mall community, through observation and artmaking. This space was smoothed for me with an encounter with the
elder in the café, who protested my drawing him. I invaded that space, smoothing it as much for him as he did for me. I retreated from the café, and have not returned since, realizing that my place was not there. I belonged connected with the youth programs, not the community itself. The first time I returned to the Global Mall to draw after the incident, I collaged Halal Meats, located next door to the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (see Figure 7). This collage drawing is representative of the process of working in that space. I piece together a space, or an image using what bits and pieces I have. A space that is always changing is created, through layers, through work. It is much less about the end than the process. A second drawing contrasts the style and process of the collage (see Figure 8). This line drawing is representational, gridded. It is relatively heterogeneous in color, in weight, in line quality. While visually representative, it held none of the qualities of the experiences I was having working in the Global Mall, none of my relationship with the space and the community.

Up to that point, I focused heavily on an end product – portraits of the community, getting to know the community, a thesis, a project. The drawing of Halal Meats is just that, a product. “Landscape,” J.B. Jackson writes, “must be regarded first in terms of living rather than looking” (cited in Groth & Bressi, 1997, p. 22). The art, the research, must be in terms of the lines and trajectories rather than the points. But both are necessary and present. It is about becoming, rather than being. A process rather than an act or an end. Throughout the process of artmaking and research, I was constantly challenged to disrupt my attempts to striate my work.
It is significant that the collage came first in this series, not the drawing. Representation illusively comes easily when familiarity is established. Just as I felt that I could draw in the café, I felt that I could visual represent the market. This familiarity was disrupted through interactions during the artmaking process. I write:

While I was painting, one of the regular volunteers came by and sat with me for awhile. Dirios popped out of his office to see what I was doing. He laughed at my collage, which way does it go? It looks like it should go this way. Laughed and left. A group of younger men came by. One said hi and began asking me something, which I didn’t understand. The volunteer told me he didn’t speak English and I told him, I don’t speak any Somali. He asked if I knew Somali. No. Arabic. A few words. Dutch? I laughed. No. He laughed. All he wanted to ask was how I was doing. They drifted away back down the hall after that. (April 14, 2011)

Some people stop and talk. Mostly younger kids and young men. They asked me what I was doing. I told them I was drawing the hall and asked if they liked to draw. Do you want to sit down? Their mother called out from the store as she passed the entryway pushing the red plastic cart, don’t bother her. I told her it was ok and gave them some paper and pencils. They like to draw bubble letters. One boy, the older brother, drew a man with a mohawk, designs on his foreheads and up into his hair. (April 16, 2011)

While incidents as drastic as with the man in the café disrupt the space, less dramatic encounters help shape it, turning it in all directions. These conversations and interactions turn my role in the community over and over, like a rock in a stream – smoothing the edges. While this becomes more refined, the process is piecemeal, like the collage. Bit by bit, nothing is placed higher than anything else. Each piece defines the space, adding to and connecting to the others. Like a rhizome, each point connects to any other point.

The contrast of these drawings serves to illustrate the research process I encountered. I began with clear intentions of studying collaborative curriculum development within the summer camp. Through conversations with SWCA staff
members, experiences with the afterschool program, funding issues, and further experiences with the organization, the study shifted. By the end, I was piecing together pieces of encounters, reflections, theory, and literature to create a different, if not better, understanding of the process of planning educational programs within the space of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance. While I continued to observe (look), reflect (think), and act throughout the process, the relationships between the pieces of the collage better illustrates the way that I experienced the space as both researcher and practitioner. It was through these relationships that the study solidified and analytical framework emerged.
Figure 7  Ruth Smith (2011) *Halal Meats* [collage]
The purpose of discussing smooth and striated space is not to define practices and places as one or the other. Rather, it is to realize the types of spaces between which practice vibrates. Both spaces are needed and necessary, present in mixture rather than isolation. Considering the ways that individuals, organizations and communities create smooth and striated spaces is an important consideration when working and researching. How do I as a researcher striate my work? How do I disturb this organization so as to create a rhizome, a smooth space, which allows for new thoughts, new ideas, and new ways of doing things? How does the community I work within smooth my understanding of the space? In what ways is the community striated, or smooth? How does
Encountering Myself, the Role of the Researcher

So much of working with a community demands attention to the self. Because of the personal nature of the question – How do I, as an outsider, create programs in and for the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance that meet the goals for the youth programs? – this study utilizes autoethnographic methodology in which “the researcher is central to the inquiry process” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 24). Carolyn Ellis defines autoethnography as:

- research, writing, story, and method that connect the autobiographical and personal to the cultural, social, and political. Autoethnographic forms feature concrete action, emotion, embodiment, self-consciousness, and introspections portrayed in dialogue, scene, characterization, and plot. (cited in Sanders, Hutzel & Miller, 2009, p. 133)

While the encounters that I experienced were defining moments for my practice and research, these encounters are utilized as they connect to other issues of entering and working with communities, explaining theory, and aiding practice.

My role changed throughout the project, from volunteer to teacher, to advisor and researcher. Negotiating these roles and maintaining relationships with the community was important and vital to my work. Through critical reflections of my practice, and the ways that literature and theory intersected with and informed my work, I was able to explore the relationships and my role in the community, especially as it shifted and changed. Throughout the process, I focused my inquiry on how I was able to work in this space, how cultural intersections affected practice. Using the autobiographical, I was able to explore the ways in which cultural and social differences defined practices.
Collection of Data

Observation was the best place to begin to collect data. It is an important feature of “look”, the first act of the “look, think, act” cycle in action research. Participant observation was particularly suitable, as it requires a “prolonged period of engagement in a setting” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 219). Furthermore, participant observation “assumes immersion in a setting (along with observation, reflection, and interpretation) is the best way to develop knowledge of others’ ways of thinking and acting” (Schwandt, 2007, p. 219). Because I began as a volunteer tutor, I was able to observe the programs with minimal assertion of my own expectations and systems of planning programs. These observations were ongoing from the beginning of my involvement at SWCA, in November 2010. During these initial observations, I also collected drawings and paintings. Artmaking became an important feature of recording my observations. Done in parallel to the work that my students were making, I was able to have the children lead me around the space and programs in which they lived and participated.

Observations became more attuned to collaborative efforts as planning for the summer camp began and my research project became more defined. I collected meeting minutes and recorded observations and reflections after each planning meeting. As camp began, I compared our daily plans to what actually occurred and documented description and reflections on the day. In addition to these written notes, the camp was documented through digital photographs and videos. These images were collected by myself, the other teachers, and the students. It was important to involve all the camp participants in the documentation of the camp.
In addition to observations, informal and in-depth interviews were conducted with key staff members, volunteers, and summer camp teachers. Informal interviews occurred throughout the planning and implementation process with the other teachers. These interviews provided a check-in point so that I could cross-check my observations, reflections, and interpretations against the other teachers’ perspectives. At the conclusion of the camp, I interviewed each of the teachers, volunteers, and staff members working with the camp using an interview guide, in which I focused on the ways in which collaboration happened in the camp planning and implementation and the planning process overall. While I provided a few general topics, it was up to the participants to frame and structure the responses. This is based on what Marshall and Rossman (2011) write is the fundamental assumption to qualitative research, that “the participant’s perspective on the phenomenon of interest should unfold as the participant views it (the emic perspective, not as the researcher views it (the etic perspective)” (p. 144). It is within the participants’ perspective that many of the most fascinating findings were found.

This data, including visual data, was triangulated across my observations, interview findings, published research, and further, strengthened as a result of a data check by stakeholders (Stringer, 2007). Interview transcripts were checked by the interviewee for accuracy and representation.

Coding data helped to minimize risk by changing names of what Lightfoot (1983) refers to as the supporting characters (p. 21). Following Lightfoot’s portraiture method, I use the real names of the places and the directors of the organizations as both are public
figures and are not anticipated to be placed at any risk as a result of participating in this study. Remaining subjects are identified only by pseudonyms. However, this was approved by the individuals and organizations involved as to respect their wishes and anonymity.

**Analyzing Tools**

The process of analysis was ultimately emergent. Stringer (2007) suggests two analytic processes for action research: 1) categorizing and coding and 2) unpacking key experiences in order to identify their key elements. Identifying key experiences emerged from my theoretical framework. Reflecting on my experiences working with SWCA, I began to identify points in which my practice and thinking was altered from an encounter with the community, my (or their) practice, or the literature. The Deleuzian concept of encounter became the foundation for my analytical framework. Through the identification of key encounter points, or points of conflict and contention, for the teachers and staff and myself, I was able to look back at the ways in which each of our ways of doing and thinking about things were challenged. In other words, identifying experiences that ruptured our notions of common sense, rendering them nonsense. These encounters were then categorized as they related to the process of planning and implementing those plans in the summer arts camp. The other Deleuzian concepts of territory, smooth and striated space, and sense and nonsense followed. These concepts were fundamental in my exploration of literature, practice, and research methodology. As I explored Deleuzian theory as it intersects with community arts education, I found that a new way of approaching my practice emerged. This addition to the approach to
community-based art education serves to direct SWCA’s youth programs in a more focused, different direction.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations are complicated when working in the community. Because I was not only researching, but also working in the community, issues of representation, sustainability, and relationship were important. Underlying these issues, was and is the cultural differences between myself and the Somali community. I am not Somali, I am Caucasian American. I do not speak Somali. I am not Muslim, I am Christian. I am a woman. Because there is a wide cultural gap between myself and the community with whom I worked, it was vitally necessary that I be aware of my position in the dominant culture and take care not to project my cultural values and understandings on the Somali community in my portrayal. In Sanders, Hutzel, and Miller (2009), Sanders shares an experience in which a white artist working for a black community allowed his artistic values and vision to dominate the values and wishes of the community commissioning the work. Ultimately, the artist was not granted the commission. Heeding this example, in both portrait and programming I took care not to allow my expectations and values to overtake the process, rather focusing on working with the community, a value of community-based action research. It was a challenge to continually check my actions and plans with the expectations of the organization and the actions of the community. In the same vein, fact checking with community members and carefully developing reciprocal relationships between organizations within and outside of the Somali community as well as between individuals and myself during the portraiture process and
action research was also necessarily continual. In addition, the Lightfoot (1983) methodology utilizes the imprint of the artist in the portrait – starting with my place in the community and looking at the community as well as the place of the artist within the community. In other words, paying particular attention to how I as researcher/artist enter the space. Or as Sanders, Hutzel, and Miller (2009) write “[in regards to] Foucault’s rituals of speaking, we recommend recognizing who is speaking to whom, under what conditions, and in what context when organizing cross-cultural arts programming and advocating for it amongst colleagues” (p. 142). This becomes vital in the issue of representation. Who is representing whom? How are each of the participants represented? Even more practically, how does my representation of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance affect their work, their future funding opportunities, and their place in the community?

Sustainability and relationship also became important issues. I believe quite strongly, as doe advocates of community-based action research that work with the organization should benefit all parties involved. Not only does this imply attention to the wishes and needs of the organization, but also that attention must be paid to how projects continue after I leave. Practice and research is only helpful as much as they are implemented and continued. How can I utilize the findings of this study at a one-time short-term summer camp to benefit the organization?

Because sustainable efforts tend to be longer-term commitments, the relationship between individual and organization became important. Trust in motive and dependency are important factors in developing sustainable practices as well as developing
relationships with the organization. Placing an emphasis on relationship helps to level hierarchies and create a rhizomatic space. More importantly, the relationships built between researcher/practitioner and the community hold potential for great unbalance. It was important to maintain an open line of communication about my research and my practice with the organization, and vice versa. This consideration was especially apparent during end-of-camp interviews. I was the teachers’ supervisor, yet I was asking my teachers to be critical and open about our work together. Similarly, I enter SWCA as a representative of The Ohio State University and represent expertise in the field. This has been reflected in the invitation to sit on the board of the Somali Cultural and Research Institute, an organization under the SWCA umbrella, serving as an advisor for programming and education. However, it is important personally and within my chosen methodologies and theoretical framework to value difference and create a more horizontal working relationship; one that emphasizes the relationships rather than the products or points.
Chapter 5: Data Analysis, Encountering Best Practices

Introduction

Chapter 4 discussed the methodology of this study through the exploration of smooth and striated space. In this chapter, the paradox between sense and nonsense is put to work in order to work with the third encounter point. As a reminder, the third encounter point is:

Encounter of best practices. In community education practice, there is a series of best practices. These best practices are established according to common sense of a particular group and are challenged through implementation within different communities with different common sense. Entering a new and different community requires recognition of the paradox between what is considered sense and nonsense, as well as the creation of new sense.

Sense and nonsense are used as an alternative way to understand the planning process and implementation of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance summer arts camp so as to challenge the way that community educators consider best practices.

The chapter begins with an introduction to the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) summer arts camp through giving a description of the planning process for and implementation of camp. Then Deleuze’s definition of common sense and good sense and their connection to best practices are explored. The paradoxical relationship
between sense and nonsense then provides a tool for analysis of key encounter points of teaching staff and volunteers, providing a new way of approaching collaboration in program development.

The Process

The Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) summer arts camp occurred the first week of August 2011 at the SWCA classroom in Global Mall from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. Monday through Friday. This one-week arts intensive camp was proposed as a substitute for a summer-long camp after government funding for a full summer camp did not come through. Two small grants funded the arts portions of the camp, including two teaching artists, supplies, and honorarium for the Walinje Somali Bantu Folk Dance group. Additional funds were secured to pay for rent and lunch.

The teaching staff included one volunteer, Kayla, and two paid teachers, Nadifa and Ahmad, in addition to myself. I served in a largely supervisory role. Nadifa, 19, Somali, is a Criminology student at ITT Tech with experience performing traditional Somali dances. Ahmad, 19, also Somali, worked previously with a daycare and plans on taking classes at OSU. Kayla, a white American originally from Cincinnati and a recent OSU graduate from the art education department, wanted to get connected with something while she looked for an art teacher position in the public schools. Dirios and Hawa, SWCA staff members, served as advisors. Both were involved in preliminary planning meetings and were present throughout the duration of the camp, although not in the classroom. Two teachers were hired from the members of the Somali Unified Youth (SUY). SUY is a not-for-profit organization founded as a youth alliance, developing
youth service to the community, improving educational opportunities and developing leadership and professional skills for young Somali adults. These youth planned and provided performances for the Somali Festival in July 2011, creating and performing theater skits promoting unity among Somalis, and have learned and performed many of the traditional Somali dances. This was suggested by Hawa in order to provide youth an opportunity for professional development and community involvement. Two applications were received and interviewed, during which the job was explained – planning and teaching the camp. Both applicants were hired.

Several meetings occurred leading up to the camp. The first meeting took place at a Starbucks at Easton Towne Center. I went over the contract information and IRB forms with Nadifa and Ahmad. Nadifa inquired about the purpose of the research. I reflected:

It was a great question. I take it for granted that this is beneficial research, at least for my own practice. But how does it benefit others? How is it new? It may not be groundbreaking, but I told Nadifa that the description and reflection on the process of planning community programs is really helpful to anyone entering a new community. Nadifa commented, “So your research is to help white people?” I laughed and said, yes, and others. Because any of these organizations are really community specific, serving a particular group of people. If you’re an outsider, you have to figure out some way to enter that space. So this is an extreme example – color wise, religion wise, culture wise – but it can serve as a type of model for programming as well as personally adapting to a new organization. (July 17, 2011)

The rest of the meeting was spent talking about big ideas and brainstorming activities.

We decided that the big idea for the camp would be storytelling. I divided the activity ideas into projects for each of the teachers, based on their experience and interest – Nadifa focused on dance and Ahmad on theater. Kayla was given visual arts, but was unable to attend the first meeting. Because both Nadifa and Ahmad were involved with the Somali Festival planning, I asked them what they learned, what they did well and
what they would like to change based on the experience. Nadifa said scheduling. Stick to the schedule. They had a problem with some acts taking more time than was allotted, throwing off the entire night. Some acts following were unable to perform. I asked everyone to take the notes from our meeting, which I distributed via email after the meeting, and to develop a schedule and project plan for our next meeting.

The second meeting focused on scheduling. Kayla was able to come, so I had everyone introduce themselves. A few days prior, I had attempted to schedule a meeting with everyone but due to some miscommunication, only Kayla and I met to talk about curriculum. Nadifa and Ahmad did not bring any lesson plans; Kayla had typed up her plans – describing them, supplies needed, and how it ties into the camp theme – giving each of us a copy. Nadifa talked through her week – learning the dance the first three days, practice on Thursday, and perform on Friday, doing all this after lunch to help boost energy and re-focus the students. When it came time for Ahmad to share, he described doing puppet theater and recreational time. We discussed the different components of puppet theater, including making the puppets, choosing the story, writing the script, rehearsing, making scenery and the stage, and performing. It was important to him that the students decide as a group what story they were going to tell. We decided to have a parent’s performance the last day, so they could see all the work that the students did during the week and watch their performances.

Nadifa and Ahmad met me at the Global Mall for a half hour the following week to check out the classroom and to walk to the Northetowne Elementary playground, a possible field trip location. Our last meeting was the afternoon before the camp started.
Kayla and I set up the classroom, rearranged and cleaned the space, and set up supplies. When Nadifa and Ahmad arrived, we met as a group to go over the schedule and first day logistics. Dirios joined the meeting as an advisor for the activities and schedule.

Each day, campers arrived between 9:15 to 10:30 a.m. Teachers arrived at 8:45 to set up the space for the day. We began each day with games, until a majority of students arrived. Then, Kayla began with art activities. We ate lunch and then danced and worked on puppet shows. Every day ended working on a collaborative mural. This was a flexible framework. We integrated story time and journal writing throughout the day, as well as a rest time during which we watched *Finding Nemo* throughout the week.

The big idea for the week was storytelling. We planned to explore different ways of telling stories – through visual art, dance and puppet theater. Kayla developed activities that culminated in four collaborative murals, utilizing different art making methods and materials: 2-D collage, recycled materials, paint, and drawing with oil pastels. Individual activities each day gave students an opportunity to explore these materials or ideas as individuals or in smaller groups. These included making altered journals, creating scenery for the Baydan project, and self-portrait collages. They also made paper mache balloons.

Each day, students had an opportunity to learn parts of and practice traditional Somali dances: *Dhanto, Buraanbur, and Nikko*. *Buraanbur* is a dance for women, typically done at weddings, which are usually segregated with men in one place and women in another. In *Buraanbur*, everyone circles up and one woman dances in the middle while all the others clap how the dancer’s body goes. When the older women
leave and the younger generation dance with both men and women, they dance the *Nikko*. Because we had both boys and girls, the boys clapped and drummed while the girls danced the *Buraanbur*. Both girls and boys danced *Dhanto*.

For the theater component, we focused on puppets. The first day, we used paper bags to practice creating characters quickly and developing a short play. After each child made a sock puppet on the second day, they used those the rest of the week. When meeting midweek to talk about the projects, Ahmad described the play creation process well. He urged the students to “take time to focus hard on the subject/story, taking time to figure out the story and the characters” (A. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011). He also showed YouTube videos as examples and inspiration. Because so many of the students were between the ages of 4 and 8 years, the teachers took the responsibility of writing down the script as the students practices, “so that they can stick with the story and really practice tomorrow” (A. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011). Each day, after making the puppets, kids got into three small groups, each assigned to a teacher. In these groups, they chose or made up a story, developed characters, made scenery, and practiced their skits. At the end of the time, each group had a chance to perform for the rest of the campers and teachers. Stories included the *Three Little Pigs*, *Tangled*, *Chinese Prank Call*, and *Cheese Castle*; a range from children’s stories to movies and comedy routines. At the end of the week, we had a performance for the parents and community members. Campers performed their puppet places, demonstrated the dances they practiced throughout the week and displayed the art work they created. Several parents (including my own), Dirios, and Hawa attended.
One week following the conclusion of the arts camp, each of the three teachers, Dirios, and Hawa were interviewed individually. These interviews were conducted in a variety of settings – coffee shops and the Global Mall.

**A Starting Definition: Common Sense, Best Practices, and the Disruption of Norms**

“Plan, plan, plan” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). This is an accurate summary of my theory of preparation for camp, or any educational program. Over plan, over prepare. My volunteer teacher, Kayla, would agree, coming from a classroom teaching background. This type of planning comes with prescribed actions – brainstorm, write it down, schedule, divide the day into times and activities. Each activity must have goals and objectives, a connection to the big idea of the camp and relevant to the kids’ lives and their education, organizing the students and their time. This is the way I have learned to work as an educational programmer.

In the same way, there are best practices for tasks from enrollment to evaluation; practices that will ensure a positive and successful outcome. However, best practices are nothing more than common sense. How many times have I caught myself bemoaning the constant tardiness of the kids of the afterschool or summer program? I arrive on time, if not a few minutes early. But concepts of time are culturally relative, as I am continually reminded. Being on time is common sense. A constructed sense. “[Sense] is not something to discover, to restore, or to re-employ; it is something to produce by a new machinery” (Deleuze, /19691990, p. 72). This sense creates stable identities, which are not representative of difference. This is what Deleuze calls dogmatic image of thought – ideas about the world which are stable, with fixed boundaries. These boundaries protect
us from what different thoughts, what is classically considered nonsense, and are comprised of common sense and good sense. “Dogmatic image of thought, which is our thought, judges by means of common sense and good sense” (May, 2005, p. 77). Common sense, generally speaking, is the ability to recognize the obvious. May (2005) describes common sense as the “partition of concepts” (p. 76). Working with common sense, good sense is commonly understood as good intuition. It is the hierarchization and measuring of things. Good sense defines what is considered success, while common sense is how it arrives. In other words, best practices operate with common sense and good sense.

The Association of American Museums defines best practices as “commendable actions and philosophies that demonstrate an awareness of standards, solve problems and can be replicated” (AAM, 2010). AAM establishes standards for museum practices, generally accepted levels that all museums are expected to achieve. This is the definition and standard of educational practice that I am most familiar with, coming from a museum background. I consider best practices to be a way of doing things that is established with efficiency and the highest odds of success. However, Deleuze provides an alternative way to consider best practices.

**Encounters, Nonsense, and the Paradox of Sense: An Analytical Framework**

Best practices are common sense, led by good sense. Common sense composes the content – the way that things are done – while good sense defines their worth – the hierarchy of practice. It is a constructed sense guiding practice. These came to a head with the practices of individuals and organizations in the Somali community, which has a
different sense. Nonsense to me. Things I considered common sense did not exist in the practice of other teachers; their common sense and good sense rendered nonsense. My good sense seemed to rise above theirs. The same could be said in reverse. However, Deleuze asserts that sense and nonsense are not opposites.

The collision of sense and nonsense creates a paradox. Todd May (2005) describes paradox as pointing in two different directions at once both towards the proposition and toward to world of which it is an attribute (104). They are not oppositional; the direction is asymmetrical. “Paradox involves the bringing together of disparate elements into a convergence that neither reduces one to the other nor keeps them apart. This asymmetry between language and world points toward something deeper than sense, something Deleuze calls nonsense” (May, 2005: 104). With these asymmetrical directions, a new sense is created and the opposition of sense and nonsense is broken.

The collision of the sense of best practices with the experiences of myself and the other teachers and staff involved in the summer camp emerged as encounters and a new sense was often created, defining a new course of action. These encounters, or events initiating a change for each of the participants, were determined through observation, video and still documentation, and interviews with each of the staff members involved with the camp. The encounters are categorized below as pre-planning, enrollment, scheduling, and collaboration. Each of these encounters were then analyzed, identifying the common sense (the categorization and boundaries of best practices) and good sense
(hierarchization of practices) of each of the participants and looking to see if a new sense, or a third sense, was created through the paradox of sense.

**Pre-Planning**

Pre-planning was a point of encounter for each of the teachers. One of the aspects of the afterschool program that I wanted to experiment with in the summer camp is what one teacher termed “pre-planning.” I had frequently observed issues with the youth programs that could have been alleviated or prevented all together by what I considered to be better planning. However, there is a planning system in place that operates well within the community, which my good sense of planning reduced.

Kayla experienced a similar reaction to how planning happened and was implemented in the space as I did. She was surprised at the amount of change that occurred between curriculum planning and implementation. “[It] was a little bit unexpected, because as a teacher you have to be flexible and change plans. I think it changed more than I thought it would” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). She continued to reflect:

You had to be more flexible because they wanted it to be more flexible. It was interesting because I noticed that Nadifa and Ahmad didn’t really plan a lot and their [activities] went pretty smoothly. And mine … didn’t go off as well. From that comparison, I don’t think I would have planned as much, and maybe let it be more of the kids’ project and the kids’ ideas… But I think having the schedule as something to start from was great. Otherwise, it would have gotten really chaotic. Like, you want to dance, let’s dance. But having a schedule to start from and having it a little more flexible was good. (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011)

Kayla experienced a tension between her ideas about pre-planning and the way that planning actually worked in the space. Her common sense was challenged by the ways in
which Nadifa and Ahmad planned their activities and how the students responded to them, rendering it nonsense.

Nadifa and Ahmad’s common sense collided with my insistence on writing out plans and thinking through each component of the camp. This was met with resistance with my Somali teachers. Ahmad admits:

To planning, I didn’t have a lot of motivation. But once we put our hands in, it was different. It made a lot of difference. And we had different ideas as we went. Each day we had new experiences and ideas that would give more opportunity. The kids contributed. They volunteered, more and more. (A. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

Ahmad, while initial assumptions about planning were disturbed, a new understanding of planning emerged from working together. Nadifa also experienced some frustration with the amount of planning before the camp.

It was annoying that we met three times, but at the end of the day, it was worth it [because] we got to know each other more, what to follow, and what the rules are. I learned that things that you plan out works out more, even if things don’t go according to plan. It’s like sports. Sometimes you know how to play a sport, but the more you practice, the better you are at it. (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

Recognizing the extent to which plans had to be flexible was an important turning point for each of the teachers. The best-laid plans often failed. In those failures, a new sense was developed and more importantly, the tension between our senses and what we each considered nonsense was established. For example, the plans for the dance portion of the camp were to teach a piece of Dhanto each day, cumulating in a group performance at the end of the week. It is a complicated dance, where students formed two lines facing each other. They would be divided into several small groups to learn and practice. It did not happen in that way. The first day, there weren’t enough kids to split into small groups, so we stayed in one large group. The little ones, especially the
four-year olds, were having trouble with the dance and were more interested in the drums, and clapping. So that’s what they did. Some of the older kids knew the dance already and helped the other older kids learn it. Kayla observed that Nadifa often asked the students who knew the dance and if they would help teach the others. Nadifa describes the planning that went into the dance portion of camp.

My role in planning before the camp started was basically to make the other teachers understand what we were doing and connect dance to learning…Planning was helpful and not…So you plan, plan, plan and then the week goes according to plan. Like the dance. We planned that we were going to learn a little bit each day in different groups. But we didn’t have enough kids to have three different groups. So we tried one big group, but it was too much. Then the older kids did the dance and the little ones clapped. We changed as we went, according to the kids and how much time we had. (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

Change was an important element to our planning. While Kayla and I were both used to pre-planning, the amount of change that needed to be allowed for and built into our plans was a challenge. Conversely, Nadifa and Ahmad were not used to taking more than a precursory look at what was going to happen. For example, Ahmad’s lesson plans were, “We will do puppets”. We each needed to think about flexibility and change in planning in a new way.

Each of these accounts of the planning process shows struggle with different systems of planning – primarily a “go and learn” approach and “over-planning” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). While there is recognition of a need for more planning within SWCA for reasons ranging from keeping parents better informed about what the kids are doing and learning to securing resources for projects and programs, merging the multiple systems of what planning looks like and how it happens is necessary to work both within the Somali community and the American non-
profit system. However, placing one sense of planning above another, as good sense is want to do, is detrimental to collaborative efforts. What is important is that each activity, each program, needed individual flexibility, determined by all the parties involved—students, teachers, and organizational staff.

As of right now, I’ll know what I’m getting into. Pre-planning. It was different than other projects because we pre-planned it. We knew what we were doing and the only that was missing was the results. And now we have the results and the feedback and I feel like we did a good job. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

Enrollment

“The kids randomly showing up the last couple of days was difficult because they weren’t signed up. It was good that we still took them in, because we have space” (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011).

Attendance and the enrollment process proved challenging. I first noticed this in the afterschool program. As a volunteer tutor, I was never sure what students would show up and when. The program was scheduled from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. Sometimes two siblings came from 5 to 6:15 p.m. Sometimes 15 kids came, some right on time, some later. This posed many problems for me— from planning activities (How many supplies? How do I structure it if kids are coming throughout the time?) to securing a proper number of volunteers for the number of kids in attendance. There were many afternoons that I was the only volunteer with twelve or more kids ranging from 4 years to 13 years old, with varying amounts of homework. They did not sign in, so record keeping of numbers and who was registered was difficult to maintain. To me, the lack of documentation was nonsense.
My intention for the summer camp was to enroll all the students myself, having them sign release forms for photographs, allergy information, emergency contact. What I considered basic information. The practice of collecting this information and having it with the teachers in the camp is just one component of what I considered to be best (and responsible) practices; practices that I have accumulated through participation in the public school system and work in other spaces of informal education. There have been problems with incomplete paperwork and record keeping in the past, and this was one way to make sure that the enrollment and participation numbers match. It was an easy option, to disregard another series in preference of mine.

Enrollment was difficult. I held three enrollment times, on Saturdays and during the week. Only three families came during this time, filling half our capacity. I left my contact information for parents to call for more information or to enroll and left release forms in the office in case I was not there. One family did enroll at the office, but the forms were incomplete and unsigned. I relinquished control over registration about a month before the camp started. Dirios and Hawa both assured me that they could fill the rest of the spaces and that they had the paperwork for the kids from the afterschool program. I wrote:

I am here, on my advertised day for enrollment, sitting at the table and chair in the hall outside SWCA classroom. The offices are shut, even Dirios’s door. And he is always here. I seem to remember an event today – a child seat check at the Somali Bantu center on the west side. Although I asked Dirios yesterday if he’d be here today – and he said of course, I’m always here.

We are stuck at 10 enrollments. Hawa guaranteed that we’d get 20 kids. Which I’m sure we will. I left registration forms with Dirios. One family enrolled three kids, but the forms were incomplete. And nothing about the research was said. I am trying not to control the program too much, but it is frustrating when I tell
Dirios about needing to talk to parents about the research and he says yes, of course and then it doesn’t happen. “Parents do not want all these papers.” Well no, but it’s necessary. (July 9, 2011)

Why was it necessary to complete the paperwork? According to my common sense, compiling information and records keeps things organized and efficient. Good sense told me that documentation was the best way to accomplish this, avoiding liability issues and problems fulfilling grant conditions. Yet, there is a paradox of the seeming necessity of thorough documentation and the laissez faire attitude towards paperwork within the organization. I was operating in a framework of accountability. The other series, while seemingly careless within mine, approached enrollment within a different framework. This framework considered responsibility in a different light, one that looked to relationships and roles within community rather than institutional liability for assistance. Neither seems to work well. The first way will always fail to be completed and the second inevitably leads to incomplete paperwork, difficulties writing grants, final reports, and completing audits and resulting in lost funding.

After the camp, Hawa reflected on enrollments:

We couldn’t recruit that many students. Some had transportation issues. Some were going to Quran schools. Some didn’t have a clue about the summer arts. Some didn’t think it was right if they were more conservative. We have to do a lot of fliers. Get prepared ahead of time. Reach out. Maybe we could do a newsletter. We could write facts about arts and educate the community about arts. Arts, not just painting, it can come with the culture. So they have to have a clearer understanding. (H. Siad, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

I had viewed enrollment as an issue of paperwork; Hawa viewed it in terms of transportation and understanding of the role of arts and culture in the community. It is not simply about paperwork but a way of thinking about programming, including paperwork. Also, the way that programs are advertised is much different. I knew that
fliers worked pretty well in the Global Mall. But I did not count on the importance of word of mouth and approval. Many of the families still did not know me as a teacher, or the programs that I did with the kids.

We have to, now we can start earlier to plan everything. Make outreach. Tell the families. Most of the families, they didn’t know what this program was but after they saw the program, they are willing to be part of it. (M. Diriye, personal communication, 18 August, 2011)

Established best practices are not best in this case. They are impractical. Papers will not be completed. Enrollment may not happen before the camp begins. But that is not practical as well. A new sense is needed, that is created from the paradox of senses, of different series, but is neither one nor the other. While a new sense was not necessarily a result of the summer arts camp, a better understanding of the ways of considering enrollment was developed for all parties. A new sense is needed in order for future Somali programs to operate more effectively within the American cultural system through which they obtain support.

**Schedules**

Previous experiences provide a basis for conceptions of common sense, a sense that has been constructed and established. From teacher meetings to daily activities, scheduling was constantly negotiated. Kayla experienced frustration in the fact that kids were coming and leaving at different times, not only at the start and end of the day but also in the middle. Many of the students had family who were storeowners in the Global Mall and often wanted to see their grandma or aunt throughout the day. “I felt like we were backtracking and being pulled in different directions at once” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). However, this frustration was off put by the benefits
of such a transient schedule. The students felt comfortable in the space. “It became more fluid because people were coming late and leaving early…You had to be flexible because they wanted it to be more flexible” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). Schedules during the day had to be flexible. But how they are flexible was challenged for some teachers.

The common sense of scheduling is constructed. For example:

At Worthington Arts Camp…you would have had to call to pick up your kid, and you would have had to have that planned ahead of time. If parents were over 10 or 15 minutes late to pick up their kids, they got fined. If they were early, they had to wait in the car. It was interesting to see the different things. (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011)

The Worthington Arts Camp policy is similar to others that I have worked with in the past. This sense places timeliness above community needs. However, in conversations with Ahmad and Nadifa prior to the camp, the desire to establish a norm for arrival and departure times was met with subdued acceptance. While both Ahmad and Nafia identified as sticking to the schedule as important after their experience with the Somali Festival in July, they also acknowledged the way that transportation to and from camp and time is viewed within the community – as something more fluid and communal than one operating within fixed demarcations.

Time is an important feature of schedules. Revisiting the notion of time as common sense discussed in Chapter 2, types of time became very important. Were we operating on American time, or Somali time? Which is appropriate for this setting? Is there a third time – summer camp time – that would work better? Even before camp started, we struggled to get into a common rhythm.
We were scheduled to meet at 2 p.m. today at Global Mall to set up the classroom. Kayla texted me as I walked into the mall to say she would be about 7 minutes late. I laughed and told her it was fine. When 2:30 rolled around and Kayla and I had been working a bit, rearranging and cleaning the space, and still no Nadifa or Ahmad, I texted them to see if they were coming. Nadifa came about 3 p.m. and Ahmad about 4. They both forgot. (July 31, 2011)

Communication about meeting times was convoluted. I attempted to schedule meetings via email, text, using days and dates, but no matter the medium we continued to struggle with time.

Did we establish a new sense of time? Yes, by the end of the week. It was a flexible time, one that was marked by activity, and the students’ needs and attention spans. It was not a time demarked by rules or strict schedules. As Kayla commented, that type of authority would have shut down the students and their engagement with the camp. But even the structure of Somali time and schedules has boundaries, as Nadifa comments:

The kids randomly showing up the last couple of days, that weren’t signed up. It was good that we still took them in. If we reach our capacity, maybe we tell them that we can’t. But we didn’t have 20 kids, so it was ok to accept new ones in the middle of the week. (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

There are boundaries and structure to the Somali way of scheduling and planning, one that attends to the needs of the kids. Each of the Somali staff and teachers interviewed said in a variety of forms that they do whatever the students need doing. Framing this philosophy with the American penchant for documentation and schedules, how might it create a new common sense? How might this affect planning and organizational issues?

**Collaboration**

There was still a lot of collaboration between the other counselors, you, even the kids. Throughout the week, we tailored it to what their needs were at the time, or their attention span or whatever it was. So I think collaboration was still a huge part of the camp. It just came in a different form, rather than collaborating with
other adults, or with the SWCA in the community. (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011)

Collaboration will be discussed further in the next chapter, but for the purposes of this chapter, we will look at the ways in which different ideas of collaboration were adjoined between teachers, students, and the organization. One of the most notable arenas for collaboration was the activities. Because I felt that collaboration was an important part of working with this community and organization, I emphasized this with my teachers in the planning process by both attempting to collaborate throughout the planning process and integrating collaboration into our projects. However, I had no predetermined definition of collaboration. I knew that I wanted to avoid the type of collaboration that was described in Sjostrom and Cooper’s (2006) *Making Art Together*, as it was discussed and implemented on the activity level.

A curious trend emerged in the interviews. When asked about examples of collaboration during camp, the Somali teachers both cited activities created and facilitated by Kayla, and both Kayla and I identified the puppet shows and dance (projects lead by Nadifa and Ahmad) as places of collaboration. “The things that Kayla was doing, the murals [demonstrated collaboration well]. It brought everyone together. They thought about ideas, like family. They drew what they thought about family. Other kids [painted] and stuck things on the paper” (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011). “I liked the non-forced collaboration. The way that kids would get in groups [during the puppet shows] and they would figure out group dynamics” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). This non-forced collaboration happened in the puppet activities and dance especially, and was process oriented rather
than activity oriented. In my reflections mid-week, I talk about the differences between
the mural activities that I felt followed the Cooper and Sjostrom collaboration and the
puppet and dance activities:

The mural project yesterday flopped miserably. Visually and with participant morale. We approached the project in the same way as the recycled material collage from the first day. Individuals drew ideas based on the group’s brainstormed big idea. This one was camp. They drew on the canvas with markers and were instructed to use the flat materials to collage on top. Way too much attachment to the drawings, not wanting to cover anything up or overlap. More importantly, this approach to collaboration does not seem to work with this group. Bringing individuals together as a group. Yes, they are working together, but they are not engaged together. They are working on their own piece. This has always been my argument against the “quilt” collaborative works, where each child gets a square that when finished is then pieced together to create a “whole.” That doesn’t seem to be collaborative. It seems…striated. No, it seems not like an encounter. The thing that is so intriguing about encounter to me (and the interest in encounter resides in the educational facilities) is the fact that you have different elements colliding, creating something different – a third thing, an “asymmetrical block”, an a parallel evolution, something a centered. Meaning, not a quilt collage in which you can pick out individual squares. I think true collaboration creates something entirely new, not one or the other, but new. New thought. Creation.

I’ve seen this collaboration in the puppet group work. They are smaller groups of three or four kids with one of the teachers. Always one older kid and two or three younger ones. They create stories – pulling from movies, fairytales, their imagination. They create characters and coach each other. While there may be a dominate voice, they work together to create something inseparable, indivisible. How do we translate this to our visual arts?

The dancing was another time with the kids really worked together. The kids who knew the dances, Dhanto and Buraanbur, helped the others. (August 3, 2011) The puppet activities were described in different terms by Ahmad, the teacher for that project.

The puppet making was a good collaboration. When everybody was told to make puppets, everybody joined and everybody wanted to do it. If anybody needed help, we helped each other. We went step by step. We showed the video and everybody listened. We cut the sock. We did it together- teacher and student. We did that puppet thing step by step. There wasn’t a time when I went to my
corner of the room and I made my puppet by myself. We all used the glue and the scissors. We helped each other out. Everybody was there for each other. (A. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

However, this process model was not entirely effective. Kayla reflects:

I think having the schedule as something to start from was great. Otherwise, it would have gotten really chaotic, like you want to dance, let’s dance. I want to say that [starting just with materials would have worked better] but I think it would have gotten really chaotic. (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011)

Collaboration, from these accounts, is more than simply working together. It is engaging together in activity, activating collective physical, intellectual and emotional activity throughout the process. It is a collaboration between process and activity, the two common senses that converged throughout camp. These three attributes work together to engage students, teachers, and the organization in collaboration.

As Ahmad describes in his description of making puppets, it is important to be physically together doing something, the first attribute of collaboration as it occurred in the summer camp. The physical collaboration was also described by Nadifa as she reflected on her role as teacher:

We were doing all of our jobs together all the time. No one single person was doing one single thing. Ahmad wasn’t just doing the puppets, we all were doing the puppets. I wasn’t just doing the dance, we all were. Kayla wasn’t the only one doing the paper mache, we all were. It was one big group thing. It was good that the other teachers were helping, so that you wouldn’t have to do it yourself. (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

Not only were the students engaged together in doing, so were the teachers. While each of the teachers were individually responsible for the lesson plans and facilitation of their individual projects, as Nadifa so clearly described, no teacher was ever teaching alone. Each was physically engaged in the others’ activities and projects.
A second feature includes collective intellectual activity. The teachers began to model this before the camp started, by brainstorming and developing project ideas together and continued to demonstrate this to the kids through team teaching. Among the kids, one of the things that Nadifa identified in her description of collaboration in Kayla’s mural activity was the group brainstorming, thinking of ideas together. Also, anytime the kids worked together the older kids helped the younger kids – whether it was writing or thinking of ideas. And it was reciprocal. The older kids listened to the younger kids.

For example, students worked in pairs on the third day to create large background scenes for the diorama photography project. During this project, Sahra and Aisha (4 and 8 years respectively) worked together. While they were drawing, the following conversation occurred:

Ruth: So what are you guys going to do?
Aisha: It’s a sand and a mountain and we’re doing the sky. And the animals she said. She wants to do the lions. And elephants.
Sahra: And a corn dog.
Aisha: Turtles and rocks.
Ruth: So whose idea was the sand?
Aisha: Mine. It was her idea to do the animals.

This was a typical exchange during the week. The engagement of both student and teacher in collective intellectual activity was an important aspect of collaboration in the summer arts camp.

The third aspect of collaboration in the summer camp was emotional engagement. This aspect emerged as the most important aspect of collaboration in the planning and implementation of the summer camp. Establishing relationship amongst the teachers, the
students, and between the teachers and students was important. Nadifa discusses this. “The first day everyone was kind of quiet because nobody knew each other. But by the second day, they got to know each other and started joking about it. We got to know each other because we were together the whole day” (N. Ahmadkadir, personal communication, August 19, 2011). Familiarity and relationship are important aspects of collaboration. Nadifa continued to discuss the relationships between the teachers, noting that the planning sessions allowed each of us to get to know the others so that we knew what to expect during camp. Ahmad picks up this theme, “Collaboration is teamwork. We have each other’s back. When we had problems, we were there for each other” (A. Mire, personal communication, August 19, 2011). Even amongst the organization staff teamwork, relationship, and helping each other out were important features of collaboration.

It’s wonderful. Well really, teamwork you know. There’s a harmony because whatever we do we do for the sake of our kiddies. To make them give thought to their identity. To keep alive our culture. So in this place, they feel secure whenever they come here. They feel they found a friend, whatever they need, you know. (M. Diriye, personal communication, August 18, 2011)

While I began this project viewing collaboration as relationships primarily connected to the organization, it quickly became more about individual relationships.

Hawa stated it well:

Collaboration [is] between the kids and your group [of teachers] and the organization. The kids collaborating. The teachers responding to the call of the kids. It’s working together as individuals. Not as an organization and individuals. But I see it as a team, working together. The concert that they were doing, the acting. It was more participatory. Everyone was participating. And that I see as collaboration. Everyone was working hard to respond to the collaboration. (H. Siad, personal communication, August 19, 2011)
This type of collaboration is rooted in individual relationships, common goals, participation and a response to the relationships. While the type of collaboration that Cooper and Sjostrom describe in *Making Art Together* (2006) is based primarily in the first two categories – physical and intellectual activity, the collaboration that emerged from the summer arts camp was rooted firmly in the third, emotional or relational. Even from an organizational standpoint, the relationship between organization and individuals is fundamental to the SWCA’s services:

> It is either reaching out or you’re reached out to. We collaborate with different organizations. We sign a contract about how we are going to collaborate or it’s volunteer based. We do referrals or we get referrals. Or we do information sharing. An agency calls, they need to do a workshop. We do it for them, they have the clients and we have the services. So it comes from different angles. It’s not just a signed contract. *We do whatever we can do to help our clients.* (H. Siad, personal communication, August 19, 2011)

This type of collaboration focuses primarily on the process of activity, rather than simply process or activity. The process of activity seems to be a new sense from those that the teachers and staff brought into the camp. The models of collaboration used to plan the activities were in and of themselves ineffective – such as the Cooper and Sjostrom activity model or the process model demonstrated by the approach Nadifa and Ahmad took to planning and implementing activities. However, when they were appropriated by the camp community and reworked to create a new sense of collaboration, addressing the physical, intellectual and emotional aspects, the students, teachers and staff began working together.

**Establishing New Sense**

The paradox of common sense offers new insights for program models. As discussed in Chapter 2, many program models and theories are insufficient for direct
implementation in community settings. For each of the encounter points experienced by myself and the other teachers and staff members, a new sense had to be established. Each of the above categories – pre-planning, enrollment, scheduling, and collaboration – demonstrates the ways in which different common sense or best practices for each came to a head and demanded a new sense be created in order for the program to continue successfully. This new sense is not a synthesis or compromise of the individual senses, but rather a product of the tension between them.

In some ways, we were quite successful, and in some ways, we were not. For example, the first mural provided a new sense for Nadifa. She recognized the collaboration occurring in this activity, through brainstorming and observing how Kayla framed the activity, talking about the concepts, materials and asking questions of the kids as well as how the kids worked together to create a final project. This was highly pre-planned. While Kayla did not recognize this success quite as readily, she did notice the ways in which Nadifa and Ahmad framed their projects more loosely, allowing it to be more of the kids’ projects and the kids’ ideas, taking it where they wanted. Neither approach worked completely. The puppet shows, for example, could have been more educationally grounded. While the kids were engaged in the activity, “you could talk about different aspects of theater [and] connect it with a specific story” (K. Schuler, personal communication, August 17, 2011). And we had more than one flop with visual arts activities. Merging these two planning and teaching frameworks required some trial and error. Considering sense and nonsense as a framework for approaching planning and
teaching, and other organizational practices, could drastically change the ways that organizations and individuals collaborate.
Chapter 6: Discussion and Conclusion

Throughout this study, I have described and discussed the ways in which I collaborated with the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance (SWCA) staff, teachers and students in order to plan and implement the summer arts camp. When I initially asked the question, how do I as an outsider enter and work with the SWCA in order to create educational programs that meet the goals of the youth programs, I quickly answered it – through collaboration. However, the face of collaboration changed throughout the process, particularly with the discovery and integration of Deleuzian theory. To conclude this paper, I will discuss the implications of the Deleuzian concepts to approaching work with communities in three categories: 1) entering the community as an outsider, 2) collaboration within the organization, and 3) specific recommendations to SWCA in regards to their youth education programs. In addition, I will address the need for additional research in community based arts education to provide a strong theoretical and philosophical base for collaborative work in communities.

Entering Communities: Rethinking Insider/outsider Roles

As I discovered in the encounter of the summer arts camp with Deleuzian theory, entering communities is not simply an insider/outsider duality. Rather, it is a series of encounters of different ways of thinking. Rethinking entering communities in terms of territory, sense, or smooth and striated space drastically alters the way that the role of the
outsider and the community is considered. The insider and outsider no longer stand opposed, but rather in difference. Recognizing the continually shifting territory, and the ways in which that territory is broken down and then reformed into something new disperses with the necessity to always get in to some place, some community, some culture. That space is always changing with encounter, and the agents are changing with it.

In a similar manner, communities that may seem smooth from the outside, are oftentimes quite striated to those who belong to them. An outsider’s striation may very well disrupt many of the practices and habits that are so systematically coded, as my presence in the café in Global Mall disrupted the space for the men who inhabited it. Considering then that all spaces are both smooth, striated, and constantly vibrating between the two allows for encounter and change. It is the tension between these series, territories, and spaces that becomes important and productive, rather than something to be avoided.

As discussed in the previous chapter, nonsense eradicates the idea of best practices. The paradox of sense is that it is multidirectional, different directions pulling at each other. It is not a straight line, establishing sense and nonsense as oppositional, but one with angle. The tension between different senses, different common senses or best practices, creates a paradox. It is within this paradox and tension that different communities converge, allowing for new practices, senses, ideas. This is a much different relationship than one that is oppositional. Sense in terms of best practices establishes a hierarchical relationship between different ways of doing things; one
practice is always placed above another. When working with communities, there are different ways of doing things. In order to approach this work collaboratively, it is necessary to eliminate this hierarchy. Considering practice in terms of Deleuzian sense provides a new vocabulary and framework for doing so. Sense in the paradoxical sense allows for a horizontal relationship – one that is rhizomatic rather than arborescent. This may mean, for example, reconsidering the ways in which enrollment is carried out rather than imposing one practice on another.

The concepts of territory, smooth and striated space, and sense and nonsense overlap and leak. While each of these concepts can be employed individually, applying them in relation to each other allows for a more complicated understanding. The paradox of sense, and the tension between series, is a similar approach to considering best practices as one that views community in terms of smooth and striated spaces. The process of deterritorialization, breaking down a territory that is formed in order to frame understanding with boundaries and a system of knowledge, is quite similar to nonsense, which disrupts a constructed sense. Understanding that each of these concepts contributes to and necessitates a new way of thinking about community programming is the key. This approach also necessitates a reconsideration of collaboration.

**Collaboration**

Focusing on the relational aspect of collaboration and its relationship to Deleuzian theory realigns practice with the community. Collaboration becomes an act of negotiation, rather than simply working together. It is not a compromise. It is not simply pieces of each party involved. Rather, it is a series of encounters and shifting space,
organized on a horizontal, directionless plane. In other words, a rhizome in which all points connect, and the lines and trajectories become more important than the points themselves, the *relation* between points. Using this approach can alter the way that educators practice within the community. It becomes less about the programs, and more about the students, the staff, the teachers, the individuals – the relational, or the process of activity. Negotiating that space requires strong ethics and a commitment to continue connecting. It necessitates a sense of sustainability and an attention to difference.

In the same way that Deleuzian theory necessitates a change in thinking about community programming, it also demands a different concept of collaboration. While authors such as Cooper and Sjostrom (2006) view collaboration as a collage, bringing pieces together to create a whole, a Deleuzian perspective converges these pieces into an indistinguishable, new creation. It is a process of subdividing and rejoining. Yes, there are aspects of the original series, but this process reestablishes them as a new series. This means or the process of enrollment that a true collaborative effort would not simply combine paperwork with the marketing of the program in order to create a better understanding of the need and role of arts and culture within the community. Rather, it would completely rethink the approach to enrollment. It could be said that to truly collaborate is to create a line of flight. A new direction, a new thought. Not a compromise or joining, but something new. So this constant struggle of smooth and striated space is necessary to smooth out striated spaces for lines of flight to be created. It is operating within the tension of senses, spaces, and territories rather than discarding or eliminating it, that characterizes true collaboration.
Recommendations

Based on the outcomes of my research, I would recommend to SWCA to refocus their youth educational programs as a cultural arts program. Currently the goals of the program are to:

- Improve academic success through tutoring and educational programming;
- Build bridges between the youth and elders; and
- Educate youth about their Somali heritage

Reevaluating the goals will help focus the program in order to create a more effective service. Because of the resources available within the community and through partnerships in the broader community, I suggest focusing primarily on the latter two goals: building bridges and cultural education. Because of the partnership with the Somali Cultural and Research Institute which houses a large collection of Somali art and artifacts and whose mission is to preserve, research and educate about Somali heritage, focusing on cultural education will increase funding opportunities and utilize local expertise. This also allows for collaboration within the community and bridging the Somali community with the greater Columbus community.

Refocusing the program requires a new model and research of a new body of literature. I focused my literature review on afterschool programs, which primarily consist of tutoring programs. However, there is a sizable body of research on community-based arts education programs, which will prove useful to SWCA. In addition, it is important to consider the role of a program model, as discussed in previous chapters. Program models, while helpful for considering different ways of doing
education, are simply guides. They are not meant to be duplicated, and cannot be so. Looking at the key elements of the model and of the community in which such a model would be implemented is vital. Similarly, simply looking for a curriculum template will not address the organizational problems of programming. A sound structure that focuses on partnerships within and extending outside the community is vital. Also, including the students and their families in the planning process would work towards addressing some of the issues that emerged in the afterschool program and the summer arts camp such as enrollment procedures and scheduling including drop off and pick up.

**The Beginnings of a Line of Flight**

This study is just the beginning. As I finish writing, I feel like I just began to skim the surface of each of these concepts, and that many more could easily take their place. Concepts like folding, difference, the rhizome. Through the exploration of these concepts, the way that I practice in the community changed and the encounters in the community altered my understanding of theory and research. Both practice and research became experimentation with SWCA in order to “awaken something within each other” and to bring forward new ideas, yet unknown. It is “an encounter in between the theory and practice, where neither has the right to function as a highest organizing or defining principle” (Olsson, 2009, p. 98). This grounds practice in theory and theory in practice and it tries not to create conditions in which thinking is greater than that which is thought about. Considering research as collaboration with the community, rather than research in or with or on a community levels the power difference that often occurs, placing the researcher and the practitioner on equal ground, each becoming points in the rhizome. It
is the line between the points, the disruptions, and the lines of flight that will create the conditions for new thought. Olsson (2009) writes, “Everything takes place at the same time and there is constant struggle with creating favourable conditions for lines of flight to be created” (p. 74).

Deleuzian theory has the potential to offer valuable insight into community-based education. It has already offered much to the world of education such as Olsson (2009) and Semetsky (2003, 2004, 2007). With a different language, this theoretical grounding offered has the potential to drastically change the way we think about and practice community-based education. There is a potential for lines of flight, the creation of new ideas. From this study, I have found the need for strategic planning within SWCA or the sister organization Somali Cultural and Research Institute and have begun new projects such as a catalogue and exhibition project within SCRI with the collection of Somali artifacts. How might one take a Deleuzian approach to these organizational practices and projects? Exploring the ways that Deleuzian theory works with these programs and the resulting partnerships, I believe that this study has created favourable conditions for lines of flight to be created by future studies.
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Appendix A: IRB Parental Permission Forms

The Ohio State University Parental Permission
For Child’s Participation in Research

Study Title: Portrait of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance: Collaborative Development of Summer Arts Program Curriculum

Researcher: Ruth Smith

This is a parental permission form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you permit your child to participate. Your child’s participation is voluntary. If you choose not to allow your child to participate in the research project, your child will still be able to attend summer camp and their experience will be in no way affected.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to discuss the study with your friends and family and to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to permit your child to participate. If you permit your child to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: To collaboratively develop program curriculum for the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance Summer Arts Camp. A series of visual and written portraits of the SWCA and Global Mall will be created in this process from observation, sketches, paintings, and interviews. The resulting portraits will be displayed in the greater Columbus community.

Procedures/Tasks: Participants will be asked to share their experiences with SWCA and in the Global Mall in one-on-one interviews and focus groups. In addition, participants will be invited to create visual images that will be used as visual data.

Duration: One week prior to summer camp until two weeks following summer camp. July 25-August 21.

Your child may leave the study at any time. If you or your child decides to stop participation in the study, there will be no penalty and neither you nor your child will lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.
Risks and Benefits: Risks will be no more than normal participation in summer camp. However, benefits include collaborative approaches to program development, more effective and relevant programming, and documentation and sharing of the Somali community with greater Columbus.

Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your child’s study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your child’s participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your child’s records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Participant Rights:

You or your child may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you or your child is a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you and your child choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights your child may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study, or if you feel you have been harmed by participation, you may contact Karen Hutzel at (614) 688-4703, hutzel.4@osu.edu, or by mail at 1961 Tuttle Park Place, Columbus, OH 43210.

For questions about your child’s rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team,
you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.
Signing the parental permission form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to provide permission for my child to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to permit my child to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to provide permission for subject</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to provide permission for subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the subject</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>Signature of person obtaining consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Waraqda Waalidka Abaalmarintisa

Darsiga Magaciisa: Portrait of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance: Collaborative Development of Summer Arts Program Curriculum

Qofka Darsiga Wada: Ruth Smith


Fadlan, war-bixintan sii taxadar leh u akhri. Hadaad doonaysid in u cunugaagu ku qaybquato barnamigkan, fadlan warqatan saxiix koobina waa lagu siinayaa.

Ujeedka: ii naa lah samaayo program ku saabsun farshaxan logu talagalay ilmaaha. waxa lah soo farsamaynaya sawiro laga qaaday Global Mall iyo SWCA. farshaxanka waxa lah soo-bandhigii jaaliyada Columbus.

Hawlaha: illmaha ka qaybnooqda darsiga waxa la wayden su’aalo. waxa laga raba inay soo sheegan khibradkooda iyo inay farsamaynaya sawiro logu talagalay aragtig mucluumaad.

Dhererka Darsiga: Luulyo 25aad – August 21aad
Cunugaagu ka qaybqaadhisu waajib ma’aha, waqti kastana wuu ka bixi kara darsiga. Go’aankaada dhibaato maa u samanayo mustaqbalka oo aad la haysankarto OSU.

Khatarka iyo Faa’iidoda: khataraaha ma ka badna illmaha oo sii caaddii u adi lahayn campka summerka. darsiga faa’iiidisa waa kordhida farsamaha illmaha iyo programaha kuu saabsuun dadka somaliyeed. waxa la so helo baa lo sheegeya jaaliyada somaliyeed iyo magalada Columbus.

Qarsoodida:

Cunugaagu waa lo dadaalii sii ay u qarsoonto warkiisa laakiin waxa jirikara xaalo o warka lagu sii deyn karo. Waxa la sii deyn kara warka cunugaagu haadi ay dowlada weydiisasho. Kooxahana wa lo ogolayahay inay arkan warka cunugaagu:
• Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
• The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
• The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study – *sponoraha caawinaya darsiga*

**Xuquuqda Qofka Ka Qaybqaata Darsiga:**

Cunugaagu ama adiga waad diid kartan inaad ka qaybqaadatin darsiga waqt kastaba. Hadii cunugaagu ama adiga shaqalo ka tahn OSU ama arday ka tahn OSU, go’aankaadu dhib uma gasaynayo shaqadada ama madada iskuulka.

Cunugaagu ka qaybqaadashdisu waajib ma’aha, waqt kastana wuu ka bixi kara darsiga. Hadii aad waraqdan saxiixdid, cunugaagu xuquuqdiisa maa lumayso.

OSU Institutional Review Board waa koox ku saabsun waxbarashada lagu samayo dadka. Kooxan aya ogoladay inu darsigan yahay miid fiicaan o la socda sharciga Ohio iyo sharciga OSU.

**Xiriiris:**

Hadii aad su’aalo, khusayn, ama dacwo haysid la xiriir Karen Hutzel. Telefonka: (614) 688-4703 Email: hutzel.4@osu.edu Boosto: 1961 Tuttle Park Place, Columbus, OH 43210.

Saxiixinta waraqda waalidka abaalmarintisa:

Waxan akhriyay waraqdan, wana fahansanahay ina abaalmarintaydii la iwaydiinayo. Wan ogolahay in u cunugaagu ka mid noogdo darsiga.

Xuquuqahaygii maa lumayo hadii aan saxiixo dukumeentigan. Koobina wan helaya.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daabacan - Magaca Qofka Ka Qayb Gelaya Darsiga</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daabacan - Magaca Qofka Abaalmarinta Dhibay</td>
<td>Saxiixa Qofka Abaalmarinta Dhibay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waxad u Tahay Qofka ka Qayb Gelaya Darsiga</th>
<th>Tariqda iyo Waqtiga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AM/PM

Shaqaalaha Bariiska:

Wan la socodsiiyay darsiga warkisa qofka ka qayb gelaya ama qofka abaalmarinta u dhibaya ka horan ay saxiixin. Melo bannaan ku ma jiran dukumeentigan. Koobina waa lo dhibay qofka ka qayb gelaya darsiga ama qofka wakiil u ah.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daabacan - Magaca Qofka Wakiilka ah</th>
<th>Saxiixa Qofka Wakiilka ah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AM/PM

Tariqda iyo Waqtiga
Appendix B: IRB Child Consent Form

The Ohio State University
Assent to Participate in Research

Study Title: Portraits of Somali Women and Children’s Alliance: Collaborative Development of a Summer Arts Program Curriculum
Researcher: Ruth Smith

- You are being asked to be in a research study. Studies are done to find better ways to treat people or to understand things better.
- This form will tell you about the study to help you decide whether or not you want to participate.
- You should ask any questions you have before making up your mind. You can think about it and discuss it with your family or friends before you decide.
- It is okay to say “No” if you don’t want to be in the study. If you say “Yes” you can change your mind and quit being in the study at any time without getting in trouble.
- If you decide you want to be in the study, an adult (usually a parent) will also need to give permission for you to be in the study.

1. What is this study about?
This study is about planning programs together through art making and conversations.

2. What will I need to do if I am in this study?
You will be asked to share your experiences in the arts programs during the summer camp with me (the researcher) and with other participants, in writing and by talking. You will also be asked to create art work that will be considered as important information. These stories and artworks will be displayed at the end of the program.

3. How long will I be in the study?
One week prior to summer camp until two weeks following summer camp. July 25-August 21.

4. Can I stop being in the study?
You may stop being in the study at any time.

5. What bad things might happen to me if I am in the study?
Nothing. You will participate in the summer camp like normal, but share what you did and what you thought about it.

6. **What good things might happen to me if I am in the study?**
   You will have an important voice in what activities you do during summer camp – you will help create them, so they should be more interesting and exciting to you. You will also see your work displayed in public.

7. **Will I be given anything for being in this study?**
   No.

8. **Who can I talk to about the study?**
   For questions about the study you may contact Karen Hutzel or myself (Ruth Smith).

   To discuss other study-related questions with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

**Signing the assent form**

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form. I have had a chance to ask questions before making up my mind. I want to be in this research study.

____________________________  ______________________________
Signature or printed name of subject                        Date and time

____________________________  ______________________________
Printed name of person obtaining assent                        Signature of person obtaining assent

**Investigator/Research Staff**

I have explained the research to the participant before requesting the signature above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

____________________________  ______________________________
Signature of person obtaining assent                        AM/PM

**This form must be accompanied by an IRB approved parental permission form signed by a parent/guardian.**
Appendix C: IRB Consent Form

The Ohio State University
Consent to Participate in Research

Study Title: Portrait of the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance: Collaborative Development of Summer Arts Program Curriculum

Researcher: Ruth Smith

This is a consent form for research participation. It contains important information about this study and what to expect if you decide to participate.

Your participation is voluntary. If you decide not to participate in the research project, you will still be able to participate in the summer camp and your experience will be in no way affected.

Please consider the information carefully. Feel free to ask questions before making your decision whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and will receive a copy of the form.

Purpose: To collaboratively develop program curriculum for the Somali Women and Children’s Alliance Summer Arts Camp. A series of visual and written portraits of the SWCA and Global Mall will be created in this process from observation, sketches, paintings, and interviews. The resulting portraits will be displayed in the greater Columbus community.

Procedures/Tasks: Participants will be asked to share their experiences with SWCA and in the Global Mall in one-on-one interviews and focus groups. In addition, participants will be invited to create visual images of the Global Mall and SWCA programs.

Duration: One week prior to summer camp until two weeks following summer camp, July 25-August 21.

You may leave the study at any time. If you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you, and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your decision will not affect your future relationship with The Ohio State University.
Risks and Benefits: The resulting portraits may pose some risk to participants because of the public exhibition of portraits. However, benefits include collaborative approaches to program development, more effective and relevant programming, and documentation and sharing of the Somali community with greater Columbus.

Confidentiality:

Efforts will be made to keep your study-related information confidential. However, there may be circumstances where this information must be released. For example, personal information regarding your participation in this study may be disclosed if required by state law. Also, your records may be reviewed by the following groups (as applicable to the research):

- Office for Human Research Protections or other federal, state, or international regulatory agencies;
- The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board or Office of Responsible Research Practices;
- The sponsor, if any, or agency (including the Food and Drug Administration for FDA-regulated research) supporting the study.

Participant Rights:

You may refuse to participate in this study without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you are a student or employee at Ohio State, your decision will not affect your grades or employment status.

If you choose to participate in the study, you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits. By signing this form, you do not give up any personal legal rights you may have as a participant in this study.

An Institutional Review Board responsible for human subjects research at The Ohio State University reviewed this research project and found it to be acceptable, according to applicable state and federal regulations and University policies designed to protect the rights and welfare of participants in research.

Contacts and Questions:

For questions, concerns, or complaints about the study, or if you feel you have been harmed by participation, you may contact Karen Hutzel at (614) 688-4703, hutzel.4@osu.edu, or by mail 1961 Tuttle Park Place, Columbus, OH 43210

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you
may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.
Signing the consent form

I have read (or someone has read to me) this form and I am aware that I am being asked to participate in a research study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had them answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I am not giving up any legal rights by signing this form. I will be given a copy of this form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of subject</th>
<th>Signature of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
<th>Signature of person authorized to consent for subject (when applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship to the subject</th>
<th>AM/PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Investigator/Research Staff

I have explained the research to the participant or his/her representative before requesting the signature(s) above. There are no blanks in this document. A copy of this form has been given to the participant or his/her representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed name of person obtaining consent</th>
<th>Signature of person obtaining consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM/PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>