

## A HISTORY OF DRAMA EDUCATION: A SEARCH FOR SUBSTANCE

**Gavin Bolton**

*University of Durham, U.K.*

### Introduction

In an introduction to *How Theatre Educates* (2003) Kathleen Gallagher of OISE at the University of Toronto rightly concludes: "... there is no correct pedagogical model on offer for drama education." By summarizing the input of a few selected teachers in the field, the aim of this chapter is to present images of the mosaic of activities that have occurred in schools under that umbrella term "drama education". A brief background explanation is also provided where the choice of *genre* has been in part determined by the political, religious or cultural climate of the time. For instance, in the Palestinian town of Ramallah in 2001 Wasim Kurdi conducted a series of workshops with 14 to 18-year olds on the siege of Akko by Napoleon, 200 years earlier. Such improvised drama is only meaningful if it is seen as a deliberately chosen distancing ploy, for Kurdi did not want his young people to use drama for venting their anger about their own political crisis, but as a chance to reflect on the broader strands of oppression (see Davis, 2003). Thus to understand a teacher's choice of drama it is often necessary to know something of the context.

Regretfully, there is not room in this chapter to include any detailed accounts of drama research, theories of drama education, the school play, the formation of national and international drama associations, traditional children's theater or the teaching of drama at university level, although these aspects are referred to occasionally. Rather it concentrates on trying to untangle the confused strands of classroom drama.

### Pre-Twentieth-Century Drama in Schools

Plato's opposition on moral grounds to any form of representation, including dramatic recitation celebrating Dionysus, gave authoritative support to opponents of school drama throughout its history: "... prolonged indulgence" he warned his contemporaries, "in

any form of literature leaves its mark on the moral nature of man ..." (Plato, *The Republic*, trans. 1955, Book 3, p. 395) He cannot have foreseen however when he also wrote, merely intending a pleasurable approach to learning, "... let your children's lessons take the form of play", (Ibid., Book 7, p. 537) that by the mid-twentieth century his words would be reinterpreted to mean freely expressed *dramatic* behavior in many classrooms round the Western world.

For many centuries following classical times drama was excluded from education. Plato's philosophical objection to theater turned into positive detestation in the early centuries of Christianity, partly because of the pagan subject matter, partly because of a general unease about breaking the Second Commandment relating to "graven image," partly because of the mixed emotions it aroused, enjoyment overriding compassion, and finally because of the degradation thought to be brought about by actors and indeed by theaters themselves, "sinks of uncleanness" (Coggin, 1956, p. 38) as Augustine unambiguously put it. The Roman Catholic Church, however, through its Monastery schools, notably St. Gall of Switzerland, introduced in the tenth century the beginnings of drama by inviting the boys to use improvised words to liturgical chants. Gradually, actions were added to illustrate Bible stories, *Quem Queritis* being among the first recorded manuscripts.

The late mediaeval/early renaissance periods saw contrasted modes of theater:

1. Miracle plays entertaining the illiterate;
2. a Platonic "playful" approach to education resulting in the setting up of "La Casa Giocosa" in 1428 in Mantua, a "joyful house" of schooling;
3. a revival of Roman scripts in humanistic schools throughout northern Europe as a means of studying Latin;
4. in England, the performance of Shakespearean texts as models of rhetoric.

Dominating education during this period, however, were the Jesuit Schools, whose Catholic philosophy adopted the Aristotelian love of theater. Suitably pious plays performed in Latin became a regular feature of religious education on the continent, eventually extending to Poland and Russia. In some places, Vienna, for example, the Jesuit school was the only place where theatrical performances could be seen. By the seventeenth century the Jesuit influence on drama spread to Catholic royalty. King Louis XIV even encouraged performances by the convent *girls* in the House of Saint-Cyr.

However, the growth of enthusiasm for drama in Jesuit schools had not necessarily the approval of the Catholic Church outside the Jesuit boundaries. Father P. Lami, a French Catholic priest protested:

Apart from the fact that the plays are usually pitiful, that they waste a lot of time, that they distract the mind, that they wreak havoc with studies, over-excite the brain, and go to the head, they are, moreover, contrary to the gospel and to our statutes. (Coggin, 1956, p. 96)

Although written in 1685, the antipathy it expresses towards school drama and the reasons given for that hostility have never entirely disappeared even to present day. By 1764 the Austrian Empire, which included Bohemia and Moravia where school

drama had been popular, set about banning drama in schools (see Gaffen, 1999), while Puritanism, the extreme form that the Reformation took in England, ensured that the extinction of any kind of dramatic art in schools was sustained virtually until the end of the nineteenth century.

## **Drama Education from 1900s to Present Day: Both Shadow and Substance**

### *Reintroducing Drama into the Classroom as Speech-Training*

If teachers were to revive an interest in drama education, then the logical step in the first half of the century was to link it with the teaching of English literature and language. A 1921 British Government publication firmly placed drama in the classroom as something to be written, read or acted – “in little scenes or pieces” and read out either from the pupils’ desks or from the front of the class by teacher’s chair (see Board of Education, 1921). In that year, however, such dramatic enactment was felt to be a brave step, building on the 20 years of pioneering work by Elsie Fogerty (1923) who in 1906 founded the Central School of Speech and Drama, an institution still having considerable influence on London drama teaching today. Thus began an enthusiastic, albeit narrow, approach to the study and practice of texts. “Elocution”, as it was called, became very popular with the middle classes through private lessons from private teachers, along with graded examinations marking achievement levels. Paradoxically, this most socially interactive of the arts became an individualized exercise in speech practice, creating a genre of drama education unique to the United Kingdom and some of its colonies including Australia, New Zealand, India and South Africa. Clive Sansom, for instance, immigrated to Tasmania in 1951, where his influence on speech training spread throughout Australia. Even today Speech and Drama Colleges in London organize examinations in these countries.

### *The Early Attempts to Liberalize Classroom Dramatic Activity*

Some schools, however, were aligning themselves with the new credo of “Progressive Education”. With its roots in the European philosophies of Plato, Rousseau, Goethe and Schiller, “education as experience” rather than book learning became the new way of thinking about how children should be taught. Experiments in education following the principles of teachers such as Froebel, Pestalozzi, and Montessori emphasized the importance of the individual child. “Freedom,” “self expression,” and “activity,” became the shibboleths of progressivism. Whereas some schools across Europe allowed young children to enjoy free “Wendy House” play, others adopted a more purposeful exploitation of dramatics. Esther Boman in Stockholm, for example, Principal of a progressive education Girls’ School (1909–1936) used drama to focus on aspects of the curriculum and on personal problems connected with the girls’ lives. Her ideas, however, were not published until 1932 (see Hagglund, 2001). In Prague, too, experiments in a more liberal use of drama were tried but without subsequent publication (see Slavik, 1996). The only

full accounts of this kind of experimental teaching published earlier, came from two British teachers.

From her appointment in 1897, a village school head teacher, Harriet Finlay-Johnson<sup>1</sup> (1911), experimented by using drama to teach the subjects of the curriculum. The pupils in her class, aged roughly 10 to 13, wrote, produced and rehearsed their own plays, performing them for each other in the classroom, each play demonstrating aspects of the curriculum they were currently studying. In keeping with the “democratic” conception of education promoted by John Dewey (1916) in America, the children saw themselves and their teacher as “fellow workers” with a shared responsibility for turning selected subject-matter into dramatic form.

This collective approach to self-learning through drama was matched in an entirely different kind of school. Appointed in 1911 as English master to a prestigious boys’ independent school in Cambridge, Henry Caldwell Cook (1917), adopted the Platonic term “play-way” and used drama as the central methodology for teaching English. Pupils successfully transformed prose, poetry and Shakespearean texts into dramatic action based on what was known of the Elizabethan stage.

The word “successfully” is deliberately introduced into the last sentence because interested contemporaries reading Finlay-Johnson’s or Caldwell Cook’s publications or actually visiting the Perse School where Cook taught could very well have put these dramatic achievements down to the teacher’s “genius” or “charisma”. This raises a problem with respect to any pioneer whose outstanding skills appear to be unmatched. In a 1922 unpublished report to the Board of Education the Inspector affirms:

... it would be very dangerous for teachers to be encouraged to visit the School with the idea that they will find there something that they might and should imitate. That being so, it seems clear that if an application is ever made for an Art 39 grant for this experimental work, it would be well for the Board not to entertain it.

Using this approach indeed remained isolated, many teachers experiencing failure. One teacher, a distinguished classroom practitioner, was made painfully aware when he tried this “playway” approach to teaching history. In achieving little more than “undisguised amusement” from his students, he dismissively summarized this new method with: “In grasping at the substance, you have even lost the shadow” (Tomkinson, 1921, p. 46).

### *Classroom “Acting”*

In the United Kingdom during the period before World War II there were no teacher-training institutions offering their students advice on how to apply this “playway” approach to Drama. In Evanston, Illinois, however, from 1924 “Dramatics” was introduced into local schools as an elective, guidance being given from the staff, led by Winifred Ward, of Northwestern University’s School of Speech. “Creative Dramatics”, as it became called, was thus introduced as a school subject in its own right. That drama was “taught” rather than “used”, gave the classes freedom to invent their own plays with all that implied of acting skills and “... a feeling for their theatre” (Ward, 1930, p. 27). Thus America’s greatest pioneer in the history of drama education, along

with her contemporary, Isabel Burger and others who followed in her path, such as Geraldine Siks and Nellie McCaslin (1984), found a pathway in schools that paralleled professional theater. Nellie McCaslin<sup>2</sup> of New York became a world authority on drama education, particularly in training teachers how to use stories, including students' personal histories, to create their own dramatic form for presentation, a *genre* that continues to spread worldwide today (see Kelin, 2005). These American pioneers attracted visitors from all over Europe, especially Scandinavia. For instance, in 1942 Elsa Olenius of Sweden modeled her teaching on Burger's "creative playmaking", setting up Var Teater in Stockholm, the first children's theater in Europe to receive municipal support. Indeed Scandinavia<sup>3</sup> throughout the century became a pivotal laboratory for drama teaching, reflecting, researching, and revising the approaches of all the world's leaders. Most have been welcomed as visitors, culminating in the 1000 delegates arriving for the IDEA – International Drama in Education Association – World Congress held in Bergen in 2001.

*Every Child Has His Own Drama Within Him: A New Kind of Substance? – Or Shadow?*

Peter Slade (1954, 1968, 1977) in the United Kingdom was at first part of a new movement, popular in many European<sup>4</sup> and American countries, introducing "Children's Theatre" into schools. Professional actors came into the school to entertain pupils with a play written and directed by Slade and specifically directed at a particular age group. He was the first director to insist that such performances be "in-the-round." By the 1940s, however, he was beginning to train teachers in his unique *classroom* methodology. In claiming that every child has his own "child drama" within him, he built on psychological theories of play that had been published since the beginning of the century<sup>5</sup> (see Isaacs, 1932; Lee, 1915; Sully, 1896). Typically, Slade required children to spread out in the school hall, each sitting cross-legged in a space of his or her own, whilst he, from the front, wove a story from their ideas. He would then proceed gently, invitingly, to narrate that story while all the class stood and simultaneously created the dictated actions. Sometimes the class would gradually merge into small groups and play out their own fantasies loosely connected with the story. Alternatively, he would put on a "78 rpm" gramophone record and the children would, separately and spontaneously, dance to the music. At the climax of their free expression in either action or dance he looked for what he called "golden moments." For the children, these trustful, exhilarating experiences were meant to be an expression of an unconscious dream, a spiritual journey.

Thus drama was seen to have a therapeutic aspect. Indeed Slade gave much of his professional time to working with "under-achieving and unhappy children."<sup>6</sup> For some followers of Slade this seemed a by-product of the work in psychiatry founded in Vienna by Moreno (1946) in 1918 and continued in New York. For others this work blended in with the new philosophy of "educating the whole person." It was the architectural setting, however, that fixed the nature of Peter Slade's approach in the minds of most teachers. He recommended the use of the school hall, because "Child Drama" needed freedom of space. These spaces were normally allocated only for a school's morning assembly and physical education lessons, a daily routine of teacher instructions to pupils evenly spaced

throughout the hall. Thus the new drama activity in England was slipped into schools under the guise of physical education; “stripping for drama” became part of the pupils’ routine.

Drama as fundamentally linked with physical training was being reaffirmed, from an entirely different source, coinciding uneasily with Slade’s use of free dance. From the beginning of the century the practice of Jaques-Dalcroze (1921) in the field of *Eurhythmics* as a basis for all art education, had had a minor effect in Great Britain on progressive thinking about school drama, but a new pioneer of considerably more influence arrived from Germany in the 1930s. This was Rudolf Laban (1948) whose classification and planned procedures for basic human movement were rapidly taken up by the British teaching profession (the *female* teaching profession, that is, for the men were called up for military service) as a new approach to girls’ Physical Education in Secondary schools.

But Laban was a man of the theater; he used his training in movement as a way of preparing actors, so that teachers in schools following a Laban program had no difficulty in seeing a kinship with professional theater. And yet it also paralleled what Slade was promoting in the primary schools. The government-led conclusion seemed to be that Laban/Slade methodologies, all requiring the school hall or gymnasium, were indeed providing a basic training for all the arts, including acting. Thus developed a curious ambiguity towards the subject. Visitors to a primary or secondary school in Yorkshire to observe drama lessons, could find themselves witnessing a series of carefully sequenced Laban movement exercises that had no make-believe element whatsoever. On departing they would be assured that such an approach was a “preparation” for future drama work. Thus drama without fiction – a new kind of shadow or a deeper, dance form of dramatic expression?

Confusion grew in England over whether appointees to the Drama Advisory Service or to teacher-training institutions should be seen as experts in traditional theater, speech-training, Laban movement or Sladian Child Drama. The latter, Child Drama, overtook the others, Peter Slade becoming for many years the virtual spokesman for the Government. Teachers of theater, in particular, found themselves pushed aside. The school stage became virtually redundant, except for the annual school play or the Christmas Nativity. Also ignored were the few remaining teachers who thought that drama was a classroom activity for exploring the subjects of the curriculum, for in Sladian Drama content was less important than freedom of expression. That children once wrote their own plays in the classroom became long forgotten.

Any teachers who felt uneasy about the freedom that Child Drama offered felt more secure when Brian Way (1967), a friend of Slade’s and a pioneer in Children’s Theatre with audience participation, came on the scene. He used the same structure as Slade – a physical education format – but he replaced the fantasy journey of the teacher’s narration with short exercises in mimetic actions of everyday life and aimed at developing each child’s intuition and concentration capacities. The personal development of the individual became the new objective for this “creative drama,” a term quickly picked up in other countries, notably in Canada where the British academic, Richard Courtney (1968), contributed massively to providing a theoretical basis for the work. Even a non-Western country such as Turkey wrestled with the distinction between “theatre in

schools” and “creative drama” (see San, 1998). However, Way’s anti-theater position paradoxically encouraged the introduction into schools of fashionable actor-training devices, so that a teacher’s lessons plans began to include “warm-ups,” games, relaxation, and sensitivity exercises. Indeed, from one point of view it could be argued that Slade and Way’s innovatory classroom practice was but an extension of experimental work already taking place in theater schools in Moscow, St. Petersburg, Paris, New York, Chicago, and Bristol.

### *Improvisation in Actor-Training – The Substance Lies in the “Releasing”*

Improvised entertainment began, long before Classical Greek times, with the Shaman and the Clown. The Shaman offered his or her audiences a glimpse of the “other” world or the dark side of the unconscious, while the Clown offered childish, scatological fantasies, or outrageous, satirical commentary. They both stand for a virtual reality, the very essence of the imagined. Absorbed into drama they appear in the Dorian *Mime* of Megara, the Sanskrit drama of India, the *Commedia dell’arte* of Italy, the little devils who ran amok through the spectators at the Mystery plays and the “masqueraders” of the Trinidadian carnivals today.

Thus begins the notion of improvised entertainment, a concept that was taken up seriously in the twentieth century with actor-trainers such as Vsevolod Meyerhold in Russia in 1910, and Jacques Copeau in the 1920s, in France. Both set up institutions with a view to reviving *Commedia dell’arte*. But their contribution extended beyond the revival of a particular *genre*: they became absorbed in improvisation as a valid training exercise. Meyerhold introduced what became known as “Biomechanics,” a training of the body in kinaesthetic, spatial, and relational awareness; Copeau included games, mime, and mask work, alongside gymnastics. These routines as preparation for dramatic performance became the norm of progressive actor-training, so perhaps those visitors to Yorkshire schools should not have been disappointed, for physical training was indeed to be the new “substance”.

There is, however, a parallel story to the European scene: in Chicago a city with a long-established tradition of theater, The Chicago Little Theater was opened in 1912 by Maurice Brown and his wife Ellen Van Volkenberg, beginning what became known as the “little theatre” movement in America. Living nearby was an astonishing figure in American Education, Neva L. Boyd, who in 1911 had already set up the Chicago Training School for Playground Workers. By 1914 she was appointed as Director of the Department of Recreation in the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. Boyd was both a practitioner and an academic sociologist promoting the use of Play in teaching children and adults. Her classroom spaces hummed with physical games, story-telling, folk dancing and dramatics. It is not surprising that her philosophy has been linked with Caldwell Cook’s “playway” approach to education. Her student, Viola Spolin, became the leading authority on the use of Theater Games and extended that philosophy and practice in further directions, for example, training community workers to use drama in their work and introducing the idea of improvising from audience-suggested material. Thus began the link with Chicago Little Theater and long before Spolin’s 1963 publication, *Improvisation for Theater*, the “Chicago style” genre of theater performance

entered the school system. From Spolin's position as Director of the Young Actor's Company in California in 1946 the practice in improvisation became, as she defined it, "playing the game". This was perhaps a misleading construction, for in some schools the word "improvisation" was reduced to "skit" with all that can imply: having fun, being slick and, inevitably perhaps, "playing for laughs."

But in another part of America, New York, a very different meaning was being given to "improvisation". In 1924 profound interest in Stanislavski led to the establishment of the American Laboratory Theater. In addition to the physical aspect of training, improvisation was used to take actors on a private, inward journey. The object of this exercise, under the guidance of Maria Ouspenskaya, was to put the actor in touch with the life of the character. Later however, under Lee Strasbourg, the activity was directed towards helping actors to meet their own selves and to break down personal blockages. Thus professional theater seemed to overlap with therapy. Supported by the psychodramatic theory and practice of Moreno and later, by the personal growth literature of such thinkers as Carl Rogers (1961) and Abraham Maslow (1954), improvisation became associated in the minds of both theater directors and some drama teachers in schools with "finding the authentic self". In many schools throughout the western world, drama workshops acquired this therapeutic flavor.

There was still yet another use of improvisation, aimed at helping actors but also adopted in some classrooms. Its instigator, Keith Johnstone, following the experimental work of Jacques Copeau, Michel St. Denis, Jacques Lecoq and Dario Fo, was himself a London teacher before he turned to work with the Royal Court Theater actors. What started in the 1960s as "hysterically funny" (Johnstone, 1979, p. 27) improvised explorations setting out to free the imaginations of the actors, gradually developed into public demonstrations in various London colleges and then, with a group of actors. Taking on the title "The Theatre Machine", it grew into performances round many countries of Europe. Some London secondary schools, learning of this new lively approach on their doorstep, set about freeing the imaginations of their Drama classes with this "hysterically funny" way of working. Johnstone moved on to Canada, eventually settling for the rest of his career at the University of Calgary from whence his "International Theatresports Institute" became established on every continent, a model of comedy combined with competitiveness and slickness that many schools found irresistible.

### *A New Kind of Substance – "Change in Understanding"*

Dorothy Heathcote was appointed to Newcastle-upon-Tyne University, Institute of Education in 1950. Local teachers were excited by her "A Man in a Mess"<sup>7</sup> drama work, but it took the rest of the world and, in particular, American Professors Betty Jane Wagner (1976) and Anne Thurman, and in Canada, leading practitioners such as Norah Morgan<sup>8</sup> and Juliana Saxton (1991) to give full recognition to this innovative approach breaking with all previous traditions. In the UK Heathcote's efforts aroused suspicion, so that when her University applied to run the country's first full-time Advance Diploma course in Drama for experienced teachers, the Government gave its approval – providing Peter Slade taught part of the course. There was much respect but little meeting point in either philosophy or practice between these two pioneers.



Both these remarkable people, like Winifred Ward before them, based their practice on honoring what children had to offer. One point of practical similarity was that they both tended to use a large space, such as a hall or gymnasium so that a whole class could be actively engaged. For Heathcote, however, drama is a collective enterprise, “collective” in more than one sense. The class as a whole, often huddled in a tight group on the floor or sitting in a cluster of chairs in front of a blackboard, is invited to make skeletal decisions about the choice of topic for the drama. Whereas the well-established drama lesson advocated by Nellie McCaslin, for instance, might start with: “What do we understand about this character?” for Heathcote the question is likely to be: “How shall *we* set about solving this problem?”

It is the teacher’s function of “teacher-in-role” (see Ackroyd, 2004) that brings extra complications to what became known as “living through” drama.<sup>9</sup> The teacher, playing a carefully chosen role, maneuvers the drama toward credibility and thoughtfulness. The teacher operates as a playwright/director and as teacher/artist, planting a seed, selecting the setting and just the right fictional moment in time that will gradually focus the children’s choice of topic and resonate into deeper layers of meaning. Thus Heathcote replaces Slade’s narrative of instructions with her own here-and-now in-role input to the drama. The group faced a problem, a mystery, a journey, a search, or a crisis of mankind – “a man in a mess” – or, alternatively, the class took on the responsibility of an investigator’s role into precision. This was a new genre of theater that brought substance back to the drama lesson, culminating at its best in a moment of awe that belongs to all forms of theater. As Mike Fleming put it: “Any significant understanding of what being ‘good at drama’ entails, must include reference to content” (Fleming, 1994, p. 53). In my own practice at Durham University I tried to bring theater form to a combination of Heathcote/Way approaches, arguing that dramatic play and theater should be seen as a continuum.

So have we arrived at true educational “substance” here? Not in the view of Brian Way’s faithful promoters such as Margaret Faulkes-Jendyk of Alberta and, later, more traditional teachers such as David Hornbrook (1991) in the United Kingdom, both of whom felt somewhat disenfranchised by the growing popularity round the English-speaking world of Heathcote’s approach. Faulkes-Jendyk (1974, 1975) argued that Heathcote’s teaching lacked “drama, creativity and education”. Even supporters of an improvisational approach recognized potential flaws. Helen Nicholson (1995), a leading British academic and practitioner, pointed out that classroom drama can be dominated by cultural dispositions such as gender stereotyping. Likewise, Johnny Saldaña (1997) of Arizona State University drew attention to the potential cultural mistrust that can occur when teacher and class are of different ethnic groups. It is also true that drama can become a platform for a teacher’s ideology – humanist, religious or political. David Davis’ (1983) tongue-in-cheek choice of title for an article on the training of young employees, “Drama for Deference or Drama for Defiance?”, nicely captures the urge felt among many radical teachers to harness drama for political ends and Sharon Grady’s (2000) more recent polemic, casting drama as a tool for confronting our own prejudices, warns against assuming that drama can do nothing but good. And there can be government imposition. For instance, in the late 1940s in Poland, performance competitions between schools were set up with a view to “glorifying the new structures of the state and the role of the Soviet Union in the world” (see Lewiki,

1995). Tor-Helge Allern (1999) of Norway gives us a bald warning: “Drama can ... be part of a destructive movement ...” (p. 202).

### *Actor-Teachers*

Heathcote’s work spread into the developed version of children’s theater, newly entitled *Theatre in Education* (TIE). Brian Way (1923–2006), in the 1950s and 1960s had successfully created his London-based professional touring companies that experimented in conducting “in-the-round” performances while school audiences at fixed moments in the play gave active support to the actors – providing background sounds or answering a character’s questions. The format of *Theatre in Education*, however, extended the performance into a half-day or full-day workshop. Tony Jackson (1980) of the University of Manchester, draws attention to the new structure and objectives:

The T.I.E. programme is not a performance in schools of a self-contained play, a “one-off” event that is here today and gone tomorrow, but a co-ordinated and carefully structured programme of work, usually devised and researched by the company, around a topic of relevance both to the school curriculum and to the children’s own lives, presented in school by the company and involving the children directly in an *experience* of the situations and problems that the topic throws up. (p. ix)

This new approach required a huge organizational shift from national children’s theater touring companies to a theatre-in-education company attached to a local city theater, Coventry’s “Belgrade Theatre” being the first. Often the selection of the theme for the drama was made in consultation with a local school. The term “actor-teacher” was coined, explicitly linking TIE [theatre-in-education (see O’Toole, 1976)] with DIE [drama in education]. How very different was the UK “Children’s Theatre” and its subsequent “Theatre in Education” from the American and other countries’ versions of “Children’s Theatre,” a tradition of plays written especially for children by skilled playwrights and performed in auditoria for children’s audiences.<sup>10</sup> Edward Bond (see Davis, 2005) is perhaps the only playwright of world distinction who has devoted many years to writing for and working alongside a TIE company (The Big Brum Company in Birmingham, UK).

There is not room in this chapter to outline in detail the “sea changes” that Heathcote brought about in her own approaches. She developed, for example, a way of working in drama with severely challenged adults and children; she introduced with her “Mantle of the Expert” (1995)<sup>11</sup> approach to curriculum teaching what will surely become central to any vision of the future in teaching the young. Her present practice, helping young people to study texts, involves an extension of “Chamber Theatre” (see Heathcote, 2005, pp.7–17) begun by Robert Breen (1986) at Northwestern University, USA.

### *Extending Heathcote’s Approach*

Whilst a deadening hand, political as well as philosophical, lay temporarily<sup>12</sup> on the development of drama in UK schools for the final decade of the twentieth century

elsewhere in the world the picture was more positive. In Poland, for example, Halina Machulska<sup>13</sup> set up a center for drama education [often referred to as “British” drama, meaning the “Heathcote methodology”] in Warsaw’s “Ochota Theatre”. At this time too, at the Ohio State University, Cecily O’Neill (1995) sought a way of explicitly combining basic theater structures with Heathcote’s communal, “living through” drama. Using “Process Drama”, as it came to be called as a way of distinguishing it from the “performance drama” of many American Schools, O’Neill would select a pre-text that provided a class with an impetus for action within a tight, coherent dramatic framework, releasing students into unknown improvisational territory. [More recently, John Carroll (2004) at CSU, Bathurst, has extended O’Neill’s concept of “pre-text” by introducing the immersive stimuli offered by digital technology, including email and the Internet].

In Toronto, David Booth (1994), a charismatic figure in world drama, has been creating his own version of communal, “living through” drama, a *genre* linking drama with stories, not the direct enactment of a story as in Winifred Ward’s approach, but, rather, with the class’s response to the themes or issues emanating from the story-line. Both “Process Drama” and “Storydrama” often rely on the use of “teacher-in-role” and the ambiguous seduction of a guide “leading the way while walking backwards” as O’Neill (1995, p. 67) nicely describes it. Consistently, the purpose of their work was growth in understanding.

### *Beginnings of a World Picture*

If the focus for innovation in classroom practice has tended to center on British and North American pioneers, from 1990 onwards Australia became a leading location for experimental practice and academic research. A sense of enterprise had uniquely brought its geographically distanced universities, under the leadership of Paul Roebuck,<sup>14</sup> John O’Toole (Griffiths & Melbourne Universities), John Deverall and Kate Donelan (University of Melbourne, where the first teacher-training course in drama was set up by Ron Danielson), Robin Pascoe (Western Australia), Brad Haseman (Queensland University of Technology), John Hughes and Jenny Simons, University of Sydney, Kathleen Warren (Macquarrie University) and others, into a cooperative thrust toward an expansion of educational drama, well-coordinated through the energetic National Association for Drama in Education, now “Drama Australia.” In their search for a wider, multicultural, South-East Asian perspective, they distanced themselves from any particular philosophy or methodology. They further raised the standard of refereed journals, initially under the editorship of Philip Taylor of Griffith University, and began a program of research into drama teaching, “new paradigms” (see for example Taylor, 1995) becoming the *in vogue* expression. United States was the only other country to formalize research programs, mostly emerging from Arizona State University under the inspiration of Lin Wright who devoted her long career to classroom drama.

It was also during the 1990s that Augusto Boal’s name featured on international drama conference programs. Mostly working with adults his approach nevertheless became a model for secondary classroom practice. His experimental theater work had started much earlier, in the early 1960s, in his homeland, Brazil where he developed the idea that an audience could stop a performance and suggest alternative behaviors

for the characters. He extended this eventually to inviting audience members onto the stage to take over from the actors, the plays always having the immediacy of current social or political issues in which the audience members had a vested interest. Indeed audiences saw themselves as victims of the very regime being openly exposed on stage. He called these newly empowered members of the public: “spect-actors.”

In 1971, during the military coup, Boal was imprisoned as a cultural activist and subsequently was exiled to Argentina. From there he chose to live in Paris where he was able to resume his theater activities – with a difference. He now had to work at one remove, no longer engaging in grass-roots activism, but in demonstrating to France and other nearby countries his innovative use of theater with the oppressed. Such was his success that by the time he was able to return to Rio de Janeiro in 1986, Centers for the Theater of the Oppressed had been established worldwide, for example, the MS-Nepal and Aarohan Theater Group [combining Danish and Nepalese theater groups], the Blossom Trust of Tamil Nadu in India, and the People’s Popular Theatre of Kenya (see Boal, 1985). Drama teachers flocked to his demonstrations at conferences; “forum theater” had become the new cult, the exposure of and opposition to “oppression” becoming the new substance.

As Boal, no longer working with “political victims,” was obliged to target alternative issues (see Saldaña, 2005) he came closer to Heathcote’s approach, both pioneers having been influenced by the philosophy of Paulo Freire (1972) and the practice of Bertolt Brecht. A combination of the approaches of both Heathcote and Boal can be found, for example, in the work today of Beatriz Cabral (see Cabral, 1998) in Brazil and in the worldwide publicly demonstrated techniques of Jonathan Neelands of Warwick University whose expert teaching practices have become a model for lively discussion at most international drama education conferences.

A recent move in developing countries, promoted in part by charities,<sup>15</sup> such as the South and Central Asia Region of Save the Children and UNICEF, organizes workshops in Bangladesh and Malawi, respectively, (see Prentki, 2003; Keyworth & Pugh, 2003) has adopted the title of *Theatre for Development* (TFD) the original intention of which was the creation through workshops of a community’s indigenous story-based project to be shared with a local audience.

Although the similarities between TIE, TFD, Boal’s, and Heathcote’s practice seem barely to have been acknowledged,<sup>16</sup> these and other parallel strands have been drawn together under the broader label of “Applied Theatre”.<sup>17</sup> Experiments in this use of theater have been tried in different parts of the world for many years. For instance, in 1987 Carole Miller took a program dealing with child sexual abuse round Victoria, B.C. schools where professional consultants were present with whom members of the audience could have personal consultations immediately after the performance. Attempts have been made in some African countries [for instance, the Themba Interactive Theatre Company of Johannesburg] and in Thailand [Sang Fan Wan Mai, an amateur Group] to use theater to combat AIDS. Among the most well-established examples of “Applied theater,” although retaining the more traditional “Theatre-in-Education” title, is *Arts-in-Action*, in Trinidad and Tobago under the directorship of Dani Lyndersay of the University of the West Indies. Since 1994 Lyndersay has been seeking to explore a range of problematic subjects “from social issues such as incest, child abuse, domestic violence,

gang warfare and drug and alcohol addiction, to the green revolution and corporate managerial relationships”<sup>18</sup> (see Lyndersay, 2005). “Sowing the seeds of a peaceful future” is the aim of teachers and university professors working together in Bosnia and Herzegovina under the project management of Roger Chamberlain (see McEntagart, 1998). Official recognition of the concept of “Applied Theatre” was confirmed in the mid-1990s by the Universities of Manchester and Griffiths where postgraduate courses were set up by James Thompson (see Thompson, 2001) and John O’Toole respectively. Philip Taylor of NYU, the first to edit the electronic *Applied Theatre Journal*, is among those who are trying to provide a theoretical basis for this kind of work, seeking, for instance, to draw a line between *Applied Theatre* and *Drama Therapy*, an area of healing developed and researched by his distinguished colleague, Robert Landy (1986) since the 1970s. Finding that line is critical, for the actors must not see themselves as therapists, confusing shadow and substance. Taylor’s headings given in the introduction to *Applied Theatre* (2003) summarize the aims of this approach: “Raising awareness”; “Posing alternatives”; “Healing psychological wounds or barriers”; “Challenging contemporary discourses”; “Voicing the views of the silent or the marginal.”

## **Conclusion**

Many teachers of drama and theater will feel comfortable with the above list of multi-purpose aims but for those whose concern is to concentrate on textual study or theater practice, as do the *partenariat* of France where teacher and actor cooperate in the classroom, such a list will seem inappropriate. Likewise the organization set up by Leah Gaffen in 1993, of “Class Acts” in Prague, with the purpose of training teachers of the English language, or the “Stopaids” street theater in Ghana, coordinated by Joseph Arthur, or the Jagran Theatre, a clown mime company working in the villages of India will each have its own well-defined, single-minded objective. Since the setting up in 1992 in Oporto of an International Drama in Education Association (IDEA), drama teachers all over the world have been communicating and celebrating together a wide range of aims and practices, but sensing, too, a shared, deeper purpose. Saldaña confirms that “The recent movements of theatre for social change and community-based theatre have influenced and affected many American drama practitioners’ ways of working.”<sup>19</sup> In 2002 Larry O’Farrell of Toronto, IDEA’s President, expressed something of the underlying faith that a diverse group of teachers share in drama education. Referring to the many conflicts recently occurring in parts of the world he writes:

Numerous testimonies have been given by teachers, artists, social workers, therapists and psychologists, working in refugee camps, bomb shelters, hospitals and improvised schools, on their use of drama and theatre to help children and young people to express their feelings of pain, loss, sorrow and anger and to declare their will to live and their hope for the future.’ (O’Farrell, 2002)

Such an expression of confidence in drama is encouraging but idealistic. Experienced practitioners in the art know that its application requires meticulous judgment in: choice

of subtext, choice of point of entry, choice of dramatic form, choice of conventions, choice of texts, degree of persistence, pace of working, degree of student responsibility, extent and style of leader's input, timing, and modes of reflection. Shifra Schonmann of Haifa University, who has devoted much of her career to working with Jewish and Arab children for an understanding of peace, concludes that "Doing things wrongly is worse than doing nothing" (Schonmann, 2001). Real life, Schonmann reminds us, can sometimes burn through any dramatisation causing its framework to collapse. One can in this truth glimpse the grounds for Plato's disapproval. But dramatic art does have its own means of protection. We call it "distancing," a concept finely illustrated by Brian Edmiston of the University of Ohio in his account of attempting to ease sociocultural conflict within a school in Northern Ireland (Edmiston, 2002). Thus if we add "selection of the right degree of distancing" to the above list, then perhaps it can be claimed that we are on our way to true "substance."

## Notes

1. A doctoral dissertation by Virginia Page Tennyson (1999) records a British contemporary of Harriet Finlay-Johnson by the name of Percival Chubb experimenting in drama teaching in a school in New York.
2. Nellie McCaslin died in February 2005 at the age of 90.
3. Leaders include Nils Braanaas of Oslo, Stig A. Eriksson of Bergen, Björn Rasmussen of Trondheim, Anita Grünbaum of Västerberg, and Janek Szatkowski of Aarhus.
4. In the 1950s when Slade was reaching a peak in his career, puppetry became popular in countries on the Continent. For example, in Italy, Maria Signorelli introduced puppetry to teach children's literature.
5. The first publication introducing the concept of *L'instinct dramatique* in young children came from the French psychologist Bernard Perez (1886).
6. This is quote from his Obituary written by Harry Dodds and published in *The Guardian* Friday, August 20, 2004, following his death in June, at the age of 92.
7. Heathcote took this label from Kenneth Tynan's "Theatre and Living" in *Declaration* (1957) by Tom Maschler.
8. Norah Morgan of Brock University, Ontario, died in November 2004.
9. Heathcote gives the source of the expression "living through" as a translation of the Greek meaning of "drama" in "Drama as Challenge" by D. Heathcote in *Uses of Drama* by J. Hodgson. (1972, p. 157).
10. A leading authority on this traditional form of children's theatre was Lowell Swortzell of N.Y.U. who died in August 2004. One of his many publications was: *Theatre for Young Audiences: Around the World in 21 Plays* (1997).
11. Research on the use in schools in South-Eastern England of "Mantle of the Expert" in the Primary Curriculum is currently being jointly conducted by Luke Abbott of Essex, Tim Taylor of Norwich and Brian Edmiston of the University of Ohio. Also see Warner (2004) and her notion of "framed expertise"
12. Leading figures in British Universities, such as Judith Ackroyd, Mike Fleming, Andy Kempe, Jonothan Neelands, Helen Nicholson and Joe Winston have raised the standards of drama teaching once more, their courses attracting world interest.
13. Machulska, Halina (1993) "Drama prowadzona przez Dorothy Heathcote" in *Drama: Poadnik dla nauczycieli I wychowawcow* 6 [12–14] It is interesting to note that the British use of the word "Drama" in this educational context could not be translated into a Polish equivalent.
14. Roebuck set up (in Terrigal New South Wales in 1974) the first of many influential Australian conferences.
15. It could be said that source of *funding* is now to some extent dictating the selection of issues.
16. A contemporary view of the common ground between Heathcotean drama, TIE, and Edward Bond's conception of theater can be found in *Edward Bond and the Dramatic Child* (2005) edited by David Davis.

17. Barbara May McIntyre a pioneer of drama education in America and Canada, who died at the age of 88 in June 2005, bequeathed a fund for a Graduate Scholarship, specifically directed toward "Applied Theatre," to the University of Victoria where she had been founder of the Theater Department.
18. As I write this chapter (March 2005) Dani Lyndersay is consulting in Sri Lanka on how the arts can help in the rehabilitation process following Tsunami.
19. Private letter by Johnny Saldaña, April 2005.

## References

- Ackroyd, J. (2004). *Role reconsidered: A re-evaluation of the relationship between teacher-in-role and acting*. Stoke-on-Trent & Sterling, USA: Trentham Books.
- Allern, T.-H. (1999). Drama and aesthetic knowing in (late) modernity. In C. Miller & J. Saxton (Eds.), *International conversations*. Toronto: The International Drama in Education Research Institute.
- Boal, A. (1985). *Theatre of the oppressed*, New York: Theatre Communications Group.
- Board of Education (1921). *The teaching of English in England*. London: HMSO.
- Booth, D. (1994). *Drama and the making of meanings*. Newcastle upon Tyne UK: National Drama Publications.
- Breen, S. (1986). *Chamber theatre*. Evanston, IL: William Caxton.
- Cabral, B. (1998). Shells: Awareness of the environment through drama, Selected IDEIRI Papers. *N.A.D.I.E Journal*, 22(1), 27–31.
- Caldwell-Cook, H. (1917). *The Playway*. London: Heinemann.
- Carroll, J. (2004). Digital pre-text: Process drama and everyday technology. In C. Hatton & M. Anderson (Eds.), *The State of our Art* (pp. 66–76). Sydney: Current Press (chapt. 6).
- Coggin, A. (1956). *Drama and education*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Courtney, R. (1968). *Play, drama and thought*. London: Cassel.
- Davis, D. (1983) Drama for deference or drama for defiance. *2D Journal*, 3, 29.
- Davis, D. (2003). Keynote address at the 3rd international conference of drama teachers in Athens. *NATD Journal*, 19(2), 39.
- Davis, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Edward bond and the dramatic child*. Stoke-on-Trent UK & Sterling USA: Trentham Books.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Edmiston, B. (2002). Playing in the dark with flickering lights: Using drama to explore sociocultural conflict. In B. Rasmussen & A.-L. Ostern (Eds.), *Playing betwixt and between* (pp. 178–187). *The IDEA Dialogues* 2001.
- Faulkes-Jendyk, M. (1975). Creative dramatics learners face objective examination. *Children's Theater Review USA XXII*, Number 2, 3.
- Finlay-Johnson, H. (1911). *The dramatic method of teaching*. London: Blackie.
- Fleming, M. (1994). *Starting drama teaching*. London: David Fulton Publications.
- Fogerty, E. (1923). *The speaking of english verse*. London & New York: J. M. Dent.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Gaffen, L. (1999). Following Comenius: Drama education in the Czech Republic. *Perspectives Journal British Council*, 9, 34–37.
- Gallagher, K., & Booth, D. (2003). *How theatre educates: Convergences and counterpoints*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Grady, S. (2000). *Drama and diversity: A pluralistic perspective for educational drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hagglund, K. (2001). *Ester Boman, Tyringe, Helpension och teatern 1909–1936*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Stockholm.
- Heathcote, D. (1972). Drama as challenge. In J. Hodgson (Ed.), *Uses of drama* (pp. 156–165). London: Eyre Methuen.
- Heathcote, D. (2005). Chamber theatre: A bridge worth the forging. *The Journal for Drama in Education*, 21(2), 7–17.

- Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. (1995). *Drama for learning: Dorothy heathcote's mantle of the expert approach to education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hornbrook, D. (1991). *Education as dramatic art*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Isaacs, S. (1932). *Children we teach: Seven to eleven years*. London: University of London Press.
- Jackson, T. (Ed.). (1980). *Learning through theatre: Essays and casebooks on theatre in education*. Manchester, NH: Manchester University Press.
- Jaques-Dalcroze, E. (1921). *Rhythm, music and education* (H. F. Rubenstein, Trans.). London: Chatto & Windus.
- Johnstone, K. (1979). *Impro: Improvisation and the theatre*. London: Methuen.
- Kelin, A. (2005). *To feel as our ancestors did: Collecting and performing oral histories*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Keyworth, L., & Pugh, K. (2003). Theatre for development in Malawi. *Research in Drama Education*, 8(1), 82–87.
- Laban, R. (1948). *Modern educational dance*. London: Macdonald & Evans.
- Landy, R. (1986). *Drama therapy*. Springfield ILL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Lee, J. (1915). *Play in education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Lewiki, T. (1995). *Theatre/Drama in the United Kingdom, Italy and Poland*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Durham, UK, vol. 1, 257.
- Lyndersay, D. (2005). From stage to street: Fourth world theatre in the Caribbean. *IDEA'S Electronic Journal*.
- Machulska, H. (1993). Drama prowadzona przez Dorothy Heathcote. *Drama: Poadnik dla nauczycieli i wychowawcow*, 6, 12–14.
- Maschler, T. (Ed.). (1957). *Declaration*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.
- Maslow, H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- McCaslin, N. (1984). *Creative Drama in the Classroom*. London: Longmans.
- Miller, C., & Saxton, J. (Eds.). (1999) *International conversations*. Toronto: International Drama in Education Research Institute.
- Morgan, N., & Saxton, J. (1991). *Teaching, questioning and learning*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Moreno, L. (1946). *Psychodrama*. New York: Beacon House.
- Nicholson, H. (1995). Genre, gender and play: Feminist theory and drama education. *New Paradigms in Drama Education N.A.D.I.E. Journal*, 19(2), 15–24.
- O'Farrell, L. (2002). A greeting from the President, *International Drama/Theatre Association Newsletter*, 1–2.
- O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- O'Toole, J. (1976). *Theatre in education*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Perez, B. (1886). *Les Trois Premières Anneés* (F. Alcan, Ed.) (3rd ed.). Paris: Ancien Libraire Germer-Bailliere et Co., pp. 325–328.
- Prentki, T. (2003). Save the children – Change the world. *Research in Drama Education*, 8(1), 39–53.
- Rogers, C. (1961). *On becoming a person*. New York: Constable.
- Saldaña, J. (1995). *Drama of color: Improvisation with multiethnic folklore*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Saldaña, J. (1997). Survival: A white teacher's conception of drama with inner-city hispanic youth. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 11, 25–46.
- Saldaña, J. (2005). Theatre of the oppressed with children: A field experiment. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 19, 117–133.
- San, I. (1998). The development of drama education in Turkey. *Research in Drama Education*, 3(1), 96–99.
- Schonmann, S. (2001). Quest for peace: Some reservations on peace education via drama. *Drama Australia Journal: Selected Papers IDEA 2001*, 2, 15–26.
- Slade, P. (1954). *Child drama*. London: University of London Press.
- Slade, P. (1968). *Experience of spontaneity*. London: Longman.
- Slade, P. (1977). *Natural dance*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Slavik, M. (1996). *Cesta k Divadeinimi tvaru s detskym kolektivem*. Prague: Artama.
- Spolin, V. (1963). *Improvisation for the theatre*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Sully, J. (1896). *Studies of childhood*. London: Longman.



- Swortzel, L. (1997). *Theatre for young audiences: Around the world in 21 plays*. New York and London: Applause.
- Taylor, P. (Ed.). (1995). New paradigms in drama education. *National Association for Drama Education Journal (Australia)*, 19, 2.
- Taylor, P. (2003). *Applied theatre*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Tennyson, V. P. (1999). Drama activities at the Ethical Culture School 1878–1930. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Arizona State University, U.S.A.
- Thompson, J. (2001). Making a break for it: Discourse and theatre in prisons. *Applied Theatre Research*, 2(5).
- Tomkinson, W. S. (1921). *The teaching of English*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Wagner, B. J. (1976). *Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a learning medium*. Washington: National Education Association.
- Ward, W. (1930). *Creative dramatics*. New York & London: D. Appleton & Co.
- Warner, C. (2004). On beyond word problems. *Education international*, 1, 49–57.
- Way, B. (1967). *Development through drama*. London: Longman.

# INTERNATIONAL COMMENTARY

## 4.1

### Namibia

#### **Minette Mans**

*Windhoek, Namibia*

Africa has a rich and colorful heritage of dramatic rituals, with action, dance, costume and masks, but drama in formal education has been neglected. Anthropologists have collected much information on the educational use of stories and chantefables to act out the values, conflicts, histories and origins of the people. Meaningful gestures which show respect, for example, became formalized and symbolic in dance and art. Masks, pantomime and puppets served as metaphors for the dramatic moments in life. *Griots (jaliya)* enacted and sang the epics. By contrast, schools in southern African countries generally base their drama education on Western models (see main chapter), emulating the approaches of Slade, Heathcote and Bolton. Educational surveys show that drama teachers are generally educated in the same approaches, but for purposes of community theater also study and practise Boal's "Theatre of the Oppressed", while others demonstrate the influence of Marx, Brecht and Fanon.

While the "real" world of theater has been occupied by theater of resistance and protest – consider playwrights Ngugi wa Thi'ongo, Wole Soyinka, Zakes Mda, Athol Fugard who acted as the conscience of their societies – these plays were often only performed outside their original protest site. Considering their main purpose being to raise social and political awareness, questions have to be raised concerning their efficacy as theater of resistance in foreign locations (Graver 1999). To date, few studies have investigated the pedagogical implications of the thriving postcolonial African theater of resistance. The integrated arts approaches of formal education in Namibia and South Africa neglect in-depth drama education, and pay little attention to the philosophies and values embedded in traditional practices. Currently theater for development predominates, and CESO's (Centre for the Study of Education) study of the use of theater for social change in Africa, Asia, and Latin America (Epskamp 1992) described promising use of traditional practices in Zambia and Namibia. Ever-growing numbers of community theater groups perform to raise awareness of a wide range of social issues such as AIDS, violence against women and children, and ecological degradation. Traditions of African drama remain neglected, and although Zeeman and

King (2002) compiled a manual for teachers using African examples, they retained the philosophical framework of the West.

Recent drama research, for example, in a South African AIDS awareness research project, used a popular television drama series *Tsha Tsha* to develop quantitative and qualitative research methods to measure processes of identification with characters. The findings were used in the development of a subsequent educational series that encourages problem-solving, development of solutions, and becoming “active agents in crafting the circumstances of their lives” (Parker, Ntlabati, & Hajjiyannis 2005, p. 1). A randomized community intervention trial investigated AIDS awareness drama-in-education programs in South Africa (Harvey, Stuart, & Swan, 2000), and a similar study on a radio soap in Zambia (Yoder, Hornik, & Chirwa, 1996), show that the use of drama proved more effective in changing attitudes and knowledge than programs without drama. Recent developments of the Southern African Theatre Initiative (Zeeman, 2005) have for the first time proposed an action plan for theaters, community theater, universities and schools to be implemented in the South African Development Community (SADC) region. This promises to delve into indigenous forms of knowledge to inform drama education.

## References

- Epskamp, K. (1992). *Learning by performing arts: From indigenous to endogenous cultural development*. CESO Paperback no. 16. The Hague: Centre for the Study of Education in Developing Countries.
- Graver, D. (Ed.).(1999). *Drama for a new South Africa: Seven plays*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Harvey, B., Stuart, J., & Swan, T. (2000). Evaluation of a drama-in-education programme to increase AIDS awareness in South African high schools. *International Journal of STD and AIDS*. Retrieved 20/08/05 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.gov/>
- Parker, W., Ntlabati, P., & Hajjiyannis, H. (2005). Television drama and audience identification: Experiences from *Tsha Tsha*. Centre for AIDS Development Research and Evaluation. Retrieved 08/08/05 from [www.cadre.org.za/tshatsha.htm](http://www.cadre.org.za/tshatsha.htm)
- Yoder, Hornik., & Chirwa (1996). Retrieved 22/08/05 from [http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/ZAM\\_96.800.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/ZAM_96.800.pdf)
- Zeeman, T., & King, J. (2002). *Action! An introductory drama manual*. Windhoek: New Namibia Books.
- Zeeman, T. (2005). *Finding feet conference: Theatre education and training in the SADC Region*. A report on the Southern African Theatre Initiative Conference, Windhoek 11–15 May, 2003. Windhoek: New Namibia Books.

# INTERNATIONAL COMMENTARY

## 4.2

### Reflections from an Israeli Point of View

**Shifra Schonmann**

*University of Haifa, Israel*

While reading Gavin Bolton's chapter, *A History of Drama Education – a Search for Substance*, I realized once again how writing such an historical account is a problematic task. This is not only because of all the obstacles that Bolton mentioned but even when concentrating on trying to untangle the confused strands of *classroom drama* that he presents, there still remains an inherent problem in writing the history.

Two historically important parallel processes have occurred in Israel in recent years: mass immigration both from the former Soviet Union and from Ethiopia as well as an unending *war for peace* with the Palestinians. The tense political situation over the last decade has contributed to the notion that education, politics and ethics are all issues which cannot be separated from each other (Schonmann, 2004; Urian, 1990). The challenges confronting the Israeli educational system are intense and need imagination and powerful ideas. *Forum Theatre; Applied Theatre; Process Drama* are all powerful perceptions of theatrical work in use. Experiments in drama education as described in Bolton's historical account have been tried in different parts of the world; and they include Israel in which these ideas have been found extremely useful to a society living on the edge (Schonmann & Hardoff, 2000).

Drama education, as a field of knowledge, develops very slowly a culture in which practitioners and scholars want to discover its origins, its people and their ideas. It is worth mentioning that Judaism rejected the theater for 4,000 years. The first encounter between Judaism and the theater took place in the Greek and Roman period and Judaism developed a feeling of deep revulsion for this form of art. The "religious elders" (Ha'zal) connected theater to paganism and clowns. It was conceptualized as an expression of debauchery: the antithesis to religious education. In the eighteenth century with the diminishing power of religion, Jewish theater began to develop – but only on a very small scale. The original lack of theater in Judaism placed the teaching of theater in the Israeli education system in a special light. Literature, music, and even painting were adopted by Judaism, but the theater was without tradition and therefore when the Israeli education system opened its gates to teaching theater it was necessary to borrow from world culture and experience.

The history of educational drama is inextricably bound up with the Progressive Educational Movement. While the development of drama/theater in education in Israel is, in essence, part of the above trend, the major difference is to be found in the short history of the State of Israel. Israel was established as a state only in 1948 and, due to economic hardships and lack of awareness in the first decades, very little was done in the area of drama education. Only in the 1970s did institutional interest in teaching drama/theater begin. Academic institutions, such as universities and colleges, began to open theater teacher training departments but, in those days, almost no research took place and there was very little academic writing on that subject. Then, in the 1980s, a considerable growth of theater teaching occurred due to an awakening in the arts and in education, and the first research projects began to appear.

Today, drama education is discussed with great interest, and reflects how much the theater as an area of both teaching and learning is needed although much of its substance is still unclear. In the Jewish schools, more and more attention is being paid to drama education (Feingold, 1996).

We need to remind ourselves that although drama education is now being viewed as a multilevel discourse, the true appeal and beauty of drama – theater in education lies in its power to create an alluring magic of theater and drama as artistic and aesthetic ways of expressing the human mind and spirit. From this point of view, historical developments can be examined in telling the stories of our professional practice. Involved in historical research, each drama/theater scholar needs to listen to the stories that are told. Only then, can he or she continue by narrating a substantive drama/theater story. *A search for substance* should include therefore more research into drama education history. Meanings that can be extracted from history can serve as important elements to open the horizons of the field.

## References

- Feingold, B.-A. (1996). *Why Study Drama? Theatre and Education*. Tel Aviv: Eitav Publishing (in Hebrew).
- Schonmann, S. (2004). Ethical tensions in drama teachers' behavior. *Applied Theatre Research Journal*, 5, 11–21.
- Schonmann, S., & Hardoff, D. (2000). Exploring new possibilities and the limits of theatre education: A role-play project with adolescent actors to improve physicians' communication skills. *Arts & Learning Research Journal*, 16(1), 134–151.
- Urian, D. (1990). *The Arab in Israeli Theatre*. Tel Aviv: Or Am (in Hebrew).