

City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Clements, P. (2003). The arts, culture and exclusion : with reference to New Labour cultural policy 1997-2002 this is a critical examination of the social function and evaluation of the arts in Britain and the extent to which they legitimate social difference or integrate the socially excluded. (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City University London)

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: https://city-ref-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/8403/

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to City Research Online policy.

City Research Online: http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/ publications@citystgeorges.ac.uk

The Arts, Culture and Exclusion.

With reference to New Labour cultural policy 1997-2002, this is a critical examination of the social function and evaluation of the arts in Britain, and the extent to which they legitimate social difference or integrate the socially excluded.

Paul Clements

Doctoral Thesis

City University, Department of Arts Policy and Management, Autumn 2003

Declaration

I declare that no part of the work referred to in this thesis has been submitted in support for an application of any other degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning. All quotations and other sources have been duly acknowledged in accordance with appropriate academic conventions: other than these the ideas and arguments presented are my own.

Copying Authorisation

I grant powers to the University Librarian or his/her duly authorised representative to allow this thesis to be copied in whole or in part without further reference to me. This permission covers only single copies for study purposes, subject to normal conditions of acknowledgement.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements p11

Preface p12

Abstract p13

Chapter 1 Introduction p14

PART I - Social Exclusion p19

Chapter 2. Social Exclusion p21

2.1 Derivation and History of the Term 'Social Exclusion'

2.2 Poverty and Social Exclusion

2.3 Social Exclusion, Employment or Engagement.

2.4 A Critique of Social Exclusion and Poverty

2.5 An Excluded Youth Underclass

2.6 An Exclusive Society and the Breakdown of Consensus

2.7 Individual Choice and Deviancy

2.8 Inclusion

2.9 Wider Parameters of Inclusion/Exclusion

2.10 Summary

Chapter 3. Cultural Policy: Art and Social Exclusion p34

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Social Exclusion Unit

3.3 Policy Action Team 10

3.3.1 Art and Neighbourhood Renewal: Key Findings and Principles

3.3.2 The Evaluation of Impact on Neighbourhood Renewal

3.3.3 Recommendations

3.3.4 A Critique of Key Principles

3.3.5 Building on PAT 10

3.3.6 Misinformation

3.4 The Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team (QUEST)

3.5 Arts Council Response

3.6 A Critical Overview of New Labour's Policy on the Arts and Social Exclusion

3.7 Summary

PART II - Evaluation p52

Chapter 4. Evaluation Methodology p55

4.1 Introduction

4.2 History of Evaluation

4.3 Evaluation Methodology

4.3.1 An Overview

4.3.2 The Positions

4.4 Formative and Summative Evaluation Design

4.5 Evaluation in Terms of Social or Aesthetic Impacts

4.5.1 A Critique of the Behavioural Approach

4.5.2 A Critique of Art Criticism

4.6 Politics and Independent Evaluation

4.7 A Constructivist Model of Evaluation

4.7.1 Fourth Generation Evaluation

4.7.2 A Critique of Fourth Generation Evaluation

4.8 A Pluralistic Evaluation of Inclusion

4.9 Empowerment, Critical Evaluation and Practical Hermeneutics

4.9.1 Empowerment Evaluation

4.9.2 Critical Evaluation

4.9.3 Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics

4.10 Stakeholder Participation in Evaluation

4.11 Summary

Chapter 5. A Critique of Comedia's Research into Evaluating the Social Impact of the Arts p74

5.1 Introduction

5.2 The Community

5.3 Fitting the Arts into an Established Framework of Positive Social Impacts

5.4 Cultural Inclusivity

5.5 Evaluation Methodology

5.5.1 Indicators to Measure Social Impacts

5.5.2 Social Auditing

5.5.3 Stakeholder Control

5.5.4 Evidence and Advocacy

5.5.5 Language of Evaluation

5.5.6 A Prescriptive Evaluation

5.5.7 Negative Outcomes

5.5.8 Lack of Standardised Evidence

5.6 Do the Ends Justify the Means?

5.6.1 Welfare Implications: Artistic Enterprise or Social Purpose

5.6.2 Cultural Rights

5.6.3 Informed Consent

5.7 Poverty and Cost

5.7.1 Lack of Financial Comparability

5.7.2 Financial Responsibility

5.7.3 Poverty

5.8 Educational Impacts

5.8.1 A Learning Society

5.8.2 Developing a Critical Attitude and Active Citizens

5.9 Relevant Social Impacts

5.10 Cultural Performance Indicators

5.11 Counter Argument

5.11.1 The Expert Evaluator

5.11.2 Appropriation: Evaluation as Pragmatism or Ideology

5.12 Evaluation, Putting it all together

5.13 Summary

Chapter 6. Evaluation Reports p107

6.1 Introduction

6.2 The London Arts Regional Challenge Programme Report: *The Arts and Inclusion*

6.3 Scottish Arts Council Report: *Not Just A Treat: Arts and Social Inclusion*

6.4 Department for Culture Media and Sport Report: *Count Me In*

6.5 Summary

Chapter 7. Evaluation Case Study p117

7.1 Introduction

7.2 Background Considerations

7.2.1 Methodological Position of the Researcher

7.2.2 The Case Study Method

7.2.3 The Context

7.3 Evaluating the 'Connecting Lines' Programme

7.3.1 The Brief

7.3.2 Background to Inside Arts Trust and Programme Objectives

7.3.3 Use of Art forms

7.3.4 Applied Theatre - Cognitive Behavioural Change.

7.4 Practical Operation

7.4.1 A Method of Evaluation

7.4.2 Contradictions in Position

7.4.3 Preparation for On-Site Evaluation

7.4.4 Observation: Evaluation in Practice

7.5 The Written Notes

7.6 'Sleepers' at HMP Wolds, Humberside (Oct 1999)

7.6.1 AM - Visits Room

7.6.2 PM – Chapel

7.6.3 Triangulation of opinion

7.6.4 Overall Impressions

7.7 'North/South' at Portland YOI, Dorset (Oct 2000)

7.7.1 AM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

7.7.2 PM – Industrial Cleaning Workshop

7.7.3 Triangulation of Opinion

7.7.4 Overall Impressions

7.8 'Sleepers' at Portland YOI, Dorset (May 2001)

7.8.1 AM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

7.8.2 PM – Industrial Cleaning Workshop

7.8.3 Triangulation of Opinion

7.8.4 Overall Impressions

7.9 The Report Writing and Outcome

7.10 Conclusion

7.11 Summary

PART III - Cultural Exclusion p158

Chapter 8. Taste p161

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Culture

8.3 Cultural Capital

8.4 The Arts as Distinction

8.5 A Critique of Bourdieu

8.6 Case Study: Outsider Art

8.6.1 Foucault: Art as Disempowerment

8.6.2 A Social Aesthetic

8.6.3 Parody: The Visible Spectacle as Deterrent

8.6.4 Art Brut and Access to the Mainstream

8.6.5 A Welfare Model of Outsiders: Art Works in Mental Health

8.6.6 The Conundrum

8.6.7 Insider, Outsiders and the Power of Society

8.6.8 Conclusion

8.7 Summary

Chapter 9. Cultural Democracy p179

9.1 Introduction

9.2 The Cultural Industries

9.2.1 As a Driver for Democratising Culture

9.2.2 As a Threat to High Culture

9.3 A Grounded Aesthetic

9.3.1 Art as Exclusion, Culture as Inclusion

9.3.2 The Common Culture

9.3.3 Real and Simulated Culture

9.4 The Community Arts Movement

9.4.1 History of Antagonism

9.4.2 Problems with the Community Arts Movement

9.4.3 The Arts as Excellence, Entertainment or Reflection of Community

9.4.4 Education into High Culture or Cultural Democracy, A Political Framework

9.4.5 Cultural Diversity

9.4.6 The Relevance Today

9.5 Case Study: The Theatre of the Oppressed

9.5.1 Historical Precedent

9.5.2 Boal's Political Position

9.5.3 Three Formats of the Theatre of the Oppressed

9.5.4 The Rainbow of Desire

9.5.5 Social Role of Theatre

9.5.6 Orature

9.5.7 Participation and Language

9.5.8 Oppression and Social Exclusion

9.5.9 Conclusion

9.6 Summary

Chapter 10. Popular Culture: Politics, Participation and Identity p211

10.1 Introduction

10.2 Politics of Popular Culture

10.3 Participation

10.4 Multiculturalism and Identity

10.5 Case Study: Reggae Music

10.5.1 History of Reggae

10.5.2 Rastafarians

10.5.3 The Music

10.5.4 The Effect of Reggae and Racial Inclusivity

10.5.5 Musical Participation

10.5.6 Reggae/Rastafarianism as a Subculture

10.5.7 Adolescent Rite of Passage and Incorporation

10.5.8 A Feminist Perspective

10.5.9 A Virtual World

10.5.10 Conclusion

10.6 Summary

PART IV - The Arts: Individual Need and Social Function p230

Chapter 11. Empowerment, Transformation and Need p233

11.1 Introduction

11.2 Transformation of the Excluded

11.2.1 Empowerment and Emancipation

11.2.2 Self-Regulatory Power and Disempowerment

11.2.3 Learning About the Self as an Agent of Social Change

11.2.4 Education for Personal Transformation

11.2.5 Transformation Theory

11.2.6 Fear of Freedom and Spontaneity

11.3 Needs

11.3.1 Theory of Human Needs

11.3.2 Critique of Human Needs Theory

11.4 Case Study: Arts Education in Prison

11.4.1 History of Penal Education

11.4.2 Prison Education Models, Shifting Paradigms

11.4.3 Critique of Prison Education and the Cognitive Model

11.4.4 Lack of Research

11.4.5 Aims and Purpose of Arts Education in Prison

11.4.6 Conclusion

11.5 Summary

Chapter 12. The Social Location of the Arts p257

12.1 Introduction

12.2 The Relationship and Future of Work and Leisure

12.3 Overwork and the Leisure Deficit

12.4 Capitalism, Autonomy and Social Inclusion

12.5 Social Intervention and Instrumental Reason

12.6 The Play Ethic

12.7 Abnormal Leisure

12.8 A Counterculture

12.9 Engaged Freedom

12.10 Summary

Chapter 13 Analysis and Conclusion p277

Appendix 1 Francois Matarasso's 50 Social Impacts (1997) p295

Appendix 2 History of Insight Arts Trust, Promotional Literature (1995) p297

Appendix 3 Final Evaluation Report for the Connecting Lines Programme (2001) p298

Appendix 4 Cuts to Arts Activities in Prisons, Unit for the Arts and Offenders (2001) p309

References and Bibliography p314

Acknowledgements

The extent to which the ideas discussed in this thesis can be claimed as original, is impossible for me to truthfully assess. That they were encouraged and developed was dependent to a large extent on some seminal modern thinkers and the help of students and staff from the Department of Arts Policy and Management at City University. These include Juliet Steyn and Michael Quine, but in particular my tutor Vicky Woollard whose perception and support has been invaluable. Thanks also to Insight Arts Trust and its former Director Tom O'Mara, as well as all the other staff with whom I worked as an evaluator. Similarly, all the students and tutors I have been involved with as a tutor at Birkbeck College, University of London, Department of Arts Management. Teaching has helped deepen my understanding of many relevant concepts and values. I must also mention the help from Karen Drezgic from the Research Department of the Arts Council, Pauline Gladstone from the Unit for Art and Offenders and Christine Hamilton from the Department Urban Studies at Glasgow University.

On a more personal note I must thank my partner for her tolerance and my children for sharing the computers.

Preface

There is a paradox related to my motives for undertaking this research. Primarily, my interest was steeped in disinterested learning. Study for study's sake. But I soon realised that such learning has helped improve my thinking and ability to write and teach, from which I have benefited financially, hence it is not disinterested anymore.

Abstract

With specific reference to the cultural policy set out by New Labour, this research explores the individual and social function of the arts and the extent to which they are agents of inclusion. The arts, an important aspect even driver of culture can be perceived as exclusive with taste reflecting socio-economic concerns which contradicts this function. Such a paradox requires an investigation into the complex and sometimes contradictory relationship between cultural and social inclusion and exclusion, as well as the methods used of evaluating impact.

The thesis is divided into four sections. Part One sets out definitions of social exclusion and relevant government cultural policy. Part Two investigates evaluation methodology and techniques of evaluating the social impact of the arts programmes in particular. This includes an analysis of relevant reports. Part Three then investigates cultural exclusion. A trilateral approach is taken that assesses taste, cultural democracy and popular culture. Part Four relates specifically to causal factors of inclusion and how the arts enable emancipation, empowerment and satisfy personal need. It also explores the wider social function and ideal location of the arts, especially with regards to a leisure framework.

Throughout, the research questions the extent to which the social role of the arts and policy is one of accommodation or more concerned with reflecting individual needs and a wider counterculture. It concludes that an engaged freedom is the more natural agenda of the arts, which contrasts with an instrumental New Labour government policy that treats social inclusion as primarily related to employment and training issues in order to increase individual social capital.

Chapter 1. Introduction

The satirical and surreal Irish novelist Flann O'Brien in his dark comedy *The Third Policeman*, used exaggeration in order to parody function in art. One of the policemen, MacCruiskeen, created what he called his supreme art:

> a brown chest like those owned by seafaring men or lascars from Singapore..... diminutive in a very perfect way as if you were looking at a full-size one through the wrong end of a spy-glass. It was about a foot in height, perfect in its proportions and without fault in workmanship. There were indents and carving and fanciful excoriations and designs on every side of it and there was a bend on the lid that gave the article great distinction. At every corner there was a shiny brass corner-piece and on the lid there were brass corner-pieces beautifully wrought and curved impeccably against the wood. The whole thing had the dignity and the satisfying quality of true art. (O'Brien 1993: 72)

This chest took the policeman two years to create. But when he had completed it, he did not know what function it should serve, as nothing he possessed was considered important enough to be put inside the chest.

The only thing which he deemed to befit the spirit of the chest, was another chest, but smaller so it would fit inside the original. This of course had to be as perfect as the first, and took MacCruiskeen two more years to create. But then he had to tackle the same conundrum with the new chest. So, as with Russian dolls, he produced 29 chests to fit inside each other, until the smallest, 'looked like a bug or a tiny piece of dirt'. The policeman then created two more, 'the smallest of all being nearly half a size smaller than ordinary invisibility'. These chests were his lifework, as he spent all his spare leisure time and energy on them. He went to further extremes:

> Nobody has ever seen the last five I made because no glass is strong enough to make them big enough to be regarded truly as the smallest things ever made. Nobody can see me making them

because my little tools are invisible into the same bargain. The one I am making now is nearly as small as nothing. (O'Brien 1993: 76)

Such a fictional scenario reveals a lot about the function of art in a modern western society. Firstly, the immense value of the artwork to its creator, and its talismanic and magical property. Secondly, as an escape valve for an extreme and obsessive nature. Thirdly, the pride the artist takes in showing his or her creations to others, although sometimes wanting to hide them from view. Here art acts as a communicator. Lastly, the tension between practical utility and an intrinsic aesthetic. On the one hand MacCruiskeen wanted to use the drawers of the chest, but on the other there was nothing deemed worthy of being placed inside these beautiful creations. Even more confusingly, he hid the fruits of his labour in the drawers, as though they were too precious for the world and not to be utilised for their obvious functional purpose of storing materials. That he was maniacally driven by his creativity helps explain the personal value of art. It also shows the extent to which its perceived mystical value or magical power (a function in itself), may be demeaned and opposed by instrumentality. Both intention and instrumentality are important strands to this research. Furthermore, this creativity gave balance to his routine working day as a policeman, worthwhile and engaging leisure that gave meaning to his life. Another crucial consideration.

Alternatively, O'Brien was pillorying the high art establishment for its excessive nature, remoteness and exclusivity, and it is this lampooning that reflects a very different function, that of social criticism in this instance and a shot across the bows of 'high' art inaccessibility. Hence there is a multi-layered and contradictory concept of function.

This brief sketch of MacCruiskeen exemplifies the tensions between personal utility and the wider social value of art, which is embedded in and embeds perspectives of identity and taste preferences. The arts are involved in that personal journey or hermeneutic, whether in terms of national or ethnic tradition, youth subculture or biography. Stuart Hall expanded on this theme of identity in terms of his own Afro-Caribbean background:

Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical,

they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialist past, they are subject to the continuous 'play' of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere 'recovery' of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which, when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within, the narratives of the past. (Hall 1990: 225)

The arts can be a conduit for expressing and representing such cultures, and the mechanism by which they are transformed. Hence the importance of cultural access and inclusion.

Consideration also needs to be given to collective concerns. The classical functionalist theories in sociology and social anthropology, treated society as an organism, a system of inter-related and self-regulating parts (Durkheim 1938; Radcliffe-Brown 1952). The Durkheimian perspective on functionalism was that it encouraged a healthy society, as all the parts were in harmony, whereas a dysfunctional society lacked such balance. But this holistic and ideal theoretical position, failed to accommodate difference and change. Such a broad social perspective is in conflict with a concept of function predicated on the individual needs and aspirations outlined above. That the individual may be pitted against the collective also undermines simplistic concepts of social inclusion. The arts as currently defined can be perceived as the pinnacle of individualism and the apotheosis of social accommodation. But this has to be considered against the extent to which visual and aural cultural symbols can affect vast audiences, and embody collective identities. Such is the plasticity and mutability of the arts.

How the arts are appropriated for such different functions is itself a highly political arena. During the last Conservative government (1979-97), the arts became instrumental in terms of basic fiscal function. John Myerscough, illustrated the economic contribution of the arts in the UK, reflecting the New Right thinking. He concluded that their value was, 'as a means of cutting the unemployed count' (Myerscough 1988: 8), and as, 'an important tool for economic development, as well as a potent means of environmental improvement' (1988: 156), regarding urban regeneration and renewal. The then government utilised such thinking in its attempt to kick start the economies of run-down urban areas.

There has been a shift of functional emphasis since the election of the New Labour government in May

1997. The language of economic capital has been augmented by that of social capital, which has encouraged a wider understanding of economics. Accordingly, New Labour adopted a cultural policy concerned with how the arts and sport could be utilised instrumentally to help address social exclusion, and specifically in terms of renewing run-down neighbourhoods. Chris Smith, then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) explained how,

> art and sport can not only make a valuable contribution to delivering key outcomes of lower long-term unemployment, less crime, better health and better qualifications, but can also help to develop the individual pride, community spirit and capacity for responsibility that enables communities to run regeneration programmes themselves. (Cited in Policy Action Team 10 1999: 2)

Therefore this research investigates the complex concepts of social inclusion and exclusion as well as the evaluation frameworks and processes that are able to show the success of arts programmes to realise these positive social outcomes. But, as the research question posits, the arts already serve a social function as validator of difference. They are the conduit of taste preferences that reflect and support wider socio-economic and political concerns of, for instance, class, ethnicity and education. Hence the conundrum, as the arts are now perceived by New Labour as a tool to help resolve problems of social exclusion, which must therefore be considered against the wider causes and hidden backdrop of cultural exclusion.

But concepts of social inclusion and exclusion are difficult to define, and those of cultural inclusion and exclusion are of an even more convoluted nature. The complex relationships between these variables are explored to better comprehend the debate surrounding the use of the arts to address social exclusion.

The breadth of this domain is enormous, therefore certain areas have been omitted from this research. For example the wider effects of globalisation on exclusion, the exploration of the intrinsic magical quality of the arts that helps engender inclusion and the discourse surrounding citizenship.

This thesis investigates the capacity of the arts to transform individuals and communities, based on the underlying principle of social justice. But crucially, it seeks to portray how those excluded themselves can be in control of this process, how best they can, either individually or collectively, help themselves and

share the benefits of society. It aims to contribute to arts and cultural policy, and to determine an evaluative template for social impacts to be realised through arts programmes.

The obsessiveness of MacCruiskeen crafting his chests, can be recognised as abnormal behaviour or creative enthusiasm, which introduces concepts of social normality and abnormal leisure practices.

Notwithstanding, active creativity and the expression of the whole character of a person can be the positive benefits of the arts and riposte to exclusion and passive cultural consumption. This is the author's position having worked in a cultural capacity with the socially excluded for over twenty years. But because such properties tend to be counter cultural and leisure-orientated, they fail to be fully appreciated. Such concerns will be clarified in the text.

Methodologically, the research combines an eclectic phenomenological and existential method using case studies steeped in personal experience to a greater or lesser degree, alongside a more theoretical epistemological discourse. This hermeneutic approach, questions the veracity of objective truth and quantitative methods of verification. Hence a mainly qualitative, critical and experiential analysis is undertaken, within a pluralistic framework that accepts the utility of quantitative data where appropriate.

The methodology fails to adhere to any specific school of thought, but is influenced by a range of modern thinkers including; Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Foucault, Paolo Freire and Max Weber. The research blends theory and practice, using a Marxist analysis amongst others, in as much as its concentration on human agency, and issues of power and its democratisation, are major themes.

The evidence used throughout, is collected from a range of fields and sources. These incorporate anthropology, arts and cultural policy, cultural and leisure studies, education, evaluation research, history of the arts, philosophy, politics, psychology and sociology. Sources include correspondence, exhibitions, lectures, observation, formal and informal interview, book and Internet sites, as well as unpublished theses.

Because of the value-driven and contested nature of much of this investigation, which impacts on methodological considerations, there is no absolute evidence to prove or disprove the research hypothesis. The thesis is therefore a specific interpretation or 'take' of available evidence, experiential knowledge and theoretical ideas, and is therefore more a narrative than a prescriptive statement.

PART I - Social Exclusion

> The arts and cultural industries are key elements in creating jobs, attracting inward investment and expenditure....[they] can also play a part in helping a New Labour government deliver its social agenda in rebuilding our sense of community which has been undermined in recent years
>
> (Labour Party 1997)

> The first challenge is to demonstrate very clearly how art and artistic activity can transform the lives and hopes of those who are socially excluded or marginalized. And then make it happen, on the widest possible scale....Take, for example, the Look Ahead hostel in Aldgate in the East End of London, which I visited a couple of weeks ago. Home to 160 homeless men and women. It was a byword for hopelessness....But instead of despairing, the Look Ahead organization lived up to its name and had the imagination to bring in two people to start using art and drama and artistic activity to transform the hostel. It is now an almost unrecognizable place. It is covered in art works and mosaics made by the residents....The atmosphere sparkles....Involvement in art can give someone, however marginalized they may be from society, a sense of self-worth, a self-confidence, something to live for and feel proud about
>
> (Smith 1999: 15)

Part One reviews relevant literature on social exclusion and New Labour cultural policy (1997-2002). The research explores the history of the term 'social exclusion' and its political manifestation. It is relational, process orientated, multi-dimensional and tricky to quantify. There are problems as to whether it refers to a lack of resources and opportunities, to areas or people. There is no stable definition of the term and the discourse exposes its contested nature. The investigation also questions whether addressing the factors that cause exclusion actually creates a more inclusive society, as it has a deeper structural foundation. It assesses what inclusion ideally appears to be, and the individual drivers of this conception. The research also creates an order of exclusion that refers to people as against place. New Labour cultural policy (1997-2002), concerned the instrumental use of the arts (and sport) to address issues of social exclusion and promote neighbourhood renewal, through participatory arts programmes, within a wider framework of action. The government defined social exclusion specifically in terms of unemployment, lack of education and skills, poor health and environment, and the effects of crime. The research shows how the policies set out by the government's Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) and Policy Action Team (PAT) 10 (chaired by the DCMS to research the social impact of arts), influenced the Arts Council (ACE) with a particular understanding and agenda. It had a mixed reception with differing degrees of success. Much concern revolved around the issue of how to prove programme success and a corresponding emphasis on methods of evaluating social impact.

Chapter 2. Social Exclusion

2.1 Derivation and History of the Term 'Social Exclusion'

In order to begin this research, it is important that the history and definition of the concept of social exclusion is examined.

The term 'social exclusion' which has a continental origin, has been in use for nearly thirty years. Rene Lenoir, former French Secretary of State for Social Action is attributed to have first coined the phrase in the 1974 publication *Les Eclus: Un Francais sur Dix* (cited in Collins et al 1999: 5). But it was the French Socialists, according to Janie Percy-Smith (2000: 1) who helped popularise the term in the 1980's. They used it to represent and aid marginal groups gain access to the system of social insurance as well as to emphasise the need for social and economic cohesion.

Graham Room (1995: 1-4) traced the use of the expression back to the work of the European Commission on Poverty. By the third programme (1990-4), the emphasis and language had changed from that of poverty, to a concern with the integration of the least privileged. An 'Observatory' on policies to combat social exclusion was introduced. This constituted an agglomeration of research institutes dealing with social policies in relation to the family, the elderly and social security. The programme was called Poverty 3: 'By the time the programme was launched, "social exclusion" became the fashionable terminology. It is debatable as to how far these shifts reflect any more than the hostility of some governments to the language of poverty, and the enthusiasm of others to use the language of social exclusion' (1995: 5).

Jos Berghman (1995: 17-18) showed how the language of exclusion was a logical extension of issues of poverty. He scrutinised and distinguished between direct poverty (living conditions and consumption) and indirect poverty (income), explaining how researchers and experts had confused the two concepts. The measurement of poverty was highly relative (the differential between rich and poor varied from country and locality), unlike the emphasis on deprivation, which was the foundation for the more comprehensive and dynamic concept of social exclusion.

Similarly, Room made the distinction between poverty which is primarily an issue of the distribution of resources, and social exclusion which focuses on relational issues like inadequate participation and lack of social integration. He then framed each concept in terms of different intellectual and cultural

perspectives. Poverty, reflected an Anglo-Saxon and very British liberal concept of society, based on the marketplace in which individuals competed for resources. Social exclusion referred to a more continental and particularly French tradition of social analysis, where society was seen in terms of status hierarchies, mutual rights and obligations. In this framework social rights were emphasized: 'Social exclusion can be analysed in terms of the denial (or non-realisation) of these social rights: in other words, in terms of the extent to which the individual is bound into membership of this moral and political community' (1995: 7).

These two frameworks reflect different traditions of analysis; British pragmatism and functionalism as against French structuralism. Interestingly, the third European Commission tried to integrate the two traditions, by investigating social exclusion in both relational and distributional terms.

Chiara Saraceno expanded these two traditions to three: 'French republican notions of solidarity, Anglo-American liberal individualism and the European social democratic notion of conflict based on hierarchical power relations' (Saraceno 2002: 6). This trilateral strand created a discourse of competing opinions and positions, rather than a specific stable concept of the term: 'The EU discourse on social exclusion has oscillated between these different "paradigms" over time, without clearly choosing among them. Thus, on the one hand it stresses the social rights dimension .... on the other hand it privileges employment as the main route to inclusion' (2002: 8). But poverty and employment, present with their focus on economic inclusion, a modernist framework of understanding, the idea of universal progress towards the eradication of poverty and more equitable distribution of resources. Whereas social exclusion, in terms of individual and collective rights, is multidimensional and more dynamic. It may refer to parenting or housing; education or nutrition. It has a more postmodern foundation. Here the holistic nature of the term can be seen in terms of its constituent and interconnecting parts. This concept of social exclusion incorporates and affects a range of fields of knowledge, for instance educational, political, cultural and economic. It is within this framework of understanding that issues of culture become apparent. Saraceno was also aware of the contradictions and conflict between individual, community and national exclusion, and how an excluded individual could be included within a specific community.

Overall, the concept of social exclusion has a strong European grounding. It can be seen to be holistic, multidimensional and highly elastic. But there are different traditions and contexts within which it is

embedded. These create a complex framework of understanding which is not without inherent contradictions.

2.2 Poverty and Social Exclusion

This distinction between poverty and social exclusion can be further elaborated. In terms of defining poverty, individuals and groups, Peter Townsend (1979: 31) assessed that people, 'can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities which are customary, or are at least widely encouraged or approved, in the societies in which they belong'. Whereas Alan Walker (1997: 8) understood social exclusion as, 'a more comprehensive formulation which refers to the dynamic process of being shut out, fully or partially, from any of the social, economic, political and cultural systems which determine the social integration of a person in society'. Berghman distinguished social exclusion and impoverishment, which denoted process, from concepts of poverty and deprivation, which denoted outcome. He highlighted the extent to which European programmes of research refocused around a curriculum of social exclusion rather than of poverty. He defined the term, 'as a breakdown or malfunctioning of the major societal systems that should guarantee full citizenship' (1995: 20). Therefore it concerned much more than just resources and consumption, being both comprehensive and dynamic in character. It considered civic, economic and social integration, as well as a lack of participation and power. This directly resulted in the denial or non-realisation of rights, hence its affinity with concepts of citizenship.

Therefore poverty can be seen as just one aspect of social exclusion. Consequently Room remarked that, 'there appear to be no unique, formal definitions of social exclusion that would command general consent' (1995: 235).

The European Commission's Poverty 3 put forward three leading principles of social exclusion: multidimensionality, partnership and participation, emphasising the process element of the concept. This has helped develop and improve a conceptual framework that goes beyond financial imperatives. The irony in Britain was that in 2001, just when the language of social exclusion was being grasped and utilised, the income gap between rich and poor was at its widest:

> The share of all UK income received by the poor has steadily decreased since 1981....with a fresh

fall under Labour after a seven year plateau....[in 1999-2000] The poorest fifth of households had 6% of national income after tax, while the share held by the top fifth has risen under Labour from 44% to 45%. (Ward 2001a)

Such uncomfortable reading for the government, adds a cynical twist to the change of language from poverty to social exclusion, and questions an agenda of inclusion which seems to help disguise the increasingly iniquitous economic reality. Furthermore, it disputes whether such a process orientated emphasis can offer a more effective solution to the acute social problems rooted in poverty.

2.3 Social Exclusion, Employment or Engagement.

The multidimensional nature of the problems that contribute to social exclusion is hardly a confederacy of equally important factors. James McCormick and Graham Leicester (1998) assessed that, 'The clearest factor in excluding people from the mainstream is poverty, both absolute and relative....The strongest cause of exclusion is lack of work....Low pay is not only a cause of poverty but in part a symptom of low status'.

Exclusion concerns basic economic and educational factors, hence the INPART (Inclusion Through Participation) research project funded by the European Commission, found that, 'most of the current inclusion policies....are, in fact, employment policies, aiming to increase people's employability and stimulate their labour-market integration'. The aim was to decrease dependency on welfare benefits, which is not the same as, 'promoting social inclusion in its wider sense' (INPART 2001).

It found problems with such a policy. Firstly, with whether the focus on employment was feasible or desirable for all socially excluded people. Secondly, whether social inclusion should be restricted to issues of employment, as it needed to be understood in terms of wider social participation. This it called 'engagement', where the excluded have their needs matched in terms of participation. It argued that social exclusion needed to be tackled through, 'bottom-up community based initiatives rooted in people's own attempts to "make something of their lives"' (INPART 2001), reflecting a self-help philosophy that promoted self-development.

This wider concept of social exclusion requiring engagement and participation, above and beyond employment measures, is a radical shift away from a conservative social policy agenda. Both require a

deeper analysis and critique.

2.4 A Critique of Social Exclusion and Poverty

There is a political agenda manifest in the language of exclusion. David Byrne (1999) perceived definitions of both poverty and social exclusion as steeped in the ideology of possessive individualism. He compared this focus with Anglo-American conceptions of citizenship which were inherently individualistic, a 'culture of poverty' where, 'the poor's own attitudes and values are identified as the source of their poverty in a process of blaming them for their own condition - the contemporary version of Protestantism's excluded and morally deficient non-elect' (Byrne 1999: 21). He castigated policymakers and economists, as it was their accounts of poverty which failed to recognise the morality embedded in such a paradigm, and the judgement of those in poverty as unworthy, although possibly redeemable, sinners.

The problems were political and due to the failure of any real class-based understanding. By concentrating on the individual, this denied a proper collective framework and awareness. Byrne conceived that the underlying paradox was, 'the inherent tension between an economic system founded on possessive individualism and ordered through free markets on the one hand, and democratic majority government, especially when informed by the principle of subsidiarity, on the other' (1999: 28). His controversial analysis mirrored the globalised nature of capitalism within a new post-industrial framework that re-confirmed the hegemony of individualism and the work ethic:

> it is perfectly evident that the possession of some combination of cultural and financial resources is the basis of membership of the superclass. In income terms this comprises the top 5 per cent of income recipients....who have accumulated massive real wealth. We should also note that this superclass generally regards itself, in atheistic terms, as a Calvinist elect. Its members have 'achieved' through inherent worth and regard themselves as fully entitled to their consequent differentiating privileges. (1999: 129)

Byrne concluded that it was impossible to eliminate social exclusion through policy directed at the excluded alone, as it was inequality, wealth and dominance of the superclass and globalised capital that

perpetuated this situation, hence the need to redistribute this wealth and influence. Localised coalitions against such globalisation needed to be developed for there to be any chance of reversing this situation. Therefore poverty was not just inextricably linked to exclusion, it was the major causal factor.

2.5 An Excluded Youth Underclass

One area of exclusion that is of particular importance, concerns adolescents and young adults. Robert MacDonald (1997) was concerned that Western societies were possibly witnessing the rise of an underclass of 'dangerous youth'. He related this youth underclass to the problematic process of becoming adult, and to altered social, economic and political conditions. He compared this with the parental generation's transition to adulthood. This reflected the transformed but fractured consensus of today, compared with that of the post-war years: 'Until the mid - 1970's, the clear majority of young people could make what are regarded now as successful, secure and normal transitions to work, to social independence and to economic security in adulthood' (Macdonald 1997: 20). Today the position of youth, particularly those disadvantaged by class, ethnicity and lack of qualification, is highly unstable: 'Thus middle-class youth can still, in main, trade on their cultural capital and carve out relatively successful paths through education into middle-class jobs' (1997: 21). There are many who reject the underclass theory, for instance Kirk Mann (1994), who maintained that there was far more diversity in terms of a black market of jobs, and undisclosed incomes.

2.6 An Exclusive Society and the Breakdown of Consensus

With reference to the broader social perspective, exclusion reflects a breakdown of the consensus. Jock Young mapped out this golden age of post-war consensus and inclusivity and compared it to the exclusive society of today:

> If the first moment in the 1960's and 1970's was that of the rise of individualism, the creation, if you like, of zones of personal exclusiveness, the unravelling of traditionalities of community and family, then the second lasting through the 1980's and 1990's, involved a process of social exclusion. This is a two-part process, involving firstly the transformation and separation of the labour markets and a massive rise in structural unemployment, and secondly the exclusion arising

from attempts to control the crime which arises out of such changed circumstances and the excluding nature of anti-social behaviour itself. (Young 1999:6)

This Young understood as the transition from modernity to late modernity, from inclusive to exclusive society. And accompanying this exclusivity was a widening inequality.

Accordingly, one result of this breakdown of consensus, has been the disproportionate growth in the number and reconviction rates of criminals. There has been an increase in the number of prisoners in England and Wales from 42,000 in 1992 to a record breaking 70,000 in March 2002 (Home Office 2002). This is a massive increase of 67% in ten years. Furthermore, this is predicted to rise to between 91,400 and 109,600 by 2009 (Travis 2002). More worryingly in 1998, 72% of all young offenders and 58% of all prisoners were reconvicted within two years (Social Exclusion Unit 2002: 5).

The direction of British society, has been moving towards increasing individualism and exclusivity, with more and more individuals and communities excluded from participating in and mutually engaging with it. This is a massive problem of engagement and social participation which goes beyond functional issues of employment.

2.7 Individual Choice and Deviancy

This change in consensus coupled with consumer patterns, has given rise to more pluralistic lifestyles. Young stated that,

The dialectics of exclusion is in process, a deviancy amplification which progressively accentuates marginality, a pyrrhic process involving both wider society and crucially, the actors themselves which traps them, in at best, a series of deadend jobs and at worst, an underclass of idleness and desperation. (1999:13)

Ironically, the more individualised and pluralistic society has become, with increasing individual choice, the greater people's insecurity. Anthony Giddens (1991) referred to this damage as affecting people's 'ontological security' and creating 'existential anxiety'. This he saw as realised in terms of the increase in usage of therapy and the need for self-actualisation. Choice had now become, 'a

fundamental component of day-to-day activity' (Giddens 1991: 80) which has undermined traditional systems of security and inclusivity. Beliefs and certainties had become disorientated by such a morass of relativism.

Young saw three areas and levels of exclusion. On economic terms as exclusion from work, a more general exclusion between people, and an encroachment of private on public space. 'Thus we have a privatization of public space in terms of shopping malls, private parks, leisure facilities, railways, airports, together with the gating of private property. These now commonplace precautions are backed by stronger outside fortification, security patrols and surveillance cameras' (1999: 18). Similarly an expansive criminal justice system was forcing ever more offenders into hidden and excluded spaces. This 'exclusive dystopia' reflecting high modernism, has created a corresponding underclass that has too readily become a scapegoat for all societal problems. Exclusion, can therefore be seen as endemic within a modern individuated capitalist framework.

2.8 Inclusion

It is important to understand what social inclusion appears to be and how it is achieved. Addressing the factors that cause exclusion may not necessarily transfer into creating a more inclusive society. Gabriel Chanan (2000), peered behind the political rhetoric and implication that there is an inclusive society from which certain people are excluded. He described what inclusion would appear like, noting that the term involved an interaction between people and place:

> The first factor would be having a job - or having had one, and, largely in consequence, possibly having some property or assets; or living in a household which has at least one person in employment. This factor immediately indicates a different relationship to the locality from that which applies to excluded people. Included people have maximum opportunity for local community involvement but are not dependent on it....
>
> The privileged person can engage with his/her locality to a variable, freely chosen degree. Well-off localities are generally safer, people are more mobile, there are more and easier places to meet.
>
> The ultimate sanction is that people have the option of not being there at all - they have a saleable property, they have the means to move elsewhere, their whole psychological orientation in relation

to the place is one of positive choice....

In poor localities the relationship of the individual with the locality is more obligatory and more fraught....More people....are likely to have a 'structural' relationship with the public services - whether as claimants, tenants or social service clients, or all three. People are likely to be more pinned down to the locality by lack of the means to be mobile, to commute, to have wide leisure choices. (Chanan 2000: 203-204)

Chanan, although he recognised the diversity and relativity of the term 'exclusion', tried to set baseline targets to show that improved community activity and development could be quantified. These revolved around the individual in terms of time spent in the locality, and community activity (awareness and involvement in local groups and organisations). His own fieldwork showed that 5 per cent of a sample taken from 230 households were highly active in community organisations (9 per cent moderately active). These people, who tended to be over forty, with a long-term association in the locality, white-collar workers or professionals, were the drivers of inclusiveness (2000: 208-209). Therefore, the excluded were dependant on specific people already included in the community.

Ruth Levitas (1996: 5) criticised the use of the term social exclusion, 'which is contrasted not with inclusion but with integration, construed as integration into the job market....[as it] treats social divisions which are endemic to capitalism as resulting from an abnormal breakdown in the social cohesion which should be maintained by the division of labour'. She understood this new Durkheimian hegemony as failing to appreciate unpaid labour and confusing the inequalities between those in work. Like Byrne, she perceived a false morality, which resulted in blaming individuals for their situation when it was inherent to the economic system. Such a confusion of terminology further questioned what the condition of social inclusion really was and whether it was attainable.

Richard Sennett (1999: 27) went further to suggest that work destroyed social inclusion: 'Social cohesion was diminishing in the workplace largely because the social honour that attaches to being an employee is diminishing. Honourable work is now symbolised by the entrepreneur rather than the employee'. This excessive individualism, was undermining the mutual ties and responsibilities that constituted inclusion.

Inclusion itself is a contested site. Firstly inclusive drivers are located in specific (already included)

characters which negates self-management. Secondly it is confused with integration. Thirdly, the work ethic a large contributory factor of exclusion, is in contrast seen by the government as the key factor for addressing exclusion. This contradiction questions its real intention and commitment to wider social participation.

2.9 Wider Parameters of Inclusion/Exclusion

The complex and dependant relationship between social inclusion and exclusion is analogous to Hall's double definition of cultural identity. The first was perceived in terms of a collective shared experience, mythology and history, the second in terms of how such identity has been fractured, the difference expressed in 'what we have become', and the reality of the future. These two complimentary identities are,

> 'framed' by two axes or vectors, simultaneously operative: the vector of similarity and continuity; and the vector of difference and rupture....the one gives us some grounding in, some continuity with, the past. The second reminds us that what we share is precisely the experience of a profound discontinuity. (Hall 1990:226-7)

Hall was referring to his own perspective and the effects of the Afro-Caribbean Diaspora, history of slavery and colonial subjugation.

But there is also a mythical history associated with social inclusion. The post-war unanimity when social classes were codified, adhered to with little social mobility, allowed such a consensus. Working class solidarity was a counterweight to bourgeois hegemony, and everyone knew their place. Such an idealised and epic British tradition failed to recognise the inequalities, racism and double standards which have since been acknowledged. The reality today and future vista is one of increasing exclusion, disharmony and conflict. The grand scheme of a ubiquitous inclusive society is a mere pipedream. The relative certainty and inclusivity of the 1950's and 1960's, which has morphed into the pluralism and exclusivity of society today, has been accompanied by: an increased wealth differential, the diversification of lifestyles, growing individualism, a greater ethnic and class synthesis and closer integration of the world. These have all created a rampant insecurity and fractured consensus. Hence

the need to exclude others. There is something of Hall's two positions of cultural identity in the inclusion/exclusion dialectic, not just in terms of reality, but also in terms of the mythology inherent in such perceptions. Therefore the concept of an inclusive society is an ideal, whereas the excluded version is a reality.

To define differing degrees of exclusion, predicated on more individual terms, there needs to be an order in which to frame the term. Therefore the research suggests five orders, that are the symptoms of exclusion, in order to disriminate between the different types:

There is a first order exclusion; those who are physically removed from society. Here exclusion can comprise a constituency that resides in prison, long-term psychiatric hospital and geriatric home. A second order exclusion refers to those economically disadvantaged, who are homeless or live in the most deprived neighbourhoods, lack jobs and the skills to do them. A third order of exclusion concerns those whose exclusion is concerned with poor communication. This can be due to disability or health, or because their first language is not English (arguably these people may well be included in their own ethnic community). A fourth order comprises those who choose exclusion (for religious, ecological or personal reasons). Lastly there is a fifth order of virtual exclusion. It refers to the mythology of Hall's vector of continuity, but more particularly to Jean Baudrillard's (1988) concept of simulation.

Accordingly, the term 'exclusion' is used to conceal that society is exclusive and excluding in general. Mark Ryan analysed the terms of 'exclusion' and 'inclusion' as examples of a political fantasy language, vacuous buzz words that are used for spin purpose, signifiers that have another signification. This, 'new language....rather than giving expression to a world that already exists....creates a world of its own, a virtual world, related more to how people might want to view things than to how they really are' (Ryan 2001:16).

These five orders of social exclusion with reference to people, reveal the heterogeneous nature and complexity of the term. This is particularly important when understanding cultural exclusion, which, refers moreso to individual and collective values, than place or lack of resources.

2.10 Summary

This chapter concerned social exclusion, which Room recognised as originating in France and steeped in a tradition of social analysis, with an understanding of social rights and obligations. He established

that there was no stable definition of the term, and unlike the term poverty it was relational, process orientated, multi-dimensional and hard to quantify. There were problems as to whether it referred to a lack of resources and opportunities, to areas or people. Berghman distinguished the process of exclusion with the outcome of poverty, and how it had a close association with concepts of citizenship. Its definitional mutability also reflected the differing cultures from which it had originated. Saraceno created separate paradigms of understanding; with French notions of solidarity mixed with Anglo-American liberal individualism and European social democratic concepts of power hierarchies. Byrne's critique of traditional definitions of poverty and more recent ones of social exclusion, identified them within a framework of possessive individualism, reflecting a contemporary version of the Protestant work ethic, with associated guilt and moral deficiency.

Room reasoned that interest in social exclusion was due to a general governmental dislike of the poverty agenda, and measures to combat social exclusion had in effect been concerned with reducing unemployment, as has been the case in Britain. But INPART argued that this denied the wider importance of engagement and social participation. Chanan's fieldwork revealed that the drivers in community activity have tended to be white-collar, middle aged and already included, which exacerbates the concern that such figures may further alienate excluded youth in particular. Such a constituency Macdonald argued, are perceived to represent a dangerous and unstable underclass, whose transition to adulthood is unfortunately more difficult than its parental generation's before.

Young associated the rise of individualism as the major causal factor of exclusion. There was a mythological presumption underpinning notions of inclusivity, which looked backwards to a supposedly inclusive and consensual British society of the 1950's and 1960's. Increasingly since then, society had proceeded to become multi-cultural and plural, with working class solidarity which was a counterweight to bourgeois hegemony, becoming further fractured. The emphasis on the individual and a privatising of public space, had further eroded notions of inclusion.

Levitas criticised the use of the term social exclusion, which was contrasted not with inclusion, but integration into the labour market. As such social divisions were endemic to capitalism, there were ethical considerations regarding the promotion of inclusion as an ideal. Sennett suggested that work itself, and a corresponding emphasis on the individual entrepreneur within a malignant form of capitalism, destroyed inclusion and the mutual ties and responsibilities underpinning the term.

Five orders of social exclusion were created which related to the dimension of people, and showed the range and degree of exclusion. But these are mere symptoms, not causes of the problems.

Chapter 3. Cultural Policy

3.1 Introduction

In order to understand the transfer and effect of the discourse surrounding social exclusion from the European Union to a British perspective, and particularly with reference to the arts, this thesis looks at the cultural policy of New Labour, which has concentrated on human capital as a means of renewing run-down neighbourhoods and communities. Accordingly, New Labour set up the SEU and PAT10 to research the impact of the arts on this agenda. The DCMS later established the Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team (QUEST) to investigate and address corresponding issues of performance. Furthermore, PAT 10 embarked on a dialogue with ACE, in order to influence its policy.

3.2 The Social Exclusion Unit (SEU)

The repercussions of the European debate on social exclusion were felt in Britain, and the New Labour Government manifest these concepts by setting up the SEU in Dec 1997, only months after its election victory. The Prime Minister, Tony Blair, asked the SEU to report on, 'how to develop integrated and sustainable approaches to the problems of the worst housing estates, including crime, drugs, unemployment, community breakdown and bad schools etc' (Blair cited in Policy Action Team 10 2000: 5). Such 'joined-up' thinking targeted four key performance indicators for successfully tackling social exclusion, namely: 'more jobs, less crime, better health, and improved educational attainment' (Social Exclusion Unit 2000: 37). The SEU set up 18 Policy Action Teams (PAT's) which dealt with the differing aspects of social exclusion: 'The[se] teams would not be made up exclusively of Whitehall officials. Instead, they would bring in outside experts and people working in deprived areas to ensure the recommendations were evidence-based and reality-tested' (Policy Action Team 10 2000: 5). Such findings would provide a reservoir of information for future government policy.

This included the acronym PAT 10, which investigated the impact of the arts and sport on neighbourhood renewal. It reported on how best to use the arts, 'to engage particularly those who may feel most excluded, such as disaffected young people and people from ethnic minorities' (Shaw 1999: 3). This research was overseen by the DCMS which had also drawn up its own Social Inclusion Action Plan embedded in four key themes for the arts: the promotion of access with regards to audience, the

pursuit of artistic excellence and innovation, to foster the arts as key to the success of the creative industries and finally, to use the arts to nurture educational opportunity (Department for Culture, Media and Sport 1998).

3.3 Policy Action Team (PAT) 10

PAT 10 was split into two areas, one researched sport and social exclusion, the other arts and neighbourhood renewal.

3.3.1 Art and Neighbourhood Renewal: Key Findings and Principles

PAT 10 set out to discover the, 'best practice in using [the] arts to engage people in poor areas....[and] how to maximise the impact on poor neighbourhoods of government spending and policies on [the] arts' (Shaw 1999: 3). The initial intention was to concentrate on 'robustly' evaluated arts initiatives and projects. The report found few of these, but much evaluation. There were only three fruitful sources cited. These included research by the Irish Arts Council on poverty and art, and the Australian Council for the Arts on the social effects of Community Arts projects. But it was the research completed by Comedia[1] which the PAT team considered exemplary, and in particular, Francois Matarasso's methodology of evaluating the social impacts of the arts was perceived as good practice. Not surprisingly he became a member of the PAT 10 team and chair of the Best Practice subgroup (Policy Action Team 10 1999: 78).

PAT 10 placed a good deal of emphasis on forthcoming initiatives, intentions and working schemes (Shaw 1999: 21-4; Policy Action Team 10 1999: 22-35). It concluded that the arts had to be far more a, 'part of the mainstream planning process at all levels of government' (1999: 28), and that longer term planning and funding for programmes was necessary, as well as an emphasis on evaluation which had to be built into them from the outset.

It listed nine key principles that brought out the potential of the arts in regenerating communities: valuing diversity, embedding local control, supporting local commitment, promoting equitable partnership, defining common objectives in relation to actual needs, working flexibly with change,

---

[1] Which with Williams' work for the Australian Council for the Arts is critiqued in ch 5

securing sustainability, pursuing quality, and connecting with the mainstream to ensure initiatives are not isolated. (Policy Action Team 10: 1999: 41-7)

But, as the report suggested, there was little evidence to prove this in practice.

3.3.2 The Evaluation of Impact on Neighbourhood Renewal

PAT 10 noted that the dearth of good evaluation practice was deemed to be due to: the lack of pre-specified outcomes and baseline starting data, the difficulty in measuring these outcomes which were hard to determine and contentious, and the short-term nature of sponsorship which restricted finance and time impacting on evaluation (Collins et al 1999: 13). It concluded that there was stronger evaluatory evidence to support sport than the arts.

There were six reasons given for the lack of appropriate evaluations of the arts in terms of their social impact: firstly, the motivation of art funders and organisations who measured the arts differently. Due to the financial determination of projects, evaluations tended to be devised to satisfy funders. Secondly, confusion between evaluation in terms of aesthetic and social objectives, with evaluators versed in one being unable to utilise the other. Thirdly, that artists and art organisations felt uncomfortable about being evaluated and were not used to this 'culture'. Fourthly, the prohibitive cost of employing an evaluator. Fifthly, the lack of longitudinal evaluations due to the short-term nature and funding of projects. Finally, because the arts funding system had not made any policy decisions to invest in these areas of social exclusion and non art funders had not made any policy decisions to utilise the arts (Shaw 1999: 6-10).

There was a marked difference between research into art and sport. The latter looked at specific areas and aspects of exclusion: poverty, gender, youth and delinquency, sexuality, age, ethnicity, disability, mental illness and learning difficulties, rural exclusion and urban exclusion (Collins et al 1999: 33-57).

But its overall conclusions were similar. Although,

> most programmes are now monitored.... evaluation is tentative, indicative and anecdotal, because insufficient (human and financial) resources are given to it and insufficient intellectual attention in most cases expanded to identify outcomes and gather the necessary evidence to demonstrate them. (1999: 26)

One of the key problems was the methodology needed to evaluate the success of art projects, and, 'potential tension between the fairly narrow, output-driven performance Indicator (PI) approach.... and the more holistic measurement of outcomes' (Shaw 1999: 4), as set out by the New Economics Foundation (NEF)[2]. Its agenda was realised in practice through the use of formative as against summative evaluation techniques, and the use of social auditing as against 'hard' objective and scientific evidence.

PAT 10 looked to a more pluralistic version of formative evaluation, which was an amalgam of best practice. It quoted Gerri Moriarty[3] (another member of PAT 10's Best Practice subgroup), who concluded after evaluating the impact of the Bolton City Challenge Cultural Activities Project in 1995, that it was, 'counter productive to adopt any one method of assessing impact. It is more useful to use a case study approach using a check-list to identify which methods may be most appropriate for each project' (Moriarty cited in Shaw 1999: 20). It also referred to John Harland's work (Harland et al 1995) on attitudes to the arts[4], for the National Foundation for educational research (NFER) and recommended it as 'essential reading' (Shaw 1999: 14).

3.3.3 Recommendations

PAT 10 made three substantive policy recommendations. (Policy Action Team 10 2000: 39-40).

Firstly, that funding bodies should ensure that an external evaluation and the finance to implement it, becomes integral to every arts programme, and that such bodies should develop an action plan to promote access to the arts for black minority ethnic and disabled citizens.

Secondly, that government departments should implement PAT 10 best practice principles and, 'avoid imposing solutions on the communities they are intended to serve' Those departments involved with crime, health and education should consider how the arts can realise social inclusion impacts.

Thirdly, that the Arts Council, 'provide a positive response to the report showing how [it] will: develop stronger partnerships with other agencies; consider novel funding arrangements for community groups;

---

[2] social auditing is more fully explained in 5.5.2

[3] also a Comedia researcher who had problems with evaluation method see 5.5.4 & 5.5.5

[4] Harland et al's concept of artistic participation and the effects of negative attitude is set out in 10.3

and involve the voluntary sector'.

Such recommendations and principles were both contentious and difficult to implement.

3.3.4 A Critique of Key Principles

But PAT 10's nine key principles which supposedly realised the potential of the arts in regenerating communities, were critiqued by two community based arts organisations from the West Midlands, c/PLEX and Jubilee Arts, who applied these principles to artists' residencies. One of the contributors artist Danny Callaghan, observed that,

> the focus is on the artist as liaison, communicator and workshop leader, as well as someone with craft skills....[which] has major implications regarding the cultural and socio-economic identity of the artists, and the skills needed to function effectively. The emphasis would increasingly appear to be placed on the need to inspire and translate the ideas of a community; in effect to develop collective intellectual capital, rather than simply product. (Patten & Callaghan 2000: 41)

What Patten and Callaghan were concerned with, was the lacunae between theory and practice. PAT 10 was successful at advocacy, but in reality such standards were far more difficult if not impossible to action.

For instance, 'valuing diversity' in community based participatory arts programmes should be a two-way process, sharing ideas and perceptions. Too often this turned out to be a form of cultural colonisation by the artist of the participants. 'Embedding local control' had important considerations and 'implications for those acting as intermediaries between the artist and host community' (2000: 43). This referred in particular to evaluatory issues concerning project objectives and outcomes, and the management of the programme. Again such a process could be short-circuited according to management needs. Similarly, in order to ensure that, 'equitable partnerships' were promoted, the benefits and risks involved had to be made transparent to all parties involved, to ensure the longevity and proper evaluation of the project. Again may not be impossible to implement. Both, 'working flexibly with change' and, 'embedding local control' reflected PAT 10's emphasis on overcoming the barrier of tailoring programmes to project criteria rather than community needs. Callaghan suggested

that, 'the dominance and influence of arts facilitators and funding structures in defining residency models has increased massively over the last ten years' (2000: 46) and the success, flexibility and scope of such projects had been duly manipulated. 'Securing sustainability' was also another ideal, as programmes were short-term, lacked integration, 'deal with symptoms rather than causes and tend to be driven by the structure of existing Government machinery rather than the needs of socially excluded individuals or communities' (2000: 46). As regards to, 'pursuing quality across the spectrum', PAT 10 perceived the importance of arts projects as, 'sustaining high quality, rather than as a distinct or opposed activity, by the widening of opportunity and the broadening of horizons....[in which case] notions of quality and benefit are easily and increasingly confused' (2000: 47).

It also claimed that programmes, 'should not be conceived in terms which stigmatise or condescend to those in the neighbourhoods concerned. The aim is to give everyone the opportunity to develop their talents and broaden their horizons and to strive for best practice in delivering services to enable people to develop their skills' (Policy Action Team 2000:39). Although this is theoretical, as PAT 10 was purely an investigative team, its use of language is confusing. It is disingenuous and patronising to refer to the 'quality' of programmes alongside issues of condescension, particularly if the socially excluded are supposedly participating on projects for their own benefit and maybe for the first time. This is an example of the application of language irrespective of context. It seems that without putting the tag of 'excellence' and 'quality' onto an arts programme, this symbolises that it lacks value. Political correctness therefore dictates that the output has to be of 'quality' as funding is dependent on this. Benefit is perceived to be integral to this 'quality', which is different from a position that accepts that the excluded should be allowed to, 'develop their talents' and express their creativity, irrespective of 'quality'. Furthermore it is unclear who are the arbiters of 'quality' and determine whether the value of any artistic input or output is undermined. Presumably not the participants.

Paul Monks director of Core Arts, an innovative multi-arts project for the mental health community in Hackney, described the problems of, 'embedding local control' and, 'defining common objectives in relation to actual need'. In 2002, the organisation dealt with 250 clients across fifteen London boroughs. Monks explained that, 'members did not want to sit down and discuss the project in terms of direction. It took four to six years informally and eight to ten years formally before the membership started to own it' (Monks 2002). The mental health community as he suggested was a highly excluded

one. It was a very slow and difficult process to encourage stakeholder input and ownership, which questions whether such objectives and outcomes are realistic for excluded communities, even if they can secure sustainability.

PAT 10's key principles were idealised and difficult to actualise in practice, which is not unrelated to its promotion of a particular governmental inclusive agenda.

3.3.5 Building on PAT 10

Two years on from the initial PAT 10 reports, saw the publication of an interim report *Building on PAT 10*: 'This progress report captures the extent to which culture and leisure have become part of the neighbourhoods renewal process' (Policy Action Team 10 2001: 5). The terms, 'art and sport', had now been replaced by the wider terms, 'culture, sport and leisure'. All the DCMS interests were now shown to be involved in this agenda, including: libraries, museums, archives, the built and historic environment.

Accordingly, local authorities, following PAT 10 guidelines, had started to develop cultural strategies: 'In February 2001, the first Beacon Councils which exemplify excellent practice in social and economic regeneration through culture, sport and tourism were announced' (2001: 6). Action plans for promoting access to the arts for both people from ethnic minorities and the disabled had been instigated with an emphasis on partnerships.

The report boasted how, 'sponsored bodies have accepted social inclusion as a genuine objective for culture and sport' (2001: 5). But crucially, the language of the report had changed, from 'exclusion' to 'inclusion'. This semantic management had already been explained as a necessary positive emphasis, ensuring that policy documents, 'should avoid reinforcing negative impressions of a place or its residents/users' (Shaw 1999: 27).

The report's main focus concerned the Arts Council's, 'strategy for promoting social inclusion through the arts' (Policy Action Team 10 2001: 5) and that there was widespread acceptance that this was a legitimate objective of cultural policy. The report now listed five governmental areas of impact for social inclusion: 'improved educational achievement, increased employment prospects, improved health, reduced crime and improved physical environment' (2001:7), the last being additional to the original list.

It stressed multi-agency working, partnership and that the arts alone could not tackle social exclusion.

It demonstrated policy changes in line with its own thinking, in a range of organisations involved in the arts.

The DCMS had established QUEST, and evaluation was to be undertaken by Leeds Metropolitan University's Centre of Leisure and Sport Research on fourteen projects. The eventual report was entitled *Count Me In*[5]. Their research strategy (in line with PAT 10's recommendations) referred to the need for long-term five to seven year monitoring and evaluation exercises.

3.3.6 Misinformation

But this *Building On PAT 10* report was also a clever exercise in misinformation. The document concluded that when PAT 10 was originally commissioned in 1998 to research into the social impacts of art and sport:

> it is fair to say that the regenerative powers of culture and leisure were not widely seen, outside of their own spheres, as significant contributors to neighbourhood renewal. Among commentators, and in the sponsored bodies and public bodies themselves, there were concerns that spending on deprived communities would mean less for the highest quality in cultural life. Since then all have embarked on a voyage of discovery. (2001: 98)

On analysis, this can be seen to be tautological. PAT 10 admitted that evaluation research was on-going, but that there was very little robust evaluation to confirm that there was any link between neighbourhood renewal and the arts and this report contained no fresh non-anecdotal evidence. Furthermore, such a claim as to 'the regenerative powers of culture' is hardly surprising in light of the political direction and influence of New Labour and the DCMS on such public bodies to involve themselves in this policy direction. But as there had been little new evaluative evidence or proof, the argument appears circular.

This report was overtly political, as it advocated how PAT 10 had developed influence over the two

---

[5] reviewed in 6.4

years since its creation, and really only showed how effective it had been in persuading especially the Arts Council. These supposed regenerative powers of culture to rehabilitate the excluded, had been assessed and expanded upon prior to PAT 10's creation, for instance in Comedia's work in the 1990's. Charles Landry and Lesley Greene suggested that,

> Arts and cultural activity have become an increasingly important part of urban regeneration in Britain....[and] increasing interest is being shown in *participatory* arts programmes.... This use of the arts coincides with a shift in emphasis in regeneration strategies towards seeing local people as the principal asset through which renewal can be achieved. (Landry & Greene 1996:1)

The *Building On PAT 10* report showed how political pressure had been exerted to achieve governmental objectives. But the obsessive and continued emphasis on the need for measurable 'hard' evidence to prove project success, seemed contradictory, particularly as PAT 10 had already advocated the utility of the arts in this area, without any. It was a fait accompli that questioned the need for any hard evidence, as spin and advocacy had determined the agenda.

The political dictat of addressing social exclusion has been the 'cause celebre' of New Labour. It was an ideologically driven campaign, with a hidden double agenda. Firstly it took a particular position and definition of social inclusion. Secondly, it successfully short-circuited the 'armslength' principle by directly influencing and controlling the policy of the (supposedly) independent Arts Councils. Furthermore this shift away from local democracy and government in the 1980's and 1990's under the previous administration, had been re-enforced by the New Labour government.

There was little evidence to prove that the arts and culture addressed social exclusion. But this seemed to have become immaterial, as the report concerned political advocacy and 'spin' supporting a government policy of social inclusion.

3.4 The Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team (QUEST)

In order to assess the performance and quality of publicly funded bodies with regards to combating social exclusion, the DCMS created QUEST in 1999, which emphasised the importance of planning and strategy, suggesting three important areas. Firstly, clear objectives; secondly, to embed these

objectives into the core activity and thirdly; to create measures of performance that reflect governmental targets of wider community development (Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team 2002: 2). It wanted to create an analytical framework that firmly embedded government definitions (and targets) of social inclusion for organisations involved in the arts and culture. Not unsurprisingly it advocated the collection of solid evidence on which to base this methodology, which included accurate evaluation, measurement and research.

It also distinguished between the overlapping terms of cultural inclusion, access and community development as social inclusion was, 'not about providing access to existing services and programmes....[but] about ensuring that those services and programmes reflect the needs and interests of both existing and potential audiences and participants', (2002: 10). This culturally democratic sentiment recognised the importance of encouraging, 'cultural and sporting organisations to engage actively in debate about cultural values, both internally and with key stakeholders' (2002: 16-17). It made recommendations on how outcome indicators might be developed for future use. It stressed three possible avenues: 'the development of quality of life indicators.... the concept of cultural capital[6].... [and] the development of indicators of cultural deprivation' (2002: 20). By concentrating on and developing indicators of cultural deprivation and quality of life, this complemented social indicators of deprivation, which would help enable resources to be most effectively targeted[7]. QUEST hitherto, had not perceived performance methodology as providing solid enough evidence for the extent of and contribution that culture had made to government targets. Hence its understanding of inclusion/exclusion was specific, comparable and embedded in a particular culture of measured performance. But it is arguable whether quality of life and cultural deprivation indicators are able to truly reflect the subjective and value-orientated nature of these fields.

3.5 Arts Council Response

The Arts Council replied to PAT 10's criticism, by accepting that there was a difference between widening access to the arts and addressing social exclusion. It insisted that, 'combating social exclusion or poverty is not the primary aim of an arts funder and that to set out to use the arts for instrumental

---

[6] Bourdieu's theory of capital is explained in 8.3

[7] the measurement of cultural indicators is discussed in 5.10

purposes only is to undermine artists' work' (Tambling 2000: 2). But it accepted that the arts can have a life-changing effect on people and identified five areas in which it could advocate PAT 10's agenda. These included: profile-raising, examining the role of regularly-funded organisations [RFO's], evaluation, multi-agency working, and targeting resources' (2000:1).

The *Building On PAT 10* report published the Arts Council's Social Inclusion Strategy, which proved its, 'firm commitment to diversity and inclusion', recognising that it had not previously funded certain communities. It also acknowledged, 'that there is a difference between widening access to the arts and addressing social exclusion' (Policy Action Team 10 2001: 18). This type of advocacy was seen as a new departure for the Council. ACE created three priorities which were indicators of social inclusion. Firstly, to increase the number of attendances at Regularly Funded Organisations (RFO's), secondly, to increase by 500,000 the number of people experiencing the arts and lastly, to increase the number of touring performances and exhibition days. (Quality Efficiency and Standards Team 2002: 29). All quantifiable statistical data.

Its own action research on evaluation entitled *Gateway to Inclusion*[8], involving eighteen projects selected by Regional Arts Boards (RAB's), was, 'to evaluate the strengths and limitations of three different models of working with socially excluded groups' (Bridgwood 2002: 5) and with the DCMS *Count Me In*, evaluation would draw together a portfolio of good practice.

Not unsurprisingly, there seemed to be a lot of confusion surrounding this inclusion strategy, and government policy. Ann Bridgwood, head of research, admitted that PAT 10, 'emphasis on participation rather than on presentation of work represents a challenge for some parts of the arts funding system' (2002: 6). She asserted that the Arts Council agreed with PAT 10 that the arts had a potential contribution to make towards neighbourhood renewal and the SEU's indicators of social inclusion. But the Arts Council's dislike for such instrumentality was made apparent. Hence she attested that the attribution of causality required through the evaluation process was a, 'laudable aim, but one which does not make the researcher's task any easier. An arts intervention may only be one of a number of factors associated with particular outcomes' (2002: 11). In order to satisfy the need for robust evaluation, she recognised that this required PAT 10 to develop clear criteria of success.

---

[8] this report was unavailable due to unforeseen delays, earliest possible publication at the end of 2003.

Helen Jermyn, in her literature review of the arts and social exclusion for ACE concluded that too often, 'The motivation for much of the formal monitoring and evaluation that takes place in the arts sector has been to comply with conditions of funding' (Jermyn 2001: 9). Approaches of measuring the term were confused and, 'For many, both inside and outside the arts sector, social exclusion is an elusive concept and difficulties in defining and measuring it have led some commentators to question its usefulness as a guide for policy' (2001: 4). She acknowledged that there was a dearth of long-term evaluations, which she attributed to the confusion surrounding the term, and questioned whether this involved proving the social effects or showing that it was a tool for personal learning, and if these approaches were compatible. Similarly, whether positivistic (quantitative) and naturalistic (qualitative) approaches could be mixed. Traditionally, artists had self-evaluated. But the central point was that evaluation had always been deemed as secondary to the main purpose of arts activity. Besides the lack of funding for it, such utility was also, 'overstated at the expense of less measurable benefits' (2001: 9). She also stressed that there were a range of models of evaluating the arts, and concomitant methodological issues.

Michelle Reeves compiled a review measuring the economic and social impact of the arts for ACE, which was intended to complement Jermyn's research. Here models and methods of social impacts were explained which offered a range of interpretation. Besides the research by Peaker and Vincent (1990) into the arts in prison, and by Senior and Croal (1993) into the arts in a healthcare setting, Reeves focused on the research undertaken by Comedia which was supported by the Arts Council. She concluded that there was, 'scope for the development of a national framework for arts impact research'[9] (Reeves 2002:102).

But Bridgwood perceived that the research in this particular area would raise, 'some interesting questions about the nature of artistic practice and criteria of excellence. A new generation of artists is making a career in collaborative work with communities' (Bridgwood 2002: 13). Whereas Jermyn was unsure whether the current, 'focus of policy....on the value of the arts in reaching non-arts social inclusion goals such as health, should be considered one of the dimensions of social inclusion itself' (Jermyn 2001: 29). This focus on collaboration and instrumentality was carefully worded. But with

---

[9] see 5.10

regards to the Council's traditional aim of promoting excellence, it failed to make explicit whether the 'quality' of the work affected the inclusive process and particularly whether poor 'quality' work was unlikely to achieve this. Jermyn discussed the importance of art education and, 'that developments in people's education, skills and attributes can increase their personal or collective effectiveness' (2001: 18), implying a link.

Although ACE professed to have put social exclusion at the heart of its policy, it was not its primary aim. Correspondingly, its understanding of the term seemed to differ from that of government, with a dislike for instrumentality and focus moreso on increasing cultural capital through educational programmes.

3.6 A Critical Overview of New Labour's Policy on the Arts and Social Exclusion.

Firstly, the SEU (Social Exclusion Unit 2001b; 2002), was partial in its definition of 'social exclusion' and the prioritisation of specific groups. Accordingly, it aimed primarily at those 'inside' society, (second and third order of exclusion); not those fringe 'outside' members already excluded in institutions (first order exclusion). Some research emphasis has since been put on reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners but primarily outside an arts agenda. Social inclusion was not initially targeted at re-integrating those who had literally been excluded from society (for instance in hospital or prison), although improving health and reducing crime were two of the four key performance indicators.

Secondly, the arts were perceived to have a small role within the multi-disciplined joined-up approach of the PAT's. But this emphasis on the holistic nature of social policy, which was the strength of the SEU, could also be to the detriment of the arts. The danger for PAT10 as intimated by ACE, was that the concentration on social objectives, could undermine artistic work, as the arts become lost in their instrumentality.

Thirdly, the concept that participating in art projects helped support and embed local control thereby regenerating communities, was idealistic. Callaghan complained that realising the nine key principles was impractical, due in main to tailoring programmes to project criteria not the needs of the community. Moreover, in many metropolitan areas, there was only a vestigial concept of community or 'neighbourhood'. Communities were increasingly being determined by interest or career and unrelated to location. Landry & Greene (1996) saw the problem of community based on common interest, as a

key problem for the creative city. If projects enfranchised and empowered individuals, they would be more mobile and able to move out of run-down neighbourhoods, leaving the excluded behind. Alternatively, such areas may become ripe for gentrification, which further squeezes out the excluded. Fourthly, there was also a contradiction and friction between top-down control of the programme with a prescriptive evaluative agenda of social impacts, and a bottom-up one which was a more local and democratic system in which stakeholders determined the outcomes. In terms of methodology used for evaluation, PAT 10 also referred to the need for longer term 'robust' evaluation projects. But in reality it conceded that most art programmes were short-term and rarely integrated. Therefore the whole debate about acquiring external evaluators and creating a more objective stance with 'harder' facts was fanciful as short-termism was the norm.

Fifthly, the influence of PAT 10 on ACE, with its attempt to bring inclusion into the heart of its operations, seemed at odds with the Council's insistence that combating social exclusion was not its primary aim, and that such a position undermined artists' work. In which case ACE was responding to a political edict and trying to accommodate this new governmental direction. Moreover, there is an historical irony which refers to disagreements with the Community Arts Movement. This ambivalence towards the excluded and cultural democracy, impinged on the central tenet of its philosophy, that of excellence within a specific artistic canon[10].

But there were wider considerations. Tambling (2000: 6-7), referred to, 'the development of cultural performance indicators' and the need 'to develop a manageable number of meaningful and consistent indicators'. Performance indicators showed the hand of government and was a wider attempt at implementing an even more bureaucratic culture onto the Council that could be measured by auditors. Notwithstanding, Gerry Robinson (2000: 6), the Chairman of ACE, talked of combating a, 'Kafkaesque bureaucracy permeating throughout the whole system'. His evidence for this was, 'data collection without purpose or outcome; [and] an absurd number of performance indicators', which he perceived as a, 'sort of madness'. He stated that he wanted, 'to create a new relationship with the arts community, one based on trust and respect between funder and recipient, and one stripped of pointless answerability'. But most tellingly, he wanted to give 'artists space to do what they are here to do - to

---

[10] the relationship between the Arts Council and Community Arts Movement is explored in 9.4

make art'. In which case, if work with the socially excluded was to be heavily monitored, guided and punctuated with performance indicators, it was an admission that such work was not perceived as art. This is another example of how confusing and contradictory the rhetoric and reports emanating from ACE have been.

Sixthly, there was no emphasis placed on creative and positive leisure, its importance and relationship to work. The DCMS utilised the term in its action plan to ameliorate social exclusion, but key governmental performance criteria of tackling unemployment and increasing job skills were more concerned with the work ethic. The criteria of reducing crime, increasing health and improving the environment, would have benefited from a re-assessment of the importance of leisure, as could have the work ethic itself[11].

Seventhly, it could be argued that the hidden agenda of the SEU was to make arts organisations more accountable. The Arts Council had been directly influenced by PAT 10, regarding social inclusion. Such a government policy direction further stripped the Arts Council of autonomy and the 'armslength' it needed from government to achieve this. But arguably, this has been self-inflicted, due to an elitist heritage and continual failure to respond to a wider cultural democracy[12].

Lastly, there were more general and wider concerns. The educationalist Marjorie Mayo critiqued government emphasis on social exclusion and programmes to increase social capital:

> social policies to strengthen social capital may be compared with economic policies to extend the holding of share capital; particular individuals and groups may indeed benefit, but the underlying structure of economic and social inequalities remains relatively undisturbed. Particular individuals and groups may even come to experience increased social exclusion as a result. (Mayo 2000: 32)

Such measures failed to change the structures and system that had created the exclusion initially. The SEU could be seen as being tokenistic, as its aims were geared at tackling the consequences not the causes of exclusion. To really address such complex issues and problems required greater political intelligence, will, priority and resources.

---

[11] see ch 12

[12] As discussed in 9.4

Ravenscroft albeit considering the previous Conservative administration, tied public leisure provision to political ideology and the creation of the 'good citizen'. Therefore, behind the benign interest of this government in utilising the arts and sport for socially inclusive purposes, there was a far less beneficent rationale: 'Public leisure provision in Britain, as in all market economies, is now a central feature of a deeply divisive process of constructing a new citizenship, one in which the politics of choice has been replaced by the politics of means' (Ravenscroft 1993: 42). New Labour has much ambition in this area. Culture Secretary Tessa Jowell, spoke of the need to increase educational, social and cultural capital and referred to the utility of the arts in enabling the poor, 'to become active and rounded citizens....with the tools to survive in tomorrow's workplace' (Jowell 2002).

The SEU and government agenda was economically driven, in order to engineer a particular understanding of an inclusive society.

3.7 Summary

The cultural policy of the New Labour government was the focus of this chapter. It created the SEU in order to embed social inclusion into its departments and society in general, and originally targeted four indicators, namely: more jobs, better educational attainment, less crime and better health.

PAT 10 was consequently set up to research specifically into the impact of the arts and sport in helping to address these issues. It found that there was a dearth of evidence to prove the effectiveness of the arts. This was due in main to the lack of long-term arts projects and appropriate evaluations, caused in part by the short-term nature of funding. There was a confusion between evaluation based on aesthetic or social objectives and the motivation of arts funders, who measured value for money. It listed nine key principles that exploited the potential of the arts and a raft of recommendations. PAT 10's key principles were critiqued by members of two community based arts organisations: c/PLEX and Jubilee Arts. This concerned the difference between theory and practical implementation, confusion between notions of quality and benefit, as well as tailoring programmes to project criteria not community needs. Furthermore, Callaghan perceived that issues of 'local control', 'equitable partnership' and 'valuing diversity', were difficult to realise due to the cultural domination of the artists over the programmes. The latter *Building on PAT 10* report became a mere exercise in advocacy, with little evidence given to pupport the success of arts programmes to address social exclusion. PAT 10 was critiqued for

promoting unrealistic and contradictory top-down objectives framed within a bureaucratic management culture that did little to empower the programme stakeholders.

The research then focused on QUEST, which was created by the DCMS to report on the performance of publicly funded bodies. This concerned the implementation and evaluation of socially inclusive impacts and outcomes. It recommended how outcome indicators might be developed and the importance of access, cultural inclusion and community development. It emphasised the needs of audiences and participants. Underlying the DCMS position, was governmental concern for investment in culture and the arts, to realise delivery outcomes that reflected social policy, although it recognised that these might not be the primary goal. Hence its concern, in line with the European Commission, was to demonstrate the unique contribution of the arts, in terms of indicators that reflected quality of life and cultural deprivation. But it is arguable whether it is possible to measure such a complex and subjective area, and satisfy the DCMS agenda to create a comparable performance culture.

The Arts Council, in turn responded to PAT 10, in a confusing and contradictory manner. It created a policy that it claimed placed social exclusion at the heart of the organisation. This comprised an emphasis on best evaluatory practice, an equal opportunities policy and encouraging RFO's to work in partnership with community organisations. It created five areas in which it could advocate PAT 10's agenda and three priority targets of social inclusion. But there were dissenting voices.

Tambling insisted that combating social exclusion was not its primary objective and that there was a difference between widening access to the arts and addressing social exclusion. Bridgewood conceded that such a concern would raise questions about collaborative work and criteria of excellence. Jermyn recognised that the instrumental use of the arts would undermine not just artistic quality, but also the social objectives themselves, as these were dependent on such excellence. Moreover, its attempts to determine cultural performance indicators, reflected an increased bureaucratisation of the organisation, in complete contrast to the published wishes of the Chairman. Furthermore, the position taken by Jermyn that the value of the arts in realising instrumental agendas could be considered a form of social inclusion, although not expressly stated, could be perceived as re-positioning ACE to its traditional agenda of democratising 'high' culture, dependent on a particular concept of excellence.

Furthermore, the SEU was partial in its definition of social exclusion, aiming particularly at unemployed and ethnic youth. There was also a tokenism in terms of tackling this massive problem,

especially if exclusion is an endemic problem at the root of modern society. Similarly, there was a danger that by concentrating on a specific employment agenda, this could be at the expense of a more leisure orientated understanding of the arts, and corresponding values regarding the 'development of talent' and 'broadening horizons', stated aims of the SEU. There was more than a hint of social engineering underpinning this rationale and associated spin regarding PAT 10 delivery of success.

PART II - Evaluation

Evaluation is an opportunity to gain different insights and provide for many voices, but it is unlikely to provide a consensual understanding about what actually took place. Indeed that is exactly its value. It can tell you many things that you need to know but is unlikely to be a useful way of quantifying work.... it is not an effective method for defining and proving predetermined outcomes. Such an objective is best achieved by procedures such as monitoring and assessment

(Higham 1999: 17)

On the face of it, evaluation research would appear to be a retrospective, purely technical activity focusing on decisions already made, processes already in place, impacts already felt....How the social problem is articulated and how one describes or measures what occurs within an interventionary site is shaped and constrained by the evaluative discourse being used

(Vanderplaat 1996: 82)

He fell asleep murmuring 'sanity is not statistical', with the feeling that this remark contained in it a profound wisdom

(George Orwell *Nineteen Eighty Four*)

Part Two investigates the concept of evaluation, its history and methodology. It then critiques the research done by the Comedia organisation into the evaluation of the social impacts of arts programmes. Furthermore, it assesses important reports completed for major arts institutions. Lastly, it presents a case study of evaluation in practice.

PAT 10 and QUEST, emphasised the importance of evaluation to prove programme success, as it determined the value and worth of arts programmes for the socially excluded. By assessing the plethora of techniques the thesis shows their political orientation, determination, and particularly, how value-based qualitative information can be subjugated within a quantitative framework for reasons of expediency. This is highly relevant in today's measured performance culture. Blind obedience to normative evaluative practice runs the risk of failing to fully appreciate the value of the arts and their potential, but also helps to disempower those participants involved. The political nature of the term is revealed which taps into wider sociological and management discourses surrounding validity. That the excluded can be better empowered and enfranchised through taking control of the evaluative process is explored. Such ideas of self-management, challenge the maintenance and enhancement of power for those who already possess it.

The foundational research done by the independent research agency Comedia, in terms of utilising participatory arts programmes for specific social purposes, which was offered as a role model of working by PAT 10, is investigated. It advocated that the arts could aid society, help to creatively solve social problems and encourage regeneration. This critique exposes the contested nature of the territory, with regards to basing the evaluation upon aesthetic or social impacts, and particularly the extent to which the search for meaningful performance indicators is in response to bureaucratic needs. Issues concerning advocacy and evidence, stakeholder consent, intrinsic and extrinsic utility, as well as social auditing, the comparability of programmes, education and cultural rights are explored. The investigation questions the underlying ideology hidden behind a seemingly benign evaluative pragmatism.

Three official reports, compiled for major arts organisations in both direct and indirect response to PAT 10's emphasis on evaluation, are then analysed. They reveal interesting discrepancies between theory and practice, and contradictions within cultural policy.

Finally, a case study is constructed that illustrates the problems in practice. This revolves around personal experience as an external evaluator for an arts organisation that takes programmes into one of the most excluded communities, namely prison. It shows that the evaluation was funder led, lacked clarity and was poorly welcomed by the facilitators involved. It found evidence difficult to collect and social impact even harder to prove. The bricolage nature of the resulting evaluation was a highly practical method of trying to overcome this, but lacked depth and was hostage to the problems encountered by the programme. That a more methodologically rigorous approach to evaluation practice was neither possible or attempted, illustrates the responsive and improvised nature of the process.

Chapter 4. Evaluation Methodology

4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter it was shown how PAT 10 emphasised the need for robust evaluation procedures in order to prove the positive social impact of arts programmes. The thesis explores evaluatory methodology, history and philosophy in order to consider its utility and effect. There are several different perspectives and models that attempt to extricate value, which vacillate between various qualitative and quantitative methods. This literature review of models is necessary as evaluation involves a blending of different concepts, values and characters from diverse fields. Ultimately there are a range of political and democratic questions to consider.

4.2 History of Evaluation

Egon Guba and Yvonna Lincoln (1989: 22-49) analysed the history of evaluation in terms of four distinct stages which they named generations. These referred to their own American society:

First Generation was dominated by positivism and ideas current in the early part of the 20th century. It concerned measuring the knowledge of schoolchildren, in terms of testing memory. Such methodology was influenced by the emergence of the scientific management movement and the phenomenal rise of social science. They called this the, 'measurement generation' (1989: 26).

The Second Generation evaluation of the 1920s was in response to the deficiencies of the first, and to the limitations of measurement. An approach was taken, 'characterized by *description* of patterns of strengths and weaknesses with respect to certain stated objectives'. Therefore evaluation was seen in terms of a method with several tools at its disposal. This was the beginning of programme evaluation with 'the role of the evaluator.... that of describer' (1989: 28).

The Third Generation of the 1950s and early 1960s began to recognise that the, 'objectives-orientated descriptive approach had some serious flaws' (1989: 29). Now the evaluator assumed the role of judge, and became an authority on the subject using the previous tools of evaluation. It was very managerial in orientation. But such an, 'overcommitment to the scientific paradigm of enquiry' (1989: 35) reflected its failure to accommodate difference of value in a more pluralistic manner.

They attacked all three generations for their failure to accommodate value-pluralism, an

overcommitment to a positivist paradigm, and the extent to which they all disenfranchised and disempowered the stakeholders. Hence Fourth Generation evaluation was based on a constructivist paradigm that included differing perceptions and responded to stakeholder needs. This was directly influenced by 1960s American society in which respect and rights for individuals and diversity blossomed. In such case the evaluation became more, 'a paradigm of enquiry' (1989: 35), which reflected a failure hitherto to accommodate difference of value. The evaluator therefore became a non-judgemental facilitator and co-ordinator. The concept of participants as stakeholders, with different value systems, required a responsive hermeneutic evaluation, in terms of the evaluator accepting stakeholder interpretations in a more democratic fashion: 'Fourth Generation evaluation is a form of evaluation in which the claims, concerns, and issues of stakeholders serve as organisational foci (the basis for determining what information is needed), that is implemented within the methodological precepts of the constructivist inquiry paradigm' (1989: 50).

This historical analysis needs to be considered with an overview of evaluation methodology.

4.3 Evaluation Methodology

An overview of evaluation methodology and relevant positions taken, is described.

4.3.1 An Overview

Programme evaluation has been beset by methodological argument and discourse, which Ray Pawson (1996: 213) described as the, 'paradigm wars'.

Jennifer Greene (2000: 984) classified four approaches which she entitled postpositivism, utilitarian pragmatism, constructivism/interpretivism and critical social science. Postpositivism was based on quantitative method, experiment, survey and cost benefit analysis. Utilitarian Pragmatism was an eclectic mixed method utilising survey, interview, observation and document analysis. Constructivism/Interpretivism was a qualitative analysis based on case study, open-ended interview, observation, document review. Whilst critical social science was participatory, action orientated, involving stakeholder participation in the evaluation process, data collection and interpretation. Greene delineated each category on the grounds of value: Postpositivism in terms of efficiency, cost-effectiveness and accountability; Utilitarian Pragmatism in terms of practicality, managerial

effectiveness and utility; Constructivism/Interpretivism in terms of pluralism, understanding, context and promoting personal experience; Critical Social Science in terms of emancipation, empowerment, social change and critical enlightenment. Green also noted that the audience for the evaluation had moved from funders and policy-makers to the communities and stakeholders themselves. Similarly, she specified that the emphasis had changed from methods of evaluation to its purpose and role, re-centring the concept of evaluation around an enhanced socio-political understanding, as against the traditional emphasis on methodology and technique:

> Currently, the diverse approaches available to evaluators offer not only choices of methods, but also alternative epistemological assumptions (about knowledge, the social world, human nature) and distinct ideological stances (about the desired ends of social programs and of social enquiry. These alternative philosophies and methods (concerned with what and how we know) and alternative ideological stances (concerning the meaning of social and community life) are constitutive of their respective approaches. (2000: 984)

Therefore the nature of evaluation reflects an array of assumptions and positions taken.

4.3.2 The Positions

The positions that evaluation practitioners and theorists have taken are therefore exposed.

The more scientific positivist theories of Ray Pawson & Nick Tilley's 'Realistic Evaluation' (1997) are focused on pure quantitative evidence. Michael Patton's 'Utilization-Focused Evaluation' (1980a;1980b;1982;1987) refers to an eclectic mix of both quantitative and qualitative methods, which reflect function and practical application, as well as emphasising the accompanying decision-making process. Alan Bryman (1988:96) looked at the researcher/evaluator in terms of his or her relationship to the subject. A quantitative researcher adopted the posture of an outsider, looking in on the social world from an etic position, whilst the qualitative researcher got close to the subject being investigated, in order to formulate an insider or emic position.

Ernie House identified eight models of evaluation which reflected different needs and evidence. Half were of social utility: Systems Analysis, Behavioural Objectives, Decision-making and Goal-free.

Whilst the other half were subjective and pluralist: Art Criticism, Professional Review, Quasi-legal and Case Study. He saw evaluation as a comparative tool and defined it, at its simplest, as leading, 'to a settled opinion that something is the case' (House 1980: 18). Such consensual thinking and interest in validity, was balanced with a flexibility and awareness of the relative nature of the discipline.

There has been a split in qualitative thinking since the 1970's. This was epitomised on the one hand by the interpretivist Responsive Evaluation of Robert Stake (1978) who stressed the importance of the particular case, and local interaction of facts with values. He moved evaluation towards an ethnological narrative. Similarly, the Democratic Evaluation of Barry MacDonald (1997), who argued that evaluation was determined by a political agenda because it was embedded in the socio-political reality by definition. Both stressed participant views and their representation in the process.

On the other hand, Michael Scriven (1991: 1-43) argued against such an interpretation and emphasis being put on the stakeholder. He re-advocated the evaluator as researcher, accumulating, editing and analysing data collected. For him evaluation was a new academic field based on expertise and judgement, most obviously located in the sciences.

Dennis Palumbo (1987) also saw evaluation as inherently political, irrespective of the intention of the evaluator. Information in the form of numerical data was more often than not utilised to subjugate people, particularly for the purposes of organisational control.

The relativist position as described above by Lincoln & Guba's Fourth Generation Evaluation (1989), was a multiple of varying constructions and negotiated understandings that accommodated difference, in order to find points of collective understanding. This allowed evaluation to become process-orientated whereby the stakeholders negotiated the terms of the programme.

Clem Adelman (1996) argued that evaluators took a relativist position and thereby avoided judgement on how organisations used power and authority. He distinguished between evaluation and a, 'change agent', in which evaluation has been appropriated in order to raise awareness. Amanda Gregory (2000), emphasised the importance of participation and democracy in evaluation, and looked into the mechanisms of power that determined these processes. David Fetterman's 'Empowerment Evaluation' (1996) was centred around self-determination, and stakeholder involvement, with the evaluator role one of facilitation. This was in response to his own work with marginalised and disenfranchised communities. Angela Everitt's 'Critical Evaluation' (1995) explored ways in which evaluation in a

social context could be developed as a critical discourse. Thomas Schwandt's 'Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics' (1997) argued that evaluation needed to be dialogical and a framework for interpretation and understanding one another.

4.4 Formative and Summative Evaluation Design

For Hakon Finne et al, that evaluation methodology gathered around either formative or summative design reflected wider issues of democracy:

> Formative evaluation approaches typically aim at improving program performance, take place while the program is in operation, rely to a large extent on qualitative data and are responsive to the focusing needs of program owners and operators. Summative evaluation approaches typically aim at assessing outcomes and impacts; they take place towards the end of a program or after its conclusion. Statistical studies are more frequently used: they measure success against formulated goals for the purpose of judgement and sometimes take on an auditor's role in assessing the use of public expenditure. (Hakon Finne et al 1995: 12).

The emphasis and effect of formative evaluation is on the democratisation of social programmes through the evaluation process. They added that:

> Evaluations are carried out as constructive dialogues between stakeholders, with the evaluator acting primarily as a communication agent. The results of these hermeneutic processes, it is argued, are changes in the cognitive maps of the participants, which do not really occur until they have changed their practices. In a way, the evaluation results are effects of use rather than the other way around. (1995: 14)

Adelman agreed that formative evaluation had a greater democratic element as it, 'admits more representational equity than summative, and giving equal voice to all stakeholders also admits diversity' (Adelman 1996: 292). Guba and Lincoln (1989:184) explained this democracy using the term, 'responsive focusing', a process by which formative evaluation can re-position itself in response

to stakeholder needs and project requirements by, 'using the claims, concerns, and issues of stakeholders as the organising elements'.

In which case the structure and methodology of the evaluation is enmeshed within wider political issues, with a formative method allowing greater democracy and stakeholder control.

4.5 Evaluation in Terms of Social or Aesthetic Impacts

For this investigation the distinction between the evaluation of social or aesthetic impact is important, as there has been much confusion and mutual exclusion of the two terms[1]. Patton categorised four different types of qualitative evaluation: Value-free, Responsive, Connoisseurship, and Utilisation Focused and made the vital distinction between,

> Responsive evaluation [which] places the program's stakeholders at the centre of the evaluation process [and] Connoisseurship evaluation [which] places the evaluator's perceptions and expertise at the centre of the evaluation process. The researcher as connoisseur or expert uses qualitative methods to study a program or organisation but does so from a particular perspective drawing heavily on his or her own judgements about what constitutes excellence. (Paten 1980b: 120)

This 'Connoisseurship' category reflected the traditional understanding of assessing excellence in the aesthetic canon, whereas the 'Responsive' category reflected how social and educational programmes have traditionally been evaluated in terms of assessing impact.

This reflected the thinking of House. Of his eight model categories of evaluator approaches, there are two of particular relevance for this research which reflect these two concerns, the evaluation of the aesthetic and social. With regards to evaluating the social impact of arts programmes, his Behavioural Objectives, model was built around achievable objectives and measurability, reflecting social utility, whilst his Art Criticism model was a more diffuse and amorphous model, based on subjective knowledge, intuition and sensitivities within the artistic canon. House critiqued each approach and inherent assumptions.

---

[1] as set out in 3.3.2

4.5.1 A Critique of the Behavioural Approach

House (1980: 227-230) critiqued the Behavioural approach, with a caveat that it was the most popular among evaluators. Its validity lay in the technological manner in which it pursued outcomes, in that objectives had to be prespecified, precise and exhaustive in order to be measurable. But this measurement then defined such success, not what actually happened in the programme. Hence the purpose of the programme may not reflect the impact achieved. In which case there is an artificiality inherent in the programme (especially if the programme is of an artistic subject, but measuring behavioural change). Other criticisms revolved around the issues of who defines the goals and in whose interests. Possibly House's most acerbic criticism was the most straightforward, questioning whether the actual behavioural goals can be measured, and similarly, if the prespecification of objectives distorts the programme, and if such outcomes are arbitrary. Hence when these techniques are applied, 'certain faults appear'.

4.5.2 A Critique of Art Criticism

House (1980: 235-238) critiqued the Art Criticism approach in terms of validity, value and legitimacy. Because it was so intuitive and learned, drawing on the evaluator's own experience, such judgements lacked legitimisation and contained bias. Issues of what and why particular criteria were utilised and on what values these criteria rested, needed to be made transparent. As did issues concerning the audience for the evaluation and the construction of evaluation reports, making them accessible to those who possibly lacked any great knowledge of the field. In terms of value, this needed to be verified and objectified.

4.6 Politics and Independent Evaluation

Palumbo recognised the conflicts faced by evaluators that accompanied practice, in terms of political agendas and evaluatory independence: 'The political dilemma facing evaluators is to steer a course between recognizing the political reality of evaluation and retaining the symbolism of neutrality' (Palumbo 1987: 20). The evaluator was both critic and advocate of the programme, in which case facts could easily become peripheral or twisted to fulfil hidden agendas. He concluded that:

value-free neutral research is not possible nor desirable. Values inevitably are part of any evaluation. This means that evaluations will not result in a 'correct' finding: they will take a political position about the desirability of various goals, whether *directly*, by judging that the goals are worthwhile, or *indirectly*, by concluding that the goals are being achieved efficiently. Evaluation, therefore, becomes a part of the goal-setting process in organisations....a process that is unquestionably political. (1987: 32)

Palumbo saw the need for all stakeholders to have a part in the goal setting process, hence the need to consult them. He concluded that rational assumptions in evaluations tend, 'to favor a certain *kind* of politics, one that fits well with the basic assumptions about individual "rationality", calculation of costs and benefits, and the maximization of "efficiency"' (1987: 246). One of the two major assumptions he highlighted was the 'individualistic' premise in which all, 'collective action can be reduced to statements about a model individual without contextuality' (1987: 241). The other referred to presumptions made concerning rationality; 'the "individual" is assumed to be a purposive, self-interested and efficient maximizer of utilities', able to prioritise and rank principles and preferences, 'such that *utility* can be defined as a numerical representation' (1987:241). A homogeneous evaluation report based on this stilted 'rational' and 'individual' human, can be thereby quantified in terms of programme success. Evaluators therefore needed to recognise the dynamics of policy formation, the use of information and how it is fed into wider processes.

Barry MacDonald (1993: 107) formulated three models of evaluation that reflected the political impetus behind it.

Firstly, 'Bureaucratic Evaluation' in which, 'evaluator[s] accept.... the values of those who hold office, and offer.... information which will help them to accomplish their policy objectives'. They therefore bend to the will of clients, and evaluations are internal and integral to a functioning bureaucracy, but lack independent control. This method prioritises service, utility and efficiency.

Secondly, 'Autocratic Evaluation' in which the expert offers an external evaluation, independent and focusing on educational merit: 'His techniques of study must yield scientific proofs, because his power base is the academic community', to whom he is accountable. This method prioritises principles and objectivity.

Thirdly, 'Democratic Evaluation', which is an emerging model, and is more 'an information service to the community' The evaluator is an information broker and deals pluralistically in method with regards to all the relative views and values: 'His main activity is the collection of definitions of, and reactions to the programme'. This is a more transparent system which recognises confidentiality and people's right to know. This method prioritises negotiation and accessibility.

4.7 A Constructivist Model of Evaluation

The recognition of such political and hidden agendas, and need for a more democratic methodology, was the starting-point for the constructivist model of evaluation, initiated by Guba and Lincoln's Fourth Generation Evaluation.

4.7.1 Fourth Generation Evaluation

The methodological classification set out by Greene earlier owed much to Fourth Generation Evaluation with its constructed and value-orientated character. The relativist position set out, approached evaluation on a situation-by-situation basis, taking account of context. It was a 'discovery' based method as against the 'verification' posture of positivist scientific thinking. It also took the claims and concerns of the stakeholders as a primary consideration unlike the a priori methodology of positivism where questions and approaches had been worked out prior to and irrespective of stakeholder input. This constructivist territory denied any "true" state of affairs, and accepted that such constructions through which people make sense of their situations were shaped by their values. The evaluator therefore wasn't a technician gathering information but 'an orchestrator of the negotiation process' (Guba & Lincoln 1989: 10). They suggested that:

If nothing else, commitment to responsive constructivist evaluation replaces the arrogance so easily assumed by the conventionalist, convinced that he or she had found out about 'reality', with a humility appropriate to the insight that one can never know how things 'really' are; that one's construction about how things are is *created* by the inquiry itself and is not determined by some mysterious 'nature'. To substitute relativity for certainty, empowerment for control, local understanding for generalized explanation, and humility for arrogance, seems to be a series of

clear gains for the fourth generation evaluator. (1989: 47-8)

Guba and Lincoln argued that there was no one right method of evaluation, which ebbed and flowed and had to be refocused. They also showed that the act of judgement needed to be outside any one person's jurisdiction, and reflect all views and tastes.

4.7.2 A Critique of Fourth Generation Evaluation

Pawson a positivist, attacked this position and argued that it demonstrated the competition for, 'epistemological supremacy' (Pawson 1996: 213). He named it disparagingly the 'constructivist three-step'. His three-pronged attack concerned firstly, the concept that social impacts cannot be conceived as independent variables but, 'regarded as complex processes of understanding and interaction' (1996: 214). Secondly, that there was a misplaced emphasis on accommodating stakeholders and searching for points of collective understanding. Thirdly, that such a position misrepresented the programmes which were not supposed to be process of negotiation, and that consequently evaluators were not negotiators. He argued that it was impossible to accommodate such multiple realities and reach consensus, as knowledge lacked neutrality and information was selective. He also railed against the, 'militant agnosticism' of such an approach with its minimised scope of understanding, and saw knowledge as transferable from one context to another: 'Context is simply the current background circumstances which encourage or enable a particular group of stakeholders to be assembled for negotiation' (1996: 217). The constructivist case was tautological.

Pawson unveiled the effect of this understanding, in terms of programmes being, 'people-led endeavours' and not, 'objects of external change-producing programs'. The weakness in the constructivist paradigm is accordingly its, 'inability to grasp those structural and institutional features of society which are in some respects independent of the individual's reasoning and desire' (1996: 217). He also attacked the claim that there was or could be a consensus of knowledge, as this assumed that there was a joint community or neighbourhood assumption about its makeup, a consensus. The social world was beyond individual interests, hopes and beliefs. People-led programmes fell down precisely because there was no consensus, and facilitators had to determine direction either directly or more covertly. There was no, 'single authentic voice of the dispossessed....[it] invariably turns out to be

multiple' (1996: 217). His judgement on constructivism was that it is too readily centred on the people making the programme work as against the programme itself, and thereby was inadequate in terms of its capacity to build a methodology for evaluation. His view was that the story format, an ethnographic account of participation based on the reality of the stakeholders involved, lacked substance and was hostile to scientific analysis. He argued for evidence as against interpretation.

Amanda Gregory also accused Guba and Lincoln of naivety and idealism in their assumptions about the evaluation process, which was, 'unlikely to promote participatory practices....which is fundamentally important to those evaluation methodologies that embody a subjectivist epistemology' (Gregory 2000: 188).

Such critiques of fourth generation evaluation offer balance, and show the extent to which this method is an ideal which can be manipulated for ulterior purposes, especially with regards to confusing advocacy with evidence.

4.8 A Pluralistic Evaluation of Inclusion

Greene recognised how evaluators were concerned with warranting their knowledge and method of enquiry, especially in terms of non-biased opinion or evidence. Hence there had been a shift from a framework concerned with methodological rigour to a more pluralistic political-ethical one. This positions evaluation in practice and is concerned with its inclusive effects on stakeholders and capacity to express their needs and views.

She perceived qualitative evaluation as a narrative which reflected individual biography or the evolution and dynamic of the group. Her constructivist framework allowed an understanding of diversity and multi-perspectives, hence the importance of, 'on-site observations and personal interviews.....supported by reviews of relevant documents and records' (Greene 200: 990).

But a plural method also included quantitative method within a qualitative framework (social auditing for instance) and even if there were methodological variations, there were important common areas: 'sampling for diversity, triangulating for agreement, and monitoring bias' (2000: 991). She stressed the importance of authenticity and understanding.

Greene also insisted that although advocacy was at odds with a disinterested, neutral and distanced evaluator (who intended to find an objective 'truth'), that this was the reality in practice: 'In short while

soundly disclaiming advocacy as bias, evaluators of this genre recognise the undeniable leanings of all evaluation and embrace those most comfortably with their own philosophy and biography' (2000: 992). Her constructivist viewpoint and method challenged the methodological rigour of traditional technique. But evaluation, if it concerned meaning, value and lived experience, was necessarily subjective and incorporated the values of evaluators. Therefore the role of evaluation necessitated a balance of, 'social scientific theories and knowledge construction, interpretation and representation with the political realities of social policy making....[and] through explicit commitment to inclusiveness, to pluralism, to ensuring that all stakeholder voices are part of the conversation' (2000: 995). This could be described as a transparent evaluation of inclusion.

Adelman was also concerned with bias and particularly how the evaluator understood the wider socio-political picture. He argued that evaluation had taken refuge in various relativistic discourse and avoided judgement in terms of the power relations that are part of organisational control. This was due in part to a lack of consensus, 'regarding the social responsibilities of the evaluator towards various "stakeholders" and the wider community' (1996: 291). He suggested that,

> relativism is out, multiple realities are acknowledged within cases, but power and moral authority and the well-placed communicative act are universals, and the means to 'define the situation'. This does not mean that the dominant view is ethically acceptable. For instance, in a democracy denial of equity is contrary to the principles of democracy....Now, evaluators are specialists in the gathering of data upon which they or the reader will construct judgements of the worth, merit or quality of the activities. They have to be aware of the social principles enmeshed in the evaluation and, knowing these, become sensitized to selective collecting of data. In writing a report, the evaluator can either make explicit these principles and argue for the evidence for and against each.... evaluation....or make out that as an evaluator they are merely accurately reporting those events about which they have data. (1996: 294-5)

Adelman criticised using evaluation as a progressive modernising tool in terms of the needs of stakeholders, as it was a reactionary control mechanism. He sensed an irony that such a modernist methodology was at odds with a postmodern reality,

but not with 'the postmodern condition' of feelings of fragmentation of integral social principles and a desperate seeking of sources of unity and community - which, by the way, may be the condition of all reflexive evaluators in their historical situation. However, postmodernist critique does not construct; there is not the sense of optimism and hope that may be integral to programs. (1996: 302).

Such being the case, the danger was that evaluation too readily reflected a political agenda, far from an objective data gathering pursuit. Evaluators needed to recognise their own position, where and how they were embedded in the whole process.

4.9 Empowerment, Critical Evaluation and Practical Hermeneutics

The interpretivist/constructivist paradigm has undoubtedly enabled a new and radical approach to evaluation, which has now attached itself to more critical and aware concepts from the social science field concerned with social change. Empowerment Evaluation, Critical Evaluation and Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics are examples.

4.9.1 Empowerment Evaluation

Fetterman defined empowerment evaluation as, 'the use of evaluation concepts, techniques and findings to foster improvement and self-determination. It employs both qualitative and quantitative methodologies' (Fetterman 1996: 4)

As a process its objectives were to empower stakeholders through their involvement in the evaluation process, in which case the evaluator was a facilitator, encouraging self-determination.

There are several pragmatic steps involved in helping others learn to evaluate their own programs: (a) taking stock or determining where the program stands, including strengths and weaknesses; (b) focusing on established goals....(c) developing strategies and helping participants determine their own strategies to accomplish program goals and objectives; and (d) helping program participants determine the type of evidence required to document credibly progress toward their goals.

(1996: 18).

This was in response to Fetterman's own work with the most marginalised and disenfranchised populations and their need for self-determination.

4.9.2 Critical Evaluation

Everitt argued for a critical evaluative method. She recognised that evaluation had been utilised as a tool of management control, which, 'not only.... bring[s] about a surveillance of practice at a time of massive inequality, budget rationing and privatization, but also staves off any possible threat to the status quo and existing power relations which a critical scrutiny of practice may bring with it' (Everitt 1995: 174).

An evaluative framework had to; be open to dialogue, promote equal opportunities, able to provide stakeholders with a structure for their stories and develop understanding. Such a self-reflective critical evaluation allowed stakeholders to think independently and autonomously. This thereby enabled stakeholders to assess their own experience and how their understanding had been shaped, which was empowering. Everitt argued that little attention had been placed on such 'value' in evaluation, as it had been constructed for other managerial purposes:

> The predominant values of our society maintained and strengthened through a myriad of processes and actions, have seemed to render, in systematic ways, some people vulnerable and fearful with little access to resources to enable them to live a full and flourishing life.... Furthermore, the 1990's has witnessed a host of values, particularly 'family' values, telling us how we should or should not live our lives. Values must be treated with care, constantly appraised for the ways in which they can become absolute regimes of truth, significant parts of discourses that maintain power relations in an unequal society. (1995: 185)

Hence the dangers of quality of life and cultural deprivation indicators, which can be used as a conduit for other managerial or governmental discourses and agendas, leaving the excluded even more

vulnerable and exposed[2].

Madine Vanderplaat also discussed the problems of evaluation processes in terms of furthering communicative and critical capacities which would enable social change. This she viewed as more a problem of discourse than practice, beyond technique. She recognised the attempts by empowerment-orientated practitioners to, 'develop strategies which will enhance the ability of the disempowered to affect social change on their own behalf' (Vanderplaat 1996: 83), which were embedded in a more collective rather than individual conception. Her concern was that empowerment-orientated evaluation may, 'stifle the practical and emancipatory knowledge to be gained' (1996: 94), by concentrating on technique.

4.9.3 Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics

These sentiments were also expressed by Schwandt who suggested that evaluation needed to be dialogical as opposed to monological in practice. He saw evaluation as practical hermeneutics which, 'rejects the modernist paradigm of subject-object thinking with its ideal of a determinate object, "out there" waiting to be known through a process of methodological self-awareness by a disengaged knower' (Schwandt 1997: 75). These dialogical encounters and understanding of others had to be recognised through a framework of interpretation. The evaluator as facilitator enabled this by encouraging educational and cultural critical reflection. He saw this role as one in which, 'the evaluator works more as partner - generating supplementary perspectives, enabling conversations, introducing new ideas about evaluation logic, facilitating examination and critique (including criticism of the tradition informing the practice of evaluation defined by the general logic)' (1997: 80).

This re-orientation allowed the evaluator a critical voice informed by specialist knowledge, which encouraged the questioning of any particular authoritative point of view. It aimed at the self-transformation of the stakeholders. Schwandt insisted that, 'we must recognize and accept the essential ambiguity and contested nature of interpretation' (1997: 80).

He stated three areas where these shifts should appear. Firstly, in education in terms of, 'critical reflection and transformation not reproduction' (1997: 79). Secondly, as a subjective humanising conversational dialogue as against objective concentration on method. Thirdly, to help stakeholders to

---

[2] such indicators were advocated by QUEST in 3.4

cultivate critical intelligence in order that they can determine whether the end product or outcome of the project is worth getting to, thereby allowing participants to refine their own practices in a self-reflexive manner.

4.10 Stakeholder Participation in Evaluation

In order to realise these radical frameworks set out above, the participation of stakeholders in evaluations is vital. To establish that they should be driven by participant needs and not by those of experts and managers is itself a highly sensitive, political and counter cultural exercise.

Amanda Gregory (2000: 180-4) cited and critiqued Rebien's three criteria that distinguish whether evaluations were participatory. Firstly, that stakeholders had active roles in terms of identifying information needs and designing terms of reference, beyond being docile objects. Secondly, that as it was impossible to include all stakeholders in the evaluation process, representatives should be involved in lieu. Thirdly, that stakeholders should participate in at least three stages of the evaluation process: designing terms of reference, interpreting data and using evaluation material.

Gregory argued that the first principle of stakeholders having an active role in practice was negated by the expert status of the evaluator/facilitator, which, 'tends to create a relation of dependence'(2000: 181) and contrary to stakeholder enfranchisement. Rebien failed to recognise such ingrained tendencies. Therefore Gregory cited Rahman and his concept of 'animation' as a way of countering this. It is, 'the process of empowering people to regard themselves as the principal actors in their lives in order for them to unlock states of mental dependence and apathy and to exercise their creative potential in social situations. Animation implies a process of learning through participation' (2000: 182).

The second principle was criticised as it failed to include all variety of opinion. It also allowed those involved to over-emphasise their concerns and even manipulate the process (to the detriment of those not involved). Representation is therefore fragile and not coterminous with full participation.

The third criteria denied a full involvement in the complete process so that understanding remained partial, and restricted the likelihood of participants to eventually self-evaluate. It also gave the impression that the evaluation could be stilted and mechanical. Such an understanding and practice lacked selectivity and a critical attitude.

Gregory also judged that these criteria were not fully defined and therefore could result in a negative impact on future stakeholder participation. The main problem revolved around how to engender participation of stakeholders in the evaluation process, and that this was a neglected issue. One major assumption was that stakeholders were motivated and wanted to be involved. Furthermore, even if stakeholders were willing and exposed to the process they could still be put off by the complexity of making the procedure fair. There was a lack of consideration of this and guidance as to how to conduct such evaluations.

Underlying her concern for participation were political considerations: 'Power is really the great unmentionable in evaluation theory....we've approached it through the back door in talking about participation and barriers' (2000: 194). In order to look at how the processes of power operate in the evaluation setting, she referred to Ledwith's Sites of Oppression matrix (2000: 195-7). This matrix was based on a Freirean pedagogy in which sites of patriarchal oppression could be identified and stakeholders working with the evaluator were enabled to investigate these mechanisms of power, which allowed a shift to critical consciousness for the stakeholders. But such complex understandings and systems for combating the inbuilt and unseen effects of power (this matrix has a multitude of variables), were in contrast with the need for, 'simple techniques that can be incorporated into our existing evaluation methodologies' (2000: 198), which included the stakeholders in the complete process. Gregory concluded that, 'Effective participation in evaluation is problematic' and that there is, 'a lack of transparency in participatory methods in evaluation' (2000: 197).

Unfortunately, the actual democratisation of the evaluation process is riddled with problems, not least the complexity of methods needed to counteract traditional top-down processes and the time and money needed to operate such systems.

4.11 Summary

Evaluation methodology and the history of the field was the subject of this chapter. Historically, evaluation has moved from measurement, to description, to judgement, to construction. It has a mutable and flexible nature. There are a plethora of evaluative designs and methods in use covering a spectrum of applications.

Greene demonstrated that different methodological positions reflected diverse values and purposes,

which included the need for both qualitative and quantitative techniques.

Finne et al distinguished between a formative method that responds to programme needs and allows bottom-up participant input and therefore greater democracy, and a top-down controlled, summative and outcome focused method.

Both Patton and House distinguished between traditional social and aesthetic objectives which have utilised different methodological frameworks. The former being concerned with a responsive framework as set out by Stake within an interpretist paradigm, in which the stakeholders are the focus of the enquiry, and the evaluator tries to understand their perceptions. The latter revolving around the evaluator as expert and connoisseur, whose perception determines the outcome, hence the enquiry is steeped in his or her experience and judgement. House critiqued a 'Behavioural' model as too precise, with prespecified objectives possibly obstructing reality. This questioned the goals and purpose of the programme, as well as who determined these, which all needed to be transparent. Similarly, he critiqued an 'Art Critical' model as lacking objectivity and reflecting the values and opinions of the critic. Therefore it lacked legitimacy from the stakeholders concerned.

Palumbo and MacDonald were concerned with the politics of evaluation, and the independence of the evaluator, which was perceived to be an ideal. They showed that evaluation methodology is far from objective, reflecting the needs and designs of interested parties.

That evaluation is teleological, interested, reflective and dependent on context, was explored by Guba and Lincoln. Their Fourth Generation evaluation was set within a relative interpretist and constructed paradigm. But such a concept is in danger of slipping into a subjective morass, where value becomes so fractured, that there is no consensus beyond the individual case.

Pawson insisted on a more rigorous scientific approach, to avoid unaccountable selectivity and an excessive focus on the individual as against those institutional and structural features of society. He assumed that there was no collective consensus and no single voice of progress for the dispossessed. He wanted to focus on the programme itself not the people involved. Even so, an objective value-free position is as much an ideal as a context specific subjectively constructed understanding.

Greene argued for a pluralistic and pragmatic line which considered a shift away from methodological rigour, to a more political-ethical framework positioning the evaluation in practice which considered the needs of stakeholders. She urged authenticity within an interpretivist understanding but with an

acceptance of the political realities. Key issues of service, objectivity, democracy and access in evaluations had very different and sometimes opposing frameworks and codes of understanding. The triangulation of evidence allowed a degree of objectivity and the incorporation of other viewpoints, but too often the evaluation method was utilised as a means to an end, not an end in itself.

Her inclusive sentiment was at odds with Adelman who argued that evaluation was a reactionary control mechanism which accepted the dominant view without question and was therefore based on undemocratic principles. By evaluation concentrating on the individual perspective, this failed to recognise even hindered any collective impact, or the real world which to all intents and purposes was an independent entity. Social problems could not be addressed by individual understanding alone. Similarly, there was a need for a consensual goal for participants. He highlighted the danger of the evaluation system denying equity, with minority interests and ethical frameworks overruled by dominant ones. He also perceptively questioned how a modernist evaluative framework interacted with the postmodern condition of the world.

Empowerment, Critical and Hermeneutic Evaluation techniques as set out by Fetterman, Everitt, Vanderplaat and Schwandt, opened the door to a more democratic framework that enabled the disenfranchised. The democratisation of and participation in the evaluation process by stakeholders is vital for the most excluded and disenfranchised populations, as this is a valuable empowering tool. Gregory examined such stakeholder participation and the problems of setting up a practical framework. She showed that the complexity of systems to neutralise any inbuilt autocratic power structures within the evaluation were hardly compatible with the need for simple processes that included stakeholders. Participation had to be voluntary, therefore evaluation needed to be accessible and relevant. In practice it is hard to replicate ideal theory.

This literature review has thrown up some difficult contradictions, not least how an advocatorial evaluatory method concerned with proving success coexists with an evidential realistic objective appraisal. Similarly, the extent to which political and managerial interests override any realistic or idealistic concern with stakeholder input and control. Even so, each method still has to contend with an imperfect world and the diktats of funding bodies.

Chapter 5. Critique of Comedia's Research into the Evaluating the Social Impact of the Arts

5.1 Introduction

From 1993, the left-leaning independent research and publishing organisation Comedia, produced a wealth of books, reports and working papers concerning the social impact of the arts and regeneration. These ranged from concepts that concerned the creative city, urban planning and design, to cultural policy and the social impact of participation in arts projects. It was highly influential on the DCMS and government, with a raft of research published, just as the New Labour regime started its governance. Chris Smith, cited Comedia in his *Creative Britain*, when suggesting that cultural activity can regenerate run-down areas:

> The work that has been done over the last three years by the Comedia group has highlighted the enormous benefits of this. Indeed the conclusion of Comedia's work - in places as diverse as Bolton, Nottingham, Hounslow, Portsmouth and the Highlands and Islands of Scotland - is that by far the best way of getting social regeneration off the ground in a neighbourhood or a town is to start with cultural regeneration. (Smith 1998: 134)

The concern for this investigation, centres around the social impact of participatory arts programmes and their evaluation. Although the Comedia researchers took different stances, the dominant research methodology was summed up by Francois Matarasso (1997), in *Use or Ornament? The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*. This method was later held up by PAT 10 as an example of good practice, as was the research by Lingayah et al (1996) with the New Economics Federation (NEF), into creative accounting and use of social auditing.

Matarasso was the major researcher, but Deidre Williams (1997) and her work into the social impact of the community arts in Australia was also used as an example of good evaluatory practice by PAT 10. Another researcher, Gerri Moriarty (1997) was also cited especially for her evaluation work on the Bolton City Challenge Cultural Activities Project (Policy Action Team 10 1999: 20).

The link between Comedia and PAT 10 was firmly cemented as Matarasso became Chair of PAT 10's

Best Practice Subgroup, and Moriarty a member[1].

5.2 The Community

That the arts can be considered as regenerators of individuals within communities, requires analysis. Matarasso encapsulated his philosophy by stating that he wanted, 'to start talking about what the arts can do for society, rather than what society can do for the arts. Unfettered by ideology, the new pragmatism can extend its principles of inclusiveness to the arts by embracing their creative approaches to problem-solving' (Matarasso 1997: iv). He also expressed the view that, 'social policy can have only one aim: that of improving people's quality of life' (Matarasso 1996b: 72). In real terms, this concerned the effect of arts programmes on individuals and communities, specifically urban regeneration, creative development possibilities and solving social problems.

But this involved many contradictions, not least, dispute over the concept of community. This has changed from being in the main about locality, to 'communities' of work colleagues, Internet users or health club members. In terms of geographic community, there is also an assumption that residents living on a rundown sink estate want to stay in that neighbourhood or care about it. If a project, that emphasises belonging to a community, concerns changing individuals, it may help alienate them so they no longer feel a part of that community. A 'positive' outcome for one person may be to leave the neighbourhood altogether, or get involved in a non-local type of community. Furthermore, as in the case of many areas of London, once a community becomes regenerated, it becomes ripe for redevelopment and property becomes more expensive to buy and rent. Such upward mobility and gentrification prices the economically excluded out.

Williams, perceived the individual's exposure to culture as entwined with community, which was vital for increased understanding of human experience:

> Community.... is firstly a fundamental element in the experience and expression of culture. Secondly, people understand culture through their experience of community, which is most powerfully expressed through myth, tradition and ritual. And thirdly, if culture embodies a system

---

[1] as described in 3.3.1

of values, norms and moral codes, then art is one of the most powerful ways in which those values are communicated. (Williams 1997: 13)

But if the social role of the arts is to help communicate norms and moral codes, these can also be an ideal, or idealised mythical representation of the past. This can reflect a particular ideology or spin, for instance the perceived inclusiveness of British society in the 1950's[2].

Also, she understood the community as a social organisation that was key to combating social isolation, and community art as a generator of social capital. But Saraceno referred to conflicting conceptions of exclusion; between individual, community, and a national perspective. It was possible to be both included and excluded, depending on context[3].

Although both Matarasso and Williams emphasised the important role of the arts in relation to the geographic community and wider society, this was understood in different ways. For Williams, community cultural activity was, 'an essential addition to, and antidote for, the passive relationship with homogeneous popular culture emanating from the commercial media' (1997:4). Whereas the value of such political counter cultural activism was questioned by Matarasso[4].

5.3 Fitting the Arts into an Established Framework of Positive Social Impacts

Williams contended that, 'The value of community-based arts production will always be severely compromised while it is stuck in a fine arts paradigm' (1997: 3), hence she constructed a framework of positive social impacts of programmes, beyond this aesthetic straitjacket.

Similarly, Matarasso (1997: 80) constructed such a structure. He emphasised that experience through participation in the arts was 'different in nature' from other 'aspects of arts activity', but admitted that social impacts were complex as, 'people, their creativity and culture, remain elusive, always partly beyond the range of conventional enquiry', and confirmed that there could be, 'positive and negative outcomes, and some which are both, or change from one to another'. He then went on to reveal that, 'if we recognise that this is *why* the arts are important to social development, rather than becoming

---

[2] the perceived inclusivity of the 1950's was idealised and can be contrasted with the racism encountered by Afro-Caribbean immigrants, who were badly excluded, see 10.5.4.

[3] see 2.1

[4] explained in 5.5.7

frustrated at our inability to fit them into an established frame, we are more likely to use them successfully and to recognise the outcomes'.

But there is a contradiction between an acknowledgement that the arts cannot be fitted into an established frame and his methodology that showed social outcomes could be determined through such an evaluation process. It also questions who and what determines 'positive' and 'negative' outcomes. Such 'value' could reflect the attitude of an individual stakeholder, funder, evaluator or political expediency.

If arts programmes are publicly funded, such social outcomes will reflect directly or indirectly the line of the SEU and government social policy. If the reality of the excluded is different from that promoted, there is a need to accommodate this within such a framework.

5.4 Cultural Inclusivity

Matarasso argued for creative activity to encourage cultural inclusivity beyond art elitism: 'Our culture must welcome, value and respond to the creativity of all our citizens - women, minority ethnic communities, disabled and deaf people, the older generations - all have rich forms of cultural expression that can contribute to the renewal of urban neighbourhoods from within' (Matarasso 1996b: 74). But scepticism and passivity can destroy such personal and community development. Cynicism in particular is often a product of exclusion, and due to wider socio-political and economic conditions. If the excluded lack self-esteem and status, labelled as losers in a winners society, they may well distrust and despise authority and an arts programme that is perceived as part of the 'established' state. Cynicism may be a defence mechanism against disappointment and exploitation, and creativity may be able to help challenge these conditions, and allow such alienation and resentment a vehicle for expression, both to challenge and express it. But this awareness and transformation does not necessarily create inclusiveness, it may further alienate and destabilise the excluded.

There is also a danger of promoting a cultural apartheid, which reflects on the intention and reason for involvement. Following Matarasso's line, the objectives behind participatory arts practice too readily involve individuals renewing themselves and neighbourhood, forging a more positive local identity. Ironically this may re-enforce working class concepts of functionality, very different to those of

bourgeois aesthetic disinterest, re-inforcing class based stereotyping[5].

5.5 Evaluation Methodology

The crux of the Comedia research concerned evaluation methodology.

Matarasso recognised that evaluation, 'is not an abstract, quasi-scientific process through which objective truths can be identified. It is relative....and fundamentally about values'. He accepted that collating standard and objective quantitative evidence, was incompatible with proving worth and quality. He went on to insist that, 'the important.....question about evaluation is which value system is used to provide benchmarks against which work will be measured - in other words, who defines value' (Matarasso 1996a: 2). Similarly, he quoted the Audit Commission and its concern that, 'the art of evaluation lies in ensuring that the measurable does not drive out the immeasurable' (Audit Commission cited in Matarasso 1996a:16). Embedded within this need to assess beyond aesthetic considerations, was that the evaluation process engaged all stakeholders.

He maintained that the subjective nature of the field contributed to a, 'lack of confidence which people working in creative industries can feel in the face of apparently more "scientific" disciplines' (1996a: 12). But then asserted that although the process of evaluation, 'can have life-altering impacts on everyone involved, from those who use them or gain their salary from them, to officers and politicians who have endorsed them. Everyone has a vested interest and objectivity in such a climate is likely to be elusive' (1996a:14). It was as if he was apologising for the lack of measurability, although he had questioned whether evaluation had to be objective and scientific. His understanding of evaluation methodology is confusing.

Therefore the research creates a critical discourse around proposed evaluation practice investigating: indicators of success, its prescriptive nature, social auditing methods, language used, stakeholder control of the process, possible negative outcomes and the lack of standardised evidence. Moreover, its purpose in terms of collecting evidence or as an exercise of advocacy.

---

[5] see 8.3 which explains Bourdieu's social classification of taste and concept of cultural capital. Furthermore, this whole area of cultural exclusion is dealt with in detail in Part Three.

5.5.1 Indicators to Measure Social Impacts

Matarasso suggested pre-set measurable indicators of impact, to judge the success of programmes. These he set out in terms of: Personal Development, Social Cohesion, Community Empowerment and Self-Determination, Local Image and Identity, Imagination and Vision, Health and Well-being (1997: 14-71). He further divided these six impacts into fifty subcategories (1997: x)[6].

He argued that, 'more than any other human activity, culture - and art as its most highly-charged expression - is concerned with values and meanings' (1997: 84). But just as he intended to fully exploit social potential from arts programmes, an instrumental method could be utilised and creatively built into non-art projects. The arts do not have sole rights over creativity, meaning and value. Matarasso expanded further: 'Art as an activity, process and object, is central to how people experience, understand and then shape the world' (1997: 84). This reflects his own thinking, and the importance he places on the arts, his cosmology. Such a statement also widens the rationale for using arts based projects, beyond the narrow confines of his pre-set indicators of social impact. If it is this very area, the actual process of creativity, that distinguishes the arts and confers value, then this is the quality that gives them an edge over other non-art pursuits, and should therefore be recognised.

He stated that, 'The boundary between personal development and community development is blurred, since the second inevitably depends on the first: it is the competent confident individuals who become the drivers of local initiatives and shape their neighbourhoods' (Matarasso 1998c: 23). But if the excluded lack confidence and competence, it is very difficult for such collective impacts to be initiated and realised, without the assistance of included characters[7], which may undermine self-management. Furthermore, indicators of social impact can too readily be an imposition within the formative evaluative design, as they shape the direction and content of the arts programme. In which case they can easily be appropriated as a managerial tool of control.

5.5.2 Social Auditing

Social auditing offers ways of measurement that go beyond financial accounting and 'hard' statistical indicators. The NEF developed a social audit to measure outcomes of activities and opinions. This

---

[6] see Appendix 1

[7] Chanan emphasised the importance of such white collar workers or professionals over the age of 40 as drivers of inclusion in 2.8

allowed measurement and meaning to be given to social objectives, beyond financial imperatives. Although such qualitative or 'soft' information was not valued as highly as the 'hard' objective evidence, Lingayah and colleagues argued that 'hard' evidence could provide mis-information as it failed to represent its target, and had little utility with regards decision-making. Similarly, they were also keen to enable a more democratic evaluative process, and insisted that, 'All stakeholders in an organisation are consulted as part of the accounting process. In this way, the values of the organisation are defined through a negotiation process' (Lingayah et al 1996: 21). The stakeholders were also, 'best able to identify the objectives of an activity, and the extent to which they are being met' (1996: 37). In which case a more democratic statistical quality of life outcome could be evaluated[8]. But within our culture which is saturated with indicators, statistical information can become meaningless. Such portable short-hand language, does not necessarily measure value. The problem with these techniques is why they need to be used. By attempting to quantify the immeasurable, it could be argued that this signifies methodological misrepresentation. The creation of a raft of statistics, whether using hard or soft evidence, is still contained within a measurable 'scientific' paradigm which is incompatible with the subjective nature of value.

5.5.3 Stakeholder Control

Matarasso also argued for, 'Empowerment through self-management' and an evaluation process that, 'lead[s] to increasingly independent and autonomous activity, since it gives people control over their participation and development' (1996a: 26). Such a goal of stakeholder control, in which arts facilitators respond to, rather than lead the projects, firstly requires long-term programmes and secondly assumes that participants want or are able to take control[9]. He championed the importance of different stakeholders contributing, 'to the evaluation process on their own terms. This does not mean being consulted or asked for an opinion within a framework established by others, but the opportunity to contribute to the shaping of that framework in the first place' (1996a: 9). But he is being disingenuous, as he has already created a template of evaluation with fifty indicators which has become an orthodoxy. Moreover, Gregory showed how difficult this democratic process was to implement in

---

[8] self-management methods that allow participants to have a voice and influence were explained in 4.9 & 4.10

[9] see 3.3.4 and Monks' problems at Core Arts in embedding local control

practice[10]. Participants can be subjugated by the techniques used, with their involvement tokenistic and contrived.

Also, the process of self-evaluation reporting may be messy and unattractive to sponsors and unacceptable to bureaucratic sensibilities. Similarly, managers or evaluators may manipulate the process in order to ensure the quality of language used and that an acceptable methodological process is utilised. Self-censorship may occur in order to give a favourable impression to funders. Programmes tend to be funder-led[11], and evaluators therefore advocate the programme to funders through their reports. The baseline is finance to continue, and the project team, manager and evaluator will direct the evaluation to secure funding. In which case the 'inclusion' of stakeholders may not be the primary concern of the programme evaluation.

The concept that evaluation is self-managed, is a possible fillip to traditional 'high' art notions of artistic freedom. Hence Matarasso explained that, 'Participatory arts projects, more then any, should see evaluation as an integral part of the creative process which fully involves all the partners'. Which includes the, 'involvement of participants in setting objectives'(1997: 90). But if those objectives set fail to coincide with those that management, evaluator and funder perceive to be positive social impacts, there is a conflict of interest.

5.5.4 Evidence and Advocacy

Evaluation in terms of advocacy, and the evidence of triangulated opinion and assessment are not compatible. Moriarty (1997: 13-19), an experienced community arts worker and evaluator, in her contribution to the Comedia research, distinguished between these terms. She suggested, 'Advocacy is primarily a political activity which involves the judicious use of appropriate information ....[whereas] evaluation is an educational process which requires examination of all the facts and feelings, especially the inconvenient ones' (1997: 17). Therefore concentrating on, 'the search for "positive messages" drowns out identification of the difficult and the unpalatable' (1997: 18). Moriarty differentiated between evaluation reports that could be published for the public, and those that contained more sensitive issues which needed to be tackled internally. She was also concerned that

---

[10] how the expert nature of the evaluator and knowledge of method, dominates the agenda and direction of evaluation, irrespective of intention is set out in 4.10

[11] see 3.4

consent be given by all stakeholders regarding the use of the information, particularly with externally evaluated reports. She found the evaluative process tortuous and questioned whether it offered anything for the arts. She was guarded in terms of public transparency regarding access to information, as she recognised how reports could be manipulated to reflect other agendas, especially the needs of funders and programme managers[12].

5.5.5 Language of Evaluation

Moriarty was jaded in her enthusiasm for the language of evaluation, as she had been, 'burned by exposure to a certain kind of imposed, mechanistic [method]' (1997: 1). Her concern was that it was a developing industry but she was unsure as to how such an understanding benefited the arts. She doubted whether the social effects of the arts could be measured, but recognised that a holistic and pluralistic approach towards evaluation was a necessary payback for utilising public money. Although there needed to be proof that programmes were doing as claimed, she argued that it was the immeasurability of the arts that was at odds with the bureaucratic systems of assessment:

> There is a mystery, a transformative power, an invisible dialogue between the observer and the artist, a complex set of experiential responses which do not translate easily into words, let alone into the kind of information which can be recorded and stored on a spreadsheet or database.... Does this 'invisibility' make it less valuable? (1997: 2)

Moriarty accepted that she colluded in such statistical evidence in order to placate and satisfy funders, but recognised that there was an issue of validity:

> It would be ironic if, just as researchers and practitioners in other fields (such as in health or organisational development) are confidently expressing their appreciation of the limitations and fallibilities of scientific models of evaluation and moving to the language of narrative and metaphor, artists were to be terrified into the belief that information has to be translated into

---

[12] see 4.6 and Palumbo's concern with recognising the political realities and lack of neutrality of the process, which can harm the programme

numbers to have validity. (1997: 11)

She recognised that evaluation was part of every creative process and something artists engaged in continually, in order to assess and thereby improve their work. Hence, the production or final product was best evidence of programme success, not a lengthy verbose report. She was the most outspoken Comedia researcher in terms of questioning the language of evaluation[13].

Matarasso also had a problem:

> Politicians, policy-makers, professionals in other fields have still to be convinced that the arts are a serious engine of community development and regeneration....we speak different languages: the artist will say 'You've only to look at people's faces to see why it matters', while civil servants want to know the contribution of the work to employability, social inclusion or crime reduction. (Matarasso 1998b: Foreword)

But his drive to emphasise the social utility of the arts, allowed him to paper over vital methodological concerns in favour of a civil servant orthodoxy. Furthermore, these different languages may not be translating the same evidence, the 'looks on participant faces' may bear no resemblance or relation to statistical verification, let alone employability or reduction in crime indicators. If evaluation methods and evidence are determined by stakeholders, they may choose a method and language that reflects their feelings and achievements, which may not be concerned with contributing to civil servant agendas.

Both Matarasso and Williams endorsed social auditing and the use of statistically formulated qualitative data as necessary and reliable evaluatory evidence. Matarasso in his reports (1998a; 1998b; 1999) bullet-pointed such statistical information, making such evidence stand-out, symbolising its importance by grabbing reader attention. Similarly in Williams' report (1997), she bullet-pointed statistics which were also emphasised in bold type, thereby standing out from the page. Both

---

[13] Her plural method was utilised in the Breightmet Arts Social Impact Study (Moriarty 2002) which used a range of qualitative and quantitative methods, and the participant voice. Although it claimed a range of impacts, she warned of over-claiming the impact of the arts. Nevertheless it contained no evidence that could be construed as negative, therefore had the appearance of being advocatorial.

techniques give the impression that the statistics not only encapsulate all information, but subjugate and control all other evidence. The programme participants were not properly represented, and their voice barely heard in these reports. In which case the evaluator was controlling the agenda in a very political manner.

5.5.6 A Prescriptive Evaluation

Even though Matarasso compiled a list of impacts as a template for evaluative purposes, he admitted that, 'Room must be given for the unpredictable outcome, the unforeseen element, and for creative approaches to reporting' (Matarasso 1998a: 47). Such a statement is a foil against the perceived dangers of a highly prescriptive structured evaluation and programme, that respond to pre-set social objectives. But this is confusing in light of his emphasis on such impacts.

If the arts are being used instrumentally, this may well clash with the perceived artistic freedoms of stakeholders, and a democratic method of evaluation that includes all stakeholder opinion. Matarasso maintained that the often unpredictable outcomes of the arts programme, were due to the nature of creativity which needed to be written into the evaluation process and management framework: 'At the outset of the creative process artists do not know whether their efforts will succeed or fail, nor even, in many cases exactly what outcomes will be' (Matarasso 1996b: 72). There is a similarity between this concept of evaluation and House's 'Behavioural Approach' model[14]. His valid criticism of such a model is firstly, the danger that measurement defines success rather than what actually happens, in which case the purpose of the programme may not reflect the impact achieved. Secondly, that there is no transparency concerning whom or what defines the process and goals. And finally, and most tellingly of all, whether the actual impacts can be measured. He perceived the prespecification of objectives as distorting the outcome.

Such unpredictability should be accepted as part of the process. But Matarasso needed to, 'build the unpredictable benefits of creativity into a sound management framework' (1996b: 72), which is a sublime piece of sophistry and shows an obsession with controlling unknown factors, precisely because they cannot be predicted by his evaluative method. What he failed to recognise, was how this need for evaluative acceptability may be unrelated to the effectiveness of the programme.

---

[14] see 4.5

5.5.7 Negative Outcomes

Matarasso dealt with 'negative' outcomes by arguing that these boiled down to, 'badly planned or executed arts projects' (1997: 80). He recognised that there were problems concerning community and individual expression and empowerment: 'There is a need for some guidance in how to ride the sometimes choppy waters of cultural activism without getting tipped out of the boat. If we accept risk we are better placed to institute mechanisms which can minimise the negative possibilities while making the most of the positive' (1996b: 74). Here he is being both judge and jury. Furthermore, if becoming culturally active and engaged represents a threat to the status quo, presumably the 'mechanisms which can minimise the negative' in practice refer to the evaluation method, which is therefore a process that can be used to filter out unacceptable evidence. Cultural activism raises awareness, and can be a 'mechanism' towards challenging and changing society to better accommodate the excluded. It seems that 'negative effects' may also constitute challenging authority in some manner, which is another possible social role for the arts.

5.5.8 Lack of Standardised Evidence

Matarasso compared the lack of evidence of the social value of arts projects, to other areas of social policy, 'certainly nothing which would be considered by a sceptic as quantitative, independent and authoritative. This does not mean that no useful evidence exists, as we shall see, but that it is in a form which few public sector agencies would find accessible or usable' (Matarasso 1996b: 74). Here he revealed his frustrations with the arts, as if he wanted them to be more standardised and manipulable (in terms of pre-set indicators) in order to raise their profile with civil servants, hence his insistence on the replicability of project objectives. But he was also at odds with this position: 'Public policy loves indicators, neat measures of success which can be applied across the board. Helpful as they may be, there is a danger that the outcomes of projects will be stretched or trimmed to fit them' (Matarasso 1997: 90). Here he is suggesting the possible reality for arts programmes directed at the socially excluded, with evidence constructed to shows projects in the light that programme directors and evaluators think will impress funders, with any real criticism or 'negative' impacts deemed undesirable. Here advocacy overwrites evidence when suitable and necessary and any sort of objective appraisal becomes impossible.

Matarasso, whilst arguing for indicators and replicability, accepted that, 'being able to show change in relation to a pre-defined indicator does not prove that the change was produced by the arts programme' (Matarasso 1996a). This is of particular importance in today's climate of performance indicators. All the social impacts Matarasso constructed reflected changes in individuals and communities. These are complex areas and to isolate a particular variable (an arts programme) as a possible catalyst, is asking a lot of the arts and furthermore, whatever convoluted statistical methodology utilised, may fail to recognise the concept of value, which Matarasso desperately wants to identify. Evaluation in this domain is, by definition, a highly subjective and qualitative phenomenon, which befits Guba and Lincoln's constructivist model[15], unlike a bureaucrat model driven by cultural performance indicators[16]. This unhappiness with, 'the paucity of existing evidence' (Matarasso 1996b:76), reflects Matarasso's search for cause and effect, which by definition, will remain illusive, unclear and hypothetical. This will be exacerbated the stronger the decontextualised evidential line taken.

Matarasso showed his own frustrations with arts evaluation as he recognised that existing, 'fact and figure....[evidence is] easily dismissed as anecdotal....[and] not worthy of proper consideration' (1996b: 77). Such an attitude flies in the face of his own understanding of the arts as producing 'elusive' and 'unpredictable' social impacts. Maybe there is no reproducible evaluative template, as the arts have an integral design fault and as Moriarty suggested, are at odds with bureaucracy. Maybe that is their strength. Matarasso's thinking exudes turmoil, as he seems to want to prove the value of the arts quasi-scientifically, but rails against such an idea. His recommendation of creativity in evaluation and that the, 'Over-zealous pursuit of scientific objectivity, and the internal validity of evaluation processes, is inappropriate and unhelpful' (Matarasso 1996a: 24), only exacerbates such ambiguity.

A self-managed evaluation may provide a truthful account for those involved, but in order for that evidence to have bureaucratic weight, it needs to be comparable and presented in a particular manner. This is the political dimension of the evaluation process, about which Matarasso is conspicuously quiet. Ironically, he even argued for such stakeholder control: 'If an arts programme is going to fulfil its empowering function, it cannot do so by disempowering people from its own processes, values and assumptions' (Matarasso 1996b: 77). He recognised that the alternative to this self-management was

---

[15] explained in 4.7

[16] performance indicators and the wider performance culture are more fully described in 5.10 & 12.5

cultural paternalism, which would fail to enable or enfranchise particularly excluded participants. Nevertheless, he implied that an authoritative top-down evaluative technique would better lever resources, hence there is an inherent weakness in and paradox to his pragmatic understanding.

5.6 Do the Ends Justify the Means?

This critique takes three areas of concern which relate to the specific agenda of assessing whether the resulting evaluation report may be at odds with the process and reality of the arts programme. Firstly in terms of the welfare implications of evaluating the arts for social impacts. Secondly, with regards to the cultural rights of participants. Thirdly, in relation to the informed consent of participants.

5.6.1 The Welfare Implications: Artistic Enterprise or Social Purpose

There are welfare implications when evaluating the impact of the arts, in terms of social outcomes which relate to the increased medicalisation of life (Foucault 1993)[17]. These include issues of morality, politics, the rights of the excluded, and self-determination. Matarasso's pragmatism failed to fully appreciate these broader holistic concerns that the methodologies of; Empowerment Evaluation, Critical Evaluation and Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics[18] tackled.

Art programmes too readily become ensnared in a welfare paradigm. That they arise, 'principally from their contribution to social policy objectives' (Matarasso 1997: 81), with indicators possibly prescribed, reflects poorly on their ability to encourage self-management and stakeholder democracy. His argument for valuing projects in terms of social outcomes, befits a welfare conception of value that can become an albatross around the neck of such projects. Money spent charitably by funders in order to help the excluded, not for them to help themselves[19]. It is vitally important that stakeholders are aware of the intention of the arts programme, whether this concerns aesthetic enterprise, social purpose or both.

Williams stated that in terms of factors for success, the initial and most important one, 'was starting with a clear understanding among all project stakeholders that they were embarking on a creative arts project with other social and educational benefits' (Williams 1997: 31). But participants need to be

---

[17] the medicalisation of life is elaborated upon in the case study of Outsider Art in 8.6.1
[18] see 4.9
[19] explained in 5.7.3

made fully aware of the social policy objectives that lie behind the project if it is not self-managed, and that they are being evaluated by something akin to Matarasso's raft of indicators. Moreover, such information although transparent may be a disincentive to participation. Williams still perceived the art project as a creatively driven enterprise, with other social benefits, hence the need for aesthetically based evidence. She recognised that such programmes were ensnared in a 'high' art paradigm which, 'places community art at one end of a hierarchy with opera at the other', and tried to re-align it: 'community art is not concerned with social work as we know it, nor is it focused on the production of art as a commodity, rather the production of art as the expression of community culture' (1997: 3). Such an active understanding allied the community arts with local cultural development and as an antidote to mass culture. Besides being optimistically idealistic, this fails to position and accommodate the 'high' art hegemony from which she wants to escape, which is similarly opposed to mass culture[20]. Furthermore, it is enough to presume that an arts programme can affect social and cultural change and inclusion locally, let alone influence wider ideological perceptions of the arts and culture. But if community participatory art programmes are the antidote to mass culture and commodity, then their role is radical and counter-cultural, challenging more than just an exclusive 'high' art paradigm, but wider issues concerning the nature of society and community [21]. Such radicality if transferred to this wider stage could have huge socio-economic and political implications.

Matarasso meanwhile, was ambiguous about the relationship between the social and aesthetic. He sought, 'to harness [the arts].... for social development', but referred to them as 'elusive, beyond the control not just of policy-makers and managers but very often of artists themselves' (1997: 87). He thought that it was, 'perfectly possible to combine high aesthetic standards with lasting social value' (1997: 86). Artistic unpredictability and creativity were inseparable, and these qualities were, 'the ultimate guarantor, for those that care about the arts, that they will continue to flourish even as we seek to harness them for social development' (1997: 87). But what he was attempting to do in terms of predicting the unpredictable and building this into an evaluatory structure, infringes on the spirit of the arts, particularly the freedoms that they allow. In which case the ends may not necessarily justify the means, with a welfare paradigm of the arts a disincentive to participation.

---

[20] see 9.2.2 for Adorno's argument against the culture industry

[21] see 9.4 for a discourse on the 'high' arts and Community Arts Movement

Furthermore, his view that, 'arts programmes can be used to achieve social objectives, even if the arts themselves cannot' (1997: 86) and that the arts were unaffected by this process, suggest that the arts are peripheral, as it is the actual participation in the programme that contains the social benefits. This is confusing, particularly as he advocated the critical value of the arts[22] and that, 'It is in the act of creativity that empowerment lies' (1997: 84).

The title of his research *Use or Ornament* albeit supposedly ironic, which as Matarasso suggested 'gently mocked' British cultural policy with its 'artificial polarisation between forms of art and their roles in society' (Matarasso 1999: 46), still gives the impression that art is either of utility (in this case socially useful) or pure aesthetic ornament. It cleverly plays on prejudices held about the irrelevance of the arts, which only someone steeped in 'high' art culture would even recognise as irony. Such mutually exclusive language is contradicted by his assessment that social impacts are inextricably linked to creative and artistic practice, therefore have an aesthetic dimension. *Use and Ornament* would be more appropriate.

Lucy Phillips (1996) another Comedia researcher, referred directly to those engaged in creative arts projects for the first order institutionalised excluded. She described how experienced arts practitioners tackled the problem as to whether such work was a social service or artistic enterprise:

> What these programs and individuals are advocating for is clearly not 'art for art's sake' - yet nor is it as therapy or as social service. The artists .....are arguing for an art that truly engages with the human experience - having positive implications for both the art form and for those individuals and communities involved in its making. (Phillips 1996: 8)

Philips formulated a compromise solution in order to try to balance these two different objectives. This position reinforced the concept that such work was categorised as 'community' art, because it had to justify its funding through social outcomes. Phillips argued that because artists facilitated such programmes they were first and foremost involved in artistic, not social work. This was their perception of themselves. Such social benefits, as Bill Cleveland suggested were, 'the unavoidable consequence of making art' (Cleveland cited in Phillips 1996: 9),in which case aesthetic considerations

---

[22] see 5.8.2

were of primary importance, with social outcomes natural consequences, hence their importance with regards to the evaluation process. Furthermore Phillips argued that, 'If the arts are not argued for on their own terms, then they are on to a losing battle against the stiff opposition of essential services who are increasingly fighting for the same funds' (1996: 21). She concluded that there needed to be a more profound debate and awareness of how the arts interacted with society, and they needed to develop, 'a common language....one which does not rely on catch-all and often empty terms such as "empowerment" but rather more towards expressing the common denominator which unites all creative endeavour' (1996: 21). Maybe that denominator is treating the arts within a paradigm of play, not as work or social utility[23].

5.6.2 Cultural Rights

It is probable that harnessing the arts for social development may infringe upon the cultural rights of participants. Matarasso's instrumental approach is not participant-led. There are issues of transparency for programmes that intend to alter the participants in some way. Many of the socially excluded are wary of officialdom and will naturally seek hidden adverse agendas. What a programme manager may perceive as benefit, may not be seen in the same light by the participant. Even when explaining the raison d'être of the project, its aims and objectives need to be transparent in order to engender a consensus. But this may not be the case in practice.

Matarasso quoted article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which asserted that, 'Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and share in scientific advancement and its benefits' (Universal Declaration of Human Rights cited in Matarasso 1998a: 49). That being the case, the evaluation of this 'participation' should be based on stakeholder perception of how they have engaged in cultural life and its consequences, fully cognisant of any social agenda to change their perceptions or situation. It should be their right.

5.6.3 Informed Consent

That participants are aware of the proposed 'means' and 'ends' ultimately reflects the transparency of

---

[23] the paradigm of play is more fully explained with reference to Dissanayake and a biological need for creativity in 11.3.2 and Kane with his play ethic in 12.6

the programme. Only then can informed consent be possible. To enable this, stakeholders need to be involved in determining both programme goals and outcomes. Matarasso admitted to taking a, 'utilitarian view of cultural activity' (Matarasso 1996b: 72), but there is a difference between using the arts to regenerate environments in terms of buildings, and regenerating those citizens who live there. On the one hand he stated that participants have to be fully informed as, 'It is unethical to seek to produce change without the informed consent of those involved' (Matarasso 1996a: 24). But on the other, when explaining the need for clear objectives, he backed off in terms of such transparency:

> Ideally projects with social aspirations should address specific needs identified in partnership with those who are intended to benefit. Although in practice this may be difficult, since the processes are developmental and there will always be a need to build trust and understanding, it must be the intention. (Matarasso 1997: 87)

Being the 'intention' is not the same as transparency in terms of informed consent. Also it is highly paternalistic. If empowerment and self-management are dependent on such transparency and involvement of participants in actual processes, then consent needs to be agreed. By admitting that projects intend to address social concerns, but that transparency is not of absolute importance, this suggests that there is another agenda beyond community or individual empowerment. It also questions the primacy of artistic quality, with the danger that aesthetic considerations become secondary. Such 'intention' allows a top-down engineering of the process which can prevent self-directed cultural activity when deemed difficult.

5.7 Poverty and Cost

In terms of cost, there is a lack of research into financial comparability between the value of arts and non-arts programmes. There are also issues of financial responsibility and the extent to which these pressures can undermine artistic independence. The other side of the coin is poverty, which if the arts are to help address, requires a deeper and more political understanding than Matarasso's pragmatism allows.

5.7.1 Lack of Financial Comparability

Matarasso thought that 'art projects can provide cost-effective solutions' (Matarasso 1997: 81) for social objectives, but did not know whether such projects were more cost-effective than non-arts projects, nor whether they were more able to realise objectives. Such evidence seems to be arbitrary, depending on the interests and agendas of those involved. This financial vagueness is compounded by his admission that such a recognition of the worth of social impacts, 'may be unwelcome to some artists limiting their creative autonomy. But how much creative autonomy can you have with someone else's money?' (1997: 86)

The socially excluded targeted by such programmes are not professional artists. They may not think inside the 'high' art canon in terms of 'creative autonomy', but ironically they may need to experience autonomy as part of the process of self-management. By arguing that other people's money was a determining factor, Matarasso was accepting that such programmes were to a greater or lesser extent funder-led, and that creative autonomy may not be perceived as an effective focus for evaluations. This could result in self-censorship and a refusal to accept that such a programme might be considered aesthetically worthwhile by sponsors, not just a vehicle for social objectives.

5.7.2 Financial Responsibility

Matarasso (2000a) expressed the need for financial responsibility, especially when accepting public money as, 'a properly elected government is entitled to pursue its social, economic, even political objectives through the way in which it allocates the public resources in its custody'. Such a discourse was further explained: 'There can be no artistic independence - in the sense of adolescent irresponsibility - when the artist is paid for by the State', which depending on the definition of 'irresponsibility', could disenfranchise many in the 'high' art community. But this position, whilst being laudable, is very conservative. It too readily disempowers and subjugates the participant/artist in order to succour bureaucratic needs and government agendas.

5.7.3 Poverty

Poverty has increased to include, 'about 22% of the population' (Jones cited in Matarasso 1997: 81), but Matarasso's pragmatic approach failed to link the causes of such poverty with the current political

and economic situation, let alone historical processes, and the role of the arts as a medium of protest and expression of such concerns. There is an important issue regarding guilt. Byrne[24] critiqued individualistic definitions of social exclusion, in which the poor were blamed for their situation, and the hidden morality embedded in this framework. In his opinion the excluded were not personally responsible for their situation, but the victims of socio-economic conditions beyond their control. Personal responsibility was accompanied by guilt and an attitude of charity towards the unfortunate. Matarasso, by urging a new pragmatism without ideology, was engaging in kidology. His unhappiness with ideological concerns was a way of avoiding these wider philosophical questions. But, unfortunately, such pragmatism is likely to reflect the normative paradigm of personal blame, which is compounded by the funding for such projects and steeped in a welfare attitude.

He affirmed that it may be easy,

> to assume that the arts have little or nothing to do with poverty....But such a view misunderstands both the arts and poverty....Poverty is still seen almost exclusively as an issue of money....A wider conception of poverty would embrace restrictions on resources and opportunities – on inclusion as well as income. (1998a: 40)

Furthermore poverty was associated with limitation, disempowerment, and 'because of contemporary culture'. But he did not explain precisely what it was about contemporary culture that caused this. He accepted that, 'cultural action has an important place in alleviating its [poverty's] impact, and in some cases, providing routes out of it' (1998a: 40), but failed to explain how. Again, he declined to ground his position politically or ideologically, hence his pragmatism seems superficial and confusing for the reader.

5.8 Educational Impacts

Possibly, the most important evaluative impacts can be classed as educational. That the arts can encourage a learning society, begs the question of what kind of society. But the objectives of engendering critical attitudes and active citizens, are traditional effects of the arts and can lead to

---

[24] see 2.4

cultural activism and heuristic lifelong learning. But both unfortunately take time to realise, in contrast to the often short-term nature of arts programmes.

5.8.1 A Learning Society

Matarasso referred to a learning society,

> in which the individual will have greater 'leisure' time while simultaneously being increasingly responsible for his or her own education and development, equal access to training and education will be a determinant of poverty....There is growing evidence that the kind of skills which people acquire through being involved in arts projects - team-working, communication, self-motivation, flexibility, creativity etc - are vital to success in the changing employment market.
>
> (Matarasso 1998a: 43)

These educational outcomes again reflect the instrumental utility of arts projects. But the educational needs of the excluded go beyond employment measures, the programme is an opportunity for a more democratic and educational acculturation agenda which refers to issues of lifelong learning and cultural rights[25].

Williams found in her research of 89 community art projects in Australia entitled *Creating Social Capital*, that such programmes, 'were catalysts for experiential learning' (1997: 24). She referred to four major impacts: experiential learning (seeing something differently), defining or re-defining (knowing what is meaningful), finding a voice (knowing what is important) and knowing how to take action (making changes needed). Such, 'impacts represent the experiences of critical reflection, renewal and transformation' (1997: 24). Moriarty meanwhile saw the actual evaluation of the programme as, 'sharing the learning process' (1997: 5), in order to make improvements for the next one. Both involved heuristic learning.

5.8.2 Developing a Critical Attitude and Active Citizens

Matarasso stated that,

---

[25] this wider agenda is embedded in issues of rights as described in 5.6.2

The greatest social impacts of participation in the arts - and the ones which other programmes cannot achieve - arise from their ability to help people think critically about and question their experiences and those of others not in a discussion group but with all the excitement, danger, magic, colour, symbolism, feeling, metaphor and creativity that the arts offer. It is in the act of creativity that understanding and social inclusiveness are promoted. (1997: 84)

But it takes a long time to develop this vital critical attitude within the time limits of most short-term programmes. Also, importantly, it needs to be established what type of critical attitude is deemed acceptable, especially if questioning the moral and political authority of government is considered irresponsible[26] and cultural activism denigrated as a negative impact[27]. This critical value may well encourage the excluded to adopt an active political understanding in order to comprehend their own situation. They may not necessarily accept the status quo or government policy. To do this, participants need to be free to explore their creativity, which is possibly the role the arts play best.

Williams recognised this, stating that community cultural expression, 'is a process through which people - communities - can use artistic expression to challenge social norms and mobilise for, or resist, change' (1997: 4-5), hinting at a more active political involvement. Even Matarasso argued for active and 'engaged citizens', revealing a hidden idealism, as such participation in an arts programme could be a stimulus to involvement in the wider society. But this is an unrealistic outcome, because often when the programme has finished, the participants return back to their excluded neighbourhoods and lifestyles.

Matarasso also asked the question 'How far does the state really want to empower or raise the expectations of its citizens?' (Matarasso 1998a: 78). But then failed to answer this concern as he deemed it beyond his research remit. But it cannot be so, as the social impacts he advocated have a political manifestation. This is surely the reality of joined up thinking.

---

[26] as advocated by Matarasso in 5.7.2
[27] as suggested by Matarasso in 5.5.7

5.9 Relevant Social Impacts

Considering Matarasso's fifty social impacts of participation in the arts[28], not all of the indicators are best served by the arts. Firstly, it depends on how wide a definition of the arts is taken; the broader this is, the more likely that the outcomes will be realisable. Secondly, there are indicators that naturally stand out as arts-orientated, although the arts give a particular angle on them all. Thirdly, there is no comparison with non-art programmes, for instance creative sport and catering projects, in terms of which could best deliver these outcomes.

There are three indicators that are particularly attractive:

The first indicator is number 18, to 'Help offenders and victims address issues of crime'. This can be affected for example, by participatory drama programmes using role play and theatrical games, in a highly creative manner that allows participants to practice being someone else and comprehend other perspectives, in ways that sport or catering projects cannot[29].

The second indicator is number 32, to 'Involve residents in environmental improvements'. This can be directly affected by a visual arts programme, producing public work for the locality, by the people of the locality. Decoration, design and environmental concerns can be addressed through a visual creative focus.

The third indicator is number 48, to 'Contribute to a more relaxed atmosphere in health centres'. This can be assisted by the product of a community music or arts projects, in terms of decor and sound. Hospitals and health centres are semi-public spaces, which need to be therapeutic, and through the arts, positive healing environments can be created and sustained.

These aforementioned indicators are arts-centred, directly result from the art activity and are not synthetically manufactured. They contain a natural instrumentality. Here the art is of primary concern and integral to the outcome. Other indicators also possess this capability, but some do not and are synthetically instrumental. For instance number 22, to 'Help involve local people in the regeneration process'; number 26, to 'Facilitate the development of partnership' and number 41, 'Transform the responsiveness of public service organisations'. These indicators have been placed onto the arts, but are not necessarily best served by them.

---

[28] see Appendix 1

[29] these issues are addressed in the case study ch 7

Matarasso (1997: 83) questioned whether social policy objectives could be better affected through non-art methods, asking, 'Could it be done without art?'. If the main objective is employability, projects could be more transparent and direct in terms of intention. There is also an issue about the social location of the arts with respect to leisure, and the needs of the excluded in terms of how they utilise their leisure time. Many of the excluded may be on the periphery of work culture, but lack constructive leisure time[30]. It is as though Matarasso is trying to advocate that the arts compete with non art programmes, to achieve similar social objectives. If this is the case, he is involved in a public relations exercise for the arts, in order to justify them through avenues of utility. But this is a dangerous avenue, as such synthetic instrumentality, may eventually narrow down the creative capacity of programmes, due to the responsive focusing aspect of the evaluation process onto social impact. The arts may therefore become redundant[31].

5.10 Cultural Performance Indicators

A marriage of the pioneering work done by Comedia with the reality of New Labour's performance culture, has led to an interest in cultural performance indicators. Matarasso distinguished between cultural and performance indicators, with the latter 'broader in scope....using the organisation as its basic unit' (Matarasso 2002: 4). He mentioned the SMART method (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timed), which is steeped in a measurement culture, but suggested that, 'most of the things which matter to us in relation to art and culture cannot be squeezed into this template, so perhaps we should ask ourselves whether we should keep trying' (2002: 6). But Comedia's meeting with the DCMS, QUEST, ACE and LA in September 2000 (2002: 6), was precisely to discuss the development of cultural indicators.

Unfortunately, as the measurement culture within the health and educational sectors increasingly confirms, the voice of the stakeholder is rarely heard. Furthermore, although Matarasso advocated cultural indicators, he seemed wary of such a culture and readily admitted that, 'we do not now, if we ever did, have much agreement about what excellence is in the arts' (2002: 7). In which case, if there is

---

[30] the issue of abnormal leisure and need for creative forms of leisure as an alternative is discussed in 12.7

[31] the instrumental use of the arts in prison and extent to which this is detrimental to them is more fully exposed in the Arts Education in Prison case study in 11.4

no consensus, any method of compiling cultural impacts into an acceptable format would be immensely difficult. Again he is contradictory and far from clear.

5.11 Counter Argument

Here a more rigorous criticism of Matarasso's method is compiled, which assesses the expert evaluator and the ideological appropriation of evaluative method by a normative pragmatism.

5.11.1 The Expert Evaluator

It is important to determine whether there is a role for the expert evaluator.

Matarasso reflected on the problems of project failure and claimed that, ' there is still not much understanding of the participatory arts beyond those involved in it, and in the absence of anything approaching standard expectations, it is possible for such work to drift along unquestioned, especially if projects are short-term and have no stated outcomes' (1998a: 74). Hence, presumably, the need for an expert professional evaluator. But arguably, people are more generally aware than he gives them credit for.

Firstly, any parent can tell how confident and empowered their child becomes having performed in the school play or band. There is much understanding of the benefits of the participatory arts by 'outsiders'.

Secondly, 'standard expectations', sounds more like the culture and language of performance indicators. Matarasso, the expert evaluator, in his *Vital Signs* (1998b) report that mapped community arts in Belfast, very slickly evaluated the changes brought about within its first eighteen months, using portable statistical form[32]. It reads like an annual company report. Such language is far from inclusive and unlikely to be read outside a very specific constituency. Understandably, it is loaded with management jargon such as 'under-achieving projects' and 'community organisational capacity', which begs the question as to whether such terms are anything more than part of a game, a simulated exercise that relates to a virtual parallel world, not to the reality of the programme. There are precious few views from participants, who are therefore further disenfranchised.

Guba and Lincoln expressed concern over evaluation information within the perspective of evaluators,

---

[32] as reviewed in 5.5.5

which does, 'not speak to the interests of other concerned parties', but is aimed at, 'affecting solely sponsors, funders or a few selected (and powerful) stakeholding groups' (1989: 54). There are clear dangers of 'standard expectations' becoming standardised method and practice, for the convenience of comparison and determining value for money. Presumably Matarasso would rail against such a scenario.

He also glossed over, 'The concern about how far a community development process (arts-led or not) could reach, and how it might be distorted by the need to deliver outputs' (1998a: 76), and the requirements of funding and government agencies. Unfortunately, Matarasso has constructed a template that can be utilised for precisely these purposes. His method, like any evaluatory technique, can be utilised politically and become the servant to a host of other agendas. Guba and Lincoln referred to stakeholders as being at risk, as they '*are open to exploitation, disempowerment and disenfranchisement*. Evaluation is a form of enquiry whose end product is information. Information is power, and evaluation is powerful' (1989: 52).

It is the process of participating and determining the evaluation which is so important, and the danger that this is short-circuited by expert analysis, which re-focuses direction away from stakeholder input.

5.11.2 Appropriation: Evaluation as Pragmatism or Ideology

Evaluation method and practice is a political minefield, and for Matarasso to fail to recognise this by insisting on a new pragmatism that avoids ideology, is both naive and obstructs a fuller understanding of many issues. If the bottom line is to use evaluation in order to impress funders, the game is to utilise and manipulate evidence (creative evaluation) in order to curry favour with economic and political masters. It is therefore a process of obfuscating a more realistic assessment of success or failure.

Furthermore, if so many of the programmes are short-term, it is unrealistic to read too much into subsequent evaluation reports, beyond advocacy.

The pragmatic Matarasso is being very idealistic in terms of the value of such reports. For short-term projects the triangulation of attitude and opinion, and an assessment of process and outcome are as far as evaluation can proceed. Besides which, 'hard' objective evidence is not available for the vast number of arts projects aimed at the socially excluded.

What is available and a determining factor, is the extent to which an attitude or opinion of a stakeholder

reflects that person's reality, whether tutor, participant or spectator. Narrative and description may better describe this process than statistical evidence. Consequently, the process of social auditing, in order to convert such information into portable and comparative statistics, may be inappropriate in terms of expressing the reality of the programme. Notwithstanding, Matarasso claimed, 'that the opposition between qualitative and quantitative data is unhelpful, since it is possible to quantify qualitative information' (1998a: 10). But it is this mechanism of social auditing that has serious flaws. Ian MacPherson et al (2000) claimed that quantitative measures of performance dominated perception because such methods,

> are considered to be reliable and valid, objective and clean, and orientated towards producing empirical outcomes that are generalizable across a variety of quite different contexts....In contrast....qualitative methods are characterized by ambiguity, subjectivity, and place more emphasis on the localised context. Its research outcomes are essentially expressed in linguistic forms, where the themes arising from the participants' perceptions of practices and environment conveyed. Thus, it is regarded as soft, less concrete, and therefore, is regarded less highly than quantitative projects. (MacPherson et al 2000: 50)

Hence the basic equation is one of the validity of those outcomes and impacts portrayed by using numerical data against those concerned with linguistic description. If the outcomes are genuinely local, MacPherson et al argued that they should be based on a set of four principles: purpose, place, process and product. This allowed such information to be contextualised. The social auditing technique is an attempt to generalise such information, for comparative purpose, hence the danger of using a method that is intended to be comparative with information that is not comparable. Their argument against quantitative evidence in social contexts, is precisely because, 'it claims for universal and generalizable outcomes across all contexts' (2000: 52).

Matarasso argued for a pluralistic multi-method procedure, a practical creative bricolage of whatever evidence can be used to support the claims of the programme. MacPherson et al cited the dangers of such an approach because the quantitative methodological hegemony undermines qualitative evidence. The use of the terms 'hard' or 'soft' evidence is testimony to the extent to which the latter is subjugated

by such a hegemony. Thick description is fine, but not deemed to be scientific and therefore unreliable. But such a method should be, 'legitimately valued in its own right' (2000: 58), as such a method is a better fit and translation of the empirical reality.

MacPherson et al quoted two of the foremost thinkers in qualitative technique Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln. They spelt out in a paragraph how and why to use such a method:

> qualitative researchers study things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials - case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical interaction and visual texts - that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals' lives.
> (Denzin & Lincoln 1998: 3)

Matarasso complained about the lack of 'hard' evidence, and need to use social auditing as a method of analysing evaluation evidence. This is probably because such a technique determines acceptability in terms of professionalism, which is embedded within a quantitative measurement mindset. In order to advocate the arts he pursued a methodological orthodoxy, although he recognised that social and aesthetic evidence was highly contextual, and needed to be understood in qualitative terms. This is indeed a paradox, one which he fails to address.

5.12 Evaluation, Putting it All Together

Guba and Lincoln described in seven points what evaluation as an entity meant:

> First and foremost, evaluation is a *sociopolitical* process....a *joint, collaborative process*....a *teaching/learning process*....a *continuous, recursive and highly divergent process*....an *emergent process*....a *process with unpredictable outcomes*....[and] a *process that creates reality.*
> (1989: 253-256)

In which case, evaluations are an approximation of the truth, unpredictable, with possible contradictory

outcomes. Matarasso is influenced by this relative contextualised perception, in terms of the cyclical nature of programmes, responsive focusing, stakeholder input and the unpredictability of outcomes, but failed to reflect the overtly political nature of the process, admitting that he was trying to talk the language of civil servant bureaucrats. It is this need to be accepted within what is after all a constructed measurement and performance culture, that distorts the evaluative process and takes it away from the control of and focus on stakeholders.

Greene explained that, 'constructivist inquirers seek to understand *contextualized meaning*, to understand the meaningfulness of human actions and interactions - as experienced and construed by the actors - in a given context....there are "no facts without values"' (Greene 2000:986). She conceived evaluation as a telling of stories, as, 'evaluation practiced qualitatively is a narrative craft', in which participants, 'gather information about their experiences in their own words'(2000: 989-990).

In none of Matarasso's three reports (1998a;1998b;1999) does he allow participants to tell their stories, let alone control the evaluation. Both *Poverty and Oysters* and *Vital Signs* include, in only one chapter, anecdotal remarks by stakeholders. Nevertheless, even though he triangulated opinion, all reports are his voice and perspective, and rely on numerical data. Matarasso sits as judge in the academic manner described by Scriven[33], controlling the whole process. Furthermore, each report contains an almost fawning advocacy of the programmes involved and lacks any critical teeth or dissenting voices. It is as though any criticism is perceived as a negative impact and unwanted, as it may hinder advocacy.

Although Matarasso described *Magic, Myth and Money* which was an account of the impact of the English National Ballet on tour, as, 'not a critical study, or an evaluation of the company's work or even a piece of market research' (Matarasso 2000: sleevenotes), it takes a similar form to the other two social impact studies. Throughout, the evidence seems to be constructed as a form of public relations exercise.

5.13 Summary

This chapter involved a critique of Comedia's research into evaluating the social impact of participatory arts programmes, especially its main writer Matarasso. This directly influenced PAT 10, which in turn advocated its methodology. The refocusing by the researchers away from the narrow

---

[33] see 4.3.2

economic agenda of the eighties, onto a social agenda to regenerate deprived urban areas, pre-empted New Labour.

The Comedia writers emphasised the role of the arts as an engine of community development, re-enforcing geographical notions of neighbourhood. They also recognised and emphasised the importance of the evaluatory process and cycle, in order to help strengthen the programme and allow input from all stakeholders. Besides social objectives, the research recognised the value of the arts in engendering both a critical attitude and a learning society. But there were many inconsistencies, not least surrounding the concept of community, how evaluatory advocacy impinged on the evidence, the use of social auditing and participant self-management.

Evaluation was the central concern in terms of fitting the arts into an established framework of positive social impacts. Matarasso attempted a pragmatic approach and created a raft of fifty social impacts, but made no distinction between those in which the arts were naturally or synthetically instrumental in achieving the required outcomes. Arguably, the latter could be better served by non-arts programmes. It is as though his agenda was to widen the gamut and importance of arts participation beyond aesthetic considerations, and thereby advocate his own position. His framework of reproducible social impacts was, ironically, highly ideological, contradictory, even Machiavellian.

Although he advocated participant self-management, this contrasted with his position as the 'expert' evaluator and report writer, denying local input and self-evaluation. The voice used in his evaluation reports was his, further disenfranchising stakeholders from the process. Moreover, local control can be undermined by a top-down insistence on the very social impacts created by him, which have become an orthodoxy. He contended that self-management as a goal could only be realised through long-term programmes, bemoaned the lack of rigorous evaluation in the field, criticised existing practice as relying on anecdotal evidence, and championed social auditing as a method of quantifying qualitative evidence. But he failed to fully acknowledge the extent to which the evaluation methodology is a contextual and political process.

In terms of transparency, participants might not perceive themselves to be excluded or in need of social welfare, even be offended by such a categorisation. Issues of social impact may therefore be a disincentive to participation, particularly if intention is to be involved in the arts, not social or behavioural experimentation. This confusion of the social and aesthetic is disconcerting, and to the

detriment of the arts. Besides, if the transparency of such social objectives is a deterrent, clarity could be purposely muddied in order not to frighten off potential volunteers.

Matarasso also seemed to be concerned with methodological acceptability, proving professionalism and advocating a programme evaluation practice that realises social impacts. This in turn advocates the validity of his position that arts programmes can be evaluated in such a way. His argument becomes dangerously circular.

There was also something absent in his thinking in terms of negative outcomes. The delineation between positive and negative impacts seemed to be far too distinct, as though success was controlled by advocatorial ambition. The arts as Matarasso suggested, are messy and unpredictable, but he still wanted to build them into a neat evaluatory template, which seems strangely contradictory.

The arts are no panacea, as he admitted. But he insisted that arts programmes can deliver, even if the arts cannot, which is confusing. Notwithstanding, this emphasises the importance of the evaluation process, which may be a tool of empowerment for the excluded[34].

The research assessed the welfare implications of evaluating the arts for social impacts, the impact on the cultural rights of participants, and need for their informed consent. Matarasso agreed that permission was needed from participants if projects were intended to change their attitude or behaviour, but he contradicted this by adding the caveat that this was not always possible, and that it must be the intention. This clouded the ethical issue as to whether those involved needed to be fully aware of the objectives of the project.

He also contended that there was a need for artistic responsibility towards public finances and that arts programmes were cost-effective solutions to social problems. But there was no financial comparability with non-arts programmes offered. Ironically, he perceived cultural action as alleviating poverty, but was strangely hostile towards such activism, and failed to take a wider political position beyond his conservative new pragmatism.

This interest in the functionality of the arts in terms of social impact, reflects a particular utilitarian habitus. The working-class have arguably valued the arts in terms of utility, whilst those with higher and more sophisticated levels of cultural capital have valued them more in terms of a disinterested

---

[34] as explained in 4.9 and specifically 4.9.1 with regards to Empowerment evaluation

autonomy. His methodology can thereby be perceived as a cultural apartheid, in which the arts are seen as instrumental for the socially and culturally excluded.

Phillips meanwhile, was concerned with whether such programmes were perceived as artistic enterprises or social services, and believed that those involved in working with the institutionalised (first order of exclusion), considered such work as artistically founded and the social impacts as a consequence. In which case the arts were intrinsically vital to the programme.

Williams, although similarly ensnared in a social auditing methodology, seemed far more radical. Hence her understanding of 'community' art as a generator of social capital, effective in combating isolation and an antidote to globalisation. She recognised its political potential as a challenge to passive attitudes to mass culture. She valued participatory arts groups in their capacity to solidify communal values and recognised that they could be used to contest social norms, and hinted at a wider ideological and active involvement for the arts.

Moriarty the most outspoken critic of normative evaluation methodology, objected to its mechanical language, and perceived the immeasurability of the arts to be at odds with bureaucratic systems of measurement. She also recognised its political nature, and the danger of misusing reports. Her point that evaluations do not represent the reality of the programme is a serious indictment of statistical method. She professed that a production or final product was best evidence of programme success and questioned whether social impacts could even be measured. She made the vital distinction between evaluation as evidence and as advocacy.

Educational outcomes in terms of individual change, were another major concern for Comedia, and the creation of a learning society, in which citizens actively participated in their culture and developed a critical attitude towards it. Such idealistic values, also promoted greater cultural activity. But again, this vision of change was also confusing, as Matarasso argued that cultural activism could easily become a negative impact.

This investigation constructed a counter argument which critiqued Matarasso's contradictory position of masquerading as a democratic evaluator, whilst reporting as an expert evaluator. It revealed the dangers of appropriating evaluative method by a normative pragmatism, especially through social auditing. The value of such statistical information is debatable, but more importantly, this method readily becomes ensnared by the norms of a measurement culture, with numerical information

subjugating qualitative written and verbal evidence, thereby undermining alternative approaches. Matarasso also failed to address the problem as to whether such a pragmatic methodology gives a convincing reflection of value.

A major difference between Comedia's research and the objectives of PAT 10, is that the former was aimed at the evaluation of participatory arts groups, whilst the latter was concerned with the narrower constituency of the socially excluded. Matarasso contended that such arts groups were driven by those more able members of the community. These self-confident 'included' characters were catalysts in motivating a constituency in which passivity and cynicism is high, and self-esteem low. But they would by definition, be absent from more excluded groupings. This difference is vital, as outcomes concerning participant empowerment and the self-direction of programmes, would be adversely affected.

Arguably, the concentration on social impacts and their realisation, may accentuate the condition of the socially excluded. Whereas a greater emphasis on stakeholder control and management of the programme may better enable this inclusive process, in line with concepts of empowerment and emancipation[35].

The value of these contributions by the Comedia writers cannot be underestimated, as they have raised awareness and initiated discussion in this particular field. But there are pitfalls inherent in the evaluative approaches offered, not least the appropriation of qualitative evidence within a quantitative framework, the relevance of pre-set social impacts, and especially the need to empower the excluded through both the arts and the evaluative process. Ultimately, the overriding question is the extent to which these evaluation techniques become a means of managerial and funder control.

---

[35] see 11.2

Chapter 6. Evaluation Reports

6.1 Introduction

This short chapter assesses three specific evaluation reports for London Arts, the Scottish Arts Council (SAC) and the DCMS, that concern the arts and social exclusion.

6.2 The London Arts Regional Challenge Programme Report: *The Arts and Inclusion*

Evelyn Carpenter (1999) in her evaluation of the London Arts Regional Challenge Programme entitled *The Arts and Inclusion*, reviewed the self-evaluation of six projects. These concerned participants from specific ethnic, homeless and psychiatric health communities, young people and those with learning difficulties. It was in response to an evaluation brief that, 'was to assess the process by which each of the six projects had identified its target audience, the quality of the participative process and the artistic quality....its concept, delivery and effectiveness' (Carpenter 1999:4). This included the impact and quality of the final work/production on participants and audience, and how this might influence a wider audience.

She recognised the political nature of the field and used specific democratic criteria to establish and understand the inclusive quality of the participatory processes which enabled audiences to be involved. This owed much to the political theory writers, Robert Dahl and David Held, and their criteria of equal value, control of the agenda, ways of participating, and new understandings and skills (Dahl had a fifth criteria of inclusion). These Carpenter contextualised: 'equal value would be demonstrated through the attitude of the artists and other key staff to the audience.... equal weight would be given to the views of the audience at important stages in the artistic process' (1999: 9). 'Control of the agenda' referred to the audience initiating artistic concepts, planning and taking responsibility for the project, whilst 'ways of participating' concerned, 'mechanisms in place or ways for the audience to express their preferences about the purpose, form and content of the artistic activity' (1999: 10). 'New understanding and skills' were understood to reflect aesthetic concerns, but also wider educational objectives in terms of making informed choices and actions in order to be able to participate creatively. Ultimately this, 'showed the extent that the arts organisations had a democratic relationship with their audiences, and had democratised their art forms'

(1999: 4). Participation relied on the sustained interest and commitment of stakeholders in the creative process, and consequently the importance of artistic quality. She was concerned that, 'the arts were valued as ends in themselves rather than for their instrumental social and economic benefits ....[as this] seemed the best explanation for the enthusiasm and commitment of the audiences to see projects through often in the face of many practical obstacles' (1999: 4).

Carpenter wanted the artists, participants and audience to have equal control over the concept, design and practical implementation of the projects. Unfortunately, half of them did not subscribe to her criteria, one of the reasons being that, 'the audience were involved primarily as learners of new artistic skills' (1999: 30). Because of this, it was not possible to share control and responsibility.

She realised that one year project funding was possibly inappropriate and that, 'there was a correlation in these projects between effective inclusion and the extent of democratisation' (1999: 32), as the two most successful projects in terms of reaching and engaging large audiences better fulfilled her specified democratic process and agenda. That artistic quality and ambition were deemed vital for successful inclusivity, firmly placed aesthetic considerations high on the agenda. But artists also needed to demystify artforms and processes to better enable access.

She concluded that, 'on the evidence of these projects, marketing was not a significant factor in reaching and engaging their audiences' (1999: 36), where intention was to engage socially excluded groups and communities. Direct contact with artists and developing bridges between different stakeholders within the community, was the best strategy. Interactive marketing methods, such as focus groups, came closest to the methods used by the arts projects to develop their understanding of audience.

Getting work into the public domain and creating permanent legacies were deemed indicators of programme success. An example being that one of the projects, the Polyglot Theatre Company, which worked with the Eritrean Community, performed *The Harvest Plays* outside the National Theatre and created texts of the work in both Eritrean and English. It also helped build a new cultural organisation for the community. Carpenter recognised that, 'artistic quality was not always an over-riding concern' (1999: 33), as there was tension between high artistic aspirations and maximising audience involvement. She recognised that:

Much evaluation focuses on the wider impact of the arts contributing to, for instance, neighbourhood renewal and making a difference to, say, health, crime, employment or education in deprived communities. Participants in the 1998/99 Regional Challenge projects did not engage in the projects for those reasons though were sometimes aware of those benefits (1999: 39).

That the motivation for the arts was intrinsic, not instrumental, saw the projects through to the end. Such commitment, in the face of a range of obstacles, was inspired by the arts and creativity, which questions the durability of an extrinsic agenda.

6.3 Scottish Arts Council Report: *Not Just a Treat: Arts and Social Inclusion*

The SAC commissioned the Centre for Cultural Policy Research at the University of Glasgow, to create a toolkit for evaluating arts projects and review the SAC's Social Inclusion Scheme which it did in the report *Not Just A Treat: Arts and Social Inclusion* (Dean et al 2001).

The 'toolkit' aspect dealt with defining measurable objectives and ensuring that, 'an evaluation does not seek merely to praise what was done, but rather takes a critical look at any problems that have arisen so that lessons can be learnt' (Dean et al 2001: 7). But the emphasis on standard measurable outcomes failed to accommodate any greater understanding of value and quality. Nevertheless, the report used direct quotes from those involved to relay the impact and effect of the project.

The research recognised that, 'ideally.... [those who are intended to benefit from a project] would be participants in the project's inception and would play a key role in influencing and implementing an evaluation framework, as well as being participants in the project' (2001: 10). But it considered that in practice, this was hard to achieve as, 'the burden of consultation and participation often falls on a few dedicated residents' (2001: 10). It admitted that such a scenario may or may not allow the views of all stakeholders, and recognised that the arts needed to recognise the importance of quality, but in effect played a minor role in accommodating social inclusion. Christine Hamilton (2002) a researcher on the project, agreed that levels of consultation were varied at the early stages with some being funder-led.

Regarding the SAC's Arts and Inclusion scheme, Goodlad et al (2002) studied ten selected arts projects and the success of the Social Inclusion Partnership Scheme (SIP), inaugurated in 1999. They concluded that the, 'arts were not featured in most of the original strategies developed by SIP's' but where they were used, they followed, 'approaches that are well-developed in community arts...[but] did not always reach those who are the most vulnerable' (Goodlad et al 2002: 4). The report discovered the extent to which the arts were not considered relevant to social inclusion and given low priority[1]. Out of forty eight recognised SIP's more than half had either never applied for SAC funding for the arts or had been refused (2002: 13). Hamilton (2002), one of the researchers commented on the different levels of involvement of the local community in each case and considered self-management was not the intended aim, 'even though community empowerment is regarded as a key aspect of tackling exclusion'. Similarly, although the researchers were asked, 'to consider evidence of new and innovative approaches to using the arts to meet inclusion goals' (Goodlad et al 2002: 50), they found approaches to be traditional: 'In terms of art practice, none appear to be particularly "innovative" – nor do they set out to be' (2002: 53). Neither did any of the projects fit into a particular art category as they offered a range of experiences and artforms. As regards impact, information was seen to be limited and it was, 'almost impossible to have any certainty about the longer-term impact of these projects on either the development of the arts or the alleviation of social exclusion in the targeted areas' (2002: 54). But the research had raised the profile of the arts in terms of their utility for social inclusion projects and in terms of partnership with other agencies and schemes. Unfortunately, sustainability was problematic as the lottery funding was not aimed at long-term developments. The researchers noted that observers of the projects and SIP schemes had,

> detected immediate impacts of participation in the projects. Personal development, self-expression, community participation and self-esteem were mentioned several times. One interviewee considered that evidence of the arts in a community in itself would be evidence that the community

[1] This backed up research done by the Irish Arts Council (1997:116) on poverty, access and participation, which concluded that 'For those living on low incomes, in disadvantaged areas, the arts were not seen as something important in their lives, but rather something that was for other people', although these people hoped that the arts would be available for their children.

would be more inclusive. (2002: 62).

Such a sentiment perceives culture as an aspect of social exclusion, related to that expressed by ACE[2]. The report concluded that the SAC funding scheme was, 'encouraging Social Inclusion Partnerships.... to use the arts as a means of social inclusion' (2002: 65), which is good advocacy. But although it failed to find long-term evidence of the effect of the arts (which was beyond the remit of the study anyway), the views of all concerned with the projects were very positive. Interestingly it utilised the term and role of 'cultural champion', somebody within the SIP staff structure who had an interest in the arts and was therefore central to their promotion. With regards evaluation, it perceived that SIP's needed to be free to develop monitoring frameworks that captured information relevant to their specific goals. However, some common approach or base of monitoring data was required to enable comparable evaluation across the scheme, of the shorter or longer term effects.

That there was a need for cultural champions to instigate arts projects, as well as the evidence that many SIP's did not consider the arts relevant for the purposes of social inclusion, questions the importance of the arts to excluded people and communities. Only those involved in the arts deemed them to be socially useful, which puts an emphasis on the motivation to participate, a major concern for voluntary groupings.

6.4 Department for Culture Media and Sport Report: *Count Me In*

The DCMS asked The Centre for Leisure and Sport Research at Leeds Metropolitan University to conduct an evaluation report of fourteen culture and sport projects promoted by PAT 10[3] which was entitled *Count Me In*, eight of which had art and media connections (Long et al 2002: 22). The research sketched out the purposes of these cultural projects for young people, but was less forthright as to whether such projects actually addressed social exclusion, and there was much veiled criticism of the social inclusion agenda. It was concerned with, 'how small a part cultural activities play in the wider, official considerations of social inclusion' (2002: 3), and also recognised methodological problems due to the, 'transience of Audit

---

[2] see 3.5
[3] see 3.3.5

Commission and Best Value indicators.... [which] illustrates the difficulty of devising convincing measures of cultural provision that are capable of supporting benchmarking exercises' (2002: 2).

The report repeatedly referred to Matarasso and the research undertaken by Comedia as a good model, but reported that although many projects had, 'latched onto the idea of "soft" indicators.... there are few signs to date that they have moved beyond the conceptual stage to identify indicators and gather the associated evidence' (2002: 29). Confusingly, it recognised that for evaluatory purposes, 'there was never any intention that a standardised set of indicators should be imposed' (2002: 29), which fails to adequately describe the intended influence of a pre-determined PAT 10 (and Comedia) agenda. It also deemed critical, 'the extent to which the projects are a response to demands from below as opposed to being imposed from above' (2002: 69). Overall, it found a lack of enthusiasm for evaluation and method.

With regards to social cohesion and citizenship (two specified areas of importance for inclusion), it suggested that, 'projects allow scope for participants to **make decisions** about outputs' (2002: 70). It raised the importance of participant decision-making and self-determination, but suggested that stakeholder input into evaluation, was impossible to action due to the transitory and short-term nature of the projects. It indicated that participatory arts should revolve around the three concepts of: empowerment, social exchange and citizenship, which required a highly complex evaluation process. But accepted that programmes were, 'rightly being encouraged to evaluate against their own aims, so no consistency of practice or procedure can be expected' (2002: 4).

The report questioned, 'just what it is that people are expected to become included in, and the extent to which they have any say in the shape of that' (2002: 85). Similarly, it argued that, 'because a project is delivered in a disadvantaged area .... [this does] not necessarily mean that the presumed benefits are accruing to the socially excluded' (2002: 85), suggesting that it did not always follow that such projects necessarily promoted social inclusion. One reason was a problem with definition, another in terms of lack of attention to outputs. The research found that it, 'sometimes found a lack of clarity of outcomes and what they constitute, which projects would do well to address regardless of whether or not they will be conducting evaluation' (2002: 83), intimating that the process needed to be better embedded into the project from the start.

It also found a conundrum and confusion with project aims as they, 'are being evaluated but not against the same criteria or agenda as DCMS adopts' (2002: 86). This in itself is a very telling observation, and could possibly be applied to the agenda of project managers as against that of participants.

One section entitled, 'Enjoyment – Plain and Simple' (2002: 59) tried to match the involvement in such projects with enhancing quality of life. Such a 'fun' orientation underpinned involvement and participation had to be considered on stakeholder terms: 'If people feel excluded any effort to re-engage them has to start with their interest' (2002: 75). Not surprisingly, the research revealed that, 'so much of the cultural provision for young people in particular seems to be validated by the extrinsic benefits that it provides' (2002: 60). But such a position fails to respect the rights or opinions of participants, overriding their intrinsic interest and rationale for participating.

The research stated that, 'if the link with social exclusion is to be established, recognising the importance of considering outcomes is essential' (2002: 77), an admission that the position had not been established. This outcome orientation may be unrealistic, and adhering to an extrinsic agenda, unwanted by those participating (as expressed by Carpenter above). Besides stressing a, 'lack of clarity of outcomes', it also explained the, 'temptation for projects to claim a wide range of benefits in order to make themselves more attractive politically and increase their chances of securing funding' (2002: 83). Hence the danger of utilising an indirect and unproven raft of social indicators to prove programme success.

The evaluation focused on the supposed extrinsic social benefits of art programmes, to create, 'a more prominent position .... [for social inclusion] on the agenda' (2002: 4). Although it was value-free research, the fact that it was commissioned by the DCMS, made it politically driven to some degree. That bottom up control could ensure a raft of relevant realisable outcomes based on participant interest and objectives, might not necessarily transfer to a pre-specified agenda of social inclusion. Interestingly, projects were keen to engage stakeholders in the activities, 'but less so in respect of their own agenda setting and decision-making' (2002: 69). Notwithstanding, the research referred to the concept of '"knowing" (the knowledge that comes from direct experience)' (2002: 86), which, arguably, cannot be translated into a mechanical and measurable valuation process.

Moreover, PAT 10's initial panacea of a longitudinal evaluatory approach to discover the link between the

arts and social exclusion[4], had not been realised. Whilst agreeing that, 'one of the touchstones of the New Labour approach to government was that emerging policy should be based on evidence rather than being ideologically motivated or purely pragmatic' (2002: 2), there was still little evidence to prove this. The report questioned governmental definitions of social exclusion based on, 'symptoms rather than causes' (2002:23) which were treated as products rather than a processes.

The research initially set out by concurring that, 'The aim of the projects is to engage the attention of participants and provide a stimulating and enjoyable experience, without which their objectives will fail to be realised' (2002: 6). But it did not make clear whether these objectives had come from the DCMS, project management, funders or stakeholders.

It concluded by admitting that, 'we are concerned that much of what we have written in this report is redolent of social engineering' (2002: 87) and that such projects should be offered for their intrinsic merits, 'offering **fun and a contribution to the quality of life**' (2002: 87). This seemed to be a direct affront and reaction to the DCMS agenda of social impacts, returning participatory art programmes to a more traditional artistic rationale of value.

6.5 Summary

This chapter reviewed three evaluation reports into the socially inclusive impact of the arts. Each were sceptical to differing degrees of such an extrinsic agenda of social utility, all concurring that there was little supporting evidence or interest in it.

Carpenter in her *The Arts and Inclusion* report, evaluated six programmes for London Arts. She founded her technique on the interest of stakeholders (participants and audience) and the equality of all input into the artistic process and content. She recognised the political dimension and framework of evaluation, and her attempt to harness a democratic process was a step towards realising a need for wider empowerment of stakeholders. There was a correlation between inclusion and pursuing a democratisation of the processes involved in the arts programme. Direct contact of artists with other stakeholders was deemed as vital.

---

[4] set out in 3.3.2

Artistic excellence, the quality of the participatory experience and final product or performance, were understood as benchmarks of social inclusion. That this was dependent on the democratisation of the arts, recognised the importance of cultural inclusion as part of the process. She described the intention of participants and audience as intrinsically embedded in the arts, with evaluative focuses on wider social impacts misrepresenting involvement. Furthermore, such enthusiasm was vital in order to see projects through to the end.

Success could be perceived in terms of work in the public domain and creating a permanent legacy. Carpenter was aware that participation depended on artistic and creative needs, not instrumental ones. The *Not Just A Treat: Arts and Social Inclusion* report, reviewed the SAC's Social Inclusion Scheme. It recognised the minor role played by the arts in social inclusion projects, and that evaluation required a critical stance. It also recognised that stakeholders needed to play a major part in determining evaluatory objectives, but in reality this process of democratisation was unrealistic. Similarly it expressed the difficulties of reaching those most excluded, which were compounded by the arts not being featured in original strategies for social inclusion, proof that the arts were not perceived as relevant.

Raising the profile of the arts among SIP's seemed to be the central concern of the report, hence a 'cultural champion' was considered vital to convince, instigate and enable art projects. Unfortunately, only those involved in the arts recognised their social utility, which emphasises a need to motivate participation in terms of creativity, and the need for voluntary projects.

Another ambiguity centred around local control of evaluation procedures in the face of the need for baseline benchmarks applicable for comparative purposes. Self-management, was not considered to be the aim of the projects, further evidence that bottom-up community empowerment, a key aspect of tackling social exclusion, was either not possible to implement or assumed unimportant. That over half of the SIP's had either never applied for SAC funding for the arts or had been refused was a damning indictment of their perceived lack of social utility.

The *Count Me In* report for DCMS, evaluated eight culture and six sport projects promoted by PAT 10. It showed how the evaluation methodology created by Comedia and especially the Matarasso model, which relied on the identification of social indicators, had not been successfully implemented. It reflected on the

conflict of interests between local control and a DCMS agenda, but conceded that enfranchising and including the participants democratically through the evaluation system was problematic[5], and negated by the inherent authority of the expert evaluator. This conundrum reflects the political nature of evaluation, which can easily fall prey to evidence manipulation, especially through a lack of objectivity. But if evaluation concerns value, the evaluator must instinctively 'know' and understand the values of stakeholders and their reason for participation. Therefore, any attempt to include must be on stakeholder terms and start with their interests.

The report challenged governmental definition of social exclusion, as symptomatic rather than causal, product rather than process orientated. Finally, it found no conclusive evidence of long-term social benefit from such arts programmes, and reckoned that projects needed to be embedded in fun in order to enhance participant quality of life.

---

[5] as shown in 4.10

Chapter 7. Evaluation Case Study

7.1 Introduction

This case study in this chapter illustrates evaluation in practice, and is based on the personal experience of the author in his role as external evaluator for a drama-based arts programme designed for prisoners.

Firstly, it describes the context and illuminates the problems as well as processes involved in determining a method of working. Secondly, it uses narrative to describe three visits to the project in operation including triangulated opinion of those involved, which have been melded into a readable passage. These are presented using a different 'hand-written' font for the sake of clarity. In order to emphasise authenticity and better understand the context, the resultant field notes have been written in the first person.

7.2 Background Considerations

There were a range of background considerations in terms of methodology and context to consider with regards to utilising evidence for this case study.

7.2.1 Methodological Position of the Researcher

The methodological position of the researcher was examined with particular reference to both evaluation report and research thesis writing. The following concepts were major influences.

Denzin and Lincoln described an interpretative crisis in the social sciences. They distinguished the analysis of causal relationships and variables, which dictated quantitative methodology and assumed a value-free framework, from qualitative methods which emphasised meanings, processes and stressed, 'the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry' (Denzin and Lincoln 1994: 4). This crisis was also reflected in evaluation methodology[1].

Denzin (1994) described how there was a legitimate role for storytelling within a framework of

---

[1] see ch 4 especially 4.3 & 4.7

interpretation. Such a framework of, 'first-person accounts.... are attempting to produce reader friendly, multivoiced texts that speak to the worlds of lived experience' (Denzin 1994: 512). Similarly, Louise Smith (1994) in her work on biographical method as a means of conveying qualitative material, argued that, 'every text that is created is a self-statement, a bit of autobiography, a statement that carries an individual signature' (Smith 1994: 286), hence the authenticity of the first person.

Jean Clandinin and Michael Connelly (1994) discussed a range of personal experience methods one of which concerned utilising actual field notes. In their opinion, 'researchers are often more reluctant than necessary to use field records. They worry that field notes will be insufficient to capture field experience adequately.... What we fail to acknowledge clearly enough is that all field texts are constructed representations of experience' (Clandinin & Connelly 1994: 422). They also reflected on the need for anonymity and to fictionalise passages and people for ethical reasons.

Beyond these methodological concerns was the need to comprehend the technique of writing up into a case study framework.

7.2.2 The Case Study Method

Robert Stake (1978; 1994) championed the case study as a method of inquiry, and particularly as it, 'may be in epistemological harmony with the reader's experience'. He went further to suggest that, 'those readers who are most learned and specialised in their disciplines are little different. Though they write and talk with special languages, their own understanding of human affairs are for the most part attained and amended through personal experience' (Stake 1978: 5).

But there was a danger with such a subjective methodological leaning. The researcher may be tempted to infer that the case has a wider application. He recognised that personal experience was, 'not a suitable basis for generalization' (1978: 6), but that it was the experience of the researcher that determined such generalisation. This system of felt understanding was based on individual perception and not scientific, but the reality through which knowledge was constructed.

Stake distinguished between three types of case study: intrinsic, instrumental and collective cases.

This case was chosen, partly because it is instrumental, and, 'provide[s] insight into an issue or refinement

of theory. The case is of secondary interest; it plays a supportive role, facilitating our understanding of something else' and 'it is expected to advance our understanding of that other interest' (Stake 1994: 237). Much of this is due to the position of the researcher, in terms of being employed to take up a particular evaluation role which was predetermined to some degree. But the case also exhibits intrinsic properties as it reveals its own story.

Ultimately, Stake suggested that, 'the purpose of the case study is not to represent the world, but to represent the case' (1994: 245), hence the need to describe the following case in the manner outlined above and as experienced in the field.

7.2.3 The Context

It is not entirely by accident that the author applied for this evaluation job, as it incorporated both his area of work (prison) and intended field of study (art and social exclusion). But this chance case study also threw up problems regarding ethics, especially those of consent and deception.

Prison is an institution shrouded in secrecy and confidentiality. There are no clear-cut rules as to what is open to public scrutiny or deemed against the public interest. These grey areas of public accountability hang over prison like a Victorian fog. Such a lack of clarity aptly symbolised the author's own position and thinking, as well as methodological insecurity.

The ethical dilemmas confronted by the field researcher were tackled by Maurice Punch (1994). Whilst he recognised the utmost importance of informed consent, in reality (especially regarding street-style ethnography) such consent was inappropriate. Within the confines of prison, such issues of consent and deception are extremely sensitive issues. Firstly, prisons are rumour factories and places where half-truths and lies predominate within a culture of exaggeration and machismo. Secondly, with regard to especially observational techniques, these are loaded with issues of surveillance and control. Thirdly, truth can be multifarious and distorted.

Punch referred to the, 'moral pitfalls of participant observation .... that warn us of the essentially "political" nature of all field research' (Punch 1994: 83), but argued that the central issue was for the researcher to, 'get out and do it', and 'infiltrate' the relevant field (the term infiltrate in itself has overtones of deception).

He cited many examples of researchers juggling with the competing practical problems of fieldwork, their own conscience, and the lengths it was permissible to go to ascertain the information sought. He also questioned the honesty of the research purpose in terms of whether consent needed to be sought and if covert research methods were justified.

> In much fieldwork there seems to be no way around the predicament that informed consent - divulging one's identity and research purpose to all and sundry - will kill many a project stone dead....proponents of conflict methodology....would argue that it is perfectly legitimate to expose nefarious institutions by using a measure of deceit. (1994: 90)

Punch accepted that some measure of deception was inevitable. After all, 'who is to perform the moral calculus that tells us what to research and what to leave alone?' (1994: 92). But he rejected conflict methodology as an inappropriate model for the social sciences, because in the long term it spoiled the field for those who followed.

Richard Mitchell also argued that research practice should not rule out secrecy, as doing so could limit possibilities. His assumption was that secrecy is a fundamental quality of society and inherent in social relations, he eschewed the conception that, 'Secrecy and disclosure are represented as polarized phenomena, antonymous and mutually exclusive' (Mitchell 1993: 3). He also referred to the, 'myth of cosmetic identity' in which the researcher believes, 'that with skill it is possible to pass unnoticed among attentive strangers' (1993: 43). In which case researchers needed to be aware of their affect on those being researched, as they were not invisible, and that full disclosure may not necessarily be productive or the best course of action.

Such issues are magnified in the prison environment, which is an area of moral ambivalence, with much mistrust of 'outsiders' and a closed-minded institutionalisation endemic. Fact is blurred and pollinated by more fictional and mythical concerns, it is neither a suitable or safe environment for disclosure. Beyond these environmental considerations there are issues of information manipulation. In terms of confidentiality, Punch relayed the strong feelings among fieldworkers of non-identification and respect for

the privacy of those individuals involved in their research. He concluded with the idealistic concept that sound ethics fitted hand in hand with correct methodology. But he conceded that, 'At the situational and interactional level, then, it may be unavoidable that there is a degree of impression management, manipulation, concealment, economy with the truth, and even deception' (1994: 95), therefore it was important that the researcher admitted to this process and was clear about intention.

The consideration of context, including self-positioning, is an important pre-condition for both evaluator and researcher.

7.3 Evaluating the 'Connecting Lines' Programme

The author was to work for Insight Arts Trust (IAT) as external evaluator for its 'Connecting Lines' programme. This aimed to help prisoners, 'examine their own behaviour and choice patterns, hold a positive self-image, make pro-social career choices .... [and] develop communication and social skills' (Insight Arts 1998a). It ran from autumn 1998 to summer 2001 and consisted of two projects; 'North/South' which was a structured drama workshop and 'Sleepers' which was a more unstructured multi-arts project.

The programme which consisted of eight sessions over four days, visited 10 prisons in three years. The following information describes the evaluatory brief, rationale behind the programme, preparatory research, considerations when creating a method, contradictions in position, on-site observations and construction of the evaluation reports. The names of those concerned have been fictionalised with identities withheld.

7.3.1 The Brief

> We have appointed Paul Clements to undertake the external evaluation....His brief covers initial research, visiting projects as they run, conducting his evaluation and assimilating our own and providing interim and final reports. (Insight Arts 1999c)

The author was interviewed twice in April 1999 by IAT for the post, by the two Directors. The initial brief

was to evaluate the Connecting Lines programme in terms of its success in addressing offending behaviour. It was agreed that he would observe the workshops and complement the internal evaluation done by the Programme Director (PD). The Organisation Director (OD), wanted evidence to advocate the worth of the programme to primary funders, who had stipulated that the programme had to be evaluated externally. He realised that there was a problem between gathering evidence regarding the success of the project and advocating it, but decided against raising this as a dilemma[2].

He had two more meetings, one with the OD and another with the PD. These both concerned the role and remit of the post. He was shown the internal evaluation procedure, asked questions about the programme and organisation, and was given much written material containing relevant information. It was his role to create a method and compile evidence and information to support the internal evaluation process, within a research framework, which would be written up into reports.

7.3.2 Background to Insight Arts Trust and Programme Objectives

IAT began as an organisation in north London in 1987, and was supported by the Inner London Probation Service, who referred clients to its drama workshops[3]. Since then it has introduced other art forms, namely: video, photography, sound, sculpture and creative writing. It has expanded to work with prisoners, but keeps within the remit of working with offenders or ex-offenders. By 2001, the organisation had many sponsors and a small nucleus of staff (the two directors and an administrator) as well as a pool of freelance tutors.

Its overriding programme objectives were to use the arts as a vehicle for exploring personal change. Issues of identity and the relationship of the individual to society could thereby be investigated through the medium of drama and role-play experimentation. Its promotional keywords were: reflection, creativity, participation and change. The arts were perceived as a possible way to, 'break negative attitudes and behaviour patterns', raise confidence and self-esteem. (Insight Arts Trust 1999b; 2000).

In one meeting, the PD gave the rationale for a successful project. This was to channel energy

---

[2] as described in 5.5.4

[3] see Appendix 2

constructively, combating the lethargy and negativity of prison, instil motivation and enable communication . Ultimately the objective was to encourage participants to better understand their potential for change, or at least acknowledge the possibility, and to see projects through to the end. When asked about confidentiality and consent, it was considered, 'tactless to bring up these issues when such concerns may frighten off participants', as it was essential to get projects off the ground quickly. Talk about rehabilitation was considered too 'heavy' in content (Insight Arts Trust 1999a). Hence there was a dilemma in terms of informed consent[4].

7.3.3 Use of Art forms

The two different projects that made up the Connecting Lines programme, although steeped in drama, were very different:

'North/South' was totally drama based and prescriptive. The two tutors involved used a curriculum and specific agenda, which was then adhered to rigidly. There were specific aims and objectives for the eight sessions, including the, 'development of spatial/physical relationships .... Exploration of themes - power, control, image and empathy....[and] beginnings of conflict resolution' (Insight Arts Trust 1998b).

'Sleepers' was founded on similar dramatic method, but less rigid and more experimental, utilising more technical and aesthetic accompaniment: photography, video and sound. Such artforms were used to re-focus attention on behaviour and the individual; watching an image on video, a photograph or hearing a voice on mini disk. The five tutors would work around a looser agenda.. It was, 'A drama led multi-arts residency culminating in a short performance/installation on day 4....The workshop structure has been intentionally created to allow for good working practice, cohesive group dynamic, empowering the individual, a successful directorial approach and a high quality final product' (Insight Arts Trust 1999c).

Both projects were thematic and could involve a performance in front of an audience, depending on the wishes of the participants.

The manner in which the organisation utilised and applied multi-arts in the programme was also set out.

---

[4] these ethical concerns are discussed in 5.6.2 & 5.6.4

These had to be treated first and foremost aesthetically, with any instrumentality naturally resulting from proper use. Quality within the canon was of primary importance and deemed to enable utility. This rationale is briefly explained with regards to those art forms utilised:

Drama allows a sense of connectedness with others. Individual behaviour becomes subject to the scrutiny and criticism of the group. The fictional plane easily becomes biographical with an exploration of real issues and emotions, thus allowing individuals to respond without a pre-determined curriculum. This enables each participant a freedom to decide individual response (and later a discussion of this response), and strategies of how to cope with issues of freedom of choice and responsibility. Drama facilitates a simulated overview of many of the real problems and issues that the participant has to face, and how they accommodate these.

Video material is a language with which especially young people are familiar. Due to its accessibility and recognisable nature, it is easy for participants to identify with it. This allows both an understanding of being a cameraman or being viewed, actor or voyeur, insider or outsider, therefore it makes transparent the dual role of watching and being watched, indicative of the prison and wider society. It also shows how image can be manipulated.

Photography provokes discussion around image, environment and privacy. Also around themes of the past, family, relationships and personal experiences. Techniques of working need to be mastered in order to achieve better results, so the underlying requirement for discipline and learnt craft can be better linked to creativity.

Music and sound encourages listening to others in a group situation. It naturally promotes an understanding of group dynamics, communication, and other people. Sound is a medium that enables the user to explore other ways of looking at the past and how recorded language encapsulates these emotions and experiences. (Insight Arts Trust 1999a).

But within this multi-arts format, drama was the linchpin and foundation for workshop activity, the dominant art form.

7.3.4 Applied Theatre - Cognitive Behavioural Change

The 'Connecting Lines' programme is part of a dramaturgical tradition, one of utilising theatre in prison to address behavioural concerns.

James Thompson (1999) documented the techniques of using drama to manage anger and offending behaviour. He showed that such methods were designed to enable participants to engage in the decision-making process. This was done by utilising drama games which emphasised role play, modelling and perspective taking. Such a problem-posing and -solving theatre encouraged cognitive dexterity. The underlying philosophy was that change (as in behaviour) required a creative approach, and therefore needed to be treated in a fashion that encouraged experimentation and necessitated a safe environment. He consequently asserted that, 'Cognitive behavioural analysis of human action is one in which events, thoughts and then subsequent actions are shown to be interrelated and mutually reliant. To put it simply, a situation that leads to a thought, which is processed into a decision, which is then put into action' (Thompson 1999: 17). Behavioural change therefore requires a performance that is rehearsed or repeated, hence drama is the natural medium and tool of operation. In theory, this is a natural process of self-reflection with the roles played enabling practice at tackling rigid thinking and behaviour. Such a natural and therapeutic process, 'should explicitly encourage a spontaneity in thinking rather than an unthinking acceptance of what is "right"' (1999: 34).

Chris Johnston (1998) ex-director and founder of IAT described the play orientation of the exercises that constituted much of the drama workshop. There was an immediacy to the practice and an accessibility lacking in other artforms. He reckoned that it, 'had a special aptness for groups who are excluded or choose to exclude themselves from mainstream culture' (Johnston 1998: 3), and stressed the need for voluntary participation, which enabled the participant to explore the medium with real inquiry. In contrast to the barrier created by compulsion. He proposed that the potential of community drama lay in four overlapping areas. These were: recreation, solidarity, the study of conflict and celebration (1998: 5-11). Play and the need to bond with others, the primary motives for participation, combined a personal search for identity with more collective and cultural considerations. Such was the approach promoted by IAT. Issues of addressing behaviour, therefore, had to be understood within this wider play-orientated framework of

motivation, a process founded in individual inquisitiveness and enjoyment. Similarly, he expressed that 'workshops in my view are more effective by criteria of self-empowerment if they place the participants in the role of content-makers' (1998:17), hence the need for some degree of participant control. Ultimately, Johnston conceded that, 'theatre is a subversive medium .... [and that when it] is conceived and organized to reaffirm political or cultural orthodoxy sits ill-at-ease with itself' (1998: 21). In which case there is a conflict of interest inherent when using drama for behavioural purposes, especially when these reflect a political agenda, and social accommodation.

Both Thompson and Johnston acknowledged the major influence of two Brazilians, the educational theories of Paolo Freire[5] and the theatrical practice of Augusto Boal[6]. For them, participants needed to be empowered to change not only themselves but also, 'the community or society in which they reside' (Thompson 1999: 37), in order to sustain personal change. But this creates a real problem within a prison environment, as participants have to return to prison society after the workshop, an inflexible and authoritarian regime, which they are not able or supposed to change. So already, there is a contradiction with applying this method.

7.4 Practical Operation

A practical technique of working needed to be considered prior to observational visits and report writing.

7.4.1 A Method of Evaluation

The first consideration for the evaluation work was to construct an evaluatory method.

Patton showed that an advocacy/adversary model of evaluation involved many ethical issues in terms of manipulating both quantitative, but especially qualitative data:

> It is difficult to be inductive and holistic when you are trying to prove a predetermined point...[hence] a comprehensive qualitative methods strategy is largely incompatible with the adversary model. The

---

[5] discussed in 9.5.7 & 11.2.4

[6] see case study 9.5

qualitative evaluator seeks phenomenological understanding; the adversary evaluator seeks evidence to support a predetermined point of view. (Patton 1980: 53)

Therefore, traditional qualitative methods of observation, interview and written feedback needed to be treated with caution, the evaluation brief was not one of objective evidential analysis, as there was a predetermined position to support in terms of addressing offending behaviour.

Patton took a pragmatic approach in his 'utilization-focused' evaluation[7]. He concentrated on the process, as well as the individual character and setting of each programme. He recognised that, 'the practice of evaluation research requires more flexibility than is likely to be provided by any single model' (1980: 58), and that a strategy was required to accommodate this. Such qualitative data could be used to isolate important factors in the programme but could not be standardised. He argued that the concerns of how decision makers will utilise evaluative information should be a driving force. His reasoning related to fulfilling a practical mandate, whilst, ' attempting to construct a general framework that goes beyond the grab-bag approach of technique mongering that leaves one with a limited bag of tricks, but no real foundation on which to build new approaches to deal with new situations and unanticipated problems' (Patton 1982: 18).

On the one hand he advocated the rigour of social science technique for collecting and analysing qualitative data, but was not happy for method and theory to override any practical imperative encountered in the real evaluative situation. He welcomed theoretical models, but also warned against strict adherence, as it was the utilisation and process of the evaluation that was of primary concern.

Stake (1995) took this process a step further in his 'Responsive' evaluation. It was the job of the evaluator to vigorously interpret the content and data collected, from a particular not general point of view. He likened evaluation research to case work:

All evaluation studies are case studies. The program, person, or agency being evaluated is the case. The

---

[7] see 4.3.2 & 4.5

study is, at least in part, a search for merit and shortcomings of that case....When fully in the role of program evaluator, the case study researcher chooses specific criteria or a set of interpretations by which the program's strengths and weaknesses, successes and failures will become apparent.

(Stake 1995: 95-6)

Such a localised concept implied a subjectivity and understanding that allowed entry into the specificity of the case, from an emic perspective. Whereas the quantitative evaluator assessed effectiveness using objective measurement from an etic perspective, the qualitative evaluator, 'emphasises the quality of activities and processes, portraying them in a narrative description and interpretative assertion. With all strategies, there is the essentiality of contexts, multiple points of view, and triangulation' (1995: 96). It required an emphatic insider understanding in order to select the important issues and criteria upon which to base the inquiry[8].

The evaluative position decided by the author, was also much influenced by Denzin and Lincoln (who were indebted to the anthropologist Claude Levi-Straus), and their concept of the qualitative researcher as bricoleur: 'The choice of which tools to use, which research practices to employ, is not set in advance. The "choice of research practices depends upon ".... what is available in the context, and what the researcher can do in that setting' (1994: 2). This included interaction with participants and triangulation of opinion from all involved in the programme, combined with observational and verbatim participant evidence to be used in the written reports. The author was also influenced by Matarasso's pragmatism and the NEF use of social auditing[9], as IAT wanted statistical evidence utilised. Quantitative evidence would be provided by collating qualitative information gathered from the feedback sheets into statistical form. Moreover, the reports would contain additional advocatorial research regarding the need for and dearth of such projects within the prison context.

---

[8] such a constructivist methodology is set out in 4.7.1

[9] set out in ch 5

7.4.2 Contradictions in Position

The position as external evaluator was contradictory. The OD wanted an external research-led evaluation to complement the internal evaluatory method already in place. He wanted hard evidence to prove that such art programmes addressed offending behaviour, as funding depended on it.

The author knew that this would be difficult to collect or prove, as the number of variables involved were phenomenal and because there was a huge debate about the effectiveness of rehabilitation programmes anyway[10]. He was unhappy with this position, but unfortunately, that was the remit which was made very clear in the interviews.

The 'Connecting Lines' programme had not worked with a consistent group for more than one project, which merely lasted four days, and had yet to establish itself in a prison, hence the need for advocacy. Therefore it was unrealistic to even try to prove that such a short-term course could meaningfully affect offending behaviour.

7.4.3 Preparation for On-Site Observation

The observation as agreed with IAT, required a day-long prison visit of the project in operation. In order to maximise these opportunities, it was agreed that this would be based on non-participant observation, which would include informal interviews with anybody involved.

In order to create more specific evidence and link the programme with addressing offending behaviour, the author decided that a 'before-and-after' technique needed to be incorporated into the project. Michael Balfour and Lindsey Poole (1998) argued that the absence of evaluatory evidence undermined many drama projects undertaken in the prison and probation environment. They agreed that it would be unwise and unrealistic to construct an ultimate evaluation process, but that changes in attitude were seen as a key indicator. They advocated a quantitative approach which consisted, 'of using two questionnaires designed to measure attitudes and administered on a pre- and post-test basis' (Balfour & Poole 1998: 224).

Therefore the PD was asked if a before-and-after questionnaire or game could be incorporated into the

---

[10] see the case study in ch 11 especially 11.4.2; 11.4.3 & 11.4.4

programme in order to gather evidence as to any changes in attitude among the group. This could be a dramatic form of evaluation, using trigger situations to see what effect these had on the participants. For instance, a simulated role play around the theme of violence and how this altered from the first day to the last. The participants could then be asked to quantify their response from 1 to 10 in terms of their anger to the trigger situation, thereby allowing changes in behaviour and attitude to be explored, and the results quantified. Unfortunately the PD decided that such a test was inappropriate, and was not in sympathy with her way of working, it was, 'too clumsy and awkward' (Insight Arts Trust 1999a). So the idea was abandoned.

In order to aid the process of triangulating evidence and opinion, the PD was asked to introduce a diary notebook for interested parties to fill in daily, in order to elicit specific descriptive detail and opinion. Hopefully this would enable the 'value' and effect of the workshop to become more apparent over time. It was designed (and re-designed) to ask the same questions daily and give space for the diarist to express him or herself. The questions were there to help direct thought, but also to allow diarists to articulate their own, and ascertain opinion (both individual and collective). The PD agreed to utilise the diary along with the internal evaluation process which included written feedback forms from participants and tutors. Also, the author had access to workshop proposals and plans from previous projects.

The prisoner feedback sheet was re-drafted and re-worded by the author in consultation with the PD. This asked participants to mark between 1 and 5, their responses to certain questions about the workshops. Originally there were six questions and the obligatory 'any other comments' at the end. These were: 'Approach, Content, Benefit, Delivery, Time Allotted and Feel Good Factor'. Two areas that needed to be added concerned how challenging the workshop had been and if the participant was involved with educational activities. Eventually the 'How Challenging' question was added, but not until the end of the programme. Redesigning the tutor assessment sheet was also discussed. That contained a session-by-session monitoring. Questions asked included: 'Summary of the Session, What Worked Well, What Didn't Work Well, Any Particular Points, Problems and Other Comments'. The redesigned form never materialised.

It was agreed that the author would have access to all feedback forms from every project, which included

all opinion in order to triangulate as widely as possible.

7.4.4 Observation: Evaluation in Practice

For the first observation at the Wolds prison, the author intended to utilise some traditional observation techniques. There were good reasons for being a non-participant observer as against a participant observer. Firstly, because he was coming into the multi-arts project on the third day of four, in order to see the process in operation. He had only met the PD, and obviously did not know the prisoners involved and would therefore be a stranger under suspicion. Secondly, he needed to see the project for what it was and how the tutors combined drama, games, video, photography and sound. Also, distance was needed to ascertain how they interacted, among themselves and with the participants. Thirdly, this had been agreed with both the OD and PD.

He realised that this way of working would be difficult as drama was a very inclusive medium. Balfour and Poole described this process and how boundaries easily become blurred, giving a real workshop example:

> The 'observer' who had originally been briefed to maintain an 'objective' distance from the drama work, found that the participative way the work was structured made it impossible not to become part of the drama. Before the end of the first day our impartial observer was playing the role of the girlfriend in the drama. (1998: 225)

Because the author had decided to concentrate his observation on the involvement of the group in the project, he had started to design a system that quantified individual prisoner participation in the project. This was based on interaction-process analysis and particularly the Bales/Flanders system (cited in Bell 1999: 160-1). In order to keep it simple, he prepared to classify involvement by the group into six categories to investigate involvement, which would be modified. These were; proposing, supporting, disagreeing, giving information, seeking information and building. This system was utilised for classifying behaviour in meetings, but seemed an ideal initial evaluative template. Broad categories were needed to portray the extent to which each person participated in and responded to the project, which could be

finessed later as the project unfolded. This would thereby allow him to gauge prisoner responses in terms of verbal and non-verbal communication.

The author was particularly interested in how tutors incorporated the excluded characters in the group and how they interacted with each other and participants, as well as how the participants interacted with each other. Therefore he decided to concentrate on informal conversational interviews during breaks, to discover opinion.

The position of observer was compounded by the foucauldian notion that surveillance had been used historically to, 'induce effects of power' (Foucault 1977: 171) and as a means of coercion[11]. There were also issues surrounding the voluntary nature of programmes. The emic knowledge of the author gained through many years of working in prison and informal discussion with inmates, had made him sceptical about coercion. For instance, the Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS) and Anger Management (AM) programmes were nominally voluntary, but there was huge pressure on prisoners to participate as such programmes were written into prisoner sentence plans and non-completion could affect parole. Therefore it was pleasing that this project was founded on voluntary participation, but this did not ensure that it would be promoted by the prison in a similar fashion.

There were other observations to consider, such as: the suitability of venue and facilities, the co-operation and attitude of all parties involved, the make up of tutor and participant groups, the drop-out rate, and whether the workshops were engaging and challenging.

7.5 The Written Notes

The following notes are an amalgam of two separate processes at work; the author's observations and thoughts, as well as the opinions of those involved. These were written up separately at the end of each workshop session, and re-edited.

---

[11] as described in the Outsider Art case study see 8.5.1

7.6 'Sleepers' at HMP Wolds, Humberside (Oct 1999)

I arrived the night before the first observation, but the PD failed to notify the other four tutors, so when I met them in the guesthouse that evening, they knew nothing about my visit. The PD admitted that she had been worried about telling the tutors. Also, it transpired that she had not told the participants about my visit either. This was not a good omen.

The PD told me that evening that there had been two men interested in writing a diary (one eventually completed). I hoped that this would give me the information needed. I met and chatted with the four other tutors, two women and two men. Division of labour: Director, Video artist, Photographer using slide, Sound Engineer and Actor. The theme of the project was: Time and Exploring the Unknown.

The next morning we entered the male prison and I was introduced to the arts co-ordinator who worked for the organisation Summit Arts. She was facilitating the programme, and took us to the Visits Room, where the workshops were taking place. I was familiar with the key culture of locking and unlocking gates, but this was my first experience of a privately run prison.

7.61 AM - Visits Room.

The PD introduced me to the group of adult male prisoners. I explained who I was and why I was there. I also asked for the group's permission to be involved. There was little response, the situation felt somewhat uneasy, so I retired gracefully to a corner to observe. As I took pen and paper out to work on my Bales/Flanders system, the PD asked me not to take any notes whilst observing as she felt that this would disrupt the group and create suspicions. I agreed to her wishes, and realised that any type of documented analysis was unworkable in this environment, so I abandoned creating a response system. Jotting down observations and ideas would have to be done surreptitiously, which was akin to surveillance. This I was also unhappy about, but evidence had to be compiled and documented. She and the other tutors were very unsure of having an observer in their midst, as were the prisoners, neither of whom had been primed. I felt uncomfortable but was not unduly concerned as I expected the observation to be difficult.

To begin with two tutors started drama interaction exercises. The most memorable and powerful, was an eye contact game, where all participants stood in a circle, and when they caught the eye of another, stared at each other, moving in towards that person and the centre in a circular fashion, fixed on each other. Issues of power and machismo were involved, creating a visual dialogue. Some men found it difficult to participate, but the game made everyone aware of the nature of power and challenge.

Meanwhile the other tutors were using the interview rooms to set up their equipment and material created the previous day. After the interaction exercises, small groups of participants became involved in this specialist and technical work, which completed the rest of the morning session.

The Visits Room consisted of a big space and separate booths for more private meetings. The workshop utilised the booths for different specialisms. The participants completed a session in each booth, in order to finish off work done previously.

Booth1: Sounds and speech played with and slowed down using the digital technology.

Booth2: Slides of images taken projected and discussed.

Booth3: Video footage played around with and ideas firmed up.

The group showed a lot of interest in the session, and I talked informally to different participants, some more willing to interact than others.

In the lunch break I was able to talk to both the project co-ordinator and the director of Summit Arts, an organisation subcontracted to run arts events and workshops. I also talked to the tutors, who were happy with the progress made in the session and overall.

7.6.2 PM - Chapel.

Session started with a group talk in which the PD asked the participants where they wanted to go with the material in terms of a performance. She wanted the group to direct the proceedings themselves to some degree, although this would make her job more difficult. Issues of democracy and ownership were discussed. One of the group wanted a theme, something concrete to work towards, another said he wanted a beginning, a middle and an end. The director re-iterated the theme of exploring the unknown and time, and the drama tutor suggested more direction. It was agreed that for the afternoon session,

two groups would work out mini plays. They would then act out scenes 1 and 3, which would describe the story (before and then after the event) leaving the other group to guess Scene 2 in the middle. These mini plays were repeated and built upon and as they were performed, background sounds introduced and slides projected over the live performances, trying to bring in other artforms. It really took off, with involvement from all. There was much personal disclosure, but little control of the direction from the participants.

Winding down, the director suggested the possibility of a performance on the last day, which was one of the aims of the project. There was a mixed response from participants. One said he didn't want to be laughed at. So the director suggested an invited audience of friends, this got an even worse response. The issue was going to be resolved the next day.

My position as evaluator was questioned directly by two of the participants at different times during the proceedings. They were suspicious. I resolved their anxieties, by telling them of my experience of working in prison and involvement in the arts. One wanted to know what I thought of it all. I told him that I thought it a very positive and ambitious project. He agreed and speaking for the group said how difficult it was to get involved in the project. To quote: 'that's the problem, we lead such structured lives in prison and it's difficult for us to take decisions and choices'. I thought his remark a strong recommendation of the programme.

The group was ethnically mixed and the only drop-out rate was for those having legal visits to attend. Another endorsement of the programme. The venues were adequate and fitted in with the prison regime (a service in the chapel in the morning and prisoner visits in the afternoon).

The prisoners and tutors filled out their feedback sheets at the end, and opinion was that the workshop had been a success.

7.6.3 Triangulation of Opinion

Statistics from feedback sheets:

8 completed forms

Approach taken	31 (78%)
Content of workshops	.25 (71%)
Benefit (to prisoners)	26.5 (66%)
Delivery	26 (74%)
Amount of time allotted	16 (40%)
Feel good factor	30.5 (76%)

Overall Analysis:

More time needed.

Very well approached, devised and delivered.

Very beneficial to prisoners.

Very good feedback from prisoners.

One prisoner redesigned the feedback form including a 'finished product' category.

Comments from prisoners:

'Because the course was so abstract, it would have helped initially if we'd been told how unstructured it would appear'

'The exercises were excellent and well delivered and executed but the organisers should have realised early from them that there were people who could create, extemporise and that everyone could recall significant chunks of text'

'The end performance isn't what it's all about, it's the whole process'

'I would be willing to take part in any future projects and would welcome back the team'

'I didn't feel we had enough input regarding the finished product'

'I think more time could have been taken to explain the theme of "time and space"...To be honest, I felt as if someone was playing with my head. If this was therapy arts where was the therapy?'

'The poster that advertised the project was very misleading....I don't feel that the aim of the project was delivered at the beginning'

'There was not enough time to have hands on experience with the visual and audio equipment available'

'If the purpose was rehabilitation. I don't feel rehabilitated'

'Good director as organiser....but she didn't take us enough into her confidence. Her encouragement was terrific but sometimes a bit "luvvie" for us "cons"'

'I didn't feel we had enough input regarding the finished product. Got bored and distracted towards the end but to be honest I think that was due to my state of mind not the job done by Insight arts'

'well "What the fuck happens now? will the material recorded and films be part of another project?.....what did it achieve?'

'Four days is not a long time for people doing a long time....I thought there was something lacking in content'

'Sound and video disappointing as they didn't complement the final presentation'

'the team from Insight arts were very professional and slick in their execution of the project. Although I think that they seriously under estimated the talents of some of the inmates here, and set their goals to[o] low'

'The benefit that courses like these have on inmates are incredibly important....Firmly believe that I benefited from taking part'

'I wasn't sure what the finished product was....I would like to add that I think there is a lot of scope for groups like Insight Arts to come into prisons and help prisoners to express themselves and help with their creativity'

'All the t[e]am worked hard for the entire four days....I felt the team have an energy about what they do and because they want to, not because they have to....I gave this the highest praise because I think this is Insight Arts strongest asset'

'I think Insight Arts are "very brave" asking for comments'

The Diarist:

The diarist showed how over the four days, his interest and questioning of the project got the better of his scepticism and reluctance. By day 4 he was 'really getting the hang of it'. Overall, it, 'was excellent as it brought out a part of me I was not even aware of'. He also referred to, 'a little bit of anxiety under certain members of the group' with a, 'lot of them .... getting "performance fever", which is very normal and understandable'. He also commented that, 'It was interesting to see of out of nothing something had been created'. He was a bit concerned that, 'the decision about having an audience yes or no was already being taken for us' as though it was a foregone conclusion that a performance would happen.

Tutor Viewpoints:

One tutor stated that there was a, 'quick and effective integration with the participant group', but that there were, 'Problems with participants arriving and leaving in the middle of sessions' and with, 'Communication and changes in location and moving of furniture' which interrupted and hindered practice. Another felt, 'Stretched in terms of keeping the project moving which required much energy'. Another admitted that, 'keeping everyone involved is difficult, as some don't really want to be involved as much as others and get easily distracted'

Two tutors were angry and dismayed at the presence of the evaluator which one described as, 'affecting the dynamic of the group in a negative manner'. All tutors were happy that the project was seen through to completion and the quality of the final performance which worked well.

Other opinion:

'I would have them [Insight Arts] back' (Education Co-ordinator)

'I think the more things that there are to do here, the less trouble they give us' (Prison Officer)

7.6.4 Overall impressions

i) There was high energy and 100% effort and commitment from the PD and tutors, who were highly skilled and able in the environment.

ii) PD let go of control, enabling the group to explore and take decisions in terms of group direction. This democracy was vital in terms of allowing participants to take responsibility. She cleverly re-introduced structure when it was needed but allowed exploration of the new. Maybe this process needed to go farther, as the group were relatively well behaved and responded well.

iii) The prison was very accommodating. The arts co-ordinator and director facilitated the nuts and bolts of moving prisoners and time schedules etc. Although the group changed as men were taken off to visits, this could have been a lot worse.

iv) The diversity of artform allowed most of the participants to be involved in the project, beyond budding performers.

v) The 'offending behaviour' remit was not the controlling or central feature of the programme, it wasn't forced onto the participators, it was steeped in a more aesthetic agenda. The participants choice to disclose biographical information was their decision. This was a natural process and such role play in the mini plays came out of enthusiasm and involvement. But whether such an environment was a safe place to do this, particularly as those involved would have to return to the wing, was arguable.

vi) The project allowed ideas from the participants (who were credited with intelligence to grasp ideas and construct stories) to be followed through. It was a voluntary exercise with consenting participation. There was no compulsion. Some of the participants were more vocal than others, but two members of the group were very peripheral. I noticed that the tutors kept them involved, including them if only for a chat. In practice the interactive nature of the project facilitated communication and self-esteem.

vii) The makeup of the tutor team was diverse, both in terms of gender, ethnicity, personality and skills. Team roles were well co-ordinated and defined.

viii) The venues used were acceptable and functional for the needs of the workshop.

ix) There was a lack of communication from the PD to the group regarding my observation and (from the written tutor comments) a lack of understanding about the position. Tutors were not happy with being observed. This should have been discussed with the PD or OD prior to my arrival.

x) The project was very ambitious and left too many participants asking for more structure in their feedback. They were not totally sure as to the rationale behind the workshops.

xi) In its brochure, IAT suggested that the programme could accommodate up to 40 prisoners, I felt that this was unrealistic. The group involved included 12 -15, only a third of the maximum. The Participants (many of whom were long-serving prisoners) were very needy in terms of individual attention. The smaller the group the easier the programme.

xii) The written feedback from two other projects already completed, confirmed that the participants wanted certificates showing their involvement. I did not personally think this was a good idea, but was persuaded by the argument.

7.7 'North/South' at Portland YOI, Dorset (Oct 2000)

I drove down to Portland early that morning for the last day of the workshop, and was greeted by a monumental old fashioned borstal. I met the two tutors, a male and a female (one I knew from the previous observation) but we had terrible problems getting into the Youth Offenders Institute. We were 40 minutes late starting. Apparently the same problem had occurred everyday. It was a very uncooperative regime. Both the Governor of Activities and Education Co-ordinator had failed to get involved, both had taken leave. Unlike at HMP Wolds, there was no co-ordinator.

We were taken to an industrial cleaning workshop which was far from an ideal location. It had bad acoustics when there was rain on the tin roof. This it did a lot of the time and during the performance. The tutors told me that they had abandoned their structured agenda, as none of the young prisoners had been informed about the intention of the programme to address offending behaviour. They had been asked if they wanted to participate in a drama workshop, so the tutors felt it was unethical to go beyond this remit and hastily re-constructed the four day workshop to be more fun orientated and reflect what they had volunteered for. This example of enforced improvisation, showed the ability of the tutors to change their method. I was also impressed that the issue of participant consent had been considered and respected.

7.7.1 AM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

As we entered the workshop, there was a group of 13 young male prisoners aged 17-21 acting. They had taken it on themselves to get started without the tutors, and were trying out their ideas from the previous day. They had decided that they wanted to create and produce a piece of work for a performance. This was to be entitled 'The Package'. What it entailed was a conglomeration of set pieces that had been created and produced over the three previous days. This included scenes such as: buying and selling drugs; motorbike and car crash (under the influence of drink and drugs); conscience of causing a death; loitering on the street etc. I introduced myself and reason for my presence, the group of young male prisoners responded positively and chatted with me. It was a typical mix of cultures and abilities. The participants had signed up for the workshop by responding to posters on the wing, therefore participation was voluntary, but without real understanding of what the process entailed. The group seemed a safe place to explore issues and themes associated with their lives, this reflected the abilities of the tutors to create such an environment. But as in the Wolds prison, these participants would have to return back to a very different and hostile situation, so disclosure could cause problems later.

The participants had told me that the Education Department in the prison did not cater for drama in any way. At least three of the group wanted to follow up with drama work on their release.

The prison officers supposedly assigned to the project quickly made their excuses and left as they had other duties to attend to. We were left without an officer present. This and other issues referring to security contradictions (leaving tutors alone in the middle of the prison, lack of interest and consistency) didn't help the project to relate to the prison. Such security implications were an issue I brought up with IAT later.

There was imagination and leadership shown by the group in determining their agenda and committing themselves to a performance. But interestingly there was diverse opinion on how to end the piece, and they asked one of the tutors to direct them. This he did. They rehearsed 'The Package' as a completed piece for an afternoon performance.

7.7.2 PM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

A group of 11 turned up, two faces from the previous day who had been unable to come in the morning were extra, whereas four from the morning session had gone to the Muslim service to be returned later. The problem of keeping a consistent group for the entire length of the project was very much a concern. The group practised and performed the piece with the four from the morning having been returned. The audience consisted of some friends and colleagues (about twenty in all) who had been allowed to watch rather than work. The performance was enjoyed by all. Feedback forms were filled out by participants and tutors at the end. Certificates were given to participants.

One prisoner commented to me that, 'There's no communication on the wings between the guys, only when we're on association. There's a lot of bang up. This workshop has given us a chance to really communicate with each other. I want to find a drama group in Somerset when I get out'.

As we left, the young prisoners were lined up and marched in military fashion back to their wings, to the disapproval of the tutors. The reality of the lifestyle led by these young prisoners could not have been better expressed. I had an argument with one of the guards concerning security and his attitude towards the prisoners. He was unrepentantly disinterested.

7.7.3 Triangulation of opinion

Statistics from feedback sheets:

12 completed forms

Approach taken	59	(98%)
Content of workshops	59	(98%)
Benefit (to prisoner)	60	(100%)
Delivery	59	(98%)
Amount of time allotted	25	(42%)
Feel good factor	60	(100%)

Overall Analysis:

- More time needed for programme.

  Extremely good feedback from all prisoners involved.

  Deemed as beneficial to prisoners.

  Much interest shown in continuing with drama and specifically Insight Arts on release.

Comments from offenders:

'Thank you very much for giving me the chance to show how we as a team could do together'

'Please come back for more'

'I think that the [Insight Arts] staff prosected [?] what was to be done and directed us in a fantastic way'

'There should be a full time drama class'

'The [Insight Arts] staff....directed us in a fantastic way....it would have been better if there was more time as it was good for social skills'

'It was great, much appreciated and would be well welcomed back'

'The tutors were very good'

'Had a great time. Please come back for more soon'

'There's no communication on the wings between the guys, only when on association. There's a lot of bang up. This workshop has given us the chance to really communicate with each other. I want to find a drama group in Somerset when I get out'

'There needs to be regular drama workshops, there's nothing here'

'Really enjoyed my-self feel good for a change'

'It was a really good fulfilling project and I enjoyed everything about it'

The diarist:

He was both positive about the project but also critical of some of the participants. Initially, he, 'went over with an open mind hop[p]ing for a short play or something' and admitted that he, 'learnt a lot about the people I was working with....[and] we all seemed to get on well'. He also referred to now knowing

everyone's names and finding difficulty in, 'coming up with idears' and 'taking decisions'. He would have liked the project to have gone on longer, but, 'took pride in building something up from scratch'. He was annoyed that 'some pricks....tryed to steel the lime light'.

He told me that he had learnt a lot about himself and, more importantly, those he lived with. He also thought that the project was as worthwhile as anything he had done whilst he had been at the Institution and, 'had a good laugh doing it'. It was the performance that interested him the most.

Tutor viewpoints:

They were both dismayed with the time loss and other difficulties with the prison. One described the, 'usual prison problems - no knowledge of us on the gate, long wait for escort while the participants waited outside venue in rain. No contact from education or organiser'. This situation worsened as the project progressed: 'the poor communication and attitude of the staff is not conducive to the work....Staff very negative towards us and the work of the lads....Appalling security - left with inmates for long periods, locked in with no access to exit/panic button etc' Tutors felt that the negative reactions of the staff were deliberate and an effort to undermine the project. One tutor expressed, 'feeling angry and appalled by the visibly harsh regime, army treatment and negativity of officers'. Also there were problems getting an audience for the performance, with no contact from the education co-ordinator throughout the four days.

Overall, and in very trying circumstances, there was a lot of positive work done. One tutor suggested that, 'The participants have relaxed into the work and we have built up a good relationship with them', the other that, 'the participants were enthusiastic and engaged fully'.

In general there was much positive feedback from tutors, with an understanding of the problems associated with the territory. The programme worked well but there were difficulties voiced.

One tutor expressed concern that he, 'needed a little more support at times'. The other saw the need to train tutors into the ethos of Insight Arts. Both mentioned that they needed more time for project planning.

Establishing trust with the participants was also seen as a difficulty.

When the offenders were frog-marched away at the end of the project, one of the tutors burst into tears saying how she did not, 'want to leave them in this awful place, they're only kids'.

Other opinion:

'we get group after group in here, if you ask me it's all a waste of time and money' (Prison Officer)

7.7.4 Overall Impressions

i) That the prison failed to accommodate the programme as much time was lost due to lack of staff to escort. Similarly, not all participants had access to the workshops for all four days.

ii) Also some participants dropped out one day then returned the next, which made continuity difficult. Although this is always a problem in prison, I wondered if there was any way in which these conditions could be written into the contract for the next project.

iii) Regarding security, there had been a total disinterest shown by the prison. A complaint needed to be made to the prison, or even higher up the bureaucratic chain, to the area manager. The attitude of the prison staff at Portland merited this.

iv) The environment and conditions at the prison were so different than at HMP Wolds, as were the participants. I wondered if there needed to be more emphasis on drama skills and education for young prisoners whose pattern of offending behaviour may be of a different order than for adults.

v) There was an internal evaluative issue regarding the alteration of agenda and method used. The Portland North/South was a good example of the need to be flexible

vi) There was a consistent group involved, who were willing to talk to me and discuss their interests and intentions. Communication between myself and all involved was good.

vii) The tutors respected issues of consent. Because the education department had failed to inform participants of the nature of the project, they altered its delivery and content.

viii) Attempting to change the attitude of participants seemed unsuitable anyway in such a militaristic environment. Disclosure could make prisoners vulnerable on the wings.

ix) The location was far from ideal.

x) The tutors and IAT failed to co-ordinate with the prison successfully and the workshop was excluded from the prison regime.

xi) The workshop was successful despite the problems encountered. But it had little to do directly with addressing issues of offending behaviour.

7.8 'Sleepers' at Portland YOI, Dorset (May 2001)

I returned to Portland for the last day of the workshop and met the five tutors (same ones as present at HMP Wolds) outside the prison in the morning. Again, there were problems getting into the prison.

7.81 AM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

The premises used were identical to the previous visit, except that the group were aged 16 or under. The Industrial Cleaning Workshop had been painted up and cleaned. There was an Officer present who was interested in the project. There had been very good liaison with the Education Department, and its newly employed Education Co-ordinator was present for a lot of the session. This was a very different scenario from the previous visit.

I introduced myself as usual and very soon realised that the group of young offenders was of a different nature than before. They were fidgeting and unable to concentrate. They were uninterested in engaging with me. The participants were still on compulsory education as they were all under 16. The Education Co-ordinator explained that, 'To a man each one of the group has rejected education in prison'. The group were on full-time classes, and the co-ordinator had decided that instead of them attending classes in citizenship and lifeskills, they would take part in the 'Sleepers' project. So there had not been any voluntarily application. He seemed to think that those who had rejected education in prison were best suited for the group as they would get most out of it. Hence the group had the most difficult members in it.

Those juveniles I spoke to said how much they hated education. There were originally 20 in the group, but this had been deemed too big as each member was very needy in terms of wanting attention. Due to

drop-out rate, this ended up as 11. Interestingly, they were all very difficult and disruptive, and an all white group.

The tutors tried to interest the group with drama games and playing with the video, sound and photographic equipment, but none of the group had a very long attention span. There was a lot of interruption, mock fighting and football, as well as literally climbing the walls. The juveniles had an inability to concentrate, were attention-seeking, and reticent to work. The first couple of days were difficult, but eventually trust had been built up. Each participant needed serious one-to-one tuition. There had been a massive energy input from the tutors, with small reward.

Eventually, a Trust game was initiated, with the group including the tutors, split into two lines sitting down on chairs opposite each other. Each person held the wrist of the person adjacent, and the object of the game was to squeeze that wrist in order to send a message down the line and reach the end of the line before the other team. The PD tossed a coin to start the game off. Only the first persons in the line could see the coin. The rule was, that if it came up heads, they did nothing, if it was tails, they set the game in motion. The first line to get the message to the end of the chain was the winner, but only if the coin had come up tails!

The PD told me that the group had done a lot of games and trust exercises. They needed a very structured programme, as they were not able to use the freedom of a more open agenda.

The second exercise saw the group split into three. Each mini group returned to the piece of drama or video work they had performed the previous day and expanded on it. To see the kids acting and involved was accompanied by a marked transformation of attitude (for as long as they could keep an attention span). But there were one or two very difficult kids who were unable to settle into anything.

The 'Angel and Devil' theme of the drama work was very good, as the kids plugged into the power roles very easily. Their voices were recorded and the response of the kids to hearing their recorded voices was fascinating.

I talked to several after the session, before they were picked up by their escort, back to the wing. They revealed very little, only to confirm their hatred for education classes and how bored they were. I talked to the tutors during lunch. They had never encountered such a demanding and difficult group.

7.8.2 PM - Industrial Cleaning Workshop

The security department suddenly decided to stop the afternoon session as it was due to start, without telling anyone. This lack of communication with tutors and Education Co-ordinator angered everyone concerned. No governor could be contacted to negotiate a reasonable ending to the workshop. The security officer cited lack of staff as the reason. I intended to include action for a complaint in the evaluation report, as the prison could have mentioned this situation before lunch and the group could have been closed with this knowledge and goodbyes spoken etc. This was an unfortunate ending as the young prisoners were due to perform their sketches and had been let down badly. The DP and I had already discussed not utilising the formal evaluation sheets, as many could not read or write. The tutors filled out their feedback sheets, upset by the intransigence and lack of consideration shown by the prison.

The Education Co-ordinator decided to use the attendance figures for the workshop towards the education department performance indicators, and also the key skills utilised by the participants, especially verbal and non-verbal communication and creativity, towards educational targets. The education department (unlike the previous visit) were supportive and involved, possibly too much as they entered the workshop uninvited and disrupted it too frequently according to the tutors. I asked The Education Co-ordinator if he would ask the group to cite what they thought of the programme for evaluation purposes. The PD and I persuaded him not to make it into a formal writing exercise but to make it into a game and possibly record views. I asked him to send results to IAT (these were never sent). He was keen to use the workshop again. Also, the Prison Governor had watched the workshop in action and had been impressed.

One prisoner when asked if he had done any drama at school, replied that he was the only one in the group who had been to school.

The prison officer told me that he thought the project was a good idea (he was an ETS tutor), but recognised that, 'when the juveniles were out of their comfort zone, they lacked discipline and played up. This was because there was immense peer pressure not to partake and to rebel against any authority'

7.8.3 Triangulation of Opinion

Statistics from feedback sheets:

Feedback forms were not used.

Comments from offenders:

'I really think the project was a benefit to me in several ways. Thank you very much for giving me the chance to show ....[what] we as a team could do together'

'very enjoyable. Makes a big difference to four walls and a suicidal cell-mate'

'Its better than sitting getting bored with education'

'It's something to do'

'Have you got any burn?'

(many participants were not forthcoming with their opinions and did not want to talk informally)

The diarist:

There was no diarist as no one was interested, and writing was a problem

Tutor viewpoints:

They were both exhausted and angry at the inconclusive ending to the workshop. One tutor considered it to have been, 'the most demanding and concentrated teaching I have ever done. Their attention span was non-existent'. He found it, 'difficult working with such needy participants, as they were unable to concentrate, squabbled and were continually attention-seeking'. They all concurred that it had been a draining exercise with a massive energy input. Each young offender needed one-to-one attention which produced small rewards. But it was generally considered very positive because the programme had connected with the offenders in a way that the education programme had hitherto been unable to do (as admitted by the education officer).

In general there was much positive feedback from tutors, although the schedule was exhausting. Issues of establishing trust were seen by one tutor as an important outcome, with a good sense of teamwork

achieved.

Another tutor saw the project as 'too sophisticated' and 'over-ambitious' for especially young offenders, as, 'there was a lack of clarity as to the objectives of the programme. Strategic planning and better preparation was needed as there was no real understanding of how the different artforms linked up'. In terms of what was needed, another tutor thought, 'that the approach and practice of each arts discipline needs to be [better] understood, that relative skills are drawn on and integrated more cohesively within the project'. Tutors recognised the importance of their particular evaluation in terms of developing the programme.

Other Opinions:

Not available

7.8.4 Overall Impressions

i) The location was again inadequate.

ii) The project reached some of the most excluded youth possible, even excluded from education due to attitude and inability to read and write. The Education Co-ordinator purposely put the most excluded and difficult kids onto the programme as they were impossible to teach and immune to the overtures of the educational process.

iii) It was as if the drama games used for group awareness and verbal and non-verbal communication surpassed any method that the prison education department had of coping with such difficult youths. This in turn is strong advocacy for using the arts with the most excluded of prisoners. The ability to communicate, participant involvement and working in a group were the most obvious social impacts, but far more time was needed with such a difficult group to bring out creativity and self-confidence.

iv) The project tried to gel with the education department in terms of fitting into their curriculum. The danger of this is that it may become dictated by such a process, and end up working with educational refuseniks, and only be seen as useful for this category. This was unfortunate because those with more education and ability could benefit considerably in terms of expressing their creativity.

v) There was an implication that the educational facilities provided were enough for those better adjusted prisoners, which undermines voluntary participation, preventing those with a real interest to be involved. The lack of interest shown by the participants may have been exacerbated by the compulsory nature of the project. The idea that prisoners have a say in what they do and make, is all a part of the empowering process, a distance from the enforced educational programme on offer, but the kids were schoolchildren, and subject to compulsory education. But just because the group was under 16 did not mean that consent did not have to be given by them, as the project was concerned with addressing their behaviour.

vi) The numbers that can be accommodated on this project were relatively small, especially as they were a very difficult group, but also because the equipment used requires much individual and intensive tuition and instruction.

vii) The key skills agenda is another area to explore, in terms of advocating the programme to education departments in prisons who are ruled by such considerations. Whether the programme wants to get involved in this area and to what extent needs to be discussed. The six 'key skills' refer to communication, application of number, working with others, use of IT, problem solving, and improving learning and performance. The 'thinking skills' agenda underpinning this involves knowing 'how' and 'what' to do, and can be split into five areas: information processing, reasoning, enquiry, creative thinking, and evaluation. IAT programmes can key into many of these areas, and it could add such an agenda to its promotion.

ix) The project was far from successful and although better integrated into the prison regime, it had been appropriated by the education department for their ends.

7.9 The Report Writing and Outcome

Over 29 months as External Evaluator (April 1999 - Aug 2001), three reports were prepared. An interim report in the summer 2000, another in the winter 2000/1 and final report in Autumn 2001[12]. Besides

---

[12] see Appendix 3

observational notes, written feedback forms from tutors and participants were utilised from each project. Extra evidence included some informal interviews of prisoners on audio. Qualitative information given by participants and others involved was recorded verbatim and utilised descriptively. This bricoleur method enabled most of the evidence to be included in some way. The reports included the voice of those involved using direct quotations as well as statistical data collated from each project. Documentary research was also undertaken, which was presented in the reports, in order to better advocate the position of IAT to their funders.

The OD asked for the final report to be re-written, which it was, as he was unhappy with its content. This was partly due to a misunderstanding, in as much as he wanted it to reflect the whole programme, but also because he considered it too negative and failed to link the advocacy to IAT potential. The final report therefore included an overview of the complete programme as well as a section consciously advocating the position of the organisation and need for arts based activity in prison.

The outcome of the internal and external evaluation was mixed (Insight Arts Trust 2002). Because the funding from the major sponsor, the Lankelly Foundation, was specifically, 'for a three year project' there was no further funding available. But the OD was under the impression that, 'an application for a future project would be welcome'. A copy was sent to another funder, the Association of London Government without reply. IAT's subsequent new three-year programme funded by the Community Fund, considered the report in terms of the suitability of the 'Sleepers' programme, and duly concentrated solely on the more structured 'North-South' programme. This new project addressed key skills as a good marketing tool as well as accreditation, which were identified in the report. It also opened up a debate within IAT about, 'the best way to get responses from participants'. Lastly, a new funder, the Esme Fairburn Foundation, asked to see the report, to help them with their own research entitled, 'Rethinking Crime and Punishment'.

7.10 Conclusion

The case was had both instrumental and intrinsic qualities, although inducing generality has to be treated with caution. But such primary material is valuable for understanding the application of evaluation in practice, particularly in the highly excluded prison environment. The narrative method allowed a greater

insight into the practical difficulties and hopefully better engaged the reader with the context.

The role of External Evaluator needed to be clarified, prior to working, It was originally considered possible to combine the two roles of evidence gatherer and advocator with integrity. The case revealed the limitations of this methodology, which in practice was adversely affected by a range of uncontrollable and unpredictable factors.

There was no doubt that the programme was successful and valued by the participants, but the claim by the organisation that it meaningfully addressed offending behaviour is contestable. The biggest problem and stricture against this, was its short length and lack of continuity. As for rehabilitative effect, it needed to be better linked up with other prison activities, projects and educational courses. But there is a paradox, as it is also important that such an approach does not compromise its own particular agenda and impact.

Programme impacts concerned individual expression, group awareness and communication, and creative methods of relieving boredom, in line with concepts of dynamic security. Prisoners need to be meaningfully occupied in order to allow the smooth running of the regime and ensure the safety of all involved[13].

This case is testimony to the recreational basis of such workshops which were voluntary by nature, and are primarily founded in a framework of play, solidarity and celebration. Therefore to isolate the secondary factor of addressing behavioural concerns as the overriding evaluative rationale, risks making delivery less effective. But such an understanding is further confused and somewhat ambiguous in prison, which has traditionally been concerned with punishment.

The role of external evaluator, as determined by the Directors of IAT, was primarily a means of enhancing the profile of the organisation with its funders. It was not coincidental that its remit of 'addressing offending behaviour', reflected wider DCMS cultural policy and support for the instrumental use of the arts, befitting its social inclusion agenda. Neither was it coincidental that IAT's major sponsor for the programme insisted on an external evaluation[14], again reflecting PAT 10 recommendations.

IAT contended that the aesthetic quality of the programme was of primary importance, as social utility

---

[13] the concept of dynamic security is explained in 11.4.5

[14] as explained in the original job interview

naturally resulted. But as it is impossible to prove that a unilateral four day course has any effect on offending behaviour, the whole rationale of the evaluation was based on an unrealistic premise, again in response to PAT 10 and the need for robust and appropriate evaluations[15]. The feedback sheets for prisoners and tutors supplied plenty of information, as did the diary, with complimentary informal questioning useful. Nonetheless, despite the unavailablity of greater depth of opinion and even biographical details of participants, what such a programme can achieve is limited.

There was also an issue of how the internal and external evaluation process combined, which was neither pre-specified or resolved. The powers of the External Evaluator needed to be made more transparent, particularly as there was initial reluctance by the PD to accommodate the evaluator or contemplate a change of working practice. This lack of independence, encouraged compliance, very different from an evidential remit showing that the programme addressed offending behaviour. This presents an argument for evaluation funding to be directed through another third party organisation, to enable a more objective appraisal and analysis. But this could be expensive.

The advocatorial nature of the evaluation, coupled with the contextual nature of the workshops, makes any form of standardisation very hard to achieve or relevant. Each observation was an intrinsic case study in itself. Because most of the data collected by the evaluator was qualitative, and in order to comply with the wishes of IAT to discover 'harder' evidence, this necessitated the use of basic social auditing techniques. But this quantitative need was contradicted by the lack of accommodation of before-and-after and interaction-process analysis methods supplied by the evaluator. It showed the difficulty of re-focusing artistic direction in order to accommodate evaluative needs and questioned the credibility of a formative evaluation-driven programme. But maybe that is realistic and proper, as overall direction and responsibility for the programme lay with IAT directors. Moreover, writing critical reports could have adversely affected the funding of the organisation. Such awareness of the wider ramifications of the reports, was integral to the evaluative process.

But three on-site observations and ten placements were too small a number of workshops over three years.

---

[15] these PAT 10 recommendations are set out in 3.3.2

This was due to cancellations and problems in acquiring placements. Also The 'North/South programme was not observed in its best light, and a fully structured workshop geared towards addressing offending behaviour not witnessed. Other placements were more successfully completed, which questions why there was no observation of these programme, particularly in female establishments. That IAT was concerned with validating the less structured and more recent 'Sleepers' programme, had a bearing on this. The evaluator had no authority in terms of visiting projects, which were determined by the PD and OD. Nevertheless, the PD still failed to notify either tutors or participants about the initial observation, which created an awkwardness and air of deception.

Participants were also not fully informed as to the nature of the programme In terms of its agenda to modify behaviour, hence there were ethical issues regarding consent, as well as problems of transparency. It was considered tactless to discuss such issues, as these inhibited the need to get participants on board, which is further testimony to the inappropriateness of such an agenda.

There was one constant, and that was the opinion of the prisoners involved. On every occasion, the feedback from them was excellent. But it could be argued that such a constituency is so bereft of interest and stimulation that they would accept even the worst projects. The difficult nature of many of the participants and trying circumstances, required immense skill and much energy from the PD and tutors, who were adept at enabling the programmes to work successfully.

One of the aims of the organisation was to work regularly with a client prison, which it had done on occasion, without long-term success. Continuity with the groups and participants, would have better enabled the possibility of showing rehabilitative effect. But it is not easy to ascribe any one specific variable as the catalyst for change (even if prisoners can be tracked through their sentences). Whether the arts can deliver rehabilitative social impacts is neither proved or disproved by this case, even though they were unable to do so in this context. If such dramatic techniques are used to facilitate behavioural transformation, they also require and enable the changed individual to impact on the environment, which is impossible to realise in a prison context, denying this natural two-way process[16], and arguably real

---

[16] as advocated by Boal see case study 9.5

empowerment, emancipation and enfranchisement[17], the drivers that address social exclusion.

7.11 Summary

A case study concerning evaluation in practice was the basis for this chapter.

Firstly, it described the background considerations to the case. This included the methodological position of the researcher, and use of biographical narrative. Accordingly a case study method was investigated to determine the extent to which this specific case was of both an instrumental and intrinsic nature. The prison context also necessitated an analysis of issues of consent and deception, which encompassed the ethical pitfalls surrounding participant observation, collusion in a culture of control, secrecy and confidentiality. The history of IAT and the creation of the external evaluation position were also documented, as was the content of the 'Connecting Lines' programme. The IAT understanding of artforms with regards to rehabilitative objectives was revealed, and particularly of applying drama to effect behavioural change. Preliminary evaluative methods were discussed and preparations for on-site non-participant observations. This included a before-and-after technique, and a system of interaction-process analysis. Besides the triangulation of opinion and re-written tutor and participant feedback forms, a diary was designed to elicit more details from the workshops.

Secondly, using the first person voice, three observations of the programme in action were written into a diary narrative. Field notes included participant and tutor opinion, as well as collated evidence from feedback sheets, all re-edited for the sake of clarity. These observations described the difficulties of working in a prison environment and extent to which the theory and advocacy of such programmes contrasted with the practical reality.

The feedback from the participants was excellent, and the workshops successful as dramatic fun and games. It was very much the ability and application of the PD and tutors that enabled the success of the programme. But its short length and lack of continuity made it impossible to prove that it had made any impression on offending behaviour. The impact of the programme was in terms of dynamic security.

---

[17] as explained in 11.2

The role of external evaluator lacked clarity. This was firstly in terms of its relationship to the internal system, and secondly in terms of its function, as it was difficult to combine the two roles of evidence gatherer and advocator with integrity. The observations by the evaluator were perceived by the PD and tutors as an additional inconvenience in an already stressful workshop environment, with some evaluatory recommendations implemented. But its influence lacked authority, hence the case showed the political character and ramifications of the evaluation process.

As for the outcome, although the evaluation found little conclusive evidence to prove that the programme addressed offending behaviour, the resultant report advocating the successful work of IAT was sent to prospective funders. This contradictory position related in part to an inability to prove or disprove causal effect. The 'Sleepers' programme was considered by subsequent funders as unsuitable and replaced in whole by the more structured 'North/South'.

PART III - Cultural Exclusion

for better and for worse the majority of people have been admitted into the general audience for culture. For worse because the majority have not had the opportunity to develop their knowledge and understanding of the arts – and much else. Hence the rise of cultural industries which make fortunes by exploiting inexperience

(Shaw 1987: 80)

Ray believed that modernism was based on hollow myths and syllogisms, (art is about aesthetic realm, the aesthetic realm exists independently of content or context, therefore content and context are irrelevant) and precious notions of individuality, uniqueness and freedom. Artists were free to pursue their research, without constraint, as long as they accepted the modernist reductivist view of history, as unilinear progression, one movement leading directly to the next, one artist superseding another. Modernism was, in fact, a tyranny

(Butler describing the artist Ray Walker, 1985: 45)

Part Three explores the complex concept of cultural inclusion/exclusion, and the relationship and contradictions between cultural and social inclusion/exclusion. Whereas the first two parts concerned social exclusion and evaluation methods that can be applied to arts programmes in order to show social impact, the research now critically investigates the arts, gathering a discourse around wider cultural frameworks. These include: aesthetic taste, cultural democracy and popular culture.

To understand aesthetic taste, the research sets out definitions of the term culture, and then introduces Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital to illustrate its class-based construction. Notwithstanding, this can be criticised in terms of a rigidity of taste categories and for not fully appreciating the effects of multi-ethnic and minority cultural influences, as well as a certain disdain for 'popular' culture.

A case study is presented on Outsider Art to show the extent to which cultural capital can be at the expense of social inclusion, and the inconsistencies within the 'high' art canon. It is the very social exclusion of certain artists and their freakish spectacle, which allows them to be culturally included. In order to be a member of this exclusive club, artists have to be fully institutionalised. The socially excluded possibly do not want to be included as disabled and sick artists, unable to gain the parity they seek. Such an 'outsider' categorisation is a parody of the exclusive 'high' art establishment, where a biography of psychological and emotional problems symbolises and replaces the artist's Curriculum Vitae.

The investigation then assesses cultural democracy. Using the arts instrumentally, for the purposes of addressing social and cultural exclusion, necessitates that they are accessible. Paul Willis' concept of a 'grounded' aesthetic and 'common' culture stressed the importance of a wider culture beyond the arts, that better enables the excluded to express their creativity. He perceived the arts as exclusive and inaccessible. Cultural access is also explored with reference to the discourse surrounding the Arts Council's traditional concept of democratising 'high' culture and the more democratic Community Arts Movement instigated in the late 1960's, which challenged its hegemony. The issues explored then about cultural democracy and the political manifestations of culture, are very relevant today.

A case study is constructed around the Brazilian dramatist Augusto Boal, whose 'Theatre of the Oppressed' tackled such issues and utilised methods of social and cultural inclusion within his participatory dramaturgy. It shows how theatre can utilise a Freirian pedagogy to address issues of social exclusion and oppression, which was realised in the third world, and Latin America in particular.

Boal, demonstrated that participation in drama-based activity could empower, enfranchise and encourage participants to realise their rights as citizens and help to change the social structures that had created the oppression initially. This use of drama for the poor and oppressed in the third world was an enabler that used theatrical method to educate and raise political awareness.

Finally 'popular' culture is studied. It is the most obvious vehicle for cultural inclusion, both in terms of its function of democratising 'high' culture and as a means of direct access and participation in the arts. The politics of different conceptions of 'popular' culture is set out, to better frame an understanding. Issues of multiculturalism and identity are also explored. But inclusive policies can be designed to integrate or assimilate cultural difference, hence the dangers of homogeneity, moreover multiculturalism can become tyrannical and inflexible.

How 'popular' culture reflects these concerns and contradictions, is explored through a case study of Reggae Music. It illustrates the elasticity of popular music, and how an exclusive music based on an obscure minority religion, was an inclusive medium for black British youth in the late 1970s, a banner of injustice to rally round. The music is easy to play, with catchy melodies and rhythms, therefore highly participatory. The case shows how issues of inclusion and exclusion are a related reaction against the cultural hegemony, which was expressed through a specific reggae youth subculture. Inclusion in this minority culture was originally exclusive, but the identity of this music changed over time to represent a general theme of oppression for a much wider constituency, albeit commodified, hence the confusion, complexity and interrelatedness of inclusive and exclusive terms.

All three case studies revolve around the complicated and contradictory relationship between cultural inclusion/exclusion and social inclusion/exclusion. They allow the thesis and discourse to broaden out beyond the narrow confines and agenda of government cultural policy. The Outsider Art Case, directly illustrates the contradictory and mutually exclusive nature of the two terms within a particular context, and how the medicalisation of life influences perception. The Theatre of the Oppressed Case, shows a wider political understanding of how drama can emancipate and empower those most oppressed, and the extent to which social and cultural exclusion are allied and reflect powerlessness. The Reggae Music Case, allows an exploration of ethnicity and cultural identity. By so doing, the symbiotic and mutable relationship of the terms of inclusion and exclusion is revealed.

Chapter 8. Taste

8.1 Introduction

Aesthetic taste is embedded in a particular paradigm of culture, hence definitions of the different and competing concepts of culture is set out. Cultural inclusion is a vague term predicated to a large extent on an emic understanding of such taste, which is partly accumulated in terms of cultural capital. Such incremental knowledge allows a conception of the arts associated with the 'high' art canon. This follows the seminal thinking of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Therefore the research delves into his structured world and discourse of distinction with an accompanying critique. The case study concerns the category of Outsider Art and illustrates the contradictions between issues of social and cultural inclusion.

8.2 Culture

Terry Eagleton (2000: 1), viewed the heterogeneous and disputed term, 'culture' as one of the 'most complex words in the English language'. Traditionally, the term has been defined as a broad based and holistic anthropological definition and way of life, or as an elite body of artistic and intellectual work. Eagleton distinguished between these versions by describing the former as 'culture', and the latter 'Culture' (with a capital c). Arguably, it is not possible to make such a clear distinction, as, 'Culture' is a way of life for some. He later referred to the culture wars and a four-cornered fight between 'culture as civility, culture as identity....culture as commercialism....[and] culture as radical protest' (2000: 129).

This investigation uses the term slightly differently and more traditionally, but not without reference to Eagleton's culture wars. Roger Scruton (1998: 1-4) distinguished between 'high', 'popular' and 'common' culture, which is the starting point for this research. An academic 'high' art and cultural domain, reflecting taste preferences; mass and popular culture concerning the cultural industries; and a pluralistic understanding of a common culture of interests. These definitions are mutable and overlap, according to context, but the research tries not to lose sight of these three axis points.

That the arts are a powerful ingredient and driver of culture and not necessarily of the 'high' variety, also shows their contested nature. The concept of cultural exclusion, refers to exclusion from 'high'

culture, as well as from participation in creative expression and realising identity. Cultural inclusion can consequently be understood bilaterally in terms of democratising 'high' culture and the need to respect a wider cultural democracy.

8.3 Cultural Capital

Bourdieu devised the concept of cultural capital, which reflected both inherited and learned aspects of taste (Bourdieu 1984: 53-4; 70-1). The culturally excluded are thereby those with little cultural capital or those with a limited range and quality of such capital[1]. The sociologist Vera Zolberg (1990: 158) described its intricate nature:

> As with financial capital in the economic arena or power in the political arena, people are endowed with more or less, higher or lower quality of cultural capital. Their ranking in each of these kinds of capital, its volume, and the career pattern of their status are related in a complex manner to particular kinds of aesthetic preferences.

The term is therefore contextual with both qualitative and quantitative aspects. That 'high' art cultural capital designated a 'natural aristocracy', and 'mass culture' cultural capital a plebeian taste, better describes how cultural exclusion is intrinsically linked to the socio-economic fabric in which the perceived quality of culture has a political manifestation. Furthermore, Bourdieu related cultural to economic capital as, 'the accumulation of a cultural capital (whether or not educationally sanctioned)....can only be acquired by means of a sort of withdrawal from economic necessity' (1984: 53-4), but was similarly pursued to determine status positions. His structures provide a Marxist perspective of culture in which the 'high' arts, an exclusive 'aristocracy of culture', supports the hegemony of the ruling class.

8.4 The Arts as Distinction

Bourdieu conceived this accumulation of cultural capital to symbolically bestow distinction, and

---

[1] see 3.4

consequently, 'art and cultural consumption are predisposed, consciously and deliberately or not, to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences' (1984: 7). 'High' culture was exclusive and naturally present in those from a particular socio-economic background. Such cultural capital could also be acquired through education, but was not generally accessible to other lower socio-economic categories:

> The confessions with which manual workers faced with modern pictures betray their exclusion ('I don't understand what it means' or 'I like it but don't understand it') contrast with the knowing silence of the bourgeois, who, though equally disconcerted, at least know that they have to refuse – or at least conceal - the naive expectation of expressiveness that is betrayed by the concern to 'understand'. (1984: 43)

Hence culture bestowed distinction and status, through a hidden code of understanding. Bourdieu explained: 'thus the encounter with a work of art is not "love at first sight" as is generally supposed and the act of empathy....[it] presupposes an act of cognition, a decoding operation, which implies the implementation of a cognitive acquirement, a cultural code' (1984: 3).

This 'cultural code', which reflected and determined artistic taste, was socially determined through the habitus, an original idea that referred to ingrained attitudes and understanding that conditioned each individual at an early age in a seemingly unconscious manner. It was a, 'spontaneity without consciousness or will opposed as much to the mechanical necessity of things without history in mechanistic theories as it is to the reflexive freedoms of subjects' (Bourdieu 1990: 56). Cultural consumption was thereby controlled by the habitus, a set of classificatory schemes and values, which were more fundamental than consciousness or language. Each individual habitus was determined by historical and social conditions. Bourdieu saw it as an internalised class condition which, 'As an acquired system of generative schemes....makes possible the free production of all thoughts, perception and actions inherent in the particular conditions of its production - and only those' (1990: 55).

Therefore those whose habitus reflected popular or mass culture were excluded from high culture. Bourdieu distinguished the popular aesthetic from 'high' art, as it was, 'based on the affirmation of continuity between art and life, which implies the subordination of form to function' (1984: 32).

Crucially, he viewed this as a hostility of those with least cultural capital, towards experimentation:

'Their reluctance or refusal springs not just from lack of familiarity but from a deep-rooted demand for participation, which formal experiment systematically disappoints, especially when, refusing to offer the "vulgar" attractions of an art of illusion' (1984: 32-3).

Bourdieu deconstructed the Kantian notion of pure disinterested taste. He attacked the contention that taste was a naturally occurring, instead of an acquired phenomenon:

> The unconscious mastery of the instruments of appropriation which are the basis of familiarity with cultural works is acquired by slow familiarization, a long succession of 'little perceptions'.... Connoisseurship is an 'art' which, like the art of thinking or the art of living, cannot be imparted entirely in the form of precepts or instinction, and apprenticeship to it presupposes....repeated contact with the work....And, just as students or disciples can *unconsciously* absorb the rules of art....by giving themselves up to it....so art lovers can, by abandoning themselves in some way to the work, internalize the principles and rules of its construction without there ever being brought to their consciousness and formulated as such. (Bourdieu 1993: 228)

This 'legitimate' taste, was part of his 'three-zone' classification of culture, followed by 'middle-brow' and 'popular' taste, key ingredients towards the creation of social identity. Furthermore, 'legitimate' taste disguised the enculturalisation process, as if such carriers had inherited it, hence the 'cultivated naturalness' of their personae. 'Legitimate' taste harked back to Kant's distinction and, 'opposition between the "taste of reflection" and the "taste of sense"....the antithesis between culture and bodily pleasure (or nature) rooted in the opposition between the cultivated bourgeoisie and the people' (1984: 489-490).

Bourdieu developed his theories on the concept of symbolic power, and his socio-historical analysis revealed the role of culture in reproducing social structures and corresponding inequalities. He explained this as,

> the way in which unequal power relations, unrecognised as such and thus accepted as legitimate, are embedded in the systems of classification used to describe and discuss everyday life - as well as

cultural practices - and in the ways of perceiving reality that are taken for granted by members of society. (Johnson cited in Bourdieu 1993: 2)

Accordingly, he perceived that the canonisation of the arts had affected the claims to power of the dominant class through its better grasp of certificated knowledge. Hence the need to understand the rules of art, not merely in order to appreciate it, but as a means of perpetuating the cultural hegemony. Taste was in effect the principle through which an individual occupied a certain social space. But within the 'legitimate' category of taste and dominant class, there was a binary frission between the bourgeoisie and intellectual/artists. Whereas the former, 'demand of art a high degree of denial of the social world and incline towards a hedonistic aesthetic of ease and facility, the [latter] dominated factions....have affinities with the ascetic aspects of aesthetics and are inclined to support all artistic revolutions conducted in the name of purity' (1984: 176).

Hence Bourdieu saw the role of the artist as either a prophet of doom and visionary or one of privileged lifestyle, and conformity to professional etiquette.

But although he demystified the artistic process, he held out less and less hope for the greater democratisation of the arts. He perceived 'popular' art to be an oxymoron, as it was an intellectual illusion that failed to recognise that natural aesthetic taste was a social construction and determined over years through the habitus. 'Popular' culture was therefore a counterfeit driven by commerce[2]. Notwithstanding, Bourdieu defied crude economic determinism from both right and left-wing perspectives, as he recognised an autonomy in modern art: 'The pure intention of the artist is that of a producer who aims to be autonomous, that is entirely the master of his product, who tends to reject not only the "programmes" imposed a priori by scholars and scribes, but also...the interpretations superimposed a posteriori on his work' (1984: 3). Beyond such artistic intention, he recognised that, 'threats to autonomy result from the increasingly greater interpenetration between the world of art and the world of money' (Bourdieu cited in Cook 2001). He did not treat the 'high' arts reductively, as he considered them to contain intrinsic importance beyond class signification.

---

[2] see 9.2.2.

Bourdieu perceived the modern artist as fighting for autonomy against the commodification of art on one hand and the historical construction of the canon on the other. The paradox was that in order to be an artistic prophet, free to play the important modernist and social role of critic (the prophet effecting struggle against the dominant hegemony), the artist had to fight against this ingrained habitus and sequential material success. Therefore to realise autonomy, the artist had to be poor and excluded, free from the constraints of the market and success. But such a romantic conception, was also a paradox. Being poor and outside of these cultural parameters, ensured ignominy.

8.5 A Critique of Bourdieu

Bridget Fowler (1999) criticised Bourdieu for failing to recognise fully the male domination of the cultural field and the feminist position, which in turn reflected a lack of reflexivity over his own position and consequential comparative analysis. Also he had no feel for 'popular' culture within modern urban society and was disparaging about it. His two positions of the arts as popular or avant-garde, were oversimplified. She suggested that, 'from the point of view of the sociology of culture, three main problems exist: descriptive status in relation to relevant comparisons, conception of the canon and the controversy over popular art' (Fowler 1999: 8).

Richard Jenkins (1992) critiqued him for similar reasons. Firstly, because Bourdieu failed to account for those great shifts in artistic production or consumption which challenged the cultural status quo, for instance the changes that were instigated and set in motion by Pablo Picasso or Elvis Presley: 'There is something profoundly social going on here - explained by neither the critical marketplace nor the 'intrinsic' power of individual 'genius'.... but Bourdieu never quite gets round to broaching the topic. There is rebellion in his model, but alas, no revolution' (Jenkins 1992: 136-7).

Secondly, another criticism concerned his ethnocentricity. Although steeped in anthropological method, his model of taste was deemed, 'valid beyond the particular French case and, no doubt, for every stratified society' (Bourdieu cited in Jenkins 1992: 138). Also Jenkins highlighted his elevated academic position and condescension towards the working classes, thereby revealing his own taste as conformist and conservative:

> Leaving aside the matter of whether aesthetic response may in some way be innate, the question of

the role of individual psychology in the creation of taste and aesthetic preference has some significance, if only insofar as it may help to account for the non-conformist aesthetic impulse.... how in Bourdieu's scheme are we to understand, for example modernism? As in the rest of Bourdieu's work, conformism is of the essence. There is little room for innovation or deviance except insofar as they represent limited manoeuvres within an overall framework of stability. (1992: 149)

Bourdieu recognised that the arts were directly political and symbolised social inequality, moreover, culture and education thereby legitimised the existing relations of domination. But he still condemned those short on cultural capital and determined by a particular habitus, to a non-creative sideline, whose interest in participation and function, affected any involvement in experimentation. He remained rooted within a 'high' art paradigm, and there are similarities with Abraham Maslow's Theory of Needs[3], which also failed to fully recognise creativity in certain constituencies.

Dereck Robbins (1991) criticised Bourdieu for his inaccessibility. He is difficult to read, which is not just due to translation, as he, 'consciously adopted.....a presentational strategy which resists any facile assimilation to the preconceived opinions of readers and resists being compartmented in relation to the latest fashionable "-isms" , to "movements", or to "schools of thought"' (Robbins 1991: 1-2).

Ironically, Bourdieu has a highly coded language and gaze not dissimilar to the 'high' arts that he deconstructs. Robbins, when assessing *Distinction*, made the wry comment that, 'readers of the book who were invited to reflect on their own cultural practice would be likely to be precisely those people who would have the power to use their awareness of the mechanisms of "distinction" to develop better strategies for preserving it' (1991: 128). Hence this highly academic language and style does little to engender change or attract interest in these issues outside of those exclusive few already involved. This flaw, backs up the earlier charge that Bourdieu had no empathy for popular culture, conforming to typical 'high' culture disdain. The irony, is that using such an exclusive language to critique the exclusivity of the arts, does little to create a more inclusive discourse.

This position is further enforced with regards to artistic autonomy. His position was steeped in the ideal

---

[3] set out in 11.3.1

that 'high' art could or should be autonomous, free from the interference and control of patrons and commerce. This is a questionable historical reality, as the art critic Clement Greenberg (1965) famously commented: 'no culture can develop without a social basis....And in the case of the avant-garde, this was provided by an elite among the ruling class of that society of which it assumed itself to be cut off, but to which it has always remained attached by an umbilical cord of gold' (Greenberg 1965: 8). The avant-garde are the storm troopers of cultural exclusivity which has ultimately been driven by the marketplace. Bourdieu recognised that modern art had ceded to fetish value consumed by those with sufficient cultural and economic capital, but it is the extent to which it has been commodified that is widely disputed.

John Street (1997) accepted that taste could be determined by material and class circumstances, but argued that, 'the objects of taste – what is acceptable, what is unacceptable – are not determined by economic circumstances. This was the business of politics....The sociology of judgement and taste has to have an accompanying politics' (Street 1997: 174). The politics of judgement had an obvious ideological foundation which Street reduced to, 'no more than the disputes that traditionally animate politics, albeit conducted within Cultural Studies' (1997: 174). Hence judgement was belief based and changeable. Such an understanding rejected both relativist and absolute stances, emphasising the contingency of values. In which case there were no absolute standards and not all judgements were equally valid. Furthermore, people were highly discerning and not mere passive consumers of culture. He went on to profess that it was the political process behind what was considered 'good' as against 'bad' that embedded acceptable taste. These aesthetic decisions made by powerful cultural gatekeepers, pre-determined all other considerations of taste, bestowing acceptability and prestige upon certain cultural products. Hence Street commented that, 'The decisions reached by those who preside over arts prizes or arts policy, those who decide what to promote and what to ignore, are the products of political processes[4]. They are not simply or solely the result of such processes, but they cannot be understood independently of them' (1997: 183). Bourdieu had not emphasised this conscious political reality, although it was integral to his understanding.

---

[4] explained further in 10.2

8.6 Case Study: Outsider Art

Much interest has been shown by the art establishment in Outsider Art and work created by those inside prison and psychiatric hospital. The prestigious 1996-7 exhibition at the Hayward Gallery entitled *Beyond Reason. Art and Psychosis. Works from the Prinzhorn Collection* showed work produced by inmates from the Heidelberg Mental Asylum. This followed on from a previous exhibition at the Hayward in 1987 entitled *In Another world: Outsider Art*, and the earlier *Outsider Art* exhibition in 1979. This case study investigates the extent to which 'outsiders' can be included through their art, and the extent to which their art is a visible spectacle and indication of abnormality.

8.6.1 Foucault: Art as Disempowerment

Mark Gisbourne (1996) introduced the Prinzhorn Collection, artwork produced by those incarcerated in German institutions, by showing how it had helped construct a status for the patients involved, but was analysed as a scientific object of study. Accordingly, 'mad' art or 'creative mark-making', the creative products of those institutionalised, 'were used for diagnostic purposes in the classifying of different stages of mental illness and as examples of degeneracy'.

Michel Foucault researched into the history of madness and punishment (1977, 1993) with an underlying interest in the power systems endemic within social mechanisms involved in constructing normality. He contended that the 'gaze' of the doctor and ability to see disease in the patient, empowered the medical establishment, but disempowered patients. The, 'Analysis and the clinical gaze....compose and decompose only in order to reveal an ordering that is the natural order itself' (1993: 94). Similarly, the gaze had, 'the paradoxical ability to hear a language as soon as it perceives a spectacle' (1993: 108). Therefore, such a classification of artwork primarily reflected psychological perspectives in terms of illness, not aesthetic considerations.

Foucault contended that contemporary western societies were disciplinary in nature, and institutions of incarceration were the realisation of the boundary and division between normal and abnormal behaviour. He argued that both hospital and prison were legal mechanisations of social control, where nonconforming behaviour was reformed by controlling time and space, thereby classifying patients or prisoners through their illness or crime.

The exhibiting of Outsider Art is voyeuristic and strangely contradictory. Although it attempts to,

speak of a simple human compulsion to make things, or to try and express in some way....a set of personal meanings, an attempt at some form of self-reconciliation....Paradoxically, perhaps, psychotic art remains something of a private world....and, because of this, we often feel a sense of anxiety by our exclusion. (Gisbourne 1996)

In a letter from Roger Cardinal (who first utilised the term Outsider Art) to Maurice Tuchman, he discussed the problem of categorising such art, alluding,

> to the creator's social or mental status....[which] seems unsatisfactory in as much as not every creator we want to recognise fits so readily into a social or psychological category. I feel strongly that to label works in a way that stresses the eccentricity or oddness of their maker tends to divert attention from aesthetic impact onto the biographies. (Cardinal cited in Tuchman & Eliel 1993: 11)

Such categorisations as Maverick Art, Isolate Art, Schizophrenic Art, Visionary Art, Inspired Art, Folk Art and Psychotic Art are used to describe or delineate these types of art.

8.6.2 A Social Aesthetic

Whether the work of those institutionalised is comparable to those outside, with both evaluated in a similar aesthetic manner is a highly subjective and thorny problem. Notwithstanding, the use of the term social aesthetic is a highly emotive term, with welfare connotations[5]. The term 'outsider' is a rigid classification and signifies that such work has been created whilst removed from 'normal' society. Tuchman (cited in Tuchman & Eliel 1993: 12) supposed that, 'many well-known artists may appear to be outsiders due to their alienation; however, alienation alone does not constitute outsiderness'. Therefore biography, far from, 'diverting attention from aesthetic impact' determines any impact, as it has to conform to strict 'outsider' regulations. This inflexible categorisation included professional artists only if, 'they fell into illness and became estranged from society'. Correspondingly, this

---

[5] the problem of considering social or aesthetic impacts was discussed in 5.6.1

supposed private world aesthetic is not obvious in terms of quality or style and cannot alone prove outsiderness, and the defensiveness of such a classificatory procedure shows how vulnerable the quality of such art is.

The aesthetic is social in as far as the validation refers to the extreme nature of the outsider life and trauma signified by the biography. It alone cannot prove worth, only the accompaniment of the life story validates the quality of the product. But such a social aesthetic character can also be seen as a wider critique. Outsider Art is a window into the rubric of the art world, as 'high' art is validated in a similar manner, not through the quality of the aesthetic alone, but through the filter of CurriculumVitae, which enables certain people and disables others.

8.6.3 Parody: The Visible Spectacle as Deterrent

The mythologically excluded and often exclusive artist (supposedly creating 'autonomous' art) resides on the fringes of society and normality, hence 'outsiders' who have the most extreme amounts of such experience or capital fit the label, but as a parody.

Colin Rhodes (2000) took a wider definition of 'outsider', which still retained a conformity and symmetry:

> The artist outsiders are, by definition, fundamentally different to their audience, often thought of as being dysfunctional in respect to the parameters for normality set by the dominant culture.... the emergence of a heterogeneous group has been made possible which includes those *labelled* as dysfunctional through pathology....or criminality....or because they appear to be in some way anachronistic, or are seen as un(der)developed or often simply because of a cultural identity and religious belief that is perceived as significantly different. (Rhodes 2000: 7-8)

This process of labelling the 'outsider', has other historical connotations.

Foucault referred to the growth of public works in 18th and 19th century France, set in motion in order to occupy the time of criminals and as a pay back to society. The miscreant worked in slavery for the public good to atone for misdemeanours. The social debts of prisoners were therefore re-paid in terms of labour. By putting prisoners to work in public places, this acted as a visible deterrent to anyone else

in society intent on a life of crime. He understood that such forced visible labour was intended to humiliate:

> A secret punishment is a punishment half wasted. Children should be allowed to come to the places where the penalty is being carried out; there they will attend their classes in civics. And grown men will periodically relearn the laws. Let us conceive of places of punishment as a garden of the laws that families should visit on Sundays. (Foucault 1977: 111)

The high visibility of such 'outsiders' made them a conspicuous spectacle. The exhibiting of Outsider Art has the same function. The traditional circus freak show of midgets, bearded ladies and deformity, to be mocked but also held up as examples of degeneracy. Ironically, 'high' artists are also parodied in a similar fashion.

8.6.4 Art Brut and Access to the Mainstream

Jean Dubuffet (Morris 1993: 79-87; Dubuffet 1992: 593-5) was the original champion of Art Brut in the 1940's. He believed in the natural rawness of this art (as against being culturally cooked) and its random, unplanned nature, which reflected something primordial about the artist, who was a shaman, expressing pure undiluted vision. Ironically, the less acceptable and excluded they became in society, the more pure their work. Such inverse (or perverse) logic exposes the art world in its never-ending search for novelty and extremism. Outsider Art is the epitome of monological self-referencing art, paralleling the exclusive modernist canon.

Colin Rhodes gave the example of Albert Loudon, an English self-taught artist and,

> recent casualty of rejection by the Outsider Art orthodoxy, because of artistic ambition....Loudon found himself subject to the fate of many marginal artists; as he seemingly "came in" from the outside, his old support dwindled, while mainstream acceptance failed to materialise.... his critics argued conveniently that his interest in his own success was deemed to have adversely affected the quality of his production. (2000: 17-20)

The paradox wasn't lost on Rhodes. By 'outsiders' engaging with the art world and society, they may be lifted out of their social category of 'outsider', to a category of 'ordinary' and the anonymity that accompanies it. Again biography that determines the aesthetic quality of artistic output, the aesthetic itself bears little weight. Hence engaging with society can be a mixed blessing.

There are parallels with other categories of the socially excluded. For instance, the status of being a criminal or drug addict may be more appealing than an 'ordinary' lifestyle. In which case social exclusion can secure social prestige and distinction.

8.6.5 A Welfare Model of Outsiders: Art Works in Mental Health

In opposition to the Outsider Art phenomenon of incorporating artists from hospital and prison into the 'high' art pantheon, there is a welfare orientated attitude and framework. This was well illustrated by the *Art Works in Mental Health Programme 2002*. This travelling exhibition was designed to, 'showcase the work and thereby increase understanding of the role of art and artistic expression in the lives of people.... affected by mental ill health'. It visited five galleries in London, Glasgow, Leeds, Cardiff and Birmingham (artworksinmentalhealth.co.uk 2002).

In this exhibition, artists were not treated as artists but as mental health patients who were creative. This was symbolised by the lack of biographical detail given about each artist whose pictures lacked even a title. Each exhibit was titled solely with the name and number of each artist, emphasising the institutionalised framework and foundation of the exhibition. The exhibition in London was held adjacent to the the Dali Universe exhibition and personality cult of the deceased Spanish surrealist Salvador Dali. This was in stark contrast to the lack of personalities in the Art Works in Mental Health exhibition, which was even held in two rooms entitled *Space 2* and *Space 3*. It was sardonic that a 'high' artist using madness as a theme with quotes such as, 'The fact that I myself do not understand the meaning of my paintings at the time I am painting them does not mean that they have no meaning' (Salvador Dali 2002), was exhibited adjacent to an exhibition purporting to promote inclusiveness for the mentally ill.

The exhibition's advertising slogan, 'The Only Thing You Need To Bring Is An Open Mind', contrasted with the style of curation which was totally impersonal, further distancing the artists from the audience. Whereas there was little biographical detail concerning the artists (for the stated

protection of artists), there were displays describing the work of the National Health Service Trusts and mental health creative networks, information about the institutions that enabled the exhibition to occur. Furthermore the exhibition was sponsored by Pfizer Limited, a multi-national drugs company, involved in supplying the National Health Service with the very medicines used to help alleviate the condition of the artists. There was a host of information explaining the company and promoting it.

The exhibition contained much interesting and original work, this multi-arts format included creative writing as well as a range of visual artworks. The quality of the work was exceptional in cases, and only the curatorial policy of presenting such artwork within the framework of mental health, signalled to the viewer that it was not 'high' art.

With regards to issues of social exclusion, one poem by Anthony Fisher 03189, encapsulated the problem:

> We don't want to be here,
>
> Neither do we want to be
>
> Out there.
>
> In here
>
> We suffer
>
> In silence. (Art Works in Mental Health 2002)

The mentally ill may not want to be included into mainstream society, nor excluded in a long-term institution. They want a third way.

8.6.6 The Conundrum

These two perspectives, 'outsiders' as high artists or as patients with an artistic side, was an issue and conundrum represented by the disabled actor Matt Fraser (2002a), in his play *Sealboy Freak.*[6]

The dilemma was whether as an actor Fraser was more empowered as a monster in a freak show or as a

---

[6] and subsequent Television programme entitled 'Freak'

disabled artist pitied by the audience, 'Clearly, there's a problem. As a disabled actor will I ever be seen as just an actor, or will I only ever be seen as a freak who acts?' (Fraser 2002b). In his television programme, he sought to answer this question by researching the American freak shows, and particularly Stanley Berent, an entertainer whose stage name was 'Sealo'. He had the same condition as Fraser, phocomenia (short arms). The routine he wrote into his play, which was shown at the Edinburgh Fringe 2001, and later in London[7].

Fraser contended that, 'The mainstream will only see a disabled performer in the same way that they view a performing seal, very clever, but just mimicry. No, no it can't be like that anymore, we've all moved on, people are no longer more fascinated by how I do things rather than what I'm saying. I am an actor not a fucking freak' (2002b).

He was obsessed with this problem as to whether he was an actor or a freak, hence he wrote a one-man play which revolved around two characters, Sealo and Tam, the first based on Berent, a freak in a freakshow, the second a disabled actor trying to find work. The point made was that there was little to separate the audience that watched theatre, from the one that watched the freakshow. Therefore Fraser had a problem with theatre, as, 'performers are limited in what they're allowed to do....[whereas] a freakshow still appears to be the only stage where we can take the leading role' (2002b). Irrespective of how the disabled actor performed on stage, the audience looked at the physical difference. He concluded that, 'Freak or actor....as for seeing the actor beyond the disability, I reckon that's for you to decide, for you to work out what it is that you want to see, so go on, use your imagination' (2002b). Interpretation and the framing of art and culture, are beyond the bounds of individual artists, such structures are socially determined and condition individual choice.

8.6.7 Insider, Outsiders and the Power of Society

From a Foucauldian perspective, the historical emphasis on the utility of work and education in the transformation of institutionally based 'outsiders', back into socially acceptable 'insiders', was not concerned with the needs and aspirations of the individual. It reflected the power of society to engineer a 'normalisation' and the punishments and cures it could legitimately carry out to achieve this. Hence

---

[7] at the Oval House Theatre (Fraser 2002a)

his use of the term 'docile bodies', to describe the powerlessness of this constituency. Foucault explained this in terms of criminals, although the disabled inherit a similar penalty, wrapped up in the inadequacy of the physical body or mind, for which they are also punished:

> We must rid ourselves of the illusion that penalty is above all (if not exclusively) a means of reducing crime and that, in this role, according to the social forms, the political systems or beliefs, it may be severe or lenient, tend towards expiation of obtaining redress, towards the pursuit of individuals or the attribution of collective responsibility....But we can surely accept the general proposition that, in our societies, the systems of punishment are to be situated in a certain 'political economy' of the body....it is always the body that is at issue - the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission. (1977: 24-5)

Accordingly, Outsider Art represents 'outsiders' as 'normality' in the way that society and particularly the art world wants them portrayed. It is a category of exclusion, irrespective of the wishes of audiences or artists, that denies such people access to the mainstream. Success is conditioned by their freaky spectacle, which is a deterrent to others. This social role is far removed from any principle concerning their social inclusion.

8.6.8 Conclusion

There are two frameworks utilised for understanding art created in hospital and prison.

Firstly, the 'high' art model and category of Outsider Art, with highly prescriptive and elitist rules as to who is allowed entry into this hallowed society. Notoriety is dependent on the cult of personality and therefore biography determines the authority of the artwork. This is a parody of the mythologically excluded 'high' artist.

Secondly, there is a welfare model, in which the personality of artists is negated, and subjugated to the welfare organisations that permit and enable them to create art, whilst looking after their interests. The implication, is that the art helps to normalise these people for re-integration back into society. The former system is geared towards cultural inclusion within the 'high' art canon, the latter is predicated on social inclusion into society. Unfortunately, they appear to be mutually exclusive.

Fraser encapsulated the conundrum, as did not want to be patronised as a disabled actor, limited in what he was seen to be able to do, unable to take a leading role in theatre, hence his fascination with freak shows, which he felt were empowering. But, unfortunately in both situations, the disabled were 'visible' through their disability, not ability. As the poem from Fisher described, such a constituency wanted a third option.

Foucault described such 'outsiders' as 'docile bodies', powerless to control or influence public perceptions or their own normalisation, occupying a position within society as a spectacle, that functioned as a deterrent to others.

8.7 Summary

This chapter investigated cultural inclusion and the concept of taste. This was grounded in Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital, which concerned both the inherited and learnt qualitative and quantitative accumulation of culture. Through his anthropological and sociological analysis of culture and aesthetic judgement, he claimed that notions of beauty were socially constructed. He likened artistic taste to culinary taste, in which intrinsic difference in preference was due to enculturisation and prestige. Underlying this simple analogy were far more complex propositions. His central proposal was that the categorisation of culture into 'high', 'middle' and 'low brow' taste reflected class habitus or ingrained attitudes. Accordingly, this gave a sociological perspective on the relevance and inaccessibility of the 'high' arts for those with low cultural capital, the socially excluded for instance, and the importance of education in allowing mobility of taste. In order to be included into the art world, the rules of art had to be learnt. He recognised the interpenetration of this world with that of finance, which undermined its autonomy. He was concerned with the role of culture in reproducing social inequality, especially as 'high' art was an exclusive category, inaccessible to the majority of people.

But Bourdieu was highly critical of 'popular' culture, and failed to realise the importance of other cultural perspectives, hence his fundamental assumption that 'high brow' had more value. Unfortunately his intellectual gaze and language are highly inaccessible, reflecting his binary logic. Critics attacked him for failing to acknowledge the male domination of the cultural field, and lack of a pluralistic perspective. Similarly, his distaste for 'popular' culture and cultural diversity, illustrated an understanding which was oversimplified and clumsy. Neither could his model explain the changes that

have occurred within the western canon, or the effect of particular artists or movements, on both popular and 'high' art evolution. Also, arguably, this canon has never been autonomous, hence this position has more to do with cultural mythology than reality. But most scathingly, it was his academicism and style of language used that paralleled 'high' culture, and although he deconstructed the arts, he seemed not to want to affect change. The 'high' arts remain exclusive and not for all.

The case study researched the 'high' art taste category of Outsider Art, portrayed by three major exhibitions at the Hayward Gallery. It explained the exclusive 'outsider' regulations, which mimicked and parodied 'high' art classification, where biography supported claims of artistic quality. The problem was the extent to which the exhibition of such work was perceived as freakish spectacle, or the pinnacle of monological self-referencing art. But the 'outsider' artist Loudon was an example of how increased social inclusion and normality was at the expense of cultural status. His rejection within the category, was directly related to his artistic ambition.

The case then explored Foucault's understanding of the power systems surrounding the mechanisms of constructing normality, and how abnormality (in this instance the art category) had been used as a visible deterrent. It was an artificial construct, in which aesthetic appreciation was socially determined and the arts were disempowering, denoting illness. This welfare model was exemplified by the Art Works in Mental Health Programme 2002, which treated these artists primarily as patients.

The conundrum for disabled and institutionalised artists was expressed by the disabled actor Matt Fraser, who railed against the limitations imposed on him as an actor, suggesting that performing in a freak show was more empowering than working in the theatre, as he was perceived by audiences as limited because of his disability. He neither wanted to be patronised as a disabled actor, or gawked at as a freak. In terms of inclusion, this was not possible on his terms.

The 'outsider' or disabled artist as a social spectacle reflects the boundary between normality and abnormality revealing issues of power and social control. Hence the relevance of a Foucauldian analysis of society which exposed its power to engineer 'normalisation', and helped express and explain the difficult relationship between cultural and social inclusion/exclusion.

Chapter 9. Cultural Democracy

9.1 Introduction

The accessibility and relevance of the arts is the primary consideration of cultural democracy. The historian, Robert Hewison (1995: 310) expressed the, 'need to make contemporary culture more representative of contemporary society' reflecting its pluralistic character. The research therefore investigates a cultural democracy around which a more inclusive agenda can be gathered. It covers a discourse surrounding the importance of democratising the 'high' arts, the accessibility of the cultural industries, and the importance of a 'common' culture steeped in mass consumerism. It reassesses the historical antagonism between the Community Arts Movement and the Arts Council in light of the current government agenda of social inclusion. Finally, it presents a case study constructed around Boal's 'Theatre of the Oppressed', to exemplify how drama can be utilised to enable cultural democracy.

9.2 The Cultural Industries

There is much debate as to whether the cultural industries aid the process of democratising 'high' culture, or are a threat to its survival.

9.2.1 As a Driver for Democratising Culture

Traditionally the 'high' art canon has been selective about democratising culture, encapsulated by such writers as Kenneth Clark and the Classical School from the right, and Theodor Adorno and the Frankfurt School from the left. The common ground was the protection of the 'high' art canon from the influences of mass culture and its driver, the cultural industries.

In contrast Augustin Girard (1981) took the position that the cultural industries, by making 'high' culture accessible to more people, aided the process of democratising it. Furthermore, that there was an inevitability about this process as, 'the ways in which culture finds expression and the development of its content and role are seen to be increasingly determined...by the industrialization of the systems of production and dissemination of cultural messages, whether in the form of products or of services' (Girard 1981: 11).

These changes have been brought about by 'cultural machines' and the resulting technological explosion of the past thirty years. He argued that although the cultural industries were at the epicentre of cultural life, cultural policies had been lopsided due to the traditional 'high' arts antipathy to them. Hence the need to develop a relationship between cultural policy-making and the cultural industries. Although there has been some movement in this direction in the past twenty years, 'This process....cannot be advanced, or even embarked upon seriously, unless it is based on information and facts that make it possible to get away from the antithesis of business and culture, or art and industry, which is as false as it is facile' (1981: 25). This dialectical position had allowed the 'high' art idiom and canon to control policy whilst remaining aloof from the wider culture, preventing any real synthesis.

Girard contended that the cultural industries disseminated culture beyond a minority audience, and because their products were relatively inexpensive, were an accessible starting point for generating interest in 'higher' culture, thereby promoting, democratising and decentralising it. Moreover, he argued that the term 'quality' was underpinned by intellectual snobbery, which was a contributory factor towards why the 'high' arts encountered, 'a kind of resistance from the bulk of people....whereas those very people [were] receptive to other messages affecting their life - styles and consumption patterns' (1981: 26). He argued against cultural policy based on this exclusive agenda, as it served, 'only to give a little more to those who are already the "haves" as regards culture and money' (1981: 26). Such a viewpoint accepted that there are many different cultural worlds, but that 'high' art was predominantly alien to the majority.

Howard Becker (1982) coined the term 'art worlds' in order to understand that 'art' had to be viewed in a wider and collective manner, as there was a proliferation of different types of artistic circles (in the broadest sense of the phrase), some related, others disparate. Different artists were embroiled in a highly complex network of people: suppliers, critics, dealers, consumers and curators for instance, who all helped 'produce' the work of art. He also included the audience as part of this world, therefore dissolving the distinction between artist and audience. His interest was in the collective nature of artistic creation, refusing to consider the individual artist as any more than another worker. Art was shaped by the activity of all the relevant agents in a particular relationship of networks. Any understanding of the arts thereby remained tied up with an awareness of the wider social system which

created and defined it, and the culture within which it operated. He maintained that,

> Though the basic idea seems commonplace, many of its implications are not. Thus, it seems obvious to say that if everyone whose work contributes to the finished art work does not do his part, the work will come out differently. But it is not obvious to pursue the implication that it then becomes a problem to decide which of all these people is *the* artist, while the others are only support personnel. (Becker 1982: x)

He questioned the traditional humanistic and aesthetic orientation of analysis, in terms of taking the artist and work of art as the focus of investigation. He also rejected the idea that any particular art was intrinsically better than any other.

His concept can be expanded to include all art forms and styles, and by including the audience, a particular constituency that relates to a particular 'art world'. Obviously these constituencies overlap, for instance a jazz lover, may also enjoy and relate to Slavonic Folk Music, Baroque Music and Punk Rock. It could also transverse art form. Such a jazz lover may have pluralistic tastes that include an interest in Classical Ballet, Art Deco, Morris Minor cars, and television soap operas. This postmodern 'pick and mix' menu reflects a consumer society with preferences. The cultural industries play a huge part in this, as they allow access to these 'art worlds' through reproduction. By assessing culture and the arts in such a fashion, from a wider collective and audience perspective, the traditional obsession with individual 'high' artists and their intention lessens in significance.

9.2.2 As a Threat to High Culture

The argument against the cultural industries is typified by a fundamental distrust of the profit motive which translates everything into a form of entertainment. Accordingly, mass culture has been accused of devaluing the creative act, threatening and 'dumbing' down culture.

Theodor Adorno (1991) who preceded Girard (writing in the mid 20th century), used a Marxist template, insisting that culture would regress under the influence of commercial product. This he considered dehumanising and alienating as it too readily supported the cultural consensus and did little to advance the arts, modernism or progress.

He is alleged to have invented the term 'culture industry' with his colleague Max Horkheimer in 1947 (Adorno 1991: 98). His argument that mass produced artefacts refer back, 'to the standardization of the thing itself' (1991: 100) and that the, 'total effect of the culture industry is one of anti-enlightenment....[which] impedes the development of autonomous, independent individuals' (1991: 106), reflected the view that cultural products were tailored for consumption, and lacked a productive creativity and spontaneity. He warned that they should be distinguished from popular 'low' art production based on creativity not consumption, which had been increasingly appropriated by the cultural industries.

By transferring profit onto cultural forms, the culture industry was an extension of capitalism, driven by economics rather than aesthetic autonomy. Hence he considered that, 'The concoctions of the culture industry are neither guides for a blissful life, nor a new art of moral responsibility, but rather exhortations to toe the line, behind which stand the most powerful interests. The consensus which it propagates strengthens blind, opaque authority' (1991: 105).

His elitist 'high' art stance and revolutionary Marxist interest in overcoming capitalism (and its representative the culture industry), seems contradictory. Jay Bernstein (1991) encapsulated this problem by referring to the, 'evident strain involved in a thesis which claims autonomous, bourgeois art is what sustains the true universality of the claims of the oppressed, while the arts produced for the masses, is critiqued as the reproduction of the alienated needs of mass society' (Bernstein 1991: 7).

But Adorno is important as he presented another angle on cultural democracy and democratising culture, illuminating the instrumental agendas underpinning the arts, connecting them to wider socio-economic and political frameworks. Therefore he pursued the ideal of autonomous art and artists, free from such restrictions and determinants[1], a Bolshevik avant-garde movement behind which the masses followed.

9.3 A Grounded Aesthetic

This investigation explores the exclusive perception of the arts and contrasts this with a relevant inclusive 'common' culture. In contrast to the traditional 'high' arts formulation, an aesthetic famework

---

[1] a wider critique of capitalism and autonomy can be found in 12.4

grounded in the reality of life, re-connecting it to lived culture, is explored. But arguably, the simulated nature of culture disqualifies a 'grounded' aesthetic, as the reality principle has been lost.

9.3.1 Art as Exclusion, Culture as Inclusion

It can be argued that the arts are exclusive whilst culture is inclusive. The evaluation research on the arts and social exclusion conducted by Glasgow University for the SAC[2], found the need for a champion to advocate the arts, as they were not generally perceived as relevant in the context of inclusion. Evidence that the 'arts' are narrowly conceived in terms of the 'high' arts, was also indicated by the Arts Council's own *Public Attitudes to the Arts*. This showed that fewer than 30% of those questioned recognised rock music, fiction, digital arts and circus skills as art forms. That the traditional 'high' arts were perceived by over 75% as constituting the arts, further embedded this opinion (Arts Council of England 2000: 3-4).

Paul Willis (1990) researched youth culture in terms of constructing and providing an argument for why, 'The institutions and practices, genres, and terms of high art are currently categories of exclusion more than inclusion' (Willis 1990: 1). He concluded that art had become separated from culture, and had become institutionalised. He referred to this as a, ""hyperinstitutionalization" of "art" - the complete dissociation of art from living contexts where the merely formal features of art can become the guarantee of its "aesthetic", rather than its relevance and relation to real-life processes and concerns' (1990: 2-3). Underpinning this position was the, 'myth of the special artist' fighting the Medusa of mass consumerism, and maintaining an elitist position for the arts.

Willis also asserted that the elitist 'high' culture had, 'lost its dominance....[and] now the very sense or pretence, of a national "whole culture" and of hierarchies of values, activities and places within it is breaking down' (1990: 128). Young people were disinterested in this conception of the arts, but had a thriving and relevant culture. This he called the 'common' culture.

9.3.2 The Common Culture

This 'common' culture consisted of much cross-referencing of the symbolic resources of mass culture.

---

[2] see 6.3

For instance: TV, video, computers, films, adverts and magazines. Willis also included style and fashion, and especially music in terms of home recording, latest musical styles and black music. He went further, including pub culture and street survival as part of a lived in culture. Creativity was symbolic and vested in signs of mass culture. This abstract bricolage concept of re-interpreting, or re-taking visual or aural signification, he termed as 'grounding' the aesthetic, making it relevant. He accepted consumerism and the commodity culture, as it referred to the, 'dynamic and living qualities of everyday culture' (Willis 1990: 18). On one level, it taps into life, but on another it is driven by a particular ideology and simulated reality, a hyperreality which is far from attainable.

The cultural theorist Jim McGuigan (1992: 10) understood this 'common' culture to be a form of cultural populism. Such a discovery was a, 'romantic reaction to Classicism....[and] attempt to break with excessively formalistic, dry and unemotional art'. There was a sentimentality attached to the ordinary people, 'their apparent spontaneity and disregard for propriety, their "naturalness"'. Such idealism was steeped in a recovered and re-created, 'organic past in contrast to a "mechanical" present'. Moreover, as McGuigan dryly attested, the concept of popular culture was the creation of the very same intellectuals of culture, not the ordinary people. Hence it was central to a clash of ideologies within the cultural field and beyond.

But there are obvious similarities between popular culture and the 'high' arts. All the symbols are mutable, re-interpretable and re-translatable. The signs of 'high' art have been utilised by the advertising industry, and much modern art uses mass produced materials. There is no clear-cut de-lineation between this 'high' art canon and the wider culture. Possibly, jazz has been more transparent in its re-cycling of ideas, which is why it has traditionally sat awkwardly between 'high' and 'popular' culture. Arguably, mass culture is driven by the new ideas appropriated from the 'high' arts (a cynic could argue these roles in reverse). Each appropriating from the other.

Accordingly, Paul Duncum (2001: 103) confirmed that, 'The once clear distinction between high and low culture no longer holds' and each artist or musician freely borrows from wherever he or she can. The 'high' art canon may have been appropriated for exclusive concerns, but the images and styles associated with the canon have become diffused into the general culture, a form of leakage. The art institutions are far from hermetically sealed off from life, and the 'high' art produced, creates yet more symbols and meanings for the pool of signs from which the 'common' culture is determined.

9.3.3 Real and Simulated Culture

It is important to investigate whether culture can be grounded in reality, as set out by Willis and his 'grounded' aesthetic. Also, to assess whether the wider culture is in tune with living contexts, or if it too, like the arts, is 'hyperinstitutionalised' and removed from real life processes. Arguably, if a 'common' culture depends on and utilises signifiers and symbols from mass culture, this leaves people stranded in a morass of advertising signifiers. It would follow that increased simulation increases exclusion from real life.

Baudrillard (1988) took the position that the real world had been reduced to a simulation and constructed three historical orders of simulacra, culminating in today's hyperreal society. There was no reality principle, as one simulacrum referred to another, without reference to it. He attacked American culture and commodification in particular:

> Disneyland is there to conceal the fact that it is the 'real' country, all of 'real' America, which is Disneyland (just as prisons are there to conceal the fact that it is the social in its entirety, in its banal omnipresence, which is carceral). Disneyland is presented as imaginary in order to make us believe that the rest is real....It is no longer a question of a false representation of reality (ideology), but of concealing the fact that the real is no longer real, and thus of saving the reality principle. (Baudrillard 1988: 172)

He argued that we desperately needed an analysis of images and ideologies, in order to save this reality principle:

> today, *reality itself is hyperrealistic*. The secret of surrealism was that the most banal reality could become surreal, but only at privileged moments, which still derived from art and the imaginary. Now the whole of everyday political, social, historical, economic reality is incorporated into the simulative dimension of hyperrealism; we already live out the 'aesthetic' hallucination of reality. The old saying, 'reality is stranger than fiction,' which belonged to the surrealist aestheticization of life, has been surpassed. There is no longer a fiction that life can confront, even in order to surpass it; reality has passed over into the play of reality, radically disenchanted. (1988: 146)

Reality had become a fiction, and the 'common' culture was just another manifestation of this. But there is a breakthrough point or threshold beyond which the re-interpretation of the signifiers of mass culture can be taken back into a public reality and ownership, for instance in terms of youth subcultures and their lifestyles[3]. The simulated fiction is re-incorporated back into the 'reality principle', but on different terms and within a paradigm of meaning that is relevant to those involved. But Baudrillard took a bleak and nihilistic attitude, whereby once simulated and within a field of simulacra, reality was lost, locked in its own fantasy:

> To dissimulate is to feign not to have what one has. To simulate is to feign to have what one hasn't. One implies a presence, the other an absence. But the matter is more complicated, since to simulate is not simply to feign.....Thus, feigning or dissimulating leaves the reality principle intact: the difference is always clear, it is only masked; whereas simulation threatens the difference between 'true' and 'false', between 'real' and 'imaginary'. Since the simulator produces 'true' symptoms, is he or she ill or not? The simulator cannot be treated objectively either as ill, or as not ill. (1988: 167-8).

Simulation is therefore like a virus that imitates reality, but ultimately works against the needs and health of the organism, or in this case the society or culture involved. But Baudrillard ignored the human and individual representation of reality, as though it was created beyond and outside of individuals in an objective manner. Whether reality is simulated or not, individuals create their reality which refers to their needs and experiences. This may be phoney in some way, but this does not deny individuals making it personal and relevant and a 'reality' for them. There are relative degrees of hyperrerality, but always a representation of some degree of reality albeit wrapped and mixed up in the distortions and simulacra. Baudrillard despaired of the world to the extent that he included everything into his paradigm of fiction: 'when the real is no longer what it used to be, nostalgia assumes its full meaning. There is a proliferation of myths of origin and signs of reality; of second-hand truth,

---

[3] see 10.5.6 and the case study on Reggae Music

objectivity and authenticity. There is an escalation of the true, of the lived experience' (1988: 171). But one of the problems, as Baudrillard himself contested, was the impossibility of distinguishing and isolating simulation from reality as it is inextricably tied up with it. By stating that everything was veering towards simulation he repressed any possibility of reality peering through in some way, an extreme position borne out of his nihilism and dialectical reasoning.

Because Baudrillard had come from a radical Marxist position he desperately wanted, 'to re-inject realness and referentiality everywhere, in order to convince us of the reality of the social, of the gravity of the economy and the finalities of production' (1988: 179), as a strategy against this invidious invasion of simulacra, hence his obsession with simulation and the loss of the reality principle. There are certain experiences and emotions in life that are atavistic and primeval, these artists have continually attempted to capture, and they are entwined in a rubric and network that is partially simulated and a partial reality. Those massive universal life events, the birth of a child, and death of a loved one for instance. Such reality sits adjacent to the mass of simulacra. Here the arts become a bridge between these positions, bringing together an understanding and reconciliation of fact and fiction, reality and simulation, yin and yan, the individual and society. In which case the arts can be seen as a reality injector, enabling people to be in touch with themselves, their community and a wider humanity. In practice, this was well illustrated by the Community Arts Movement, which was designed to enable those excluded from the 'high' arts to actively express themselves artistically through a 'common' culture of interests and experiences.

9.4 The Community Arts Movement

The Community Arts Movement, had an altogether different cultural and socio-political understanding of the arts beyond concepts of spreading 'high' art aesthetics. It was spawned in the 1960s as a democratic attempt to make the arts relevant to a wider constituency. To some extent it was a reflection of a new youth culture rebelling against official traditional formats. It was unashamedly experimental and counter cultural, but still steeped in the creative arts. It arguably failed to recognise cultural diversity, steeped in issues of class rather than ethnicity.

9.4.1 History of Antagonism

The Arts Council investigated the phenomenon of 'community' arts, through the *Baldry Report*, published in 1974. On the one hand it viewed the movement as, 'A new development in the arts', but on the other it asked: 'Should the Arts Council be involved?' (Arts Council of Great Britain 1974: 7-9). It recognised that it posed a challenge to Arts Council hegemony, but also that the more experimental areas could be re-incorporated into the 'high' art cannon.

The Working Party was undecided as to whether 'community' art produced acceptable art, but agreed that it needed support. It decided,

> that community arts should be treated as a separate category...[but] The concern of community artists with process rather than product, with the effect of their work on the community rather than the achievement of standards acceptable to specialists in the various art forms, sharply differentiates their aims and activities, and consequently the criteria by which they should be assessed, from those expected in other categories through which the council operates. In addition there are several other ways in which community arts work cuts across distinctions and patterns of thought which underlie most of the Council's work.
>
> It cuts across the distinction between particular art forms....[and] as a group they pay little or no attention to the boundaries between art forms....It cuts across distinction between professional and amateur....[and] The division between experimental and non-experimental is also scarcely acceptable. (1974: 13-4)

That 'community' arts did not fit into Arts Council categories, cutting as it did across different media and the artistic boundaries that it had determined, which supported John Pick's criticism of the Council as being overly bureaucratic and controlling. His claim was that, 'it is the bureaucracy that must respond to art' (Pick 1991: 103), not the other way round. But crucially, the Community Arts Movement evaluated its work, in terms of the, 'effect on the community rather than by the standard of an end-product' (Arts Council of Great Britain 1974: 16), which allowed the Arts Council to dismiss such projects as lacking sufficient aesthetic value. Ironically, it was precisely those community based projects with an experimental dynamic that were the most challenging to its hegemony. Hence

'community' art was kept a distinct category away from 'high' art, in order not to devalue the cannon. Owen Kelly (1984) recognised the problems described in the *Baldry Report*, in terms of the extent to which the Community Arts Movement had been misrepresented. He showed how the Association of Community Artists (ACA) had sold out to the Arts Council in order to garner funding and resources for the movement. He paraphrased and ridiculed Lord Gibson, then chairman of the Arts Council, who viewed the aims of 'community' arts as enabling, 'people to be creative solely so that they can learn about art from the inside, find out how much they have been missing, pull themselves together and start attending galleries, theatres and concert halls' (Kelly 1984: 19).

Kelly perceived the Community Arts Movement as therefore,

> fashioned by its desire to seek funding, and by its willingness to ignore the price that was extracted for that funding - in the progressive loss of control over the direction of the movement and its ability to construct a programme to put its aims into practice.... more and more groups [were] organised around the criteria espoused by the funding agencies. (1984: 24)

Such funder control re-established the cultural hegemony, away from issues of cultural rights and democracy, where creativity was a driver for empowering and emancipating the culturally excluded. Therefore, historically, the Arts Council has not been inclusive in its policies or understanding, so there is more than a touch of irony with regards to its interest and concern to put social inclusion at the heart of its policy today[4].

9.4.2 Problems with the Community Arts Movement

Kelly (1984: 18) set out the difficulties described by the *Baldry Report*.

Firstly, these were political, due to the fact that the movement was in opposition to 'high' art and critical of the Arts Council's elitist, 'few but roses' attitude. Hence its slogan of, 'let a million flowers bloom'.

Secondly, because of, 'the difference between a belief in collective creativity and a belief that creativity

---

[4] as set out in 3.5

is essentially and necessarily individual'.

Thirdly, an emphasis on process and active participation, as it was,

> not what was being done that is interesting but how it was being done. In fact it was precisely in the area of technique (in the usual sense) that community artists were breaking new ground. They were devising methods of working which were based around groups, and they were trying to develop ways in which the groups could draw upon the strengths and weaknesses of the people involved, and in which every member could make a contribution without feeling debarred by the stronger or more confident members.

Fourthly, because the projects were run by 'animateurs', a term that refers to facilitator-come-artists, with relevant social skills. They were neither amateurs or professionals, so they could not be classified by existing structures. This was a radical departure from and challenge to Arts Council classification of art worthy of subsidy.

Lastly, the activities were socially and culturally inclusive, on the terms of those participating. Kelly assumed that,

> The intentions of those who had started the community arts movement had been to enable working people to be creative in ways that would make their creativity socially effective... they believed that people's new-found effectiveness in the area of creativity would raise their morale and lead them to seek to empower themselves in other areas of their lives... it was everybody's right to participate in the shaping in the world in which they lived. (1984: 21-2).

But the Arts Council saw, 'no basic contradiction or dichotomy between 'community' arts and established arts. Support for the one should not, and need not, involve hostility towards the other. The two should be complimentary' (Arts Council of Great Britain 1977: 9). Furthermore, it expanded on this theme confirming that part of its, 'purpose [was] to ensure that a larger portion of the population enjoys some worthwhile form of artistic experience than at present' (1977: 9), which was an admission that its policies thus far had been unsuccessful with regards to involving the majority of citizens. Kelly

likened this attitude to, 'herding community artists into reservations in the barren areas of the established terrain' (1984: 21), with a total lack of consideration for context.

Interestingly, it was in reference to the 'community' arts that the use of the word 'evaluation' was first used in its reports (Arts Council of Great Britain 1974; 1977). This was in contrast to traditional subjective judgements made of the 'high' arts, which lacked transparency. In which case, the use of evaluation is symbolically steeped in a struggle and methodology of control[5].

9.4.3 The Arts as Excellence, Entertainment or Reflection of Community

The Arts Council 1976-7 *Annual Report* insisted that the quality of community art projects had to be assessed. It also suggested that, 'The word "excellence", so long used in Arts Council parlance, is an affront to those who think (quite wrongly) that it involves a rejection of popular arts in favour of the grandest and most expensive art forms' (1977: 9). And yet, there was little transparency with regards to how it arrived at determining what was 'excellent'. The report went on to lecture about policy with pertinent and emotive argument:

At its worst, democratic cultural policy assumes that 'the masses' will never be capable of enjoying the best in the arts, and so must be provided with a second best, or less. Surprisingly, Mathew Arnold detected this trend over a century ago when he wrote that:

'Plenty of people will try to give the masses, as they call them, an intellectual food prepared and adjusted in the way they think proper for the actual condition of the masses'. This is sometimes called 'giving the public what it wants', but it really means giving the public what it can most easily be persuaded to accept. (1977: 10)

It cleverly referred to the providers of the, 'poorest kind of mass entertainment' as joining hands with the art populists in terms of, 'underestimating people'. This obfuscation enabled the Arts Council to smear 'popular' art forms with being overtly commercial ones, which was not always the case. It also ruled out the possibility that commercial, 'mass entertainment' might have quality.

---

[5] the history of evaluation is explained in 4.2 and its wider use as a political tool in 4.6

There was little recognition of the extent to which the 'high' arts were an import for the majority of people and alien to their culture and community.

Su Braden (1978: 167). writing about 'community' art schemes in the 1970s, saw them as functioning to enable, 'artists and the arts....[to] relate more closely to the needs of contemporary society'. She recognised such projects as enabling a personal journey that each individual could make within a particular community or tradition: 'People make culture....It is to do with self-expression and social needs. It is active not passive....to be lived rather than....to be appreciated' (1978: 174). She compared 'high' art which was inactive, asocial, aesthetic and middle class, with 'community' art which was active, social, relevant and working class.

The Community Arts Movement was highly political and the apotheosis of Arts Council elitism. It was involved with traditionally non-aesthetic concerns, and was explicit about the social role of the arts (that of encouraging cultural democracy and as a foil to the cultural hegemony). Furthermore, the movement was complicit in holding a mirror to the 'high' arts, and the Arts Council their major institutional supporter, in terms of its role and relevance in society.

Firstly, the Arts Council had a particular take on what the arts constituted. As Pick (1991) described, its subsidised art world culture became British culture. Secondly, and equally contentiously, it could be argued that it feared a de-mystification of the 'high' art canon. This could reveal the extent to which it had been appropriated by international capitalism, and could be reduced to an arm of commerce. Hence 'excellence' could be seen to be determined by the marketplace, not aesthetic quality.

That the arts could be embedded in the community necessitated a different framework of understanding that challenged traditional aesthetics and notions of entertainment.

9.4.4 Education into High Culture or Cultural Democracy, A Political Framework

Roy Shaw, Secretary General of the Arts Council in the 1980's, viewed education as the vehicle for democratising 'high' culture. He responded to Braden's view that 'high' art culture was an irrelevance for most people: 'The Arts Council, she alleges, is founded on the, '"artistic deception" that this culture is *potentially* for all, and needs only more education to make it *actually* available to all...[but] one of the commonest fallacies in approaching serious arts is to assume that they must be immediately accessible' (Shaw 1983: 8), hence the need to utilise education as a mediator to make, 'accessible

excellence'. He justified decades of Arts Council policy and the extent to which it had been directed towards the minority educated bourgeoisie:

> The difference between many middle class people who enjoy the serious arts and many working class people who don't, is not that the arts are bourgeois but that they are difficult and that most middle class people have had more opportunity to study them and become familiar with them, not only through formal education, but most importantly through the almost subliminal educational influence of a cultivated home background. (1983: 8)

What Shaw did not recognise, was the extent to which this was a partial and culturally specific view of the arts. He had failed to see beyond Arts Council propaganda and his own axiomatic argument. By starting off with the premise and established view that the 'serious arts' are difficult and inaccessible, it proves their exclusivity and more relevantly, validates a consequential policy. There are other artworlds and artistic paradigms. The arts therefore, in order to be 'serious', had to be rubber-stamped by the Arts Council, in which case it was dictating (not responding) to them, as Pick suggested.

Kelly viewed the demise of the Community Arts Movement in the 1980's as, 'herald[ing] its arrival as one of the caring professions' (1984: 36). He reckoned that the need for professionism and training in the movement, was proof that it had become a neutered entity, filtered through establishment processes. He explained the need for a political framework for the 'community' arts in order to re-attach them to their roots and make them meaningful and radical. His position was that the Movement was an important counterbalance to the centralisation and dominance of the established state and cultural hegemony.

In order for the 'community' arts to be radical, he argued for self-direction and control to be vested in participants, which encouraged the empowerment of those who most needed it. But cultural democracy sat uneasily with the highly centralised Arts Council, which pursued a partial attitude to culture, moreover its pursuit of the democratisation of culture could also be perceived as a chimera and illusion. Kelly argued vehemently in favour of the Community Arts Movement, as the, 'The knowledge that arises from such participation is much more likely to lead to those collective understandings which I have termed *primary*....[*as* against] *secondary understanding*; formally recognised but fragmented'

(1984: 100). The 'primary' reflecting cultural democracy, lived experience and participation, the 'secondary' democratising culture and passively viewing the values and culture of others. He explained further:

> The current argument in favour of the 'democratisation of culture' goes hand in hand with the tightening of professional control over the production of cultural outputs, for it suggests that what we need is more of what we already have, given to us by better trained versions of the people who are currently trying to give it to us.....Cultural democracy, on the other hand, is an idea which revolves around the notion of plurality and around equality of access to the means of cultural production and distribution. It assumes that cultural production happens within the context of wider social discourse. (1984: 100-1)

The 'democratisation of culture' agenda was therefore not just about persuading people of the virtues of the 'high' arts and furthermore, that they were the cornerstone of civilisation, but of engaging in the, 'systematic downgrading of other activities, which have been shunted into categories which are treated as though they were automatically, and self-evidently, of a lower order' (1984: 55). Kelly contrasted the 'less serious' popularity of Country and Western music with that of 'worthy' Opera. All art forms are a part of a particular heritage, but such classifications in terms of value, as Bourdieu attested, have been socially constructed.

Willis took the line that people had an inherent creativity which related to culture rather than the arts. Therefore he rejected the assumption of both the 'high' art democratisation and 'community' arts fraternities, that creativity could only be realised through an introduction to the arts. His 'common' culture which related to accessible consumer goods and styles, was truly culturally democratic and affirmed, 'our active sense of our own vital capacities' (1990: 12), irrespective of the arts.

This a vital area of contention, and dependant on definition. That the arts are a creative driver of culture, embeds them into the term. They are both steeped in history and separate from it, which allows them to express Hall's two concepts of cultural identity[6]. They have the capacity to be appropriated for

---

[6] set out in 10.4

a range of uses, allowing a rich, varied and diverse cultural democracy. Therefore to dissociate a 'common' culture from the arts altogether, reduces the extent of this variety.

9.4.5 Cultural Diversity

Kwesi Owusu (1986) when expressing the struggle for Black Arts in 1980's Britain, similarly argued that even the well-meaning Community Arts Movement failed to view itself objectively and understand cultural diversity. Although, 'its fifteen or so year history has espoused a tradition of seeking to address inequalities and discrimination, [it] has also failed to challenge the real issues of racism' (Owusu 1986: 42-3). He blamed this on white activists perceiving black people as victims in a patronising manner, without understanding the dynamics of culture and the authority behind such culture. He criticised the Community Arts Movement for leaning too heavily on Eurocentric art forms and culture. He argued for, 'establishing a new democratic hegemony' (1986: 44) as British concepts of ethnicity and ethnic arts minimised and belittled 'black' Art, subordinating it to 'high' art in terms of importance and quality. Hence the need for, 'Black cultural liberation' (1986: 46). But he realised the extent to which 'black' arts were determined by socio-economic and political contexts, and how such art is sustained by the community it serves:

> In effect, 'ethnic' arts policies were the translation of colonial policy to the metropolis. The 'natives' of Jamaica or India became the ethnics of Britain, and funding bodies saw it as their duty to help them preserve their cultural identities....If there was any change in attitudes between the colonial and post-colonial periods, it was the new atmosphere of liberal benevolence. (1986: 29)

This active understanding of art and culture, in which those involved were struggling to express themselves and their culture, is inherently political.

Rasheed Araeen (2000) illustrated the problems in her discussion with the black artist Eddie Chambers about an alternative 'black' Art, which was, 'produced by black people largely and specially for the black audience, and in which, in terms of its content, addresses black experience' (Chambers cited in Araeen 2000: 240). Araeen wanted such an art to address the whole of society. Her concern was that by incorporating 'black' art into the mainstream, 'it would be very difficult to distinguish between black

art as a specific historical formation and the general category recognised and promoted by the establishment' (2000: 242). In terms of 'black' aesthetics, due to the overarching hegemony of western and 'white' aesthetics, neither considered there to be an essentially black visual art, unlike 'black' music. One of the possible reasons for the demise of a consciously 'black' art was because, 'as a radical movement [it] is no longer there' (2000: 253). Chambers suggested that not all black artists created 'black' Art, which addressed the history of slavery, imperialism and racism in order to challenge the white establishment. Araeen agreed that such a paradigm marginalised it and limited its audience[6]. Diversity was broader and more heterogeneous in nature, incorporating present realities.

9.4.6 The Relevance Today

It is important to recognise the historical relationship between the Arts Council, determined to a large extent by government policy, and participatory 'community' arts programmes initiated by the Community Arts Movement. Arguably, the control of funding in the 1970's and 1980's, had a detrimental affect and neutered their radical capability. This is pertinent today. That the empowerment and self-management of the culturally excluded was considered by Kelly to necessitate a political framework and understanding through the medium of the arts, challenges Matarasso's new pragmatism[7] as well as wider cultural policy, embedded in the nine key principles set out by PAT 10[8]. What is also revealed through analysing the Movement, is the tension between competing frameworks of culture, in terms of class and ethnicity, established and youth culture.

9.5 Case Study: The Theatre of the Oppressed

This case centres around the Brazilian dramatist Augusto Boal, and how he transformed theatre from a passive spectacle, to an active and engaged interaction, that related to issues and agendas foremost in the lives of those excluded people involved. His 'Theatre of the Oppressed' was a social and political use of theatre, designed to help correct poverty and injustice, which understood as its first principle that anyone could act, challenging traditional western dramatic concepts and aesthetic attitudes. Key was

---

[6] see 10.4 and Kruper's tyranny of multiculturalism
[7] set out and critiqued in ch 5
[8] set out in 3.3.1

his double use of the word to act, in terms of performing and taking action on and off stage. Theatre was a stage to enact ideas and try out changes in lifestyle and thinking.

9.5.1 Historical Precedent

Boal (1979; 1992) based his method on orature, a non-western all-encompassing holistic art form used by pre-literate cultures of the world, and still utilised in parts of Africa, Asia, and South America. Orature was an opportunity and forum for all those members of the community to voice their opinions and problems. Historically, it had utilised the spoken word, through a cultural event and a traditional communal use of creativity. Such a framework did not distinguish between art forms or between the arts and other non-aesthetic concerns. Therefore the arts were both unified and practised within the wider socio-political arena.

9.5.2 Boal's Political Position

Boal's theory of theatre were set out in his, *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1979). Boal did not eschew professional theatre, but conceived of many diverse forms that it could take. Initially, it was conceived as a rehearsal for revolution, to inform, educate and influence, as well as incite to action. He perceived theatre as too often a plaything of the rich, and wanted to return it to being a means of popular communication and expression. Therefore, his work with the Arena Theatre of Sao Paolo in the 1950's and 1960's took theatre out to the poor areas of Brazil, where it was utilised as a tool of liberation, influenced by Freire's (1970a;1970b) pioneering work of utilising language and literacy for the same ends. He recognised that: 'Theatre is born when the human being discovers that it can observe itself; when it discovers that in this act of seeing, it can see *itself* - see itself *in situ* : see itself seeing' (Boal 1995: 130). This mixture of observation and reflection had to be realised within wider socio-economic and cultural frameworks, hence it was a form of politicisation.

9.5.3 Three Formats of the Theatre of the Oppressed

His 'Theatre of the Oppressed' had three progressive formats which could be overlaid:

Firstly, 'Invisible Theatre' which took drama out of the theatre and into public places and situations. It was invisible because the audience was not aware of its intention. The settings were in public and drew

an audience of inquisitive people. Boal called them spect-actors as they were drawn into issues that the drama played out, unaware of the theatrical nature of the drama. It was realist theatre, relating to issues of interest and concern to the audience:

> Invisible Theatre consists of rehearsing a scene with actions that the protagonist would like to try out in real life, and improvising it in a place where these events could really happen and in front of an audience who, unaware that they are an audience, accordingly act as if the improvised scene was real. Thus, the improvised scene becomes reality. Fiction penetrates reality. What the protagonist had rehearsed as a plan, a blueprint, now becomes an act. (1995: 184-5)

He also called this simultaneous dramaturgy. The spect-ator would be drawn into the drama, 'encouraged to intervene in the action, abandoning his condition of object and assuming fully the role of subject' (Boal 1979: 132). Hence such drama took place where an unsuspecting audience could be engaged. For instance in a restaurant. The actors would enter for a meal, sit down and prepare to eat, then start to argue. Such a scenario would have been pre-arranged and stage-managed, with the other diners unaware but soon embroiled in the drama.

Secondly, 'Image Theatre' in which, 'The spectator has to participate more directly' (1979: 135) in a series of drama exercises and games played out through imagery. Boal thought that image was more accessible than language which excluded many poor and illiterate people, and those who had different dialects. It was a more universalist medium:

> Image Theatre is....designed to uncover essential truths about societies and cultures without resort in the first instance, to spoken language - though this may be added in the various 'dynamisations' of the images. The participants in Image Theatre make still images of their lives, feelings, experiences, oppressions: groups suggest titles or themes, and then individuals 'sculpt' three dimensional images under these titles, using their own and others' bodies as the 'clay'.
> (Jackson cited in Boal 1992: xix)

Boal's method was to teach a series of exercises and games which would be used as ice-breakers. Once

the spect-actors were warmed-up, he would encourage them to create their own images. He saw this form of theatre as, 'one of the most stimulating, because it is so easy to practice and because of its extraordinary capacity for making thought *visible*. This happens because use of the language idiom is avoided' (1979: 137-8).

Thirdly, 'Forum Theatre'. This required, 'the participant....to intervene decisively in the dramatic action and change it' (1979: 139) and was a more advanced form of theatre, usually requiring a warm up using one of the previous categories. The audience is posed unsolved problems and encouraged to solve them:

> Forum Theatre consists, in essence, of proposing to a group of spectators, after a first improvisation of a scene, that they replace the protagonist and try to improvise variations on his actions. The real protagonist should, ultimately, improvise the variation that has motivated him the most. (1995: 184)

Forum Theatre allowed everyone a voice and input into the drama, to put different points of view as in a debate. The scene would be re-enacted accordingly, 'staged exactly as it had been the first time, but now each spectator-participant would have the right to intervene and change the action, trying out his proposal' (1979: 140). The event would be presided over by a facilitator or intermediary, 'called the "joker", 'whose function was to ensure the smooth running of the game and teach the audience the rules' (Jackson cited in Boal 1992: xxi). But the joker had no intrinsic power and could be replaced by the spect-actors, if deemed not to be doing the job properly. There was no imposition of ideas onto the spect-actors, therefore Forum Theatre avoided being preacherly, dogmatic and manipulative. Boal went further to ensure that,

> The joker's function is not that of facilitator, the joker is (in Boal-speak) a 'difficultator', undermining easy judgements, reinforcing our grasp of the complexity of a situation, but not letting that complexity get in the way of action or frighten us into submission or inactivity. (Jackson cited in Boal 1995: xix-xx)

Invisible Theatre allowed the spectator a window into the drama. Image Theatre was highly accessible and inclusive as it utilised a universal language of symbolism and imagery. Finally Forum Theatre used more complex and language-orientated drama. This progression from Invisible to Forum Theatre, increasingly allowed the spect-actors to engage in discourse.

9.5.4 The Rainbow of Desire

Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed was an evolving phenomenon, and after experiencing working away from the South American dispossessed (particularly in Europe and its psychiatric institutions in the 1980's), he aimed at unlocking the therapeutic potential of drama. The *Rainbow of Desire* (1995) was a handbook of exercises to enable this. His earlier emphasis on the collective and political causes of oppression turned more individualistic. This move from external to internal oppression, still had the same reference point of empowerment and enabling participants to create and formulate their own futures. This change of emphasis from the socio-political to the psychological reflected Boal's realisation that hitherto, his method contained inadequacies. These he explained through examples. One such instance was being confronted by a former participant Virgilio, who accused him of not literally practising the revolution he preached: 'it was difficult to explain - both to Virgilio and to ourselves - how we could be sincere and genuine and true even though our guns wouldn't fire and we didn't know how to shoot' (1995: 2). Virgilio could not understand why Boal wanted him to spill his blood, but not his own or that of his company.

Another instance, concerned the anger of a Peruvian woman participant, sparked off by the inability of an actor in her view, to realistically portray how a woman scorned would react. Boal later confessed to having learnt a great deal from these experiences:

> With Virgilio, I had learnt to see a human being rather than simply a social class; the peasant rather than the peasantry, struggling with his social class and political problems. With the big Peruvian woman, I learnt to see the human being struggling with her own problems, individual problems, which although they may not concern the totality of a class, nevertheless concern the totality of a life. And are no less important for that. (1995: 7)

Boal's original socio-political concepts and solutions were idealistic and failed to understand the complexity of human relations. His later revised, 'Theatre of the Oppressed had three main branches - the educational, the social and therapeutic' (1995: 15). But he still utilised all of the earlier arsenal of techniques he had devised, depending on the situation encountered.

9.5.5 The Social Role of Theatre

Boal saw theatre as, 'the most perfect artistic form of coercion' (1979: 39). It referred to major events in life, social occasions and mundane everyday living, and allowed humans, 'to observe themselves in action' (1992: xxxvi).

He studied classical Greek theatre and especially Aristotle's coercive system of tragedy, and deconstructed how the tragedy functioned. This revolved around the extent to which the hero of the drama was at odds with the ethos of society, and how the mechanisms used to pitch the hero against society, altered the hero's destiny and ensured the sympathy and empathy of the spectators. The initial conflict of hero pitted against society was then resolved through the drama, and the purification and cleansing of all anti-social traits. This theatrical socialisation of the hero became a template for drama. Boal referred to it as, 'a powerful system of intimidation....working to carry out its basic task: the purgation of all antisocial elements' (1979: 46). Such a conservative use and form of drama was in opposition to Boal's more progressive concepts. He saw such classical methods still used today:

> this system appears in disguised form on television, in the movies, in the circus, in the theaters. It appears in many and varied shapes and media. But its essence does not change: it is designed to bridle the individual, to adjust him to what pre-exists. If this is what we want, the Aristotelian system serves the purpose better than any other; if on the contrary we want to stimulate the spectator to transform his society, to engage in revolutionary action, in that case we will have to seek another poetics. (1979: 47)

Boal understood how inherently political the theatre was. It served vested interests but was also a mechanism and precursor for change. As his interests lay with the oppressed, drama became a vehicle for political objectives that reflected their needs, to serve a more radical and democratic interest

critiquing those very norms that subjugated them. Theatre was thereby a rehearsal for change and revolutionary action. He contended that it was vital for participants to, 'create it first in the theatre, in fiction, to be better prepared to create it outside afterwards for real' (1992: 39). His dislike for dramatic techniques used for television and theatre was, for instance, reflected in how actors fictionalised reality through empathy or osmosis:

> the juxtaposition of two universes (the real and the fictitious) also produces other aggressive effects: the spectator experiences the fiction and incorporates its elements. The spectator - a real living person - accepts as life and reality what is presented to him in the work of art as art. Esthetic osmosis. (1979: 113)

Therefore the real life situation of the spectator was subjugated to and dominated by the power of the fictional scenario, which experience was transferred through theatre. Boal reversed this process through a realist theatre that reflected the life of the spect-actor. He set out his cosmology:

> In the beginning the theater was the dithyrambic song: free people singing in the open air. The carnival. The feast.
>
> Later, the ruling classes took possession of the theater and built their dividing walls. First, they divided the people, separating actors from spectators: people who act and people who watch....Secondly, among the actors, they separated the protagonists from the mass. The coercive indoctrination began. Now the oppressed people are liberated themselves and, once more, are making the theater their own. The walls must be torn down. First, the spectator starts acting again: invisible theater, forum theater, image theater etc. Secondly, it is necessary to eliminate the private property of the individual actors. (1979: 119)

His method of working contradicted classic dramaturgy. Participation was crucial, working outside the walls of theatre in everyday public places. Subject matter had to relate and reflect the concerns of the oppressed in order that they participated voluntarily. That being the case, drama was returned to its

natural position as part of carnival, away from the artifice of theatre.

His later move into more psychological territory and a therapeutic individual understanding of people and drama, was a political move away from the Marxist line he had previously taken. This showed a, 'dissatisfaction with dogma....[and] essential allegiance to humanity' (Jackson cited in Boal 1995: xxi). His interest was in tackling injustice, with the key aim of delivering happiness. By recognising that addressing the socio-political concept of oppression from the outside had to be accompanied by a recognition of internalised oppression (which he called the 'cop in the head'), he thereby tried to embed the individual within the collective. Artistically, this related to the tradition of orature.

9.5.6 Orature

Boal's dramatic method was based on the inclusive tradition of orature. Owusu showed how such an holistic understanding of the arts and culture embodied in orature, was anathema to a Eurocentric notion of culture:

> Creativity was not an entirely separate realm of intellectual activity, but one which was integrated to an organic structure of production. This was an important premise of orature, one which constantly challenged and resisted trends and tendencies toward 'art' as purely decorative, toward individualism, and the separation of art forms. (Owusu 1986: 140)

He acknowledged that orature as a method, was a means of redressing issues of cultural appropriation. He wanted oraturists to re-establish such traditions which had survived precisely, 'because they have always been part of popular resistance movements against western culture' (1986: 141-2). He saw orature as vital for the survival of 'black' culture in Britain, an alternative hegemonic structure based on traditional creative principles practised in a more visibly democratic and inclusive manner. Besides a commitment to the, 'unity of art forms', it was the collective nature of orature, in terms of the, 'quality of collaboration' through active participation, that was the basis for this counter-culture. He concluded that, 'We do not "bring" culture to the people: nor do we, in some patronising way, aim to "give people the means of artistic expression". By aiming to break down the distinction between artists and public, producer and consumer, we submit ourselves to the service of our communities' (1986:

162).

Orature therefore, provided a framework for harmonising the arts in a holistic fashion into multi-arts, as well as a recognition of individual creativity within a collective dynamic, in a manner that the highly stratified and structured western cannon could not.

9.5.7 Participation and Language

Boal made similar observations in dramaturgy. He compared bourgeois theatre, in which the passive audience were objects who watched politely, to the theatre of the oppressed which was active rehearsal-theatre, in which the spect-ators were subjects encouraged to participate. Therefore, 'Contrary to the bourgeois code of manners, the people's code allows and encourages the spectator to ask questions, to dialogue, to participate' (Boal 1979: 142).

He realised how theatre was a microcosm that symbolised and represented the inequality and oppression of the wider society. Therefore the structural changes required to tackle oppression in society, had to be represented by structural changes in the theatre.

He was indebted to Freire's pioneering work in literacy, and the concept that structure and sounds of the language learnt, influenced thinking. Similarly with drama, the structure, method utilised and subject of the drama effected cognition. Boal referred to his ALFIN literacy project in Peru, which taught not only literacy in both first native Indian language and Spanish, but the language of the arts; for example, puppetry, theatre, photography. This also included an understanding of self in the community and greater awareness of wider socio-economic and political factors.

Freire (1970a; 1970b) understood the role of education to be a process of liberation, not a 'banking' of facts and figures. It too readily became an instrument of oppression in which the teacher imparted education to a passive audience, a praxis of dictation from expert was repressive. He criticized, 'Education .... [as] suffering from narration sickness' (Freire 1970a: 45) and his remedy was a problem-solving libertarian education, in which both student and teacher learnt from the process. He rejected an education solely based on the expressed needs of learners, it had to include the oppressive causes and problems unearthed through the process. This he reckoned enabled the, 'discovery that both they and their oppressors are manifestations of dehumanization. Liberation is thus a childbirth, and a painful one' (1970a: 25). Education was therefore an act of participation and cognition, not a transfer of

knowledge. This required an ability to think critically and creatively, which empowered the individual and could then be transferred to the wider group, thereby encouraging the transformation of the community. This raising of individual and collective consciousness and consequential transformation had an overtly political tone[9].

Freire maintained that the process of learning 'language' was allied to an understanding of culture and the socio-historical situation the students found themselves in. Adult literacy was part of the broader process of cultural action: 'Becoming literate, then, means far more than learning to decode the written representation of a sound system. It is truly an act of knowing, through which a person is able to look critically at the culture which has shaped him, and to move toward reflection and positive action upon his world' (Freire 1970b: 205)'. The methodology utilised emanated from the experiences of learners who were encouraged into a liberating critical dialogue, by the teacher. Hence,

> the solution to their problem is not to become 'beings inside of', but men freeing themselves; for, in reality, they are not marginal to the structure, but oppressed men within it. Alienated men, they cannot overcome their dependency by 'incorporation' into the very structure responsible for their dependency. There is no other road to humanization - theirs as well as everyone else's - but authentic transformation of the dehumanizing structure.
>
> From this last point of view, the illiterate is no longer a person living on the fringe of society, a marginal man, but rather a representative of the dominated strata of society, in conscious or unconscious opposition to those who, in the same structure, treat him as a thing. (1970b: 211)

Freire understood Eurocentric culture as a tool of oppression and control, hence the relevance of an alternative and re-framed cultural hegemony.

Correspondingly, Boal advocated the need, 'to change the people - "spectators", passive beings in the theatrical phenomenon - into subjects, into actors, transformers of the dramatic action' (1979: 122). Here acting referred to action on society in order to transform it, where drama was the rehearsal, a total role play that awakened the critical consciousness and opened up discourse. But within this framework

---

[9] see 11.2 which concerns education as a tool for transformation, emancipation and empowerment

of an alternative culture that reflected collective needs, he never subjugated the individual spect-actor to dogma or ideology, keeping a healthy respect for difference. This he showed through his dramaturgy. For example, the exercise called, 'pushing against each other' in which two spect-actors faced each other, holding each other's shoulder and pushing with all their strength. The aim of the game was to remain upright in balance. He commented that: 'This is exactly what a player must do during a forum session: neither give way to the intervening spect-actor, nor overwhelm him, but rather help him to apply all his strength' (Boal 1992: 66), and aptly describes the symbiosis of self and other. As The Arena Theater of Sao Paolo progressed it, 'closed its doors to European playwrights, regardless of their high quality' (1979: 162), enabling specifically Brazilian cultural issues to become the focus, which were better expressed through the use of native language and artists. This also encouraged solidarity and an exploration of participant identity[10], which is a key issue of inclusion, for both group and individual.

Both Freire and Boal understood the structural and ideological implications of 'language' (whether verbal, artistic or symbolic), and the need to escape dehumanised structures of dependency, through a dynamic participative process that engaged and helped transform those very structures.

9.5.8 Oppression and Social Exclusion

There are four particular issues that Boal revealed through his working method, which refer directly to utilising the arts for purposes of social exclusion.

Firstly, that the separation of actors from spectators is a false one, and sets theatre up to be subjugated to the needs of controlling interests, the culture of oppression.

Secondly, that the 'language' used has to be understood, relevant and owned by all.

Thirdly, that it is important to understand the relationship between the individual and collective, and the need to transform dehumanised social structures of dependency, in order to liberate individuals and communities.

Fourthly, a recognition that poverty and illiteracy are the twin pillars of oppression with education the radical liberator that transforms society.

---

[10] the term is discussed in 10.4

Moreover, the language of 'exclusion' today denotes that the individual is out of kilter with the social machinery, whereas the term 'oppressed' intimates a victim of wider social structures. Such terminology de-politicises this reality, and puts the onus onto the individual to fit back into the system.

9.5.9 Conclusion

In drama the separation of actors and spectators was understood by Boal as false. In order for the oppressed to transform their lives, they needed to participate actively (hence to act) as against passively consuming art. Drama was a rehearsal for social and individual change, the basis for his 'Theatre of the Oppressed', which was participative and enabled people to observe themselves and prepare to play out these injustices, which could be acted on for real in their lives and communities. Boal recognised that this natural utility was determined by the art form, and could not be artificially imposed or added. Traditionally, classical theatre had been utilised to re-inforce social norms, which were antithetical to the needs of the oppressed. Therefore he converted drama into a vehicle for criticising the norms, based on the non-western concept of orature.

Influenced by Freire's educational theories of literacy, he recognised that the structure and comprehension of 'language' determined participation and cognition, which was not a transfer of knowledge from the expert to the student. Boal therefore encouraged active engagement as against passive acceptance, based on a Freirian pedagogy. This included the need to alter the dehumanising structures of dependency that created the oppression. He first recognised these in terms of collective socio-political forces from the outside, then later in terms of the individual psychological forces from within. Therefore transformation had an individual as well as a collective dimension, but crucially the former was embedded in the latter. This allowed a truly 'joined-up' holistic approach to tackling oppression and injustice, which when applied to theatre, realised cultural democracy.

Boal is persuasive, he re-engages the arts with a 'common' culture in a dynamic and radical manner. But the extent to which the spect-actors really determine the direction of the drama can be questioned, as it is his ideological agenda being played out. Moreover, there are practical issues as to the extent to which it is possible to fully implement this particular theoretical dramaturgical framework. But his polemical understanding backs up Kelly's argument that the 'community' arts need to be consciously political, as it is impossible to engage with the arts for purposes of addressing exclusion, without there

being an understanding of causality. But Boal's move towards a more psychological therapeutic terrain, also bears witness to Kelly's criticism of such projects showing the arts as a caring profession, wrapped up in concepts of welfare. Which is yet another technique of subjugating the oppressed to normative frameworks[11].

9.6 Summary

Firstly, the chapter looked at the cultural industries as a driver for cultural democracy. Augustin Girard, contended that they were integral to democratising 'high' culture, allowing access for a wider audience. He also argued that cultural policy had for too long reperesented the interests of this exclusive minority constituency, at the expense of the majority, giving more to those who already had sufficient money and culture. Theodor Adorno argued that the cultural industries prevented aesthetic autonomy and standardised artistic production, driven by the profit motive, 'dumbing' culture down. He revealed the instrumental socio-economic and political agendas underpinning the arts.

Secondly, it assessed the extent to which the arts are perceived as exclusive, and how the inclusive concept of a 'common' culture and 'grounded' aesthetic, re-earthed and blended them into everyday life. The Arts Council's own research showed the extent to which public opinion conceived the arts within a 'high' arts paradigm, with 'popular' art forms not generally recognised as art forms. Willis researched youth culture and discovered what little part the traditional 'high' arts played. He considered an active moving 'common' culture which embraced consumerism and was steeped in the symbols of 'popular' culture, as the resource from which the youth created their own culture. This centred on a postmodern pick and mix attitude to the shifting signification of symbols and signs. Arguably, this can be seen as a romantic reaction against the rigid and formalistic classical western cannon. Nevertheless, the arts are also a part of the pool of symbols from which the 'common' culture is created.

Baudrillard referred to a simulated culture steeped in consumerism, lacking any democratic basis, which disqualified a grounded aesthetic. He perceived culture as a hyperreal fiction and dissociated from the reality principle. His nihilism discounted the possibility that such a simulation could

---

[11] this foucauldian perspective was described by the Outsider Art case in ch 8

germinate reality. But the arts can be a very relevant vehicle for those universal aesthetic experiences of life and death, which reconnect people with the primal forces of humanity.

Thirdly, it looked historically at a specific 'common' culture in practice. The Community Arts Movement through its fraught relationship with the Arts Council, provided a window into the disputed territory of cultural democracy in the arts. The 'community' arts concerned a radical unleashing of cultural discontent and youthful rebellion, in opposition to the traditional Arts Council policy of 'raise and spread', democratising 'high' culture and educating those culturally excluded into the canon. This included questioning passivity, as well as the individual and aesthetic basis of creativity. Ultimately, it wanted to break the cosy elitism between the 'high' arts and class. But it was no panacea, as it failed to accommodate 'black' arts, leaning heavily on Eurocentric notions, and was accordingly accused of racist practice. Traditionalists would also claim that it took a patronising attitude to people by assuming they were not able to assimilate the 'high' arts. But this is itself culturally specific.

This historical situation is highly relevant today. Kelly expressed the need for a political framework and understanding through the medium of the arts, to engender cultural democracy. He showed how the funding control of these participatory arts programmes had a detrimental affect and neutered radical capability, including the ability of participants to self-manage and empower themselves. This challenges present government frameworks of utilising the arts to address social exclusion.

The case study of the Boal's 'Theatre of the Oppressed', illustrated how drama has been used to enable cultural democracy and inclusion. It explained his radical political position and the three progressive dramatic formats utilised: 'Invisible Theatre', 'Image Theatre' and 'Forum Theatre'.

After visiting Europe, this evolved into three main branches: the educational, social and therapeutic. Here he tried to address the balance of the individual within the collective, by considering psychological problems, the 'cop in the head'. Fundamental to his method was the double meaning of the term to act, and the engagement of all participants whom he termed 'spect-actors'.

Through deconstructing classical theatre, Boal distilled its coercive essence and social role. By working outside of theatre and re-positioning it as carnival, this enabled a more natural dramaturgy.

He was indebted to Freire's pioneering work in the field of literacy, challenging pre-conceived notions of 'language' utilised as a means of control. Through a critical awareness of how 'language' could be used to determine a wider cultural understanding and action, the socio-economic and political

implications of oppression could be challenged. Boal recognised poverty and illiteracy as key to oppression, with education as the radical mechanism of liberation.

His use of theatre was as a popular medium of communication and expression, based on the non-western concept of orature. Such a method was both culturally and socially inclusive. On the one hand it allowed everyone to participate using a common language, on the other, it empowered and enlightened.

Chapter 10. Popular Culture: Politics, Participation and Identity

10.1 Introduction

Following on from and connected to cultural democracy, consideration is given to 'popular' culture as an inclusive driver. A framework of different political understandings of such a culture is constructed to emphasise its wider importance and influence on society. Also how participation in the arts and especially music is embedded in 'popular' culture. It investigates issues of identity and how this is related to broader themes of multiculturalism and diversity. The research offers a historical case study of Reggae Music, which was highly inclusive, popular and participatory, a vehicle through which black British youth were enabled to forge their particular identity.

10.2 Politics of Popular Culture

Street (1997: 147-162) explained 'popular' culture in terms of political characteristics, and the extent to which it was perceived as a form of manipulation or populist self-expression. He took two crude dimensions of culture. Firstly popular and elite, secondly radical and conservative. He cross-referenced both dimensions to create four political views of 'popular' culture.

'Conservative elitists' eschewed 'popular' culture as it lacked discrimination. There was no place for it within the classical canon of the arts as it actively subverted and undermined this tradition and the moral order that it represented.

'Conservative populists' reflected the populism of the tabloid press. They presented themselves as democratic populists, 'legitimated by the evidence of the market [but they were]....engaged in interpreting 'popular' culture and taste in particular ways. It is creating rather than reflecting the "people" and their pleasures' (1997: 152). So it was grounded in and celebrated a particular experience, bound up in nostalgia, defending a particular cosmology that all too easily reflected popular prejudice.

'Radical elitists' understood the potential of culture to change society, but viewed 'popular' culture as the manifestation of reactionary forces that wanted to prevent change, or to use change for other agendas. Their position reflected the views of Adorno and the Frankfurt School[1]. There were three

---

[1] set out in 9.2.2

strands: 'One strand compares popular culture unfavourably with "folk culture; the second makes an unfavourable comparison with the avant-garde; and the third sets it below traditional classical or high culture' (1997: 154).

'Radical populists' responded to the elitism of the Frankfurt School and were grounded in the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). They believed that the people themselves knew best, and their taste and creativity needed to be respected. Willis, re-framed the products of mass culture into what he labelled the 'common' culture, which consisted of re-taking the signs of mass culture[2]. This lived street culture, took as its starting point the audience and consumer. The relationship between 'popular' culture and politics set out by Street, took the position, 'that if we fail to take popular culture seriously, we impoverish our understanding of the conflicting currents and aspirations that fuel politics' (1997: 6). He also recognised the extent to which this understanding was wrapped up in issues of identity: 'Popular culture's ability to produce and articulate feelings can become the basis of an identity, and that identity can be the source of political thought and action. We know who we are through the feelings and responses we have, and who we are, shapes our expectations and our preferences' (1997: 10). The claim by Street that 'popular' culture and politics used similar terms of reference, and are weaved together within the fabric of society, underpins their inter-dependence and importance. 'Popular' culture was dominant, it helped organise and construct our values and identities, hence the importance of discrimination and criticality within this canon.

10.3 Participation

'Popular' music in particular, is participatory and inclusive. Therefore the nature of participation in practice is examined.

Harland et al (1995) researched into this phenomenon and the attitudes associated. They cited a definition of participation in the arts, in terms of three interconnecting systems: 'a making system (i.e. producing acts, actions or artefacts as creator or performer); a perceiving system (i.e. concerned with discriminations and distinctions as a critic); and a feeling system (i.e. dealing with the affect as audience member)' (Harland et al 1995: 14). They researched the extent to which negative attitudes

---

[2] set out in 9.3.2

obstructed participation, and constructed a raft of different attitudes associated with participation and non-participation.

Anthony Everitt (1997) researched specifically into the participatory capacity of music and identified three levels of engagement:

> The first is comparatively inert joining in - singalongs, moving and clapping to gospel music and chants at football matches are examples. The second involves a certain degree of reflection. One thinks of Victorian families singing and playing music to each other during their long television-less evenings or, to come up to date, the activity of choral societies and brass bands. Choices are made about 'when', 'how good', 'what kind', 'who with' and so forth, but such choices are probably based on instinct and taste rather than analysis. The third overlaps with the second level, but is no longer simply a question of music-making but of discussing matters of taste, quality and style and of becoming knowledgeable about the material to be played or sung, its history and context. We are talking here not just of practice, for the sake of it or for the fun of it, but of the conscious development of critical understanding. (Everitt 1997: 20-1)

These three levels also reflect Harland et al's 'making' and 'perceiving' systems.

'Popular' music encourages the initial engagement which circumvents much of the negative attitudinal barriers to participation, but it can also involve more complex and contoversial issues of taste and discrimination. It is both an initial staging post in terms of confering identity and its only expression for the vast majority.

10.4 Multiculturalism and Identity

Concepts of identity are embedded in various discourses, not least ethnicity. Willis recognised this in his fieldwork, specifically in terms of Caribbean and Asian traditions. The youth from these communities, 'use their cultural backgrounds as frameworks for living and as repertoires for symbolic resources for interpreting all aspects of their lives' (Willis 1990: 8), a recognition of the ethnic minority communities within the larger culture that sustain them. In terms of diversity, these distinct cultures may reflect ethnicity, nationhood, gender or a specific subculture, but the process is one of identifying

with a minority culture at odds with the wider cultural consensus.

Hall (1990) an important driver of the CCCS, considered two different concepts of cultural identity:

'The first position defines "cultural identity" in terms of one, shared culture, a sort of collective, "one true self"....which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common' (Hall 1990: 223). This consisted of a shared body of cultural codes, from which his own Caribbean perspective, was a 'oneness' or 'caribbeaness' of black experience. This understanding was rooted in the black Diaspora and post-colonial attitudes black identity. The second but related position,

> recognises that as well as the many points of similarity, there are also critical points of deep and significant *difference* which constitute 'what we really are'; or rather – since history has intervened – 'what we have become'....cultural identity, in this second sense, is a matter of 'becoming' as well as 'being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. (1990: 225)

This double positioning of identity was described in the introduction to this text. The first position was an idealistic and contested portrayal of history, as black experience has been ordered and positioned by colonial and negative regimes of representation. The second position was more realistic and mutable. Hall was interested in how the arts (and in particular cinema), represented these issues of cultural identity. Modern multi-cultural society was heterogeneous and diverse, with hybrid cultural identities, created by a mixing and blending of taste. He accepted,

> that identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to a radical historicization, and are constantly in the process of change and transformation. (Hall 1997: 4)

The complexity of identity (and identification) prevents any simplistic or fixed conception, as it is steeped in differing discourses and perspectives, which themselves have been melded by ideological and historical forces. Choice helps to formulate individual cultural perception, and this can be based on misconceptions, which only adds to its mutability.

The educationalist Joachim Knoll (2001) in his research into multi-cultural education, recounted how minority cultures are caught between inclusion and exclusion. He distinguished between assimilation and integration, by comparing the social policy of different countries. The definition of assimilation in the United States, 'is understood to mean complete absorption into the new society. This implies that the initial double identity is to give way to a *single*, American identity' (Knoll 2001: 72). Whereas the term integration as employed in Canada, 'is intended to indicate that the state and non-governmental organizations....should provide a framework within which minorities can, if they wish to do so, retain their own language, religion and culture and relate to their culture of origin' (2001: 73). With regards to cultural exclusion, he perceived assimilation as the inclusion of minorities into the mainstream, but distancing them from their indigenous or inherited culture. Whereas, integration, included minorities through accepting their minority culture, but helped exclude from the mainstream, hence the paradox of homogeneity and diversity:

> The discrepancy between the desire for national and political homogeneity and the actual experiences of minorities still persists, so that there is as yet no answer in terms of modern state actions and political self-perception to the question of the degree to which minorities must adapt or remain separate. It is undisputed that there are no guidelines that can be applied throughout the world. (2001: 82)

The anthropologist Adam Kruper (2002) argued that multiculturalism was tyrannical, and the idea that any person was beholden to, or determined by a culture was misconstruing the term. Although identity was wrapped up in notions of cultural diversity, fixed in a particular past, the danger was not allowing a freer understanding, internal debate or even rebellion against a particular cultural position. Multiculturalism, particularly when practised by the state, was based on the premise that, 'you've lost your culture so you have to be forced back into it. Never mind that you have learned something new, that you have kicked over the traces of your parents; you're told that you have lost your way' (Kuper cited in Kuper & Taylor 2002: 11).

The danger of such labelling, was that it directed people into a way of perceiving and conceiving the world with the hidden threat or guilt that by not doing so, they had denied their ancestry. By accepting

this position, they thereby denied, 'part of their possibilities; part of their options' (2002: 11). In many ways this is Hall's second position of cultural identity, but whereas he saw this as a necessary addition and related to the first position of shared ancestry and history, Kuper saw it as more in opposition to this ancestry, which denied and prevented this reality.

Both the terms multiculturalism and identity are surrounded by contested claims. Such positions can be on the one hand fixed into an historical framework, but also be of a more mutable persuasion.

10.5 Case Study: Reggae Music

This case study on Reggae Music shows how identity can be formulated through popular music which can help embed a specific subculture. This imported music had an energising effect on the Afro-Caribbean youth culture in this country in the late 1970's and early 1980's. Ironically, it was culturally inclusive and accessible, although rooted in the specific religious concept of Rastafarianism, which was exclusive and espoused black superiority. This was the first time that a rebellious youth subculture in this country had been initially based on black as against white youth.

10.5.1 History of Reggae

Historically,

> Reggae has its roots in the Jamaican folk. In fact, its history is so closely bound up in the Jamaican social and cultural experience that genuine reggae music has remained largely defiant of outside cultural swamping and imitation. Most Jamaicans....would concur with Pamela O'Gorman when she says: 'I really do believe that there is something in the so-called myth that Europeans cannot play reggae music. I think they can get the basic things out of it, they can reproduce it to a certain extent. But it is never going to have that touch of authenticity about it. (Johnson & Pines 1982: 46)

Howard Johnson and Jim Pines (1982) showed that there was a direct lineage of music from Mento (Jamaican folk music) of the late 1940's to 50's; to Ska dance music (a combination of Mento and rhythmic American R & B) of the late 1950's and sixties; to Rock Steady (a less severe and slower

rhythm than Ska) of the late 1960's; to Reggae (a combination of Ska and Rock steady with a simplified rhythm and powerful bass) in the 1970's. This culminated in the 1980's with the huge international success of Bob Marley and the Wailers.

There has also been a strong religious and socio-political element to the music and lyrics of this tradition. The early Mento music was strongly influenced by a non-conformist Afro-Christian Pukkumina religion, 'Ska represented a conscious effort to shake off the European influence in Jamaican popular music' (1982: 48), whilst Rock Steady was embroiled in the gangsterish lifestyle of the Rude Boys (best captured by Jimmy Cliff in the film *The Harder They Come*) and life in the Kingston ghettos. The Reggae movement as Dick Hebdige (1979; 1984) recognised, was influenced by all of these, but in particular by the Rastafarians and their religion:

> Reggae draws on a quite specific experience (the experience of black people in Jamaica and Great Britain)....It is cast in a unique style, in a language of its own - Jamaican Patois, that shadow-form, 'stolen' from the Master and mysteriously inflected, 'decomposed' and reassembled in the passage from Africa to the West Indies....[this] proved singularly appealing to working class youth both in the ghettos of Kingston and the West Indian communities of Great Britain.
> (Hebdige 1979: 30-4)

Such an experience was re-lived by black and white youth in the 1970s and 1980's, which historical period included the race riots in urban Britain. Techniques created by the Reggae tradition (Toasting and Dub Poetry for instance) were the foundation for the 'black' music of today.

10.5.2 Rastafarians

The Rastafarian movement originated in Jamaica during the 1930's and was a continuation of the Afro-religions as expressed by the Maroons and especially the Pukkumina religion. The belief was that the Emperor Haille Selassie of Ethiopia was God the Returned Messiah. This in itself was the fulfilment of a prophecy made by the legendary Marcus Garvey to, 'look to Africa, when a black king shall be crowned. For the day of deliverance is near' (Garvey cited in Hebdidge 1984: 8).

Lloyd Bradley (2000), whilst researching the history of Reggae, stated that in 1959 Jamaica, 'an

estimated 100,000 Jamaicans – roughly one in twenty-five of the population – were Rastafarian, with many more openly sympathetic' (Bradley 2000: 63). A Rasta state had earlier been created, a loose commune of 1600 at Pinnacle in the Jamaican hills. But this had been forcibly dismantled by the law on an anti-drugs raid in 1954. These people drifted into Kingston and most ended up in the city's overcrowded shanty towns, hence the large concentration of Rastafarians in the capital, and later recording studios.

Rastafarianism was an individualised religion in which knowing Jah (God) was actually being him. Followers made themselves distinct by growing their hair into dreadlocks (hence their name 'locksmen'), and smoking the 'holy herb' marijuana, which possibly accounted for the high number of visionaries and prophets. They, 're-interpreted the bible in Black terms; they reversed the meanings of the biblical themes and symbols which had been projected by the dominant European-Christian tradition. "Black" now symbolised purity and good, while "white" represented evil' (Johnson & Pines 1982: 79-80). Rastafarians espoused Black superiority, as the black person was an exiled and re-incarnated Israelite. This tied in with the mythology of the Israelite migration (carrying the Ark of the Covenant) from Solomon's Temple and Jerusalem to Ethiopia (heaven) to escape Babylon (hell). Such a scenario fitted the black Diaspora and Jamaican slaves transported from Zion (Africa), longing to return to their spiritual home. Hence repatriation to an African homeland was a recurring theme of Rastafarianism. It was a millennial cult, with a return to an idealised homeland for a better life, rejecting Babylon and 'white' European culture. These 'locksmen' became an exotic elite with high religious capital, and low economic capital. They wore red, green and gold (the colours of the Ethiopian flag), tended to be vegetarian, shunned alcohol, and had a distinctive language which made, 'extensive use of metaphors and parables' (1982: 82). They had great influence over the rebellious young unemployed of Kingston and Jamaica, as well as those of Jamaican descent in Britain. High unemployment nationally and even higher among the ethnic minorities in Britain was a breeding ground for discontent, and the message was transmitted through Reggae music.

10.5.3 The Music

Hebdidge perceived Reggae music to be polymorphous, ' transmogrified American soul, with an overlay of salvaged African rhythms, and an undercurrent of pure Jamaican rebellion. Reggae is

transplanted Pentecostal. Reggae is the rasta hymnal' (Hebdidge 1984: 18).

The Rastafarian Bob Nesta Marley had the greatest effect internationally and arguably on disaffected black youth. Titles such as *African Herbsman, Get Up Stand Up*, and *Redemption Song* contained Marley's Rastafarian teachings. He befitted the role of prophet, icon and star, with his long locks, physique and looks. He and his band The Wailers, 'were the most popular (and commercially successful) exponents of this tradition, spreading the Message in terms which were intelligible to wider audiences' (Johnson & Pines 1982: 63). Their last concert was at Crystal Palace in South London in 1980. Marley died of cancer in May 1981 aged 36, which only added to his status (Marley 1984: sleeve notes).

Bradley quoted Danny Sims, an associate of Marley who suggested that,

> like our leaders, like Marcus Garvey, like Malcolm X, like Martin Luther King, Bob Marley was one who, once he knew he had something to get across to the world, couldn't rest because of his vision....he was searching for an acceptance for those visions....To a generation Bob Marley was.... a true revolutionary and a man who never left the people he loved and struggled for.
>
> (Sims cited in Bradley 2000: 421)

Reggae and in particular Marley, became the vehicle for expressing social comment and injustice as well as spreading the Rastafarian gospel around the world: 'It's difficult, of course, to properly understand Bob Marley's music without considering Rastafari..... It must be stated that Rastafari was at the very core of the Wailer's music' (Marley 1984: sleeve notes).

Simon Jones (1988: 93-4) accepted that Marley had, 'rendered a more radicalised yet musically cosmopolitan form of Jamaican music for mass white consumption', but that for many blacks this signalled the end of his political and musical credibility. Yet the highly subversive Punk Rock of the late 1970's appropriated much from Reggae, including its authenticity, opposition to mainstream culture and political ideology. It too addressed themes of the everyday, poverty and protest, but mainly for a white audience.

10.5.4 The effect of Reggae and Racial Inclusivity

Jones related the racism that operated in the housing and job markets for Afro-Caribbean immigrants in Britain, in the early days of post-war settlement, to racism in the leisure and entertainment sphere:

'Faced with such exclusion, blacks were forced to rely more heavily on their own institutions of entertainment and recreation' (1988: 33). Ironically, social exclusion thereby helped shape and conserve their musical culture, which became the framework that enabled the exposure of later Ska and Reggae music to its public. This embedded a subculture that was at odds with eurocentric values and custom.

Reggae in particular had a dramatic effect on black youth in Britain. It helped to forge an identity for many, including them into a black culture and religion. The music expressed themes of alienation, spirituality and overcoming subjugation, which was reflected in Britain at the time by a growing disaffection and joblessness, a time of conflict between black youth and society.

Hebdige explained that besides Punk Rock, Reggae had been appropriated by a new form of music known as 'Two-Tone': '[This] transmogrified ska... presented a total package of sound and image so thoroughly integrated that the multiracial "message" could be inferred - without being explicitly rendered - by a broadly sympathetic audience' (Hebdige 1988: 214). Such music allowed solidarity between black and white youth. But there was a certain amount of inverted racism towards these bands, especially regarding poor musicianship. Bradley referred to it as the, 'English One Drop' (2000: 435), which within the black community was looked at with disdain and humour.

Jones, researched the dialogue between black and white youth, and assessed that by the end of the 1980s, Jamaican popular music had had a profound impact and,

> provided white youth with the raw material for their own distinctive forms of cultural expression....Through the political discourses of Rastafari, reggae has provided young whites with a collective language and symbolism of rebellion that has proved resonant to their own predicaments and to their experiences of distinct, but related, forms of oppression.
>
> (Jones 1988: 231)

This illustrates the contradictions inherent in terms of inclusivity and exclusivity, and how related and

relative such terms are. The 'Two-Tone' success and that of Rock Against Racism (RAR), symbolically managed to incorporate socially excluded youth into a particular subculture. But ironically pure Reggae was uncompromising in its black message. Its identity and cosmology were always at odds with the wider European (Babylon) culture, from which it wanted to be excluded. Hebdige agreed that,

> The transposed religion, the language, the rhythm, and the style of the West Indian immigrant guaranteed his culture from any deep penetration by equivalent white groups. Simultaneously, the apotheosis of alienation into exile enabled him to maintain his position on the fringes of society without feeling any sense of cultural loss, and distanced him sufficiently so that he could undertake a highly critical analysis of the society to which he owed a nominal allegiance. (Hebdige 1977: 152)

Although it reached out to the disaffected, and Marley was a huge commercial success, British culture was unable to assimilate the Reggae cult. Like other subcultures, the social role of the music was to enable disaffection, giving solidarity to that cause.

10.5.5 Musical Participation

Reggae is a highly inclusive music form. Firstly, it is participatory, and well-known songs can be readily copied. This is due to the simplicity of the chords (basic majors and minors), firm and consistent rhythm, and catchy melodies. Such a musical form is ideal for a range of participants. As a learning tool for exploring keyboard and guitar, the formation of basic chords is vital. Similarly with the bass, there are simple lines that can be learnt and a wealth of ideas to explore for drumming and percussion due to the heavy rhythmical element. As regards vocals, there are opportunities for lead and harmony backing, that can be experimented with or learnt.

Secondly, Reggae allows opportunities to create songs, explore lyrics and melody. It is a simple format and framework for writing, exploring and expressing views. It has all the accessibility of pop music, but with an added dimension, in that it represents a particular culture of the oppressed. Participants can investigate their own attitudes to religion, society, politics and life in general. Today new forms of

black music (Rap, Hip-hop, Garage and Ragga), are rooted in Reggae and the sound system culture. The lineage is direct.

With regards to participation[3], Harland et al's (1995) concept referred to; enjoyment, skill development, socialising, comfortability, self-identity and aesthetic attitude. These are all met through participating in 'making', 'perceiving' and 'feeling' Reggae. 'Self-identity' would obviously favour those from similar ethnic backgrounds, but the music is more inclusive than that, and because it touches on issues of oppression, can be felt beyond this immediate culture. 'Comfortability' is about the extent to which participants feel at ease with the music. This is highly subjective, but overall Reggae contains accessible melody and rhythm, and 'life-related' lyrics. All the other attitudes referred to are met intrinsically by the music.

As for the negative attitudes that result in non-participation, Harland et al perceived these to be; a talent barrier, lack of comfortability, boredom and lack of relevance, bad image among peers, and psychological discomfort. The 'talent barrier' and 'psychological discomfort' are easily overcome, as the framework of Reggae is simple and tunes accessible. 'Boredom and lack of relevance' and 'bad image' would be more likely and obvious today than twenty years ago, when Reggae was more fashionable.

Participation and thereby inclusion, as already expressed by Everitt, moved from a culturally democratic position to a more critical one, increasing cultural, educational and social capital for those involved. Reggae music is a perfect medium, as it can be used to include participants initially, in a singalong manner; then in accordance with Everitt's second level of engagement, as a teaching medium, actually playing and creating the music. And with regards to his third level of engagement, it can be utilised as a tool through which to learn about black history, religion and culture, even the more abstract concepts of social exclusion and oppression.

10.5.6 Reggae/Rastafarianism as a Subculture

The arts have always had a role in terms of portraying the cracks in society, the extremes, the unsuccessful, the outcast and exploited. There are clear needs for members of society to relate and

---

[3] set out in 10.3.

identify with each other through a 'common' culture, but it is impossible for everyone to be included within a particular system of communication or culture.

Hebdige explored youth subcultures and the extent to which objections to the consensual hegemony and apparently natural order were expressed through them. Such counter cultural phenomena as Teddy Boys, Mods, Punks and Ravers, have expressed the cultures of those excluded working class white youth from the 1950s onwards. Reggae music similarly and initially expressed the angst of disaffected black youth. Besides music, these subcultures found expression through dance, drugs, fashion and a specific style associated with that particular subculture. They were a reaction to the dominant culture and taste. Hebdige explained:

> Style in subculture is, then, pregnant with significance. Its transformations go 'against nature', interrupting the process of "normalization". As such they are gestures, movements towards a speech which offends the 'silent majority', which challenges the principle of unity and cohesion, which contradicts the myth of consensus. (1979: 18)

He understood subcultures not as an expression of some sort of revolutionary ideal or greater truth, but a means through which those subjugated members of society could rise above their situation and express themselves. Furthermore, these movements were not led by the market, although bound up in the culture industry. As Simon Frith (1984: 39) remarked, 'Styles depend on commercial teen culture (pop music most obviously) but weren't created by it - ted and mod and punk and skinhead styles certainly weren't dreamed up by businessmen'. Deviancy in terms of style has very working-class roots, a statement of solidarity, 'us' against 'them', a riposte to bourgeois values.

The subculture exists on the fringes of society, where the excluded youth can share their values and identity. Some will eventually be incorporated back into the wider culture, others maybe not.

Frith researched subcultural theory in terms of delinquency, and resistance to the dominant culture. It was the music which solidified the identity of such groups. His interest was not in, 'how a particular piece of music or a performance reflects the people, but how it produces them, how it creates and constructs an experience - a musical experience, an aesthetic experience - that we can only make sense of by *taking on* both a subjective and a collective identity' (Frith 1996: 109). He took this further,

relating back to issues of re-interpretation. He saw the process as less well defined and more complicated in nature than model youth subculture groupings. It was,

> not just the familiar postmodern point that we live in an age of plunder in which musics made in one place for one reason are immediately appropriated for another place for quite another reason, but also that while music may be shaped by the people who first make and use it, as experience it has a life of its own. (1996: 109)

Frith suggested a, 'mobile' identity, an experience and process triggered by sound: 'music, an aesthetic practice, articulates in itself an understanding of both group relations and individuality, on the basis of which ethical codes and social ideologies are understood' (1996: 111). The listener participated in the music identified with the subculture, which allowed his or her self-expression and encouraged group solidarity and identity. Reggae as a music form, took on a 'mobile' identity, as it was appropriated not just by the cultural industry, but also by those without any connection to its Jamaican roots. White youth grew dreadlocks in order to imitate and identify with the Rastafarian ethos, others enjoyed and consumed the music purely for its rhythms and melodies, despite its roots.

In terms of social inclusion, Reggae was able to include different people for different reasons, beyond the original influence and intention of those musicians involved.

Frith saw music as the most vital art form as it was, 'best able both to cross borders - sounds carry across fences and walls and oceans, across classes, races and nations - and to define places; in clubs, scenes and raves, listening on headphones, radio and in the concert hall, we are only where the music takes us' (1996: 125). But he stressed the importance of distinguishing 'good' popular music from 'bad', in order to create a more critical awareness of the medium, as understood by Everitt's third level of engagement.

10.5.7 Adolescent Rite of Passage and Incorporation

The need for an adolescent to be included within a youth subculture that is excluded from society (and eventually re-incorporated into the mainstream), can be perceived as an individual, 'rite of passage'. This was a term coined by the anthropologist Arnold Van Gennep (1960: v) in his classic study of, 'the

analysis of ritual behaviour in its relation to the dynamics of individual and group life'. He studied small-scale pre-literate societies and how they ceremonially dealt with adolescent life crises through the 'rite of passage'. He distinguished three different phases: separation, transition and incorporation. In many societies the ritual would take the form of removing certain age-groups from the wider social group and physically isolating them in order that they learnt adult ways and understanding. This meditative transition phase could involve teaching from a wise sage, and be accompanied by taking hallucinogenic plants in order to learn important mysteries and cosmologies. A more modern representation of this phase would be Carlos Casteneda's meeting with Don Juan Matus, and his initiation into deeper understandings (Casteneda 1990). Similarly, there is a relationship between the wise sage and aged Rastafarian, which incorporates an older mythopoetic understanding of life. Eventually, those wiser and better educated adolescents would then be re-incorporated back into society on different terms. Van Gennep expressed that his, 'analysis of rites of incorporation is valid for understanding the problems associated with the "alienated" and "unclaimed" of modern societies' (1960: x). There is a need for exclusion at specific life crisis points, in order for such groups to be re-included later. Without a mechanism and framework for adolescent exclusion (the subculture), the likelihood of inclusion later is reduced.

Not unconnected to this concept of incorporation, John Storey (1998b) studied the American West Coast youth counterculture of the 1960s, and how this alternative social vision challenged the prevailing hegemony and particularly the war in Vietnam. It moved from resistance to incorporation, as the commercial potential of the movement became manifest and exploited. There is a similar process at work, of exclusion from the mainstream in order to be re-bound into it. Similarly, 'The collapse of the West Coast counterculture following the incorporation of its music' (1998b: 233) has parallels with the Reggae subculture. But this counterculture concerned middle class and educated sections of American society, the future leaders and apologists for the next generation of American society. Hence the pressing need for incorporation of the culture. Such a simplistic analysis cannot be so easily applied to the Reggae subculture, as it concerned a minority and disenfranchised constituency. Here the actual commercial success of Reggae is an example of the hegemonic accommodation of opposing values, which in turn links the cultural sphere to the body politic. This is what Tony Bennett (1998) in his analysis of 'popular' culture, expressed as, 'the processes through which the ruling class seeks to

negotiate opposing class cultures on to a cultural and ideological terrain which wins for it a position of leadership....what is thereby consented to is a *negotiated version* of ruling-class culture and ideology' (Bennett 1998: 221). Arguably, that may be the case, but the romantic counter cultural hippy idiom, which is a, 'utopian.... subversive Bohemian variant of bourgeois individualism' (Storey 1998b: 226), is more readily incorporated and assimilated than a subculture steeped in a minority ethnic culture, as it relates better to the white bourgeois habitus. Hence there is a much more uneasy relationship with Marley's revolutionary and redemptive lyrics.

10.5.8 A Feminist Perspective

There are other perspectives on Reggae. Carolyn Cooper (2002) compared the conservatism of Marley with the more recent outspoken music of Shabba Ranks. She assessed representations of female sexuality through both sets of lyrics from, 'the two major directions of contemporary Jamaican popular music: reggae and dancehall [ragga]. Both performers have achieved international superstar status as exponents of Jamaican music and articulators of the cultural values embedded in the music' (Cooper 2002: 347). Whereas Ranks was misogynistic and sexually explicit, Marley was the conventional male chauvinist romantic, 'overtly political and covertly sexual' (2002: 348). Although visionary, anti-establishment and revolutionary in song, rights for Marley were perceived in socio-economic terms, whereas for Ranks they were in terms of sexual equality, (albeit using a particular language shocking to middle class ears and values). Cooper asserted that the change in lyrics reflected the evolution of Jamaican society, 'from a rural, peasant-based agricultural economy to an urban, wage-earning economy' (2002: 356). Most tellingly, she related the chauvinism of Marley directly to, 'the conservative, biblically grounded peasant values of his rural origins' (2002: 356) and the Rastafarian religion, which particular understanding of freedom was bound up in a male hegemony and exclusivity.

10.5.9 A Virtual World

The anthropologist Barry Chevannes (1994) explored the roots of the Rastafarian Movement. Its deliverance out of captivity and back to Zion, was based on an idealisation of Africa that culminated in the ascent of Ras Tafari (Emperor Hails Salassie I). He ascended the throne of Ethiopia at the same time that the movement was born out of the troublesome 1930's in Jamaica. The authenticity of the

Reggae experience through the Rastafarian cult can be similarly critiqued.

Such an idealisation of place was a theme taken up by Andy Bennett (2002) who researched into this relationship between music and location. He chose the 'Canterbury Sound', experimental music created in the late 1960s by bands associated with Canterbury in Kent. These included the Wilde Flowers, Caravan and Soft Machine. His intention was,

> to add a new dimension to our understanding of the relationship between music and place by considering how recently developed media, notably the Internet and digital recordings, are enabling new constructions of this relationship. Using the example of the Canterbury Sound, I have examined several ways in which fans of the latter have used new technologies as a means of building a retrospective and 'virtual scene'. (Bennett 2002: 98)

The Canterbury Sound has therefore become an urban myth, and Canterbury an urban mythscape. The music is a blend of folk with jazz, using very English phrased and spoken lyrics, which has helped construct a fictional interpretation of urban space[4]. This linking of musical styles with specific urban spaces, has a history (for instance the Beach Boys with California, and Nirvana with Seattle), but this Englishness has become weaved, 'Into the city's tourist gaze' (2002: 90), and an alternative to the cathedral as an attraction.

The identification of Canterbury with this music has a lot to do with marketing, as has the promotion of Jamaica through Reggae music[5]. But whereas Canterbury is associated with 1960's experimentation and collectivity, this mythological Jamaican landscape belongs to a Christ-like Marley, the prophet who eases the suffering for the excluded. Not unsurprisingly, one of his later albums was entitled *Legend* (Marley 1984).

10.5.10 Conclusion

The Reggae subculture which had massive popular appeal both in Britain and worldwide, was far from

---

[4] the concept of simulation was discussed in 9.3.3

[5] The Jamaican Tourist Board (2003) has used Marley's 'One Love' as the theme for its advertising campaign 'Spirit of Jamaica'.

a normative consumption of standardised 'popular' music. Although the music was an example of a culturally inclusive art form, easy to singalong and perform, it was highly contradictory.

The music originally expressed real-life sentiments that allowed disaffected and alienated black youth in particular, a culture to identify with, giving solidarity to their cause. Its religious roots and message embedded in the exclusive black Rastafarian religion (an inversion of traditional religious symbolism), were disseminated through its musically inclusive nature. Bob Marley, its greatest exponent, expressed the angst and injustice of life, with which the black youth identified. But such social inclusivity within this black constituency and subculture, did not necessarily apply outside of it, even though the music was commercially successful. In terms of social inclusivity, it is therefore paradoxical; on the one hand the music had a huge effect on breaking down racial barriers, on the other it was seen as the preserve of a Black culture. This is a good example of the related, dependent and contextual nature of social and cultural inclusion/exclusion, and the contradictions inherent. That the black community in Britain had historically been excluded through racism, ironically allowed a specific black Jamaican musical heritage to prosper, unassimilated, which created the framework for its promotion in Britain. It is also an example of how the signs of a minority culture can be appropriated by majority culture, and the mutable and mobile nature of culture in which the understanding of its symbols changes over time and context. Although a popular form of music, the critical and revolutionary style of lyrics exemplify something beyond its commodification.

10.5 Summary

Firstly, the chapter ventured different political constructions of understanding popular culture. Street, dissected it into two dimensions. The first of which revolved around the axis of elitism and populism, the second around radicality and conservatism, yielding four political perspectives which impact on understanding cultural inclusion. These showed popular culture as a form of manipulation or means of self-expression, factor of social change or endorser of the status quo. This necessitated a political understanding of how each position allowed people to determine and participate in their own culture. Secondly, it assessed different perspectives of identity and how these were determined by notions of multiculturalism and diversity. Such a position challenges prevailing fixed multicultural perspectives, which fail to perceive the more postmodern reality and choice with regards the interpretation of cultural

symbols. Identity is mutable and the significators can be re-interpreted in different ways, hence the shifting hermeneutic basis of culture. Stuart Hall enunciated the importance of cultural identity in terms of displacement and the black Diaspora. He formulated two concepts of cultural identity, one in terms of ancestry and the past, the other regarding the reality of being different and the future. Joachim Knoll showed how minority cultures are trapped between inclusion and exclusion, and the extent to which they are lost through assimilation into mainstream culture, or saved through integration moreso on their own terms. Adam Kuper argued that multiculturalism was tyrannical, dictating cultural terms in a way that was not necessarily the reality for many, which actually hindered and restricted their own options for development.

Thirdly, it presented a case study of a highly accessible Reggae Music, from a long tradition of Jamaican music, which helped the black British youth to forge a particular identity. It traced its history and that of the Rastafarian religion. Due to its participative nature, it is a highly inclusive form of music, which satisfies both Harland et al's negative reasons for non-participation and Everitt's positive levels of engagement, respectively.

As a subculture, it was the first in this country to be 'black' orientated, but was appropriated from its exclusively black religious roots, to encompass more general issues of oppression. This allowed a more mobile identity. There are similarities with the American West Coast Counterculture of the 1960's, but whereas the Reggae subculture retained its Rastafarian identity, this resistant culture was assimilated. That both were appropriated into the commercial mainstream, is another example of the hegemonic power of popular music.

The Reggae subculture can be situated within the framework of Van Gennep's 'rite of passage', which conceived the need for adolescents to be separated (excluded) from society for a transitional period, before being incorporated (included) back into the mainstream. He understood this functional framework of exclusion used in pre-literate societies, as an accepted aid to inclusion in the longer term. The music can be critiqued as overtly male in orientation and for creating an idealised image of the world, in which the identification of place (Jamaica), was far from reality driven. Overall the case was a good example of the interconnected and contradictory relationship between social and cultural inclusion and exclusion.

PART IV - The Arts: Individual Need and Social Function

One of the most moving narratives of modern history is the story of how men and women languishing under various forms of oppression came to acquire, often at great personal cost, the sort of technical knowledge necessary for them to understand their own condition more deeply, and so to acquire some of the theoretical armoury essential to change it. It is an insult to inform these men and women that, in the economic metaphor for intellectual life now prevalent in the USA, they are simply 'buying into' the conceptual closures of their masters

(Eagleton 1996: 5)

Rationalization is at once enervating disenchantment and enlightening empowerment. It has led to increased freedom and at the same time facilitated internal and external domination on an unprecedented scale. This ambiguity is intended. Rationalization is at once a terrible condition, the worst evil, and the only human path for liberation

(Alexander 1987: 187)

It wasn't so much the having to work that depressed us, but the thought that this would change us. We wanted to believe we could go out to work and still keep our desert island intact. But we knew, underneath, that work would turn us into the sort of creatures who went to work: puppets who only owned half their lives

(Swift *The Tunnel*)

Part Four tries to determine both from an individual and collective angle how the arts relate specifically to causal factors that enable inclusion and more generally to society. It concerns the education, empowerment and needs of the excluded, as well as the social function and location of the arts.

With regards to the excluded individual, it considers concepts of personal transformation, emancipation and empowerment, need and motivation. It assesses a Freirian educational pedagogy which concerns key factors that may help address social exclusion. Such creative and heuristic learning, is both transformative and democratic, with the self as agent of social change. The arts and creativity can permit a more spontaneous and participatory learning, allowing truly empowered and democratic citizens.

Abraham Maslow constructed a 'hierarchy of needs' which is set out and critiqued. He stipulated that only after primary physiological drives had been satisfied, could secondary cultural drives be realised. In contrast, by perceiving the arts as a biological need, this presents them in a very different light.

A case study on Arts Education in Prison, looks more historically at the role of prison art education as a metaphor for adult educational practice and lifelong learning. It illuminates the struggle between individual creative needs and social accommodation showing how the shifting paradigm of penal policy has historically affected its practice. The different rehabilitative educational frameworks are set out around four models which have a wider application. Worryingly, the arts are increasingly perceived as redundant in terms of intrinsic utility.

The research finally assesses the social location of the arts, a contested area, exploring the relationship between work and leisure. By placing them within a play or leisure ethic, this exposes and challenges a cultural policy and strategy that utilises the arts primarily to help generate and instil a work ethic into the socially excluded, and questions whether the role of the arts is normative or transformative.

Increasingly society has become involved in abnormal and deviant forms of leisure, which is not unrelated to this overbearing work ethic driving ever more extreme, dehumanising and alienating forms of capitalism. Furthermore, it is this brand of entrepreneurial capitalism which has both appropriated the concept of autonomy and ditched concepts of mutual rights and responsibilities, that has helped cause exclusion. This rationalisation of society, that underpins and embeds capitalism, has increasingly subjugated and abnormalised leisure, away from active creative expression and production, to passive consumption and

dangerous pursuits. The extent to which the participatory arts offer an engaged freedom and necessary counterculture, an alternative that challenges this rigid 'iron cage', is therefore explored.

Chapter 11. Empowerment, Transformation and Need

11.1 Introduction

Addressing issues of social exclusion requires amongst other considerations, an enabling of the excluded individuals, hence the importance of concepts concerning emancipation and empowerment. Similarly, there are associated issues of need and motivation. The research presents an educational methodology that encourages such concerns and creates a discourse around personal transformation, which positions creativity central to this process.

The case study concerns arts education in prison and how educational philosophy has been affected by extrinsic instrumental concerns. This illuminates the struggle between individual creative needs and social accommodation. Taking a historical perspective, it explores four prison educational models, establishing a more politicised understanding of utility, a microcosm with wider application to society.

11.2 Transformation of the Excluded

In order for the socially excluded to be included, this requires a transformation of individuals and the social structures that encourage the condition. That the former is embedded in the latter, makes the investigation ever more convoluted.

11.2.1 Empowerment and Emancipation

Tom Inglis (1997) analysed the concepts of empowerment and emancipation in terms of how power relations and structures affected the field of adult education. He challenged the commonly held view of, 'freedom and emancipation being attained through personal transformation' (Inglis 1997: 3). He perceived emancipation as having a more collective definition, whilst the concept of empowerment had been colonised by corporate organisations and their interests. He cited the need for value which was central to humanity and overcoming self-interest.

Inglis perceived empowerment as working the system which, 'involves people developing capacities to act successfully within the existing system and structures of power' (1997: 4). This has traditionally been one

of the aims of lifelong education, but it has increasingly been appropriated by business, organisational management and industrial training. Empowerment could therefore also be perceived as a subtle and pervasive means of organisational manipulation. Emancipation on the other hand was concerned with changing the system which, 'concerns critically analysing, resisting and challenging structures of power'. (1997: 4). The more psychological emphasis of empowerment with the realisation and reconstruction of the self, understood education in terms of unblocking and unlocking capacities in response to the effects of power, not confronting this process. Furthermore, there was a need to discover, 'some pre-social, authentic, essential self.' (1997: 7).

Inglis suggested that the process of self-realisation shifted the focus onto the individual, which ignored the analysis of power and the structures that operated to control that individual.

11.2.2 Self-Regulatory Power and Disempowerment

Inglis was influenced by Foucault, who perceived power as exercised through opinion and surveillance[1]. The resultant inspecting gaze was internalised whereby, 'each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself' (Foucault 1980: 155).

This self-censorship could be transferred to educational processes, as paradoxically, these constraining factors were contained in transformative learning practices. Inglis quoted Foucault's analysis:

> Instead of producing docile, amenable, regulated bodies through external forms of control....there has been a shift to more subtle forms of control. Through an ongoing process of externalizing, problematizing, and critically evaluating one's being, actions, and thoughts, a critically reflective self is constituted. This self becomes the center of control. If properly constituted we no longer need the regulatory discourse of psychiatry. Through emancipatory learning, we become our own psychiatrists. (Foucault cited in Inglis 1997: 7)

---

[1] a broader analysis of Foucault's concept of power was set out in the Outsider Art case, especially 8.6.1; 8.6.2 & 8.6.7

Arguably, self-regulation in Adult Education has failed to liberate or empower, as the student too readily (and subconsciously) self-censors in order to appease the educator, and operate within acceptable frameworks.

11.2.3 Learning About the Self as an Agent of Social Change

Inglis perceived learning about the self and corresponding empowerment, as excluding the necessary analysis of oppression, the effects of power structures and how they operated in society. Therefore although there had been a proliferation in popular forms of psychological literature, about self-confidence and assertiveness to help enable individuals to feel more empowered, they were not emancipated. In order to achieve this, Adult Education teachers needed to confront students to analyse the social and political structures that informed our realities and, 'recognize and challenge the structures, hierarchies, privileges, rhetoric, rules and regulations of the educational institution within which they operate' (1997: 10). This included an analysis of power structures in the family, workplace, society and nation. It could be too threatening and destabilising for students to operate in practice.

Individuals needed to acquire skills and knowledge in order that they had the freedom to make informed decisions. But this traditional accumulation of educational capital did not affect the underlying structures of oppression.

11.2.4 Education for Personal Transformation

Inglis assessed education for emancipation as, 'a collective educational activity which has as its goal social and political transformation' (1997: 14). Therefore, education needed a theory and pedagogy of power, in order to move beyond individual to social change.

This was in contrast to empowerment, which concerned individuals attaining greater economic, political, social and cultural capital. Here education was a form of investment in a normative accumulation of power, in order to obtain greater rewards.

Freire had earlier critiqued such a understanding utilising the term 'banking education'. He viewed this

conventional framework of education as an act of depositing. Students were receptacles to be filled by the educator. This,

> banking concept of education...negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry....The more students work at storing deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world of transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them. (Freire 1970a: 46-7)

He espoused a 'problem-posing' liberational education. The process was of vital importance, and required teachers to desist from imposing their views onto students: 'Whereas banking education anesthetizes and inhibits creative power, problem-posing education involves a constant unveiling of reality. The former attempts to maintain the submersion of consciousness; the latter strives for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality' (1970a: 54).

Freire embedded this praxis in the process of learning language, which was dependent on an understanding of culture and the socio-historical situation the students found themselves in. Adult literacy was part of the process of cultural action[2]. Cultural literacy enabled the process of critical reflection necessary to free the oppressed from the 'sick man' syndrome, in which literacy was seen as the medicine to cure the illness. Such traditional practice ignored the real political and socio-economic structural foundations that had initially caused the problems.

Freire perceived that the students held the solution, through their own action:

> for, in reality, they are not marginal to the structure, but oppressed men within it. Alienated men, they cannot overcome their dependency by 'incorporation' into the very structure responsible for their dependency. There is no other road to humanization - theirs as well as everyone else's - but authentic

---

[2] as shown in the Theatre of the Oppressed case study in 9.5.7

transformation of the dehumanizing structure. From this last point of view, the illiterate is no longer a person living on the fringe of society, a marginal man, but rather a representative of the dominated strata of society, in conscious or unconscious opposition to those who, in the same structure, treat him as a thing. (Freire 1970b: 211)

Only through raising consciousness and the collective 'conscientization' of those students could an authentic transformation of the person in terms of humanisation occur. This required an educational input based on critical reflection and rational discourse, and a process of non-authoritarian teaching in which a genuine and respectful communication between student and teacher occurred. This then ideally led to action in the real world. Freire insisted that, 'Becoming literate, then, means far more than learning to decode the written representation of a sound system. It is truly an act of knowing, through which a person is able to look critically at the culture which has shaped him, and to move toward reflection and positive action upon his world' (1970b: 205). Such literacy dissolved the distinction between verbal and symbolic language, and focused on wider issues of cultural democracy, in order that participants were better able to shape their environment and ultimately society.

11.2.5 Transformation Theory

Jack Merizow's (1991) Transformation Theory of emancipatory learning was steeped in a Freirian pedagogy, but without the politics and social action. It was a universal educational theory grounded in, 'rules that are implicit in linguistic competence or human development' (Merizow 1991: xiii). He was unhappy with psychological theories, particularly behaviourist assumptions, as they were so amenable to bureaucratic control, and were measurable only because they focused on anticipated behavioural outcomes. The missing dimension was the social conditioning that influenced how adults made meaning, how it was constructed and validated.

Like Freire, he saw, 'the process of problem solving [as] the mechanism by which transformations in meaning schemes occur or new schemes are created as we encounter new data that do not fit our preconceived notions' (1991: 197). This necessitated reflection on problems and acting on insights.

Emancipatory education was about awareness and could be framed within pre-existing fields of adult education. These included; critical reflexivity, creativity, artistic expression, personal development and therapy, conscientisation, dialectical thinking, consciousness raising , philosophical analysis and some forms of religious conversion and eastern mysticism. Many of these categories concerning emancipatory education are intrinsic to the arts.

Ultimately, through his Transformation Theory, Merizow attempted to analyse and comprehend how adult learners created meaning out of their experience. This required andragogy, which he defined as, 'an organised and sustained effort to assist adults to learn in a way that enhances their capability to function as self-directed learners' (1991: 199). The consequences of which reduced learners dependency on educators, and increased their responsibility for defining learning objectives and needs.

He saw the role of an educator as provocateur[3], encouraging alternative and rational discourses. But unlike Freire, he always saw, 'education [as] the handmaiden of learning, not of politics' (1991: 208) with, 'perspective transformation....the engine of adult development' (Merizow 1994: 228).

He assumed a benign socio-economic and political reality, and a society that wanted to nurture independent free thinking adults and decision-makers.

11.2.6 Fear of Freedom and Spontaneity

Those excluded from society, may fear freedom, which can also impact on their willingness and ability to express their spontaneity.

The social psychologist Eric Fromm (1977) argued that, 'Freedom from external authority is a lasting gain only if the inner psychological conditions are such that we are able to establish our own individuality' (Fromm 1977: 207-8). He perceived the problems of personal freedom and the assertion of individuality as being

locked into wider social issues as well as inner psychological problems[4]. Individual powerlessness lacked

---

[3] similar to Boal's concept of 'Joker' in Forum Theatre as set out in 9.5.3

[4] the external sociological causes of oppression and internal psychological factors are described in the Theatre of the Oppressed Case in 9.5.3 & 9.5.4

spontaneity and led to a feigning to authority and compulsive automaton-like behaviour, or into authoritarianism moreover, 'The suppression of spontaneous feelings, and thereby of the development of genuine individuality, starts very early as a matter of fact with the earliest training of the child' (1977: 208). This powerlessness and insecurity helped design a very isolated individual. Fromm understood that such isolation needed the challenge of spontaneity:

> Spontaneous activity is not compulsive, to which the individual is driven by his isolation and powerlessness; it is not the activity of the automaton, which is the uncritical adoption of patterns suggested from the outside. Spontaneous activity is free activity of the self and implies, psychologically, what the Latin root of the word *sponte*, means literally: of one's free will. (1977: 223)

He referred to artists as spontaneous, whose thinking, feeling and acting were expressions of themselves. Such behaviour could free the individual from the confines of such authoritarian isolation. But there was a danger that spontaneity unlocked other aspects of character which could be antithetical to such objectives. He did not espouse anarchy, distinguishing between rational authority and irrational authority, the latter of which could be usurped through a more spontaneous nature. Rational authority was never in conflict with the true needs of the individual. This allowed people to be free to find out who they were and be themselves. He espoused a philosophy of positive action:

> Whether or not we are aware of it, there is nothing of which we are more ashamed than of not being ourselves, and there is nothing that gives us greater pride and happiness than to think, to feel, and to say what is ours. This implies that what matters is the activity as such, the process and not the result. In our culture the emphasis is just the reverse. We produce not for a concrete satisfaction but for the abstract purpose of selling our commodity; we feel that we can acquire everything material or immaterial by buying it, and thus things become ours independently of any concrete effort of our own in relation to them. (1977: 226)

He emphasised process in terms of activity, in favour of product. There is a similar philosophy behind participation in the arts, where spontaneity is shown through creativity. Such a creative axis allows the person to, 'live, neither compulsively nor automatically but spontaneously.... [and to be] aware of himself as an active and creative individual....[who] recognises that *there is only one meaning of life: the arts of living itself*' (1977: 226-7).

Hence Fromm linked up the creative act with a self-consciousness that democratically positioned the person in opposition to autocratic power. Furthermore, because the excluded constituency may lack the spontaneousness required to be able to creatively express, the arts were integral to emancipatory learning,

11.3 Needs

The research assesses the concept of need, specifically in terms of creativity.

11.3.1 Theory of Human Needs

Maslow constructed a hierarchy of human needs, reflecting his Motivation Theory (1971). This was later described as his Theory of Human Needs (Doyal & Gough 1991), and distinguished between the primary and secondary drives which determined these needs. The former had a physiological makeup, whereas the latter were cultural. He concluded that,

> the chief principle of organization in human motivational life is the arrangement of basic needs in a hierarchy of less or greater priority or potency. The chief dynamic principle animating this organization is the emergence of the healthy person of less potent needs upon gratification of the more potent ones. The physiological needs, when unsatisfied, dominate the organism, pressing all capacities into their service and organizing these capacities so that they may be most efficient in this service. (Maslow 1970: 59).

Only when needs had been satisfied could people possess 'functional autonomy', 'independent of the very gratifications that created them' (1970: 58), which allowed self-realisation, and fulfilment of latent

potential.

Maslow (1970: 35-58) listed five needs that had to be satisfied. This included: the primary 'Physiological Need' at the base of the pyramid; to secondly, a 'Safety Need'; thirdly a 'Belongingness and Love Need'; fourthly 'Esteem Needs'; and at the apex of the pyramid the 'Need for Self-Actualization'. He insisted that, 'There is usually such an overlapping that it is almost impossible to separate quite clearly and sharply any one drive from any other....the very concept of drive itself probably emerges from a pre-occupation with the physiological needs' (1970: 26).

Nevertheless his argument was that secondary cultural needs are in general dependant on primary needs being satisfied (although he acknowledged possible exceptions). Subsistence needs such as hunger and housing, as well as more advanced needs related to security, stability, belonging through family ties and social recognition, had to be met to some large degree, before the need for self-realisation became relevant. Even so, he admitted that with regard to aesthetic needs, 'We know even less about these...and [I] have at least convinced myself that in *some* individuals there truly is a basic aesthetic need' (1970: 51). But in general, Maslow's theory suggested that for those whose basic needs had not been met (especially the socially excluded), art activities were at best an irrelevance and at worst perverse. The priority should be to satisfy their basic needs.

11.3.2 Critique of Human Needs Theory

Maslow was a universalist, and accordingly claimed that, 'Our classification of basic needs is in part an attempt to account for this unity behind the apparent diversity from culture to culture. No claim is made yet that it is ultimate or universal for all cultures. The claim is made only that it is....a closer approach to common human characteristics' (1970: 54-5).

But his Human Needs Theory is too neat, reality is far messier, uncontrollable and unpredictable. The charge of cultural specificity is also hard to defend against. Although particularism, in line with postmodern sensibility, is highly fashionable, universalistic arguments hold a fascination, particularly for those with a scientific leaning who view humanity in a more biological manner.

Len Doyal and Ian Gough took a more relativist position. For example, they asserted that, 'Some people

seem far more concerned with their self-actualisation than their safety' (Doyal & Gough 1991: 36) and questioned Maslow's typology. They wanted to separate the universal element of his Needs Theory from human motivation and drive. They challenged the instinctual drive behind it as, 'we can strongly desire things which are seriously harmful and, in our ignorance, not desire things which we require to avoid such harm' (1991: 49). With regards to 'functional autonomy', they conceived this to be a basic need, and distinguished between primary and secondary drives in terms of, 'the extent that it underlines the distinction between action which is based on a process of reflection from action executed uncritically' (1991: 68). That being the case, the arts can be seen as part of the process of introducing second order preferences.

Maslow's model of human nature is very rigid and incapable of incorporating the many unknown variables and individual drives that reflect personality. He admitted that some people can be born with innately high creativity, but still regarded the hierarchy as a representative model. A case in point is the artist Stephen Wiltshire, who was autistic and, 'seen, classically, as being intensely alone, incapable of relationship with others, incapable of perceiving others' feelings or perspectives, incapable of humour, playfulness, spontaneity, creativity - mere "intelligent automata", in Asperger's terms' (Sacks cited in Hewson 1991: 7). He was able to draw complex buildings from memory and was described by the museologist Sir Hugh Casson as, 'possibly the best child artist in Britain' (Casson cited in Hewson 1991: 11). For somebody who was barely able to satisfy the third level of 'relating to others', Wiltshire was more than able to show his creativity and spontaneity, qualities associated with the fifth level of self-actualisation. Maslow circumvented this problem by suggesting that such creativity was a compensation as such, 'creativeness might appear not as self-actualization released by basic satisfaction, but in spite of lack of basic satisfaction' (1970: 52).

Possibly the strongest argument against Maslow, is political. He used a psychological framework in which to state the socio-economic and political reality of American society. His argument is tautological as he assessed human needs from his particular perspective without looking at wider influences, hermetically sealed within a psycho-biological paradigm. So it is not altogether surprising that he used a hierarchical theory to describe a hierarchical society. He also demeaned (whether intentionally or not) those at the

bottom of society, as though they were underdeveloped and second-class. It is very difficult to dissociate an ethical dimension from his theories.

Elaine Pearson and Ronald Podeschi (1999) critiqued Maslow's emphasis on individualism, which was culturally specific and, 'reflects a US belief in progress, one fuelled by other mainstream values such as newness and change, with education as a road to renewal of society, as well as the self' (Pearson & Podeschi 1999: 45). He failed to recognise wider social constraints or his own cultural position. They differentiated between 'individuality' and 'individualism'; the former, 'defining individuals both in terms of their uniqueness and in their embedment within the social matrix' whilst the latter more metaphysical term, 'exists apart from any social arrangement' (1999: 50). Maslow confused these terms, not fully appreciating the reality of how the individual was embedded socially, falling back onto an ideal location.

Robert Shaw and Keith Colimore (1988) took another political perspective, accusing Maslow and his theories of presenting a, 'new and seductive Social Darwinianism' (Shaw & Colimore 1988:56) and concomitant blame culture, which justified capitalist privilege and personalised culpability, in terms of failure to attain the level of Self-Actualisation. His theories perpetuated elitism and inequality, as there was little recognition that the excluded individuals at the bottom of the pyramid of needs, had to overcome socio-economic and political barriers in order to reach this privileged state.

Meanwhile, Ellen Dissanayake (1992; Gablik1995) regarded the arts themselves as being a human need. She concluded that, 'art comes from a need to make things special' (Dissanayake cited in Gablik 1995: 42) which set humans apart from animals. She established her biological and evolutionary concept of art, claiming that it was, 'an inherited behavioural tendency to act in a certain way in certain circumstances, which during the evolution of our species helped us to survive' (Dissakayane 1992: 38). Ironically, by utilising a Darwinian template, she considered art to be a biological need which required satisfaction, for the purpose of pleasure, 'and whose denial may be considered a vital deprivation' (1992: 38). The arts were a basic need, not part of a selective hierarchy. But ironically, the 'high' arts separated us from this need: 'it is as if while we were becoming more and more enlightened and "civilized" – distancing ourselves from the exigencies of nature and the superstitions of the tribe – we were also progressively forsaking ancient, elemental, human satisfactions and ways of being' (1992: 4). The enculturation of peoples and societies had

moved the 'high' arts away from biological needs to make special and assuage pleasure. Accordingly, Dissanayake questioned whether her basic premise that the arts enabled us to feel good through participation, could be satisfied through the 'high' arts, due to their exclusivity:

> One has the feeling that ....[the arts] are matters of interest only when they reach the stage of being remote, like heavenly bodies or artificial satellites serenely revolving in the empyrean. We discount, disregard, or forget the blazing forces that got them up there and our sympathetic thrill of exultation and participation as they rose aflame leaving earth and us behind. (1992: 25)

She studied Sri Lankan culture, and attacked western aesthetics as being caught up in a circular argument in which, 'something was assigned to the category of genuine art if it was deemed capable of providing and sustaining genuine aesthetic experience. Genuine aesthetic experience was defined as something one experienced when contemplating genuine art' (1992: 40). Consequently, 'Today's philosophers of art have totally abandoned trying to define the word or the concept' (1992: 41).

Dissanayake approached art as a behaviour, as it had similarities with accounts of young animals at play. Such involvement lacked ulterior motive and the rationale for such conduct was steeped in the intrinsic benefits of enjoyment and fun. Play allowed the uncertain to happen, the novel to be tried and unpredictable behaviour to be expressed[5]. This need in humanity was founded in the arts and celebrated in ritualised customs throughout the world. Human needs and motivation are concepts that attract competing discourses.

11.4 Case Study: Arts Education in Prison

This final case study looks at arts education within the excluded prison environment, to assess a deeper understanding of their purpose and instrumentality. Irrespective of whether they are an individual need or conduit for social accommodation, they have an effect in terms of emancipating, enfranchising and empowering this constituency. Discourse concerning their psychological, educational and rehabilitative

---

[5] see 12.6 and the Play ethic

utility allows greater insight into their function.

11.4.1. History of Penal Education

William Forster (1989; 1998) researched the history of penal education concluding that, 'whatever society provides by way of educational services within its prison system must depend, in the end, upon what that society perceives "education" as being' (Forster 1989: 343).

He delineated definite areas of educational activity which have become established in British prisons: vocational training, remedial education (basic literacy and numeracy), academic programmes (from GCSE to degree), the therapeutic (cognitive skills and anger management courses) and finally the recreational in which he placed arts and crafts. These were, 'viewed as harmless activities which enable a sentence to be lived more easily' (1989: 346) He also referred to this area as, 'the most prevalent and yet the least systematically explored' (Forster 1998: 69).

Forster saw an uncertainty among prison educationalists in terms of whether education should be non-interventionist with regards social deviancy or wrapped up in reformative work. As regards to the evidence to prove rehabilitative intervention, 'Enquiries into the longer term effects of prison educational experience are hampered both by the necessary privacy of the ex-prisoner and by the difficulty in isolating education, per se, from all the other effects of imprisonment' (1989: 346). He likened the prison service to the adult education movement as both had been bedevilled with defining their purpose. He distinguished between three overlapping educational categories: firstly, personal development; secondly, social purpose to, 'redress social injustice and educational disadvantage....[and the] need for informed democracy' (1998: 70); and finally, community education with emphasis on participation. He was concerned with the pressure of an increasing functionalism, which was reflected in demands for measurable outcomes to justify expenditure, and with the far-reaching claims for the effects of prison education, beyond what could be proved.

11.4.2 Prison Education Models, Shifting Paradigms

Stephen Duguid (1998: 21-29), offered a more forthright critique of prison education and especially the

present emphasis on psychological cognitive approaches. Within the shifting paradigms of modern correction theory, the Canadian system included:

Firstly the 'medical model' (1945-1975) an, 'approach to criminal behaviour that saw it as an illness, the specific causes of which could be diagnosed and prescribed for' (1998: 22). Hence education was a form of treatment.

Secondly, the 'rejection of any rehabilitation model' (1974-77), as there was no surety of success. This was re-interpreted as a 'nothing works' theory, in which, 'benign neglect [was] as "effective" as treatment [which] was music to the ears of government accountants looking for money to save' (1998: 27).

Thirdly, the 'opportunities model' (1977-87). This reflected the re-emergence of an educational paradigm which Tom Gehring perceived as consisting of five components: Cognitive instruction (critical thinking), participative decision-making (choice), moral education, criminal personality, and a focus on the humanities (Gehring cited in Duguid 1998: 28).

Lastly, the 'new medical model' (Late 1980's to present) was born. Here the direct programming of cognitive skills became independent of educational input. The 'opportunities model' was seen as too unstable, with responsibility vested in the hands of prisoners. Allowing them to make choices, was regarded as aimless, so the responsibility was taken away and the adult educational approach rejected. Duguid saw this as, 'the slippery slope between education and treatment' (1998: 29). Such a cognitive skills programme that tackled behaviour within a psychological paradigm, was advocated because it was perceived to be more efficient and a better morale booster for staff.

11.4.3 Critique of Prison Education and the Cognitive Model

But Duguid (1998: 37-8), argued that the cognitive skills programme was less successful at reducing recidivism, than an adult educational model. The cognitive skills programme reduced re-offending for the low-risk group by only 11.2% compared to the control of roughly 50% after one year, and had minimal effect on high-risk categories of prisoners. Whereas in a parallel study of the effects of a post-secondary education programme, roughly 80% of those participating successfully completed three years out of prison on release. On top of this 57% of the high-risk offenders were successful in the same period. The education

programme rather than cognitive skills seemed to be more successful, albeit more time-consuming and costly.

He lampooned the, 'merry-go-round of correctional policies, none of which have done more than advance careers, enhance professionalism and cost money - to say nothing of the human costs to those who were forced to experience the various intrusive treatments' (1998: 39). One of the main reasons for the rise of the New Medical model, was a need for quick results to satisfy funding and also a need to improve the morale of prison staff, as the 'nothing works' idiom needed to be inverted, to give prison staff a purpose.

Michael Collins (1988) took a critical Foucauldian angle on prison education. He was keen to show that, 'the kind of power relationships and coercive structures that impinge, with more immediacy, on prison education also shape much of the modern practice of adult education; in particular that which is characterised as self-directed learning' (Collins 1988: 101). He saw education in prison as being an accommodative strategy that helped sustain penal objectives, in terms of surveillance and control.

Offenders were marked out for treatment and correction to normalise and correct the criminal mind. The irony being that, far from transforming prisoners into honest citizens, prisons were better able to manufacture criminals more adept and better networked in their profession of crime. He surmised:

> And yet the vast set-up to treat, correct and, hence, infantalize criminals as delinquents remains firmly embedded in the penal system as a normalizing technology. It serves to fix individuals via panoptic techniques (the documentary apparatus, psychiatric assessments, diagnostic testing etc.) that lead to precise, objective codifications of the individual. (1988: 103)

Therefore Collins regarded prison education as a metaphor for adult education and a paradigm which thwarted any genuine democratic principles. He argued for a more transparent identification of the power relations in play. He recognised the modification of criminal behaviour within a framework of cognitive psychology, as a technique of normalisation and control, with prison educators taking a predominantly accommodative role. This carried with it an artificiality that was not conducive to supporting or encouraging autonomy within prison education practice.

11.4.4 Lack of Research

There is a lack of research into the success of rehabilitative programmes, although there are rafts of statistics supporting different claims.

For instance, the SEU, who recognised the excluded nature of offenders and ex-offenders, and the need to tackle drug related crime, with 70% of prisoners having a drug misuse problem (Social Exclusion Unit 2002: 61), also extolled the success of cognitive skills programmes: 'A Home Office review suggests that prison-based thinking skills programmes can result in reconviction rates which are up to **14 percentage points** lower than comparison groups. Based on the number of prisoners expected to complete such programmes this year, this represents a reduction of around **21,000 crimes**' (2002: 81).

But neither the Home Office or the SEU are impartial, embedded within government agendas. This view differs from Duguid who earlier presented the case against a cognitive skills programmes in favour of adult learning, based on a broad educational curriculum. Both he and Collins were concerned at the lack or trustworthiness of research that proved the validity of rehabilitation programmes. Collins warned of,

> premature claims about reduced recidivism rates....[as] many of these claims are based on studies that are readily undermined. How, for example, does a researcher realistically identify and control all the significant variables for this kind of population, and carry on the project over a long enough period of time that takes into account a sufficient number of students during their incarceration and after release? (1988: 105)

Such areas of concern include: the length of time allowed to prove lack of recidivism, and whether there are other more important causal offending variables. Similarly, the programme pre-screens participants, choosing only specific categories of prisoners with particular behavioural profiles. These include problems related to, 'impulse control, rigid thinking, lack of means end testing and egocentricity' (Waplington 1999: 13). Arguably, these offenders are the most likely to change their criminal habits anyway.

Furthermore, Maguire and Honess (1997: 63) in their investigation into distance learning in prison were surprised at the, 'dearth of research on prison education in Britain'. They researched the completion of

distance learning educational courses, through a longitudinal study of thirty prisoners.

11.4.5 Aims and Purpose of Arts Education in Prison

It is important to determine the aims and purpose of arts education in prison.

Nick Flynn and David Price (1995) undertook a national survey of education in prison. They quoted the Prison Service Arts in Prisons Working Party, which listed a range of purposes for arts education for prisoners. This included: using time constructively, expressing themselves effectively and acceptably, developing self-awareness and achieving a sense of self-worth, respecting others and working collaboratively, developing skills and taking pride in them, as a route back into education for those with poor literacy skills, becoming more in touch with themselves and their behaviour, maintaining and strengthening ties with family, making choices and accepting responsibility, as a way into employment, to relate better to prison staff and others through shared interests (Flynn & Price 1995: 18).

Marian Liebmann took a more therapeutic line citing the arts in prison as a means of non-verbal communication, as a bridge between therapist and client, as a means of self-expression and self-exploration, as a safe way of dealing with unacceptable emotions such as anger, as an aid to discussion, to help mobilise people and for the sake of enjoyment and creative development. (Leibmann cited in Flynn & Price 1995: 18-9).

The visual artist Colin Riches (1994) expanded on this theme referring to the hidden therapy behind classroom or workshop art projects. He took it for granted that these were now accepted practices with an important part to play in psychological healing and growth. But such an understanding had to be contextualised. He recognised, 'that there are important therapeutic benefits implicit in visual art programmes. For a serving prisoner, these benefits may simply help him to survive his sentence' (Riches 1994: 100). The dramatherapist Sally Stamp (1998) used similar arguments to support the use of drama in prison.

James Thompson (1999), argued that applied theatre was ideal for tackling anger management and

addressing offending behaviour[6]. He allied this approach with a cognitive behavioural perspective, placed within a psychological not an educational framework.

Anne Peaker (1994: 59-60), who set up the Unit for Arts and Offenders, 'in support of the development of arts opportunities for people in prison and special hospital and special units', considered them neither contained in an educational or therapy framework, and somewhere between the two[7]. The function of the arts for inmates was individually determined but came, 'from a need to find a voice of their own in a situation where they have few means of communicating with others and where they suffer a consequent loss of identity' (1994: 57). This was conceived within a holistic framework which sought to develop the whole person. Furthermore, the arts were a vehicle through which inmates kept, 'themselves occupied and as an escape from the pressures of their immediate surroundings' (1994:60). The creative capacity of the arts allowed and instilled confidence in prisoners, challenging their low self-esteem and assuring them that they were worth educating.

Annie Blue (1996) in her research into education for women in prison, showed that there were four central areas in which arts education could be utilised to explore issues of social relevance: deviance, loss, connection and empowerment. Although her work was specifically about the condition and situation of imprisoned women, it can be expanded to include a much wider constituency. She argued for an, 'art education which aims for empowerment and liberation, rather than normalization and containment' (Blue 1996: 4). Deviance, through utilising the arts was therefore a possible, 'vehicle for exploring self-identity and sabotaging the efforts of the regime to "manage identities"' (1996: 71). In terms of countering the effects of loss, 'Art education offers a wide range of opportunities for women to name the things that are absent.... and develop new ways of seeing and knowing' (1996: 72-4). Blue saw the need for education to make connections, therefore arts education had to be culturally plural and open. The urge to create also included a need to connect disparate ideas or feelings from inside to the outside world, and the sharing of such hidden thoughts and ideas with others. Finally, because the arts increased self-confidence by encouraging ability and expression, they were a vehicle for empowerment.

---

[6] as detailed in the Evaluation case study of drama-based arts programme in 7.3.4.

[7] see Phillips with regards to the nature and evaluation of the arts within institutions in 5.6.1

Paul Clements (2002), who conducted group music classes with Vulnerable Prisoners, some of the most excluded in prison, recounted how music naturally encouraged communication for this most inarticulate of constituencies. Also, when researching into the changing role and curriculum of prison education, he discovered the consequences for a particular education department with regards to the instrumental use of the arts. At HMP Brixton, an old Victorian local prison, the curriculum in 1996 included 43 weekly classes in arts subjects, whereas correspondingly, by 2001 this accounted for 10. Furthermore, such classes were run only if they included a basic and key skills curriculum. Arts classes had been replaced with classes entitled, 'Firmstart with Pottery' and 'Basic Skills through Art' amongst other instrumental agendas. Hence he commented that, 'Sadly, the renaissance in prison arts has been replaced by an age of instrumental reason and measurement'.

In a survey conducted by The Unit for Arts and Offenders (2001), 75% of prisons had experienced cuts to their arts programmes in the 2000/1 financial year and 43% of classes were cut to make way for the basic and key skills curriculum. This included the visual arts, woodwork, craft, drama, pottery, music and photography. It recommended that arts classes should be supportive not alternative to this curriculum, in line with government thinking and claimed that there was hard evidence that the arts could deliver basic and key skills at level 2. It also alleged that the arts reduced offending behaviour (although no evidence was given)[8].

David Wilson (2001), a writer and researcher on prison education, whilst not denying the need for a basic skills agenda, calculated that this failed to account for 30-40% of the prison population, who required a higher level of education. He put this emphasis on basic and key skills down to the introduction of the core curriculum in 1995 and, 'the development of key performance targets which seek to reduce the number of prisoners released without basic skills at level 2 or above' (Wilson 2001: 18).

Anders Lustgarten (2001: 22), an experienced prison educator, went further in his condemnation of, 'the systematic eradication of expressive, creative courses in drama, art and culture'. He ridiculed, 'Statistics ....[as] the surrogates of success. Annual intake 1000 men, annual productivity 1000 certificates, result

---

[8] See Appendix 4

(irrespective of what's taught, to or by whom), education'. But his greatest wrath was reserved for the actual qualifications:

> instead of qualifying people in readily assimilable marketable skills like IT and web design, with salaries that might actually compete with a criminal income, we give them lowest common denominator qualifications that on their own aren't likely to override the stigma of criminalisation for prospective employers.

In contrast, he explained his involvement in prison drama, and how through the rehearsal schedule he could visibly assess the changes and gradual empowerment of prisoners through their involvement in a production of 'Accidental Death of an Anarchist' at HMP Wandsworth. Such support for the arts, which dealt with quality and value, was unfortunately lost in the measurement culture of today[9].

Flynn and Price concluded that,

> Art activities....are more concerned with internal goals – development of the "self", communicating, respect – than with external goals – gaining qualifications or skills directly applicable to employment or survival. Progress cannot be demonstrated as easily as examination results. Achievements are more subtle, more psychological and more difficult to put into words. (Flynn & Price 1995: 18)

From their survey, Education Co-ordinators were divided as to the worth or purpose of arts education:

'Some Education Co-ordinators considered arts activities to be an important part of the education curriculum; others considered them to be leisure pursuits only. This is reflected in a lack of consistency regarding the organization of arts exhibitions and the use of outside sources of funding' (1995: 32).

Arts education in prison is very popular, and there are five main reasons for advocating them. Firstly, dynamic security. By occupying prisoners in something of interest and fun, that absorbs them, this helps

---

[9] Advocacy for arts based programmes in prison is set out in Appendix 2

towards the security within the prison, and is a welcome contrast to the negative boredom of prison life. Secondly, the arts are a re-introduction to education for many prisoners who truanted from school. By engaging the hands and the eyes of new students, this naturally develops to the mind. Once interested in the arts, students will be more willing to look at more mundane and less attractive educational options, those for instance linked to the basic skills curriculum. Thirdly, creativity and new ways of thinking, traditional aims of the arts, are the territory of rehabilitation[10]. For instance applied theatre allows the space to practice new roles[11]. Fourthly, as already mentioned, the arts offer an opportunity to explore individual potential and alternative interests as well as increase self-esteem. They aid communication and allow prisoners to value their own and other people's ideas and cultures. Lastly, as Matarasso suggested[12], engagement with the arts helps produce empowered active citizens and develops a critical attitude in them.

11.4.6 Conclusion

The history of prison education and corresponding functional models, have concerned individual enlightenment and social accommodation, revealing different discourses for the criminally excluded. It has suffered from the same malaise as adult education in general, beset by problems of definition. It can be seen as a microcosm of wider educational issues, especially the extent to which in general (and the arts in particular), curricula should revolve around extrinsic rehabilitative, vocational and basic skills agendas. Not surprisingly, the availability of arts classes in one particular prison has been adversely affected by such concerns. This is no accident, as the concentration on such skills, which reflects government policy and SEU objectives[13], is not primarily concerned with the intrinsic qualities of the arts.

Whichever way the arts are perceived and function, evaluating their value ill-fits the performance culture by which the success of educational input, content and output is measured. That arts and creative education can empower and emancipate is not disputed, only the framework or intention of both policy and practice to allow this. The arts engage the hand, eye and brain, they concern the whole person and need to express

---

[10] see 7.3.3 & 7.3.4 and the use of the arts and applied theatre in prison
[11] see 9.5 and the Case Study of Augusto Boal
[12] see 5.8.2
[13] set out in 3.2

an inner creativity and identity. Both prison educational (and wider penal) policy fails to properly accommodate this, which reflects poorly on intended aims as well as the quality of wider rehabilitative and social strategies. Prison is a microcosm of society, and the manner in which prisoners are educated symbolises and reflects the wider educational rationalisation of creative educational potential. That a psychological framework has replaced an educational one, in terms of gearing resources towards specific re-habilitative programmes, further accentuates the need to promote post-secondary adult education immersed in the humanities. An interesting relevant arts-orientated curriculum as a re-introduction to education, would encourage a critical and creative exploration of the self and wider cultural values, in order to encourage change, as well as a more rounded independent citizen. This agenda predicated moreso on internal goals, is in contrast to the present educational emphasis on external goals and certification. Due to the lack of and inconsistent research, claims that present re-habilitative programmes are successful reveals more about the mechanisms of bureaucratic spin and advocacy than of evidence.

11.5 Summary

This chapter examined transformational factors that can help address social exclusion, and the extent to which education can be perceived as the key battleground between competing discourses.

Inglis distinguished between working within the system (empowerment) or changing that system (emancipation). By transforming people through the educational process, this may empower, but it crucially concealed the need for structural change within society and its institutions to accommodate the problem. Unfortunately, self-regulatory learning has constrained emancipation, emphasising individuals without recourse to the oppressive structures that determine them. The research therefore appraised the work by Freire and Merizow on transformative learning, social and individual change through critical reflection. Merizow used the term andragogy, to describe the ideal educational transfer of knowledge that enabled adults to learn heuristically and function in a self-directed fashion, thereby reducing their dependency on the educator. Freire insisted that the excluded participate in the process of their own inclusion, where education was not perceived as banking educational capital, but transformative action. Within this paradigm, the role of the arts is paramount, with creativity and spontaneity allowing critical

reflection and analysis, encouraging a more rounded and self-directed learner. But this is a highly idealistic philosophy.

Fromm recognised that the condition of powerlessness in individuals was directly related to a lack of creativity and spontaneity, which led them to fawn to the authority upon which they were dependent, or assume an authoritarian stance. He associated creativity with self-consciousness and awareness, hence the importance of self-direction through the arts which were integral to emancipatory learning.

Maslow's model Theory of Human Needs has attracted a range of competing critiques. He suggested that the arts were not of primary importance for the excluded, as they required physiological needs to be met first. Although he accepted that certain people can be born with innately high artistic needs (the case of the autistic artist Stephen Wiltshire being cited), he failed to accommodate the arts as a biological need, more a cultural addendum. Doyal and Gough, challenged his cultural specificity and separated the instinctual need drive from motivation. Furthermore, he lacked any collective appraisal and perpetuated concepts of elitism and privilege. Pearson and Podeschi distinguished between 'individuality' and 'individualism', the former embedded within a social matrix, the latter reflecting Maslow's failure to recognise any social arrangement. Overall, Maslow lacked self-reflexivity and through his seemingly objective psychology, too readily propagated his own American culture and socio-political structure.

Dissanayake treated the arts as a need, which undermines the 'high' arts remoteness and exclusivity. She perceived the arts as participative play, encouraging a feel-good-factor. This re-positioned them away from the cold and uninvolved straightjacket of western aesthetics, reflecting a more worldwide understanding and social agenda of ritual and celebration.

The case study researched arts education in prison and through an assessment of the history of penal education, attempted to clarify its purpose and particularly whether education should be non-interventionist with regards social deviancy or wrapped up in reformative work. Duguid created four models of education, showing an historical change in utility. Firstly that education was a form of treatment; secondly, that it was an opportunity for self-development; thirdly, that it had no real effect and was a waste of money; fourthly, that fashionable rehabilitative cognitive skills treatment programmes planted within a medico-psychological paradigm, had become divorced from and replaced traditional educational practice. Although

there was a lack of research into the validity of rehabilitative programmes in prisons, due to their multi-variability, Duguid insisted that a creative and critical post-secondary education steeped in the humanities, was a better rehabilitative tool, than a psychologically based cognitive skills programmes. But this required proper funding. The SEU differed, promoting the success of psychologically based rehabilitative schemes in decreasing rates of re-offending.

The role of arts education in prison further illuminated the struggle between individual creative needs and social accommodation. Opinion as to their role and function was divided and inconsistent, but current instrumental use of the arts within a basic and key skills agenda, has affected their wider utility and more importantly, the arts curriculum has atrophied. In contrast, Flynn and Price concluded that the arts were more concerned with internal goals and self-development, than an extrinsic agenda related to employment and gaining qualifications. It could also be argued that their importance is directly concerned with combating the stress caused by imprisonment, and as relief from the problems created, rather than future rehabilitation and inclusion into society. That prisoners might find out more about themselves or other instrumental concerns was an additional bonus.

The research offered five reasons for supporting the arts in prison: to aid dynamic security, as a re-introduction to education, as an agent of change, to encourage self-knowledge and communication, and finally, to help create active and critically empowered citizens.

Chapter 12. Leisure

12.1 Introduction

By exploring the relationship between work and leisure, this helps to locate the position of the arts within society. The research creates a broad discourse around the work ethic, social intervention and abnormal recreational practices, in order to better understand leisure and a possible social role of the arts. It considers whether they should be determined by an alternative play ethic, and explores the extent to which the arts function best within this framework, but are too readily appropriated and distorted by a controlling work ethic.

12.2 The Relationship and Future of Work and Leisure

The social psychologist Michael Argyle (1989; 1996) considered the future of work in light of a corresponding increase in leisure time due to technological innovation, computerisation and automation. Argyle defined leisure as, 'those activities that people do in their free time, because they want to, for their own sake, for fun, entertainment, self-improvement, or for goals of their own choosing, but not for material gain' (Argyle 1996: 3). He recognised a decline of work hours, but was unsure how future scarcity would be distributed among the population. What was clear, was an unequal and unfair distribution of leisure time.

The business management guru Charles Handy (1985) understood the changing nature of work, and how increasingly full-time paid employment and the security of such a position was of the past, and that increasingly in the future, work would become more competitive, less secure and centred around freelance and flexible portfolio practices. He referred to two particular expanding areas of the labour market: the 'grey economy' was one which referred to areas of work such as DIY, cooking, gardening and knitting, that are somewhere between work and leisure. The 'mauve economy' was another, which referred to part-time and self-employed activities that developed out of hobbies, turning leisure interests into business, as in photography, writing or drawing. (Handy 1985: 46-50).

His agenda was in terms of benefiting business management, whereas for Argyle it was in terms of

understanding the future of work and its relationship with leisure, which was a major source of happiness and well-being, a foil against the stress of working.

Argyle (1989: 7-28), showed how historically these two concepts had evolved. The Greeks had held a positive doctrine of leisure, which was about self-development through education and contemplation; music, ritual, philosophy and athletics. This was supported later by a Renaissance emphasis on developing human potential, a boom in the arts, philosophy, astrology and science. Freedom from an oppressive and doctrinaire papacy.

But by the time of the Reformation and the rise of capitalism, salvation by faith and especially work, prepared the ground for the Protestant work ethic, and proving personal worth to God in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. Leisure in contrast, was associated with sloth and the devil. In the United Kingdom, prior to the Industrial Revolution there was no clear distinction between work and leisure. But as the peasants flocked to the towns and cities for work, the new capitalist and Protestant industrialists frowned upon leisure activity as idleness and drunkenness, hence the beginning of the suppression of working class culture, and the subjugation of leisure by the work ethic. Nowhere better can this be seen than in the paradox of unemployment today. Argyle insisted that, 'The unemployed have more time for leisure than those at work, but take part in less leisure of nearly every kind.... this appears to be an area where the introduction of leisure activities could make a very important contribution to one of the greatest social problems of our time' (1996: 78). He perceived this increased non-working time as problematic as it was not converted into satisfying forms of leisure.

In order to mirror the decline of work, he offered four ways forward: work sharing, workfare, weakening the work ethic and leisure that provides the satisfaction of work. The last two categories are of particular interest to the arts and their importance to society, in terms of developing people's leisure activity and knowledge.

Argyle realised that the distinction between work and leisure was difficult to delineate as both, 'may involve exactly the same activities....Some of the main differences are that leisure is more autonomous, although less when done in a group' (1989: 315-6). Therefore he distinguished between the playfulness and autonomy of leisure, and the seriousness, quality control and network of obligations attached to work. But

in reality there was more of a hybridisation. Leisure pursuits could be accompanied by very important mutual ties and responsibilities, that were not unattached from business, furthermore, new forms of capitalism have now ditched such obligations[1].

Argyle listed the psychological benefits of leisure, in terms of social identity, personality and socialisation. Leisure group membership contributed to a sense of identity and self-esteem which could allow, 'quite high levels of self-disclosure' (1996: 130). This he described as 'intimacy motivation'. But different personalities required different leisure needs. Extroversion had strong links with especially sport, whereas music and ballet were more introverted. Social skills were necessary for many types of leisure. These included: leadership, assertiveness, conversation and seeing other points of view.

The relationship of work to leisure could be shown in terms of: spillover (of work into leisure), compensation (in leisure for work) and neutrality (no relationship between the two). Spillover tended to be for those with better jobs, neutrality for those with more mundane ones. Motivation was in terms of: social gain, social learning, intrinsic motivation (the leisure pursuit in itself), self-image and identity (1996: 157).

But there were those for whom the psychological benefits of leisure and the development of such interests did not apply. He listed four groups: firstly those who had not acquired enough interests and were therefore bored (for example, the unemployed). Secondly, those who had very undemanding leisure interests (for example, television viewers). Thirdly, those whose leisure was bad for them (for example, drug addicts). Lastly, those whose leisure was bad for others (for example, football hooligans) (1996: 274).

In contrast, Hewison, when assessing the cultural landscape of 2010, argued that, 'The concept of a job for life has already vanished - by 2010, even a "career" will seem rather different. People will have to be more adaptable, more creative in their use of their time and skills. In fact they will have to become more like artists' (Hewison 2000: 21). But just as predictions of a 'post-work' society have been exaggerated, such wishful thinking has to be treated with caution.

Argyle promoted the necessity of leisure and educational counselling to ensure benefit and contended that leisure needed to be developed in terms of government policy and understanding. Furthermore, the

---

[1] see Sennett's argument for work destroying social inclusion in 12.4 & 12.5

relationship between this need and economic concerns, in terms of diluting the work ethic and creating more imaginative and flexible labour patterns, was still in its infancy.

12.3 Overwork and the Leisure Deficit

Chris Rojek (2000: 25- 35) recognised the effects of overworking on individuals and society. He cited Juliet Schor (1992: 11), who writing about American society, termed the negative effects of overworking as the leisure deficit. This was the result of pressure put on workers to maximise earnings and the obsessive cycle of work and spend, encouraged by the consumer culture. The net result included: ill-health, sleep deprivation, divorce, under-socialised and anti-social children, and listless exhaustion. The leisure deficit was a qualitative devaluation of life.

Rojek criticised Schor for overstating her case. He surmised that, 'Overwork plays a highly significant part here, but it is not the lead factor' (Rojek 2000: 27), although he considered her position as a welcome counterbalance to the post-industrial theorists who had started to predict the 'post-work' leisure society over thirty years ago. He concurred with both her and Argyle for the need to rediscover leisure, which required a dilution of the work ethic, but warned that, 'without a strong affirmation of a new leisure ethic which neutralises the work ethic by producing socially and economically acceptable criteria of time regulation, the switch to leisure will cause more problems than it solves' (2000: 35). This was due to modern technoculture and the emphasis on fast forms of leisure (computer games, Internet, fashion shopping, channel-hopping etc) which had all helped neuter sustained and meaningful leisure activity. It was this, 'growth of technoculture [that] catches the individual in ever more sophisticated interludes of fast leisure which fragment consciousness, provide an exaggerated view of human freedom, distract social consciousness and prevent transformative action' (2000: 38).

Rojek also mentioned Baudrillard (2000: 37-8), who insisted that there was no such thing as free time. Leisure was status-placing and performance orientated. He argued that leisure time was bound to the work ethic and was not an autonomous activity:

> leisure is not the availability of time, it is its **display**. Its fundamental determination is the constraint

that it be different from working time. It is not, therefore, autonomous: it is defined by the absence of working time. That difference, since it constitutes the deep value of leisure, is everywhere connoted and marked with redundancy, over-exhibited. (Baudrillard 1998: 158)

His pessimism revolved around the impossibility of wasting time through leisure as each person was tethered to time, caught up in the ethics of pressured performance.

Whichever way the leisure deficit is conceived, it reveals the negative effects of the work ethic.

12.4 Capitalism, Autonomy and Social Inclusion

Sennett (1999) further argued that work and its underpinning ethic destroyed social inclusion[2], which was situated around values of mutuality and dependency. Capitalism thrived on autonomy: 'In the current political economy, dependence is considered degrading, even to the extent that welfare state bureaucracies.... are being challenged to operate more like flexible businesses, focusing on the short term, making no guarantees, weaning people from dependency' (Sennett 1999: 27). He tried to understand the internal logic of social inclusion, which belonged to a more paternalistic brand of capitalism. Today, labour was perceived in purely contractual terms with increasingly less duty or responsibility of the employer towards the employee. He reckoned that, 'The political economy that rules us tries to put another value in place of social inclusion: autonomy. We should not reject this replacement out of hand. Autonomy is a fundamental modern value; someone in control of himself or herself commands respect' (1999: 26). Sennett (2003) also referenced his own biography, son of a poor white single mother and raised on a notorious 'sink' estate in Chicago, championing music and the values of self-help and craftsmanship, as a means for the poor and socially excluded to gain respect and progress: 'It's generally true of ghetto communities that talented kids get hassled when they stand out, their talent threatening the ethos of failure in which other children become compliant. But in the Chicago ghetto, music and musicians were the exception'. Even playing his classical instrument, the cello, was acceptable, as music was concerned with

---

[2] as set out in 2.8

the 'craftsman's self-respect' not 'brute success'. The former respected by others and challenging for the individual learner, whilst the latter craftlessness, a product of a soulless capitalism.

This self-controlled 'autonomy' of the craftsman, is completely different from 'autonomy' which as a condition and aspiration has been appropriated by the capitalist machinery.

Adorno (1970: 321), described the modernist intention behind the production of artwork, as embodied in its opposition to society which, 'art can mount only when it has become autonomous. By congealing into an entity into itself - rather than obeying existing norms and thus proving itself to be "socially useful"....[art concerned a] tacit critique of the debasement of men by a condition that is moving towards a total-exchange society'. This position was represented by the cultural industries[3]. The revolutionary changes he wanted to see, were bound up in a paradox as the more autonomous the arts became, the more this, 'leads itself to ideological abuse: arts distancing from this horrifying society also betrays an attitude of non-intervention'. In which case, the capacity of the arts to accommodate and instigate progressive social change is stymied by their autonomy and distance from those who would benefit. Furthermore this blissful vision of autonomy, appropriated by capitalist chicanery, has become an agent for delusion and exclusion. Therefore there is a lacuna between the intention of individual and collective self-control and the self-determination offered by an autonomous framework, and its reality within the socio-economic and political framework. The autonomy of modernist practice has only served to undermine a wider cultural democracy, riven by an integral elitism and exclusivity. It has seemingly failed, and its appropriation for wider hegemonic utility, places it alongside its supposed apotheosis, the cultural industries and mass culture.

An example of this social utility and lack of autonomy, was the use of war art for propaganda purposes. Merion and Susie Harries (1983), researched the First World War artists, who contained in their numbers some of the most avant-garde experimental artists of the age. This 'high' art was used, 'as a means of conveying propaganda messages to an educated minority' (Harries & Harries 1983: 74). They recognised that there was a bilateral operation at work in which the more graphic photographs and images were an attempt to influence working class opinion, whilst the more aesthetic modernist artwork an attempt to

---

[3] as set out in 9.2.2

influence educated bourgeois opinion. That 'high' art can be reduced in such fashion, questions not only its autonomy but also its progressive capability.

Autonomy can be perceived in a negative manner, particularly in relation to social exclusion, which is both complex and confusing. It obfuscates this important quality, but also reveals the power and control of modern capitalism, and the extent to which progressive modernist ideals have under-estimated its effect.

12.5 Social Intervention and Instrumental Reason

Rojek (1985: 34-82) set out the historically differing positions on the need for rational planned intervention in terms of leisure.

The interventionists were the 19th century thinkers, Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim. For Marx, as capitalism subjugated the freedom of the individual, intervention in terms of a complete revolution was necessary to ensure that everyone could enjoy leisure which was hitherto a privilege of the rich. Durkheim was a functionalist, who saw leisure as a means of correcting social problems in order to maintain the consensus. This latter paradigm encapsulates the rationale of PAT 10 and the SEU[4].

The later laissez faire or non-interventionist thinkers were Sigmund Freud and Max Weber.

Freud understood the purpose of play as affirming the existence of the unconscious. It was an expression of the pleasure principle. Rojek perceived Freud's work on the pleasure principle to be indispensable for modern leisure theory. For children, when they reached the oedipal crisis and the collision between their needs of instant gratification and the taboos of the adult world, play and pleasure became increasingly timetabled. Freud took this as his key cultural reference point in the structure of civilisation, the point at which the child internalised acceptable public behaviour. Hence the pleasure/reality principle dialectic. This struggle between the two principles, was a localised expression of the struggle between life and death instincts. Freud thought that the work and leisure pre-occupations of the masses should be manipulated by elite groups, but never followed this proposition through. This was left to the Frankfurt School with their ambitious marriage of Freud and Marx in their approach to the arts.

---

[4] see ch 3

But it is Weber, writing at the turn of the 20th century, who is of particular concern to this study. He had a fatalistic view and perceived life as intrinsically confrontational, with the individual isolated and alone. He insisted that, 'discipline inexorably takes over ever larger areas as the satisfaction of political and economic needs is increasingly rationalized...[but that] this universal phenomenon more and more restricts the importance of charisma and individually differentiated conduct' (Weber cited in Alexander 1987: 197). Jeffrey Alexander whilst assessing his Rationalisation Theory, viewed Weber as a complicated and paradoxical thinker. The basis for his rational modern scientific society, was a highly irrational religion, hence his ultimate concern, 'that scientific theory be absolved of metaphysical ambition', was in conflict with his obsession to find, 'the meaning of life' (Alexander 1987: 185). Arguably it is not possible to delineate between religion and science, which cannot be defined in such a mutually exclusive fashion. Weber (1974: 53) understood the Protestant work ethic as determining the spirit of capitalism where, 'the earning of more and more money, combined with the strict avoidance of all spontaneous enjoyment of life is.... thought of so purely as an end in itself, that from the point of view of the happiness of, or utility to, the single individual....appears entirely transcendental and absolutely irrational'. Hence religion was the irrational basis for capitalism and its rationality. He perceived bureaucracy as the template of rationality, a framework that allowed capitalism to impose a structure of control and discipline, which dominated the individual. This imposition he termed the 'iron cage' with depressing and irrational consequences for humanity. Accordingly, the end-point of this cultural development would result in '"specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved"' (1974: 182). Such pessimism is at odds with the apparent dynamic spirit of modernist progress. Bryan Turner (1992) in his analysis of Weber and this central paradoxical concept of rationalisation, contended that its origin in the irrational Protestant quest for salvation had far-reaching application. He noted the, 'contradictory relationship between formal and substantive rationality where substantive questions of value are subordinated to formal questions of logic' (Turner 1992: 115). A further dilemma was in terms of the outcome of rationalisation, which left the world void of meaning.

George Ritzer (1996) in his research into the McDonaldization of society, conceived this form of fast-food consumer consumption as an extension of Weber's concept of rationalisation. This rationality was

predicated on four basic components, 'efficiency, predictability, quantification, and control through the substitution of nonhuman for human technology' (Ritzer 1996: 20). That bureaucracy and consumption suffer from the irrationality of rationality, is realised through the dehumanisation of such systems. Therefore he concluded that, 'In Weber's view, bureaucracies are cages in the sense that people are trapped in them, their basic humanity denied. Weber feared that these systems would grow more and more rational and that rational principles would come to dominate an accelerating number of sectors of society' (1996: 21). Furthermore such rationality was a control mechanism denying human expression. The relationship between rationality and irrationality was complex and contrary with one impinging on the other, providing an arbitrary and unstable synthesis.

Rojek explained the social effects of rationalisation and the instrumental reason underpinning capitalism:

> instrumental reason…refer[s] to that form of consciousness which judges performance by economic, and bureaucratic effectiveness alone.... Thus, the value of actions was determined in terms of the effect they had in achieving rationally calculated goals. Instrumental reason under capitalism, relates wholly to narrow problem-solving issues. It carries no undertaking to achieve an organic understanding of the relationship between the problem-solving activity and the wider human whole. (2000: 36)

Therefore the danger of utilising the arts for purposes of addressing social exclusion, is that they are encased in an ideology of instrumentality which negates the very properties within the arts to affect the heart and spirit. Hence the search by Matarasso[5] for replicability, performance indicators and use of statistics to prove effectiveness with a narrow focus on particular social effects, is to the detriment of a wider human and holistic effect. He admitted incongruously, that he wanted to appeal to those bureaucrats with influence, without recognising how, by so doing, this influenced the arts activity. As Rojek commented, 'Pursuing problems instrumentally cuts off individuals from everything except their discrete area of self-interest' (2000: 36). Correspondingly, for PAT 10 and Matarasso, their pursuit of social

---

[5] as set out in chapter 5, especially 5.5.1; 5.5.2 & 5.10

impacts as a method of evaluating the impact of arts programmes, is underpinned by a very different rationale from those participating[6]. Rojek concluded that the root problem was caused by the present understanding that, 'quality delivery of service and measurable output for input are now worshipped as the precondition of effective action' (2000: 37). That the reproduction of the signs and language of performance culture, is the way to appeal to powerful bureaucracies like the DCMS and ACE, is stating the obvious, but in effect it reduces the arts to a prescription. It also undermines realistic local democracy, as this culture is parachuted onto arts groups as the progressive way to better lever finances. The equivocation of government cultural policy predicated on the concept of 'joined-up' thinking, is therefore exposed. Sennett, expanded on this discourse of instrumentality by arguing that today 'flexible capitalism', had further corroded character as it had created a victim mentality in which the authority of the individual had vanished and control over life direction and time had decreased:

> THE OLD WORK ETHIC revealed concepts of character which still matter, even if these qualities no longer find expression in labor. The old work ethic was founded on self-disciplined use of one's time, with the emphasis laid on a self-imposed, voluntary practice rather than merely passive submission to schedules or routine. (Sennett 1998: 99)

Consequently, there has been a consistent historical movement towards rational standards in the organisation of play, as leisure and work have been shaped by the same forces.

Weber argued that the rational ordering of life and the needs of capitalism had done little to advance human happiness or give meaning to life. Hence his disenchantment with industrial society. It is because instrumental reason and its companion the work ethic, so overwhelmingly dominate society (and government motive for addressing social exclusion), that his understanding is so relevant. Moreover, the irrational consequences of pursuing rational policy, particularly in light of the all pervading performance

---

[6] this was concluded in the Evaluation Case Study 7.10, where the interest in participation in art workshops was foremost as a creative outlet, not as an instrumental and rational agenda for challenging behaviour.

culture of measurement that has ensnared it, seriously questions the veracity and wisdom of top-down government cultural policy. As with evaluation, this process needs to be more democratically embedded. Consequently Ritzer's warning of the dangers of McDonaldization seem perversely prophetic.

12.6 The Play Ethic

The research has already argued the need for a leisure ethic to help neutralise the effects of the work ethic. The instrumental government cultural policy of utilising the arts to encourage the work ethic is paradoxical, as the arts are an agent that can naturally counteract the rationalisation process embedded in instrumental reason, encourage the craftsman's self-respect and help re-discover a creative and active leisure.

Owen Kelly and Eva Wojdat (1997) who researched into the social impacts of the arts using digital technology, offered a third way between work and leisure. Here the merging of work and leisure allowed participants to attain the relevant work skills within a creative environment:

> Our research showed that the acquisition of new technological skills occurred in three distinct ways. Some people learnt new skills because they were taught them as part of a course or project....Other people taught themselves, simply by being in a position to play with the relevant hardware or software ....A third group....learned through observing their peers, and asking questions of them.
> (Kelly & Wojdat 1997: 27).

These projects were based on a leisure framework where social impact indicators were perceived, 'as an apparent by-product of the creative process' (1997: 7). This enabled a broader section of stakeholders to realise relevant social outcomes and was therefore highly inclusive.

This merging of work and play through technology was described by Pat Kane (2000). He argued for a play ethic, which was a re-alignment of work and leisure. It was due to the pressures of work that we had little time for family, and community as, 'we subject ourselves to routines and duties which at best seem pointless, at worst unethical or immoral'. In line with post-industrial thinkers, he failed to comprehend the necessity or utility of a work ethic, as the technological revolution now allowed the necessary socio-

economic change. He envisaged play classically, 'as the great philosophers understood it: the experience of being an active creative and fully autonomous person'. Kane contrasted this attitude of play with that of passive leisure consumption, a response to the stress created by the work ethic which, 'was always about battering down our responses, regimenting our behaviour - all those Christian inhibitions that were drilled into the 18th and 19th century worker, so that he could divide himself (and his labours) for the better workings of industry'. Play had unfortunately, 'been corralled into the pen of "leisure" and "entertainment".....Or it has been infantilised as an immature state of being, a permissible excess in the young, which all serious adults must put behind them'.

He envisaged a brave new world of technological 'players' which required proper financing of the public sector and a, 'welfare system that invested in and sustained our non-working lives rather than distrusted and demonised them'. This necessitated a reduction of the working week, a re-alignment of educational aims in schools, and the equitable distribution of jobs. Society could therefore match its own technological capability. Moreover, he likened the new digital generation of twentysomethings as possessing a different mentality towards work which better synthesised it with play. He recognised the progressive, creative and empowering influence of such digital innovation as it promoted shared ideas and challenged concepts of individual property rights, which contrasted with Rojek who perceived technoculture as bound up with consumerism and negating democracy (2000: 40). Even so, Kane was concerned that utilising culture and education for work related ends, drove a work-based personal development philosophy ensnared within the work ethic[7].

Nonetheless, he recognised no contradiction in this play ethic giving people back their lives within a new framework of capitalism. This was because it required a very similar regard for re-skilling those excluded at the bottom end of society. He insisted that the post-school generation were rejecting contemporary labour, precisely because the work ethic had become all pervading. But so have generations before, all to be re-incorporated into a new and re-branded capitalism (as in the case of counter cultural hippies like Anita Roddick and Richard Branson), leaving the work ethic unscathed. That aside, Kane believed that, 'an

---

[7] this is not unlike Inglis' criticism of empowerment, see 11.2

education for creativity which wanted to be truly "inclusive" would have to listen to this elemental and popular desire for playfulness'. Like Boal before him[8], he saw a precedent in the pre-industrial carnivals and festivals enjoyed by local communities, and linked modern day drug culture to this need for an alternative utopia, an escape from the reality of the work ethic. Support for Kane's position again depends on how optimistic it is possible to be in light of modern capitalism, and the extent to which technoculture is part of the problem. In many ways these concerns reflect the differences between the Birmingham and Frankfurt Schools[9].

Dissanayake took another approach to the problem, specifically in terms of the social location of the arts. She likened the arts, which she perceived as a biological need, to play[10]:

> Art, as I know it from aesthetics and art history classes, is 'nonutilitarian', 'for its own sake' ....Art, like play, was not "real" but pretend: the actor playing Hamlet did not really stab the actor playing Polonius. Art made exquisite use of surprise and ambiguity....Art, like play, was something extra, an embellishment, an enhancement to life. (Dissanayake 1992: 43-4)

That the arts should be conceived within a play framework, was also related to practising the required skills needed for survival. In young animals this included, 'skills that eventually enable them to find food, defend themselves, and mate, among other adult necessities. Also – importantly – in play they learn how to get along with others' (1992: 44).

The relationship of art to play is more obvious in non-western societies. Dissanayake, took a cross-cultural perspective and considered the western understanding aberrant. One of the reasons was due to the, 'excessive sense of art....being an individual pursuit, an autonomous activity' (Dissanayake cited in Gablik 1995: 47). This was a sign of the dysfunctional nature of western society, which was inharmonious environmentally. It was also a sign that 'high' art had become removed from humanity.

---

[8] see Theatre of the Oppressed case study 9.5.5
[9] see 10.2
[10] see 11.3.2

The play ethic, whether steeped in a universal and symbolic anthropological understanding of culture, or in modern technological reality, persists, despite the overbearing work ethic and rationalisation of society. Also active leisure pursuits (including the arts) enable the creation of fully autonomous players, which can be contrasted with the negative autonomous effects of capitalism. Notwithstanding, play is the most obvious and natural location for the arts which needs to be recognised in light of seemingly 'abnormal' leisure practices, which are not unrelated to this rationalised autonomy.

12.7 Abnormal Leisure

Jeremy Seabrook (1988) was concerned with 'abnormal leisure'. He reviewed the historical changes in Britain, from an exclusive leisure class to a more inclusive leisure society, and was disturbed by a particular feature of leisure, 'which emerges from people's discussion of their chosen activity and this is that many of them speak as though it drove them. It is, they tell you, addictive. You get obsessed, it takes you over, you get hooked, it becomes a way of life, it gets out of control' (Seabrook 1988: 7).

More recently Rojek referred to the medicalisation of life[11], in terms of how behaviour and moral conduct were socially controlled. He recognised that this perception had affected abnormal modes of leisure. His argument was that: 'leisure cultures are often significant causal factors in explaining drug abuse, alcoholism, dangerous sexualities, violence and murder. Further, in kow-towing to the legalized, medicalized model of deviant leisure we fail to see the continuities between deviant leisure practice and ordinary, "normal" leisure practice' (2000: 147). This 'abnormal leisure' (which could slide into criminal activity) was an opportunity for members of society to let off steam and, 'may be defined as pushing limit experience so that it threatens the self or others' (2000: 176). It included liminal leisure, moral transcendence and edgework.

Liminal sites allowed individuals to stand outside the structures of society thus allowing critical reflection. He cited Victor Turner: 'Liminal phenomena....are often subversive, representing radical critiques of the cultural structures and proposing utopian alternative models' (cited in Rojek 2000: 148). Examples include

---

[11] described in the Outsider Art case ch 5

the hippie culture of the 1960s and the beat culture of the 1950s[12]. Rojek argued that,

> Traditional society supported 'antistructures' of time and space in which individuals could stand outside the axioms and conventions of the day. In these liminal zones, collective ritual and symbolic behaviour enabled emotional discharge from the ordinary restraints of everyday life. The effect of liminal activity was not to transform society, but to re-inforce it by providing a safety valve for the release of excess emotions and energies. (2000: 161)

Other areas of 'abnormal leisure' including moral deviance and edgework, seem more threatening to both society and individual. Criminal conduct is an obvious example of moral deviance and, 'the desire to transcend the general moral restrictions and "timidity" of the times.' Edgework referred to, 'large numbers of people in their leisure devot[ing] themselves to risk-taking activities.' (2000: 151) These perilous recreations seeking excitement were reactions to the control and conformity of everyday life. Such activities included bungee jumping, sky diving, or unprotected sex.

Rojek included invasive, mephitic and wild categories of abnormality, all of which helped define leisure in a more negative manner. He concluded that, 'human beings are attracted to behaviour which goes beyond limits, because the limits of everyday life often seem arbitrary' (2000: 195).

This seems like a window of opportunity for the creative arts. But there is a danger that these moralistic implications will create an ethical rod for the back of leisure activities and the arts, if they are utilised functionally in a Durkheimian fashion, to address such 'abnormality'.

Andrew Brighton (2000: 40), by comparing New Labour cultural policy with that of Soviet Socialist Realism, sought to portray the dangers of a, 'policy guided by misplaced social piety'. Utilising the arts instrumentally to help normalise society also ran the risk of moralising British culture. The effect of which, 'is to demote not just dissenting culture but also aesthetic integrity' (2000: 40-1). Utilising the arts to address social exclusion, especially if this involves 'abnormal leisure', therefore becomes an ethical

---

[12] the youth counterculture of the 1960's is discussed in the Reggae Music case in 10.5.7

straightjacket, presuming that a moralistic society will result.

Matarasso, on the other hand, took a more communitarian stance: 'It would be wrong and pointless to try to impose limits on artistic freedom, but responsibility is freedom's shadow, and we should be thinking much more about the implications of artistic practice' (Matarasso 2000a: 70). He stressed the normality of artists who were neither a 'priestly caste' or detached from the moral ties and responsibilities that constitute society, a much needed foil to the individualism of the liberal arts establishment.

Practising the arts can have a natural counter cultural disposition, in terms of protest and lifestyle. They are part excluded and part included, precisely because they are difficult to contain within any particular framework. They can also be obsessive and are linked to a mythical hedonism, which sets them up to be perceived as 'abnormal leisure' practices.

The increased extent of abnormal and dangerous leisure forms, shows the need for people to escape the 'iron cage'. The necessity of rediscovering leisure is the best foundation for investing in the arts within a paradigm of play, as a balance to this rationalised capitalism. The arts are necessarily counter cultural. But it asks a lot of the arts to effect any real change, or of a rationalised society to fund such programmes.

12.8 A Counterculture

Just as the arts need to be participatory and active, so does the intellectual, who the writer Edward Said (1993: 17) understood, 'belongs on the same side with the weak and unrepresented'. He very clearly stated this as a choice:

> whether to be allied with the stability of the victors and rulers, or - the more difficult path - to consider the stability as a state of emergency threatening the less fortunate with the danger of complete extinction, and taken into account the experience of subordination itself, as well as the memory of forgotten voices and persons. (1993: 26)

The socially excluded are the subordinated voices and persons in our society, who arguably cannot be represented by those in positions of power who, whether consciously or not, may have colluded in their

exclusion.

Likewise the arts, which allow individual and collective criticism of the status quo. By positioning them within a leisure paradigm and in opposition to the work ethic, they thereby retain this important function. Even from a normative Durkheimian perspective, the arts may best serve social inclusion by allowing an escape valve from the pressures created by the work ethic (as in liminal leisure activity). By focusing on creative leisure, this may better enable integration of the excluded into society. Such liminal practice refers to the evolution of alternative thought and action. Rojek assessed the history of political movements from taverns and public spaces:

> one of the serious features of leisure is that it constitutes the time and space in which cultural values can be objectified and subject to reflexive investigation.... The loosening of inhibitions in these leisure and recreational spaces led to questioning the values underpinning normality and posed the question of change.... the relaxation of inhibitions in these spaces is one reason why they are attractive to people and often challenging to orthodox and official social values. (2000:147-8)

The problem then becomes one of the degree to which this counter cultural paradigm is within a Durkheimian functional synthesis[13], supporting the status quo, or the extent to which it is concerned with really transforming that perspective. The arts vacillate between the two, on the one hand the standard bearer of civilisation and tradition; on the other its greatest critic and advocator of change.

12.9 Engaged Freedom

Rojek argued for an engaged freedom. He concluded that, 'it is a feature of modernization to raise utopian hopes while delivering a dystopian lifeworld' (2000: 196). He thought it wrong that governments should engage in a policy to, 'socialize and train our populations to expect or experience lifelong adult paid labour between the ages of 18 and 65. The economy no longer requires it' (2000: 210). This is further evidence

---

[13] as the rite of passage concept of incorporation set out in the Reggae Music case study attests in 10.5.7

suggesting that cultural policies to address social exclusion which are geared towards employment, are misconstrued. The positioning of lifelong learning, as well as a critical and creative understanding, within a leisure or play ethic, would counter and dilute the work ethic. People would be able to develop according to their needs, which would allow, even help create, a more socially cohesive and inclusive society.

Rojek (2000: 207-9) argued for an ethically constructed and durable leisure policy, not one that is in response to the work ethic, but one in which the aspirations, care, rights and needs of citizens are bound in mutual respect, which requires that leisure is re-discovered. This would allow an 'engaged freedom'. Unfortunately, as he recognised, the power and influence of commodity capitalism make this ideal very difficult to realise.

12.10 Summary

Traditionally, leisure has been seen as a refuge from work and in a symbiotic and supplicant relationship to it. This chapter reviewed their relationship, in order to socially locate the arts.

Argyle argued that the psychological benefits of leisure were a balance to the negative effects of work. This included the need to weaken the work ethic to embrace the changing nature and future decline of work, the result of technological innovation. Unfortunately, the distribution of leisure time was far from equitable, with ironically, those without work taking less part in leisure activity. He further explained the evolution of concepts of work and leisure, and the historical division of the terms which occurred after the Industrial Revolution. This was synchronous with the subjugation of working class culture, as the new capitalist and Protestant industrialists associated leisure activity with idleness. This has left a vacuum which has since been filled by mass culture.

Similarly, Schor emphasised the negative effects of excessive working, the leisure deficit, and extent to which this was destroying the fabric of society. She proposed a need to rediscover leisure. Rojek argued the need for a new leisure ethic, but was concerned at the extent to which modern technoculture and the emphasis on fast forms of leisure, negated meaningful recreational activity. Baudrillard (after Weber) took the most pessimistic line, arguing that leisure time was status placing and bound to the work ethic, not separate.

Sennett attacked a more recent caustic brand of autonomous capitalism and concomitant work ethic, for destroying social inclusion. Previously, more paternalistic forms of capitalism had been embedded in values of dependency and mutuality, where self-help and craftsmanship prospered. Leisure in terms of the arts were the site for this self-controlled autonomy, very different from the overbearing craftless ethic of brute success. He suggested that work now increasingly concerned autonomy, just as Adorno had perceived the struggles of the modernist arts movement. It was this concept of autonomy, through which an ideological battle is being played out, that affects the utility of the arts, and concepts of inclusion.

Rojek set out the arguments and personalities behind those who advocated rational planned intervention in terms of leisure, and those who did not. The conservative functionality of Durkheim and instrumental revolution of Marx were contrasted with non-interventionists, Freud and especially Weber. His Theory of Rationalisation revealed the paradoxical nature of society, showing the irrationality of instrumental purpose.

Kelly and Wodjak when investigating the social impacts of the arts using digital technology, showed how a mixture of taught and play orientated learning, successfully allowed the acquisition of work based and creative skills. Kane argued the need for a creative play ethic, to supplant the work ethic. The alienation of people from their inner needs and abilities, helped deny the development of self-directed and autonomous citizens. Dissanayake perceived such autonomy as proof of the extent to which the 'high' arts and western society had become environmentally inharmonious, dysfunctional and removed from humanity. Play was a natural phenomenon found in animals, related to rehearsing the skills of survival. Furthermore it was steeped in a collective understanding and practice.

Leisure ironically, once seen as a sign of moral decadence by puritanical Christians, was still perceived as central to anti-social behaviour and self-harm. Rojek referred to several different forms of 'abnormal leisure' which was a reaction to a highly mechanistic and controlled society. But risk-taking activities and the transcendence of morality, have always been a part of the hedonistic mythology of artists, traditionally situated on the fringes of society. They have been part excluded and part included, precisely because the arts are difficult to contain within any particular framework, falling between work and play, pleasure and reality, fact and fiction. The increasing extent of dangerous leisure forms, shows the need to escape the

'iron cage', and best advocates the re-discovery of leisure through investing in the arts within a paradigm of play, as a balance to a rationalised capitalism. But this places the arts into an ethical straightjacket, and assumes as Brighton recognised, that a moralistic society will prevail. The role of the arts is more counter cultural, as investment in leisure life is seen as secondary to work and wealth creation.

The future may hint at a post-work leisure society, but this underestimates the ability of new forms of capitalism to re-embed themselves into society. The autonomous classical 'player', seems a distant legend, as more invidious forms of capitalism have appropriated leisure whilst denying creativity and self-development. Only through an engaged freedom, in which cultural rights are respected, can leisure be liberated from the shadow of the work ethic, which has appropriated and commodified it.

How they interact in future will also have an enormous effect on inclusion. Whether this will translate, as Hewison and Kane suggested, into more creative and leisure-orientated working practices, or as Rojek suggested, into increasingly abnormal and negative leisure experience and practice, remains to be seen.

The extent to which the arts function as normalising agents within a Durkheimian template, or as counter cultural agents of transformation, resistance and engaged freedom, changing that very template, is crucial. But cultural policy is unlikely to advocate the latter, in which case Weber's non-interference, seems highly appropriate. As Giraud[14] recognised, cultural policy tends to serve those who have already acquired culture and money, but without it, there would be no opportunity to rectify this injustice, leaving the excluded further adrift.

Worryingly, the dominance of newer brands of capitalism and instrumentality, personified by Ritzer's McDonaldization of society, portray a bleak landscape. The mantra of efficiency, predictability and quantification, is very much the legacy of a performance culture stranglehold that permeates all areas of society. Hence the social location of the arts is at best liminal, located on the edge of normality in order to escape from it.

---

[14] see 9.2.1

Chapter 13 Analysis and Conclusion

Social and Cultural Exclusion

Part One investigated the concept of social exclusion, which Room (1995) noted lacked any clear or formal definition. The term can be applied to a locality, lack of resources or opportunities, communities or individuals. It is process orientated, multi-dimensional and heavily inter-related with other institutional, economic and political concerns. There also needs to be a distinction made between the epithet of 'social exclusion' being attached to a person, and that person's recognition of this condition. Becker studied the sociology of deviance, and used the term 'outsider', to denote someone unable to live by the rules of the group:

> But the person who is thus labelled an outsider may have a different view of the matter. He may not accept the rule by which he is being judged and may not regard those who judge him as either competent or legitimately entitled to do so. Hence, a second meaning of the term emerges: the rule-breaker may feel his judges are outsiders. (Becker 1973: 1-2)

This not only sums up the relative and constructed nature of the concept of social exclusion, but can also be applied analogously to a formative evaluation methodology utilised for assessing the social impact of arts programmes. Issues of control, empowerment, enfranchisement and emancipation help determine inclusion. But this has to be negotiated with the excluded. Empowerment cannot be decided by a third party (manager or government bureaucrat), such change has to be voluntary and transparent.

Notwithstanding, addressing social exclusion is not the same as creating a more inclusive society. It does not necessarily follow that the one leads to the other. Ironically, the use of the term social exclusion was due to governmental dislike of the language of poverty. But in order to help modify society in such a way, economic considerations in terms of equity and re-distribution have to be tackled, otherwise such rhetoric about an inclusive society becomes merely a public relations exercise.

Part Three investigated cultural exclusion which is an even trickier term. Bourdieu's (1984) concept of

cultural capital is a convenient starting point, as he recognised that it consisted of both a quantitative and qualitative element, as well as an inherited and learnt aspect. The research has revealed the complex relationship between terms of exclusion and inclusion, and the need for a wider socio-political framework of reference. The extent to which cultural capital reflects these concerns is only activated within the social forum. As Robbins stated,

> our social positions are only modified by our cultural tastes in as much as the cultural system assigns more value to some tastes than to others. We are not intrinsically altered by preferring Mozart over Morrissey or Manet over Man Ray, but the judgements of value made between our preferences within the cultural system affect our position within that system and have consequences for both our economic and social position-taking. (Robbins 2000: 32)

In which case social inclusion is related to such cultural signification and specific cultural capital.

Accordingly Goodlad et al' s (2002) report for the SAC, contained the claim that evidence of art in the community was in itself proof of a more inclusive community, and that poorer exluded constituencies were cultural deserts. Not unsurprisingly, the Arts Council understood that addressing social exclusion was not its primary concern and that this focus could undermine art (Tambling 2000), as for example, it was more important to encourage innovative cultural production. This reflects a position which has historically maintained a bilateral concept of the arts, as described in relation to the Community Arts Movement, where the social aesthetic and 'common' culture were deemed separate and inferior to a 'higher' aesthetic culture. The Arts Council has concluded that the value of the arts to assist instrumental extrinsic concerns can be considered a dimension of social inclusion in itself (Jermyn 2001), which leaves its cultural citadel intact. Inclusion on these terms is about education into 'high' culture and accruing cultural capital, as dictated by the Council. It still shows a distaste for a wider cultural democracy.

Breaking the cycle of cultural exclusion (or lack of capital) is highly relevant, but it is the process and manner through which this is remedied that is the educational battleground. There is a crucial distinction between participating as an active creative agent or as a passive consumer of somebody else's framework

of the arts and culture. It is the taking part that emancipates from the excluding cycle and allows control to be taken over what has been created. The arts are not only participatory, they allow a vital critical perception and are a vehicle for its expression. But this process is a very dangerous one if it is conceived in terms of assimilation and normalisation, with overtones of cultural imperialism and racism.

Ultimately, the thesis questioned whether such an individuated and ontologically insecure society as described by Giddens (1991), moulded in an exclusive framework, has the will to change. That the excluded already serve a social and cultural function helps explain the nature of society, dominated by an exclusive 'high' culture (albeit with its hegemony under pressure from mass culture) and determined by the iniquitous economics of capitalism. The arguments for cultural democracy, have historically been concerned with combating a culturally exclusive perspective and agenda, in which the term 'quality' has supported a particular aristocracy of culture and corresponding form of cultural capital. Such democracy is crucial in the context of this research, particularly as the arts were in some cases perceived as an irrelevance with regards to social inclusion, again as reported to the SAC (Goodlad et al 2002).

Only by promoting the arts in broader and more pluralistic frameworks can such prejudice be tackled. But such idealism fails to recognise that in reality, the arts have been appropriated to signify difference in society, which is in oblique opposition to any socially inclusive purpose. Hence they are central to an ideological battle.

From another more holistic perspective, a necessary social function of the arts is to counterbalance an excessively rationalised society which alienates and dehumanises its citizens, a causal factor of exclusion in its many guises. Consequentially the arts need to be counter cultural, but a counter cultural government policy is an oxymoron (or at the very best highly unlikely).

Both concepts of social and cultural exclusion are far from straightforward, and it is important to consider the yin and yan relationship between the terms of inclusion and exclusion. One needs the other in order to be defined. Inclusion cannot be realised without exclusion and vice versa. Accordingly, the irony was not lost on Eagleton who aptly described,

> a pluralist culture....[as] exclusivist, since it must shut out the enemies of pluralism. And since marginal

communities tend to find the larger culture stiflingly oppressive, often with excellent reason, they can come to share the distaste for the habits of the majority which is an abiding feature of 'high' or aesthetic culture. (2000: 42)

There is no clear definition of these terms which tend to ebb and flow. Inclusion can be exclusivist, whilst exclusion can create a solidarity of common interests. The case studies on Outsider Art and Reggae Music exemplified this and underlined the strange and contrary relationship between these positions.

Evaluation Methodology

Part Two examined programme evaluation methodology, itself a hugely contested area, to better understand how the process can be utilised for inclusive purpose. Initially, the research intended to discover an equitable evaluatory template, but such idealism soon became bogged down in the politics of the process and concomitant paradigm wars. Evaluation as a method is only as value-free and neutral as those who design, fund and control it. An equitable democratic evaluative process which directly empowers the excluded, is dependent on participant control and self-determination, which although difficult, can be realised through concepts of evaluation as empowerment, critical reflection and practical hermeneutics (Everitt 1997; Fetterman 1996; Gregory 2000; Schwandt 1997; Vanderplaat 1996). Unfortunately, the agenda of utilising the arts for the purpose of addressing social exclusion, as advocated by PAT 10 (1999; 2000; 2001), was intended as a means of communicating with bureaucratic organisations who financially determine projects and was shaped by government policy. Moreover, because the evaluation process is one of advocacy, a game of levering resources, telling funders what they want to hear impinges on, even discredits the evidence. These problems were made apparent in the Evaluation Case, where evaluation was predicated on showing how a multi-arts programme addressed offending behaviour. It found little conclusive evidence to prove such an impact, but was able to advocate to funders the importance of such programmes to do so.

Beyond a laudable concern for clear evaluation procedure, little research has been undertaken to answer the conundrum of self-direction and management. Even New Labour as Stated by Smith in the introduction,

expressed a view that the excluded should run regeneration programmes themselves. How control of the process can be ceded to the participants is an overriding concern and highly symbolic of the process of inclusion. In order to understand and value programme effect, it has to be assessed from an emic perspective, as part of the hermeneutic process which empowers and enables those involved. As Schwandt (2000: 191) reckoned, 'To find meaning in an action, or to say one understands what a particular action means, requires that one interpret in a particular way, what the actors are doing'. In order to empower participants, they should be the judge of whether social impact evaluation objectives and processes are integral and a consequence of the arts, furthermore, they should determine the relative importance of these impacts. Again, in practice, this process is difficult to implement because of the short-term nature of arts projects and long-term nature of ownership outcomes. The intrinsic difficulty for the excluded to take ownership, is precisely because of their exclusion.

Matarasso (1996a; 1997) in particular created a raft of guidelines on how to evaluate social impacts, which have become an orthodoxy. But these run the risk of pre-determining outcomes for community arts programmes, thereby overriding local control and empowerment. Notwithstanding, the cyclical responsive focusing of evaluative method introduced by Lincoln and Guba's Fourth Generation Evaluation (1989), challenged the quasi-scientific control of programmes by evaluators and managers, by assuming a relativist and contextual value and reality. Such responsive focusing allows the participants to influence and control the direction of the programme and evaluation. Matarasso's reports (1998a; 1998b) in particular lacked a plural voice, which was exacerbated by his use of statistical methods and social auditing, and conspired to take control from participants, quantifying their qualitative experience. Responsive focusing was controlled by him the expert.

Evaluations are funder and management driven, which helps justify Long et al's (2002) claim that such a government policy agenda of utilising the arts to aid social inclusion can too easily become a form of social engineering. Their report found no evidence to prove that arts programmes reduced social exclusion, especially in terms of long-term benefit. Moreover Carpenter (1999), was convinced that participation depended on artistic and creative needs, not instrumental social impacts, and that this was the crucial motivation that ensured project completion.

The central tenet that evaluation is a political process stands, hence the need for transparency in order that value can be distilled and separated from issues of power and control. That evaluation remains such a hidden political tool is testament to this failure. Notwithstanding, if the social function of the arts is considered as an expression of our radical heritage, this is neglected by evaluating within a measured performance framework. As Tristram Hunt and Giles Fraser (2003) argued, British cultural heritage is not necessarily conservative, 'league tables and targets do not stimulate us to ask again the big questions of liberty, justice and democracy'. Issues concerning social inclusion have to.

Although the excluded require a local and democratic evaluation framework, by definition this cannot be determined or realistically encouraged by bureaucratic structures steeped in hierarchy. In reality, due to funder and managerial pressure, the time, space and finance is unlikely to be made available to allow the equitable evaluative framework advocated in this research. This impacts on policy considerations.

Leisure Framework for the Arts

In Part Four, the thesis explored the increasing need for a leisure and play framework in which to socially locate the arts. It concluded that such a template was unrealistically counter cultural within an advanced capitalist system. The irony was that present technological capability could liberate people from the work ethic, but that society was embedding itself in ever more mercenary and paternalistic forms of capitalism, thereby re-enforcing its stranglehold. Furthermore Sennett (1998; 1999) suggested that it was this form of entrepreneurial capitalism that was a major cause of social exclusion. Rojek (2000) recognised that abnormal leisure practices have appeared in response to the increasing rationalisation of society in which we live and argued the need for a leisure policy, beyond instrumental agendas. This research concurs with regards to the arts, but it is unable to conceive how this could be implemented without a weakening of the work ethic and massive structural changes. Therefore the arguments regarding emancipation, empowerment and need, whilst being practical methods of inclusion, are unrealistic, due to their particular ideological grounding. Notwithstanding Dissanayake (1992) argued that creativity was a biological need and art a behaviour. Both needed to be ritually expressed in order to help articulate cultural identity. But western 'high' art had obfuscated these properties in order to support and cherish exclusivity.

Arts and Cultural Policy

New Labour's policy initiatives concerning the arts and social inclusion, were set out in Part One of this thesis, but they seem grossly inadequate, partly stymied by their rigid instrumentality. There is a need to rediscover leisure, which can only be achieved if it is treated as a policy aim in itself. The arts should be a significant part of a progressive cultural policy that addresses many of the concerns set out in this research. They need to be separated from use value and as a vehicle for work related ends, although in some cases there is a natural instrumentality that will develop accordingly, as Kelly and Wodjat (1997) recognised in their research into the digital arts, which can be encouraged. This difference between natural and synthetic utility is a major consideration. So much of the New Labour agenda, and the social impact research of Matarasso failed to recognise this, advocating much ill-conceived synthetic instrumentality.

Although this investigation has been strongly influenced by a non-interventionist position, a reaction to current and past policy, such an approach is dangerously elitist. But both New Labour, through its instrumentality, and the Arts Council, through its questionable democratisation of 'high' culture, have failed to rediscover leisure. For the arts this requires active participation, respect for taste, diversity and value within an equitable pluralistic and culturally democratic framework. There needs to be a social matrix within which creativity, artistic excellence and expression can be embedded, beyond a self-referential inaccessibility. Pearson and Podeschi (1999) made the dictinction between individuality and individualism. Public money spent on the arts should be aimed at the whole population and encourage individuality, a recognition of the individual within the social framework and promote correspondingly democratic methods of evaluatory self-management. Unfortunately, this is highly idealistic and fails to appreciate why so much of the public sphere has been privatised.

With regards to the policy of inclusion, there is a paradox. By utilising and evaluating participatory arts groups in order to help integrate the excluded back into existing socio-political structures, they support the status quo. Such an understanding may not aid inclusion, just further exclude, as it is precisely those structures of the status quo that are a major causal root of the exclusion. Hence, secondly, if the social function of the arts is to enable stakeholders and emancipate them in such a manner that allows them to start taking control of their lives, and challenge the aforementioned structures, then these need to be

adjusted. Control over artistic production and the evaluation process can invigorate and empower excluded stakeholders. Such cultural and evaluative democracy is also highly symbolic in terms of wider inclusive intention.

This former scenario is embedded in a Durkheimian paradigm and reflects New Labour's cultural policy which can be recognised as, 'primarily defined in relation to exclusion from the formal labour market' (Williams 2002: 203), not on the wider issue of social participation, as set out by INPART (2001) with concomitant stakeholder learning and empowerment. Here the arts have a conservative function, returning the excluded back into the same iniquitous society from which they have been excluded. This is also wrongly predicated on the mythically homogeneous 1950's society, not on the heterogeneous 2000's.

The research set out to produce a realistic arts policy guideline. It has been unable to do so, due to the aforementioned considerations. Too often as Giraud (1982) commented, cultural policy considers those who already have culture and money, supporting the existing hegemony. Furthermore, as this research has shown in the Outsider and Arts Education in Prison Cases, when money is allocated for those less fortunate, it is packaged in a 'welfare' framework, with those in authority unable to dispense power and control to those whose inclusion requires exactly that. So arts and cultural policy are unable to deliver in the ways suggested in this thesis, as this requires a counter cultural mindset that challenges the hierarchical foundation of both policy and society. Moreover, the field is complex and contradictory, so even if the necessary conditions could be realised in practice, and a suitably civil society possible, policy is still problematic. The research is therefore left on the horns of a dilemma, more a ground clearance exercise trying to broaden knowledge of the domain, than able to recommend any realistic policy considerations as originally intended.

The empowerment and emancipation of the excluded may help create a more inclusive society, but this requires greater democratisation of culture and power, as well as greater equalisation of wealth, none of which is properly reflected in government policy nor likely to be. It is possibly the concept of an inclusive society that is misplaced, anathema for British society which is historically class bound and increasingly determined by ever more exclusive and excluding brands of capitalism.

The Illogic of the Arts

The arts possibly reflect a more magical pre-scientific conception of the world, which may be risible in today's rational technoculture, but ironically, such an ideal is still embedded in the western 'high' art canon. In terms of transformation, creativity, empowerment, self-worth and emancipation, these all involve degrees of external and internal change, vested individually in a spiritual domain moreso than any rational one.

Similarly, the functional habitus can be criticised for its overbearing hegemony. Bourdieu's (1984) social construction of taste albeit brilliant, appears parsimonious and patronising. That the working class or excluded are disinterested and unconcerned with spirituality and alternative non-materialistic cosmologies, even superstitions is untrue. Their lives may be filled with mundane and instrumental concerns, but this is the result of socio-economic conditions not vice-versa. According to the bible and research entitled *The Widow's Might*, the poorer in society give more generously to charity with a higher proportion of their income than the wealthy (Ward 2001b), the reversal of a mundane functional mindset. Such irrationality in terms of fascination with popular astrology for instance, is still at the heart of our rational society, as are the arts and culture. The arts may well aid inclusion, but not necessarily on the terms set out by a rational government cultural policy.

The Original Hypothesis

The research has shown that there is no definitive social function of the arts in Britain, as the term is multi-layered, mutable and dependent on ideological intention. Likewise, the extent to which they legitimate social difference or integrate the socially excluded.

But what ties the three processes of social inclusion, evaluation method and cultural inclusion, is key to this dilemma. Firstly, human agency. Any process of inclusion requires active participation. Creative production as against passive cultural consumption, as well as direct involvement in evaluation processes in order to shape and determine the wider community, even society, in some fashion. Secondly, the democratisation of the power structures which itself is dependent on human agency. Thirdly, as Stuart Hall and Paddy Whannel (1998: 63) described in relation to 1960's popular culture, the need to distinguish

between the, 'contradictory mixture of the authentic and the manufactured', encouraging a more discriminating audience.

But unfortunately, the New Labour agenda between 1997 and 2002, although it promoted active engagement and production, was undermined by encouraging passive consumption. Capitalism is integral to such consumption and active participation is a possible defence against such a condition. This has not been properly recognised by the SEU or PAT 10, and is conspicuously absent from government discourse. Furthermore, managerial practices concerned with performance measures have consolidated existing power structures, not democratised them.

The agenda surrounding discrimination and criticality, is the linchpin of the 'high' art habitus, with the judge as evaluator and management decision-maker. That such a precious and powerful tool can be democratised, challenges a rationalised capitalist society and bureaucratic arts institutions.

Such empowerment of the excluded therefore seems incompatible with New Labour's initiatives. Society is exclusive, and in the main economically and work ethically determined. To fail to recognise so, places much onto the shoulders of the arts in terms of their capacity to socially include. The government has ironically, always represented such exclusive values, hence the excessive overpopulation of prisons and ambivalence even hostility, towards asylum seekers (two highly excluded communities). That the arts are utilised as a cheap form of social glue and no more, underestimates and neuters their more radical possibilities, especially their capacity to enable all citizens to express their cultural and social rights. Government policy has suffered from its own narrow definition of exclusion. The ability of the arts to transform and include does not fit into a pre-determined position. The arts do not work to prescription, they liberate, enable new perspectives and foster a critical awareness. The effect cannot be mechanically calculated, as Moriarty (1997) suggested, because it is of a personal and value orientated nature.

The initial research hypothesis implied that the social function of the arts was dependent on and maintained the cultural consensus. The subsequent research has shown that this is hard to deny, furthermore, that the SEU and PAT 10 agenda of utilising the arts to address social inclusion is itself supportive of this hegemony. Ironically, there is a danger that the instrumental use of the arts will exacerbate exclusion. Education may encourage mobility of taste, but this is a long-term process, unlike the short-term nature of

many participatory arts programmes. Such reasoning has underpinned Arts Council philosophy for many years as already stated, in order to democratise 'high' culture. But it is debatable whether this policy has been successful. As the arts educationalist Gillian Moore claimed, 'we are in danger of creating a two-tier system – the rich get performances and exhibitions, the poor get .... workshops' (Moore cited in Everitt 1997:135), which partly reflects Bourdieu's social definition of the arts as distinction or of function, but does nothing to remedy this inequality. The arts cannot be restricted instrumentally to the narrow SEU agenda and definition of social inclusion, which was illustrated through retrospective reference to the Community Arts Movement. Its radical political edge and a cynicism towards the western canon of art, spawned a conscious cultural activism. That such a tradition can meekly subjugate and supplicate itself to a government agenda seems bizarre, especially as it is the established community arts organisations that have created the infrastructure for participatory arts programmes. To deny this and argue that such an understanding is impractical in terms of currying favour with government, bureaucrats or funders, ignores this reality. It fails to comprehend how the arts operate on participants and effect those involved, but most blatantly, it disregards the polemical disposition of the community arts, which were in opposition to an exclusive and inaccessible art world. The participatory arts are able to include and affect in a therapeutic fashion (besides their more radical capabilities), which is neither a remedy or excuse for the wider injustices that exist in society. An arts based group activity may be able to alter the dynamics and thinking within the group, but it is powerless to tackle wider structural injustices in society, particularly, if as Matarasso (1997) implied, cultural activism and political education are not deemed relevant. The case study on the Theatre of the Oppressed assumed a radical social revolutionary position as the only means of combating exclusion. Even so Boal eventually moderated this ideal position, embedding his dramaturgy in a more individuated psychological domain. Unfortunately in reality, such an egalitarian position is not sustainable.

In contrast, the Evaluation and Arts Education in Prison case studies, showed how well the arts function at helping excluded prisoners cope with the immediate stress of their environment, encouraging survival. Notwithstanding, the subjective nature of the arts can have a huge transformational impact on certain people, leaving others involved in the same creative endeavour, unaffected. But these long-term life-

enhancing and spiritually enriching effects, do not necessarily mean that such art disciples are more included in society. After all, artists have traditionally tended to exist on the fringes of society. They are Becker's original 'outsiders'.

Social Justice and Ideological Concerns

The driving force behind this research is the need for social justice, and that the less fortunate in society should have the chances and opportunities that the better connected, able and financed have. Such a position can be loosely described as of socialist origin, but justice has a longer pedigree. Frank Ridley in his research into the heroic Roman slave leader Spartacus reflected on, 'The story of human revolution of "moral man" against "immoral society"' (Ridley 1965: 6). But perhaps the greatest exponent of individual freedoms and 'rights' was Thomas Paine who set out his 18th century republican political treatise in the infamous *Rights of Man*. He perceived that within a just and civilised society, the poor would receive the resources and education they needed. (Foner 1985: 17-18). That human rights consist of a plethora of factors besides materialism, links Spartacus and Paine up with Article 27 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which advocated cultural as well as social rights. This thesis is underpinned by such ethical concerns, hence the conjunction of cultural with social exclusion, and research of equitable evaluation processes.

It could be argued therefore, that the role of participatory arts groups is to allow the socially excluded to express their creativity and culture, irrespective of social impact, particularly if the instrumental use of the arts for the socially excluded, exacerbates their cultural exclusion, maintaining a cultural apartheid, and re-enforcing a working-class functional habitus.

The contested nature of social exclusion is also related to disputed concepts of citizenship, another area omitted from this research. Nevertheless, John Shotter (1993) argued for social accountability beyond the parameters of the individual. He maintained that, 'no one yet quite knows what it is to be a citizen, it is a status which one must struggle to attain in the face of competing versions of what is proper to struggle for' (1993: 115-6). Accordingly, the government agenda has positioned the excluded within a particular version of morality, which as the research suggests, does not necessarily serve their interests. Its emphasis on

symptoms rather than causes of exclusion, and product rather than process, re-enforces this.

But there is another crucial but hidden aspect to this investigation with regards to transformation. Karl Marx made the crucial distinction between base and superstructure. He wanted, 'to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic, in short ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out' (Marx 1976: 5). Whether this economic base can be scientifically determined is outside the remit of this research, but this central distinction places the arts in an ideological domain. This challenges the new realism of the SEU (2000) and PAT 10 (1999; 2000), as well as the pragmatism of Matarasso (1997), who maintained that utilising arts programmes to impact on social and economical concerns is removed from any ideological considerations as a democratically elected government had the unrestricted right to pursue its policies.

As for the position of the excluded in society, with particular reference to attempted social engineering, their helplessness was starkly portrayed by the renowned travel writer Colin Thubron on his tour of Siberia. He described the failed collectivisation of soviet communism and its attempt to transform humanity, in the distant Altai Republic: 'Already, in September, it was preparing for winter, its yards filling with fodder and firewood. Hopelessly remote, powerless to change or to rebel, it was enclosed on its own survival' (Thubron 2000: 85). As suggested by the prison case studies, the socially excluded are immersed in a cycle of survival, in whatever guise this takes. For this research, it originally appeared, to be an imbalance of material goods, chattels and freedoms accruing. But after much probing, the insurmountable obstacle for inclusion is the rational framework of materialism, which scientism and capitalism determine. The arts embody and express an holistic, spiritual and creative dimension which is a foil and necessary counterculture to this irrational age of reason, far beyond the 'joined-up' thinking of the New Labour.

The Problem Areas

There were several problems encountered throughout the research, four of which are listed below.

Firstly, the research failed to discriminate between art forms in terms of potential social impact, which would have backed up the distinction made between synthetic and natural instrumentality. This was a major

intention originally, but as the research progressed the ideological nature of determining the arts through social impact, became increasingly obvious. Therefore making the case would have qualitatively devalued them. Furthermore, participation in the arts can only be meaningful for the individual, if that person perceives it to be. Another angle on the need for an emic understanding. Nevertheless, the performing arts possess a more social dynamic than those solitary artistic pursuits, which are more individually challenging. So it would follow that a group dynamic would better relate to social inclusion. But arguably this restrictive division of the arts into such categories symbolises the problem. Hence a multi-arts or holistic approach would better serve inclusion, away from traditional classification, enabling more choice and interests to be met, reflecting the 'common' culture (Willis 1990) to which the young in particular respond. Similarly, no substantial research was unearthed concerning the comparability of art programmes with non-arts ones. Moreover the initial research for an arts programme evaluative template was replaced by one of participant self-management and autonomy, albeit difficult to implement.

This alternative counter cultural construction, within a Freirian liberational framework (Freire 1970a; 1970b; Boal 1979), allowed the control of the programme and evaluation to be in the hands of those excluded participants. But in practice Gregory (2000) and Monks (2002) showed just how difficult it was to encourage excluded participants to take ownership of projects, let alone tackle the hierarchical structures inherent in these processes. This gap between theory and practice was left unresolved.

Secondly, the issue of artistic quality was not fully investigated. If the transformation of individuals and communities is the intention, then this might be dependent on artistic excellence (as advocated by IAT in the Evaluation Case). Traditionally quality has been concomitant with a specific 'high' art and craft framework of understanding and taste, but not exclusively. There are other 'Art Worlds' wrapped up in popular, historic and common cultures, which as Willis suggested, can be re-interpreted and used creatively within different frameworks. Owusu's (1986) explanation of orature, the basis of Boal's Theatre of the Oppressed, recognised the quality of other aesthetic cultures and conceptions. But the quality argument can too easily be appropriated, hence as Williams (1997) attested, the community arts needed to break with such a paradigm, and dictate their own terms of excellence by creating their own rules of engagement.

The quality of product also needs to be weighed up against that of experience. Hopefully the two are

dependent, and in a symbiotic relationship, with utility naturally emanating from the art. If quality is unimportant, as the external utility of the arts is of sole importance, this questions their use in the first place. The arts enable creativity and expression, which may not be containable or relate to a pre-set social agenda. They may well tap into a counterculture or protest against the status quo. But how this translates in terms of an agenda of inclusion, cannot truthfully be calculated or pre-empted. A liberated human spirit will operate according to its own regulations. Nevertheless, in order for the concept of quality to be respected, this has to be made transparent, and preferably by those stakeholders concerned.

Thirdly, the need for further research into the relationship between the obsessive nature of the arts and abnormal forms of leisure, as described by Rojek (2000). The implication of this investigation was that the positive and active nature of the arts enabled them to be a safe surrogate for increasingly abnormal and dangerous leisure pursuits as expressed by O'Brien in the introduction. But with reference to the earlier criticism of the SEU for using its inclusive policy to engineer society, there are major ethical considerations and pitfalls to consider. Not least, that such 'abnormal' forms of leisure are deemed abnormal, and that arts policy should be controlled by a normative bourgeois morality. Such thinking also questions the morality underpinning the social role of the arts, that they should civilise and enlighten in line with classical and Victorian mores. Matarasso would deem this as a negative impact, but such abnormality and obsessiveness has become the norm, and fulfils a need for many citizens.

Lastly, the investigation found little research into the area covered, specifically in terms of whether the arts successfully address social exclusion (on SEU terms). Furthermore, because this policy is relatively new and on-going, a lack of evidence regarding benefit long-term.

With regards to addressing re-offending, one of the SEU's areas of social impact, there were two case studies directly involved. The first Evaluation Case found little evidence to suggest that short-term arts programmes had any effect, whilst the second Arts Education in Prison Case, questioned the veracity of the stated success of cognitive skills programmes, as success had been manipulated. Whereas there was research that a curriculum steeped in the wider humanities, and on a long-term basis, did have a more significant effect (Duguid 1998). In terms of the contribution of the arts, this therefore needs to be considered long-term, which contradicts the short-term nature of present policy and funding initiatives.

Furthermore, with regards to the main SEU interest of increasing employment, the 'joined-up' nature of its method of combating exclusion further obfuscates the impact of the arts. No research was unearthed showing any direct cause and effect (assuming this is possible). PAT 10 (2001) boasted about its influence on particularly Arts Council policy, without unearthing any evidence that the arts actually addressed social exclusion. This manipulation of fact undermines the concern flagged up by Moriarty(1997), that advocacy should be separated from evidence. This is naively ideal, especially against the backdrop of a New Labour government obsessed with news management and 'spin'.

A New 'Take'

There are many definitions, contradictions and subtleties regarding the relationship between inclusion and exclusion, which is further complicated by cultural and social variables. This research is a particular 'take', that has questioned the suitability of the arts to realise government policy and its specific conception of social exclusion. There are several important signatures:

Firstly, the social impacts agenda so beloved by government, is not necessarily replicated by arts programme participants, and cannot therefore be parachuted onto them. The reason for participation in the arts has to be prioritised and respected. There also needs to be a distinction made between instrumental concerns that naturally result from the arts as against those that are more synthetic and inappropriate, hence purpose has to be considered. Furthermore, if cultural exclusion is regarded as a strand of social exclusion, then the nature of such exclusion becomes vitally important in itself, beyond the Arts Council agenda of democratising the 'high' arts. Arts education is very much the ideological battleground in which competing paradigms of culture are played out.

Secondly, that both social and cultural inclusion are necessarily of a qualitative nature. Only an emic understanding steeped in experiential knowledge allows a three dimensional understanding. This is very different from a more objective and quantitative analysis, and attempt at social auditing, which too readily promotes managerial 'judgement' from those in positions of authority, disempowering the excluded further. With regards to evaluation methodology and the arts more generally, an emic position better comprehends value and translates the effects of creativity and inclusivity. Moreover, the evaluation as well as the arts

programme need to be owned and controlled by excluded stakeholders, in order to neutralise inbuilt power structures. Hence the democratisation process within the evaluation method parallels that for cultural democracy in the arts.

Thirdly, that within a play paradigm the arts encourage an engaged freedom and personal emancipation. This is an important antidote to an increasingly rationalised society, in which abnormal and negative forms of leisure (due in some part to an encroaching work ethic), have become increasingly prevalent. Hence the importance of the intrinsic benefits of participating in the arts, of creativity, self-esteem, self-confidence, communion and spirituality. But leisure has historically suffered from ethical scrutiny, due to its dialectical opposition to the work ethic, with which it is ensnared. That there is a possible mutual collusion between work and social exclusion, destroying inclusive sentiment, undermines governmental policy and reveals the importance of a counterculture in which the participatory arts are intrinsically recognised within an emancipatory leisure framework.

Fourthly, that the transformation of excluded characters requires their consent, and necessitates a holistic understanding of the sites of oppression and exclusion. This refers to Freire's (1970a; 1970b) problem-posing liberational education, which requires autonomous self-directed learning. Boal's 'Joker' or 'difficulator' comes as close to the role of artistic or evaluative facilitator as is possible, given that the very position carries authority. Spontaneous empowerment and artistic creation are idealistic and in practical terms there have to be 'jokers' to enable the artistic and evaluative processes to successfully operate. But the democratic evaluative template set out by Gregory's (2000), is in effect practically unworkable, as it requires too much money, time and patience to implement. Which is further exacerbated for a cynical and disempowered excluded constituency. As Chanan (2000) recognised, it is the older white collar or professional members of a community that are the inclusive drivers, whom the excluded are dependant upon. But again, the extent to which these characters can aid inclusion without deeper structural and ideological changes in society, seems limited.

Fifthly, to recognise the difference between empowerment and emancipation, as set out by Inglis (1997), the former working the system and the latter changing it. The government and Arts Council policy interest is predominantly concerned with empowerment, within the existing structures. That engagement and social

participation offer a wider conception of social and cultural inclusion, requires them to reach out beyond employment measures and educating new audiences into the western aesthetic canon. This emancipation is culturally democratic and requires self-direction and management.

To enable this, there needs to be a wider acceptance and response to diversity and difference in taste preferences, which are legitimate and of equal value. Therefore it is vital that quality control mechanisms are made transparent, and that value or worth is not an exercise of advocacy and manipulation.

Unfortunately, this is highly unlikely, as both the Arts Council and government have vested interests, the most obvious of which is controlling the agenda. Arts and cultural policy cannot therefore deliver for the socially excluded, without considering a more counter cultural position. It is not totally beyond the bounds of possibility that such a democratisation process may occur, but there needs to be a seismic change, which presently at best seems fanciful.

Finally, although the history of art reveals previous cultures where the arts might be perceived as instrumental, created for instance in response to the specific needs of patrons, the arts today are embedded in an overbearing aestheticism. They are elitist, inaccessible or oppositional in spirit, and necessarily sit at the edge of society, exclusive, excluded and excluding; Hence the paradox of utilising them to address social exclusion. Correspondingly, for the government to advocate their use in such a utilitarian fashion, attaching a synthetic instrumentality, fundamentally misunderstands the nature of artistic production. This refers back to the introductory quote from O'Brien, where the policeman MacCruiskeen creates as a foil to his boring job, a special creative world of interest and pleasure. He carved chests not just to give meaning to his life, but in order to assuage his obsessiveness. Furthermore their mystical value put him in touch with a more spiritual domain, beyond mundane existence. He was very protective of this escapist world, where the arts were instrumental in opening the door to another dimension, which is vast and anarchic. But crucially this emancipation cannot be reversed. Once the artistic genie has escaped from the lamp, it becomes capricious, wilful, obsessive and above all a free spirit. A person in such a condition is far from willing to be socially engineered by anyone.

Appendix 1

50 SOCIAL IMPACTS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE ARTS (Matarasso 1997: x)

1. Increase people's confidence and self-worth

2. Extend involvement in social activity

3. Give people influence over how they are seen by others

4. Stimulate interest and confidence in the arts

5. Provide a forum to explore personal rights and responsibilities

6. Contribute to the educational development of children

7. Encourage adults to take up education and training opportunities

8. Help build new skills and work experience

9. Contribute to people's employability

10. Help people take up or develop careers in the arts

11. Reduce isolation by helping people to make friends

12. Develop community networks and sociability

13. Promote tolerance and contribute to conflict resolution

14. Provide a forum for intercultural understanding and friendship

15. Help validate the contribution of a whole community

16. Promote intercultural contact and co-operation

17. Develop contact between the generations

18. Help offenders and victims address issues of crime

19. Provide a route to rehabilitation and integration of offenders

20. Build community organisational capacity

21. Encourage local self-reliance and project management

22. Help people extend control over their own lives

23. Be a means of gaining insight into political and social bias

24. Facilitate effective public consultation and participation

Appendix 1

25. Help involve local people in the regeneration process

26. Facilitate the development of partnership

27. Build support for community projects

28. Strengthen community co-operation and networking

29. Develop pride in local traditions and cultures

30. Help people feel a sense of belonging and involvement

31. Create community traditions in new towns or neighbourhoods

32. Involve residents in environmental improvements

33. Provide reasons for people to develop community activities

34. Improve perceptions of marginalised groups

35. Help transform the image of public bodies

36. Make people feel better about where they live

37. Help people develop their creativity

38. Erode the distinction between consumer and creator

39. Allow people to explore their values, meanings and dreams

40. Enrich the practice of professionals in the public domain

41. Transform the responsiveness of public service organisations

42. Encourage people to accept risk positively

43. Help community groups raise their vision beyond the immediate

44. Challenge conventional service delivery

45. Raise expectations about what is possible and desirable

46. Have a positive impact on how people feel

47. Be an effective means of health education

48. Contribute to a more relaxed atmosphere in health centres

49. Help improve the quality of life of people with poor health

50. Provide a unique and deep source of enjoyment

Appendix 2

insight
Arts Trust



– OFFERS OPPORTUNITIES TO EX-PRISONERS AND THOSE ON PROBATION, TO FIND NEW DIRECTIONS FOR THEMSELVES THROUGH THE MEDIUM OF THE ARTS.

– ORGANISES ARTS-BASED CRIME AWARENESS PROGRAMMES IN A VARIETY OF COMMUNITY SETTINGS.

– LEADS OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES IN PRISONS AND PROBATION CENTRES.

Policy.
IAT employs the arts as an imaginative territory within which participants can explore opportunities for personal change. Here, fundamental questions about self, and the self's relationship to society, can be worked through. It is only with new understandings about personal identity that offenders can find a lifestyle away from crime. Within drama, a sense of connectedness with others is developed. Personal patterns of behaviour can be dramatised and challenged. New roles can be practised. Photography provokes discussion around image, environment and privacy. Sculpture can embody dreams, experiences and aspirations. Creative writing can summarise past experiences and help integrate these into the present. All our work is group-oriented, interactive and participatory. Those who have taken to crime as a lifestyle may find an opportunity here to find ways to break negative attitudes and behaviour patterns. Confidence and self-esteem are lifted through the production of creative work, and emotional sharing leads to friendship and perhaps a new contract with society. Participants' engagement with IAT does not necessarily end with the conclusion of a programme. We positively encourage clients into work experience opportunities, and many ex-offenders now contribute to, or co-facilitate, IAT programmes.

Partnerships and Projects.
Partnerships are created between ourselves and other organisations, both within and outside the criminal justice system. IAT works in partnership with the Inner London Probation Service to deliver a range of programmes. We have worked with North East London Probation Service for several years. We have contributed programmes or performances to a range of prisons including HMYOI Feltham, HMP Morton Hall, HMP Pentonville, HMP Norwich, HMP Belmarsh, HMP Grendon, HMP Risley and many others.

WE ARE ABLE TO ADAPT PROGRAMMES AND PERFORMANCES TO SUIT CONFERENCES OR SPECIAL EVENTS. WE HAVE IN THE PAST WORKED ON SPECIFIC PROJECTS WITH KENT PROBATION SERVICE, MIDDLESEX PROBATION SERVICE, HMP PENTONVILLE, NOTTINGHAM PLAYHOUSE THEATRE-IN-EDUCATION TEAM, THE FEDERATION OF PRISONERS' FAMILIES SUPPORT GROUPS, CARIS AND OTHERS. WE WELCOME ENQUIRIES TO COLLABORATE.

History.
IAT began life as a weekly drama programme in the Camden area, enabling probation clients to engage with the arts in their free time. This programme became supported by the Inner London Probation Service and soon clients were referred by Probation Officers throughout London. The project has expanded over recent years and 1997 brings its tenth anniversary. IAT has moved from running drama programmes to utilise other art forms; video, photography, sculpture and creative writing. It has widened the scope of the work; programmes dealing directly with offending behaviour and the development of life skills have extended our core role. The Trust has developed a professional theatre company which tours productions on crime issues to prisons and other settings. Partnerships have been another feature of this expansion; IAT is currently linked with a number of European organisations.

Funding.
Core funding is provided by the Inner London Probation Service and the London Borough Grants Committee. Additionally, IAT is funded periodically by the Arts Council of England, the London Arts Board and the Foundation for Sports and the Arts. The European Commission has funded IAT to develop the European Programme. Other financial assistance has come from the European Social Fund, the Prince's Trust, the Economist Charitable Trust, Morgan Crucible Charitable Trust, Northern Foods plc, the Henderson Administration Group an

Paul Getty Trust.

insight
Arts Trust

9 ISLINGTON GREEN
LONDON N1 2XH

T (0171) 359 0772
F (0171) 359 4217

www.penlex.org.uk/insight.html
e-mail: insightartstrust.demon.co.uk

Reg. charity No. 1058390
Reg. company No. 3244092

Appendix 3

Final External Evaluator's Report

For Insight Arts Trust

This report is in two parts. The first revolves around research that advocates the need for the Connecting Lines programmes in prison and the second an overview of the Connecting Lines programme itself. This is the final report of three.

1. Advocacy for Arts Based Programmes in Prison.

(Research into Current Prison Education and Rehabilitation Programmes)

'Although institutions are now becoming more outward looking, they are nevertheless places in which people largely lose control over their own lives....The particular nature of institutional living and the educational deprivation of many of the people who are resident in institutions are factors which may lead them to seek a rather different kind of involvement in creative activity than that which is normally looked for by those engaging in adult education classes. For example, whilst for some participants the motivation may be the acquisition of skills in order to achieve a more professional end product, or the quest for like-minded company, the initial impetus for those in institutions more frequently comes from a need to find a voice of their own in a situation where they have few means of communicating with others and where they may suffer a consequent loss of identity' (Peaker 1994:57)

a) Cuts in Arts Activities in Prison

Of all the 134 penal establishments listed in the 1997/8 volume of the Prisons Handbook (Leech 1998), 66 (49.2%) gave details of how many teachers full and part-time were employed in their respective education departments. By the 2000/01 edition, only 50 of these establishments gave updated information (a reduction of 24.2%). Only 50 establishments therefore gave reliable data over the three year period as to the change in numbers teaching. This is 37.3% of all establishments.

In total, there were 258 full-time and 944 part-time teachers in all fifty establishments in 1997/8. By 2000/01, this had changed to 280 full-time and 896 part-time. What this means in effect is that there was an 8.5% increase in full-time teaching staff over this three year period and a corresponding 5.1% decrease in part-time teaching staff over the same period. The majority of full-time posts created related to the expansion of the basic skills agenda as promoted by the prison service and government, the corresponding decrease in part-time teachers relates to the running down of curriculum areas that weren't directly involved in basic education. In the main these were arts related subjects that had traditionally been taught by hourly paid part-time tutors. This has been in response to the fact that prison education has to meet specific KPI's that enhance the prison's status, and that these refer to the evaluation of three Key Skills: numeracy, literacy and communication.

Many prisons now require arts subjects to include a relevant Key Skills agenda in order to operate and survive. The intrinsic arts for art's sake philosophy is a distant echo, the arts have to prove their worth in terms of an external social agenda.

The Unit for the Arts and Offenders (Bulletin No 21) has developed a 100 hours drama project that meets the Basic Skills KPI (City and Guilds Wordpower at level 2 and Key Skills at level 2) as a means to make the arts more relevant in this culture of performance indicators. But does this reference to basic numeracy and literacy undermine the intrinsic value of the arts subjects? The Unit for the Arts and Offenders also researched the problem of cuts to arts provision in prison. Of those surveys returned, 75% of prisons had experienced cuts to their arts programmes in the 2000/1 financial year and 43% of classes were cut to make way for the basic skills curriculum. This included the visual arts, woodwork, craft, drama, pottery, music and photography. (Unit for Arts and Offenders 2001). This is basic evidence of the need for the Connecting Lines programme.

One case study that I am cognisant of, is that of Brixton Prison. In the early 1990's it ran a large and varied

educational programme. It employed 2 p/t drama teachers, 2 p/t craft teachers, 3 p/t music teachers and 4 p/t art teachers with one f/t, as well as various poets and writers. By Autumn 2001, there was only one p/t art teacher who incidentally had to meet basic and key skills KPI's in order to operate, and one p/t pottery teacher who had to teach business skills. This case is a good example of the 'measurable driving out the immeasurable', to the detriment of education in general and the arts in particular. (Home Office 2000).

b) Effectiveness of Prison Programmes with Regards to Rehabilitation

Home Office Prison statistics state that there has been a huge increase in the prison population from 50,000 in 1988 to 62,000 in 1998. This is a massive 24% increase over ten years, and set to rise accordingly over the next ten. Furthermore, 58% of all prisoners discharged in 1995 were reconvicted within two years of discharge (Home Office 1998). More worryingly, 77% of all young offenders were reconvicted within two years.

On top of this, more recent statistics concerning the reconviction rate of those who have completed an accredited offending behaviour programme: 'figures suggest 22% reconviction rate for those who have finished an accredited offending behaviour programme, as against 39% for those who haven't had the treatment'. The figure is higher when considering those participants who have been on unaccredited courses, 30% reconviction rates as against 39%. Apparently such 'cognitive skills programmes appear to be effective with certain types of offender' (Home Office 2000). After analysis, such figures become meaningless, for two basic reasons. Firstly, prisoners are chosen by their 'likelihood' of not re-offending. This is done by psychological screening of prisoners pre-course (presumably more rigorous for the accredited course) and secondly, due to the fact that reconviction rates are judged using a one year time-span (although the Home Office used a two year time-span for judging reconviction rates in 1995), the full longitudinal impact is unknown. Obviously, the greater the length of time used, the greater the reconviction rate will be. But using the Home Office's own figures, there was a 17% drop in reconviction rates over a one year period of those who had been accepted onto accredited courses. But what the Home Office haven't give figures for, is the proportion of prisoners ineligible for the programmes and discarded by the screening process. By choosing those criminals most likely not to reconvict, the process is self-fulfilling. In all likelihood, these characters would choose to get out of crime anyway, given any reasonable rehabilitative help. Also there is definite coercion to participate, as results are kept on prisoners records. In reality, prisoners choose when or if they are going to change their behaviour and lifestyle, and this cannot be enforced. The importance the Connecting Lines programme puts on voluntary participation is far more in tune with encouraging individual behavioural change from within.

c) The Need for Non-Coercive Creative Programmes in Prison

The questionable success of rehabilitation and education programmes as detailed above, is all the more justification for outside agencies, and especially Insight Arts, to fill the gaps that are now appearing. Such work has a more democratic and less prescriptive manner than the formal courses run by the Home Office, and relate better to such social objectives as empowerment and self-esteem. Outside agencies unattached to the inherent prison power structures and institution, have an edge.

There are several supporting reasons:

Firstly, the feeling of coercion behind current educational philosophy and the rehabilitative projects utilised, key them into the power structures inherent in the prison situation. Many prisoners and staff are uneasy about this and their effectiveness. Education is for life and for real, not just a game to play in prison in order to satisfy prison performance indicators and prisoner sentence planning. It's important that self-improvement in terms of education or rehabilitation is continued outside prison on release. To quote a prisoner who served time at the State Prison of Southern Michigan;

> 'the entire counselling-treatment program is a game, the rules of which I must try to learn in order to placate the prison officials and manipulate the parole board at my parole hearing. I have to serve my time, but in addition, I must prove that the counsellor has been successful and that I am rehabilitated and ready for parole'
> (Furtado and Johnson 1980:252)

Secondly and following on from the first point, many prisoners have rejected formal education already (school truancy etc), and they are suspicious of formal educational or psychological formats that replicate an examination and qualification system. Trish Smith, Education Co-ordinator in HMP Wandsworth referred to the context of education and the need to address 'the negative experiences of previous education and that a variety of strategies may be needed to re-engage people in education. Learning can only take place if individuals want to learn' (Smith 2001).
Similarly, prisoners are wary of rehabilitative programmes and officialdom in general. They are naturally cynical, rebellious and suspicious. The Connecting Lines programme breaks through such cynicism precisely by making the learning interesting, enjoyable and relevant.
The criminologist Michael Collins argued that the whole rubric within prison determined the prison education system: 'education and training in prison is essentially accommodative, an adjunct to the overall apparatus of surveillance, regulation and punishment' (Collins 1988:101). He further critiqued prison education as being a metaphor for adult educational practice in general. By emphasising qualification, this only further exacerbates the power relationships and coercive structures already in operation. These challenge 'prevalent notions held about the nature of self-directed learning....as a guiding principle for an emancipatory practice' of learning. He concluded that for educational processes to be successful in prison, they have to loosen their attachment to the power processes in operation in the prison. What better than an outside agency to do this.

Thirdly, Ernest Goffman coined the phrase 'total institution', and developed the term to refer to the extent to which the institution became the boundary and focus of an individual's life, especially in terms of it taking up a disproportionate amount of that person's time, interest and energy. This included staff as well as inmates in prison. In order to return and include such people back into the wider community, this institutionalisation and isolation needed to be addressed. Grossman (1968) thought that such dysfunctionalism was corrected best by the introduction of outsiders into the institution, in order to break up such patterns that eventually become internalised. Better still, to introduce a programme like Connecting Lines that aims to empower those people not contain them, that encourages self-expression, builds up self-confidence and respect and awareness for others. Hence the importance of Insight Arts being apart from the power relations of the institution.

Fourthly, now that the prison educational agenda is pre-occupied with basic and key skills, this ostracises those prisoners who have had some formal education, or are educationally skilled beyond what such an agenda offers. Besides being rigid, there is a patronising attitude about present policy, with the focus and reason for education dependant on such skills.
David Wilson, a writer and researcher on prison education, whilst not denying the need for a basic skills curriculum, voiced his concern that,

> 'a policy based solely on this approach implicitly suggests that those with literacy and numeracy skills do not commit crime, and leaves a void in regime provision for development beyond this level. In short art, drama and vocational classes start to disappear and it becomes even harder to work towards higher educational achievement' (Wilson 2001)

This accounts for 30-40% of the prison population, who are left with nothing, as well as all those considered having basic skills deficiencies, who, for whatever reason, don't want such educational provision, or want to get involved with something less patronising that relates to them and their life.
Philip Priestley perceived education to be an enabler that helped offenders 'acquire greater control over their own offending behaviour. It will be experimental. Since there is no single way of effectively helping offenders to change their behaviour and no exact knowledge about what methods work best with which kind of offence' (Priestley 1991:11). Such an honest appraisal of the complexities and variables that dictate offending behaviour also recognised that experimentation and creativity is vital when considering transformation, as these are the real drivers of change and are the currency of the arts. Furthermore, rigidity and coercion are anathema to creativity, which has to come from within the prisoner, not forced from outside. As Anne Peaker suggested in the initial quote, prisoners need to find their identity and a voice, and this has to be on their terms, as it is their lives and the way that they lead them that is the issue. The drama-

orientated work of the Connecting Lines programme is a platform that allows prisoners vital practice at finding their 'voice'.
Kevin Warner co-ordinator of prison education in Ireland referred to the needs of prisoners being met by 'a wide curriculum, from which people can pick and choose....[as] different areas of education will attract different groups of prisoners' (Warner 1998:18) This was founded in the Council of Europe Select Committee's adoption of the concept of 'dynamic motivation'. This concerned the problem of low motivation among prisoners, due to their past experience of the educational system. Hence the importance of providers to create a good atmosphere, gearing education to adults and individual needs that draw in the student's life experiences and a wide menu of subjects. Education had to fit the student, not the other way around which is the case at present, whereby education is primarily answerable to rigid performance indicators. Motivation to participate and enjoyment are the indicators as to whether the student is really engaged. If a prisoner is compelled or heavily persuaded to attend a course, this undermines the whole process. The interest and enjoyment consistently shown by participants in the Connecting Lines programme underpins their motivation to participate.
Also, as the Connecting Lines programme involved and was accessible to young offenders from a variety of ethnic backgrounds, an even stronger case can be made for the needs of what the government sees as the most excluded group in society. The government's Social Exclusion Unit even advocates the arts as having a vital role in addressing issues of exclusion in terms of educational opportunities and reducing crime for this group (Policy Action Team 10 1999).

Fifthly, the value of the arts. The arts often work on a subliminal level and change occurs individually, when something has huge personal relevance for the participant. This cannot be quantified although many have tried to do so and evaluating its impact becomes a problem. But using crude social evaluatory techniques does a disservice to the natural powers inherent in artforms. Creativity has never prospered in a culture of tick boxes, it is of a different order, and from the other side of the brain. This has to be reflected in the process of evaluation itself. But in terms of social objectives, empowerment and the increased confidence of the participants are of greatest concern. Real empowerment in turn needs to be democratic, so that the views of participants can effect change and even determine future projects. Each project needs to be owned by all stakeholders. This follows on from the work done by Francois Matarasso and his seminal work on evaluating the social impact of arts projects. He maintained that art programmes needed to address the needs and aspirations of participants, who in order to become stakeholders of that project had to become involved in decision-making at every level. He called it 'empowerment through self-management'. Therefore the evaluation process 'should lead to increasingly independent and autonomous activity, since it gives people control over their participation and development' (Matarasso 1996:26). This process can be seen as even more vital in prison, where the constituency feels less in control than in society in general. But the problem, is that this democracy flies in the face of the heavily bureaucratic and autocratic structures in place in prison. The Connecting Lines programme and especially Sleepers, allowed elements of stakeholder control over the direction of the project. This was manifest most obviously in the discussion that participants undertook as to whether they wanted to present their work to an audience. It was their collective choice and voice that determined this.

Sixthly, there is a definite social role for the arts in prison, but the crucial question is how to balance personal expression and individuals taking control of their lives, with the autocratic prison structure dictated by standardised performance criteria. They are unhappy bedfellows. The work done by Insight Arts encourages empowerment and participants to take control and become more confident, and is successful precisely because it is not part of the prison establishment. It is this established system that so many prisoners are at odds with, and there needs to be outreach educational and rehabilitative programmes that allow and encourage cynical prisoners into educational opportunities, and to reflect on their lives. Hence the importance of the non-coercive drama-based and multi-arts work done by Insight Arts. Here prisoners can then find out about themselves on their own terms, and their input and comment will be used in order to mould future projects more towards their needs. This form of incremental evaluation will make projects more relevant for prisoners and therefore more effective. As Matarasso concluded 'Over-zealous pursuit of scientific objectivity, and the internal validity of evaluation processes, is inappropriate and unhelpful' (Matarasso 1996:24).

d) Conclusion

The arts in many ways are in opposition to the whole concept of prison as I hope the points above have indicated. To quote the artist and prison teacher Colin Riches; 'Art is about risk-taking, self-exploration and self-expression; prison is about regulation, imposed controls and the minimising of risks' (Riches 1994:77). Words like healing, growth, empowerment, self-discipline and self-confidence seem lost within the dull and uniform penal environment. The rigour and conformity of the regime is in direct opposition to the needs of its inhabitants, hence the problem with official Home Office programmes and institutionalised education departments, weighed down by their need to conform to official targets. Also many art departments are being run-down or forced to incorporate the key and basic skills agenda. This may work for some prisoners, but it will ostracise others as the classes then become too much a part of the system that has already been rejected by the prisoners. What is also clear, even using the Home Office's own figures, is that reconviction rates are far too high, and that the prison population is steadily increasing, especially among the young. There needs to be as wide a variety of methods to combat this, in terms of techniques of addressing offending behaviour, and as wide a range of subjects available for prisoners to study. Much good work is done by prison staff, but there are increasingly gaps opening up in terms of making classes and projects relevant to all prisoners. Increasingly, rehabilitation and education programmes are systematic and coercive, and therefore less likely to allow prisoners to work out (or want to work out) problems themselves. Such programmes can bring out the more rebellious side of character, or the game-playing calculated manner previously quoted. Also, methodologically, such programmes increasingly dictate terms, as they are beholden to performance indicators. There is a need in prison for voluntary outside arts projects like Connecting Lines, that address offending behaviour without any punitive element, as a balance to the increasingly centralised and controlled agenda offered to prisoners. Such bodies can allow a more creative and expressive involvement by prisoners on their terms, which rehabilitation ultimately has to be. Change from the inside due to self-discovery and a more heuristic and democratic approach to utilising the arts. The prisoner decides to change and this voluntary process of empowerment can so easily get lost in the power plays that make up everyday prison life. Similarly, with reference to this maelstrom of power, Insight Arts has to ensure that it's not appropriated in any way by the prison, and that it retains its credibility as an independent outside organisation.

Bibliography

Collins, Michael. 1988 Prison Education: A Substantial Metaphor for Adult Education Practice *Adult Education Quarterly* Vol 38 No 2

Furtado & Johnson. 1980 Education and Rehabilitation in a Prison Setting *Journal of Offender Counselling, Services, Rehabilitation* Vol 4 No 3

Goffman, Erving. 1968. *Asylums* Penguin

Home Office. 1998 *Prison Statistics England and Wales* HMSO

Home Office. 2000 *Accredited Offending Behaviour Programmes 1999-2000* Offending Behaviour Unit Living Skills Team Home Office

Leech, M. 1998 *The Prisons Handbook* Pluto Press

Leech & Cheney. 2001 *The Prisons Handbook* Waterside Press

Matarasso, F. 1996 *Defining Values: Evaluating Arts Programmes* Comedia

Policy Action Team 10 1999 *Research Report: Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal* DCMS

Peaker, A. 1994 The Arts and People in Institutions *Journal of Art and Design* Vol 13

Priestley, P. 1991 *What Works. Effective Methods to Reduce Re-offending* Conference Proceedings 18th - 19th April 1991

Riches, C. 1994 *The Hidden Therapy of a Prison Art Education Programme* in *Art Therapy with Offenders* Liebmann, Marian (ed) Jessica Kingsley

Smith, T. 2001 The Context of Education in Prison *It's Wandsworth* No 19

Unit for the Arts and Offenders. 2001 *Cuts to Arts Activities in Prisons 2000-2001* Unpublished survey.

Warner, K. 1998. The Issue of Motivation in Prison Education *Penological Information Bulletin* No 21

Wilson, D. 2001 Valuing Prisoner Education *Prison Report* No 54

2. Remit: The *'Connecting Lines'* Programme

This final report refers to all ten placements of the arts based Connecting Lines programme which took place between Feb 1999 and Aug 2001, with specific mention of the most recent placings.
The programme consists of two separate projects, the drama based 'North/South' and the multi-artform 'Sleepers' programmes.

a) Advocacy

Augusto Boal the Brazilian dramatist has spent much of his life working with the socially excluded around the world. He saw theatre as 'the most perfect artistic form of coercion' (Boal 1979:39), as it referred to major events in life, social occasions, mundane everyday living, and allowed humans 'to observe themselves in action' (Boal 1992:xxxvi). He saw the arts and especially drama as a distinct language. 'By learning a new language, a person acquires a new way of knowing reality and of passing that knowledge on to others' (Boal 1979:121). Hence the language of drama, the structure, method utilised and subject influence not just ways of thinking, but how we think.

b) Methodology

The key task in evaluating the 'Connecting Lines' programme, was to triangulate all opinion and views: participants, tutors, prison staff and anyone else with involvement. There was both qualitative and quantitative evidence available, based on written prisoner and tutor feedback, as well as more informal verbal feedback. For a more detailed description of the projects, a diary format was introduced that covered each day and the views of one or more keen participant. There was also an on-site evaluator observation of the projects, which was non-participant in nature.
Particular areas of importance were the extent to which projects were seen through to the end, the ethnic diversity of the group and the extent to which all members irrespective of ability were included and communicated, and how such a group gelled collectively. Issues of self-confidence, awareness of others, social cohesion and empowerment went hand in hand with creative expression, enjoyment, personal involvement and development.

c) Overview

The programme was very well received by the participants, with completed evaluation forms showing the popularity of both projects with definite perceived benefit and enjoyment experienced. Tutors overall enjoyed the experience, and delivered their objectives well (regime problems aside), achieving intended outcomes.

d) Feedback to the Programme

i) North/South

This was the main part of the programme and very well received over the three years of operation. Here are some comments:

'it's good to improvise and analyse situations in real-life - it may even help us to deal with situations similar in the future' (female prisoner from Winchester)

'Four days wasn't long enough, but it was still time to learn about working together as a group.....I would recommend it to anyone' (female prisoner from Newhall)

Appendix 3

'There's no communication on the wings between the guys, only when on association. There's a lot of bang up. This workshop has given us the chance to really communicate with each other. I want to find a drama group in Somerset when I get out'
(male prisoner from Portland YOI)

'Today we done a session on group work, trust in other people, group and trust work in the hole group. The purpose of the session in my eyes was to bring the group together and too trust in hole. Some people didn't think it was easy. Actually that's the wrong word some people didn't have faith or trust in others but eventually went with it'
(male diarist from Stocken)

'I enjoyed doing drama and now feel confident in myself. This is a subject I would definitely do in the future' (male prisoner from Stocken)

There were seven completed North/South projects and using all feedback statistics from those feedback sheets completed, figures suggest great enthusiasm and effectiveness:
In terms of benefit to prisoners they gave the project a 94% mark, in terms of their assessment of the approach taken by the tutors they gave it a 95% mark. But in terms of time allotted they gave it an average of 40%, a resounding success in the eyes of the participants, who longed for more sessions.
A new category was introduced in the evaluation sheets for HMP Stocken 'Did the project stretch you?', this received a 96% affirmation, helping reflect the educational and rehabilitative impact of the project.

ii) Sleepers

This was a smaller part of the programme, more experimental and overall very well received over the three year of operation. Here are some comments:

'I really think the project was a benefit to me in several ways. Thank you very much for giving me [us] the chance to show ....[what] we as a team could do together'
(male prisoner from Portland YOI)

'thoroughly enjoyable. Highly imaginative. Makes a big difference to four walls and a suicidal cell-mate' (male prisoner from Portland YOI)

'The benefit that courses like these have on inmates are an incredibly important....
I firmly believe that I benefited from taking part' (male prisoner from the Wolds)

There were three completed Sleepers projects and using all feedback statistics from those feedback sheets completed, figures suggest the project was highly successful and enjoyed by participants. In terms of benefit to prisoners they gave the project a 76% mark, in terms of their assessment of the approach taken by the tutors they gave it a 79% mark. But in terms of time allotted they gave it an average of 37% again a resounding success in the eyes of the participants, who longed for more sessions.
There were no evaluation sheets from Portland YOI. The prison suddenly prevented the last session and performance to happen (which is when the sheets are filled in), but the programme director had already decided that such sheets were inappropriate as many of the group couldn't read or write. The Education Co-ordinator promised to collect feedback in class, this didn't materialise.

e) Tutor Comment

i) North/South

In general there was much positive feedback from tutors, with an understanding of the problems associated with the territory. The programmes worked well but there were some difficulties voiced:
One tutor expressed concern that it was unclear why a particular exercise was chosen and what it hoped to achieve, he also confessed that he 'needed a little more support at times'.

Another saw the need to train tutors into the ethos of Insight Arts. Establishing trust with the participants was also seen as a difficulty. Tutors also mentioned that they needed more time for project planning.

ii) Sleepers

In general there was much positive feedback from tutors, although the schedule was exhausting, with an understanding of the problems associated with the territory. Here are some opinions:
Issues of establishing trust were seen by one tutor as an important outcome of Sleepers, with a good sense of teamwork achieved. But it was seen as 'too sophisticated' and 'over-ambitious' for especially young offenders. There was a lack of clarity as to the objectives of the programme. Strategic planning and better preparation was needed as there was no real understanding of how the different artforms linked up. In terms of what was needed, one tutor thought 'that the approach and practice of each arts discipline is [better] understood, that relative skills are drawn on and integrated more cohesively within the project'. Tutors recognised the importance of their particular evaluation in terms of developing the programme.
In Portland YOI, the tutors found it difficult working with such needy participants, as they were unable to concentrate, squabbled and were continually attention-seeking. Each young offender needed one-to-one attention, hence there was a massive energy input from tutors with small rewards. But it was very positive because the programme had connected with the offenders in a way that the education programme had hitherto been unable to do (as admitted by the education officer).

f) Other Opinion

Opinion from governors, education officers and prison officers involved was supportive and encouraging.

'To a man each one of the group has rejected education in prison. This project has helped to include these offenders' Education Co-ordinator Portland YOI

'The project is a good idea, but it's a real problem taking juveniles out of their comfort zone, as they lack discipline and play up. There's intense peer pressure not to partake.'
Prison Officer Portland YOI

g) Evaluator Observation

Portland 'Sleepers' Project
In keeping with the first two reports, I have included an account of evaluator observation. This just happened to be the most difficult placing for the project over the three years. Although it was untypical, it highlights some pertinent problems.

The group consisted of juveniles aged 15-16 who were on full-time education classes and the Education Co-ordinator had decided that instead of them attending classes in Citizenship and Lifeskills, they would take part in the Sleepers project. So it wasn't voluntarily application that determined the group, but there again due to their age, education was compulsory. So the project fitted into the prison education timetable. The Education Co-ordinator seemed to think that those who had rejected education in prison were best suited for the group as they would benefit most. Hence the group had the most difficult members in it. Those participants I spoke to told me how much they hated education. Originally 20 in the group, but it ended up with 11 all white and very needy disruptive individuals.
One participant when asked if he had done drama at school, said that he was the only one in the group who had been to school.
The tutors found the week had been the most difficult they had ever encountered.
In the morning session, the participants had an inability to concentrate for more than a couple of minutes, were play fighting all the time, attention-seeking, and reticent to work. The participants found it very difficult to cope with the more unstructured elements but practiced their sketches and tutors had to work hard to keep their attention.
The afternoon session was cancelled by the security department without notice. A typical example of the bad communications frequently encountered when working in this environment. Lack of staff was given as

the reason. But everyone could have been informed earlier, so that the group could have been closed and goodbyes spoken etc. This was an unfortunate ending as the members of the group were due to present their sketches.
The attendance figures were used by the Education Department towards their performance indicators, in terms of key skills agenda, especially verbal and non-verbal communication and creativity. The department (unlike on my previous visit) were very supportive and involved, possibly too much as they entered the workshop uninvited and disrupted it possibly too frequently. The Governor had watched the work previously and been impressed.
The project reached some of the most excluded youth possible, even excluded from education due to attitude and inability to read or write and lack of interest. The Education Co-ordinator purposely put the most excluded and difficult kids onto the programme as they were immune to the overtures of the educational process. The drama techniques and methods used for group awareness, verbal and non-verbal communication outpassed anything that the Education Department had in their armoury to cope with such difficult youths. The ability to communicate, participant involvement, group awareness and cohesion, and self-confidence were the most obvious social impacts. Much time and patience was needed with such a difficult group to bring these social objectives out. Praise is due to the tutors for the way they coped with the situation.
The danger of this collaboration with the Education Department, is that the project may be appropriated and dictated by the need to work with educational refuseniks. This was unfortunate because those with more education and ability could have benefited and enjoyed it considerably. I didn't like the implication that the educational facilities provided were adequate for those better adjusted prisoners who weren't allowed to participate. This comes back to the issue of voluntary participation, to allow those with a real interest to be involved. The idea that prisoners make a decision in what they do, is all a part of the empowerment process, a long way from the enforced educational programme on offer.
Another problem was that the tutors had their patience and skills tested to the limit. Are they experienced and trained for dealing with such a group? Furthermore, the numbers that can be involved in such a project are relatively small.

h) The Balancing Act (Summary)

i) Evaluation procedures and processes have evolved over the two and a half years of this project which are sufficient for the Connecting Lines programme as it stands. But information needs to be gathered during and on the last day of the project, as it's difficult to get responses after the event (as at Portland YOI).

ii) For social outcomes and objectives to be better realised, longer projects are needed which would necessitate a more rigorous evaluation procedure. As it stands, the programme is only the first step. It's far too short a period to really tackle offending behaviour, hence the difficulty of selling it as such. As an introduction it's excellent, but there needs to be follow up work, or a longer timespan for the project.

iii) There is a dearth of arts based activities in prison contexts. Although the Sleepers project at Portland YOI was fraught with difficulty, it showed that drama based initiatives can reach some of the most excluded offenders in a way that formal (and more informal) education cannot. But such arts based activities have to be careful not to be seen as the last resort for influencing the most difficult prisoners, as they have much to offer to a wider spectrum of offenders.

iv) The weakness of rehabilitation programmes in prison, is that there is an element of coercion (in terms of being written into sentence plans etc). Prisoners need to want to change their behaviour as they cannot be made to, hence the voluntary nature of Connecting Lines allows an exploration of the territory through role play without pressure. This has to be the starting point in a long and complex process that may take several years to realise and cannot necessarily be mapped out by existing methods utilising Performance Indicators and Targets that concentrate on easily quantifiable evidence. The programme needs to understand this weakness and exploit it.

v) Continuity within the projects is a real problem for several reasons. The most obvious is the lack of co-operation and respect from the prison regimes, which at HMP Stocken and Portland YOI, decided

unilaterally to lock up participants when they should have been working on the project. Ironically, if the prison were paying out more money for the services of Insight Arts, then it would have to be be far more accountable from its own end in terms of auditing use of resources.

vi) Overall the issuing of certificates is beneficial and reflects the utility of the project to those involved. But if it is to be accredited, the project needs to be longer. Also, unfortunately, too many certificates awarded in prison have little bearing on real life and are correspondingly unrecognised outside of it. Arguably, certification deflects from the real point of the project; looking at offending behaviour and participants having an unpressurised space in which to do this.

vii) If the courses are longer, the pressure and expectations of the prison for performance may well be greater. As it is, such performances are very good PR for Insight Arts, but can disempower those participating, as part of the empowering and group bonding process relates to the making of this very decision. Programme objectives need to be made clear to all concerned from the start.

viii) A need to review project objectives for both programmes and better training, transparency and planning for the tutors involved. Unfortunately, there needs to be room for improvisation and change of plan written into objectives and intended outcomes, as the situation inside the prison itself often dictates this against the best intended plans.

ix) There seems to be a lack of clarity for the Sleepers programme. How does the experimentalism of the project meld with the rehabilitative objectives? Tutors also need to understand how artforms compliment each other and work together. There also needs to be more realism in terms of numbers that such a project can accommodate and the constituency (i.e. are young offenders appropriate participants?). But there is a more creative adult constituency inside prisons that would relate better to the Sleepers programme and the freedoms inherent in it, than North/South and it's more structured approach. The two programmes have different albeit overlapping constituencies.

x) The balance between direction and self-direction is another awkward balance, particularly in prison, and with so little time to work. Ideally, the participants should have a determining input into how the project operates, but this would require a pre-project meeting and is not necessarily practical. On the other hand, this is maybe not possible for the North/South programme due to its structure.

xi) Such a scenario of pre-project meetings would also help in terms of recruitment, making sure that participants know what they are involved with, as well as allowing tutors to input into the process and fully comprehend project objectives.

xii) There is one underlying dilemma. To what extent is the programme about drama and creativity, and to what extent is it about tackling behaviour? Do they necessarily fit hand in glove? Either way, this needs to be explored and taken down to its bare bones. Such resulting information can then be used to promote the programme, de-mystifying the processes used, making its utility more obvious to both tutors, participants and prison staff.

i) Recommendations

i) That the programme be extended (IE from one week to three).

ii) That if the programme is extended, before-and-after evaluation techniques be built into it to gauge the changes in attitude and thought of participants. These will need to be strategically written into the objectives and realised through the techniques utilised. Such evaluation should be creative, befitting and as relevant to the programme as possible.

iii) That training is given to tutors into the ethos of Insight Arts, and how that particular tutor's work and artform is integrated into the overall strategies and aims of the programme.

iv) To re-think the use of the two different programmes within Connecting Lines in terms of their constituencies and make their purpose more transparent to both tutors and participants, so that all concerned understand the proposed impact.

v) To ensure that a pre-project forum is set up that includes tutors, prison staff and interested participants. This forum would help explain aims and objectives, and outline how these would be achieved during the week, to avoid any appropriation of the project. Selection procedures will need to be looked at.

vi) To find common ground with the prison, for instance to see where the programme can work together with prison education departments. This would necessitate looking at the Key Skills agenda and deciding whether it is possible or even desirable to accommodate it in some way. Lack of such knowledge handicaps the plausibility of the Connecting Lines programme to those with power in prison, to whom the package has to be sold. The people who determine prison activities, aren't necessarily knowledgeable of the arts, nor particularly interested. Their interest lies in satisfying performance targets. Therefore it might be fruitful to research how the programme might accommodate these. Such an understanding may help in terms of the initial approach to prisons, and augment bookings.

j) Bibliography

BOAL, Augusto. 1979. *Theatre of the Oppressed* Pluto Press
BOAL, Augusto. 1992. *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* Routledge

Paul Clements
External Evaluator
Autumn 2001

Cuts to Arts Activities in Prisons 2000 - 2001 A survey

KEY FINDINGS

- 30% of the questionnaires that were sent to every prison establishment in the country were returned
- 75% of prisons have experienced cuts to their arts provision in 2000/1 financial year
- 43% of classes have been cut to make way for Basic Skills or Key Skills classes
- One class has been replaced by Social and Life Skills
- 18% have been cut for financial reasons
- A wide range of arts activities have been cut, including Visual Art, Woodwork, Craft, Drama, Pottery, Music and Photography.

Registered Charity No1058949, Company Limited by Guarantee No 3266072
Founded by: Anne Peaker
Patrons: His Honour Sir Stephen Tumim, Jude Kelly OBE, Antony Sher, Benjamin Zephaniah
Trustees: Nigel Bilsbrough, Dr. Andrew Coyle, Christopher Maughan, Jill Vincent
Co-Directors: Pauline Gladstone, Angus McLewin

Address: The Unit for the Arts and Offenders, Neville House, 90/91 Northgate , Canterbury, CT1 1BA
Tel: 01227 470629 / 379704 Fax: 01227 453022 Email: info@a4offenders.org.uk Web: a4offenders.org.uk

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Cuts to the arts should be stopped and the trend reversed**
- **Arts activities should be given a significant role within prison education because:**

- Arts activities should not be seen as alternatives to Basic and Key Skills, but as useful allies.
  Learning will only take place if students find material enjoyable and relevant, if they are motivated to learn and are interested in the process. Teaching styles should match prisoners' learning needs – there is now hard evidence that the arts can effectively deliver Basic and Key Skills at Level 2 as they are accessible, popular and can break down the barriers to learning that many prisoners experience when faced with more traditional teaching methods

- The curriculum should be broad and,
  "*match the provision, styles of learning and delivery, assessment and guidance found within Further and Higher Education and Training*"
  (The Prison Research and Education Unit 1994)

- *"These activities have a particular potential to enable prisoners to develop and express themselves"*
  (The Council of Europe, referring to education in prisons, 1989)
  Through the simple act of engaging in an arts medium people can make sense of difficult, complex, vital and universally human experiences and they do so with amazing power, facility, richness and effect

- There is now also hard evidence that experience of the arts can reduce offending behaviour.

The Unit for the Arts and Offenders, March 2001

Institution	Cuts to Arts?	Details of Cuts	Decision-Maker	Reason Given	Replacement?
HMP Stafford	Yes	All classes in A Wing cut Nov 2000. Art Sessions for Basic Skills Group previously 5 groups, now only 3 since Jan 2001	HMP	Overpsend on budget	No
HMP YOI Guys Marsh	Yes	2 x Arts and Craft half-term courses	Governor	No reason	No
HMP Foston Hall	Yes	Guitar workshop - evening class withdrawn	Governor	Poor attendance Figures	No
HMP Lewes	Yes	Art/ Pottery have been cut to make way for Basic Skills	Area Manager/ Governor	Key Skills given priority	No
HMP Risley	Yes	Ceramics and general art classes to be stopped from April 2001 //	Governor	Non-accredited courses cut; need to meet KPT's	Yes
HMP Downview	Yes	Drama and Art (both 5 x 3hr per week)	Governor	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HM YOI Feltham	No	None			
HM YOI Portland	No	None			
HMP Birmingham	Yes	Creative Skills classes reduced from 10-5 hrs week	Head of Regimes	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HM YOI Wetherby	Yes	Art Evening Classes (3), Music Evening Classes (1), Craft Evening Classes(2) and Woodwork Evening Classes (2)	Governor	Budget	Yes
HMP Gartree	No				
HM YOI Aylesbury	Yes	Music (6 per week),Art (5 per week) and Yoga (1 per week) from March 2000	Head of Regimes	Budget	No

HMP Lincoln	Yes	Art reduced from 13.5-6.25 hrs per week; woodwork removed from curriculum	Head of Regimes	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HMP Albany	No				
HMP Manchester	Yes	3D art cut from 5-3 days per week	HMP	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HMP Bristol	Yes	Will be cut across curriculum from March 2001	Governor	Budget	No
HMP Camp Hill	Yes	All Art/Craft classes ceased Dec 2000	Head of Regimes	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HMP Nottingham	Yes	Pottery,Stained Glass, Handicrafts, Woodwork all cancelled	Governor	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HMP Dartmoor	Yes	Music cancelled in 1998	Governor	Budget/ Do not meet KPT targets	No
HMP Standford Hill	No				
HMP Blantyre House	Yes	Photography cancelled in July 2000	?	Budget	No
HMP Grendon	No				
HMP Springhill	No				
HMP Acklington	Yes	Art and Design cancelled, guitar class poss. To go in Feb 2001	Head of Regimes	Do not meet KPT targets	Yes
HMP Wealstun	Yes	Art and Woodwork reduced, music cancelled	HMP	Budget	No
HMP/DC Rochester	Yes	Art class for detainees cut Oct 2000	Head of Regimes	Poor attendance figures	No
HMP The Verne	No				
HMP Brockhill	Yes	Art has become part of Social and Life Skills and evening classes have beeen cut	Governor and Education Manager	Course priorities	Yes

HMP Garth	Yes	Music has been closed	HMP	Tutor did not accredit it	No
HMP Bullwood Hall	Yes	Art cut from 4 to 2 classes; multi craft cut from 10 to 5 sessions; pottery cut from 4 to 1 session	Governor	Budget	No
HMP Belmarsh	Yes	Painting and Drawing have been cut from 11 hours to 5 and a half	Head of Regimes	Do not meet KPT targets	No
HMP Exeter	Yes	Art classes moved from education department to landing - now non-specialist and no water	Education Manager	To offer outreach programme	Moved rather than replaced
HMP Ford	Yes	Craft cut by 55% Visual Art has been cut by 45%	Governor	To increase Basic Skills classes	Yes
HMP Weare	No				
HMP Frankland	Yes	Art, Woodwork and Craft have all been cut	Prison Management		No
HMP Featherstone	Yes	Drama, Music and Art/Craft have all been cut	Head of Regimes	To increase Basic Skills Classes	Yes
HMP Preston	Yes	Music class has been cut as a day class		Do not meet KPT targets	No

References & Bibliography

Published Sources

ADELMAN, Clem. 1996. Anything Goes *Evaluation* **2** (3), 291-305.

ADORNO, Theodor. 1970. *Aesthetic Theory* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

ADORNO, Theodor. 1991. *Culture Industry Reconsidered* in BERNSTEIN, J (ed) *Adorno the Culture Industry* (London: Routledge)

ALEXANDER, Jeffrey. 1987. *The Dialectics of Individuation and Domination: Weber's Rationalization Theory and Beyond* in LASH, Scott & WHIMSTER, Sam (eds) *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity* (London: Allen & Unwin)

ARAEEN, Rasheed. 2000. *Black Art A discussion with Eddie Chambers* in OWUSU, Kwesi (ed) *Black British Culture and Society.* (London: Routledge)

ARGYLE, Michael. 1989. *The Social Psychology of Work* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

ARGYLE, Michael. 1996. *The Social Psychology of Leisure* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

ARONOWITZ, Stanley & DI FAZIO, William. 1994. *The Jobless Future* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press)

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN. 1974. *Report of the Community Arts Working Party* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN. 1977. *32nd Annual Report: Value for Money* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN. 1978. *33rd Annual Report* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

ARTS COUNCIL OF ENGLAND. 2000. *Public Attitudes to the Arts* (London: Arts Council of England)

ARTS COUNCIL OF IRELAND. 1997. *Poverty: Access and Participation in the Arts* (Dublin: Arts Council of Ireland & Combat Poverty Agency)

BALFOUR, Michael & POOLE, Lindsey. 1998. *Evaluating Theatre In Prisons And Probation* in THOMPSON, James *Prison Theatre: Perspectives and Practices* (London: Jessica Kingsley)

BANKS, Tony. 1994. *Commons Debate on the Arts*, Hansard 5 May 1994 in WALLINGER, Mark & WARNOCK, Mary (eds) *Arts For All* (London: Peer Trust)

BAUDRILLARD, Jean. 1988. *Simulacra and Simulation* in POSTER, Mark (ed). *Selected Writings*

(Cambridge: Polity Press)

BAUDRILLARD, Jean. 1998. *The Consumer Society* (London: Sage)

BECKER, Howard. 1973. *Outsiders. Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: Free Press)

BECKER, Howard. 1982. *Art Worlds* (San Fransisco: University of California Press)

BELL, Judith. 1999. *Doing Your Research Project* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

BENNETT, Andy. 2002. Music, Media and Urban Mythscapes: a Study of the 'Canterbury Sound' *Media, Culture & Society* **24 (1)**, 87-100

BENNETT, Tony. 1998. *Popular Culture and the 'Turn to Gramsci'* in STOREY, John (ed). *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Harlow: Pearson Educational)

BERGHMAN, Jos. 1995. *Social Exclusion in Europe: Policy Context and Analytical Framework* in ROOM, Graham. (ed) *Beyond the Threshold* (Bristol: Policy Press)

BERNSTEIN, Jay (ed) *Adorno The Culture Industry* (London: Routledge)

BOAL, Augusto. 1979. *Theatre of the Oppressed* (London: Pluto Press)

BOAL, Augusto. 1992. *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (London: Routledge)

BOAL, Augusto. 1995. *The Rainbow of Desire* (London: Routledge)

BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction* (London: Routledge)

BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice* (Cambridge: Polity)

BOURDIEU, Pierre. 1993. *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity)

BRADEN, Sue. 1978. *Artists and People* (London: Routledge)

BRADLEY, Lloyd. 2000. *Bass Culture when Reggae was King* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

BRIGHTON, Andrew. 2000. *Towards a Command Culture: New Labour's Cultural Policy and Soviet Socialist Realism* in WALLINGER, Mark & WARNOCK, Mary. (eds) *Art for All?* (London: Peer Trust)

BRYMAN, Alan. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research* (London: Routledge)

BUTLER, Paul. 1985. *Ray Walker* in *Ray Walker* catalogue of the exhibition at the Royal Festival Hall, London 17/5 - 16/6 1985 (London: Coracle)

BYRNE, David. 1999. *Social Exclusion* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

CARPENTER, Evelyn. 1999. *The Arts and Inclusion. Evaluation of London Arts Board's 1998/9 Regional Challenge Programme* (London: London Arts)

References & Bibliography

CASTENADA, Carlos. 1990. *Journey to Ixtlan: Lessons of Don Juan* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

CHANAN, Gabriel. 2000. *Community Responses to Social Exclusion* in PERCY-SMITH, Janie (ed) 2000. *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

CHEVANNES, Barry. 1994. *Rastafari Roots and Ideology* (New York: Syracuse University Press)

CLANDININ, Jean & CONNELLY, Michael. 1994. Personal Experience Methods in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

CLEMENTS, Paul. 2002. Arts and Regeneration: Prisons.....The Role of the Arts in Prison *London Arts Cafe Newsletter* **19,** 12

COLLINS, Michael. 1988. Prison Education: A Substantial Metaphor For Adult Education Practice *Adult Education Quarterly* **38 (2),** 101-110

COLLINS, Michael, HENRY, Ian, HOULIHAN, Barrie & BULLER, James. 1999. *Policy Action Team 10. Research Report: Sport and Social Exclusion* (London: Department for Culture Media & Sport)

COOPER, Carolyn. 2002. *Virginity Revamped. Representations of Female Sexuality in the Lyrics of Bob Marley and Shabba Ranks* in *Black British Culture and Society* OWUSU, Kwesi (Ed) (London: Routledge)

COUNCIL OF EUROPE. 1986. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights [adopted and proclaimed by general assembly resolution 217A iii 10/12/1948]* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe)

DEAN, Jo, GOODLAD Robina & HAMILTON Christine. 2001. *Toolkit for Evaluating Arts Projects in Social Inclusion Areas: A Report to the Scottish Arts Council* (Edinburgh: Scottish Arts Council)

DENZIN, Norman. 1994. *The Art and Politics of Interpretation* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna. 1994. *Introduction. Entering the Field of Qualitative Research* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds). 1998. *The landscape of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE MEDIA AND SPORT. 1998. *The Comprehensive Spending Review: A New Approach to Investment in Culture* (London: Department for Culture Media & Sport)

DISSANAYAKE, Ellen. 1992. *Homo Aestheticus. Where Arts Comes from and Why.* (Seattle: University of Washington Press)

DOYAL, Len & GOUGH, Ian. 1991. *A Theory of Human Need* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

DUBUFFET, Jean. 1992. *Crude Art Preferred to Cultural Art* in HARRISON, Charles & WOOD, Paul *Art in Theory 1900-1990* (Oxford: Blackwell)

DUGUID, Stephen. 1981a. *Rehabilitation Through Education: A Canadian Model* in MORIN, Lucien (ed) *On Prison Education* (Ottawa: Canadian Government Publication Centre)

DUGUID, Stephen. 1981b. *Prison Education and Criminal Choice: The Context of Decision-making* in MORIN, Lucien (ed) *On Prison Education* (Ottawa: Canadian Government Publication Centre)

DUGUID, Stephen. 1986. What Works in Prison Education? *Adult Education* **58 (4), 329-324**

DUGUID, Stephen. 1998. *Policy, Praxis and Rehabilitation: Prison Education in Canada 1945-1995* in Forster, William (ed). *Education Behind Bars* (Leicester: National Organisation for Adult Learning)

DUNCUM, Paul. 2001. Visual Culture Developments, Definitions and Directions for Art *Studies in Art Education* **42 (2), 101-112**

DURKHEIM, Emile. 1938. *The Rules of Sociological Method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)

EAGLETON, Terry. 1996. *The Illusions of Postmodernism* (Oxford: Blackwell)

EAGLETON, Terry. 2000. *The Idea of Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell)

ELLIOT, Anthony & TURNER, Bryan (eds). 2001. *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory* (London: Sage)

EVERITT, Angela. 1995. Developing Critical Evaluation Evaluation **1 (1), 173-188.**

EVERITT, Anthony. 1997. *Joining In an Investigation into Participatory Music* (London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation)

FETTERMAN, David. 1996. *Empowerment Evaluation* in FETTERMAN, David, KAFTANAN, Shakeh & WANDERSMAN, Abraham (eds) *Empowerment Evaluation Knowledge and Tools for Self-Assessment and Accountability* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

FINNE, Hakon, LEVIN, Morten & NILSSEN, Tore. 1995. Trailing Research *Evaluation* **1 (1),** 11-31.

FLYNN, Nick & PRICE, David. 1995. *Education in Prisons A National Survey* (London: Prison

Reform Trust)

FONER, Eric. 1985. *Introduction* in *Thomas Paine Rights of Man* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

FORSTER, William. 1989. *Adult Education In Prisons* in TITMUS, C (ed) *Lifelong Education For Adults. An International Handbook* (Oxford: Pergamon Press)

FORSTER, William (ed). 1998. *The Prison Service and Education in England and Wales* in *Education Behind Bars* (Leicester: National Organisation for Adult Learning)

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977.* GORDON, Colin (ed) (Brighton: Harvester Press)

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1993. *The Birth of the Clinic* (London: Routledge)

FOWLER, Bridget. 1997. *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory* (London: Sage)

FRASCINA, Francis & HARRIS, Jonathan (eds). 1992. *Art in Modern Culture an Anthology of Critical Texts* (London: Phaidon)

FREIRE, Paolo. 1970a. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

FREIRE, Paolo. 1970b. The Adult Literacy Process As Cultural Action For Freedom *Harvard Educational Review* **40 (4)**, 205-225.

FRITH, Simon. 1984. *The Sociology of Youth* (London: Causeway Press)

FRITH, Simon. 1996. *Music and Identity* in HALL, Stuart & DU GAY, Paul (eds) *Cultural Identity* (London: Sage)

FROMM, Erich. 1977. *Fear of Freedom* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

GABLIK, Suzi. 1995. *Conversations Before the End of Time. Dialogues in Life Art, Life and Spiritual Renewal* (London: Thames and Hudson)

GIDDENS, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

GIRARD, Augustin. 1982. *Cultural Industries. A Challenge for the Future of Culture* (Paris: United Nations)

GOODLAD, Robina, HAMILTON, Christine & TAYLOR, Peter. 2002. *Not Just A Treat: Arts and Social Inclusion. A Report to the Scottish Arts Council* (Edinburgh: Scottish Arts Council)

GREENE, Jennifer. 2000. *Understanding Social Paradigms Through Evaluation* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

References & Bibliography

GREENBERG, Clement. 1965. *Avant-garde and Kitsch* in *Art and Culture* (Boston, Mass: Beacon Press)

GREGORY, Amanda. 2000. Problematizing Participation *Evaluation* **6 (2), 179-199.**

GUBA, Egon & LINCOLN, Yvonna. 1989. *Fourth Generation Evaluation* (Newbury Park: Sage)

HALL, Stuart. 1990. *Cultural Identity and Diaspora* in RUTHERFORD, Jonathan (ed) *Identity. Community, Culture, Difference* (London: Lawrence & Wishart)

HALL, Stuart & WHANNEL, Paddy. 1998. *The Popular Arts* in STOREY, John (ed) *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Harlow: Pearson Educational)

HANDY, Charles. 1985. *The Future of Work* (Oxford: Blackwell)

HARLAND, John, KINDER, Kay & HARTLEY, Kate. 1995. *Arts in their View A Study of Youith Participation in the Arts* (Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research)

HARRIES, Merion & HARRIES, Susie. 1983. *The War Artists* (London: Michael Joseph)

HEBDIGE, Dick. 1977. *Reggae, Rastas & Rudies* in HALL, Stuart & JEFFERSON, Tony (eds) *Resistance Through Rituals* (London: Hutchinson and Co)

HEBDIGE, Dick. 1979. *Subculture the Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen)

HEBDIGE, Dick. 1984. *Reggae, Rastas and Rudies: Style and Subversion of Form* (Birmingham: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies)

HEBDIGE, Dick. 1988. *Hiding in the Light* (London: Comedia)

HEWISON, Robert. 1995. *Culture and Consensus* (London: Methuen)

HEWISON, Robert. 2000. *New Times the Arts in 2010.* in *Arts Council of England Working for the Arts* (London: Arts Council of England)

HEWSON, Margaret. 1991. *Stephen Wiltshire Floating Cities* (San Fransisco: Michael Joseph)

HIGHAM, Ben. 1999. Assessing Evaluation *Sounding Board* Autumn 1999.

HOME OFFICE. 2002. *Prison Statistics England and Wales* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

HOUSE, Ernest. 1980. *Evaluating with Validity* (Beverly Hills: Sage)

HUNT, Tristram & FRASER, Giles. 2003. Revolutionary Putney *The Guardian* 19/2/03

INGLIS, Tom. 1997. Empowerment and Emancipation *Adult EducationQuarterly* **48 (1), 3-17.**

JAFFE, Aniela. 1978. *Symbolism in the Arts* in JUNG, Carl. *Man and his Symbols* (London: Pan)

JENKINS, Richard. 1992. *Pierre Bourdieu* (London: Routledge)

JOHNSON, Howard & PINES, Jim. 1982. *Reggae Deep Roots Music* (New York: Proteus)

JOHNSTON, Chris. 1998. *House of Games Making Theatre from Everyday Life* (London: Nick Hern)

JONES, Simon. 1988. *Black Culture, White Youth. The Reggae Tradition from JA to UK* (Basingstoke: MacMillan)

JUNG, Carl. 1978. *Man and his Symbols* (London: Pan)

KANE, Pat. 2000. Play For Today *Observer Magazine 'Life'* 22/10/00 20-29

KELLY, Owen. 1984. *Community, Art and the State: Storming the Citadels* (London: Comedia)

KELLY, Owen & WOJDAT, Eva. 1997. *The Creative Bits. The Social Impact of the Arts using Digital Technology* (Stroud: Comedia)

KNOLL, Joachim. 2001. Minorities – Caught Between Acculturation and Exclusion *Adult Education & Development* **56** 69-82

KUPER, Adam & TAYLOR, Laurie. 2002. The Tyranny of Multiculturalism *New Humanist* Summer 2002. 10-11.

LABOUR PARTY. 1997. Create the Future. A Strategy for Cultural Policy, Arts and the Creative Economy (London: Labour Party)

LANDRY, Charles. 1995. *The Creative City* (London: DEMOS)

LANDRY, Charles and GREENE, Lesley. 1996. *The Art of Regeneration. Urban Renewal Through Cultural Activity* (Stroud: Comedia)

LEVITAS, Ruth. 1996. The Concept of Social Exclusion and the New Durkheimian Hegemony *Critical Social Policy* **46 (16)**, 5-20

LINGAYAH, Sanjiv, MACGILLIVRAY, Alex & RAYNARD, Peter. 1997. *Social Impact of Arts Programmes Working paper 2. Creative Accounting: Beyond the Bottom Line* (Stroud: Comedia)

LUSTGARTEN, Anders. 2001. Notes from the Underground *Prison Report* **55, 21-22**

MACDONALD, Robert (ed). 1997. *Dangerous Youth and the Dangerous Class* in *Youth, the 'Underclass' and Social Exclusion* (London: Routledge)

MACDONALD, Barry. 1993. *A Political Classification of Evaluation Studies in Education* in HAMMERSLEY, Martyn (ed) *Social Research* (London: Sage)

MACPHERSON Ian, BROOKER, Ross & AINSWORTH, Paul. 2000. Case study in the Contemporary World of Research: Using Notions of Purpose, Place, process and Product to Develop Some Principles for Practice *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* **3 (1), 49-59.**

MAGUIRE, Mike & HONESS, Terry. 1997. *Supported Distance Learning in Prisons* (London: Prison Education Trust)

MANN, Kirk. 1992. *The Making of an English "Underclass"?: The Social Divisions of Welfare and Labour* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

MARX, Karl. 1976. *Preface and Introduction to A Critique of Political Economy* (Peking: Foreign Languages Press)

MASLOW, Abraham. 1970. *Motivation and Personality* (New York: Harper and Row)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1996a. *The Social Impact Of The Arts Working Paper 1. Defining Values Evaluating Arts Programmes* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois (ed). 1996b *Predicting the Unpredictable* in *The Art of Regeneration Conference Papers* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1997. *Use or Ornament* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1998a. *Poverty and Oysters* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1998b. *Vital Signs* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1998c. *Learning Development* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 1999. *Magic, Myths and Money* (Stroud: Comedia)

MATARASSO, Francois. 2000a. *Freedom's Shadow* in WALLINGER, Mark & WARNOCK, Mary (eds) *Arts For All* (London: Peer Trust)

MAYO, Marjorie. 2000. Learning for Active Citizenship: Training For and Learning From Participation in Area Regeneration *Studies in the Education of Adults* **32 (1), 22-35.**

MCGUIGAN, Jim. 1992. *Cultural Populism* (London: Routledge)

MEZIROW, Jack. 1991. *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning* (San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass)

MERIZOW, Jack. 1994. Understanding Transformation Theory *Adult Education Quarterly* **44 (4),** 222-235.

MITCHELL, Richard. 1993. *Secrecy and Fieldwork* (Newbury Park: Sage)

MORIARTY, Gerri. 1997. *Taliruni's Travellers: An Arts Worker's View of Evaluation* (Stroud: Comedia)

MORRIS, Frances. 1993. *Paris Post War Art and Existentialism 1945-55* (London: Tate Gallery)

MYERSCOUGH, John. 1988. *The Economic Importance of the Arts* (London: Policy Studies Institute)

O'BRIEN, Flann. 1993. *The Third Policeman* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

ORWELL, George. 1989. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

OWUSU, Kwesi. 1986. *The Struggle for Black Arts in Britain* (London: Comedia)

PALUMBO, Dennis. 1987. *The Politics of Program Evaluation* (Newbury Park: Sage)

PATTEN, David & CALLAGHAN, Danny. 2000. Artists Residencies and Social Exclusion *Public Art Journal* **1 (3)**, 40-48.

PATTON, Michael. 1980a. *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* (Newbury Park: Sage)

PATTON, Michael. 1980b. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (Newbury Park: Sage)

PATTON, Michael. 1982. *Practical Evaluation* (Newbury Park: Sage)

PATTON, Michael. 1987. *Evaluation's Political Inherency: Practical Implications for Design and Use.* in PALUMBO, Dennis (ed) *The Politics of Program Evaluation* (Newbury Park: Sage)

PAWSON, Ray. 1996. Three Steps to Constructivist Heaven *Evaluation* **2 (2)**, 213-219.

PAWSON, Ray & TILLEY, Nick. 1997. *Realistic Evaluation* (London: Sage)

PEAKER, Anne & VINCENT, Jill. 1990. *Arts in Prisons* (London: Home Office Research & Planning Unit)

PEAKER, Anne. 1994. The Arts and People in Institutions *Journal of Art & Design Education* Vol **13**, 57-64

PEARSON, Elaine & PODESCHI, Ronald. 1999. Humanism and Individualism: Maslow and his Critics *Adult Education Quarterly* **50 (1)**, 41-55.

PERCY-SMITH, Janie (ed). 2000. *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

PHILLIPS, Lucy. 1996. *The Social Impact Of The Arts Working Paper 9. In the Public Interest: Making Art that Makes A Difference in the USA* (Stroud: Comedia)

PICK, John. 1991. *Out Vile Jelly* (London: Brynmill)

POLICY ACTION TEAM 10. 1999. *Policy Action Team 10. A Report to the Social Exclusion Unit* (London: Department for Culture Media & Sport)

POLICY ACTION TEAM 10. 2000. *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal. Policy Action Team Report Summaries: A Compendium* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

POLICY ACTION TEAM 10. 2001. *Building on PAT 10 Progress Report on Social Inclusion* (London: Department for Culture Media & Sport)

PUNCH, Maurice. 1994. *Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

RADCLIFFE-BROWN, A. R. 1952. *Structure and Function in Primitive Society* (London: Free Press)

RAVENHILL, Mark. 2000. Help! I'm Having an Art Attack *The Guardian* 18/11/00

RAVENSCROFT, Neil. 1993. Public Leisure Provision and the Good Citizen *Leisure Studies* **12**, 33-44.

RHODES, Colin. 2000. *Outsider Art* (London: Thames & Hudson)

RICHES, Colin. 1994. *The Hidden Therapy of a Prison Art Education programme* in LIEBMANN, Marian (ed) *Art Therapy with Offenders* (London: Jessica Kingsley)

RIDLEY, Frank. 1965. *Spartacus* (Ashford: Frank Maitland)

RITZER, George. 1996. *The McDonaldization of Society* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press)

ROBBINS, Derek. 1991. *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu. Recognizing Society* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press)

ROBBINS, Derek. 2000. *Bourdieu and Culture* (London: Sage)

ROBINSON, Gerry. 2000. *The Creativity Imperative. Investing in the Arts in the 21st Century.* The New Statesman Arts Lecture 27th June 2000, Whitehall. (London: Arts Council of England)

ROJEK, Chris. 1985. *Capitalism and Leisure Theory* (London: Tavistock)

ROJEK, Chris. 1995. *Decentring Leisure* (London: Sage)

ROJEK, Chris. 2000. *Leisure and Culture* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

ROOM, Graham. (ed). 1995. *Beyond the Threshold* (Bristol: Policy Press)

RYAN, Mark. 2001. *Manipulation Without End* in WALLINGER, Mark & WARNOCK, Mary. (eds) *Art for All?* (London: Peer Trust)

SAID, Edward. 1993. *Representations of the Intellectual. The 1993 Reith Lectures* (London: Vintage)

SCHOR, Juliet. 1992. *The Over-Worked American* (New York: Basic Books)

SCHWANDT, Thomas. 1997. Evaluation as Practical Hermeneutics *Evaluation* **3 (1)**, 69-83.

SCHWANDT, Thomas. 2000. *Three Epistemological Stances for Qualitative Inquiry. Interpretivism, Hermeneutics and Social Constructionism* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

SCRIVEN, Michael. 1991. *Evaluation Thesaurus* (Sage: Newbury Park)

SCRUTON, Roger. 1998. *An Intelligent Person's Guide to Modern Culture* (London: Duckworth)

SEABROOK, Jeremy. 1988. *The Leisure Society* (Oxford: Blackwell)

SENIOR, Peter & CROAL, Jonathan. 1993. *Helping to Heal: Arts in Healthcare* (London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation)

SENNETT, Richard. 1998. *The Corrosion of Character. The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism* (New York: Norton and Company)

SENNETT, Richard. 1999. How Work Destroys Social Inclusion *New Statesman* 31/5/99, 25-7

SENNETT, Richard. 2003. Self-help and Symphonies *The Guardian Review* 18/01/03

SHAW, Phyllida. 1999. *Policy Action Team 10. Research Report: Arts and Neighbourhood Renewal* (London: Department for Culture Media & Sport)

SHAW, Roy. 1983. *Developing Access to the Arts* in ARTS COUNCIL OF GREAT BRITAIN *38th Annual Report* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

SHAW, Roy. 1987. *The Arts and the People* (London: Jonathan Cape)

SHAW, Robert & COLIMORE, Keith. 1988. Humanistic Psychology as Ideology: An Analysis of Maslow's Contradictions *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* **28 (3)**, 51-74.

SHOTTER, John. 1993. *Psychology and Citizenship: Identity and Belonging* in TURNER, Bryan (ed) *Citizenship and Social Theory* (London: Sage)

SMITH, Chris. 1998. *Arts and the Man: Culture, Creativity and Social Regeneration* in *Creative Britain* (London: Faber and Faber)

SMITH, Louis. 1994. *Biographical Method* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

References & Bibliography

SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT. 2000. *The Social Exclusion Unit* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT. 2002. *Reducing Re-Offending by Ex-Prisoners* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

STAKE, Robert. 1978. The Case Study Method in Social Inquiry *Educational Researcher* **7 (2), 5-8.**

STAKE, Robert. 1994. *Case Studies* in DENZIN, Norman & LINCOLN, Yvonna (eds) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

STAKE, Robert. 1995. *The Art of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: Sage)

STAMP, Sally. 1998. *Holding On Dramatherapy with Offenders* in THOMPSON, James (ed) *Prison Theatre: Perspectives and Practices* (London: Jessica Kingsley)

STOREY, John (ed). 1998a. *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Harlow: Pearson Educational)

STOREY, John (ed). 1998b. *Rockin' Hegemony: Wets Coast Rock and Amerika's War in Vietnam* in *Cultural Theory and Popular Culture* (Harlow: Pearson Educational)

STREET, John. 1997. *Politics and Popular Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press)

SWIFT, Graham. 1985. *The Tunnel* in *Learning to Swim and Other Stories* (London: MacMillan)

THOMPSON, James. 1999. *Drama Workshops for Anger Management and Offending Behaviour* (London: Jessica Kingsley)

TOWNSEND, Peter. 1979. *Poverty in the United Kingdom* (Harmondsworth: Penguin)

TRAVIS, Alan. 2002. Record Prison Population on Track to Pass 100 ,000 *The Guardian* 10/12/02

TUCHMAN, Maurice & ELIEL, Carol. 1993. *Modern Artists and Outside Art* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)

TURNER, Bryan. 1992. *Max Weber from History to Modernity* (London: Routledge)

VANDERPLAAT, Madine. 1996. Beyond Technique. Issues in Evaluating for Empowerment. *Evaluation* **1 (2), 81-96**

VAN GENNEP, Arnold. 1960. *The Rites of Passage* (London: Routledge & Keegan Paul)

WALKER, Alan. 1997. *The Strategy of Inequality* in WALKER, Alan & WALKER, Carol (eds) *Britain Divided. The Growth of Social Exclusion in the 1980's and 1990's* (London: Child Poverty Action Group)

WAPLINGTON, David. 1999. *Enhanced Thinking Skills: Example of an Accredited Course* in

Criminal Justice Conference What is What Works? Conference Report 19-20 Jan. (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

WARD, Lucy. 2001a. Record Income Gap Between Rich and Poor *The Guardian* 18/4/01

WARD, Lucy. 2001b. Poor Give More Generously than the Rich *The Guardian* 21/12/01.

WARNER, Kevin. 1998. The Issue of Motivation in Prison Education *Penological Information Bulletin* **21**

WEBER, Max. 1974. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Allen & Unwin)

WILLIAMS, Colin. 2002. Social Exclusion in a Consumer Society: A Study of Five Rural Communities *Social Policy & Society* **1 (3), 203-211**

WILLIAMS, Deidre. 1997. *The Social Impact Of The Arts Working Paper 8. How The Arts Measure Up* (Stroud: Comedia)

WILLIS, Paul. 1990. *Common Culture* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press)

WILSON, David. 2001. Valuing Prison Education *Prison Report* **54, 18-19**

YOUNG, Jock. 1999. *The Exclusive Society* (London: Sage)

ZOLBERG, Vera. 1990. *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

Internet Sources

ART WORKS IN MENTAL HEALTH. *About the Programme* at Artworksinmentalhealth.co.uk website visited at 16.15hrs on 7th June 2002.

BRIDGWOOD, Ann. 2002. *Social Inclusion: Policy and Research in the Arts.* at www.artscouncil.org.uk website visited at 11 30hrs on 12th October 2002.

INCLUSION THROUGH PARTICIPATION. 2001. *National Case Studies. Final Report: Work Package 4* Research into Social Exclusion in Europe at www.angelfire.com/ut/import website visited at 17 45hrs on 25th January 2002.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 2000. *New Life Maps* at www.newlifemaps.com/whoare/insarttrust.html website visited at 18 15hrs on 2nd January 2000.

JERMYN, Helen. 2001. *The Arts and Social Exclusion: A review Prepared for the Arts Council of England* at www.artscouncil.org.uk website visited at 18 15hrs on 2nd December 2001

References & Bibliography

LONG, Jonathan, WELCH, Mel & BRANHAM, Peter. 2002. *Count Me In. The Dimensions of Social Inclusion Through Culture and Sport* at www.lmu.ac.uk/research website visited at 15 00hrs on 27th June 2002.

MATARASSO, Francois. 2000b. *To Save the City: the Function of Art in Contemporary Europe Society* at www.comedia.org.uk website visited at 19 00 hrs on 1st November 2002.

MATARASSO, Francois. 2002. *Cultural Indicators A preliminary Review of Issues Raised by Current Approaches* at www. comedia.org.uk website visited at 19 00 hrs on 1st November 2002.

MCCORMICK, James & LEICESTER, Graham. 1998. *Three Nations Social Exclusion in Scotland* at www.scottishpolicynet.org.uk/scotpol website visited at 16 30 hrs on 26th October 2001.

MORIARTY, Geri. 2002. *Breightmet Arts Social Impact Study* at www.breightmetarts.co.uk website visited at 19 15hrs on 10th November 2002.

QUALITY, EFFICIENCY AND STANDARDS TEAM. 2002. *Making It Count. The Contribution of Culture and Sport to Social Inclusion* at www.culture.gov.uk/quest website visited at 21 00hrs on 13th December 2002.

REEVES, Michelle. 2002. *Measuring the Economic and Social Impact of the Arts: A Review* at www.artscouncil.org.uk website visited at 12 45hrs on 12th October 2002.

SARACENO, Chiara. 2002. *Social Exclusion. Cultural Roots and Diversities of a Popular Concept* at www.childpolicyintl.org/publications/Saraceno.pdf website visited at 18 30 hrs on 5th May 2002.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT. 2001a. *Preventing Social Exclusion* at www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk website visited at 15 30hrs on 26th October 2001.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT. 2001b. *Reducing Re-Offending by Ex-Prisoners* at www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk website visited at 13 15hrs on 22nd November 2002.

Exhibitions, Performances and Lectures

ART WORKS IN MENTAL HEALTH. 2002. *Art Works in Mental Health* Exhibition at the Dali Universe, County Hall, London. July 3rd to 13th 2002.

DALI, Salvador. 2002. *The Dali Universe* Exhibition at the County Hall Gallery, London. Visited July 12th 2002.

FRASER, Matt. 2002a. *Sealboy Freak* Performed at the Oval House Theatre, Kennington, London.

February 6th to 20th 2002.

JOWELL, Tessa. 2002. *Government, Culture and Creativity* Unpublished lecture given at City University, London. May 9th 2002.

MONKS, Paul. 2002. *Performing Miracles: Core Arts* Unpublished lecture given at St Thomas Hospital, London. December 3rd 2002.

Discography and Televisual Sources

FRASER, Matt. 2002b. *Born Freak* Transcript of Channel 4 programme shown at 23 00 on 11th July 2002.

JAMAICAN TOURIST BOARD. 2003. *Spirit of Jamaica* Advert shown on Channel 4 at 21 30 on 30th January 2003.

MARLEY, Bob. 1984. *Legend the Best of Bob Marley and the Wailers* (London: Island Records)

Unpublished Sources

BLUE, Annie. 1996. *Education For Women In Prison: Containment Or Empowerment?* Unpublished MA thesis in Adult and Continuing Education, Institute of Education, London.

GISBOURNE, Mark. 1996. *Beyond Reason. Art and Psychosis Works for the Prinzhorn Collection* Exhibition Catalogue, South Bank Centre, London.

HAMILTON, Christine. 2002. Unpublished personal e-mail correspondence. 2nd December 2002.

HARLAND John, KINDER, Kay, HARTLEY, Kate & WILKIN, Anne. 1995. *Attitudes To Participation In The Arts, Heritage, Broadcasting And Sport* Unpublished report for the Department of National Heritage, from the National Foundation for Educational Research.

HOME OFFICE. 2000. M.S. *Accredited Offending Behaviour Programmes 1999-2000* Unpublished report by the Offending Behaviour Unit, Living Skills Team, Clelland House, Home Office.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1998a. *Connecting Lines* Unpublished information pamphlet promoting organisation.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1998b. *Internal Evaluation Report for Connecting Lines* Unpublished transcript of meeting in London on 10th November 1998.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1999a. Unpublished transcript of meeting in London on 14th October 1999

at Insight Arts Offices.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1999b. *New Life Maps Presentation Pack* Unpublished presentation pack for Insight Arts training day at the Diana, Princess of Wales Memorial Fund, London, 10th November 1999.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1999c. *Agenda* Unpublished manuscript concerning the structure and content of the Sleepers programme.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 1999d. *Connecting Lines. Year 1 Report for the Lankelly Foundation* Unpublished report.

INSIGHT ARTS TRUST. 2002. Unpublished personal e-mail correspondence. 30/10/02

TAMBLING, Pauline. 2000. *Social Exclusion – A Response to Policy Action Team 10 from the Arts Council of England* Unpublished policy document, Arts Council of England, May 2000.

UNIT FOR THE ARTS AND OFFENDERS. 2001 *Cuts to Arts Activities in Prisons 2000-2001* Unpublished survey of Prison Education Departments.