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The objective of this study was to support the claim that drama education is no "mere frill" in the curriculum but is, in fact, important to the formation of attitudes and values in young people. The study moved in two directions. The literature was explored to establish a position on what is intended by the terms "attitude" and "drama education" and to demonstrate a connection between these two terms. Following a review of the literature which demonstrated that there was reason to believe that children's attitudes to ageing and to old people are less than ideal, the two strategies of a practical investigation were begun.

In examining the attitudes of Grade 5 children to the elderly and to the ageing, quantitative and qualitative investigations were undertaken. The quantitative investigation employed the Children's Attitude Towards the Elderly (CATE) (Jantz, Seefeldt, Serock, and Galper, 1976) instrument to examine attitudes in one control and two experimental groups. The qualitative investigation consisted of the analyses of: (a) interviews with the teacher and children of both experimental groups during and after the three units of drama education, (b) pre- and post-drawings by children from these groups, (c) the reflections written in their journals by children of the experimental groups after the drama education units, and (d) field notes taken during participant/observation in the drama classroom. The experimental groups were taught drama employing two different methods. Group A pursued the topic "Young People/Old People" in the drama classroom in child-directed drama, while Group B explored the same topic in teacher-directed
drama. The results of both strategies were compared and contrasted under the rubrics of the theoretical positions on "attitudes" and on "drama education" adopted for the study.

The research results converged to support the claim that, for the children of both experimental groups, doing drama had assisted them as they rebuilt their attitudes to old people and to ageing. No such improvement had occurred for the Control Group. Positive attitude change consisted in (a) greater knowledge of old people and ageing, (b) a diminution in the fear of ageing and old people, (c) positive feelings toward the elderly, and (d) identification with the interests, feelings, goals, and means of elderly people. In addition, the qualitative study revealed that some children recognized that drama caused them to re-value the people in their own lives.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Set designers in the theatre have two main purposes as they conceive of their mises en scene. The first is to construct a set which will work for the actors and for the audience. The second purpose is to build a set which is aesthetically satisfying. Central to both of these purposes is the conveying of the import of the play to be presented.

In this introductory chapter, the task of the writer is similar to that of the designer. As the setting for the study, this chapter must work in the sense that the reader must be able to refer to it and, in so doing, make its action components come to life as a real concern of real people. Complete aesthetic satisfaction is rarely achieved in the presentation of a play and it is even more rarely achieved in the creation of an academic study. It is, however, partly attainable and, at least, the central conception must be made clear.

This study is entitled, The Effect of Drama Education on Children’s Attitudes to the Elderly and to Ageing. The general setting, then, is education. The particular setting is drama education. The purpose is to focus on drama education and, even more precisely, on an aspect of what engagement in drama education means for children and teachers.

For the focus to become clear, the notion of drama education must be explicated. This notion is set in at least three contexts, and to provide a framework for the study, they must be clearly delineated as follows: (a) what is understood here as education, (b) what is understood as drama, and (c) what is understood as drama education. Each of these contexts has a history and each has proponents and detractors. The presentation of this research is offered in the context of a particular view of what I understand by education, in the context of a particular view of what I understand by drama, and, in the context of a particular view, rooted in both of these, of what I understand by drama education. My position on each of these is sketched below in order to provide the parameters within which the research was first conceived.
Education is a polymorphous concept with at least four forms. In one form it appears as training, in another it appears as instruction, in a third as initiation, and in a fourth as induction. "The third of these, initiation, is concerned with becoming familiar with social values and norms, and successful initiation leads to the ability to interpret sensitively the social environment" (R.D. Bramwell, 1990). It is the position of this thesis that all four forms are important but that the first three are necessary but not sufficient conditions for the real business of education which is induction into the "thought systems" of a culture. The thought systems of a culture are the means whereby members of a culture come to know and the knowledge acquired by those means.

Furthermore, too much of our education has been predicated upon skill training and the acquisition of knowledge and too little on how we come to know. Recent studies in education which emphasize the practical knowledge of teachers and children, though not of recent origin, have reflected this concern (Elbaz, 1983), Connelly, and Clandinnen, 1987). It is present as far back as Rousseau and is argued for in various forms by Pestalozzi (1801), Montessori (1912), Froebel (1897), Dewey (1897), Stenhouse (1975), and Bruner (1976) among others in education, and it is a central concern in the works of Rogers (1954) and Maslow (1971) in the field of psychology.

The question for the learner is: "What do I already know which will help to make full use of further knowledge and of the many different ways of coming to know?" The question for the teacher is: "How can I help children to make full use of what they know and how they know it in order to induct them into public knowledge and into (other) ways of knowing it?" This question is quite different from the one that teachers usually ask: "How can I give my students the knowledge that I have in the way in which I have it?" or "How can I train them to do what I do in the way that I do it?" For me, the children's experience and that of the teacher are both employed in a joint recreation of meaning which furthers the knowledge and the means to gain it of both parties. It is true that teachers generally know more than children and that they may understand more fully how to come to know but, sadly, the latter is not always the case. For example, we do not as members of a culture, come to know only through the use of word and number or through some technological extension of these (Gardiner, 1985). The two questions posed above are those which hold together the particular view of education which is the frame for this research, that is insistence upon the importance of the learner's experience and insistence upon the use of many ways of coming to know.
The particular setting deals with what we understand by drama and it also deals with how these two large concerns inform what we mean by drama education. It is necessary to begin by entering a disclaimer that "drama" does not mean "theatre". It means neither the presentation of plays for an audience nor the study of scripted works. As used in this thesis, drama means the creation of pieces of work drawn from the experience and imagination of the participants as they reflect upon some aspect of the human condition of interest to them. The particular aspect may be their choice, but it may also be proposed by the leader as a representative of their culture. In the present study, the leader is the teacher and the participants are students in her class.

Since "to create" demands the use of a form to give the creation meaning, building a piece of drama involves coming to a meaning which is then given form. The drama is, in effect, a "coming to know" which reflects upon experience and employs that experience by embodying it in the action of imagined characters. The theory of drama is dealt with more fully in the body of the research.

The work here has a more precise intent. It centres on the relationship between drama and real attitudes in the real world. The position for the research is that drama may affect its participants' attitudes. The question then is: "What precisely does engagement in drama contribute to the education of children?" Negotiations in drama lessons help children to discover something of what it means to be human, and so this dissertation treats as central the question, "Is it possible that part of the participants' coming to know is a coming to know what their own attitudes are, what may be the attitudes of others, and what, in general, may be the attitudes of their society? Reflection on all of these may then cause drama's participants to look once more at their own attitudes.

Having delineated the general thrust for the investigation, a further question arose, namely: "What do we mean when we talk about attitudes?" The research literature in this area revealed the complex nature of attitudes. It also revealed that many of the investigations previously undertaken into attitudes had proceeded without a firm conception of what constitutes an attitude. In addition, it was discovered that little philosophical work had been done on the topic. Eventually, I decided to tease out from the philosophical literature a position on what attitudes will mean for this research.

It was obvious at this stage of preparation that the study would have to be limited in some way. Accordingly, I cast about for a particular attitude or set of attitudes which would conform to the following criteria: (a) Important in the education of children,
(b) Important in the education of children but presently neglected, (c) of interest to children and (d) central to drama. Looking at these criteria, it seemed that attitudes to other persons would be those which were most appropriate to the research. The enquiry had now entered the ethical domain. Of these, it was decided to select an attitude or congeries of attitudes which also had importance for present-day society, namely, attitudes to old people and to ageing.

This introduction should have made it clear (a) that the research for this study was based in a particular interpretation of what is meant by education and, (b) that the research dealt with two theoretical fields, drama and attitudes, both of which required explication before the investigation of its central problem could proceed. The thesis, then, consists of two parts: (a) the theory of drama and of attitudes and, (b) the investigation of the effect of a drama program on children's attitudes to old people and to ageing.

**Organization of the Thesis**

Offered in Chapter 2 is an interpretation of theories of drama in education as expressed by outstanding educators. In Chapter 3, an argument is presented for my position on the possible meaning of attitudes. Detailed in Chapter 4 is an exposition of an aspect of my own theory of drama. Within the context so provided, the presentation in Chapter 5 outlines the case for believing that children's attitudes towards old people and toward ageing are less than ideal in today's society. The design for the practical investigation is also presented in this chapter. The report on the data obtained by means of a qualitative investigation of what happens in drama for some children is given in Chapter 6. The empirical findings are reported in Chapter 7, and the conclusions and implications of the study are presented in Chapter 8.
HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION OF DRAMA THEORY

This chapter contains an exploration of the dominant theories of drama in education in England, the United States, and Canada since the 1930s. The exploration provides an insight into how drama in education has come to be understood and articulates a theory of drama which links to the exploration of values and attitudes offered in Chapter 3. As a result, the chapter contains a basis for the enquiry of this thesis into the effect of drama on children's attitudes. The review relates accounts of drama in education to the investigation of attitudes and values, a link which is central to this study. In effect, the discussions in Chapters 2 and 3 form the theoretical base from which this study proceeds. Contributions to the theory of drama in education from Britain, the United States are considered in addition to those from Canada, as these countries' contributions were the historical precursors of drama in education in Canada today. The work of each major contributor from each country will be reviewed and summarized.

DRAMA EDUCATION IN BRITAIN

In the early part of the 20th century both Caldwell Cook (1917) and Mrs. Findlay Johnson (ca.1910) recorded their methods of using drama in the classroom. For Cook, the importance of the drama lay in the opportunity it offered the boys of the Perse School for active involvement in Shakespeare's works (Cook, C. 1917). He therefore advocated that the study of Shakespeare should be pursued by acting out the plays. This idea grew into a method of working in which all aspects of the production of the plays were, eventually, in the hands of the students. In the teaching of poetry, he established a choral speech approach to the works of well known poets. He encouraged his students to write their own poetry and finally developed strategies which enabled them to write their own plays.

Johnson (1910) maintained that drama was the natural way for children to learn therefore, she used drama to teach the school curriculum and had no interest in the
production or in the writing of plays. These two pioneers were concerned with two quite different approaches to drama: the first might be considered a theatre approach based in the drama/theatre art form as an efficient way to learn, while the second might be looked on as using dramatic principles and procedures as a teaching method in the service of the curriculum.

The work of Slade and Way

In the 1940s and 1950s a third approach was developed. The works of both Peter Slade (1954; 1958.) and Brian Way (1967) were based in the idea that children's natural way of learning was through their own play, a theory was directly related to the naturalistic philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1762). Scientific studies of the play of young children by Piaget (1951) and the work of Montessori (1912) and of Froebel (1897) in education gave this approach a great deal of authority.

Peter Slade

Peter Slade, however, discerned in the movement of children a natural development of artistic form and worked with Rudolph Laban (1980) and Anton Dolin (dancer) to help children develop their natural art form in movement by supplying skill training, and exposure to both formal dance works and professional dancers' expertise. The emphasis was upon the expressive and improvisational nature of the children's movement as it encapsulated their ideas. The development of those ideas was through the forms that the children employed naturally and the extension was through giving the work respect, in the teaching, by supplying skills and ideas for incorporating elements of form. The method evolved is sometimes called "Dance Drama", although, on occasion, speech was used in the works the children created.

The children's bodies were seen as instruments of their expression and therefore the warm-up sessions and the teaching of skills formed an integral part of the lessons. Early in the training, the teacher offered a piece of music as a stimulus for creative expression. In addition, the teacher would sometimes give a voice-over narration as the children interpreted a story or music in action. At this stage, all the participants would be interpreting the music simultaneously. Later, in small groups, the children would choose a piece of music and collectively create a movement sequence. The original ideas would be refined as the children worked with their group and they would begin to develop a form for the piece. It was then that they cooperated with the teacher to learn
new skills or movements that would make the work more satisfying. If they felt it was appropriate, words or small scenes were added so that the result could communicate its meaning to an audience.

Slade's (1954) main concern, in his first book, was to convey his sense of a form of children's art which evolved its own symbols in space. He emphasized the natural shapes that the children used and the sensitivity of the groups. The children developed social awareness by sharing life views and emotional responses and expressed their life experiences in their projected play. The book stressed absorption and spontaneity and the idea of children struggling with an art form as they discovered their own shapes and "time-beats." For the teacher, this meant striking a delicate balance between guiding the children toward neatness and precision and preserving spontaneity. Described by Slade (1975) as a "doing of life," the work culminated in performance, but it was a performance of child art, not theatre. He also felt that for youngsters at age 12 or 13 years this doing of life or unconscious art form dies out and that they are ready to tackle theatre form. Slade did see the expressions of children as a natural evolution of form. He viewed the form as primarily an aesthetic one, and the critical reflection upon the form as aesthetic reflection. Within this constraint, however, he did deal with stories and themes which explored value and attitudinal conflicts. The focus in the educational endeavours which Slade undertook was the "celebration of the child and the beauty of his works" (1954, page 2).

In his work in therapy, however, Slade was very close to Strawson's description of the psychologists' mandate in making what was involuntary come under the conscious control of the patient (Strawson, 1974). Slade thought about the exploration of experience, of attitudes, and of value concerns as it was extant in the drama work in three ways:

1. He described drama as "the doing of life."
2. He linked the drama to the play of children as a natural way of coming to know.
3. He was much criticized, in his early years, for practising a kind of therapy on the boys of East London when he worked to help them develop more acceptable social attitudes.

Nevertheless, the drama which Slade did was centered in the aesthetic power of the children he taught and the bringing of that power into refined aesthetic expression.
Brian Way

Brian Way was the other person to develop a new approach in the 1940s and 1950s. His work with children was not concerned with theatre or with performance of any kind. He saw drama in education as a development of the uniqueness of individuals, a process which should have as its goal the advancement of the whole person. This development was to occur through the exploration of self, of others, and of the objective world by the use of the senses and of concentration. Way viewed drama as a fundamental, creative outlet for originality and personal expression. Through drama, the children came to know the resources they had, their creative power, and the worth of their intuition. Way (1967) described drama as a way of living and of knowing which transcends mere knowledge and is non-intellectual.

In his book Development Through Drama, Brian Way (1967) described his philosophy and presented a series of exercises that would lead to the development of the whole person he described. He stated quite clearly that what he was concerned with was the development of people, rather than of drama. This humanistic trend, typical of his time, owes much to the work of Rogers (1954) and Maslow (1971) in psychology and, in the structure of the exercises, to the teachings of the early Stanislavski (1936).

It is important to note here that Way (1967) took the Stanislavski System out of its context of the Moscow Art Theatre just as Lee Strassberg did in formulating his Method acting. Stanislavski's exercises to give life to technique-ridden actors were created with the basic assumption of and in the strict insistence upon the use of physical and vocal skills. These elements were missing from Way's work. Perhaps he viewed this aspect as purely an addition from theatre, while assigning his exercises in imagination and in emotion to the development of the human side of the actor. In terms of the discussion of values and attitudes, one might see Way's version of drama as a subjective expression which allows the child to bring into consciousness the imaginative power which he/she possesses. It also allows for the discovery of the power of the senses in their direct use in informing consciousness, in evoking images of experiences in the past, and in stimulating the imagination. The work described by Way also emphasized the use of the physical self as a vehicle for the expression of ideas. When they followed Way's ideas in the work, the children were expressing in a self-created form but they were not submitting that form to critical scrutiny using aesthetic, logical, or any other kind of criteria.
Just as Way used Stanislavski out of context, so followers of both Way and Slade, by selecting those parts of their work that made sense to them, misrepresented the original philosophies. Followers of Slade took one of three directions:

1. Into therapy, either individual or social, as in the case of Aimes, Warren, and Watling (1986) and less directly in the case of Courtney (1987) and Moreno (1975);

2. Into dance drama which was much more rigidly controlled by Rudolph Laban’s exercises and latterly by Martha Graham’s as in the case of Veronica Sherbourne (1950) and many exponents of dance in the physical education field; and

3. Into mindless, emotional self-expression which led to much anxiety on the part of headmasters and other authority figures in British education (Allen, 1979).

This last distortion of Brian Way’s work led to an unhealthy anti-intellectualism among drama teachers. Such a philosophy served poorly the cause of drama in education as the 1960s drew to a close and the emphasis on self expression assumed more reasonable proportions in education. The phrase “shared ignorance” (Hornbrook, 1985), a comment on group work, began to be bandied about among his detractors. Anti-intellectualism also led to a serious split in the ranks of those who taught drama, because it was an avowedly anti-theatre approach. In England at this time (1960), much of the drama work done in schools centered around those involved in producing “The School Play” as an adjunct to their other school duties—usually the teaching of English in secondary schools (Courtney, 1966). These drama teachers were themselves either steeped in the theatre tradition or had received elocution and some acting instruction in teachers’ training colleges or at universities. This writer was among this number, although usually such teachers were drawn from the ranks of those who pursued an arts education at the tertiary level and therefore, brought to the work both a literary bias and a love of theatre.

Summary of the work of Way and Slade

In summary, both Slade and Way, as pioneers in educational drama, answered an educational need that was being made more and more explicit in the early years of their
developing of a philosophy of drama. In response to this need, and to honour the con-
tribution that the individual child makes to his/her education, Slade moved in the direc-
tion of evocation and gentle structuring without loss of spontaneous expression of the
child’s own art form. Way moved toward the child-centred approach to self discovery.
Thus, relating to others and to the objective world was ego-centred and emphasized the
value of individuals while down-playing the functions of community. Slade’s approach
allowed of performance while Way’s ruled out performance and concentrated on the
child’s discovery of his/her own resources. Both men were influential, were misunder-
stood, and were misrepresented by their followers, so that serious divisions developed
among drama teachers by 1965. These divisions may be seen as existing on a contin-
uum from strict conformity in pursuing theatre art education to an unstructured self
expression with the goal of discovering personal resources. Already, however, other
drama teachers were at work and were asking hard questions about the role of drama in
a child’s education. Two of these, who have since become major international figures,
were Gavin Bolton and Dorothy Heathcote.

The work of Bolton

One of the most prolific writers in drama in education is Gavin Bolton. His work is
considered here in the order in which it appeared in print. The main points in each piece
of writing are given and from these a summary of his point of view is constructed.

Bolton (1966) used Piaget’s concept of symbolic play in children as the basis for
child drama. He made the point that the drama distorts reality by selecting only those
aspects of the real which are of concern to the child. It might be argued that such selec-
tion is the normal modus operandi for all persons when their attention is focused on that
which is other. It might be more accurate to suggest that drama selects those aspects
of meaningful experience which the child sees as central to that meaning. In the drama
classroom, this symbolic play takes place in a collective social setting so the play has a
collective meaning, and group responsibility and group decision making are fostered.

Bolton discerned two distinct types of dramatic playing: make-believe and ritual. In
the make-believe play, the children are carrying out a procedure very much like the
symbolic play documented by Piaget. If, however, they have been given the content of
their play in a story or in previously explored make-believe, then the playing is pared
down to its essence and becomes ritualistic in form. These rituals help the children to
examine central themes as they contribute to understanding. Both the playing and the
understanding represent a move toward the symbolic and the symbol in children's drama that is embedded in concrete action. This experience of the concrete "feeds children's understanding of the general" (Bolton, 1986, p.36). The teacher's responsibility, in this interpretation of drama, is to secure involvement at the initial level and then to select for further exploration the "moments of greatest significance."

Bolton saw value in sharing the created work as an occasional experience to give the children a sense of completion and he saw movement training as separate from drama. He also condemned the type of exercise based on "moving like X," and insisted on attention to the symbolic nature of drama.

Bolton (1971) viewed both theatre elements and children's play as contributing factors in educational drama. These elements combine to help children to learn about their feelings and attitudes; both theatre and play elements assist in refining such feelings and attitudes in the course of the drama. The purpose is to help children achieve understanding of what it means to face facts, to interpret without prejudice, to identify with others, and to develop principles. The drama can achieve this understanding if it addresses the theme(s) in the children's concrete doing in an imagined present. This view of drama relies on the ability of the teacher to discern such themes and then to work toward bringing them into consciousness through delineation. In his article, Bolton (1971) was dealing directly with the procedures whereby individuals become aware of and scrutinize their feelings and attitudes.

Bolton's (1975) discussion of emotion returned to the idea of the central place of the symbol in drama with children. At this period, he was concerned that the children's immediate concrete response to the external event in the drama be subsumed ("it is minimally important and may disappear") in the perception of the event in symbolic terms. The emotional response is to the symbolic situation and is both personal and universal. Emotion and thinking which are inseparable achieve a meaning compatible with the symbolic context. Personal emotion relies on the emotional memory of the participants. In this latter concern, Bolton (1975) demonstrated an unstated link with the Stanislavski system.

Three dimensions of meaning achieved in a piece of drama were delineated in a further article (Bolton, 1976.). The first level is in the actual context of the drama participant. The second is the imagined concrete context with which the drama is concerned. The third is the symbolic level at which the drama has universal meaning. Each of these levels is important for the drama participant but the one central to the drama is the symbolic one.
In this article, Bolton (1976) offered insight into the procedures which are central to the drama and which demand that the group negotiate what is, in fact, the case about the situation being explored in the drama. Both the subjective meanings in experience and the generally accepted meanings are submitted to scrutiny by the group with the help of the drama teacher.

Later, a short article showed a tendency in Bolton's (1977a) work to move toward a direct link with the content of other subject areas in classroom drama. He made the point that the drama lesson should meet the objectives of the regular school curriculum at the same time as it meets the educational objectives of the art form. This is not the same thing as saying that drama is relegated to serving as a powerful teaching method.

Bolton (1977b) returned to the art form in a second article in which he discussed the importance of psychical distancing in drama. The dialectical relationship between the concrete, imagined world in action in the drama and the selected features of the real world of the participant achieves this distance and allows the triggering of universal meanings. These meanings themselves provide distance in reflection. A second distancing force is the time. Drama takes place in the here and now but employs the past in the service of: (a) the future commitment to altered stances of the participants, and (b) the consequences of the new meanings the participant achieves. Bolton acknowledged, here, a concern of Slade's with "beat" as an important aspect of time distancing. The beat concept was for Bolton, occasioned by the alternation between the present concern in concrete action and the universal meanings that are addressed. For Slade, this concept was much more tied up with the natural rhythms of the child's movement. Stanislavski (1949), in his idea of tempo-rhythm, united both of these conceptions and also related tempo-rhythm to a spatial component of relationships of the ensemble in constant adjustment to each other. For Stanislavski, the tempo-rhythm was controlled by the through-line of action of the play.

Bolton (1977b) wrote of a spatial dialectic between the physical concrete context and the evoked imaginary context as a factor in distancing, but this may represent a symbolic-time distancing rather than a spatial one. It achieves spatial attributes only when it is consciously employed in refined symbolic action. Such a gloss may have been the intention in this article although it is not quite clear. The concept of distancing becomes an important one in Bolton's later writing, as he addressed the problem of projecting a participant into drama to decrease the emotional risk. This article, together with his later writing on the topic of distancing, makes clearer how the procedures of drama explora-
tion make urgent the scrutiny of its central concerns as one clarifies group thinking in the service of the symbol which is to carry the meaning. The individual is no longer required to take the risk of scrutinizing personal behaviour but can transfer that scrutiny to the characters and situations which were created to be analagous.

Bolton (1978a) also discussed the controversy "to show or not to show." In showing his/her work the child is moving from the perspective of participant, "me- making- it-happen" in the building stage, to the spectator stance of "it -is -happening -to -me" in the stage of honing works to refine and reach for the art form. While regretting the constant adoption of a showing mode, even when the work is not being shown in the drama classroom, Bolton made a case for the value of occasional showing to deepen children's understanding of their own drama. Bolton's (1978a) article showed a link with the James Britton (1970) theories of children's writing processes which were current at that time. Both Britton and Bolton recognized the point that public acceptance of a form as meaningful increases the value assigned to the form and, therefore, to the values and attitudes for which it is a vehicle.

That many drama teachers avoid emotion by confining their classes to exercises, by limiting the work to the consideration of "nice" feelings, and by the use of feeling only in its adjectival sense, was a matter of regret for Bolton (1978b). He made the point that "significant feelings can only be wrought from significant thoughts" (1978b, p.101). For this reason, both significant experiences and appropriate form are required to achieve an emotional experience which acts as a verb in the drama. When this level of drama is achieved, emotions as an adjective and as a verb are both present and are interdependent. Some teachers may be uneasy with this level of emotional involvement, but Bolton pointed out that the emotion may be tempered by the fiction, by control, by the universality or the particularity of the meaning, or by the technique of distancing which characterizes the dramatic form. Again, the influence of both dispositional feelings (those which have become a habit in given situations) and of occurrent feelings (those newly evoked by a current situation) on the actions, values, and attitudes of characters in the drama makes its contribution to the depth of the scrutiny of value positions which the drama discipline pursues.

Bolton's (1986) article probably written as early as 1979 entitled "The Activity of Dramatic Playing" is arguably one of the most crucial pieces of writing about educational drama. In this article, Bolton analysed drama as an activity using the insights of Vygotsky into children's play. He analysed dramatic playing assigning its quality on the
continuum from experiencing to performing, and then confined his attention to the type of play which tends toward experiencing. In this type of play, he described three important factors for the drama teacher: (a) the quality of the experience, (b) the awareness of self, and (c) the meaning that the child intends to project by his play. The quality of spontaneity so much underlined by Slade was here given new insight as Bolton identified the dialectic present in the quality of the experience as both active and passive, both constraining and liberating.

This dialectic demands a commitment to the rules of the playing. As a result of adhering to the rules of make-believe, the child is released from the pressures of conforming to the real pressures of his everyday world. The discipline of the play rules results in personal freedom. This special quality occurs only in symbolic play and is not present in practice play. When it occurs in games, the rules are non-negotiable and therefore fixed from beginning to end, but in symbolic play they are always open to renegotiation.

Secondly, Bolton made a distinction between self consciousness and self awareness and argued that a heightened self awareness is possible in symbolic playing. Again, this is achieved by the double context in dramatic playing and symbolic play because participants are in the fiction they have created and are also using personal experience in the real world to make that fiction ever more present for self so that they can live in it. Bolton described this as a metaphoric relationship of the two contexts which allows the child to explore the personal meanings that are present in the experience. In discussing possible meanings for two fictional children engaged in such play, Bolton demonstrated how natural symbolic play becomes dramatic playing when guided in a collective decision-making process. He emphasized the integrity required by the group to discover appropriate meanings that help the children to understand themselves and their world more fully. He pointed out that there are impersonal criteria of truth and merit which can be applied to meanings explored in this way and that these tend toward universal meanings and therefore toward art.

In the last part of the article, Bolton (1986, p. 66) dealt with the implications of this theoretical position for teachers of drama. Here he emphasized a component of drama in education that is unique to the subject, namely, that of reaching toward feeling which is tied to judgement or appraisal and thus constitutes education of the participant’s attitudes. Unfortunately, in the last part of this article, Bolton came down in favour of this new understanding of people which can adjust attitudes being left unstated and implicit. What seems to be central here was Bolton’s concern that the emotions experi-
enced in the past should not be revisited by the participants but that the emotion the participants feel be directed and evoked by the aesthetic form at the moment of the participant's involvement with it. He felt that to make such learning explicit, to "conceptualize" it in addition to the "crystalizing" which takes place in the drama itself, involves, in some way, a pre-empting of an implicit knowing that is embedded in dramatic or theatrical symbolization. An explicit post-dramatic reflection on valued learnings which "recollect in tranquility" the relation of the drama to past events like a post-theatrical reflection on theme, does not really diminish the drama theatre/experience. Rather, it heightens it, and sustains a sense of wonder in the participant. In addition, it provides the occasion for pedagogical reinforcement which works at an emotional, psychological level as well as at an intellectual level.

In 1979, Bolton's first book, entitled *Towards a Theory of Drama in Education*, was published. A summary of the content is provided below, followed by a short commentary. Bolton described four types of drama then popular in British schools: (a) exercise, (b) dramatic play, (c) theatre, and (d) drama for understanding. Although he saw some value in all four types of drama, he maintained that only "type D" or (d) could adequately be defended as an educational enterprise. He supported this position by demonstrating that this type of drama is primarily concerned with a change in appraisal of the participants which is an affective/cognitive development of value judgements. This change is brought about by the interaction of the two concrete contexts with which drama deals—the imagined, present context and the real-life experience the participant brings to the drama.

Drama is facilitated by the symbolic use of actions as the participant moves from objective precision (attending to the fact that, for example, glasses break) to subjective symbolisation (attending to the aspect of personhood that is embodied in a gift). This move is made in the service of the three levels of meaning which the participant experiences simultaneously: (a) a collective attitude which is congruent with objective meaning, (b) the participant's feelings about those objective meanings, and (c) the personal feelings of the participant which are irrelevant to the objective meanings. As the participant works in a group, personal feelings and meanings are subservient to those of the group, and the group's neutral consensus on observable facts takes precedence, as it is compared with the affective examination of value judgements. The individual is made aware of disparities in his/her thought and comes to new insights about the drama topic. When the actions are selected and carried out to express the group's meanings, the breaking of stereotypes occurs.
Before this sequence, which Bolton described can take place, the teacher must find the angle that will lead to new insights by selecting the action from what is initially created by the children and providing the value to be explored. As they explore, new attitudes are adopted and the participants experience a heightened awareness of the imagined situation which is seen from a viewpoint never adopted before. Thus, drama reaches for meanings which are beyond the literal through the concrete form and this symbolization stirs deep feeling. In this way, the participants feel their way into new knowledge in a dialectic between the concrete and the abstract. In the discovery of new insights, participants achieve a sense of autonomy and satisfaction as they adapt to what is worthwhile for them. It is their own discovery of principles, implications, consequences, and responsibilities in the objective world that gives them the right to express that discovery after reflecting upon it by distancing.

Two aspects of the art form aid discovery and reinforce it in expression: (a) metaxis (Boal, 1979) or the real and the imaginary held in the mind simultaneously and (b) the aesthetic/referential attention which the form demands. The attention is referential because it deals with an instance of a general case and it is aesthetic because the participant has to struggle toward the best possible expression of the new understanding in action. The type D drama described here is a reframing of concepts already held. The teacher's responsibility is to structure the work so that this thinking from a different viewpoint will happen.

Although Bolton did allow that exercise and dramatic play can evolve into type D drama, he dismissed both in this first book. Initial expression of a superficial view in dramatic play can create its own resonances as the procedure he described is in progress, and the child is affirmed in using personal resources in its initial stages. Exercise can, and probably should, assist the child to greater freedom within the discipline of the art form as he/she gains greater control of individual resources. Exercise also aids the final aesthetic/referential attention, giving this phase of the work greater authority and fluidity and therefore increasing satisfaction. The natural artistic seeking of the child, which Slade (1954; 1958) most firmly asserted and which Way (1967) viewed as the sum total of development, are very important factors but are not given their due in Bolton's book.

It must be noted here that the procedure of metaxis is vital to an understanding of children's drama. The procedure of metaxis is significant because both the imagining of the ideal and of its opposite allows the children to put into perspective their own
thoughts and feelings on the topic being explored. In addition, the negotiation with peers allows for an approximation of a normative position to emerge simultaneously. Dealt with here is the preliminary construction of principles which have grown out of the child's life experiences and out of his/her imagination and which are presently offered for scrutiny in the drama.

Four articles by Bolton (1980 a, b, c, d) centred on the relationship between drama for the child in the classroom, theatre for the actor on the stage, and theatre for the child as audience. They will be dealt with together here as their main points are applicable across the continuum. Objects used in child drama focus the theme of the drama (the king's lost ring, for example, without which the unity of the kingdom will be destroyed); They are used symbolically to extend the character (the sword or scarf which enhance the courage or the frailty of the character), to establish context (the throne or the garbage can which are respectively central to the operation of the character), and to engage feeling more precisely, because they are symbols and are evocative of images which either extend meanings or emphasize them. Thus, the use of objects in child drama serve an analogous function to objects on a stage for the actor.

Like the actor, the child, too, chooses logical actions to express meaning and these are, both in their selection and in their sequence, drawn from common sense rules which operate in the everyday world. In the first two of the 1980 articles then, Bolton was moving back toward Peter Slade's view of the child as natural artist. In the later two articles, published the same year, he distinguished between the child and the actor. This distinction lies in the notion of the child "being in the drama" as contrasted with the actor acting to communicate meaning to an audience. It is the teacher who focuses meaning for the child by the use of the theatre elements of tension and contrast. What must be preserved for the child is the quality of spontaneity, the emphasis on adopting new viewpoints, and the insistence on social negotiations. Bolton implied, therefore, that these qualities are not of the essence for the actor, and one has to admit that this is true for many of those involved in today's theatre. It is just these qualities, however, that Stanislavski, (1936), Brook (1968), Benedetti (1976) and Growtowski (1968) have fought to reawaken in actors. These authors stand in a relationship to their actors very like that which Bolton has described as ideal for teachers of drama in education.

The final article of 1980 contrasts drama in education and theatre in education, and seems, while asserting the value of theatre in education, to be concerned mainly with
what it cannot accomplish for the child. While both enterprises have the aim of chang­
ing the child's understanding, in drama in education the children are the agents for the
change as well as the recipients of a new perspective.

Because in drama, participants stand in this dual relationship to their experience
they, in concert with others, devise rules by which they will explore that experience.
Through the abstraction of everyday situations, the child gains control over the social
milieu (e.g. when they treat of an imaginary prince whose parents are separated) and
this is the functional aspect of the drama in preparing the child for life. There is also a
universal aspect, however because the drama unites the personal, subjective view to
the more objective meanings which participants, with their fellow workers, can agree
upon as the logical components of the drama's fiction.

These ideas were more fully explored in a later article which Bolton (1981) sub­titled
“A Reappraisal.” ( Bolton, G. 1981). Here, he was at pains to emphasize that the view
of drama as “doing” has ignored one central aspect of the work which is primary to its
function in education. The main work is not bound up with what is done and its mean­
ing but is concerned with the tension between the “particularity of the action and the
generality of the meanings implied by the action,” Bolton, (1981, p. 2). Drama cannot
be claimed to be an escape because the rules demand an objective reflection upon the
logic of the everyday to make decisions. The dual perspective of identifying with the
fiction and being aware of that identification, in order to reflect upon and intensify the
quality of life, is the very nature of being involved in drama. A further impetus toward
objective reflection is inherent in the drama situation because of its nature as a collec­
tive art. The participants, as they work in a group, represent commonly held beliefs and
values. Meaning is therefore negotiated within the drama at three levels: (a) at the
functional level of the reality of the action, (b) at the level of the significance of the
action, and (c) at the level of the experience held by the participant at that present mo­
ment. Drama must concentrate on the second level of significance so that the partici­
 pant becomes only subsidiarily aware of the other two. This means that the context be­
comes less important as the significant meaning is spontaneously encountered by the
participant in the drama. The teacher employs the techniques and the form of theatre
to bring the participant to this encounter. In this article, Bolton (1981) is influenced by
Heathcote and Slade from the drama world, and by Michael Polanyi’s (1958) theories of
tacit knowing and of focal and subsidiary awareness as he evolved a philosophy of
drama.
Two articles in 1982 preceded the publication of Gavin Bolton’s second book in 1984. In the first, he put his view of drama in the context of the other pioneers in drama in education and within the framework of epistemology (Bolton, 1982a). His concern was that the drama teacher must have clear and compatible views of drama, of education, and of how he/she conceives of knowledge. He saw Way’s and Slade’s work as based in a view which emphasized growth (development) and play. Heathcote, Ward, and Dewey he characterized as believing in stimulating engagement with the environment to obtain insight into the solution of problems. Bolton (1982a) then offered a clear statement of his own view:

Drama offers the development of minds, the growth of knowledge and the refinement and extension of the conceptual framework by which experience is ordered. The child combines the objective and subjective views of the external world and deals with philosophical questions which put him in touch with values. (p.241)

For Bolton, drama is concerned with knowing about, with knowing how, and with the kind of knowing which leads to understanding the human condition. This is accomplished by focusing, by the injecting of tension, and by the creation of meaningful symbols.

The second 1982 article dealt with drama as learning, as art, and as aesthetic experience. As learning, drama is concerned with understanding the objective world, its facts and its values. As art, the doing of drama is a personal engagement with the art form. The participant is led into an experience of the art form through the consciousness of the group that form is being created. As a result, the participant is disposed to experience the aesthetic impact of the form (Bolton 1982b). Bolton’s second book makes a strong case for the consideration of drama as a respectable subject for study in schools. Drama is described as a way of knowing which looks beyond the facts to their implications through structured artistic form. Its intent is to plumb the depths of aesthetic and spiritual knowing through the use of concrete imagined situations and through the use of symbolic theatre elements. It is a collective art in which the individuals attempt to draw a personal circle within a social context. It is not therapy but prevention because it both prepares the understanding to address future conflicts and brings understanding to past conflicts which was not formerly present. Dramatic playing is an intention to be, whereas performance is an intention to communicate. Control within the form should
not come from what happens next but rather from a disposition to describe and to fore-
shadow through the dynamic of the situation.

To emphasize this position, Bolton (1982b) compared the works of Brian Way (1976) and Dorothy Heathcote (1978). Way isolated action, and was disposed toward exercise and the egocentric development of the child's resources. The work was short term and depended on a recall of emotion. Heathcote, on the other hand, has been concerned with what is outside the self. Drama is a group expression that celebrates what is common between people. It is not direct, but only appears to be so as the participant links art with content to go beyond facts to more universal significance. Through drama, the participants go outward into the world in order to go inward to achieve detachment. In this way, they achieve a union of the arts and the sciences because by looking at the one you see the other. Bolton saw Heathcote's use of the teaching strategy of the mantle of the expert as being on the edge of society's rituals. Through this strategy, Heathcote achieved a literal and metaphorical juxtaposition of game and drama. The work is apparently non-serious in its frame, but is serious in its pursuit of what is quintessential for that particular expert in real life for real life ends. The use of this strategy brackets, liberates, and protects the child within the make-believe of the child as expert. The child is easily engaged in the non-serious, which is short term, and from there must be led to the serious concerns the work implies.

Drama's business is, according to Bolton, the intellectual and emotional understanding of serious concerns as it achieves its outcome. This achievement is made possible only by the injection of tension and by role. Tension is achieved by contrasts, by formality, and by waiting. Role demands more maturity than that required by real life because it is an abstraction from life. The child is saying "I am to role X as my experience has led me to imagine an X." By this analogical relation to role, Bolton asserted that the child is distanced from his/her own experience and protected (sic) into emotion as he/she brings X to life. The child submits to the role and is detached from it by the interplay between the real and the fictitious, (i.e. by metaxis). The collection of Bolton's wide and penetrating insights in all of the above writings are brought into juxtaposition in his second book. Here the heritage of drama education, its relationships to theatre and to educational institutions, to game, to emotion and to art are brought together to build a strong case for drama as a "pivot" of the curriculum (1984 p.186)

Two articles from 1985 were available for scrutiny. In the first, Bolton praised the early work of Way and Slade for responding to the needs of their time but has ad-
dressed two misconceptions about drama that arose from their work (1985a). The first was an undue concern with plot which, in Bolton's view, limited spontaneity and detracted from the essence of drama which was the theme. The second was an over-emphasis on the uniqueness of the individual which detracted from the idea of drama as a collective art concentrating on what people share. Drama is a form of group symbolism seeking universal truths.

The second 1985b article, again, insisted on three modes of drama, namely practising, experiencing, and performing. Bolton has reinforced the idea of drama for understanding which aims at engaging with knowledge, at either the contextual or at the generalized level, to reflect upon it. Here, however, he has tended to move drama away from the fiction of make-believe and place it in the context of game in Wittgenstein's sense of rule-based playing. He also returned to Polyani to locate the focal awareness of the participant in the game and not in the learning taking place. He wanted less precision about outcomes, less emphasis on living through drama, and the adoption of a more phenomenological position in relation to claims for knowledge and learning in drama. The drama is a reshaping of meanings by the child, as a result of experiencing the phenomenon of drama in action and becoming emotionally involved with matters of universal concern.

In summing up Bolton's work, one could begin with the statement that drama in education takes place with a teacher and a group of individual participants. It is a collective art form in which meanings are negotiated between the individuals and the group. The negotiation of meaning involves a private individual negotiation, as a participant compares previously held subjective values, on a matter of universal concern, with the more objective values of the group. It is a group negotiation of meaning as the group struggles to express in an imaginary situation their collective view of significant matters. They have some experience of such matters in everyday life and the drama demands that they look at them in some depth. Because these negotiations are carried on in action and in reflection, with the aid of elements of an art form, in an imaginary game-like situation, the participants are symbolically creating the meanings while attending to the doing. The insights which are gained are both affective and cognitive learning because (a) the art form has protected the students into emotion which they experience in the symbolic action they have created, and (b) the exploration is individually and collectively owned by the participants and they are committed to it by negotiation. The area of knowledge which is explored and about which the participants come
to a new insight is the domain of values. The participants achieve a reshaping of their understanding in this domain by the symbolic exploration in action of a fiction to which they apply their experience.

This understanding of matters of universal concern is achieved tangentially as the participants attend to the concrete, evolving fiction. They achieve satisfaction in examining and reordering their individual experience, in understanding others, in the resolution of the fiction and in the intellectual and emotional investment they have made in achieving a dramatic form for their understanding.

The teacher's function is to change the focus of the fiction to attend to matters of universal concern, to use the drama form to protect into emotion, and to intensify the involvement. Drama in education is an aesthetic reappraisal of values in concrete action in a fiction which is lived in a dynamic symbolic relation to past experience.

The mode of enquiry is analogical and metaphorical. Bolton appeared to reject a further articulation of the understandings achieved in drama to attack head on the values addressed in the work. It is the position of this thesis that the greater the clarity achieved by the participants, the greater the likelihood that the new values will become incorporated into the intentions of the individuals and thus become explicit in the actions of the individuals. Reflection on the form of the drama produced by the participants and translation of the central concerns into other forms will reinforce the knowledge attained and will encourage change.

The Work of Heathcote

Dorothy Heathcote was a weaver whose employer enabled her to take up a scholarship she had won to study acting at the Bradford Theatre School in England. Toward the completion of her acting training, she decided that she was the wrong size and shape to pursue an acting career and turned her talents to the teaching of children. She came to national attention in the field of education as a result of her work with delinquent boys in Newton Aycliffe. She was employed by professor Brian Stanley as a trainer of teachers of the Froebel method, at the institute of education of the University of Durham and then was, later, appointed to the institute of education of the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne as a drama specialist. When that college was expanded to become an autonomous institution, she remained there, and after acquiring an M.A., became a trainer of teachers of drama.
While at Newcastle, she came into contact with Laurie Stenhouse, James Britton, James Moffat, and John Dixon. Her love of theatre, of literature and of language was reinforced by these great educators and her view of education expanded from a largely Froebelian perspective to a much larger vision. It is this larger vision which informs her work in drama in education and which is the main concern of this thesis. When asked what she teaches, Heathcote will reply that she teaches children and this is not a trivial remark although it would be more accurate today to say that she teaches persons. The remark derives from a Froebelian view of children as a seed to be nurtured, and determines a philosophy of education which tends to see disciplines and subjects as largely irrelevant in their divisions, to the enterprise of education. People are learners, want to learn, and will enjoy learning if means can be found to help them to see that the learning make sense. Heathcote has found such a means and has evolved very careful structures to facilitate the learning.

Writing in 1971, she offered a definition of that means—drama.

Drama is anything which involves people in active role taking situations in which attitudes not characters are the chief concern. It is lived at life rate and obeys the laws of suspension of disbelief, agreeing to pretence, employing all experience and imagination available in an attempt to create a moving picture of life which aims at surprise and discovery for the participants. (1971, p.1078)

In 1972, she spoke of drama as a release of energy which contributes to the growth of children as they live through the drama to new insights into human actions and feelings. Drama should be used in the way that will most effectively aid the child to learn. It is a releaser of ideas rather than an interpretation of ideas as the participant considers his past, in the light of the drama experience, to move into the future with new insights. Therefore, what is selected for attention must lead to this kind of exploration. The formal theatre and the informal classroom drama are but two views of the same thing (Heathcote, 1972).

Concern with the structure of knowledge and how it is dealt with in schools underlies Heathcote’s 1975 article (Heathcote 1975). Here, she offered three ways in which drama can honour the ambiguity that exists in real life between the world of facts and its truths and the world of legend or saga with its kind of “truth.” She called these: The Mantle of the Expert, Meeting the Role and Being Where You Are at the Present Time.
The last demands that the participants face the chosen situation and work through it. Meeting the role demands that they meet the role as personifications of an imagined character and the mantle of the expert demands that they face the issues in a discipline as experts in that discipline. In all three cases, the chosen way of working has to bring the world of myth and that of facts together and encourage the search for more facts or myths to handle the problem presented until understanding is achieved. Role is signing not acting and the objects attached to the role become the means to extend belief, to further one of the searches, or to improve the clarity of the role and sharpen its focus.

These three ways must be used within the device of a "frame" which attends to a central human issue. Thus, the possible frames for considering the building of a space craft might be "Do we have a right to spend money exploring space when people are starving?" or, more generally "Who decides?" or "How safe is it to travel in one of those things?" or "What does a spaceship builder contribute to our lives?" and so on.

By 1978, Dorothy Heathcote was known on both sides of the Atlantic and in the Antipodes; thus the publication of Betty Jean Wagner's (1976) book Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a Learning Medium, was hailed with great joy by concerned teachers. The book offers several reasons why teachers should use drama and presents accounts and analyses of lessons taught by Heathcote to illustrate these functions of drama. The emphasis is on what children learn in drama and how they learn it. There are two basic premises: (a) that through “plummeting deep into feeling and meaning” children come to know in a new way; (b) That the use of symbols and of theatre elements in drama allows the participants to understand themselves in their society. (Wagner, 1976, p.38)

By joining the feelings the participants have experienced in the past with those of imaginary characters" distant in space, time or experience" the children come to understand the characters they adopt in role after creating them in imagination. Thus, the first premise achieves an understanding of others through feeling with them, an empathy which is linked to analogous feelings the participant knows well. It goes beyond the facts of other cultures, other times, and other ways of life. It is a knowing how it is or was, rather than a knowing about. This first premise is a necessary condition of the second and is partly constituted by it.

The second premise is that through the elements and the symbols of theatre (i.e., the tensions in its form and the release of those tensions), the participant builds, controls and examines the feeling of the other (a character the participant adopts for scrutiny) in his/her own here and now. This is here described as left-hand knowing. The
direction of this type of knowing towards cracking the codes of other subjects or toward the development of language is a large part of Heathcote's concern.

The aids to enquiry which the teacher must provide in structuring and in shaping the learning in the lesson are the second concern of Wagner's book. Slowing the pace, challenging superficial thinking, distancing the children to allow for reflection, varying the register, focusing the action and the attention on the significant, and insisting on "the one big lie" to which all have agreed, are all vital strategies. Five ways in which this might be accomplished are:

1. Sharing her own point of view about values
2. Offering a conflicting view
3. Suddenly adding a condition to the agreed situation to change the focus
4. Inserting reflection periods and
5. Employing theatre elements of sound/silence, movement /stillness and light/dark.

All these techniques are playwriting techniques which capture meaning and, "hold it taut in the discipline of the art form" (Heathcote, 1980b. p.84). This form of learning through drama, is given authority by:

1. Its pedagogical structure
2. Its provision of a new way of knowing in the disciplines and
3. Its extension of language capacities.

The pedagogical authority is achieved in the clear and logical consistency between formal, informal, and technical relationships. The formal relationship is between the individual and the culture—participants come to know what their culture accepts as knowledge about how things are with people in their world. The informal relationship is one in which the right to debate authority is given to the participant within the drama. The technical relationship is one in which everyone in the drama has the right to assume authority. All of these relationships are intrinsic to drama form and they are the basis of theatrical form.

In a 1978 article Heathcote, turned her attention to drama in the service of the academic disciplines to assist participants in "cracking the codes" (i.e., to discover meaning which is hidden by the syntax or by the structure of another discipline which is, as yet,
imperfectly understood by the participant). The earlier idea of two forms of truth perdures, but the attention is directed to what disciplinary truths mean for ordinary people. Drama is seen as an unwinding mechanism which takes apart the cable of knowledge to search for meanings in its strands. In this article she uses the code of written text to demonstrate how drama can accomplish its unwinding. Using a set of colour graded cards to represent symbolically the different conceptions of love from modern times back to the conception of courtly love central to Troilus and Cressida she begins to crack that code. The cards have expressions of love written on them ranging from purple prose, through poetic expressions in literature, to the actual text. These are the facts with which the participants are brought into confrontation. From confrontation, the students were asked to choose the expression of love with which they most strongly identified. They explored the meanings in their chosen written declaration in group improvisation. After the exploration, all the discovered meanings were put together into a journey which culminated in a confrontation with each of the characters in Troilus and Cressida (student teachers in role). The students then questioned the characters until they could understand courtly love. At the end, all the students wrote the text of Troilus and Cressida in their own words demonstrating and reinforcing their understanding of the concept.

Heathcote’s 1981 article examined drama’s concern with the structure of knowledge. It posited drama as an informal approach to knowing which uses the elements of theatre form to give it tempo and reflection while drawing its authority from group verification of truth. The outcome is satisfaction and the limiting factors are emotional involvement and belief. The modes of enquiry are through simulation, analogy, and role as “fixing devices.” It is important to note here that the terms “simulation” and “role” were used by Heathcote in a very specific sense. Simulation refers only to events which set up the situations of the drama. It does not refer to any aspect of role. Role refers to the adoption of an attitude which might be looked upon as one facet of a character and should not be confused with acting.

Professor James Eggleson conducted a taped interview with Dorothy Heathcote in 1982 after observing her teach. In that interview, she asserts that the function of drama in the schools is to add to the orthodox inquiry of the other disciplines an unorthodox way of looking at knowledge through “the theatre’s art of signing.” This art combines form, content, colour, space and light and it is this art that she borrows for the classroom, “because of the resonances the sign creates in the learning”. In addition, drama
moves into a special time and uses the mode of a negotiated fictional reality. Both signing and the special time of drama create another dimension in which meaning can be depicted. It is similar to the method used by scientists when they create new hypotheses except that in drama that mental activity is manifested in behaviour.

The children also meet the reality they see in a different way in drama because they are allowed to be infinitely skillful and infinitely resourceful. The teacher aids in this meeting by assuming the child has that power and also by taking over power to negotiate a deeper level of meaning. The teacher's intention is to ensure that there is no split between subjects in drama and the children's coming to know by means of a language of feeling.

Scientific explanation and mythic explanation are equally valued and valuable, e.g., man's impact on landscape must be scientifically accurate in explanation but mythically established as an organic relationship. What people know about objects is joined with how they see themselves in relation to objects. Children in drama choose appropriate objects and rearrange them in the imaginary world so that they have ownership of the objects but only as they exist in a scientifically accurate way in reality. Once the appropriation and rearrangement is accomplished the child can behave in an imaginary world which is not limited by artificial dissonances of subjects and one which benignly tolerates a multiplicity of different kinds of knowledge. Therefore drama extends, elaborates and reinforces conceptual maps and also synthesises conceptual maps.

Addressing the power of the time element in drama in a 1983 article, Heathcote explained that in other school subjects children deal with things that happen elsewhere than in their lives. In drama, the children are within the situation, seeing it from a present point of view. The pressure of the dramatic moment makes them draw on their experience to cope with the here and now. They have to find new ways of knowing to make new connections from those dormant past experiences. Although drama appears to move forward, it unpacks previously held conclusions because it stands still. "It is knowledge within the learner that creates the focus or drive that demands new essential knowledge" (Heathcote, 1983, p.697). Teachers must take a stance between knowing facts and knowing by intuition or knowing holistically. "As children grow and develop, it seems that the movement of one's life, who that self is, and the seeds that are there to be unfolded are the most important kinds of learning and discovery in our lives." (Heathcote, 1983, p.697). Heathcote saw children as too little in touch with the procedures of humankind's making and too much in touch with the products of that making. She in-
sisted that one must create interactive knowledge by taking product knowledge back into previous personal knowledge. The teacher is also the inductor into society’s values and is one side of the language dialectic. Books of all kinds are there, not just to be read and to be accepted, but also to be shouted at. Drama, therefore, must work at many dimensions of the sign and children must be viewed as crucibles of knowing which must be constantly stirred up.

Heathcote’s concept of the mantle of the expert was explored further in a 1985 article co-authored with Phyl Herbert. The child, in this conception, is the one who knows, in the mantle of a sociological / anthropological expert. This conception can inform all areas of the curriculum as an integrating force which is based in the social matrix of groups. The teacher can direct the child’s energies to work at related tasks that are problems for the group. Learning then becomes a personal, conceptual, and social fluctuation within the power in the group. The teacher shares in the group’s construction of knowledge and becomes an enabler. She negotiates her position in the group and protects their ignorance by demonstrating the value of what they know and enabling them to represent it symbolically. The purpose is to construct socially group images which illustrate the group’s knowledge, and to use these to work through problems. To do so the teacher must select the metaphor, define the task and the role, use teacher modelling, employ frame change to focus moves in attention, develop the images of the place and situation for the drama, and rely on the ritual making power of the student.

In sum, to read Heathcote, to watch her films, to listen to what others say of her and to read what others write about her is to misunderstand, at least to some extent, how she teaches drama. In this summary, therefore, an attempt is made to include this writer’s idea of what it is like to be a participant in a drama led by her. In the writings about her and in her own writing we have the impression that she is deeply concerned about the children’s understanding of the objective and of the mythic world. In other words, Heathcote’s form of drama might be thought to be content-strong. The drama almost seems to be relegated to the position of a tool of learning in the domain of empirical knowledge and in the domain of values. Her second dominant concern appears to be the idea of empowering children by requiring that they view themselves as experts who are infinitely skillful and infinitely resourceful and who deal with issues. Indeed, she has said that her most important idea is the “Mantle of the Expert.” It is, indeed, an idea of overwhelming importance. It is psychologically important in its understanding of
Maslow’s concept of affirmation (1972). It is philosophically important in Lonergan’s terms as self appropriation of knowledge and values (1978). It is important in terms of Dewey’s theory of education (1938) as he discussed integration and recovery and is linked to Bruner’s view of enabling the child (1970). Most importantly, for the present purposes, it is important in its relationship to the idea of giving and taking focus in theatre which is the basis of ensemble playing (Stanislavski, C.1948).

As a member of a Heathcote class, I was most conscious of this last aspect. Where I was most expert was in bringing my experience into the present situation of the drama and integrating it into the situation of the group. Yet it is an aspect of the work for which I could find no reference in the writings, tapes, or films.

Even more important than the mantle of the expert, for this participant, was Heathcote’s idea of brotherhoods. It is an idea that is found in theoretical literature in education, philosophy, psychology, and theatre, as is the mantle of the expert. In a drama room it is one of incredible power. As the participants moved along in the drama, believing in the fiction and creating the imagined world, Heathcote would suddenly interject with, “As you stand there painting your bowls to offer to the Sun God, you are of the brotherhood of all men who have a talent to return to your deity.” This interjection would plunge the work into an emotional and awe-inspiring level which lead the participants into an intensely moving, highly controlled ritual, almost stunning in its beauty. This is true evocation of the natural art form, as Peter Slade (1954) so sensitively recognized, and it is seldom absent from Heathcote’s work although it is not much emphasized. To characterize her work as the use of theatrical forms as techniques for learning other subjects is a distortion, in this writer’s view. Beyond theatrical forms and including the use of them, she is able to move the participants into an engagement with the essence of the drama which is its themes. In so doing, she can produce beat and rhythm which infuse the knowing with emotional power. The knowing is secondary but firmly anchored in the art form. Heathcote’s drama lessons are, if conceived of as serving learning or as cracking codes, nonetheless pure dramatic art and it is the art that puts the power in the children’s hands. It is in the aesthetic experience of being in an art form and “held taut in it” that the participant is led to new understanding.

All of the elements that have been so carefully worked out to help a teacher to use Dorothy Heathcote’s drama methods will fail as drama, if the nature of the art form is not given in the experience of the drama that is done in her name. It will not fail in offering the improved form of learning described above. What is created in the classroom, how-
ever, is more than the sum of all these parts—that is, it is art. As art it has "necessary but not sufficient conditions" (Weitz, 1977.) and therefore the spectrum of attitudes and values into which the art enquires is bounded only by the complexities of the conditions of the person as being in the world and as person. Since both the person and, therefore, the possibilities of the person's being in the world are endless and unknowable, drama then deals with the mystery as well as with that which is available for scrutiny. The discovery of this depth to the enquiry engenders wonder in the participants, an awareness of their own ignorance and a limitless curiosity.

It is important to note, however, that participants in the drama classroom do not create art in every lesson. Such creation is a slow process and, as Heathcote has said, there will come a time when more and more power can be handed over to the children as they come to understand the art form. Then the teacher touches the work more and more lightly and suddenly it is there and they have made it.

North American Authorities

The development of an understanding of the role of drama in the schools has not been confined to Britain. In the early part of the century, the work of John Dewey had inspired Winifred Ward to initiate a program of drama/theatre into education. In her own university, there has been much support in the last 18 years for the work of Dorothy Heathcote who caused great consternation in the 1974 American Theatre Association convention in Minneapolis. Gavin Bolton, Brian Way, and Peter Slade have also visited the U.S.A. several times and their influence is present in certain areas, but for the majority of American drama teachers, Winifred Ward and her pupil Gerry Brain Siks, have been the formative influences together with a strong theatre bias.

The Work of Ward

Winifred Ward, an American, worked for most of her life at the University of Illinois at Evanston. She became a national figure in drama in the U.S.A., both for her work in creative dramatics in classrooms and also for her contribution to theatre for children. Ward's (1930) first book, Creative Dramatics, had the greatest influence on drama in the classrooms of the U.S.A.. Forty nine years later, the form of drama advocated here is present in a dissertation from Lehigh University (Pappas, 1979) and a second edition of
a language arts text from Oregon published as late as 1988 has a chapter which advocates like methods (De Haven, 1988).

Ward's first book is concerned with the use of narrative to allow children to act out the events the narrative contains. This method, she stated, causes the children to gain confidence and to become emotionally involved with the characters. A second book, published in 1939, entitled Theatre for Children, set standards for what theatre could accomplish for the child. Ward saw theatre viewing as a means of vicarious experience for the child, an experience which expanded horizons, prepared future audiences and provided possible future leisure-time activities (Ward, 1939).

Either adults or children might be the actors in such theatre and the plays produced should vary according to the ages of the children. The examples illustrated in Ward's book show a concern with elaborate production of fairy tales, folk tales, and legends.

A third book in 1952 remained locked into story line or plot but now there was free improvisation of the characters' speech. Ward listed benefits of this activity: (a) the children think creatively and independently, (b) learn to cooperate socially, (c) understand the viewpoints of others, (d) experience controlled emotional release, (e) learn to think on their feet, and (f) have fun from literature (Ward 1952).

By 1957, however, Ward's perspective had shifted to embrace the idea of the child as playmaker in which he/she actively "tries on life" (Ward, 1957). She defined playmaking as all forms of story-based or improvised drama which develop an idea into a plot with characters. Again, the work was to be an emotional outlet which developed self-expression and a feeling of worthiness while it improved social understanding and cooperation. She advised integrating the subject areas into the playmaking and tying it together with story. This activity developed creative thinking, the ability to think on one's feet, and improved understanding through enlightened self-interest and problem-solving. Ward approved and encouraged the therapeutic aspects of the work. Her book incorporates sense awareness and brainstorming exercises and advocates emotion-filled action together with movement and voice training. All of the drama was to lead to evaluation by teachers and children in which attitudes and appreciations were to be valued above skills and facts. Drama was here characterized as the "moving force of life" leading to democratic living. In addition, in this later writing, Ward incorporated an idea which came into prominence later in the writings of Augusto Boal (1974) in theatre and in the writings of Paulo Freire (1970) in education. This idea is the notion of empowerment of the participants in the drama. Because the drama is created by the children
using their own imagination and experience, the children come to own the piece of drama they create. Dorothy Heathcote advocated the gradual handing over to the children of the decisions made in creating the drama as students become more proficient in the art form. As this investing of power in the drama takes place to an ever greater degree, the pieces produced come to represent more and more closely the convictions and the commitments of the group creating the drama. If the pieces produced are then validated by the children’s peers as true expressions of values and attitudes, the pieces created will themselves attain greater value and will allow in their creators a sense of satisfaction and eventually of pride. Thus, both a sense of ownership and a sense of the power of their own creations render the participants ever more committed to and competent in scrutinizing the complexities of the human condition through the drama. (Boal, 1977; Friere, 1970. (See also analysis in Chapter 3.)

In 1960, Ward prepared a bulletin called “Drama With and For Children,” for the U.S. Department of Health and Welfare (Ward, 1960). This document presented drama as a language art developing from the play of children which was guided by the teacher into an orderly creative process. The drama was never to be written down, nor was it to be shown to an audience. It was a means to express creative thinking which provided the incentive for children to do research, to listen, and to evaluate. Ward made a plea for child drama as an art form and claimed that sense awareness was the beginning of aesthetic discrimination. (cf. Way, 1967).

As she looked back on her career, in 1981, Ward’s view of creative dramatics retained improvisation as its base (Ward, 1981). The claims she made for it were wide ranging. This form of drama led to personal and social development, allowed communication of ideas, concepts, and feelings, and facilitated learning, values clarification and understanding. Her emphasis now was on the understanding achieved through acting out perceptions of the world. Ward pointed to the need to insist equally on logical thinking and intuition. This combination personalized knowledge and yielded aesthetic pleasure.

In sum, in the course of Ward’s career, she moved from an emphasis on formal ideas in theatre and literature to an informal approach which builds its own form in the work the children create. From a dominant concern with story and plot line, her work evolved to an approach which had, as the central focus, the empowerment of the children and an eliciting of their natural aesthetic sense. However, today she is more honoured for her contribution to good theatre for children than she is for the development of
children's classroom drama. Currently, many teachers in the U.S., believing they are following in her footsteps, cling to her earlier literary and theatrical ideas. Her later insights are “more honoured in the breach than in the observance.”

The Work of Richard Courtney

One of the most prolific Canadian writers in drama education is Richard Courtney. His works began with a concern for the purpose of theatre in schools and moved through a consideration of classroom drama as a subject in its own right to a discussion of dramatic theory. The areas of his concern are: (a) research into drama in education, (b) clarification of dramatic theory and of the use of terms in drama, (c) attention to practice in drama to clarify its aims and goals and (d) use of drama in therapy. The following discussion concentrates only upon his theory of drama and his theory of drama in education.

Courtney (1966) saw the school play as providing the content of a subject study, the means to that study and an outcome which is a demonstration of the creative life of the school. The means of inquiry in this subject study is improvisation. This mode of enquiry may lead to play-making or to the examination of a play text. Movement and speech are the tools of this enquiry and these make use of the play to refine skill in their use. The design skills for set, costume, light and sound serve to bring the school together in a community enterprise which celebrates these combined efforts in a theatrical event.

The school play complements a second type of activity which Courtney (1967) called classroom drama. In designing a school drama studio, he made provision for both types of activities. The classroom drama is concerned with “the natural development of the individual within his play.” (1967, p. 2). It is both creative and therapeutic in its aid to natural development, and that development is a controlled, oral, physical, imaginative, social, intellectual, and aesthetic development. The assertion here is that drama is play-based. Drama as pretence, or as a response to stimuli which later moves into making up stories and acting them out, finally leads to the creation of plays or dance dramas. The development is linked to the way groups of children manipulate space.

The idea of classroom drama as both creative work and as therapy is further developed in Courtney's (1968) Play, Drama And Thought, his major work in this realm. This extended work sees the imagination as a universal human capacity which is inherently dramatic. Therefore, drama is an all-embracing concept central to the whole growth of
man. In the exercise of this capacity, the Apollonian use of reason and the Dyonysian expression of emotion come together to serve natural man in shaping thought. The imagination unites reason and emotion to this purpose. Evocation of the power of the imagination occurs through the senses and through play. When such natural evocation of the imagination is practised by imitating life, an art form is created. The constituents of the art form are the sensori-motor, the playing of role, and the aesthetic. The work of developing intelligence and of developing art are not separate. "Drama is an experiment with life in the here and now" (Courtney, 1968, p. 58).

Courtney addressed the relation of imagination to dramatic art in 1971. He analysed the work of Sartre, Ryle, and Furlong, and espoused Furlong's ideas on the structure of the imagination to establish this relationship (Courtney 1971). Drama is an analogue of imaginary life. The "identification" which people make in creating a character, or in relating to one, is based in the idea of action as externalized imagination through which people manipulate life. Therefore, pretence is a form of thinking (Courtney, 1971, p. 165). Courtney also linked Furlong's categories of "in imagination" and "with imagination" to Peter Slade's conceptions of personal and projected play, respectively. Drama is, therefore, a synthesis of images arising from different sensory responses, both in imagination and with imagination, in action. This delineation of drama is more a fecund conception than that of imitation which relies on recalling and it produces creative work.

Imagination masters internal life while action masters external life. When the two come together in imaginative dramatic play, they deal with the whole of peoples' existence. Courtney (1971) linked the coming together of this duality to Piaget's operations of assimilating and accommodating, which he viewed as working together in drama. The actor, by thinking through this duality, both achieves the "real" in working "in imagination" and "the mastery of the real" in working "with imagination."

The application of Furlong's categories to drama yields stages in the use of the two types of imagination. The sequence, "percept—image—act," he concluded, is a basic human procedure in life and in art. The child through play, the adult through social roles, and the actor through characterization all use the sequence in action with other people.

A 1973 article by Courtney described a continuum of spontaneity: at one end is the play of children and at the other is theatre. This model is a plausible one and is comparable to Bolton's (1974) thoughts which come from a different line of reasoning. Less plausible is his comparison of theatre and the other fine arts because it adopts the views that:
1. visual art works -sculpture and painting- are simply there in experience;
2. a musical work is constrained by conductor and composer; and
3. a work of dance is constrained by choreography; whereas
4. the theatre work is a reciprocal creation of form by actors and audiences.

Courtney (1973) wanted, therefore, to establish the continuum of spontaneity from least in visual art to greatest in drama. I suggest this to be a misconception of each of these art forms and of the aesthetic dialectic itself. If it is not a misconception it is not, I suggest, a useful way of conceiving of them. If, instead of relying on spontaneity as the criterion in the argument offered here, Courtney were dealing with the interactive structuring of world views, the comparable insight might be more useful (see Chapter 3). Intentional use of spontaneity in the arts is, in my view, as varied as the artist's use of it and as varied as the audiences' responses will allow it to be.

In an article entitled, “The Discipline of Drama,” Courtney (1977) attempted to establish drama as a discipline whose framework is non-Aristotelian. Aristotelian frameworks are based in the literary form of playwriting, with acting and production as minor techniques within the art form. Non-Aristotelian approaches are those which are based in representation where production determines the art form. The non-Aristotelian approach is holistic. In this approach, Courtney (1977) wrote, “Drama is the dramatic process in life as a whole and theatre is the art form of the life process” (p. 233). From our play we develop mental constructs by the interaction of our inner and outer worlds. Imagination and acting in a dramatic context are the “inherent components of natural human learning” (1979, p. 233). Theatre is not a metaphor for existence; it epitomizes it. It is the only one of the art works which exist in time and in flux, employing the whole human being as the main element of the form. It does not attempt the ideal, but attempts “significance in content and attempts a form which is the essence of consciousness” (1979, p. 237).

Theatre form is a symbol of human existence and is apparent only in subsequent reflection. It has its effect through a meeting of subjectivities (cf. Bruner's (1986) Actual Minds Possible Worlds). The audience and the actors participate in an I/Thou relationship. Thus, it is an explanatory mode dealing with both existence and with natural phenomena.

Theatre is equally valid for the subjective needs of child, adult, and actor. It is for all a “useful explanatory mode for coping with experience” (Courtney, 1977, p. 241).
According to the level of development, it can satisfy both the dramatic and theatrical needs of an individual. It is interpretative reasoning which is meaning-giving since it involves re-cognition as a result of re-play which results in re-creation.

The ideas of re-play, re-cognition, and re-creation are developed more fully in Courtney's 1982 publication Re-Play. Here Courtney claimed that drama is central to art as a whole because it is central to the creation of meaning. Drama is persons in a context, in a culture, exploring a series of possible futures. It enquires into the dramatic nature of life and of education. In elementary school, this enquiry can lead to the basic language art and math skills which help children adjust to their existence. In secondary education, it should be a subject, as it treats meaning symbolically so that students discover new meanings in their existence. It should also, at this stage, be used as a teaching method, to provide a feeling base for learning and should infuse the whole curriculum. Because in drama actors use themselves, others, and objects as actual and as symbolic, they relate to everyday life and to an imagined world. Their enactment in this imaginary world provides a bridge between their inner world and their personal and cultural world, which has, as its focus, the dramatic act. They, themselves, become symbols of persons in the world and find a new way of re-cognising, that is, a new way of knowing. These insights offered by Courtney seem to be focused on what all academic enquiries already do and on bringing these academic enquiries into a personal experience in drama.

This approach is extremely worthwhile, since the complaints about present educational institutions deal precisely with the lack of links to personal experience in what is taught. However, it is the position taken in this thesis that, while many such uses of drama are possible, and even in some contexts advisable, they do not constitute the core of the drama enquiry which addresses the values and attitudes of persons.

In offering ritual, myth, and symbol as ways of knowing, Courtney has seen drama as using movement, sound, and being as the media of exploration. Within a role, moral values and community and inferential thinking provide the bases for logical thought. Because, in this process, meaning is intentionally created out of experience, "transfer of meaning" is possible in drama and there is a motivation to learn which is concentrated and persistent (Courtney, 1982, p.22). Because it is an organic model of learning, it fosters creativity and giftedness, allowing children to develop as symbol makers energetically involved in the work of creation (1982, p.61). This view is too general and involves a tautology that weakens the persuasive power of the argument in this book.
Courtney (1982) further claimed that the symbolic and abstractive development in drama, which organizes in wholes, is conducive to language learning and to language expansion and, therefore, leads to an understanding of literature (p. 68). Courtney also saw drama as therapeutic when there has been a misordering of experience. Finally, he saw it as leading to a deeper understanding of Canadian culture as people come to understand its symbolic actions because in drama the base in community action provides a meeting of intentionalities. In such a meeting, one acknowledges others and their significant concerns.

Summary of Courtney's Work in Educational Drama.

In summary, Courtney has been greatly influenced by the work of Peter Slade (1954) in drama, by Marshal Mc Luhan (1967) in communication, and by Martin Buber (1965) in philosophical perspective, as he brought his considerable scholarship to bear on drama in education. In spite of vast differences in background, he shared, in his later writings, much in common with both Gavin Bolton and with Dorothy Heathcote. He shared the idea of a drama in education model which makes the inner outer, which reorganizes past events in the service of meaning, and which shapes future attitudes. Unlike these two latter authors, he has not taken a position on the definitive function of drama in education beyond this point. His position has been more general, in that it persists in adhering to the many purposes that drama can accomplish for people and, on the whole, he argued well for this position. Courtney, and indeed drama in education itself, is caught in a paradox. Because it uses whole human beings in its enquiry into the human condition, it can indeed turn its attention to any aspect of that condition whether that be therapy, the objective world, or the world of values. On the other hand, it is legitimate to ask what function it serves that is peculiarly its own as a discipline, as an art, or as a subject of study. In this writer's view, Courtney has not confronted this paradox.

Summary and Critique of Authorities Discussed

Slade's view is based in the child as the spontaneous and absorbed creator of an art form which educators can help to refine. The art form is based in children's movement which is central to their natural play and is cooperatively moulded in groups.

Way wants drama to help children discover and express their inner resources. This discovery, through the senses and the expression, in using the whole person, is through
a controlled and concentrated private or group form which they also discover. The educator, by providing stimuli to the senses, alerts the imagination and encourages the expression of its products.

For Ward, children are interpreters and creators of stories who, through these activities, discover their own values and the values of others. The educator encourages the interpretation and creation and helps children to give them form and to prepare their insights to be shown to others. She sees the work as empowering children and the sharing of the work as affirming them.

Courtney sees drama as the doing of life to enable the child to re-cognise his attitudes and values through a re-play which re-creates past experience by enacting an imagined situation in a group.

Dorothy Heathcote uses all the elements of theatre form, or whatever else that will help, gradually to hand power over to the children so that they can investigate, using their whole persons, both empirical and mythic knowledge. The educator's job is to negotiate the learning conditions and to insist on attention to universally significant meanings.

Gavin Bolton advocates a tangential approach to the underlying values which are the central concern of the drama so that they are caught, not taught. The children's purpose is to explore the imagined situation using their past experience in action. The teacher's purpose is to demand logical thought and to insist on rigid attention to theme (significant and worthwhile concerns), so that the reflecting on the drama may cause a reappraisal of values and attitudes.

Drama cannot continue in education to be all things to all persons. It can be, and probably is, both therapy and prevention. Social adjustment of behaviour undoubtedly occurs. Drama is a powerful teaching method for both the empirical and the mythic domains of knowledge. Anthropologically, it provides the ideal situation for participant observation to enable understanding between cultures and sub-cultures. It extends language and provides the means to experience many different speech registers.

In its structures, drama is developmentally related to play and is cognate with game-playing in its adherence to rules. Children can safely express themselves, create, and embody their imaginings' dreams and ambitions. They can rehearse life skills and prepare to become better teachers. But what is it as subject in a school or as discipline in a university? What is it, as Dewey asked in Art as Experience, that is "The significance that belongs to (it) when isolated in reflection?" (1934, p14).
APPROPRIATE ATTITUDES

In the preceding chapter, theories of drama in education were dealt with. In the interpretation given, it became clear that drama was concerned with the experience of its participants, with their imaginations, with their attitudes and values, and with the relationship that all of these had to the learning which takes place when participants play with these components in order to wrest meaning from their lives by creating an art form. In short, drama is a means of ordering what we come to know through being persons in the world. In this chapter, therefore, an attempt is made to clarify the connections between being a person in the world and one's attitudes.

From a consideration of what it is to be a person, the concept of "attitude" is examined through the philosophical ideas which underlie such a concept. The examination describes a possible structure of an attitude as an identifiable construct for a person at a particular time, and offers an explanation of what constitutes appropriate and less appropriate attitudes toward old people and toward old age. Finally, the related concepts of positive and negative attitudes, of strength of attitudes, of stereotypic attitudes, of gerontophobic attitudes, and of ageistic prejudices are considered and their relationship to the central concept of an attitude is examined.

Attitude as Word

The word "attitude" is widely used. It characterizes aspects of animate and inanimate objects as well as characterizing human behaviour. In this thesis, the use of the word "attitude" to characterize rocks, plants, or animals is assumed to refer either to (a) the orientation or stance of an object within a context or (b) a metaphoric use:

1. The use of the word "attitude" to express an orientation within a context was originally an aesthetic use of the term. It referred to the position and stance of a figure within a frame or within a context. This use may provide considerable insight into the concept of an attitude as it is to refer to human beings, and as such it will be employed to begin the analysis.
2. The metaphoric use, which assigned to inanimate objects the attributes of humans, is found extensively in literature. The assumption of literary intent may be readily accepted in the case of rocks or plants, e.g. "the mountains frowned their disapproval of the scene" or "the attentive asters rustled appreciatively." However, this use is less readily acceptable in the case of animals.

Metaphoric extension of the use of the word "attitude" into the realm of mental operations is found in the early psychological literature. Metaphor was used in these early writings to characterize a phenomenon which the psychologist had discerned but for which there was not, as yet, any scientific definition. As a result of the use of the word in this pseudo-scientific sense, the distinction between true metaphoric (literary) use and "scientific" reference became blurred. Therefore, when animals are characterized as having an attitude, the extent to which the intent is concrete, metaphoric, or scientific may not be clear.

It may be argued that the ascription of an attitude to an animal is a legitimate description of the animal's observed behaviour. If, then, the use of the word "attitude" is limited to one instance or to many of observed behaviour, such arguments may have some justification.

The position adopted here is that the word "attitude," as commonly used, ascribes to the actor who manifests a certain behaviour, much more than the behaviour concerned. Over long periods of use, the two meanings of the word have run together. Therefore, what is meant in ascribing an attitude is clear only when the context makes clear which of the meanings is intended.

Attitude ascribes to an actor the quality of at least some emotional investment in the behaviour. For example, animals who "slink away" from a situation (observed behaviour) often have ascribed to them an emotion of fear. There is little hesitation, too, in ascribing the emotion of anger to the behaviour of animals when their attitudes are described as "ferocious" or "threatening." The ascription of such emotional descriptions may not, in fact, be justified and may lie in the interpretation of the animal's behaviour which the human observer makes—an interpretation, moreover, which may owe more to the reactions of the human viewer than to any emotional investment by the animal.

This thesis is not concerned with the attitudes of animals, nor indeed with whether or not one may justifiably talk about attitudes in animals whatsoever. The use of language has been raised at the outset to indicate two important questions in the consideration of
human attitudes: (a) What position does human behaviour hold in the concept of an attitude? and (b) What role does interpretation of behaviour, whether in emotional or in any other terms, play in influencing what it is that one may justifiably designate as an attitude? There is a need to question why, if attitude is merely a synonym for behaviour, the word is used at all. These two behaviour-related concerns are discussed more fully at the end of the philosophy section of the chapter.

PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS: PART 1

This thesis is concerned first of all with attitudes of persons to other persons. Specifically, it is concerned with the attitudes of Grade 5 school children to elderly persons. It is also concerned, though perhaps less directly, with the attitudes of the Grade 5 children to the process of aging taking place in their own lives.

The concept of a person

Because this thesis is concerned with attitudes of persons, it is necessary, first of all, to be clear about the way in which one conceives of a person. P.F. Strawson, the Wayneflete professor of metaphysics at Oxford University, has been knighted for his contribution to philosophy. He has integrated metaphysics and linguistic philosophy and extended the scope of linguistic philosophy beyond the limits set by its more empirically oriented adherents. Strawson has pointed out that the idea of a person is a first-order concept. He asserted, in other words, that it makes no sense to conceive of some mental, intellectual or emotional entity divorced from a corporeal entity. Strawson explained:

What I mean by the concept of a person is the concept of a type of entity such that both predicates ascribing states of consciousness, and predicates ascribing corporeal characteristics, are equally applicable to a single individual of that type......The concept of a person is logically prior to that of an individual consciousness. (1966 pp. 135-137).

From this postulate, and using the original meaning of the term "attitude" as that of stance or orientation to objects, "attitude"can be seen as a perspective from which to view persons as both corporeal entities and as states of consciousness.
Stances which refer to persons, and in that reference intend to encompass the person’s meaning for an observer, in phrases such as, “that is a good mind,” are therefore inappropriate. On the other hand, the phrase, “She/he has a good mind” is appropriate, if such is the case, since the logically secondary nature of “mind” has been made clear.

Strawson (1962) stated further that in dealing with the concept of person “we have to do with a class of predicates to the meaning of which it is essential that they should be both self- ascribable and other ascribable” (p.137). Therefore, the concept of a person includes all aspects if, and only if, both consciousness and corporeality, are ascribed in equal measure to all others. All that we can discern in our own consciousness such as desires, wants, needs, goals, and means, or bodies such as pain or strength, must all be given equal recognition in the persons of others (whether or not we judge such to be demonstrated) before we can be said to realize fully the concept of a person. A logically appropriate attitude toward persons, as a result, will consist in recognizing the corporeality and the states of consciousness of all others as equally constraining as that of our own personhood. To say of others that they have no goals, or compassion, or capacity to love, while asserting or implying our own goals, compassion, or love, is to contradict Strawson’s second postulate.

Already we may discern the possibility of adopting postulates for the person other than those offered by Strawson. We may, for example, have a concept which regards states of consciousness of a person as logically prior to that of personhood. This would imply a different attitude toward the person and would affect other attitudes we might hold towards individual persons. For example, it would perhaps imply that we view the operation of conscious states as those to which we must attend in ascriptions of personhood, thus largely discounting the corporeal aptitudes and capacities of the person. At the very least, we would view the physical capacities as less worthwhile than the mental capacities. Adoption of such a stance would then lead us to value chiefly those states of consciousness which an individual could demonstrate for us and to undervalue corporeal capacities. Our attitudes toward persons would then become attitudes toward demonstrated states of consciousness. Again, in examining the second postulate, if we hold to Strawson’s first postulate of unified entity but ignore or deny the necessity that such an entity be other ascribable, then we have limited our stance to one which might be characterized as ego-centred. Such a stance is often demonstrated by young children when they are challenged about a behaviour and plead, “But mummy, I want to be
good." What they very often mean is that they want to desire to be good. They see that they have demonstrated that they do not want to be good but plead that they have a second order volition to want to be good, rather in the fashion of a St. Augustine who prays "God make me good but not yet." If we claim that such small children have no second-order volitions, we may be ascribing to them a type of non-personhood which is not well founded (cf. Dennett, 1976).

The ability or willingness to demonstrate any of the states of consciousness cannot be a criterion of personhood, since a lack of demonstration does not imply the lack of the state of consciousness. If we consistently follow a stance which asserts that only what is demonstrated is present, our views of persons will clearly be influenced by that stance—it will mould our views attitudes toward other persons. In acknowledging old persons only as both consciousness and as corporeal entity, we may ignore or deny their goals or their means while at the same time asserting the importance of our own. We may assume that their goals and means do not exist because they are not demonstrated or asserted. Such an assumption would be inappropriate under rigorous application of Strawson's two postulates. It would constitute an inadequate attitude to a person. These basic notions will be central as we come to consider, later in the chapter, attitudes as they apply to relations between persons.

**Person as Being in the World**

Since, however, a person cannot be conceived of as existing without a context for that existence (i.e., as a human actor of some kind), we will consider now the human person as a being in the world.

Strawson (1962) saw the human being in the world as existing in an A-Relation to that world; that is, the individual is both (a) affected by that world and (b) affects it. All that is external to the person will therefore be available to affect him/her and to be affected by him/her. Social mores, physical environment, discrete objects, the world news, indeed, all that is other exist in these two types of dialectical relationships with the person (Riegal, 1979).

By choosing either one of these stances to the world, the person adopts an attitude to himself/ herself as a being in the world. The two types of action specified by Strawson and based on the notion of form are form-producing and form-yielding actions. The concept of form used is one of discerned pattern, order, or structure in the latter use, that is, form yielding-F.Y., and of created pattern, order, or structure in the former
The following section contains an exploration of the two types of action delineated by Strawson and a discussion of their implications for clarifying appropriate attitudes to persons.

**Form-Yielding**

First we will deal with our stance as we yield to the form in what we experience as external to us. Strawson (1959) has conceived of the individual, when affected by externals, as adopting a form-yielding mode of action. When, therefore, individuals look at something, the sensation they experience will become, almost simultaneously, their perception of that object, or of those aspects of the object, to which they attend. This action might be described as “taking a look” (Lonergan, 1978). At the level of naive realism, the assumption will be, in such a situation, that “what is” can be seen by taking a look. “I saw it, measured it, etc.” is the reason and justification given for the explanation or description of the form observed. This is accurate if and only if, the “I” in the sentence is not forgotten. I choose for attention those aspects of the object that my experience has led me to recognize and make sense of. Which aspects of the object I select for my attention will make a crucial contribution to the attitude which an individual develops towards an object. The role which selection and attention play in their contribution to an attitude will depend on the experience of the person “taking a look.” As we consider the form-yielding actions of the person, it is crucial to note that what will become meaningful to him/her in some way, is usually as a result of one of two approaches to the object.

The approach might be one of recognition of the object as belonging to a previously acquired category, that is, “Oh, that’s a...” Or it might be one of non-recognition, that is, “What is that?” In the second case, the examination must begin with the search for some aspect of the object, to which our attention was drawn by its salience, which we recognize from previous experience in order that we may begin to make sense of it. We may assert that, in this type of attention, we assign initial meaning to the object and then proceed to search it to achieve clarity in that meaning. The object guides our efforts. Thus:

1. F.Y., subject to previous experience either in categorization or in response to salience, is a response which is a relatively passive one in that the viewer accepts and inquires into aspects (generally easily available) of the form or partial form as given in the object.
2. Those aspects which we select to attend to are based on a subjective decision and lie in our experience as well as in our preferences. Therefore, both the attention, with its results, and the selection, which is subjective, must be scrutinized to see whether our conclusions about the object are justified. Meynell (1985), after Lonergan (1978), has suggested that verification of the results of the attention only, does not justify a conclusion by itself—selection, too, must be examined and justified.

3. We must, in effect, give good reasons to justify our subjective selection in order to achieve a critical realism (cf. naive realism). Strawson's (1962) form yielding actions might be related to Bruner's (1976) notion of concept acquisition, to Witkin's (1976) notion of field-dependence, or to Piaget's (1976) notion of accommodation. Whatever the relationships, the adoption of a form-yielding stance carries with it an intention to attend to what is external to the self, that is, to an object of some kind which is other. In this attention the implication is that the actor is capable, by the exercise of his/her senses or some technological extension of them, of discerning some aspect of the form that is intrinsic to the object of his/her attention.

4. An actor, in other words, is capable of discerning some part of what is in fact the case about the object in question. As a result, therefore, of the aspect to which the person chooses to attend, and of his/her acceptance of what is in fact the case about that aspect of the object, the actor, in form-yielding operation, has adopted a stance or attitude to the object. Furthermore, the discernment and acceptance of form becomes the person's subjective experience of the object and constitutes his/her construction of that object's meaning for him/her in the world.

5. Persons are intending to make the object in the world meaningful to them as a result of attention to and examination of that which is other. Thus, the stance or attitude adopted has the added power of the meaning with which they have has invested it, as a result of their form-yielding efforts. It must then be the case that the meaning and the stance adopted, i.e., the attitude in our present construction, become inextricable and mutually support one another. For example, if we attend to the work habits of an individual we have selected those work habits for our attention. If then we note that there is much activity and little result from the work, we may take that to mean that the individual observed is not a very effective worker.

6. Our stance toward the individual will then be determined by the meaning for us, or by the value, which we place upon effectiveness in the given situation or context. If the value placed upon effectiveness is high in the context, we may be dismiss that individ-
ual as a person. By selecting work habits for our attention and by arriving at a stance which is dismissive of personhood, both the objective evidence and the subjective selection have a part to play. In dismissing the person as a result only of the justified objective stance, we have ignored other aspects of the person and perhaps of the context and we have failed to provide justification for our selective attention. As a result, we have not only inadequately dealt with the concept of person, but we have also inadequately scrutinized the form-yielding we have done. The dismissive stance we have adopted is unjustified. This we may describe as an inappropriate attitude. An appropriate attitude would be a stance arrived at as a result of a justified subjectivity, of a justified objectivity, and of a justified interaction between the two. The judgements rendered, both subjective and objective, are a dialectical selection from both objective and subjective positions.

The six points made above have rested both on the work of Strawson and on the works of the less well known Lonergan (1978) and Meynell (1985). It is the case that the work of Heidegger (1977) also supports the position taken here.

In this difficult task of providing justification for the stances we take in adopting attitudes, Strawson has not failed us (Strawson 1966). The subjective component of the position just described is one application of the person as form producer. This aspect will be examined when we deal with the person being in the world as form producer in the next section.

In endeavours of form yielding, however, it is often not possible to examine the object under consideration at first hand. So, in many instances, the form-yielding that we do is to a form discerned and interpreted by others and accepted in general by the society within which we live. In this latter case, we become acceptors of meaning rather than makers of meaning and such acceptance is, of necessity, more often unexamined than not. Our stances are often, in this instance, those we adopt from others without asking whether they are appropriate and without examining what relevant aspects of the object or context we have left out of consideration, that is, we accept without scrutiny the judgements and the attitudes of others. To extend the example cited above to this type of case, we may accept the judgement of another's inefficiency without asking how that judgement was arrived at, and without asking what considerations, other than inefficiency, are relevant to the making of the judgement of the other as a person. We may, in addition, ignore or accept unquestioningly the subjective selections which have been made by the person offering the judgement. It may be, for instance, that the cited lack
of results, while it does not suit the individual making the judgement, may be a cause for approbation since it is the result of a painstaking checking of results, essential to the enterprise upon which he/she is engaged. Thus, if we are to claim that our scrutiny of others results in appropriate attitudes, form-yielding activities and the meanings we abstract from them should be carefully and thoroughly examined in context, with attention to as many factors as possible, both in the context and in the person about whom we are making a judgement.

Summary of Part 1

The above analysis on form-yielding activities of the person as being in the world, show that attitude or stance is inextricable from idiosyncratic meaning. What we know, as a result of what we select for our attention and as a result of the past meanings we can relate it to, is in this sense a subjective construction of knowledge. What is the case and the meaning together result in a judgement being made. Such a judgement must rely on good reasons as a result of close examination of the context and of any persons involved including the self. Given that all of the above steps have been followed by an individual, it might be claimed that such an individual has made a valid judgement and justifiably holds the stance or attitude he/she adopts which is based on the valid judgement. In short, we have the position of an appropriate attitude as a stance adopted as a result of a valid judgement which is based in careful examination of all aspects of context and of person which we can discern. Such a stance is supported by good reasons derived from the examination. (The term “good reason” as it is used in this thesis refers to those reasons, within a particular situation, which by consensual agreement conform to present understanding of what is in fact the case.)

This is a position of “critical realism” (Meynell, 1889) where “true objectivity lies in authentic subjectivity” (Lonergan, 1978). This analysis has resulted from reflection upon the postulates of Strawson (1966) and is supported by the insights of Heidegger (1977) as they operate in our lives. The position stated is conceived of as being an ideal position and, as such, would rarely be realized because of the stringency of its conditions. Socratic censure of the unexamined life appears to advocate a similar position and stringency.
Form Producing

The second activity of persons as beings in the world which Strawson (1966) describes is that of form production. In the second half of the A-Relation the individual is seen as form-producing. Again, a similar notion occurs in Bruner (1976) as concept formation. Similar ideas are those of field independence (Witkin, 1976) and Piaget’s (1976) notion of assimilation. In each case the actor assumes a greater measure of control and functions as a meaning-maker who creates forms by the manipulation of ideas and of objects. As we have seen, the form-yielding and form-producing activities may be all but inseparable. In this section, form production will be seen as the primary intention of the actor.

Personal Subjective Meaning

To make sense of the human condition of being in the world we create forms which aid in understanding that condition. The central focus of the actor’s attention here seems to be on achieving insight into what might be the case. Some intermediate products of such activity might be hypotheses formulation, a tentative construction of an art form, or creating our construct of an individual whom we need to understand.

The raw materials for such formulations or constructions are both the internal, subjective ideas and responses of the individual and the objective, external world which he/she inhabits. Both ideas and external objects are manipulated by the actor to derive and to express new insights. In this case, the actor is actively creating what are to him/her new idiosyncratic meanings i.e., personal meanings.

There are five symbol systems which can be used to create such meaning embodiment. They are word, number, image, gesture, and sound (Dennett, 1985; Gardiner, 1980; Hirst, 1989). That these meanings are subjective in their initial formulations does not imply that they will remain in such a subjective and unexamined state. For such meanings to become other than particular in their application, for them to come to represent insights which are of practical and widespread use in the life even of one individual, they must be scrutinized as to their applicability.

In particular, it is by employing what we already know as a result of experience that we evolve personal meaningful forms. Also, the new form must represent for us a further insight that is worthwhile or we shall merely repeat what we already know. The insight will be worthwhile if it has value for our understanding but it will be more worthwhile if it has utility in enabling us to attain a variety of understandings, i.e., if the insight is fecund.
Individual Value of Form Production

Therefore, the value we place upon the forms we produce will have a spatio-temporal context. Such value will be rooted in what we have come to know and to value in the past. It will contribute to present understanding and it will have the potential to contribute to future understandings. In each of the time frames, it will have either a wide ranging or a narrow applicability. Thus, its value is, in the individual personal sense, tied to both the contribution the insight makes in space-time and to the width of the applicability—in short, to its strength and to its fecundity.

The claim to strength will be supported only by scrutinizing the insight for good reasons. Again, the scrutiny must begin with an examination of the meaning the insights hold and of the generalizability of such a meaning. Consider now the playwright building the characters in a play. What factors in the past of the character may be invented to provide good reasons for the character's present petulance? What present and future applications might be derived to support or to justify such petulance in the given circumstances of the play? Is the character's petulance, experience, and justification applicable, directly or by analogy, to the real experience of the author? What factors have been omitted from consideration, and which selected for attention? Is the selection which has been made justified by good reasons and does it distort any aspect which is in fact the case? If such distortion occurs, can good reasons be provided to justify the distortion? Such questions are asked in the service of achieving a judgement about the value of the form produced by an individual. The form itself will reveal a meaning for the individual and as such will have a value for that individual. The scrutiny of the value in the way indicated will, at the individual level, either enhance or diminish the value of the form. Thus, the individual stance to the form will be either reinforced or undermined.

Also, in the applicability of the form, its fecundity will be either reinforced or undermined. If the insight is found to be fecund, the value will be increased for the individual and again the individual stance to the form will be reinforced.

Public Assent to Individually Created Forms

If the stance, on careful individual scrutiny, is reinforced, then the new insight must be submitted to public scrutiny to provide verification or falsification of the insight. In the case of our playwright, if the stances adopted by a character, the experiences of the character's past, the authenticity of the emotion in the given circumstances, and the future consequences of the character's actions find their resonances in the lives of the
audience and provide valuable insight into what might be the case about some aspect of the human condition, then the insight becomes fecund in the lives of those audience members. Should public verification be obtained, then the individual attitude will be one of increased value accorded to the form. To determine an attitude to the form produced and toward its creator requires individual scrutiny and public scrutiny, careful examination, providing good reasons based on the examination and honoring the form as a valid insight. Thus, in the case of an art work or of a scientific theory, as well as in the case of our assessments of other persons, individual scrutiny followed by public verification will result in either acceptance or in rejection of the form. Because the form is a new insight, it may well call into question previously accepted insights. Attitudes to the previously accepted forms must therefore be re-examined in its light.

Thus, in contrasting Strawson's two modes of being in the world, we note that, in form-yielding activities, the attention of the actor is other directed and the intention is to come to understand that which is other. In the case of form-producing activities the attention is inward and self-directed and the intention is to create forms to embody insights in a new structure of ideas and objects. In the former case, the question is, "What meanings exist in these?." In the case of the latter, the question is, "How can form be given to my ideas and these objects to embody new insights (meanings) ?"

**APPROPRIATE AND INAPPROPRIATE ATTITUDES TO BEING IN THE WORLD**

In the above discussion we have seen that, in the case of both form-yielding and of form-producing activities of the person as being in the world, it is the making of meanings which is the intention that drives each action. In both cases, the endowing of an object or of an experience with meaning will lead to an attitude toward the object or the experience as a result of the value of its meaning. If the meaning attained is reinforced by past knowledge and by present and future applicability, the value of the meaning is enhanced. The validation or verification of such meanings will increase their value and reinforce a positive attitude adopted toward them. To provide such validation or verification, scrutiny of the meanings in their contexts must be carried out and good reasons for asserting their value must be found to justify the attitude adopted toward them. The selection for attention of aspects of objects, of situations, or of persons must also be justified. Without such a scrutiny and justification, the attitude adopted to the object or
person as a result of its value cannot itself be justified. Individual scrutiny and valuing of objects and persons is further validated and verified by submitting the examination, justification, and insight to public assent or question.

Inappropriate attitudes will consist in the refusal or resistance to any of these steps. Appropriate attitudes will therefore result from the conscientious following of such steps and from the arriving at a justifiable attitude based upon them.

REFUSAL OF FORM-YIELDING OR FORM PRODUCING CAPACITIES

Strawson's formulation arose as a result of his analysis of Kant's (1966) *Critique of Pure Reason*. The two modes of action delineated by Strawson (1966) might be considered also as two discrete stances adopted by an individual to his/her being in the world. If we consider one aspect of what we mean by an attitude as a stance adopted by a person, Strawson's modes may, in this sense, be thought of as constituting two quite different attitudes towards what we mean by being in the world. For example, those who consciously persist in choosing to operate in a form-yielding mode will cling to other-created forms. Their reliance is on the public assent which is accorded a particular view of the matter and ignores the selections (including their own) which have been made to arrive at that view. This is one type of unjustifiable attitude. A possible consequence of such a choice, in the extreme case, would be to view the world as determining our actions in it, and the meanings drawn from its forms would assume a disproportionate predominance in our lives, for example, an "it is here in black and white" attitude to print. Yet it is also possible that many persons, in responding to their world by being affected by it, do not yield to the forms which others agree may be discerned in it. Rather, they refuse to accept the evidence of their senses, of scientific explanation, or of good reasons and as a result they refuse to yield to what is generally accepted as being the case. They, quite simply, place their own construction upon it. We might in such a case, where there is rejection of right reason, or of justified true beliefs, or of both, view the reaction as irrational and characterize it as an unjustifiable attitude to what is in fact the case, for example, believing the world is flat.

Equally, in the matter of form-producing activities of the person, there may be those who, in large part, neglect the exercise of form production. They prefer, instead, to view what is in dispute or what is available to them to mould into a new insight or artifact,
either as incomprehensible or as already rigidly constrained in a form or within some limits. In the case of incomprehension, there is a part of experience which is rejected or not dealt with. In the case of constraints or limits accepted without good reason, there are those who, for example, cling to one school of painting and dismiss any other as bad art. Or there are those who, in conceiving of God, limit their conception to that promulgated by only one religion. In both cases there is an obvious curtailment of the activities of the person as a result of an incomplete conception of what it is to be a person. This leads to an inappropriate attitude to one of the possibilities of being in the world. We might be justified in claiming that such a person is limited as a person by an inappropriate attitude toward being a person in the world. This limitation will also restrict, as Strawson has also pointed out, the concept of personhood when we apply it to our consideration of others.

From the foregoing, it may be seen that the concept of personhood is weakened by the embracing of unexamined false belief, by failing to address the incomprehensible, and by adherence to limited beliefs. This shortfall is the result of inappropriate attitudes to the two basic form-yielding and form-producing activities of the person as being in the world, outlined in Strawson's work. The inappropriate attitude is due, in turn, to an inadequate conception of the person as being in the world or to an inadequate response to an adequate conception of a person as being in the world. We might therefore posit that the concept of the person and the concept of attitudes to the activities of a person are basic and mutually constitutive, that is, by allowing of unlimited possibilities in form production and unlimited capacity to yield to right reason and to justified true belief the person might be conceived of as untrammeled by inappropriate attitudes. By curtailing form production and refusing to yield to right reason and justified true beliefs, the person might be conceived of as being limited by inappropriate attitudes.

But the emphasis must be that acceptance of discerned forms, or of those accepted by the wisdom of the day, is always provisional. The nurturing of a questioning and critical attitude to accepted and discerned forms would, under Strawson's construction, be a necessary condition of maintaining the fullest potential for form-producing activities. Therefore, an adequate stance to form-yielding and form producing activities of the person is that of critical realism (Meynell, 1989). Such a stance implies reflection upon and scrutiny of objective, contextual, and subjective aspects of judgements. If we accept that this latter stance is implied, we are close to Heraclitus's notion of constant flux.

In other words, Strawson's formulation allows us to see that the state of our knowledge at any time provides both the challenge to our present knowledge and the impetus
to create new forms of order, given that we see both modes of acting in the world as essential, that is, that we have appropriate attitudes based in our understanding of what it is to be a person. Both our present knowledge of what is, in fact, the case and of what is in dispute are the basic tools available to human persons as they strive to make sense of the world and of themselves in the world.

**APPROPRIATE ATTITUDES AND STRAWSON'S POSTULATES OF THE PERSON**

This analysis so far has relied on Strawson's (1962) three postulates on personhood. The first is that the concept of a person is logically prior to both the corporeality and the states of consciousness of the person. The second is that it is logically necessary that predicates which are self-ascribable are also other-ascribable. The third postulate is that the actions of a person as being in the world are either form-producing and/or form-yielding activities. The first postulate allows us to see that any attention to logically secondary aspects of the person without reference to the logically primary entity of person constitutes a distortion of the concept of a person. Therefore, stances adopted to selected aspects only are inappropriate ones. In this thesis, the original meaning of the word "attitude" as a stance adopted toward an object has been the one employed to examine the concept of an attitude.

As a result of the first postulate, inappropriate attitudes to persons would be those that are adopted as a result of attention to some aspect of the person without attending to all other aspects which can be discerned and without attending to the awareness that there are aspects of the person which cannot be discerned. As a result of Strawson's first postulate, in what then would an appropriate attitude to persons consist? We must first of all admit that we can never know the complete entity that is a person. Therefore, an appropriate attitude would first have to be the same as that which we adopt toward the mysterious. Some aspects of such an attitude might be those of reverence toward the mysterious, the awareness of our own ignorance and a consequent quality of respect together with a desire to understand, that is, an insatiable curiosity and questioning attitude.

In the examination of the second postulate, appropriate attitudes seem to reinforce those discerned in the examination of the first postulate. If others are unknowable in their entirety then we have an unknowable self too. We now have some idea of respect
and reverence for self as well as a humility in the face of our own ignorance and curiosity and questioning of the unknown—both self-ascriptable and other-ascriptable.

As a result of the third postulate, we have argued that appropriate attitudes consist in continuous and rigorous scrutiny of the forms we produce and accept, of the values we place upon those forms, and of the attitudes we adopt to the meanings that those forms have for us, individually and publicly. In addition, consideration of the work of Lonergan (1978) and Meynell (1985) and Heidegger (1977) reveals the need for self scrutiny. This scrutiny can be accomplished only after careful examination and after justification of the values and attitudes discerned by the offering of good reasons.

When such form-producing and form-yielding activities are directed toward the understanding of, the valuing of, or the attitude toward another person, some appropriate attitudes must consist in: (a) careful scrutiny of our own values, attitudes, and reasons as well as of the forms we accept or produce, (b) examination of what is, as well as of what might be the case, (c) consciousness of our own ignorance, and (d) respect for the mystery of persons as well as for their form producing and form-yielding activities. These four notions might be viewed as cornerstone conceptions of appropriate attitudes.

**PHILOSOPHICAL IDEAS: PART 2**

The second section of the philosophical inquiry into the concept of an attitude expands the ideas of the first section by examining the practical actions of a person in the exercise of his/her form-yielding and form-producing capacities.

**Intention and Order**

Intrinsic to Strawson’s (1968) analysis is the necessary condition of intention to be either form yielding or form producing. The person, as we have seen, can decide to limit or to refuse either mode. This does not mean that such intention is conscious, although the need to understand is often a conscious struggle. We might say that a primary intention is to understand or to make sense of both the self and what is other. This intention appears to be related in some sense to attitude. If self as person—or equally other as person—is misconceived (inappropriate attitude to person) then the intention to understand is restricted by an inappropriate attitude. That is, the acquisition
of subjective meaning is impeded by inappropriate attitudes which consist of inadequate conception of the idea of a person.

Intention here is concerned with the acceptance or the production of form. Joined to the notion of intention then, we have a picture of a person as one who intends to understand by creating order. The order the person intends is then the discernment of subjective meaning. Oakes (1988), in his analysis of Weber, points out that,

Action defined by subjective meaning, as the logically required object of understanding or interpretation, ..... [relies on]...intentions, beliefs, motives, purposes ..... determined by value judgements....[and that]....character is formed by the choices made. Thus the ideas and ideals of actors lead to personal coherence which is potentially unlimited. When there is shared coherence we are moving towards some order under limits which produces ideal types which have cultural relevance. (p.32)

Dialectic Tension

The intended order has to be the ordering of something according to some criteria. One basic system for ordering would be what is true and what is not, another what is beautiful and what is not, and a third what is good and what is not. These would give rise to sense-seeking, justice-seeking and harmony-seeking as some order-making activities which are proper to a person as an intentional agent. In other words, the person would aspire to truth, to beauty and to goodness and would use his/her form-yielding and form-producing modes of action to reach for them.

In reaching for beauty, for example, individuals would then both yield to the beauty in the forms they encounter and would also strive to produce beautiful forms. In reaching for truth, they would yield to forms which most truly represent what is, in fact, the case and would strive to discover forms which would more closely explain what is, in fact, the case. In seeking goodness, they would yield to the forms of goodness encountered and search for ways to create good forms. In all three searches, individuals would also be required to question and to be critical of all the extant forms and to justify the acceptance or rejection of each. Equally, in form production, justification of each creation would be a necessary condition. The justification in each case would lie both in the reasons given and in the argument presented using those reasons. The submission of these reasons and arguments to public scrutiny and in the acceptance of the forms by
others as meaningful, validates the form produced and validates the need to question further the form to discern its inadequacies.

The ideal person as being in the world strives always to find deficiencies in the extant forms of beauty, truth, and goodness, and equally strives to create forms which more nearly approach these ideals. Thus, these persons seeks to disorder and to order. Persons will only be ideal, however, if they assign to all other persons the same capacities and intentions. In short, appropriate attitudes to persons as beings in the world will include a conception of a person's capacity both to seek disorder and equally to seek its re-ordering and to assign to all others a like capacity and intention. The form-yielding and form-producing activities of the person are thus in constant dialectic both in themselves as actions and within the categories of order and disorder to which the person attends.

Thus, the fact of being both form yielding and form producing produces a dialectic tension between what makes sense and what does not in the search for truth, between what is harmonious and what is not in the search for what is beautiful, and between what is just and what is not in the search for what is good. The need to flout or question existing accepted forms in this sense leads to new constructions and these new constructions lead to further questions. Temporary resolution will lead to changes in the ways in which persons view the world, and therefore themselves in the world, even if they have achieved the ideal attitude to the person as being in the world. As individuals confront such temporary resolutions, they themselves are changed by the moment of resolution as they confront the present accepted order and adjust to it.

Summary of the Implications of Strawson's position

The consideration of Strawson's view of the person in the world as both form-producing and form-yielding may then be seen as leading to the notion of the human person as an intentional maker of order. Confronting the dialectics of sense/non-sense, of harmony/disharmony, and of justice/injustice, persons arrive, from time to time, at moments of balance, or of temporary resolution. In these moments, with reflection and scrutiny, persons have an ongoing and evolving insight into themselves as beings in the world and have re-constituted their self through developing this insight. Secondly, in the Strawson view, they will see all others as following exactly the same ongoing and evolutionary process of intentional order making and resultant self re-constitution. Thirdly, persons will not be viewed as sums of discrete parts—mind, body, emotion etc.—but as
whole human persons who are primary actors in their efforts at sense-making, harmony-seeking, and justice-seeking. The ideal person, then, as a result of being in the world, will have a critical and questioning attitude to all extant forms and will be continually creating new forms as a whole human actor who reconstitutes self through criticizing, questioning, and creating. This ideal person will also assign to others similar capacities as they pursue like intentional activities as a necessary condition of being a person in the world. For such an ideal person, what are appropriate attitudes toward others? Before an attempt can be made to answer such a question, one must move away from the commonalities of persons as beings in the world and consider briefly what is meant by the individuality of individuals.

Individuals

It is widely accepted that the corporeal structure of each person is different from that of every other. The findings of genetics have been strong enough to demonstrate that this is, in fact, the case. Therefore, in our corporeal nature, a second order consideration, we can be thought of as individuals simply by attending to this fact. There are also those conditions or those contexts within which we come to attend to our world and to our concept of the self in the world which is commonly referred to as our nurturing context. Even siblings' individual nurturing context are vastly different. Their nature demands both that they attend to different aspects of their surroundings from their other siblings and that others treat them differently because they are perceived to be different in their natures. The physical conditions of the nurture of siblings may change drastically and the social milieu may also be altered as new children are born. The experiences and reactions to those experiences build both upon the corporeal differences and on the diversity of contexts to emphasize the individuality of individuals. Both nature and nurture, then, contribute to the differences between individuals.

As individuals, the value they assign to the various form-yielding and form-producing activities which are available to them as persons in the world will then depend on their nature and upon their nurturing. The educational experiences that individuals receive, and their idiosyncratic responses to it, will further shape the pursuits, as persons in the world, which they deem to be worthwhile (Rorty, 1976). Thus, the second consideration of persons as individuals as well as persons in the world leads to idiosyncratic self-construction. The view which individuals then take of the activities of form yielding and of form production will be affected by their idiosyncratic nature and nurture.
Suppose for a moment that all persons have an ideally realized conception of the person as being in the world. They will still have in their sense-making, harmony-seeking, and justice-seeking activities, to name only a few possibilities, certain individual aspirations and intentions which are more valuable to them than are others because of their nature and nurture. They will have predelictions, needs, wants and desires, perceptions, apprehensions and intuitions which will lead them to value the true, the beautiful, and the good to different degrees and, therefore, to assign effort to those pursuits which have the greatest value for them as individuals. Since this valuing will affect the selection, attention, concentration, and effort, it may reinforce the values themselves. As reinforcement takes place, one area at a time, it will, at any one time, appear as if the others are not valued at all. Then the stance or attitude of the individual will appear, at that time, to be positive to the central concern and neutral or negative toward other endeavours.

As individuals move through the present concerns, one at a time, they give strong attention to one and cursory, or even no attention, to others. If, however, they reach a moment of balance or resolution, then reflection upon themselves as persons in the world will show a core of predominant concerns or values which tend to perdure as they move from one type of effort to another.

In some individuals, the pursuit of truth predominates while less effort is expended on the search for beauty or goodness. In others, goodness will predominate and so on. For many people, it is likely that some aspect of each will be an important value and will be intermittently attended to, although one area is given the lion's share of their effort at any one time and even overall. That is, for each individual one might say there are cornerstone predelictions.

This type of pattern might be described as the consistent core of values for that person and that core may have its own hierarchy which makes its demands for attention and effort on the selection. Thus, when an individual is acting without constraints, the selection for attention and effort should, in this construction, be evidence of a consistent core of values which determine an individual's attitudes or stance toward the areas to which he/ she chooses to attend.

These ideas would support the view mentioned earlier that attitudes are realized in the behaviours that individuals choose to exhibit. While this thesis might be supported for the ideal person acting only with his/her need to pursue truth, beauty and goodness in mind, it can easily be the case that the pursuit is not the result of a need but of a
want, a desire, or a predeliction. In this latter case, the behaviour may indicate to the observer, for example, the pursuit of an argument because of a positive attitude to the value of truth. In fact, the individual concerned may pursue an argument in the service of a desire for power and the pursuit of truth not their intention.

Persons demonstrate their attitudes in either overt or covert ways. When the overt behaviours are true reflections of the attitudes of the individual, then one may say that they are acting honestly. When, in addition, such attitudes are consistent with the values that a person holds, one may say that the person is acting with integrity. Such actions will have the effect of increasing the individual’s self-regard (Penelhum, 1976).

Ideal persons then, are those who, as being in the world, act with honesty and integrity according to the values that they hold. They act with regard to the hierarchy of those values that they have determined. The attitudes of such persons to their own pursuits may then be characterized as honest and integrated. In characterising single attitudes as honest and integrated, ideal persons will be able to justify their position at the level of their adopted values and at the level of the hierarchical disposition of those values. Such people will carry through this value stance toward their ideals, as they take a consistent attitude stance toward particular instances. In addition, as they carry through this attitude into consistent actions, then their behaviour may indeed be a measure of their attitudes, and such attitudes may be truly appropriate.

The second consideration of persons as individuals, as well as persons in the world, also leads to idiosyncratic self-construction. This construction of selves is, in part at least, a matter of acquiring attitudes which are positive toward those values they wish to pursue, and negative toward those values they choose to downplay. The choices made in the self-construction seem to be related to the nature and nurture of the individual. If one could conceive of a person who has a clearly articulated value hierarchy, who, with honesty, adopts attitudes which are entirely consistent with that hierarchy of values, and who carries those attitudes into consistent behaviour, it may still be the case that the chosen hierarchy of values has not been carefully examined.

Unexamined Form-Yielding

Unexamined form-yielding might occur when the values people espouse are those adopted as a result of the nurture they have received and which they never question. An example might be those whose backgrounds have caused them to live with the idea that, although one must be kind to black people, there is little reason to believe that
blacks are other than an inferior race. If this stance is not questioned, a construction of the value of respect for persons as being limited in the case of blacks will ensue. Thus, while individuals behave with honesty and integrity when dealing with all other persons, they unconsciously apply the limited value to blacks without being aware that there is a flaw in the thinking they have used to apply the value in their attitudes. This is a case of accepting a false belief as a justified true belief and, because it results from lack of careful scrutiny of beliefs, might be considered as one form of prejudice (Alston, 1968).

Incomplete Knowledge

A similar error may result when a value is accepted as justifiable by individuals when they are not in possession of all the facts, or when those persons believe they have considered all aspects of the value when they have, in fact, omitted some. This case we might characterise as one of partial knowledge of the value in question. Here, the attitudes adopted with honesty and carried into behaviour with integrity are based on a value which is flawed as a result of incomplete knowledge or understanding. This problem may occur as a result of errors in logical reasoning or as a result of as little as one error in a justified explanatory chain. (Alston, 1968.) One example of such a sincere error is seen in the acceptance of the myths or stereotypes about a particular race, gender, or age group. A person may genuinely believe that at a certain age an individual’s contribution to society is over, may wish such individuals well as they begin a well earned rest, and may therefore adopt inappropriately condescending and undemanding attitudes towards them as persons. While it may be true that elderly persons do require more rest, it may not in fact be the case. While it may be true that one of the obvious contributions to society is over at retirement, it is seldom the case that there are no other contributions that the elderly person does not need to and is not desirous of making.

Interpretative Errors

Knowledge of the values adopted may also be limited by interpretative errors. Some people may interpret the value of kindness, for example, as consisting in always offering approval to what others do, provided it is within the law. Thus, they may, by adopting this stance in their dealings with others, convey approval of inappropriate behaviour in others thereby reinforcing the negative values or attitudes of others. For example, they may impute to others the need to assert themselves when they are, in fact, manipulating
or exerting unjustifiable power over others. Treating such behaviour with tolerance or kindness may lead to reinforcement of the inappropriate attitude. To offer unconditional acceptance of others without analysis of their behaviours according to appropriate value positions is therefore to mislead the other, no matter how kindly the intent. This, too, could be a basis for prejudice.

**Logical Errors**

Errors in logic can also mislead persons of scrupulous honesty and integrity as they strive to realize their values in consistent attitudes and behaviours. Assigning to individuals the characteristics of some group to which they belong can often constitute one type of logical error:

(a) Members of motor cycle gangs are violent-
(b) James belongs to a motor cycle gang therefore,
(c) James is violent.

A second type of logical error is to assign to a group the characteristics of one, or of a few, of its members:

(a) Bob and Elsie and Jack are black.
(b) Bob and Elsie and Jack are shiftless. therefore,
(c) All blacks are shiftless.

It is not uncommon to hear intelligent, honest persons, who believe they are acting with integrity, advance such arguments and to support them with such expressions as “You would realize I am right if you had lived in the Southern States.”

**Dispositional Feelings**

It is also possible to encounter with a particular group of persons a series of situations which have aroused, time after time, anger or fear in a person. As a result, the person may develop a disposition to anger or fear against members of that group. The recent influx of Asians into the lower mainland of British Columbia has caused some people to become angry about the resultant high prices of homes in the area. This anger is directed largely toward the Asians. In addition, the Asian people, in order to express their culture in their new surroundings, have torn down existing homes and replaced them with structures which have changed the character of long-established
communities. As they see their old way of life disappearing, long-time residents have become fearful for their own identity. The combined effects of fear and anger have led some long-time residents of the lower mainland to view the Asians as a threat, almost as adversaries, and, as a result, in spite of their best efforts to act with honesty and integrity toward others the established inhabitants are incapable of treating the Asian people as full human persons. This kind of response is a third basis for the growth of prejudice.

Occurrent Feelings

In particular situations individuals may also experience occurrent emotions, that is, emotions which are temporarily engendered by specific situations, which distort their judgement and therefore lead them to mistake the values applicable in the situation. For example, they may jump to the defence of a loved one impelled by the emotion of protective love in a situation where the loved one is in the wrong and may even have been the instigator of the dispute. Without the distortion of values caused by the emotional involvement, the individuals concerned would normally behave in a way consistent with their held values. Frequent distortion of this kind can also lead to a permanent distortion of the values concerned or equally lead to the emergence of a dispositional emotion. Both of these results can lead to inappropriate attitudes becoming established in persons, often without their complete awareness.

Unexamined Behaviour

Thoughtless behaviour, continually repeated, which is inappropriate and not called into question, may establish a pattern of behaviour or a habit in an individual which is largely unexamined. Such a pattern or habit may, if it is contrary to the values held before the habit was established, erode the commitment to those values and therefore gradually permit the adoption of inappropriate attitudes (Warnock, 1987).

SUMMARY OF PART 2

The foregoing discussion has briefly highlighted some difficulties facing those who attempt, with honesty and integrity, to realize in their behaviour and attitudes the values to which they are committed. This attempt at realization is carried out by those who
have ideally achieved an adequate concept of a person and who have made sincere efforts to articulate and justify the values they hold, to adopt stances which are appropriate to their values, and to behave in ways which are consistent with those values and stances. But, as has been shown: (a) adopting a false or incomplete belief, (b) making errors in interpretation or in logic, (c) being swayed by occurrent or dispositional feelings or (d) acquiring habits of behaviour which are unexamined and which weaken a commitment to values all can lead persons to some degree of distortion of appropriate attitudes or adoption of inappropriate attitudes. These can occur in persons of honesty and integrity with a fully developed concept of person as being in the world.

The reality is that, for most people the concept of a person as being in the world is not fully developed and the distinction between a person’s needs as person in the world and their wants, inclinations, and predelictions is not clearly held. In addition and as a result, their perceptions of others are often distorted and their values are unclear and unexamined. Therefore persons are more liable to errors in logic, in what is, in fact, the case and liable to err in the control of their habits, of their occurrent and dispositional feelings and of their interpretations.

This discussion of persons, and its implications for how attitudes are conceived of has relied largely on the work of P. F. Strawson (1962). A philosopher from a totally different background, who has also addressed the question of how one conceives of persons is Daniel Dennet (1976). Therefore, to provide further support for the view presented it is necessary to examine the view of persons offered in his work.

Dennett’s Account of the Person.

In Dennett’s (1976) work persons are rational, intentional and conscious human beings who see themselves as such. Following Locke, Dennett sees the metaphysical notion of a person as being distinguishable from the moral notion of a person but has taken the stance that there is, “every reason to believe that metaphysical personhood is a necessary condition of moral personhood” (p177 ). He agreed with Strawson (1962) that states of consciousness and the attitude taken toward such states are mutually interdependent and necessary conditions of personhood, and agreed with the traditional position of persons as rational beings. He also adopted the notion of reciprococity of persons as a necessary condition citing, among others, Strawson’s position which was adopted for the purposes of this study. Further, Dennet asserted that persons must be capable of verbal communication and that they must be self-conscious in order to
achieve moral personhood. This last condition is the position which was argued for in the previous section of this chapter and is supported in Dennet's work by wide philosophical reference. Clearly, Dennet's account of a person conforms very closely with the one argued for here, although the method of argument differs greatly. Three substantive differences remain:

1. Dennet's claim that verbal communication is a necessary condition of personhood—or at least of moral personhood
2. His claim that 3rd order volitions (wanting to desire a good) are equally a necessary condition
3. The claim made here that we can never know all the necessary conditions of personhood and the question of the implications of that claim.

Each of these disparities are dealt with in turn below:

**Verbal communication, Third-order Volitions, and Personhood.**

The basis of these claims is, as far as I understand Dennet's argument, that to achieve moral personhood a person must both be involved in reason-giving and persuasion and must also act upon third-order desires. If we accept this first claim, however, we must designate those who are dumb or those who choose not to communicate verbally as lacking to some extent in moral personhood. It is entirely possible to conceive of a person who acts with the greatest moral probity and who, at the same time, refuses to indulge in reason giving because of lack of capacity, because of a recognition of the futility of defending an adopted position, or because of a stance of individual moral choice. With regard to the section of Dennet's argument which deals with giving oneself reasons, with asking oneself questions, and with entering into dialogue with oneself about one's own moral stances, there is no question that some form of dialogue is entered into. The question, (which in the view of this writer is unanswerable), is what forms such a dialogue might take?

Since the majority of persons make use of verbal communication as a matter of course in entering into dialogue as we understand it, it is easy to make the assumption that such might be the form of discourse adopted in dialogues with self or others about
moral stances of all kinds, including the transition from third-order to first order-desires. But it is not necessarily the case that such internal or external arguments are in the form of verbal communication and this claim is (a) too simple to cover our normal operation, (b) designates as non-persons those who are demonstrably full persons as we experience them, and (c) puts a burden on the common operation of moral stance acquisition which is unrealistic.

Let us treat of the three objections made here, in turn, as they apply to dialogue with self and with others. A point made earlier, that the stances we adopt are largely unexamined, is germane. It is generally when we are challenged in some sense that we attend to making a case for our adopted stances. Indeed, we are often unaware of the precise nature of our stances, even less aware of the principles upon which we adopt them and, seldom, of our own accord, tease out the underlying value or values of which such principles are exemplars. We have to be pushed very hard before we will embark upon a rigorous scrutiny which bears upon any one of these three examinations, in a dialogue either with self or with others. As argued earlier here, such examinations are theoretical and ideal exertions, and whether they must be done, how much, and how well they are done, and whether or not they are couched in verbal form, are questions which are, in large part, unanswerable.

The verbal dialogue is one which may be asserted to be the clearest and the most accessible to rational scrutiny, under one view of the matter. An alternative view is that it is not, in fact, our normal procedure. We tend to be in and to act through our experience, informed by idiosyncratic past experience, according to our nature and to our nurture, and to adopt moral stances in the flux of circumstance and of social norms. Therefore, examining and reflecting upon such procedures would most naturally proceed from an analogous type of enquiry and not from verbal argument or from verbal problem resolution alone. It is upon this crucial scenario of action/ reflection that the crux of this thesis rests.

The objection to the exclusion from moral personhood of those who are incapable of verbal argument, of those who reject such argument as worthwhile or of those who believe that entering into such arguments with others is a form of usurpation of a personal moral prerogative is, I believe, on two grounds:

First our experience with full moral personhood in persons from each of the above categories militates against acceptance of such a position, for example, those who cannot speak or who cannot fully comprehend speech, and those who resist verbal,
moral argument. This is not to suggest that indulging in or seeking verbal justification is a bad thing or a morally retrograde step. Rather, the position of this thesis is that it is valuable for many, perhaps even for most people, at some stage in the journey towards becoming ideal persons but that it is not a necessary condition for moral personhood.

The second ground for objection is a reiteration of the position that verbal justifications and persuasions, while they form some part of many people’s way of life, are not a common modus operandi. Many persons live through a variety of gradations of unexamined moral stances continually refining them toward some approximation of ideal stance without challenge or without the giving of verbal accounts and justifications. It may be the case that the process could be accelerated or refined by such verbal examination. It may even be the case that for some people such verbal articulation is necessary for some reason. But it does not therefore follow that it is a necessary condition of moral personhood. However, it does follow that those who would concern themselves with moral attitudes, or with the changing of such, should be capable of orally expressing the necessary justifications and it also follows that skill in the fashioning of arguments and in refining them are required to affirm moral positions and to clarify the quest for ideal positions for most people. They are especially required by those whose experience, wants or desires tend to move them far from what we conceive of as ideal. The point is again that such spoken arguments, no matter how well crafted, are abstract and thus at a distance from life experiences. In the creation of drama pieces, the participant is not at such a great distance, in that drama consists in a reworking of the participant’s own experiences, informed by imagination, in action and in reflection.

An additional objection to Dennet’s stance on spoken communication rests on the sheer impossibility of providing spoken reasons, and certainly of providing justification, for the multiplicity of stances which persons take in everyday intercourse. Continuous communication of this kind would lead to a situation in which there was little time left for action.

Nonetheless, if we view the position adopted by Dennet concomitantly with the argument offered so far in this thesis, it is clear that both lead to the conclusion that reason-giving of a rigorous kind is required. If not exclusively spoken then of what other kinds might it be? It might be a numerical persuasion that would alter a stance. Visual images might provide guidance. A piece of music might illuminate the ideal. Acts of others might alter a position. Personal experience of the effects of inappropriate attitudes may demand a reassessment. There are many reason-giving means without the spoken
which are at a person's disposal. Among such means is drama creation.

It must also be allowed that few of these means will suffice in and of themselves as reason-givers or as persuaders and that, for some people to become fully persons, the use of spoken means will in fact be necessary. All that is claimed here is that it is possible that non-spoken factors can build up as strong an argument as words in working toward the attainment of an ideal personhood.

**The Mystery of the Person.**

The argument provided in this thesis has, on two occasions, pointed out that one can never come fully to know a person, that at the centre of each person, including the self, there is something unknown. Dennet, too, has acknowledged this mystery but has drawn no implications from it. His reasons for accepting this mystery are that the concept of a person is inescapably normative and that there are, therefore, no sufficient conditions for personhood. Perhaps aspiration to the ideal is a part of the mystery and perhaps that aspiration is, in itself, a necessary condition of personhood. Aspiration might, in fact, be important.

**Attitudes of Persons Toward Other Persons**

The notion of justice as a guiding principle in our dealings with others is well established. It is widely adopted as a value. The traditional approach has been that good, right and truth are properties. Toulmin (1958) has shown that they are not correctly conceived of as properties which demand agreement / disagreement or conclusions, that, rather, they are acknowledged by the giving of worthwhile reasons. Toulmin stated that it is in the character of values that they evoke reasons. He argued, too, that subjective notions of value do allow the idea of satisfaction and that, therefore, because we can conceive of everybody agreeing on ethical matters, we have the notion of agreement about the reasons evoked for seeing a value as worthwhile.

Rawls (1971) appeared to agree with Toulmin (1958) about the ability of a group of people to agree about the value of justice. He stipulated, however, that a group of people could agree about what constituted the value of justice only if they were protected in their deliberation as by a veil of ignorance which prevented them from knowing what personal goods would, as a result, accrue to them as individuals. Whatever the
arguments against this method of examining what constitutes justice, the removal of desires and wants from the normal human equation did allow Rawl's argument to proceed more clearly. The justice value would then allow of a society in which persons had the right to pursue their goals and to employ means to their goals which seemed to them to be appropriate, where to do so did not damage the goals or the means of others.

Downie and Telfer (1969) have characterized the justice value as resting upon a principle of respect for persons, which implies an attitude of agape (a form of love) for the goals and means of others together with the attitude toward them of treating them as ends (i.e. in the sense of being valuable in themselves). This thesis has gone somewhat further than the attitude of agape and the suggestion is made that a symbiotic relationship is the attitude that underlies the need to adopt the attitude of agape. This suggestion has been proposed on the basis of the notion, explored earlier, that individuals are capable of personhood only inasmuch as and insofar as they are capable of assigning to other persons the same capacities as they ascribe to themselves. Thus, the principle of respect for persons would include the notion of agape but would be based in this necessary symbiotic condition of personhood.

The attitude of respect for persons, however, implies a clearly defined range of practices which could achieve the status of virtuous acts. As Maclntyre showed so clearly (1981), "We have to accept as necessary components of any practice with internal goods and standards of excellence the virtues of justice, courage and honesty" (p. 191). If we can subsume honesty toward others under the concept of justice, as Downie and Telfer have suggested, and if we can leave aside courage for the moment, it would seem that justice and its logical consequent— respect for persons through love and in symbiotic union— is likely to obtain for us positive self regard.

The practice of the virtue of justice, then, through the principle of respect for persons and explicated in our attitude of loving symbiotic union with them in their goals and in their means is our route to positive self regard. Nor will the need for the virtue of courage be far behind in this endeavour since, as McIntyre (1981, p. 196) also pointed out, we cannot expect to be rich and famous but rather often misunderstood in the exercise of such practices.
Attitudes to Elderly Persons and to One’s Own Ageing

The focus of this thesis is on attitudes to persons and, in particular, on attitudes to elderly persons and to one’s own ageing. In the remainder of this chapter, the stance chosen for examination focuses on the relationships between persons, and the attitudes discussed are those based on the second notion of Strawson (1962): to hold a concept of a person as form-yielding and as form-producing is to hold that the concept applies to all others and that all other persons have capacities and intentions to behave in a like manner.

In concert with the virtue of justice, appropriate attitudes toward the aged will be those which fully recognize their form-yielding and form-producing capacities, and those which at the same time recognise their goals and their means to those goals. This statement implies: (a) an honouring of the value hierarchies of elderly persons, (b) the ability to discern their goals and means and to support the pursuit of those goals and the employment of those means, and (c) an interest in, as well as an effort toward, acquiring adequate knowledge about the elderly as persons. We must also have some sense that in following such attitudes we are working from a value base which sees the elderly as valuable in themselves and as necessarily valuable because they reveal our own value as persons in symbiotic union with them. Accordingly, our behaviour and our feelings toward the elderly must be scrutinised in the light of our value stance and, in so doing, we scrutinize our attitudes.

Attitudes toward our own ageing then will consist in seeing that as we age we move ever closer to the achievement of an ideal attitude to all persons, including the self. Therefore, ageing is a slow and gradual self-constitution towards an ideal self. Thus, attitudes toward the elderly and attitudes toward our own ageing support and reinforce one another.

That such insights can only teach us what our dispositions to act should be and thus provide a moral framework for us, is in the nature of becoming persons and in particular in their aspirations as they conceive of the ideal. “What education in the virtues teaches me is that my good as a man is one and the same as the good of those others with whom I am bound up in human community” (McIntyre, 1981. p.229).
Children's Attitudes Toward Old People

We must expect that children of 10 to 11 years of age will be at the very beginning of the journey to create intentionally the self they wish to be. What the role of education of children's attitudes might look like, then, is one of bringing them to the understanding of the personhood of older people. This understanding would imply increasing their knowledge of old people, of their goals and of the means they use to reach those goals. It would imply bringing them to an understanding of the symbiotic nature of personhood. It would imply the eliciting from children of a questioning approach to their own attitudes and those of others. It would insist on the giving of good reasons for feelings, judgments, value hierarchies, and behaviour. It would, perhaps, involve some investigation of ideals and aspirations, and it would at all times demand a learning situation in which they themselves were viewed as gift and as gifted persons.
Chapter 4

THEORY OF DRAMA

The purpose of this chapter is to offer a theory of drama in education which will unite the conceptions expressed in Chapter 2 and relate them to this writer's experience in the classroom. The discussion is based on the notion that drama is a conscious attempt to scrutinize the actions of human beings in order that participants may come to an understanding of persons and, in so doing, may define more clearly for themselves which ideal and normative notions of personhood will stand for them. The central idea of drama which informs this chapter is that of drama as an art form. Therefore, it is the constraints of the art form in its demands for selections, logic and the offering of good reasons that provides the basis for the argument presented.

A human life is a continuous carrying out of explicit and tacit intentions (May, 1969, p. 242; Rorty, 1976, p. 9). Intentions, as they define and are defined by enduring traits, are based in what is worthwhile. What is worthwhile to a person is normally designated as a value. To have a value means to have developed a set of principles about the value or to hold the value as a result of following principles which are consistent with what is right for an individual at a particular time (Peters, 1966, p. 114; Sesonke, 1964, p. 12). Following principles and allowing them to guide intention leads to actions, if those principles are seen as basic to human self-interest. Holding a value will lead to the sacrifice of desires, if the desires militate against principles when the principle is held strongly enough. The strength with which a principle is held will be affected by and will affect the intentions and the actions.

Actions supporting intention which is determined by a principle, reinforce that principle; principles, which are used to inform or to evaluate acts or intentions, will, by the success or failure of these acts and intentions, reinforce or weaken the acts or intentions (Warnock, 1987, p. 90).

Satisfaction will ultimately consist in the extent to which the acts or intentions provide positive self-regard for the person (Downie and Telfer, 1969, p. 87). If self regard is achieved, then the principle comes to be more firmly held than formerly, the intentions are more firmly directed, and the acts are more likely to follow intention. Thus, as more and more principles are more firmly held, the values from which they derive and which
define the value for the individual become clearer. As values become clearer, they illuminate more subtle principles which then, in turn, come to be followed.

Actions, then, are bellwethers of human intention, principles, and values. In their success or failure in increasing one's self regard, they are the means whereby people gauge the strength of their intentions, principles, and values and also the means whereby they evaluate them. The reasons people give for these successes or failures in achieving self regard are themselves subtle reflections on the domain of values. They are particular to that domain and, therefore, the quality of the reasons will determine the quality of the evaluation.

Acts are all human impingements upon the world outside the self, together with all intentional efforts made within the self, that is, actions, speech, and reactions together with thoughts, ponderings, efforts at understanding, and prayer. People are defined by their acts as persons. They judge themselves as persons by their acts. By their acts, they take the risk of weakening their self regard. Intention without action does not have the same moral power. Action without intention is expression of instinct or of emotion, or both, and only when it is joined to reflection can it enter the moral formation procedure described here.

The Child's Action in a World

Drama is action. Because it is removed from what is regarded as "real life", the risk involved in dramatic action is less than that in real life. Drama has rules that are different from real life. Persons involved in drama agree that all are going to create a world which in some sense exists only in the imagination (Bolton, 1984; Heathcote, 1975). It also exists, however, in some sense in the real world and it is both these senses that the teacher of drama must understand and use if drama is to exist in their classrooms.

First, the imagination must have its base in reality and its logical sequence in reality (Bolton, 1984). The world created in the imagination will rely for its constituent elements on sensory experiences which the children have had in the real world (Way, 1967). Even if the world they posit is made of gold with marshmallow hills and Coca-cola seas and has no gravity, the sensory nature of the chosen constituents, as the children know them, will determine the mode of life for its characters. That is, the qualities with which they endow their worlds will become the binding and limiting conditions of life for those
who live in them. The reasons given for inclusion or exclusion of certain acts will have direct reference to those limits.

**Situation**

The experience of the children will form the basis for the situation that they wish to or agree to explore (Bolton, 1976; Courtney, 1973; Heathcote, 1982). Drama proceeds from consensus about what is worthwhile to explore and about the imaginative conditions that will provide the rules for that exploration (Bolton, 1979; Heathcote, 1982). First, such consensus must be reached by recourse to the rules of negotiation which all children understand because they have experienced those rules in daily interaction.

It is not merely a transaction that is entered into here but a true negotiation since, as Dorothy Heathcote said, “Transaction seems to deal with the obvious manifested. Negotiation implies that I will myself to be the servant of the quality of the transactions that go on in that room” (Personal communication, 1982). This difference is understood in varying degrees by all the participants in the drama and must be thoroughly understood by the teacher.

The situation, once defined by consensus, becomes a second binding and limiting condition of the drama. For example, if the group decides that the situation is a condition of drought faced by villagers, then the children’s real-life knowledge of the effects of drought on people, on animal life, on plants, and on the land, form the logical basis from which the drama proceeds. Again, the situation chosen must be seen by all to be worthwhile. The reasons offered for the choices of the acts which can take place in the situation must relate back to that situation— they are context-bound.

**Characters**

Once the rules are established from real life, the imagined situation is invested with characters (whether in role as attitude, in Heathcote’s sense, or in more developed forms of role). These characters are drawn either from fantasy or from the real experiences of the participants. They must conform, however, to the behaviour that such characters would logically exhibit in the real world. Why? Because the only way the children can understand the behaviour of such characters is by endowing them with recognizable attributes from their own experience. If they do not do so, they will be unable to believe in them or identify with them or with their problems. Thus, the characters will cease to have meaning for them and will therefore be unable to claim their sustained
attention. So, in peopling the imagined situation, the real world is again present in the traits of the characters which are drawn from the children's experience.

The world, as the children have experienced it, then determines the behaviour of the characters they create. This creation of characters is an individual activity and provides a third but individual limit on the drama. It is the testing ground to which the children refer when they evaluate the appropriateness of their characters' actions. The attitudes and values of the created characters must be appropriate both to the character as created, and to the experience the participants have had of attitudes, values and principles operating in the real world.

Events

When the characters begin to interact with one another, a series of events is created. These events will be built from imagination and from the child's experience of what makes sense, and what those kinds of characters might do if they existed. What makes sense and what people might do is again drawn from the experiences they have had. The nature of the chosen imagined event will also partially determine the action of the characters. If the actions first chosen for them do not conform either to the logic of the event itself, or to the picture of that character already built up, then the child must expand the character or alter the event (Bolton, 1976). Thus, a consensual judgement of the event provides a fourth limitation which the children have created and accept.

Both logical consistency and character elaboration or alteration also derive from the real world experiences of the children. As events and characters resonate in this way, many possibilities are explored and they rely for their logical force on the close observation and experiences the children have encountered in the real world. In other words, the characters will behave as real people have been perceived to behave in the children's real life whether they are panda bears, sunflowers, Martians, Vietnam veterans, embassy prisoners, or research scientists. The children are relying on reasons which they must show are logical for the choices they make (Bolton, 1976).

Problem

Drama's people taking part in events in the world created, in the situation and with the other inhabitants, face problems. All chosen problems again come from the perplexities people suffer in like encounters in the real world. This is a fifth logical limitation. The intellectual, moral, or aesthetic efforts the characters must make to overcome or
adjust to a problem are firmly based in the child’s conception of people’s real capabili-
ties and real strivings in those areas. Again, and for the sixth time, the drama has been
limited and this time by the logical consequences of earlier imaginative and reasoned
choices.

Change
As the characters confront the problem chosen, in the chosen world, under the cho-
sen conditions, and as they overcome or adjust to it, the characters themselves change,
as do their relationships with others and with their world. What kind of change does the
drama demand of those characters? It demands a change that is consistent with the
child’s conception of how real people change and how events can effect real relation-
ships. Again, the seventh limit is imposed by the need which the children have to make
rational decisions about how and why people do change. The ability to make such
decisions is present in the children’s repertoires and derives from their experience.

From this analysis, it is clear that the imagination is invested in the creation of the
drama at each of its necessary steps. It is also clear that the logical and rational de-
mands of the drama are equally constitutive and that this constitution is intentional,
achieved through rigorous thinking, supported by real experiences, and shaped indi-
vidually with the constraints of the group which determine form. Therefore, the social
construction of the drama as a cooperative art shapes form as it lends objectivity to its
enquiry.

Inner Worlds
Each character, inhabiting the world negotiated for, involved in the events decided
upon, faced with a problem in the situation with his fellow characters must, if consistent
with the world which permeates the drama, have real thoughts and feelings. At this
point in the drama, all the decisions that have created limits are at work refining and
focusing the actions that the characters choose. The actions resonate in the minds of
the children and they begin to think as the people in that situation might well do. As the
embryonic “thinking like others” begins in the child, so too the feelings, inseparable from
thought, begin to be experienced by the children (Bolton, 1978; Courtney, 1982; Heath-

As what is real in the drama evokes in the characters the thoughts and feelings
which are themselves real, the child begins to invest self in the drama at a new level.
But the dramatic push demands that, unlike real life, all relevant thoughts and feelings be expressed in action or recognised in reflection, so that true action may follow the honest thoughts and feelings of the characters. This is a push that the teacher must initially demand but which is necessary for the drama to become a group creation of meaning (Bolton, 1977; Heathcote, 1982 tape).

In this series of moments of emotional union with the drama, when this level of involvement is accepted by the participants as logically necessary, all that has gone before and is now present in the work and in its focus becomes a living aspect of the human condition. It is then that the work begins to move into drama as form, which is informed by content and impelled by honest emotion; it has more than shape, it has its quintessential content in the real feelings and thoughts of the participant/characters. The images of self and of other in the character begin to meld. Recognition of this, the inner world of one’s character, and the embracing of it as one’s own for the duration of the drama, relies, for its honesty, on how true the thoughts and feelings of the characters are to the real thoughts and feelings of the participants. The limit of honesty has been discovered and will now be the core of the drama. The art form has been born.

In the interests of the pursuit of the above argument, one essential factor has not been dealt with. The limitations which have been discussed are joined at each stage by a further limitation, which is the necessity to select from experience in each case. If the participants insisted on including all the details of each experience, the drama created would be unbearably long and the point of it would be lost. As a result, the participants are forced to ask themselves at each stage, "What is it that is central, in the experiences that I have had, which will illuminate the present embodiment?" (Reid, 1969). The economy of the art form and the selections it demands thus become clear to the children as they build their own drama. Indeed, it is often the case that, in early efforts, either not enough is offered to make the point of the drama clear, or, that too much is offered to make it accessible. The teacher then must help the children in the process of their selection until economy is achieved.

What Is Drama?

Drama is quite simply reflection on the human condition in action, in an imagined world, constrained by logical choices which are based in experience and informed by honest thoughts and feelings.
Drama is, therefore, a moral endeavour as it addresses the moral questions oc­ca­sioned by that world—it searches for what is good. It is an intellectual endeavour as it strives to make sense of that world—it searches for what is right. It is an aesthetic endeavour as it gives form to the understandings of the participants and as it detects rhythms and patterns—it searches for what is harmonious. It is a psychological endeavour as it demands reflection upon and use of one's own understanding of one's own experiences, thoughts, and feelings—it is contemplative of self. Drama is an interper­sonal endeavour as the individual consciously recognizes the inner worlds of others—it seeks symbiosis. It is a comparative endeavour as individuals, in action, work through arguments and reflect upon their consequences—it is a mutual, logical creation. It is an inter-subjunctive endeavour as individuals create joint meanings—it is a seeking through community (Bruner, 1986, p. 58) In all, it is personally and subjectively constit­utive, as the individual alternates between the demands of experience and of imagina­tion—a self-reconstruction.

The objective reflections on experience under logical constraint rely on analysis and synthesis, and combine both the objective factual world and the subjective understand­ing of persons (in character creation) to achieve judgement. It is, in short, the child's philosophy in action, and depends for its power upon the investigation of the dialectic tensions between right and wrong, harmony and disharmony, and sense and nonsense. It is firmly rooted in the real world and uses the workhorse of the imagination to provide distance from that world and through that distance to achieve communion with what it is to be human. It is based in honesty and therefore calls forth trust. As a result, this philosophy in action has as its goal, and as a necessary condition, individual moral integrity.

The intention to investigate what makes sense and does not, what is right and what is not, and what is beautiful and what is not, lies at the heart of the drama as it does in all modes of human enquiry. The intention is more ambitious than other modes of enquiry because it is focused on the central concern for what it is to be a person in the world. It is not focused on the intimate investigation of the objective world as is the case in science. Nor is it centred in the events that occur in the world, past or present, but rather on the meaning for the human being of those events and phenomena as they are explicative of what it is to be a person.

The intention of drama, then, is to enquire into particular events and phenomena for the purpose of discovering what in general can be said to be right and true and satisfy-
ing in being human. The mode of enquiry is to proceed by a series of acts of investiga-
tion into a particular situation and, in concert with fellow investigators, to discover what
meanings those particular acts reveal about people in the world. The meanings discov-
ered will be available to society's understanding only if they are given a mode of ex-
pression that will order them for society. The mode of expression is the art form which
is both experienced and reflected upon.

The foregoing has been an attempt to analyse what the form of all classroom drama
evokes in its participants. Situation, events, characters, problems, and change are all
basic to every drama no matter the genre or philosophy of drama espoused. It is not
suggested here that any of these integral steps will automatically be of high quality, that
the imagination will conjure up highly original worlds or situations, that the logic will be
sound in every choice made, that the honesty will be complete or, that the child's experi-
ence will always be sufficient to the task. On the contrary, the drama would have no
place in education if these conditions were met. Indeed, they might be thought of as
the goals of drama education. What has been presented thus far is the bare bones of
the beginning of drama—its skeletal structure up to the moment of the first emergence
of thoughts and feelings of a chosen character. The steps outlined can be, and often
are, superficial in quality, particularly in the early stages of drama participation / investi-
gation. Nor is it suggested that the order given in the argument is the order in which the
drama investigation will proceed. That order will depend on the individual teacher and
on the perceived needs of the children.

What is being suggested is that choices are being made, that those choices depend
on the logical manipulation of experience and on honesty, and that they are explicative
of imagination at work in people as they distance themselves from everyday experience,
reflect on it, and use it. The intention is enquiry into the meanings in being human in the
world. The expression is an art form based in symbols that people create to order those
meanings.

**Distancing**

Before further investigation of drama can proceed, it is necessary to examine in
more detail what constitutes "distancing." Distance is created by the fact of an imagi-
nary situation, characters, and events. These components are all to be incorporated
into action, as if in the here and now. For each one of the components, the links to
reality as experienced by each of the participants will be of varying strengths. Similarly,
the thoughts and feelings of the characters, created in logic and imagination, will be close to, or will be distant from, the experiences of the participants.

If any of the components closely mirrors an actual experience, then the imaginative context is likely to be superseded by a real, strong, or recent experience in life. In such a case, the distance required by drama will be lost and the participant may be exposed in reliving an event in the past.

While it may be argued that such exposure will be therapeutic for the participant (see Courtney, 1982), it is important to remember that therapy, except in its most general and communal sense, is not and cannot be defended as being an aim of drama participation in an educational setting. On the other hand, it is not possible to be conversant enough with every participant’s background to provide absolute protection for all participants from such a reversion into reliving. The important thing is to provide as many distancing pauses as possible while maintaining the flow of the drama. There is a variety of techniques which can be employed to achieve this goal (see Bolton, 1984). The idea of distancing must be seen as central to drama so that “reflection in tranquility” can be achieved.

**Action-Non Action**

The deliberate devising described above is joined with spontaneous responding to what has been devised (Bolton, 1981). Consequently, to say that drama is “doing” is to misunderstand its power. As Bolton has said, it is dependent on, and independent of, concrete action. The hard, logical thinking, the reflection on experience, the imaginative flight, and the relating of personally recognized thoughts and feelings to the universal experience, are all equally constitutive of drama. Doing as you have imagined, while using what is real, is the tension which both provides distance and involves one in the action one creates. Conforming to the demands of logic, while continuing to develop and expand an imaginary world, is a tension which empowers the doer as temporary bringer of order.

Imaginative identification with a character, while attending to the logic of a shared event and the internal logic of experienced thoughts and feelings, is a two-way tension which is central to the action—without it the action is empty. All of the internal relationships between action, event, situation, characters, problems, and continuous relating of these to experience, create resonances within the dramatic form and, therefore, within the participant even if no one stirred throughout. This is what Dorothy Heathcote (1982...
tape) meant when, in reply to Professor Eggleson, she declared that scientists are probably involved in drama when they are being creative. The difference is, of course, that the participant in drama is, at the same time, actively concretely creating in ongoing action, as he/she responds to reflection and to action. Central to the action, whether deliberative or spontaneous, is the participant.

**The Participant in the Space**

The participants in a drama, as has been seen, are related to their work in a deliberative-intellectual, identificatory-emotional, and spontaneous-responsive mode. In this effort, they use their imagination to manipulate the skeletal structures of dramatic form. But, in a very real sense, they are neither the persons their experience has made them, nor the characters that they created while participating in the drama. Both personas allow them to see a third figure and that is the central figure in dramatic art. This figure exists as a result of looking at experience through both the personal lens of the lived experience of the participants and through the created lens of the imagined experience of the character. This figure defines itself intellectually by a comparison of the sense-making capacities of the other two. The participants define themselves morally by the value-making decisions of the other two. They define themselves aesthetically by the harmony they find between the other two. They are icons of the present conceptions of the other two of what they hold in common to be the case. Icons are neither totally one nor totally other but live in both in the action. They are the formal self in dramatic action and they move and speak in the space.

Because other people are involved in this same procedure with any participants, the formal persona is moulded by a collective vision which has been collectively negotiated through action and through deliberation in the skeletal drama form. They move, therefore, in the space as their authors' conception among the conceptions of the author's fellow workers reflexively adjusting in moment to moment action.

Evidence of the icons' presence is not hard to find. They are present in disagreements and in approval as the participants argue about what "everybody" does or agree on how amazing it is that people behave" just like that." The icons are there, as participants discuss the drama to evaluate it. "He wasn't mean enough for X to happen," or "I had trouble believing in your character because—." They are there when participants discover how difficult drama is, and greet the returning drama teacher with the question "Does this mean we have to start thinking again?" The icons, as they are called here,
are the shadowy figures who embody the goal in the struggle to get the characters in that situation under control and back into the character in action where they belong. This struggle is to disperse the shadows and embody the icon truthfully, rightly, and harmoniously. The difficulty is to envisage them clearly in imagination, to give them substance in the facts of the drama, to assign them right action in the circumstances given their character, and to find that movement which will epitomise their action in the space.

It is the last activity that is the clue, for it is the first formal element in drama. It is the symbol used only in the drama art form—it is the gesture or gestus of Brecht (Brecht, 1936). As in all art forms, it is the how of the manipulation of the symbol within the form that allows of quality in its truth, in its rightness, and in its harmony.

The icon persona described here is a conceit. But the claim embodied in the conceit is an empirical claim. It would be possible and very revealing to study drama procedures from this point of view but the literature shows no evidence of this investigation in reports of research. The purpose of making the claim is to illuminate the symbol system central to the drama and used by the drama in its investigations. It is, however, what Growtowski (1968) referred to when he spoke of the immolation of the self, what Iris Murdoch (1977) meant when she spoke of acting as an “unselfing,” and what Peter Brook (1969) has worked his whole life to reintroduce into a professional theatre struggling against economic despotism and public, and well-earned, apathy.

Why is it that the claim for the centrality of the symbol of gesture can be made? Surely when an audience sees a play the play is full of words and those words are central to the drama? This is, indeed, the public conception of what is meant by drama. To understand this apparent dissonance, it is necessary to return to the origins of drama in myth and in ritual.

Scholars from all areas of dramatic activity have recognized movement and word and their interaction as the two phenomena basic to an understanding of drama and have linked them to ritual and to myth. In drama in education Bolton, Courtney, Heathcote, Slade, Ward, Way and all their disciples recognize this connection. In theatre, whether as practitioners, critics, or theorists, Artaud, Boal, Brook, Coggin, Goethe, Growtowski, Hornby, Stanislavski, and States, have all detected such common factors with ritual and myth. In philosophy, this connection has also been asserted in the works of Cassirer, Dewey, and Langer.
Ritual is a community expression of individuals' understanding of themselves in relation to their world and to themselves. It was always an attempt to bring meaning through creating some order in the beliefs held about persons and their world. This is poetically present in Clifford Geertz’s (1977 ) account of the death ceremonies of a king observed by a Dutch explorer and interpreted by Geertz after long association with the inhabitants of Bali (1977).

From the time of Homer, there is written evidence of the importance of myth, and in early Greek plays there is further evidence of those myths turned into ritual. This close connection of myth and ritual has led to a misconception about the relationship between narrative and play forms.

Ritual and myth are, indeed, involved in the expression of the same central human concerns as are narratives and plays, but they are different forms (Bolton, 1981). One proceeds through action in its investigation, the other through events and actions which are described. The symbol of the first is gesture and of the second is word. This confusion is very old, simply because myths often took the concerns of ritual, expressed in public and abstracted action, and clothed them in story. Subsequently, too, the public enactment of the central concern of a well-known myth often formed the content of early dramas. However alike these forms of ritual and myth were, in the public mind and in overt structure, they were always radically different in the symbols they used. The symbols used in their investigation and the mode of enquiry are different.

One might protest that the results were very similar. As participants in myth, people listened to them, and their involvement with them was intellectual and emotional through that listening. As participants in ritual, people looked at the action, and in the early days were represented within it by chorus, by movement, or by singing. In the choral representation of Greek theatre the members spoke for the people, commenting on the action of the characters. In older forms, the participation was by chant, by instrumental accompaniment, and by sympathetic movement evoked by the action, identifying with it and emphasizing it. In mythic form, participation was internal, through involvement with the plot and through a willingness to see when aided by description.

In ritual, the looking, as it has become today in the theatre form, is essential to the understanding. In the early Greek culture, to hear a rhapsode recount a myth, any part of the town might become the venue for listening. Later, the myth or story teller visited homes where the people gathered to hear the story teller. But ritual, as far as is known, always had a special place within a community in which the ritual was conducted. This
was not because it was associated with formal religion, because that ordering is of a later date, but rather because the need to understand themselves and their world was essential for survival for individuals and for the tribe. It was of primary importance, therefore, and as a result had a central place in the community. It was also through the rituals that young persons came to understand the meanings that their society had already wrested from experience.

Unlike our forebears, modern society does not make attributions of cause as a result of awareness of the majesty of the skies or of the cyclical nature of the seasons. Nor is it seen it as a community responsibility to create common meanings out of the experience of today's world. In institutions, in religion, in education, and in theatre, society has erected buildings particularly suited to carry on aspects of this endeavour. The majority of the activities carried on in these buildings is concerned mainly with the knowledge of the centuries dispensed with authority, in spite of the wisdom of Rousseau or Dewey.

These activities may be directed to utilitarian ends, or to political ends, or even, as in the recent government interpretation of the B.C. Royal Commission, to the health and prosperity of the populace (1988). What is central to human life is left to the church, philosophers, a few playwrights and other artists to determine and to dole out to us for passive consumption. Thus, the populace has the findings of empirical science, which is beyond the comprehension of most of society and must therefore be accepted on faith, and the findings of scholars and artists about their insights into the human condition. More than ever before in history, the populace are acceptors of meanings rather than makers of meanings. People can, of course, reflect on these meanings and arrive at an interpretation of them to help them make sense of their own particular worlds.

The enormous advances in scientific understanding of the world, their very awe inspiring nature, have led society to look outside itself for understanding. Thus, even the advances that have been made are diluted, and that diluted understanding is brought to bear on the conduct of ordinary lives. People have lost the desire to take on the responsibility and to experience the joy of making their own idiosyncratic meanings in the commonly monitored understanding of a community. A community is needed which intends empathetic general understandings of humanness, respects individual contributions to insight, and celebrates in its investigations both the uniqueness of individual goals and means and the commonalities to be found in those goals and means (Mc Intyre, 1981, Ch. 18). These were the intentions of early ritual and their basis was
communal action in reflection. They are the intentions of the drama art form. For each small tribe, the reflections on their experience which they chose as central to their ritual were, of course, different from all other tribes.

Therefore, the intentional and important formulations in ritual expressed the culture of the tribe. They were universals for that tribe conceived as honestly as possible to ensure survival. As the world grows smaller, people are brought into contact with cultures whose rituals and beliefs have evolved to present-day formulations different from their own. Their dramas will reveal some beliefs and values held in common, and some that are widely different. As the drama develops, people must attend both to commonalities and to differences—to commonalities because wider revelation of joint beliefs draws people ever nearer to the truth; and to differences because people cannot cease to investigate good reasons either to entrench their own beliefs or to adjust them. What is dangerous is for a society to ignore them or to assume they are, in their own ideology, race, or society the sole repositories of truth. Always the drama must concentrate, as Bolton (1981) warned, on significance and search for good reasons. In so doing, drama relies on the direct gift from ritual of gesture as its primary embodiment. Thus, gesture informed by good reason and given power by its significance is primary in drama.

**Drama's Symbolic System**

The fundamental symbol of drama, the act in the space, sculpts that space and imparts life to it. It is not, however, except in very rare instances, a lone act. It is in that space first of all with the acts of other participants who sculpt the space too. The lone actor defines his/her own act by attention to its symbolic meaning for the drama and for his/her character in the drama. Then he/she must consider the relationship of that chosen act to the acts of other actors in the same drama and the same space.

The primary concern as the actor makes this relationship is the joint meaning that any group of acts creates. This is the “what” of the act. It is the reason why preliminary work in drama is concentrated, and must be so, on precisely what each participant is to do. It is the reason that the analysis, presented here, began as it did.

The second concern is to answer the question of how the space has been sculpted by the joint meanings of all participants. This concern is with the visual aesthetic and that symbolic form has its own constraints—harmonious combination of rhythm, dynamic, pattern, line, and so on. This is the “how” of the act.
As the participants sculpt in the space, make joint meanings with their group, and attend to the visual aesthetics of their actions, they must also ask if the joint meanings are clear. The clarity is not necessarily in view of a possible audience, but primarily to address the question of whether the meaning offered in gesture is dense enough by itself to carry the significant import of the drama. Where the action is judged to carry that meaning, or to express more than can be said, the action stands alone. Where this is not the case, words grow out of the necessity of meaning. Such words have their own resonances and those may be affirmative, depictive, explanatory, ritualistic, or relational. These features of word will be dealt with at another time. For the moment it is important to note that they grow out of the action.

As the word is born out of the drama, its resonances subtly alter the acts and words waiting to be born in others, and they affect the subsequent acts of the speaker. In so doing they can threaten the significant central meanings which are always inexhaustible; for example, loneliness can never be completely explored—to attempt it would be to destroy the form. Therefore, the elements of economy and of precision enter the form to serve the “through line of action” which is to express as poignantly as possible the feeling struggle caused by the theme (Stanislavski, 1936).

Again, it must be insisted that the beginnings of the drama form are being discussed here, and it is not claimed that great success in economy or in precision will occur, or that the skills are refined. The purpose here is to come to some understanding of drama in education and how it may best serve young people.

When this point is reached in the drama, it is time to clarify exactly what it is that the participants wish to say about the imaginary situation and characters they have created. At this point, or even before, both Bolton and Heathcote would intervene by changing the focus, introducing brotherhoods, or in some other way dropping to the universal. This is sometimes essential, but it is possible to elicit the main and significant concerns of the drama from the participants themselves. It is at this point that the drama asks to be slowed and re-explored to sharpen focus. The participants are often aware of this need and want the same as the art form wants—that it be about “something that’s important.” This, too, is an empirical claim and might well, with profit, be investigated.

The drama has now reached the point where all of its essential elements are extant as an art form, and the participants’ basic symbols of act and of word are present in the space. They are present in the here and now of the imagined situation, characters, events, problems, and worthwhile, significant concerns which are firmly, rationally, and
logically based in the past experience of the participants. It is then that the central symbol of the theatre form has come into being and that central symbol is presence.

Now there is a choice. Does one withhold the expertise of the theatre form which will free the child to become ever more expressive in act and in word, in rhythm and in sculpting, in giving and in taking focus, in stillness and in movement, in light and in dark, and in sound and silence?

Heathcote (1983) would say that she works to improve language. Slade (1954) would offer gentle refining of movement skills without losing spontaneity to achieve, “Justice for the child and the beauty of its works” (p. 44). Are all the other skills to be allowed to operate only as they aid the child to build belief, or as they contribute to the moment of eliciting central concern, or of evoking reflection? To be quite clear, it should be pointed out that this is an ethical question, not a question of choice of pedagogies.

Drama is an art form. That is its educational place (Allen, 1979). What would the ethic of the art form have to say about this choice? What would the idea of respect for persons have to say? If the claim is made that in drama the reappraisal of values gives a participant satisfaction, how much of a restriction has the teacher the right to put upon the quality of that satisfaction? If the claim is made that new insights or viewpoints are gained in drama, how much status are people willing to allow such insights by the care and attention lavished on them?

For this writer the decision is clear. The work is refined and polished in respect for its intrinsic worth and to do so, skills are gently and carefully offered as they are required. The limit of what is offered is decided by what the participants are both capable of and willing to accept as they respond with integrity. This does not mean that participants are being prepared for performance—although for some drama teachers that is an administrative expectation that must be resisted until the children will experience further satisfaction in it. Nor does it mean that the procedures of the elicitation of the art are ever subsumed under a welter of skill or exercise sessions. What it does mean is that, as in any other discipline, the skills are offered which are necessary to make a statement in that discipline—or, as in any other art form that is offered as an integral part of education—all the depictive tools and all the skill in their use that the participants are able to embrace joyfully.

Drama is like other art forms in another important respect. It is also a discipline in the academic sense. It has a specific area of concern or body of knowledge which it explores. This domain it shares with philosophy, namely, the domain of values and their...
function in human lives. It has a mode of enquiry which is pursued by a professional community of experts and which is the action/reflection dialectic. The experts in the discipline of drama are in many sub-specialties which include all the areas of theatre, of criticism, of theory, and of history (Hornby, 1977) as well as, in this century, the field of drama in education. Finally, they form a community of scholars who work to further the discipline in active cooperation. That schisms exist is a fact of academic life shared by many other disciplines.

The concern in this chapter has been to offer a clear statement of the theoretical position on the topic for this thesis which is informed by the expertise of outstanding theorists in the field and by experience in the drama classroom. It was not expected that the drama teacher who was chosen as co-researcher for the thesis research would share this position. However, the position of the chief researcher (this writer) must be clear since it was from this position that the drama teaching, which formed an integral part of the study, was viewed, analysed, and is discussed here.

Central Research Questions

The position taken has viewed drama in education as an exploration of what meanings are to be found in the individual, both as person and as being in the world. The central research question of the thesis was, "What effect might a program of drama have on the attitudes of Grade 5 children toward aging and toward old people?"
ATTITUDE INVESTIGATED AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to the investigation of Grade 5 students' attitudes toward the elderly and toward ageing. The intention was to discover whether or not drama education, when it is used with children to investigate the topic of young people-old people, can cause their attitudes to the elderly and to ageing to change. Such an investigative stance in the thesis makes the assumption that children's attitudes in this regard need to be changed—that they are either less than ideal, inappropriate or negative. In this chapter a case for this pre-supposition is made.

Literature on Ageism and Gerontophobia

A recent study by Levin and Levin (1980) on prejudice against the elderly, sees the disciplines of physiology, psychology, and sociology, by reporting constantly upon negative aspects of ageing, as contributing to a negative view of ageing and of old people. In such literature, Levin and Levin discerned a tendency to “blame the victim” for the crime. They argued that this tendency has caused the isolation of the elderly in society and that the elderly themselves, by adopting a strategy of disengagement, have exacerbated this social distance between themselves and other age groups. They noted that similar reactions toward and by target groups are paralleled in examinations of racism and sexism.

Among the aged, however, reactions vary from passive acceptance with concomitant self-devaluation to overt political activism, for example, in the activities of the Grey Panthers, a U.S. militant group of seniors fighting for seniors' rights. In this vigorous assertion of rights, evidence exists of an emerging “sub-culture,” which could be interpreted as another sign-post pointing toward prejudice, and toward discriminatory practices in society.

MacPherson (1983, p. 242) explained this social dynamic of response to negative attitudes at work by stating that society demands certain behaviours and attitudes of its members. This phenomenon, a kind of assimilation, he identified as the macrosystem. First, he explained that, by and large, the middle aged and the elderly accept this macrosystem. The young rebel, since their value systems challenge those of society.
Second, he observed that, by accommodation, learned behaviours have caused the elderly to adapt continually to societal expectations. This individual adjustment he called the microsystem. Together, the two systems (macro and micro) produce and preserve views of ageing and of old people which influence the population at all levels, in their beliefs and attitudes.

While views such as those of MacPherson (1983) and Levin and Levin (1980) might be dismissed as instances of social theorizing, it is worthwhile asking whether examples of the movements they have described exist in everyday experience, and whether they might shed light on how today's society views aging and the elderly.

Consider the advertisements for such products as "Grecian Formula" and "Oil of Olay." From the mere existence of such products, it would be reasonable to infer that there is at least a segment of the population that wishes to avoid the appearance of ageing. Is this a question of aesthetics? If so, should the public restrict its view of human beauty only to those of youthful aspect? If the concern is not aesthetic, is it that society believes either that some benefit might accrue, or that some hurt might be avoided, if one does not appear to be elderly? Whether the intention is to avoid hurt, to obtain a benefit, or to satisfy a youth-bound aesthetic, it would appear that ageing qua the look of ageing is what many wish to avoid.

The notion that visible signs of ageing may lead to some hurt may be based in a perception of powerlessness in those who are old. It may equally be based in the view that external marks of age are linked to, or indicative of, some internal degeneration of mind or of spirit in those who are elderly. Similarly, if the intention is to acquire some benefit, then it would appear that there are benefits which society does not bestow on those who are old but reserves for those who are younger. Avoidance of the visible signs of ageing on aesthetic grounds unreasonably limits the domain of the aesthetic. On the other hand, older persons may believe in the pervasiveness of such a youth-bound aesthetic so that they are afraid to be judged as no longer attractive. Again,

"The message that our culture often gives us is that love (making love and being in love) is only for the young and the beautiful. People over 65 are no longer interested in or suited for things such as romance and passion" (Bulcroft & O'Connor-Roden, p.989).
It seems, therefore, that in the consideration of the prevalence of youth-preserving products, there is support for the notion that the macro system holds negative views of ageing. Since such products are financially successful, there is reason to believe that some elderly people are adapting to this (micro) view of society. Thus, there is at least one example of the interaction of the macro-system and of the micro-system, as MacPherson (1983) has suggested, as society constructs a view of old age and ageing.

Telling examples of Levin and Levin's (1980) disengagement are advertisements of retirement villages. Recently, advertisements of retirement villages on television, in newspapers, and in magazines have increased in stridency and number. These villages provide private homes, with minimum guest accommodation, arranged around a community centre where the social life of those in their later years may take place insulated from the intrusion of other age groups. Outdoor tasks, or pleasures, such as snow removal and gardening are handled for the residents and the homes are built to require minimum structural upkeep. "Senior centres," which provide day-time recreational facilities for the less affluent elderly, are similarly insulated from those who are younger. For the elderly who also have health problems, geriatric wards are provided where few younger persons, other than care-givers, are part of the daily life of the occupants. Variations of these types of facilities abound in today's society, and their common feature seems to be the separation of the older generation from other age groups.

Elders, viewing this phenomenon, might be forgiven for assuming that such separation represents a societal intention and it is clear that, in large numbers, they seem to acquiesce. They make their lives within these limits and are, thus, in large part, cut off from the mainstream. As life pursued under this limitation becomes a habit, it would not be surprising if outside affairs diminished in importance relative to the concerns of their restricted world. Levin and Levin's (1980) use of the idea of disengagement by the elderly as a response to the provisions, if not the intentions, of society seems, at least to this extent, well-founded. If, on the contrary, the provision of such homes and facilities is a result of the desires or needs of the elderly and are not in any way the result of the desires of younger minds at work in society, then one must ask "Why does this group wish unilaterally to insulate itself from the rest of society?"

In their book entitled Aging and Modernization, Cowgill and Holmes (1972) developed a theory of ageing in a cross-societal perspective. As a result of comparing the roles and status of older people in 15 different societies, from the pre-literate to those of the greatest industrial development, they concluded that with increasing modernization
the status of older people has declined. Cowgill's (1974) later reflection on the findings led him to extract four factors in the modernization process which were strong and persistent variables in their contribution to the devaluation of the elderly. He showed, by analysis, that these factors — health technology, economic technology, urbanization, and education—led to four states of affairs, each of which contributed to the lower status of the aged. These Cowgill (1974, p. 58) named “Generational Competition, Obsolescence of the Jobs of the Aged, Residential Segregation and Social Distance and the Inversion of the Status of the Societal Contribution of the Aged” (1974).

Generational competition leads to the concept of retirement which, because of a predominant work ethic, has lowered the status of those not working. Obsolescence of the traditional occupations of the older segment has also contributed to the move to retirement. The attraction of the big city has meant that younger members of society have moved away from ageing parents—a social segregation of the elderly which, in Cowgill's view, leads to the cult of youth. Children who were more educated than their parents no longer sought the wisdom older relatives had to offer and turned instead to books and data bases. All of these factors working together have led, in Cowgill's view, to the intellectual and moral segregation of older people. The data he collected, for all but one of the 15 societies examined, showed a steady decline in all these factors of the status of older people. The exception, Japan, showed a less sharp decline in all these factors of decreased status of older people. This exception was attributed to the Confucian ethic which demands respect for elders and worship of ancestors although, even in Japan, there was some decline.

Persuasive as this theory was, and is, in explaining the negative attitudes toward the elderly found in investigations in the 1960s and 70s, Marshall (1983), in his review of subsequent work, pointed out that the theory is not as universally applicable as it first seemed. Work by Bengtson (1975) stressed the need for a clear distinction to be made between the societal process of modernization and the individual process of modernity whereby people are exposed to and adapt to the modernization going on around them. Hendricks (1980) concluded that there is a variation in the rate of modernization from society to society and within the different segments of a particular society, which denies the claim of a smooth and even decline in the attitudes toward the elderly. Thus, both the individual adaptation to modernization and the rate of societal change do alter the force of the explanations offered by the original modernization theory. However, subsequent refinements do not alter the claim that there is, to a greater or lesser degree in
modern societies, a tendency to devalue older people, when compared with more traditional societies. The degree of devaluation which occurs will be determined partly by individual adaptation to modernization (modernity) and by the rate of modernization in a particular society.

The literature of gerontology is replete with references to the myths and stereotypes which surround the subject of old people (Hendricks & Hendricks, 1979; Kart, 1974; Palmore, 1971). Other reported views are formed by myths or stereotypes about old age as a state, for example, the view that Shakespeare's seven stages of man is an immutable rule. Such literature implies that statements about myths and stereotypes either cause or contribute to negative attitudes toward ageing and old people.

There is, however, a lack of clarity in both the explanation of what is to count as a myth or stereotype and in the nature and effect of any contribution to attitudes that they may make. The issues of logical errors, myths and stereotypes are related to the conceptions of attitude and prejudice discussed in Chapter 2.

**Psychological Studies of Attitude to Ageing and to Old People**

In early studies by Tuckman and Lorge (1953; 1954) they investigated attitudes toward ageing. The distinction between attitudes toward aging and toward old people is not clear in those studies. Their earlier work with 147 graduate students as respondents, employed a questionnaire which examined misconceptions and stereotypes, and was entitled "Attitudes Toward Old People." However, an examination of the categories employed in their instrumentation revealed that some items were concerned with the respondents' attitudes toward their own ageing or toward ageing as a concept.

In 1954, Tuckman and Lorge reduced the size of the questionnaire in size and increased the study sample to investigate attitudes of 533 junior and senior high school students. The title they gave this study was "Attitudes of Junior and Senior High School Students Toward Ageing," but the questions included items which were clearly measuring attitude towards old people. Tuckman and Lorge (1953, pp. 249-260) concluded from the results that there was significant support for stereotypical attitudes toward the aged and toward ageing (1954, pp. 59-61). This lack of discrimination between what the scales measured and what they claimed to measure weakened the construct validity in each case.

Kogan (1961, pp. 44-54), who was critical of this research, developed a new questionnaire which distinguished between beliefs and attitudes and measured attitudes
only. Employing a Likert scale, he showed that negative attitudes toward the elderly were associated with (a) anomie, (b) negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities, and (c) negative attitudes toward a variety of physically handicapped groups. He concluded that (a) attitudes are multidimensional, containing elements of belief, feeling, knowledge, and behaviour, and, (b) there is some justification in characterizing society's attitudes toward the elderly as a form of prejudice.

When Rosencrantz and McNiven (1969) tested 287 undergraduate students, they employed yet another scale which they created from the categories developed by Osgood, Succi, and Tannenbaum (1957). Osgoode et al. (1957) had investigated attitudes as multidimensional entities, and said of their instrument:

This instrument allows the influence of connotative judgement, and total scores can be found in addition to more meaningful scores in each dimension. It is this latter exercise which is most important in research of this type, since we may gain an understanding of the interplay of the dimensions comprising an attitude. (p. 64)

With this instrument, (Osgood et al 1957) these researchers found significant differences in the attitudes of undergraduate students to varying age groups. The instrument attended to the connotations of words used to describe the feelings, beliefs, behaviours, and knowledge of the respondents, and used factor analysis to examine the data. The elderly (aged 65 years and over) were undervalued in the instrumental-effective dimension and in the autonomous-dependent dimension (the first category includes actions of old people which affect the lives of others in some significant way while the second indicates the tendency of the elderly either to order their own lives or to allow others to do so for them). Older men were adjudged the least socially acceptable sub-group of the young, middle-aged, and elderly groups. The study also showed the effect on the respondents' attitudes of contact and experience with the elderly. Overall, this study confirmed the tendency, previously noted, to undervalue older people — a tendency leading to a lack of respect and, conceivably in the long run, to prejudice.

In 1971, McTavish undertook a review of the research into attitudes toward the elderly in “Perceptions of Old People” in which was documented the devaluing of old people and old age as a state. McTavish (1971, p. 90) substantiated the complaints of Kogan (1961) and Rosencrantz and McNiven (1969) and praised the work of the latter for its multidimensional approach. In a more recent review of attitudes in general,
Shrigley (1988) characterized attitudes as evaluative beliefs which predispose people to act in a certain way. Thus, the move in assessing attitudes appears now to preserve the multidimensionality aspect while assigning different weights to the dimensions of feeling, beliefs, knowledge, and dispositions to act. Over the last three decades, therefore, the work of both Kogan (1961) and of Rosancrantz and McNiven (1969) appears to have been supported.

Much of the work, cited above investigated the attitudes of respondents whose mean age would be in the late teens. However, the Kogan studies dealt with a much wider age range. As was argued earlier, the social milieu is likely to affect the attitudes of younger people and it is to studies of these younger people and their environment that this discussion must now turns.

Children’s Attitudes to Old People and to Ageing

Children’s attitudes were examined more exhaustively in the years following McTavish’s (1971) review (Borges & Dutton, 1976; Seefeldt, Jantz, & Glaper, 1977; Thomas & Yamamoto, 1975). In the Thomas and Yamamoto study, 1000 children enrolled in Grades 6, 8, 10, and 12 were the subjects. Their attitudes were measured using three pictures of men of different ages and a semantic differential scale. The pictures were the basis for an essay written by the children, and the scale measured evaluative, feeling and potency dimensions in their attitude towards older people. A three-way analysis of variance (grade x gender x concept) was used to examine the data. The authors found that their results disagreed with the notion of uniformly negative attitudes towards old people, except for factors of activity and potency. Evidence of some negative feelings, some misconceptions, and some negative projections of behaviour was found, but some positive results were also obtained for those factors. They, therefore, supported the view that attitudes are multidimensional, complex, and highly flexible. For these reasons, Thomas and Yamamoto (1975) suggested that negative attitudes towards the elderly “may be greatly influenced by realistic education, relative to the valuable contributions old persons can and do make in society” (p. 128). Since pictures, essays, and a semantic differential measure were employed in this research and confirmed some evidence of stereotypy, it supplemented the earlier evidence of the existence in children of some negative attitudes toward the elderly.

In their second study, Jantz, Seefeldt, Serock (1977) used the Kogan scales with tape-recorded oral responses to open-ended questions about the elderly and about old
These were administered individually to 180 children, enrolled in Grades 3-11. Although the researchers found positive attitudes to the elderly in the children's accounts of their feelings, there were negative or stereotypical responses in knowledge about the elderly and in descriptions of behaviours with the elderly. Again, the study supported a predominantly negative view of the elderly as persons. The instrument used in the Jantz et al. (1977) work was chosen for an aspect of the present study.

In 1976, Borges and Dutton examined the differences in attitudes of groups of respondents aged 6 to 65 years towards the process of aging. The young respondents were asked to project, on a Likert scale, how they would feel about being aged. Meanwhile, the elderly were asked to list those periods of their lives which they recalled as having been good, less good, and so on. Young and middle aged persons were found to devalue the 65+ years life phase, but, in contrast, the elderly judged their old age to be as happy as their happiest times in childhood. This lack of agreement in the views of different age groups about the various phases of life indicated a tendency among the younger respondents in the study to devalue old age as a state. It also demonstrated that young persons and the middle aged were less than confident as they view their own futures. The study results did point to the need to alter attitudes about aging which the elderly themselves saw as untrue, and the data also indicated what appeared to be an ambient fear of aging (gerontophobia).

In recent years, further research has confirmed these earlier findings of ageism and possible gerontophobia in children (Fillmer, 1984; Seefeldt, 1982, 1984, 1985; Tarrier, & Gomes, 1981; Weinberger, 1979; Wernick, & Manaster, 1984). As a result of these numerous studies over an extended period, there is strong support for the claim that there are negative attitudes to be found in children towards aging and towards old people. These studies were not confined to the North American culture but include work done in Peru and in Thailand; therefore, the results have shown some uniformity across three cultures. Such attitudes are a matter of serious concern. In addition to studying the attitudes in young children, some researchers have studied such influences as books, television and print advertising which might affect the attitudes of children. Research on children's literature is particularly significant for the present study.

Research on Ageism and Gerontophobia in Children's Literature

E. F. Ansello (1977) has been in the forefront of research in which books written for children are analysed to discover if they present negative or stereotypical views of age.
ageing and old people. In his review of many studies of books for children, Ansello stated that such books are either ambivalent or negative in their attitudes towards older people. Older characters appear in lesser roles, are unidimensional rather than multidimensional, and lack development. Ansello (1977) noted the cumulative effect of this as a subtle stereotyping which portrays older people as “unexciting, unimaginative, not self disclosing and not self sufficient” (p 215). Furthermore, he found that such portrayals encourage children “to love, pity, and avoid the old” (1977).

In 1983, Pearson-Davies investigated children’s theatre scripts and found more negative than positive character descriptions, either overt or implied. In addition, she observed that ridicule of some characteristics of older people was sometimes the central conflict in the plays she surveyed. Three-dimensional images of the elderly were rare. Of 430 characters, 53 (11.3%) were old, and of these, only three were developed.

In 1976 and again in 1977, Peterson analysed the Newberry Medal Award books for adolescents. In the first batch, 51 of 53 books had at least one older character, but altogether, older characters numbered 159. As these represented 12% of all characters, Peterson did not define this percentage as under-representation; however, since only 10% of the characters were older women, he categorized them as somewhat under-represented. As only 4.6% of the books contained details about the older characters (conceived of as items of information), they could seldom have been major characters.

Peterson (1976) did not find older people portrayed as non-functioning or portrayed in a negative light, but did observe that the books suffered from “errors of omission rather than errors of commission” (p. 321). He concluded that, “by reading these books teenagers will simply confirm their affiliation with the youth culture, to which society at large is subservient.” (1976). Peterson’s 1977 research confirmed these results: the attitudes portrayed had become even more negative. Agreement with these findings can be found as well in more recent research (Barnum, 1977; Vraney & Barrett, 1981).

Studies of books written for elementary school children have included an equally negative prospect. (Ansello, 1978; Hurst, 1981; Kingston & Drotter, 1981; Lehman, 1985; Sera and Lamb, 1984; Seefeldt, et al., 1977; Serock, 1980). In addition, a study of the portrayal of the elderly in television commercials viewed by children showed equally negative portraiture (Serock, 1980).

From such research, it appears that the view of the elderly promoted in some books
for children is one which would reinforce any negative attitudes children may have. In the three previous chapters, attention given to establishing the basis from which the present investigation proceeds. The purpose of the discussion here was to establish that there is a need to be concerned about children's attitudes to the elderly. To this end, the research literature which dealt with attitudes towards the elderly and toward ageing was reviewed. Particular attention was given to the literature which included research into the attitudes of children to old people and ageing. In addition, research was reviewed on books written for children with themes portraying old age and old people. The conclusion that children may well hold negative attitudes toward ageing and old people was supported in the majority of the sources that could be located.

Given that children have been found to hold such negative attitudes, and given that there are influences in their environment which could reinforce such attitudes, it was deemed likely that the group of children with whom the present research was carried out would exhibit some degree of less than desirable attitudes to the elderly and to ageing.

Since this study was based on the notion that drama education may affect children's attitudes, an exploration of what is meant by drama education was conducted in Chapter 2. The work of drama educators from Britain, the United States, and Canada was reviewed to explicate the present understanding of that discipline and art form. Furthermore, a statement of this writer's position on drama education was given in chapter 4 and supported by drama authorities where possible. This latter exposition was undertaken for two reasons: (a) to demonstrate the writer's perspective or bias as a participant observer in the classroom of an other drama teacher, and (b) to form the basis for comparison and "thick" (Geertz, 1973) description of the drama encountered in the course of the research. The use here of the word "bias" must be understood in the context of the interpretative enquiry which was carried out. It does not necessarily carry a negative connotation, but rather represents the writer/researcher's point of view on important concepts at the heart of this study. Thus, the concepts of attitude, prejudice, stereotypy, gerontophobia, drama education, and research methods are those on which the researcher's stance must be made clear before the research is described.

Chapter 3 established the writer's position on attitudes toward old people and toward ageing in order to set the stage for the research. Descriptions of what count as appropriate attitudes to ageing and old people were cited from the discussions of personhood and of attitudes in the literature of ethics, law, and philosophy.

The position adopted for this thesis was that an appropriate attitude to old people
can be said to be respect for them as persons. Such an attitude can be described as having three characteristics: (a) the notion of symbiosis, (b) the notion of the right of the person to idiosyncratic goals, and (c) the notion of the right to choose the means to pursue such goals, provided that to do so does not interfere with the goals and means of others. Such attributes were based in the understandings that (a) the concept of what it is to be a person is central to the attitude one adopts toward others; (b) the proposition that what is self-ascribable must equally be other-ascribable if people to have an adequate concept of a person; (c) the notion that people must continually examine their own judgements for good reasons for the stances they adopt toward other persons; and (d) the awareness that since there are necessary but not sufficient conditions in all definitions of a person, they can probably never completely know a person, either self or other. Therefore, part of the respect we offer to ourselves and to others consists in the wonder one offers to oneself and to others consists in the wonder that is felt when in the presence of a mystery.

Appropriate attitudes toward old people are seen to include: (a) honouring and making possible the achievement of their goals and means, (b) ascribing to old people the same capacities, thoughts, feelings, and reactions one ascribes to oneself, and (c) affirming the autonomy and mystery of the individual. These attitudes will result in (d) actions which strengthen that autonomy and which recognize, wonder at, and celebrate that mystery. These attitudes are symbiotic because in ascribing capacities, reactions, actions, and individuality, and in recognizing the personhood of the elderly, society is brought to knowledge of and wonder at the self, as they are by appropriately recognizing the personhood of all others. In symbiotic action, agape is discovered with all persons. Respect for persons thus consists in agape rationally evoked in symbiotic awareness, scrutiny, attention and action. As well as a preliminary for the research, the position outlined in Chapter 3 was an explanation of this researcher's perspective in approaching the investigation into attitudes toward the elderly.

Perspectives and Rationale of the Study

The study was designed after a review of the instruments available to measure children's attitudes to ageing and to the elderly. Even at the outset this researcher felt dissatisfaction with such instruments. Few offered the possibility of open-ended questions and none was precise or subtle enough to elicit from respondents, in any illuminative detail, the reasons for the stances they might be willing to claim for those investi-
gated. Understandably, such instruments were constructed with attention paid to the
time it would take to administer them.

As a result of these three limitations, a decision was made to carry out both a quali­
tative study and an empirical investigation. Despite, the disadvantages mentioned, the
decision was made to retain an empirical component, because the research was to be
carried out with classrooms of children who worked in groups to create the drama. It
was felt, therefore, that despite their drawbacks, empirical instruments would provide at
least a profile of the attitudes of the children as a group before and after the drama.
Such group profiles would be supplemented by the individual accounts given by the
children of their attitudes at the beginning, during, and after the drama, and by the
teacher accounts of the lessons, of the drama produced, and of her observations con­
cerning the attitudes of the children. The researcher’s field notes and the children’s
journals added to the data collection.

Decisions about design were made as a result of the assessment of available instru­
ments and of the conditions under which the research would take place. Such deci­
sions were also indicative of the researcher’s biases.

Thus, three sets of researcher bias were present in the approach to this research as
a project, in addition to those which emerge in the discussion of qualitative methods in
Chapter 6. These biases were:

1. The bias in the position on attitudes adopted for the investigation (Chapter 3).
2. The bias inherent in the position on what the researcher means by the term
   “drama education” (Chapter 2).
3. The bias extant in the position taken on the appropriate means to investigate the
   problem.

Choices were, however, supported by eminent scholars in the various fields. This in­
vestigation was being conducted with a view to obtaining as thorough a picture as pos­
sible of the effect of drama education on children’s attitudes to the elderly, but it is being
conducted with these biases in mind.

Design of the Study

A quantitative framework of pre- test post-test with control group and two experi­
mental groups was decided upon. Within this framework, supporting it, providing addi­tional insights into it, and in interaction with it, Chapter 6, a qualitative investigation was
designed.
The qualitative investigation comprises analyses of:

1. drawings created by the students, pre- and post test;
2. interviews with the drama teacher and with the students, conducted at the beginning, during and after the investigation;
3. recollections of the drama work collected from randomly selected pairs of students and individuals, at the end of each of the drama sections;
4. drama work which was videotaped and analysed at the end of each drama section;
5. observations made in the drama classroom while the researcher participated in the drama work; and
6. students' journals as they reflected on the drama work they had done after their tasks were completed.

In each of these six methodologies, transcripts of the taped interviews were offered to the respondents for scrutiny to see if their thoughts, feelings, and understandings were truly represented in the documentation. Alterations, deletions, and additions were then made to the transcripts. Thus, the meanings which emerged from the qualitative investigation were a joint construction by the respondents and the researcher together, as they examined and reflected upon the raw data collected. Chapter 6 provides more detailed explanation of the qualitative procedures adopted.

Structure of the Quantitative Investigation

This section contains descriptions of the sampling procedures, the groups of respondents, the instrument, the collection of the quantitative data, the scoring procedures, and the statistical manipulation. The results of this part of the investigation are given in Chapter 7.

Sampling

Since the experiment was conducted in school settings, with pre-determined groups of students (i.e., classes), no claim is made to random selection of respondents. In addition, the instrument chosen for the quantitative section of the study has no norms with which the results may be compared. For these reasons, no use is made of inferential statistics in the presentation of the acquired data.
The selection of groups of children was limited by the willingness of the school authorities, and of the parents of the children concerned, to participate in the experiment. Grade 5 children were chosen as participants because the psychological literature suggested that at around the age of 10 to 11 years, attitudes tend to become set. Permission to conduct the experiment was sought and obtained from school boards, principals, teachers, and parents of the children. Since qualified teachers of elementary school drama were, at the time, relatively rare in Calgary schools, it was necessary to select the experimental groups on the advice of the school board's director.

**Experimental Group.**

The school system chosen for the research was the Calgary (Alberta) Catholic School District #1. In discussion with the director of research for that school board and as a result of the researcher's background as a teacher in the St. John (Elementary) School of Fine Art in that system, it was decided that the students enrolled in Grade 5 at that school should form the two experimental groups. Both the director of research and this researcher felt that, as a result of a teaching background, the researcher would gain more ready acceptance there than elsewhere. Since the student participants would not be known personally to the researcher, the quantitative work would not be compromised. Ready acceptance by staff, the school principal, and the students was likely, as all had heard of the researcher or had been involved with her at one time. In addition, there was no other elementary school in the system in which drama was taught as a subject in its own right by a qualified drama teacher.

Also, the role of researcher was seen as valuable to this particular school, which had opened just 4 years prior to the commencement of this research into drama. The reasons for the school's success have not as yet been investigated. Nor have the claims for academic or other gains by the students, as made by parents and teachers associated with the school, been substantiated by research. The school administrators welcomed any research done because they believe very strongly in the methods of education implemented in their school. They also believe that research into the whole field of attitudes is vital to the success of all children in school. For all of the above reasons, the Grade 5 students of the St. John School of Fine Art were chosen to form the study's experimental groups.
Population of St. John School of Fine Art.

It is necessary to describe the population of the school in general terms because the children who attended this school at the time of this research came from all areas of Calgary (a fairly large city of some 700,000 population) and their parents chose the school for a wide variety of reasons.

First, there were those children who resided in that area of the city in which the school was situated. These children had priority for places in the school if they were proven members of the Catholic faith since there were no other elementary Catholic schools in the area. Such children may have had little interest in the arts and the same may have been true of their parents. They attended St. John school simply because it was close to their homes.

On the other hand, some parents living in the area, who had heard of the school's reputation or who held an interest in the arts or in the type of education offered there, were at pains to discover their child's baptismal certificates in order to prove their child's right to attend the school. These children constituted the first group who attended St. John school.

Children who resided in other areas of the city were bused to the school, free of charge. They were admitted on a first-come, first-served basis. It should not be assumed, however, that all those who were accepted applied because the children or their parents held an interest in the arts, or that they were convinced that education in and through the arts was a good thing. There were several identifiable groups of children who attended St. John school: (a) those who failed to make progress in more traditional classrooms; (b) those whose teachers or principals recommended the school as a result of behaviour problems exhibited by the children in their former schools; (c) those who were gifted but had not been challenged in regular classrooms; (d) those whose parents were interested or involved in the arts; (e) those who were the children of educators and came because their parents held an understanding of the education offered there; (f) those, of course, who came because they thought they would be trained for "stardom" of one kind or another; and, finally (g) those small numbers who came to St. John because they were true artists in-the-becoming.

As there was no added cost to attend this school, theoretically, its students could come from any financial background. In fact, the preponderance among enrolled children of well-educated parents meant that the earning power of the parent population was above average on the whole. There were a few children who came from very poor homes.
Control group.

A discussion was initiated with the school board's director of research to enable the identification of a control group in a school which was likely to have a socio-economic status (SES) spectrum analogous to that of St. John. I accepted the recommendation of Brebeuf Junior High School and obtained permission from teachers and staff to pre-and post-test those students whose parents gave permission.

Initial Procedures.

Letters to parents requesting permission for their children to participate in the study were sent out with the students to 49 parents of the Brebeuf School control group (Appendix A). These letters clearly stated that only 40 minutes of the children's school time would be taken up by the research.

Similar letters were sent home to 68 parents of the St. John School two experimental groups. For these children, the time out of class was clearly stated to be 40 minutes. In addition, parents were advised that further 500 minutes of in-class drama time would be given over to the exploration of the theme "young people, old people". (Appendix A).

For the control group, permissions to participate totalled 19 (39%) out of the possible 49. For the experimental groups, permission totalled 58 (85%) out of a possible 68.

The parents were also asked to complete a personal information form along with the permission form (Appendix B). This second form dealt with the SES of the parents, their racial origin, and the country of their birth. For both the experimental and control groups, only one parent in each declined to complete the SES form. As a result of the permissions received, 19 students in the control group and 58 in the experimental groups were pre-tested.

The students were grouped as follows:

1. Experimental (or Drama) Group A, 31 students. Drama teacher facilitated child-directed drama with a minimum of teacher direction.
2. Experimental (or Drama) Group B, 27 students. Drama teacher employed a measure of control over the drama, that is, teacher-directed drama.
3. Control Group C, 19 students. Language-Arts teacher followed the regular school program.

Each student was assigned a number so that all test results could remain confidential. The empirical instrument, therefore, was employed to yield only group or sub-group scores. The art work was labelled by a code so that the group to which the child artists
belonged was hidden from all but the researcher. Tape recordings of children's inter-
views were preserved but the speakers were not identified, either by locale or by their
own names. Videotapes were treated in like fashion, that is the tapes were edited by
the researcher to substitute pseudonyms for any names used in the talk and drama
pieces created by the children. Informed consent without prejudice was obtained from
all parties involved (Appendix B).

Treatment

The story, The Berenstain Bears and the Week at Grandma's (Berenstain & Beren-
stain, 1986), was read to Group A children. They subsequently read it alone, and then
in a small group, created incidents from it, or incidents they constructed, to create their
own drama on the theme "young people/old people." This was the method planned for
Experimental Group A.

Experimental Group B children read the same story with a teacher, subsequently
read it by themselves, and then used it in teacher-directed drama. The methods of the
drama teacher with both groups are described from the analysis of the extensive class-
room observation carried out and from an analysis of the interviews with the teacher.
During these interviews, the teacher provided accounts of her own methods of teaching
drama and of the philosophies which guide her in choosing those methods. This de-
scription of pedagogy is part of the presentation of the qualitative findings discussed in
Chapter 6.

The Control Group children followed their regular school program between the
pre- and post-administration of the quantitative instrument and between the
execution of the pre- and post-drawings.

Pre-drama motivation and understanding

The story, The Berenstain Bears .......... was used to introduce some of the concerns
which children might well choose to address in drama, but it could in no sense be re-
garded as a great literature. The theme of the book is that coming to know and under-
stand grandparents can lead to a change in attitude. This theme is pursued through a
series of situations which lead the youthful characters in the story to discover many
interesting and unexpected aspects of its older characters. Nonetheless, the work is
one-dimensional in characterization and simplistic in plot and the theme development is
minimal. It should be noted that the choice of this story was made, even given its disad-
vantages, since the purpose was merely to introduce some ideas that the children might like to investigate in their drama. The simplicity of *The Berenstain Bears* was a positive factor in choosing it, as its comprehension was likely to be close to 100% and its theme was likely to be easily accessible even to the poorest students. Good literature might also, because of its dramatic content, hide part of what drama may do, in and of itself, without assistance from the literature as literature.

**Attitude To Be Examined.**

This study was limited to investigating Grade 5 children’s attitudes to old people and to old age. It also attended, therefore, to prejudice against the elderly (ageism) and to the concomitant fear of old age (gerontophobia). Specifically, it dealt with the need to educate children to think about the aged and to reflect upon their own attitudes toward older people and toward ageing. The study of these attitudes centred upon the degree to which children conceive of old people as full persons and on the degree to which elements of that concept are lacking. The assumption was made as discussed in Chapter 3, that attitudes toward others are dependent upon how clearly and how firmly the concept is held of what it is to be a person, and the assumption that respect for persons is widely recognized as a moral principle.

The researcher examined what effects, if any, drama education might have in instigating and focusing reflection upon old age and upon old people. Also examined were the results of such reflection as found in the attitudes of children, after a period of drama education which explored the theme “Young People/Old People.” These attitudes were then compared with the ones found in children who followed the regular school program.

**The Quantitative Investigation.**

The following includes a detailed description of the quantitative research instruments used in the study.

All respondents were pre- and post-tested by means of the instrument entitled “Children’s attitudes Toward the Elderly” (CATE), developed at the University of Maryland by Jantz, Seefeldt, Galper, Serock, 1976. (See Appendix C). The pre- and post-test results were compared by examining the descriptive statistics obtained from the raw data. Results which showed differences were interpreted according four categories: (a) knowledge of the elderly, (b) discrimination in the view of the elderly adopted, (c) the
degree to which honouring of the elderly was present, and (d) the extent to which fear of the elderly, of old age, or of ageing was present. The purpose of this test was to examine the attitudes of the children to the elderly pre and post test.

In addition all respondents in the two experimental groups were administered a test developed by this writer called a "Test of Comprehension" (TOC) (see Appendix D), after reading the story The Bernstein Bears..........., which was the stimulus for the drama. The purpose of this test is to control for any lack of comprehension which may occur and which would interfere with the efficacy of the story in eliciting the drama. Since the story was chosen for reading level two grades below that expected of Grade 5 students, this variable was not expected to interfere, except in a very few cases.

The interest of the children in the chosen story was felt to be high, as the characters in the book had been used to create a television series. When the story was made available in the pilot study of the T.O.C. to children at the Grade 5 level, they showed interest in it and gave as the reason for their interest a liking for the characters they had seen on television. In the previous year, the pilot group, consisting of Canadian Boy Scouts and Girl Guides in Calgary and a complete Grade 5 class (which this writer was then teaching at St. John school) were tested with the TOC, to discover whether or not there was good comprehension of this story and to see if reliable results from the use of the instrument were possible (the result of the pilot studies of the TOC and the CATE are obtainable from the author). There were few children in the experimental group who had low scores on the TOC. Those who did were identified by the TOC and this factor was monitored in the early part of the drama.

After 3 1/2 months of drama work, the CATE was re-administered to determine whether any of the group scores had changed over time. This procedure provided a condensed and limited description of group attitudes at each stage.

The Qualitative Investigation

The following includes a detailed description of the qualitative methods used in the study.

Analyses of children's art.

Art work entitled "Young People/Old People" was assigned to all respondents as pre- and post-treatment. All drawings were submitted to experts in the interpretation of children's drawings, one expert in the field of art education and one in the field of child
The evaluators were unaware of which drawings were pre- and which were post, nor did they know from which groups the drawings came.

These evaluators were asked to carry out two "sorts" of the art work. The first sort was into three groups, categorized according to strong, medium, and weak expression in the portrayal of individuals, relationships, and symbolization. Competence in art skills was not a criterion. The second sort involved sorting within each of the three groups in turn, and consisted of determining which were negative portrayals, which were neutral portrayals, and which were positive portrayals of old people. The final task of the evaluators was to characterize in short phrases the meaning implicit in each of the drawings. When the sorts were complete and returned to the researcher, the descriptions of the evaluators were analysed and compared, and the results were related to the groups in the study and to their positions pre- and post-test.

Analysis of children's accounts.

At the end of each drama unit, the respondents were asked about the items they had considered in creating their drama pieces. They were asked about the main idea they wished to explore and also about their attitude to drama. As the work progressed, the respondents were interviewed (tape recorded) by the researcher to discover if they had acquired new insights into the notion of old people as persons. Respondents chosen for such interviews and offerings of accounts were determined by three criteria: (a) their willingness to participate, (b) the exigencies of the classroom situation, (e.g., if a student in a French class was behind in school work, he/she was not chosen), and (c) the awareness that some teachers were unwilling to excuse students for interviews when those teachers planned to cover work considered to be particularly demanding. The accounts and interviews of the student respondents were analysed, summarized, and described, and then referred back to the respondents to determine if their thoughts, feelings, and opinions had been truly represented in the transcription.

Analysis of drama scenes.

The notion of triangulation is an important one for all qualitative sections of this type of design. In this procedure, the qualitative data are analysed, and confirmation of insights into a topic of interest found in any individual account is sought from two other
accounts. In the present study, videotapes of initial improvisations, and sections of final scenes in each drama unit, were analysed by the researcher to discover if the videos revealed any insights into children's attitudes about old people or into drama as experienced by children. Some attempt was made to achieve confirmation of the categories which evolved in these analyses and triangulations were sought for this purpose. Since the analyses were qualitative in this part of the investigation, the researcher decided that numerical treatment and conventional notions of inter-scorer reliability were inappropriate. Categories for triangulation derived from the descriptions themselves and from the conceptions of attitude, prejudice, and stereotypy, developed in the study, but it also included evidence in journal writing and in subsequent study units.

During all of the qualitative work, the students and teachers assisted as "co-researchers." (See example of teacher interview in Appendix G.) The decision to proceed in this manner was made as a result of two principles: (a) the making of meaning in interviews, talks, and accounts was a joint interpretative enterprise; and (b) this researcher's ethical stance was that teachers and students were co-researchers in the investigation for this part of the study.

Validity and Reliability of Instruments

The validity and reliability of both quantitative and qualitative measures are discussed below.

Quantitative Measures

As discussed earlier, the CATE instrument was created by Jantz et al. in 1976. In describing the CATE, these researchers stated that it was designed to "assess children's attitudes towards old people through analysis of the affective, behavioral and knowledge components of attitudes" (1976, p. 18). The CATE instrument consisted of four sub-tests. In the first, open-ended questions were used. The second, a semantic differential, used bi-polar scales on the evaluative dimension. In the third, artists drawings of the same man as he aged were used to elicit responses to open-ended questions. The last test used a Piagetian-based concept of age measure. All sub-tests were pilot tested. Any item to be included by Jantz et al. in the test in the final instrument had to meet the following four criteria. An item had to be:

1. judged to be valid by an expert in measurement and in the field of ageing;
2. understandable, acceptable and of high interest to children in the 3-11 age group;
3. economical, tapping the most amount of information in the shortest amount of time; and
4. codeable, scoreable and yielding results than can be analysed statistically.

(Jantz et al., 1976, p. 13).

After these researchers pilot tested the items so selected, and further refined the instrument, it was used to measure the attitudes of 180 children aged 3-11 years drawn from a variety of socio-economic backgrounds, and from both urban and agricultural communities. Subsequently, the CATE instrument was used to measure children's attitudes towards old people and towards old age by members of the original research team (Seefeldt et al., 1978; Seefeldt, 1982, 1984, 1985), and other researchers (Miller, Blatlock, and Ginsburg, 1984).

These studies were concerned with the use of CATE to study cross-cultural and other populations rather than with the replication of the original study. Both McTavish, (1976) and Burros, (1985) indicated that, in their view, the instrument should be regarded as experimental, and that replication was necessary. Accordingly a pilot study with 19 Grade 5 students who were members of Canadian Girl Guide and Boy Scout troops, was carried out in Calgary by the present researcher in 1988. (Pilot study results may be obtained from the author).

Qualitative Measures

As indicated earlier, it was expected that the samples of children's art work, talk, response to interviews, improvisation, and performance, would, in and of themselves, help determine the criteria which could be applied to the analysis of such data. However, this effort was guided but not controlled, in its structure, by the conditions for appropriate attitudes which were teased out in Chapter 3.

Procedures employed by the researcher in assessing the validity and reliability of quantitative measures were not appropriate to the assessment of qualitative and descriptive data. Every effort was made to carry out this part of the experiment with rigor, and the results, that were considered to reflect attitudes to the elderly and to drama, stemmed from careful triangulation of the data. Agreement with other competent viewers and listeners was examined and an attempt at correlation, in the statistical sense of the word was considered and rejected as too limiting in the face of the richness of the data obtained. The researcher reported all qualitative findings to the "co-researchers"
in order to resolve ambiguities and to verify the interpretations made. Credit has been given to all co-researchers, both teachers and students, in the final documentation after permission to do so was obtained. If students did not wish their attitudes to be revealed, the analyses were not shown to parents. Pseudonyms were substituted in the text, quoted in Chapter 6, to preserve anonymity for those who wished it.

Collection of Data

One week before the experiment began, the teachers of all groups were asked to assign the art project and to allow the students to work at it, without advice or interference, for one class period of 40 minutes' time. All teachers were provided with numbered sheets of drawing paper, and asked to insist on the use of black, fine-tipped felt pens, and to keep a record of the numbers assigned to each child in their classrooms. In this way the art work which was analysed pre-treatment, was identified post-treatment by the researcher after the "sorts" were made by the expert art evaluator.

Permission was granted to administer the pre-test of the CATE and, upon request, a small room was made available in which to conduct the individually administered test. It had been estimated that the testing of 25 respondents would take 250 minutes in total. Unfortunately, the pre-testing of the control groups had to be done only as the permission sheets slowly trickled in, and the testing finally stretched out over a 2 week period. For the experimental group, 6 full days was required to cover the testing of all 58 respondents.

For each experimental group, the treatment consisted of two, 45 minute sessions per week for 8 weeks. The sessions were adjusted in Groups A and B (i.e., the drama schedules of the school concerned), so that both groups would be involved for identical periods of time, identically spaced.

At the end of this period, the CATE post-test was administered to all three groups. When the drama teacher felt it was appropriate, the researcher videotaped randomly selected groups of students. After they had been videotaped, those students were identified by the teacher so that their post-test CATE results could be marked as a subgroup of the experimental group.

Scoring of Tests

The CATE interviews were transcribed and then scored by the researcher and the TOC was scored by the researcher. The 40 randomly selected pre- and post-art works
were evaluated independently by one art educator and by one child psychologist. The transcriptions of these evaluations were analysed by the researcher. The tape recordings of interviews were analysed by the researcher as were the videotapes.

Limitations of the Study

Both experimental groups and the control group of students were drawn from the Catholic school system which has a mandatory religious education curriculum. Thus the ethical education was similar in content for all those enrolled in that system during their time in the classroom. It was likely, however, that there were large discrepancies in the moral training these students received at home. Whereas the initial test results may have shown the attitudes of these children as being slightly more positive than those of other children in non-sectarian schools, it was the change in attitude, if any, which was the focus of this study.

Individual teacher styles and degrees of enthusiasm for the project affected the manner in which the research was dealt with in the classroom. This variable was not controllable. A plea to read and to discuss with enthusiasm, and to encourage involvement with the research project, was made to the teacher of the control group and to the teacher involved with both experimental groups.

Lack of familiarity with tape-recording techniques on the part of the researcher caused some problems. It was found that attempts to tape-record discussions between children, while they were creating the drama, were totally inaudible because the noise level in the drama studio was too high. To achieve an acceptable level, it would have been necessary to remove groups from the studio while the children were in the process of creating the drama. Clearly this would have led to a highly artificial situation, vastly different from the situation to which the children were accustomed. The decision was made not to remove the children in order to record their interactive talking but rather to collect their accounts after they had their ideas well in hand. In like manner, videotaping led to distraction of the drama group, and it was decided to video their pieces as they completed them and when they were in a performance mode.

Although an outline of the drama theories has been given in both Chapters 2 and 4, the actual sessions did not resemble any one of these, nor was it intended that they should do so. This variable is one that should not be controlled, as to do so would interfere with the teaching style of the participating teacher. The drama was conducted as the teacher judged it should be, and is described in the analysis of participant obser-
vation in Chapter 6. After the drama teacher had time to read the research proposal, she was interviewed at the beginning of the study to discuss the proposal with the researcher.

Positive Aspects of the Study

A number of positive aspects of the study emerged, and they include the following:

1. The review of the philosophical literature provided a firm conception of an attitude and this conception informed the exploration of the participants' views which emerged in interviews, in their recorded talk, in the drama, and in the art work.

2. The pilot study aided in strengthening the validity of the quantitative instrument.

3. Aspects of the quantitative instrument which lacked depth were covered in the interview questions and in the accounts recorded by the participants.

4. Gender and race are variables which may affect group scores and this problem was dealt with by descriptive statistics of these sub-groups in the quantitative investigation, and by attention to variation in the choice of respondents in the qualitative descriptions.

5. Unequal numbers which the groups and sub-groups of respondents provide were acknowledged in the statistical descriptions.

6. Feelings and knowledge which the children could not yet articulate did find expression in the art work and in the video-taped drama. The interviews and observations of the teacher provided insights into methodology and philosophy of which the teacher was not herself aware.

The details of the study design have been dealt with in this chapter. Chapters 6 and 7 provide reports on the findings of the study in the qualitative and quantitative realms respectively. In the final chapter, the two approaches are drawn together in summary, connections and contradictions between them are pointed out, and the implications and conclusions are discussed as they relate to the nature of drama and to the nature of attitudes.
QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF THE INVESTIGATION

As indicated in the chapter dealing with the design of the study, a qualitative investigation was carried out within the framework of the quantitative study. The intention is to relate the findings of one method to the other. Therefore, in this chapter, a report of the findings from the use of qualitative methods is given and, following the report of the quantitative findings in Chapter 7, the two sets of findings will be compared to seek areas of agreement and disagreement.

In the first part of this chapter, the background and points of view of the co-researcher/drama teacher are given and the milieu of the study and the methods of teaching are described. The purpose of these descriptions is to make clear the context within which the school children undertook their drama investigation. It will be noted in the teacher's biography, for example, that many of her stances on drama, on the elderly, and on personhood have connections with some of the ideas discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Following this contextual orientation, reports of the data in each of the areas of interest in the study are made and triangulations will be indicated.

As mentioned early, all interviews conducted with children and the drama teacher were tape-recorded and transcribed, verbatim. All tapes are available from the author at The University of Calgary. The style employed here for reporting excerpts from the interviews has been modified slightly for ease in both reporting and reading; thus, at the close of a response, the reference will indicate the interview number (Int. I), the page number on which it appears in the transcription, and the date of the interview (e.g., Mar. 3/90).

The Drama Teacher

Kathleen Hanrahan (hereinafter referred to as “Kathleen”) was the drama teacher for both of the experimental groups in this study. Born in Sudbury, Ontario into a Canadian
air force family, she pursued her schooling in several different provinces and U.S. states. The family moved every two or three years. Her high school years were spent in Great Falls, Montana. Up to that time she had been raised in a very traditional home, but during the high school years she had difficulty in obtaining transportation to church. She felt she missed something during those high school years. Her friends at that time were debaters, “either agnostics or severe atheists” (Int. III, p. 27, Mar. 3/90). Accordingly, she decided that, “when I was on my own I would do something about it” (Ibid.).

When Kathleen enrolled in university, she found herself abandoned when the family moved east and “I got dropped off at this house—I was so naive from high school—and these kids were living together and drinking and doing dope and selling drugs and the whole works” (ibid.). She decided to investigate some churches and eventually became a Catholic after two years of pursuing her studies in art. She earned a Bachelor of Education degree with an art major and an English minor.

After graduation, Kathleen went to Medicine Hat, Alberta and taught high school art, was married, had her first daughter, and lived in Lethbridge, Alberta for a few months, looking after her daughter. She subsequently moved to Calgary, Alberta and obtained a job teaching art/music/drama in a junior high school. During this time she was assigned a special post with the Calgary Catholic School Board as a demonstration teacher in art and drama at the Fine Arts Centre. This post continued as she remarried and bore her second daughter. When the Fine Arts Centre was disbanded, she was appointed as an art teacher at the St. John School of Fine Arts. [At this time, the writer was the drama teacher in that school. When I left to enroll in doctoral studies, Kathleen moved into drama teaching].

When this project began, Kathleen was in the early stage of her third pregnancy, discovered that she was a diabetic, and, physically, was not very well. Even so, she read the research proposal and agreed to participate. However, the work was delayed until the constitution of the classes in the school could be finalized. Kathleen and this researcher had one meeting before this time to ensure a common understanding of the
research.

During the progress of the drama classes and the interviews Kathleen had some trouble with her health, discovered that the house the family was renting had been sold from under them, shopped for, bought and moved into a new home, and went into childbirth labour. Throughout all of this upheaval, she remained in unfailing good humour and retained her interest in this research.

The Teacher's view of Drama

Kathleen declared that drama is innate in the child and that its use in education is to educate the whole child, physically, spiritually, emotionally and practically. It gives the children a “sense of their own spirit” (Int. I, p.1, Oct., 10/89). Her view of education is that the individual spirit of the children should be supported by the education they receive. She stated that educators should use drama skills “to lead the children to further understand their own sense of self and their place in their own space and their place in greater space-to discover some reinforcement about who they are” (Int.I, p1, Oct.,10/89)

Since I was unsure of the meaning here, I returned to this topic in a later interview. The questions asked at the later interview and Kathleen’s responses are offered in full here:

Q. You said in the first interview that drama gives the children a sense of their own spirit. What I wondered was, if you could explain to me what you meant by “spirit”?

A. I think what I mean...like, I’d like the child to develop, or give them a sense of their own spirit, I mean to enable them. I want to be an enabler. I want to empower them. I want them to believe in their own intuitions, and their own ideas; to believe that those things are important to express, and they’re the basis for developing and growing and broadening their own insights. It has to do with—I’m talking spirit in the sense of the “human spirit”.

Q. Yes. It is a question of them — what they are now and what will they develop to be the core, the essence, of what they are as people?

A. Well, they need to know that now they have that! If they go tonight or go tomorrow they are valued and important just as they are. You know, with their little, wholesome selves, you know.

Q. Yes. So it’s really a kind of essence, the being, inside of them?
A. It's the absolute being. That's right—which we have at any age at any point in
development. We always have it. It's the same thing that makes a newborn cry,
you know the very essence of being. (Int. IV, Mar. 3/90, p. 23).

In further discussion of what Kathleen meant by saying that drama education was
"practical," she explained that she wanted children to take the learning achieved in
drama and insert it into other areas of thinking. She said that such use of drama
learnings might be intellectual, behavioural or social (Int. IV, Mar. 3/90, p. 24). The
metaphor which Kathleen used when she spoke of the children's space and their place
in greater space was revealed in this same later interview. The children's space she
conceived of as their firm sense of self which they carry away from the drama into the
larger world of social issues and of "what life is bringing them" (Int. IV, Mar. 03/90, p.25).

Kathleen said that an ideal education would use drama in every subject area in order
to involve the whole child in the learning. She believed that this could be done, that the
reality is that it is not done. Therefore it is vital, she asserted, that in the absence of
such a view of education, every child has the opportunity to experience the holistic
learning achieved through drama.

The Teacher's Methods of Teaching Drama

The characterization Kathleen gave to her preferred way of teaching drama was that,
"it is developmental" (Int. I, Oct. 10/89, p.3). She employs the children's present condi-
tion to involve them in structured dramatic play and her first concern is to move them
from play to an awareness of structure. This she does either by teacher-directed activi-
ties or by "drawing activities out of the children" (Int. I, Oct 10/89, p.3, ). The children
then move into building their own drama, and often one class is a continuation of the
preceding one. The children are building the lesson plans and she is doing what she
calls her "subversive guiding" to move the drama in the way she wants it to go (Int. I,
Oct 10/89, p.3).

Kathleen said that the first direction she wants for the drama is for teacher and chil-
dren to come to a mutual understanding of each other's cues. For "teacher survival,"
she builds in different roles for herself. After the children are in control of their bodies, she uses the structures of drama circle, audience rows, freezing, and lights on and off, to cue the children not only about what role the teacher will now take but also about the expectations for the children that are implicit in those roles. The drama circle demands of the children that they adopt the posture of drama and that they are intellectually prepared to focus on: the work for the day, their reactions and questions about that work, and the rules that the particular segment of the work requires. Audience rows have two main functions. The first is the obvious one of providing a situation where the children can show their work to each other. The second is the opportunity for the children who are audience to question the children who have shown their work. The third is to allow for effective group discussions, with the teacher initiating or involved in them. The use of “freeze” commands or of “lights off” is for two purposes—control and clarification of objectives for the work. When the room is too noisy or when the work is not of sufficient depth or skill, these strategies, she pointed out, allow the teacher to intervene very quickly without interrupting in any important way the flow of the drama the children are building. In this first stage, the teacher is taking the power in order to set up a structure for the drama which, she declared, will empower the children.

Kathleen then sets up cues for the children to recognize when she wants to discuss with them what they have created in their drama. By the simple expedient of sitting on a stool she signals to the children that now is the time for them to sit in their audience rows to discuss the work. When the children are building the drama, she will move from group to group and enter into the discussions. In class discussions she will adopt a role in place to illustrate a difficulty or to encourage thought, and if small groups come up to her with a difficulty she will adopt a role in order to help. Kathleen will not lead a whole-class drama in role nor will she move into small-group drama in role. She explained to me that she was not comfortable with these methods.

Although this description, derived by the researchers from interviews, video tapes, and from participant observation, is Kathleen’s preferred way of working. She described two other methods of teaching drama and their functions which she sometimes uses.
The first was what she calls a "teacher-direct it day." This is when she teaches skills, for example, formal mime skills which the children are going to practise. She does this because she believes it is important to cover the drama curriculum, because she believes that the acquisition of skills is necessary for the children to have the tools required to produce their own drama, and because they, the children, love to practice and then use these skills, as she says "over and over again" (Int. I, Oct. 3/89, p.7).

The second type of drama lesson Kathleen uses sometimes is a day, separate from the "doing of drama", when the children write in their journals. Here the children are reflecting privately on what they have done in their drama. This allows both the children and the teacher to see "how they have absorbed things and how they have thought them through" (Int. I, Oct. 10/89, p.9). Also, she sees this as valuable because it allows her to see what is happening for individuals in the drama, and she believes this is not otherwise communicated.

Of the methods described here, it was the first method of allowing the children to build their own drama both with (Group B) and without "subversive guiding" (Group A) which was used in the drama with the two Grade 5 classes involved in the study. This method Kathleen designated as the riskiest, "because as teacher you have to let go and sometimes things lose control and so that's scary, and you feel uptight when you've got to bring them back" (Int. I, Oct 10/89, p.8). The other method used consistently in the study was that of allowing the children to perform their drama pieces for the rest of the class, and asking for reactions and questions from the audience.

What happens in drama for the children?

Kathleen believes that something affirming of the individual self happens for the children as they do drama. Some children come to elementary school drama believing that they are going to learn how to become actors and actresses, and so Kathleen has the additional responsibility of making a distinction between what happens in the drama classroom and what theatre is for her students "so that their little hearts are not disappointed (Int. I, Oct 10/89, p.12). She feels lucky that, in this particular school, she does
not have to make similar explanations to the parents because "people have a lot of respect for what is happening. They see some carry-over from the drama into the children's daily behaviour" (Int. I, Oct. 10/89, p.12).

She did point out that the children do perform for the other grades three times a year in "celebrations", and that there is an expectation of an end-of-the-year performance. She believes that there are some important benefits to the performance element for the children: namely (a) It is a good preparation for the drama they will have to do in junior high school and senior high school, (b) "It is good for them to relate to an audience-to get the adrenalin up," (c) It is good for the children to learn that "rehearsals stink and that the final product usually comes together in the end." She sees the negative aspects of performance (for other grades or for the public) as: (a) "It is a lot of work for teachers and children and a lot of responsibility for children of that age. As a result the children feel a lot of stress and they feel anger which is expressed in their journals." (b) The notion of facing public space with their drama where they have to speak differently and behave differently means that a certain amount of conforming has to take place, and this is in marked contrast to the protected environment of the drama room. The children feel, Kathleen believes, that "all the trust I've built up with them I've taken away" (Int. I, Oct. 10/89, p.15). She insists that the children do enjoy the parental recognition that they receive as a result of performing.

Kathleen feels that there are "tons of connections" between drama in the classroom and books for children, and between language development and drama in the classroom. The children "become more articulate, feel more free to express their opinions, take more risks in speaking to adults, and speak more freely to one another" (Int. I, Oct. 10/89, p.18). Sometimes, she feels, "it happens naturally that drama offers the students an opportunity to come to understand circumstances in their own lives which are bewildering." She does not approve of drama as therapy and will not direct it. Children's drama is an art form, she believes, when it is happening in the "privacy of their own little world," but she sees performance as less of an art form because it is "less honest." She would like to see drama used as a learning medium in teaching of
other subjects. The social skills learned in drama, she feels, often do not transfer into other areas of experience because they are not reinforced. The doing of drama satisfies children, in her view, because an adult affirms their expression of opinions and feelings and because drama allows children to express themselves in the way that is most comfortable. As a teacher, she derives satisfaction from the children’s drama when that drama allows her “to see the child in myself and I am sitting there laughing my head off...like because I completely identify with their point of view”.

Teacher’s View of Ageing and of Old People

When asked when old age might be thought to begin, Kathleen explained that, for her, it was not a question that could be answered by reference to a person’s chronological age; rather it was a question that related to the state of health of persons and their attitude to their state of health. She felt that she, herself, could be classed as “old at 34” because she suffers from a condition which gives her chronic pain and the experts have given her little hope of recovery. Several times she emphasized that it is the limitations caused by failing health, together with the acceptance that there is no hope, which combine to give an “old-age attitude” (Int. II, Nov. 10/89, pp. 2,3,8). To illustrate her view of old age, she offered two major narratives which interwove with her own experience of health problems.

The first narrative was of her mother who was now, at age 50 younger, in Kathleen’s view, than she had been at 30. Her mother suffered a heart attack at age 47 and, as soon as she was sufficiently recovered to be mobile, instituted a program of “daily goals for herself—not long term—daily goals; goals by the hour!” first of all to get back to health and then to improve her appearance and her emotional state:

She’s in her fifties now and I’d say she’s more vital and a younger person than she ever was in her thirties! And honestly, now she’s young! And she’s beautiful——And her emotional self being well, just being so healthy in her thinking; less bitter, there wasn’t bitterness anymore and there was’nt—she did’nt uh, she no longer has to make people feel guilty. (Int. II, Feb/90, p.4)

The second narrative, which is also intimately bound up with her own, is that of
Grandpa Moors (her own grandfather). At retirement this man was selling off the equipment in his wooden mill because his wife had a dream of travel at retirement and he was training young people to take over the mill. Before he could retire, his wife fell sick and died, and

My Grandpa, then, had no goals. He had no goals! He was left at about 68, 69 with....To give her her dream. If he had to give up this equipment—he would choose to make her his goal. Yes, “now I will love you; now I will spend the time with you during the day that you need. (Int. II, Feb/90, p. 6)

As the narrative proceeds we learn that Grandpa Moors, “Even got on top of that, and he started running away to Montana on weekend visits with a woman from his church” Sadly, he did remarry— a woman who treated him as elderly and he became less manly, “he let , you know, this woman just made his decisions for him.” Kathleen sees her grandfather as having the two central goals in his life—the mill and her grandmother, “Everything that my Grandfather was and became is where I get my sense of self, really.” So in describing how her own affliction has made her old at 34, Kathleen refers to both of these narratives to explain that,

It has to do with attitude. Like, I still have this idea that in my mind, if I can stir up the right attitude and the right gumption, I can get on top of this even if I do have pain. So I think the means old people use to reach their goals is to get that attitude. (Int. II, Feb/90, p.8).

In two further narratives, Kathleen expanded on two other factors which the above narratives had touched on: (a) the effect that the loss of a loved one can have on the older person’s perception of their own age, and (b) the effect that the attitudes of others towards them can have on older persons. Compassionately, she drew a sketch of a retired caretaker who had lost his wife and a sketch of the plight of old people in general as others pass them by:

You’d quicker pass by an older-looking person, a person with white hair—let’s say
that that is a signal, a sign of old age—You see someone with white hair, you tend to walk by, rather than pause and relate? It has to do with relatedness, that's what it is. Is there a fear? I don't know what there is, but it's just an ignorance of people who are older. A fear, an ignorance, a not knowing. — I think that it is insensitive to them as human beings, as people. And they're aware of how others are treating them. (Int. II, Feb/90, pp. 8,9)

Kathleen sees herself in the shoes of such older people at a later date, and "all my wisdom of all that I've collected in my years, in my life, that there's not going to be one person who is going to give a bean" (Int. II, Feb/90, p.9). It is not really her own position which is central to her, however, and as she talks and thinks further about it a strong moral position emerges: "Take them for who they are please—dignity, dignity. Dignity is life—I don't think it should begin somewhere. I don't think it should end somewhere. I think that all human life deserves dignity forever" (Int. II, Feb/90, p.10)

The behaviours which would be central for Kathleen in the appropriate treatment of the elderly are inclusion of them in everyday activities, not just physically but in allowing them to make a contribution—"Let them bring you a cup of coffee sometimes"—and the permitting and tolerating of their rituals—"the minute someone takes that from him, he's losing part of the person he is" (Int. II, Feb/90, p.10) She stressed non-interference in the lives of the elderly but admitted that there are times when someone may have to interfere for the good of the elderly person. She is concerned even here that great care be taken and sensitivity demonstrated because "there is always the chance of unfairness whenever a person makes a decision for another" (Ibid.).

The Teacher and the Concept of Person

Kathleen explained that some people are not truly "persons". They don't allow themselves to become persons because of the limits they create by only developing one side of themselves. She gave examples of those who concentrate on only the intellectual or on mainly the physical in their lives. This she attributes in part to the work ethic and the reaction to that ethic which causes us to judge ourselves according to how our work has defined us. She sees an underemphasis on leisure pursuits, and believes
that we should allow them also to be the criteria by which we judge ourselves as persons. Furthermore, she believes that such dedication to a limited area of human endeavour as well as narrowing people also allows them to avoid the risks inherent in struggling to become a complete person. In particular, she cited those who are dedicated to presenting themselves "as pretty objects" (Int. Ill, Mar 3/90, p. 17).

In delineating characteristics of an ideal person, Kathleen emphasised the spiritual aspect of the person. By this she means "Spiritual in terms of viewing me as a person and accepting me." Such a person would be capable of talking with her at a deep level about themselves, about relationships and about the world, and they would be able "to relate and communicate on a spiritual level; to see each other as gift to each other" (Int. Ill, Mar 3/90, p. 20). The ideal person would also be able to accept the feelings other people have so that other persons would be safe in expressing their feelings to them. She envisages a person with whom she could be active and who would respect her interests and support them—someone who would call out the good in her, "looking at people as having great potential in the person—helping them to reach that potential—not to the point where you are hurting yourself—having the life sucked right out of you" (Ibid.). In order to acquire this respect for persons which she has described, Kathleen sees the first step as being social, "to be willing to risk and meet people on a level that... offers the possibility of discovering each other as gift" (Int. Ill, Mar 3/90, p. 23). Cooperation with others is the core for Kathleen of this growth in respect for persons. "The more people do that with one another, and take time for one another, that way, the more they are growing themselves"(Int., Mar 3/90, p.23). The reason she gives for teaching respect for persons is that,"what goes around comes around—If I want that for myself, then I should be 100% willing to give it". She offers firm support for notions of justice and fairness as the underpinning of the notion of respect, and quoted the African legend of the two crocodiles who share the same stomach. She feels that the civilized world is "so uncivilized," demonstrating "a sick aggression compared to less advanced cultures who share so much more with the old and with babies" (Int. Ill, Mar 3/90, pp.
17,18). While asserting that such teaching of respect begins at home, she said that it must grow to an ever-enlarging concept of justice (Int. III, Mar 3/90, p.25).

Summary of Ethnographic Insights on the Drama Teacher

The foregoing outline of the teacher of drama in this research project does reveal some important lines of belief and of moral principle which have relevance for the teaching of the topic of young people/old people. In addition, the narratives, reflections, and judgements on persons, on drama, and on old age have revealed large areas of agreement with the arguments presented in this study with regard to the nature of drama, appropriate attitudes to old people and to ageing, and with the categories of the empirical work. Each of these areas of agreement are dealt with in turn below.

Drama Theory and the Teacher's Perspective on Drama

The teacher perspective on drama, on what drama is for, on its uses, and on what happens in drama for the participant are those of a teacher and not of a theorist. Kathleen brings her philosophy of the importance of the dignity of the human person and their potential to inform her view of drama. She wants the children, through drama, to come to see themselves as worthwhile in their feelings and opinions. She does not mention the acquisition of knowledge but affirms the beliefs of the children. However, in her practice, Kathleen makes use of many different books for children which then inform the drama the children create, for example, she will often use the study of African legends as a starting point for storytelling or for dramatization. She emphasizes that both the action and the reflection components are important. In her discussion of the children's opinions, she is very close to the notion of the investigation of values and attitudes offered by the researcher in Chapter 3.

The areas of disagreement are also important. Kathleen is much closer to the work of Way (1967) than is the position argued for in Chapter 4. There is less insistence on logic, on elements of form—as distinguished from elements of skill—on the offering of good reasons and on teacher direction toward understanding, which is undertaken in a
deliberate and sequenced structuring of the drama work by the teacher. As a result, and as the descriptions of the methods of instruction show later in the chapter, the difference in the methods employed with the two groups is a small one.

The Teacher and the Concept of a Person

The description given of ideal persons, of goals of persons, and of the means to these goals is very similar to the notion of symbiosis in respect for persons as argued in Chapter 3. The teacher’s concept of fairness, of justice, and ideas about co-operation, talking, and acceptance, have their counterparts in both the theory of drama offered in this study and in the discussion of personhood. Kathleen’s notion of growing as a person, as one cooperates and supports the goals and means of others, is very close to Strawson’s (1962) second postulate. It is the case, however, that the connection between the basic concept of personhood and the method of teaching the drama was not made by this teacher. This statement asserts that no steps were taken to structure the drama to bring the concept of personhood together with the concept of attitude toward the elderly, but it does not assert that the teacher had not herself made that connection.

The Teacher and the Elderly

The view that the elderly were inappropriately treated in our society was supported both in Chapter 4 and in teacher interviews. The notions of: (a) knowing the elderly, (b) allaying fears of them and of old age as a state, (c) honouring the goals and means of old people, and (d) approaching the understanding of the elderly as requiring independence, and (e) recognizing them for what they are, were very clearly and forcefully expressed by this teacher. These were the four categories (knowledge, discernment, rapprochement, and phobia) investigated in the use of the empirical instrument (reported in Chapter 7). These four categories and the teacher’s identification of similar ones are those which contribute to the central notion of respect for persons argued for in Chapter 3 as appropriate attitudes toward persons as we strive for symbiosis.
The notion of scrutiny of self and scrutiny of evidence and offering of good reasons were not part of the conceptual base of the teacher as a conscious articulation or as principles of procedure in her practice. This is not to say that they were not there, but it is true that they were not insisted upon or suggested in the drama methods which Kathleen employed with either of the experimental groups.

The teachers in charge of the classes which comprised the control group were neither interviewed nor observed in their classroom practice because they were not dealing with the concept of young people/old people with their groups.

**Context of Study**

The children were involved in a discussion/information session before the study began. I explained to them that I was interested in finding out what they thought went on for them in drama, that I was interested in discovering what their ideas were about young people/old people, and also in how their thoughts and feelings about the topic changed after they had studied them in drama. I explained that I had to know what they really thought and felt and not what they thought I wanted them to feel and think. For this reason, I wanted them to become co-researchers with me in the project. The teacher, Kathleen, participated in the discussion and gave them the packages containing permission slips and S.E.S. forms, (see Appendix A) to take home. They posed many questions which I attempted to answer, about how we were going to do this. I took them through the various steps that we would follow and gave them my reasons for following these steps. It might be thought that to clearly delineate the purposes of the study would have an effect on what the children would say and do during the experiment. This was both an ethical point and a design dilemma. Ethically, the children had to be “co-researchers” and not “subjects”. The design problem of guarding against a Hawthorne effect was a real one. I tried to offset this possibility by emphasizing at the time, and throughout the course of the study, that only what they honestly believed to be the case was of any use in the pursuit of new knowledge, in general, and in the pursuit
of understanding the drama and its possible effects, in particular.

**Methods Employed in Teaching Drama**

As described in Chapter 4 there were two experimental Groups, A and B. Although the classes were equal in size, the number of children taking part in the experiment was not the same for each group. This problem occurred because some children had declined to take part, some had entered the school after the study was underway, and the presence of a Grade 5/6 split class whose members were added in equal numbers to each of the Grade 5 classes for drama. Group A was taught by a drama method which allowed the children complete control over the content of their drama. Class instruction for this group was restricted to reminders of skill criteria and to management of the class. Indeed, the teacher remarked that she "became a manager in this class" (Int. IV, Apr. 3/90, p. 5). The children were given only the title—"Young people / old people" (hereinafter referred to as YP/OP).

Group B was taught with teacher intervention to guide the content of the drama. In addition to the skills criteria, the children were asked either to "Tell me something about YP/OP" or "Give me a message about YP/OP" (Field notes Oct 23/89; Nov. 20/89) [This type of notation indicates the writer/researcher's own diarized notes, carefully recorded during observation of the drama lessons.] This could be described as instruction about the content. With this group, too, there were shared narratives about YP/OP by the teacher. Several times the discussion on the sharing or showing of a piece of work hinged around what message was given or what was learned about YP/OP in the drama.

In reflecting with Kathleen on the two different teaching methods she used, she said her interventions were minimal in the Group B drama, and that perhaps she might not have made as great a difference in the two as I wished for. This was, in fact, a concern of mine as the experiment progressed, although I was determined not to suggest or to guide the teacher's interpretation of what constituted the difference in the two methods. The purpose of the methods was not to teach attitudes in either case, but rather to lead
the children effectively to teach themselves. In the case of Group A, the intent was to allow them to stumble upon whatever the employment of drama would reveal to them (as in the Way (1967) approach). In the case of Group B, the intent was that the teacher-directed drama would lead the children to a direct confrontation with the notion of respect for persons, for its implications, and for its justifications. As I watched all the classes and re-read my field notes, I assumed—because there was such a slight difference in the two methods that there would not be much chance of the research results showing any difference between the two groups in the effect of the drama investigation (both were closer to Way’s (1967) methods than they were to any of the other theories of drama in education). The first inkling that our assumptions were wrong came when we watched the drama the children created at the end of the first unit, which was on mime. The second shock came when, some three weeks later, both groups showed their story telling at the end of that unit. Using only the content about old people as criterion the work produced was of widely differing quality as pieces of drama. At a subsequent interview, both the teacher and this chief researcher agreed that Group A’s drama pieces were superficial, short, unclear, and rather boring and that, in contrast Group B had produced pieces which were interesting, showed evidence of thought, and were longer—in some cases quite extended (Int. IV, Apr 3/90, pp. 5,6,7). The Teacher and I did not think this was due to the difference in method; indeed, we assumed that it was not. As a result and in addition to the testing already planned for, we decided to test the I.Q. of the two groups after the experiment was over. Interviews with the children in the month of March, 1990, however, threw an entirely different light on the matter, and will be reported later in this chapter.

Details of the Methods

For the Group A, lessons concentrated on the skills of drama and on an understanding of the form with which the children were dealing at any given time. In the first unit, mime, the emphasis was on mime as a silent art, on clarity in the movements and gestures used, on the care that had to be exercised in the portrayal of feelings of the
characters, and on the use of the children's knowledge of their sensory experience. These were the objectives given to the children and they were the points of discussion in the evaluation of their created mime pieces. The two following units were storytelling and dramatisation. Throughout all three units of the drama study of YP/OP, the more general skills of focus posture, control of the physical self, believability and clarity in the work, were continuously demanded in addition to skill in the genre of dramatic expression employed. Indeed, the self-evaluations by the children attended exclusively to focus, posture, and self control. For the Group A, after the above objectives were given and the children were ready to go off in pairs to create their drama pieces, then and then only were they reminded that the topic of the drama they created was to be YP/OP.

Group B, after a brief reminder about the general skills and the specific mime skills, was sent off into pairs and asked to recall the events from The Berenstain Bears and the Week at Grandma's, to choose an event, and to create in mime an incident which showed an young person having fun with a grandparent. This was followed by a session of walking as the cubs felt when they were left at Grandma's, walking as the cubs thought Gran and Gramps would look before they met them, moving as the grandparents thought the cubs would move before they met them, and, finally, walking through the meeting of the cubs and grandparents. The children were then asked to lie down, curl up, and get into their heads a picture of an old person they knew or had seen, and then they walked in the space as the old person. In audience rows, the class then viewed the characters created and reacted to the feelings that they discerned in each other's work. The last part of this lesson was spent in pairs beginning work on a mime involving a young person and an old person. Again, the teacher's side-coaching was on the portrayal of the feelings of the two characters.

In the evaluation of the mime pieces the Group A was continually asked what feelings were shown and what use of the senses were used. The Group B was asked, in contrast, what the work told them about YP/OP. In addition, the Group B was given a teacher narrative about an experience she had had as a young child with an old person,
and a long class discussion ensued about fear of old people, how that affects us, and whether it is a justifiable fear. The narrative and the discussion were evoked by one of the created mimes which showed fear of old people.

The mimes of the Group A led also to a class discussion of whether one of the mimes shown was realistic. It was a mime that showed the YP being violent towards the OP. The children gave many examples of either experiences of people being mean to old people or of reports of similar behaviour from TV or newspapers. With the Group A there was an extended class discussion of the likelihood of old people riding motorcycles which had been portrayed in one of the mimes they created and watched. The children moved from this to a discussion of the things that old people can do that other age groups might not think they can do. During this discussion, some children were completely absorbed by the ideas being offered, some looked skeptical, and some nodded agreement. One girl told of her grandmother who did aerobics and who was fitter than the girl. This story seemed to have great impact on the class who listened intently and for the most part looked either thoughtful or vindicated by it.

The second unit in which the two groups studied the topic of YP/OP was one on storytelling. Before the research project started, the children in both groups had learned a string game of building a ladder and now they were to use this game as they told their stories. Again the emphasis with the Group A was on the form of the storytelling and the skills involved in being a good storyteller. They were told that the story had to be about YP/OP and had to include at least two characters. Group B also were reminded of the same criteria, but the emphasis here was on the message they were going to communicate to their audience about YP/OP. The teacher asked for volunteers to show their stories before they were completed, and then commented on the messages they conveyed before they went off to work on them again.

See if you can solve something, teach something. Respect concerns of YP/OP. Think of yourselves telling the stories to a Grade 3 class and substitute problems—change things to give it meaning—build on your story events. Stories should always show change but you need to spend time on the meaning. The next time I stop you I
am going to ask you for the message of your story. (Field notes, Nov. 20, 1989)

In the dramatization, the third unit of the study of OP/YP, again the emphasis for Group A was on the skills of this genre, and they were told to take the theme YP/OP and "do with it what you wish—we lost it in the storytelling." They were then given time to sort themselves into groups according to the numbers of characters required in the stories and poems the teacher had selected. The stories and poems were distributed to the appropriate groups and the children set to work. Several children approached the teacher during the class and said that they did not know what part or all of their story meant, and others came up to the teacher to say they did not know what the story had to do with YP/OP. To each of these groups, the teacher returned a similar reply, "What do you think it means?"

The teacher prefaced her introduction to dramatization with Group B by remarking to me, "I want to explain the stereotypes and ask them to rebuild a more honest picture." She began by asking how many felt they had grown in ideas and understanding of old people, and 13 children claimed that for them this was the case. A discussion was then initiated of what we mean by a stereotype. At the end, the teacher warned that the stories and poems they were going to use in dramatization had many stereotypes of old people in them and that it was up to them to find them by looking at the characters very carefully. She made it clear that these stereotypes were to be changed in their dramatization so that the characters were portrayed in a more genuine and honest fashion. The children had difficulty with this concept and the teacher helped the groups in detecting the stereotypes, in eliciting from the children what a more honest picture of the character might look like, and in explaining the meanings in the text which they could not discern. The teacher again insisted with Group B that it was a message about understanding old people that they were concerned with in building the drama.

The descriptions of the drama produced by the children in each of the three units will not be given here. If there is interest in viewing the products on videotape or any of the other documentation they may be obtained from the author. Examples of some
transcribed interviews follow the references in the thesis’ appendix. (See Appendix F, G). The reasons for excluding such descriptions are: (1) that this investigation is limited to what the drama changed, if anything, about the children’s attitudes to old people; and (2) the performance product was discovered, by interview, to reveal only the tip of the iceberg of what was taking place in the children’s minds and feelings as the project progressed.

Children’s View of Drama

In interviews with the children, an attempt was made to discover what the children thought the drama was for, what happened for them when they were involved in doing drama, and what learning went on in drama class. It is important to note that the children were interviewed in pairs, or in groups of three or four. The small groups interviewed came sometimes from Group A and sometimes from group B so that the views of both could be compared. The decision to interview in groups caused problems in transcribing the tapes but it led to more open discussion, often among themselves (see Appendix F, G). This was a procedure I adopted intuitively. The children’s words transcribed here will all be double spaced since there are a large number of them and they include many over four lines and many less than four lines.

What Drama is About

In analyzing the interviews it was discovered that for the children drama was about people, their feelings, their thoughts, their problems, and their opinions. This section documents the triangulations on each of these points.

“Drama its ...its what people do” (Int. I, Nov. 20/89, Boy 1, Group B, p. 1).

“Yeah, and he wasn’t sure how many I was drinking and he was like, "Oh my gosh" he’s wondering how much I drink and he’s wondering if that’s why I close the door in his face, and stuff” (Ibid., Boy 1, Group A, p. 4).

“Its about people...It deals with their problems... their moments of joy their sad
times, their thinking, their mad times" (Ibid., Girl 1, Group B, p. 22).

"I think it’s like puzzles. Um, I think the puzzle’s about um, the ways that you can, um, think of what your experience is" (Dec. 12/89., Boy 2, Group B, p. 8).

A. "I thought it might be different to use animals instead".

Q. And what were the animals standing for inside your head?

A. "Human beings" (Int. II, Dec. 20th., Girl 1, Group A, p. 2).

"Because then you know what other people feel like and not just yourself but other people" (Ibid., Girl 2, Group A, p. 5).

"About people I guess. Different things people can do"—Boy 3 Group A

"Learning about emotions"(Ibid., Girl 3, Group A, p. 9).

"Well it's fun, because you get to um, other people tell stories and you get to know what they feel like and they might feel the same as you" (Ibid., Girl 2, Group B, p. 10).

"Working on ideas about everyday life" (Ibid., Boy 3, Group B, p. 24).

"Yeah, and then when you act out, you act someone different and you learn what other people may feel besides what they’re really acting (Ibid., Girl 1, Group A)

"Yeah, because, say, if you’re this one person, and you’re your normal self and then you act this other person who has deeper feelings ‘cause your acting for them in a play, and then when you watch it, you’ll find that other people do act different. So if you see someone like that you’ll know what’s bothering them; how they’re maybe feeling and that you can always come and help them" (Int. III, Mar. 1/90, Girl 3, Group B, p. 4).

"I know to learn more about people" (Ibid., Boy, Group A, p.13).

"You also get to learn about people’s feelings (Ibid., Girl 4, Group B, p.14).

"How you think" (Ibid., Girl 4, Group B, p.14).

"Well, the other people—what they think, like, what the—imagination of a creature or a character, or the, um, the thoughts she thinks the character would be like”

(Int. II, Mar. 1/90, Girl 4, Group A, p.20).

"It’s also like stepping into another characters shoes, and having fun and seeing what they’re like" (Int., Dec 12/89, Boy 4, Group A, p.5).
In each of the above cases, different children were being interviewed and, in each case, they were responding to questions on what drama was about. For these children, the experience of drama was about people, their feelings, their thoughts, their imaginations, and their motivations. What they seemed to want to convey was that, through doing drama, they could come to understand other people and be more able to identify with them.

What Children Use in Doing Drama

The same group of children were also asked questions on what happens inside them as they are building a piece of drama. The following documentation reports their views on this topic. When asked where they got their ideas for the drama they had created, they offered this series of replies:

"Yeah, it's just like my brother and my Mom. My brother can go to parties. If he drinks, he has to phone my mom. My mom won't care. My mom will just go and pick him up and bring him home. And then she'll just send him straight to bed" (Int. I, Nov. 20/89, Boy 2, Group A, p. 3).

This response was meant to explain why the old person agreed to join his son in drinking—an incident which had occurred in his drama.

"It has to go into your heart, into your mind, and into your soul to find what you are going to do for this play. Maybe there has been an incident where a young person or an old person has helped you, or both" (Int. I, Nov. 20/89, Girl 3, Group B., p. 21).

"You use your imagination" (Int. I, Nov. 20/89, Boy 3, Group B, p. 21).

"Well, um, I think that, in, T.V., I watch a lot of it. And movies. I like watching them. And, um, I get ideas from all of those and mix them together. And then I put them to make sense and uh... (Int. II, Dec. 12/89, Boy 6, Group A, p. 7).

"From myself like well, like my cat she used to have a real long name, it was Topsy, and I could spell it when I was three..." (Ibid., Boy 4, Group B, p. 7).

This response was meant to explain an unusual character that had been used in this
boy's drama creation. Even though the character was just a baby in a cradle, he could talk.

"I can just listen to people's stories and stuff. Well, it helps me get ideas and stuff" (Ibid., Boy 5, Group A, p. 9).

"Well my grandpa died before, so I sorta got my idea from that" (Ibid., Girl 5, Group A, p. 5).

"Oh well, I was playing in the garage with some mouse traps we were fixing up, and my grandfather came in to help me with it. And we used a ladder to climb up and put them into these places, and that's how I got the story" (Ibid., Boy 5, Group A, p. 7).

When he was watching other pieces of drama that were shown before they were finished one boy tried to explain how his partner had got an idea:

"Um, it could be, um, one about Patrick's—uh, the motorcycle one. It could be that, um, that old people could, um, do have a lot of money, and then, he just thought, oh, and then when he watched it he just thought of the opposite. And so....."

Q. Is that right, John? However could you have thought that? That's excellent! Of course! Could I ask you something, John?

A. Yes.

Q. Do sometimes the things you see in drama bring up to your mind the opposite things?

A. Yes ......Well, I never even did see an old man on a motorcycle”. (Int. II, Dec. 12/89, Two boys, Group A, p. 3).

"Well it was getting close to Christmas and I thought to make it more interesting I'd use a character that was from Christmas." (Int.II, Dec. 12/89, Girl 4, Group A, p. 3).

"Like it's, gets more familiar with you each time you do it, and, I'm not really sure. It's sort of gets familiar with you, so you can, it's simpler each time you do it." (Ibid., Girl 4, Group A, p. 4).

"Well, my grandpa died before, so I sorta got my idea from that, when both of the
parents died in the aeroplane (characters in her piece), and my grandpa died from cancer. (Ibid., Girl 7, Group B, p. 5).

"We changed them (from the real life events), like, to make them more exciting and make them sound more interesting." (Ibid., Boy 6, Group B, p. 8).

"Well I used this one experience I had with my grand ma. Well, I had to go over to her house for the summer..."(Ibid., Girl 6, Group A, p. 16).

There were many more examples of this type. In short, the children seemed to be saying that when they come to create their drama they use their experience of characters, of places, of animals, of situations and of things as well as their imaginations. This is in line with Boal's (1969) idea of Metaxis, with Bolton's (1984) account discussed in Chapter 2 and with the theory of drama offered by this writer in Chapter 4. In each of these accounts and in the interviews with the children, one notion was clear: The experience of the child and the use of imagination being employed together in the here and now of the drama. Furthermore, there was the suggestion from two different children that they "put it to make sense" or, "It's simpler each time you do it". So, for some children at least, there appeared to be an awareness that the drama was helping to sort out in their heads things which they had experienced. The difference between the two groups seemed to consist of a highly personalized insistence on the here and now of personal reflection for Group A, while for Group B the reflections were more generalized, with fewer references to personal anecdote.

The Purpose of Drama

All of the children were asked to explain why drama contributed to their education and to try to describe what they thought was unique about it. The following exerpts indicate their thinking on this matter.

"Well, because if there's a lesson, if there's a moral, that's all you should think about! The moral" (Int., Nov. 20/89, Boy 3, Group A, p. 6).

"You don't have to be quiet. You can talk in drama! And you can't do that in math. or
in, well you can talk in French, but you can't talk about things that are really im­por­tant." (Ibid., Girl 3, Group B, p. 16).

"Okay. I also think that um, drama is there for a certain purpose. It's there because we need as human beings, to show our emotions and just socialize with other people. And show them our...like you could show your point of view in a couple of different ways: Show your point of view in a lecture. You could show it in a report; you could show it in art; but you can show it in drama!...Well, it joins up with, uh, brains. Your head, the thinking head. It, um, comes from God's talents" (Ibid., Girl 3, Group B, p. 18).

Adding to this, her friend said, "Are you trying to say that God sometimes sends down messages and He puts them in our heads so that we can...that we can act them, and so other people can get the message of what we're acting?" Her friend agrees: "Yes, something like that" (Ibid., Girl 4, Group B, p. 18).

"We need drama for education. Because drama is one of the most wonderful ways of exploring your opinion! And it's also one of the most wonderful ways of learning, learning to have self control, learning to deal with yourself" (Ibid., Girl 3, Group B, p.20).

"I think it's from way, back" (Int. 1, Dec. 12/89, Girl 4, Group B, p. 4).

"I think it's for learning in different ways, maybe" (Ibid., Boy 3, Group A, p. 4).

"You're sort of growing" (Ibid., Boy 4, Group A., p. 4).

Referring to the storytelling unit where they were using a string game to develop their stories, one student offered, "It's like you're in a different world! You're in a totally different land, a totally different world, and you're, you sort of go back into the future, or something; or up to the future, into the future" (Ibid., Girl, Group B).

"You learn how to tell stories. To make up stories with your imagination. You also learn lessons, and things like that in legends, and things like that too...And you can show your emotions a lot about stories and about the things you think of" (Int. 1,
“Well, it’s fun, because you get to, um, other people tell stories and you get to know what they feel like and they might feel the same as you” (Int. II, Dec. 12/89, Girl 5, Group B, p. 10).

“You learn to be comfortable in front of an audience, talking right to an audience sometimes” (Ibid., Girl 6, Group B, p. 22).

“You learn to focus, and maybe when you’re older, if you have to, like, maybe if you have to meet in front of a whole bunch of people and something so you won’t be nervous...Well, we share ideas...About, well, if we’re doing stories, or if we have to, like, do the same as the other person, the other person might say, “well let’s do this,” and then add in that....(Ibid., Girl 4, Group B, p. 22).

“You might want something different. You might not want to participate. Like me I didn’t want to be an old”..(Int., Mar 1/90, Girl 6, Group A, p. 54). We worked out good ‘cause we kind of all wanted to be old...And we agreed to co-operate really good...Uh we got along better, and when we were in mime I found it more easier because there’s all girls. I was the only girl in dramatization (in her group) so it was a bit harder. But it still cooperated (Ibid., Girl 5, Group A, pp. 544-562).

“We’re learning how to do things just in case it wants to be our career when we grow up....Then I would say that they should keep drama because it keeps you—you learn how to act with big groups and small groups and how you can change your voices, and how you can become other people, and how your mood changes, and when you act with bigger groups and small groups you learn more, because, um, you might think big group that it would all be chaos, or it might be all so good. But in it you find different opinions and that helps in drama because in other classes you don’t learn that. Like how to work with big groups and small groups”(Ibid., Girl 8, Group A, p. 13).

“Yeah, because, say, if you’re this one person, and you’re your normal self, and then you act this other person who has deeper feelings “cause you’re acting for them in
the play, and then when you watch it, you’ll find that other people do act different. So if you see someone like that you’ll know what’s bothering them; how they’re maybe feeling, and that you can come and help them...Yes because you have nothing else. You’re all working together. (Ibid., Girl 4, Group B, p. 14).

" We get to know about each other... You learn more...more about...about other peoples ...Well, other people what they think like, what the imagination of a creature or a character, or the,um; the thoughts she thinks the character would be like... So you know what they thought the character would be like...And then when a girl and a boy...understand how girls think and how boys think...Because you can never understand how the opposite sex thinks...Yes, because maybe when you get married if you understand your husband's thoughts...And not get into as much fuss. So you can use your drama skills anywhere. And not only in acting but anywhere—and in your marriage—your family—yeah your job, your classes— your brother —and boys—and you can use your drama skills in school (Int. II, Mar. 1/90, Girl, Group B, p. 21-22).

The following excerpt consists of two girls in Group A talking very fast over one another.

A. "And it has a kind of message like a fable."

Q. But that’s not what you start out to do?

A." No, but you get a message in your head, like, about the meaning—I had to get that character of a blind man that, see I've never been blind so,—and in one case we were poor and I've never been poor, and in fact——Yeah. And also, like, when we were practicing it, we had a dog, but then we realized we’d have to eat the dog if we were poor, so

Q. So you decided not to act being poor?

A. Yeah, Yeah.

Q. So you found out what about yourselves?

A.1. Um, how lucky we are.

A.2. More about us, with what I did most of the time in drama—Yeah, So we have,
in the drama, like, I'd say to the chairman of the school board, we have time to share our thoughts in drama. We have, she gives us time to, uh, like, sort of, uncover our thoughts in drama.

Q. When we were talking about the dog, you didn't want to kill it.
A. “No. We valued it—Yeah, and also if we did a dramatization on, maybe, uh, parents dying, and stuff, we'd realize how lucky we are to have our parents—And then you'd go home and see them different” (Int., Mar. 1/90, Girls 8 and 9, Group A, pp. 23-26).

In these excerpts on the purpose for doing drama, the children were addressing a topic that they seldom, if ever, think about. They were engaging in thinking about their own thinking, feelings, and gut reactions about what is true for them in the drama class. It was difficult for them; they had long pauses and sudden rushes of ideas [or insights] where they tended to interrupt and talk over one another, but they gave the impression that they enjoyed it, and usually left the interviews with thoughtfull looks, satisfied looks or with overt expressions of “That was great!”. The interviews conducted in March, 1990 took place after the post-test, and there was no need to be concerned about the learning occurring in the interviews rather than in the drama. These interviews were therefore more pointed, and included what could be called drama questions such as: “If I were chairman of the school board, how would you convince me to keep drama in the school?” Again, although the interviews with members of the two groups held the main ideas in common with one another, there was once more an insistence in Group A on personal anecdotes and on individual personal learnings, while in Group B there was a greater tendency to apply the individual learnings more generally.

The answers given seem to indicate three areas of agreement among all the children interviewed:

1. In drama children learn about each other's thoughts and feelings in ways that are not possible in other subjects.

2. By adopting a character or a situation in drama they are able, (a) to come to understand better those in different circumstances from their own, and (b) to
come to value differently their own and other's situations.

3. In drama they are able to express their opinions on a wide variety of topics.

These notions seem to support the view that by studying old people in drama the children might express their opinions about them, might come to understand each other's thoughts and feelings on the matter, and might come to value old people differently.

The Children's View of Old People After the Drama

The children were asked, in this section of the interviews, to reflect on the drama they had done and explain what they thought the drama was about. At this point the drama teacher and I began to see that what had been for us some rather poor drama produced by Group A had, in fact, some substantial substance which the actual performances did not reveal. However, a distinction between the two groups will not be made in the analysis of the interviews; rather, the analysis will attend to the overall view which the children had of old people and their view of what had changed in their attitudes toward old people. In this section it was not clear at all times who was speaking on the tapes, but I did know which were boys and which were girls and from which groups they came. The following are some examples of the transcriptions.

Q. What section of yours [mime] might people [as audience] not have liked?
A. When I joined him [in the drinking]—well, some people might think if old people drink, that old person might, like, ... be mean to kids, or something."
A. "And they might also think that that person's going to get drunk and sick and..
A. "He's dumb, He's gonna live in a dumpster or something"
(Int., Nov.20/89, Boys, Group A, p. 5).

"Well, I think old begins at retirement age because that's when the bosses, um, thinks a person's getting too old for their job" (Ibid., Boys, Group A, p. 9).

"They could be old whenever they want to be old,'cause, like, you could be 75 and still be young! You could act just like a kid" (ibid., Boys, Group A, p. 9).

"Well, if you want to be old you can be old. You could just sit around the house or
something like that. And if you want to be young, you can still be young. You could play soccer." (Ibid., p. 10). This same boy, in speaking of his grandmother, related how she taught him to carve soap and I remarked that she must be an artist. He replied, “Everyone’s an artist in their own way.”

“Well, we learned that old people and young people, they’re not, they don’t have to be enemies. They can be friends too (Ibid., Girl, Group A, p. 11).

“So I’ve even learned that you should always respect your elders” (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p.11).

“You can even be stronger than other younger people, when you’re older” (Ibid., Girl, Group A, p. 11).

“It’s just that people who can’t do as much, or maybe don’t keep up with things that are happening in the world. Maybe they are a little bit behind in what’s happening, so maybe life—life to us, maybe we think that they seem old because they’ve lived so much longer than us. And they don’t really understand and they still have their ways from when they were little...” (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 12).

“I know my great-great-grandmother. She just thinks, like, she’s no good any more. And some of them, some mothers, think that they should have lots and lots of attention, but not always other people do that. So they might feel left out, or they might feel that they don’t belong, or nobody wants them.....Well, we can, um, change that if we make them feel like we want them—that they’re special to us! Because I think that some old people are really lonely—just like in our mime—no one is left and I should be gone too—nobody comes to visit them...they just forget about them...nobody ever calls, or writes them letters. None of their grandchildren ever call them up and say, ‘Hey, Grandma, you want to come over and have some fun’—Or maybe they have a problem with their legs, right? And they think that other people are not gonna want them with them because they have a problem with their legs and maybe other people will tease them and they won’t want to be with them anymore....Too good for other people [teenagers] But you never know, you may be
like that someday too, and how will you feel?...You have to respect other people's feelings, because if you don't respect other people's feelings, it's going to come back and hit you in the face some day Yep! (Ibid., Girl, Group A, pp. 12-15).

"Well the old man in his house...because he hardly had any money...well because they might be slow getting to the bank (to pay taxes)"

"I used to think that old people were really rich because when they retire they have a lot of money, because they might save up all the money that they get paid from their jobs. So they have enough money to pay their taxes and everything....Well, in John's drama he might not have had a job or anything...Yeah he didn't have enough money I guess" (Int., Dec. 12/89, Two boys, Group A, pp. 2-5).

"It was about all of them I guess [people] young people and old people that they can help each other....and they help each other. They both help each other" (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 1).

"It's, uh, you could have fun with your grandpa, if you don't really know that, or with your grandparents...and they can have fun with you...create things with you" (Ibid., Boy, Group B, p. 12).

"That grand parents still have good advice. Like, sometimes they can have good advice like other people....The grandmother always kept on trying, and trying and trying with her grand daughter until they got it right...Well, I think it's so important of trying and trying so then you can know that it's easier...the better you can get at it" (Int., Dec. 20/89, Girl, Group A, p. 13).

"Old people can be very wise and helpful to young people" (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 20).

"He was really surprised at what the grandapa had done, so then he said he wanted to use the weedeater to get close to the fence to make it neat. So the grandpa got it down, and when he was using it he couldn't get it to work right, so the grandpa came over and he helped him to do it better" (Ibid., Boy, Group B, p. 20).

"I feel sorry for them [old people] because they're the same people and they
can't...they just move slower sometimes and that. And then people make fun of them, or they don't talk to them, or you know, when they need help they don't get it" (Int., March 1/90, Girl, Group A, p. 2).

Q. Because the children in your mime...
A. Didn't know about, didn't like them [old people]...
Q. Didn't know enough about old people?
A. And then these ones did....
Q. Did you know a lot about them before?
A. Yep.
Q. Was he an old person that you knew at the beginning of your mime?"
A. No, No.
Q. But you got to know him and then you didn't feel the need... I think sometimes when we're afraid of things, what are the ways we show we're a little bit scared?.
A. We act different. We act more mean....We blame others because we're afraid (Ibid., Girl, Group A, pp. 2, 3).

"That they're [old people] good and lots of help, and they can give lots of advice about what to do...And they can build stuff" (Ibid., Boy, Group B, p. 4).

"Well you still need other people, and co-operation will work, even though they're older." (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 6).

"Most people always take advantage of the older person. Like, young people are always beating up the older person. Okay me and Carlos—okay, I was in the house and Carlos is the older person, he's the grandpa. He came to visit and um, then we went to go and listen to a tape and I started dancing. Then Carlos tried it and it was quite bad. Then we tried something that Carlos knew, which was drawing and then it was really good" (Int., March 11/90, Two Boys, Group B, pp. 1, 2).

Q. "What did the two of you [the young person and the old person] do with the book's help?"
A. Get together in a relationship and...find out that we have a good relationship with the children" (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 4).
In all of the above, and in the transcripts in which they were embedded (see Appendices E, F, G) there is a discernible recognition, or a growing recognition, that old people are full persons as are young people, and that the children understand or have come to understand that elders are often not thought of, or treated as if they were full persons. The differences between the two groups, in this last unit are now less marked. More of the children in Group A have moved to general statements about the elderly as persons, so that their replies have become less distinguishable in content from Group B responses. This change may have been a function of the differences in the questioning and in the focus of the questions. However, it can be said that even when the questions were personal, some of the respondents in Group B did revert to general responses while the members of Group A did not until they were required to generalize, by the nature of the questions.

In the next set of abstracts the children specify how their attitudes toward old people have changed as a result of doing the three drama units, and this will be reinforced by the journal writing they did just after the drama ended in late January. The video tapes did not shed any light on the gains in children’s understanding or on the change in attitudes which occurred, so they will not be described or referred to. The last part of the discussion of qualitative data deals with the analysis of children’s pre- and post-drawings and this, too, will be seen to reinforce the interviews. Thus, it will become clear that triangulations from within the children’s accounts are also triangulated, outside their accounts in interviews, by drawings and private journal writing

How the Children’s View of Old People Changed

In an interview with the drama teacher, where we shared reflections on the drama and how we felt it had gone, Kathleen expressed the idea that the children might have created the drama to suit one or both of us and not from a sense of conviction about what they believed to be true. We discussed this point at some length and she concluded that this was more likely to be true for Group B children, who were more teacher-directed, “Because they had more clues given to them about how I felt on the topic of
old people” (Int. IV, Feb, 18/90, p. 20). On the other hand Group A may have been, “just as keen to please the teacher” but had no clear way of knowing how they could do so “because I wasn't giving them clues, whereas the other group did have clues.” I pointed out that drama in schools presupposes the presence of a teacher and that there would always be some part of what children created in drama, or in any other subject, which is done to gain teacher approval. This conversation highlighted an important point which needs further research. There is, in dealing with moral matters, a basis for controversy. If a teacher gives strong clues to her/his values, and, if, then, on the basis of pleasing the teacher the children give back what they believe the teacher wants, how much of what is done in the name of moral education is induction into the belief systems of the teacher; and how much of what is done is enquiry which looks at possible positions, scrutinizes them and then balances individual views of the normative and the ideal. This is a very important question and one which is has been brought into sharp relief by the present enquiry.

At this point, in the discussion between the teacher and myself the differences in our views of drama came abruptly to the surface. Having read the interview transcripts, Kathleen moved to a reflection on the children's drama which was encapsulated in the statement, “One form of drama wasn't less than the other.” On the other hand, I was more than ever convinced that had Group B received less of the teacher's views on old people and had more demands put on them to articulate clearly and forcefully their own views within the drama they created, then the difference in what drama, which is strongly teacher-directed, could do over the Brian Way (1967) type of approach would have been more clearly demonstrated. It is true that what emerged as a result of the drama methods that were employed was that drama, in and of itself, did appear to make the demand that the children do some examination of their opinions of and attitudes toward old people even when a Way type of approach is used. The problem seemed to be that the teacher interpreted the notion of teacher-directed drama as a “subversive guiding” to some correct position, whereas I interpreted it to mean to push
the children within the drama they created, to pause, to reflect, to question, and to argue the issue of what attitude they [the children] saw as justified towards old people.

Kathleen also declared her delight and excitement at the evidence she had in the unit which she taught after the study was finished. She saw the carry-over as consisting in Group A's ideas on retention of personhood even though the physical self is transformed by aging. The subsequent unit was called, "Transformations and Explosions." Overall, Kathleen's view of the result of the study for Group A children was "that they got some' meat' out of this."

"I feel like they're thinking about these issues because they dealt with it in their drama...I was wondering, I did wonder, gee, if this unit didn't mean anything to these kids but it did! Yes, It did. It really made them think" (Int. IV, Feb. 18/90, p.10).

The Children's View of Change in Their Own Attitudes

The children quite clearly believed that their view of old people had changed, either (a) because they had not thought about the topic before, (b) because they had accepted views which they had not scrutinized before and now felt, after some scrutiny, that they could accept old people more fully or (c) because they felt that they had gained new insights, knowledge, or understanding of old people or about ageing. It may be, however, as Bolton (1976, p. 6) has said that the children already knew the facts they "discovered". Or it may have been that they already "held" the view, that they were not aware that they held it and that, rather than demonstrating what they already knew, they were bringing what they "understood" into consciousness in the drama. The children offered the following comments (excerpted from interviews March 6/90) on the meaning for them about old people and old age in the drama they had done.

Q. What did you think old people were like before the drama started? Did you think about them at all?
A. Hmmm, not much. Like, there's this old lady and we play hockey on the street. And when the ball goes on her lawn and we go to get it and she yells "get off there".
Q. So you didn't have a very good picture in your head of old people?
A. No.
Q. Has it changed at all?
A. Yeah, uhuh That... I think they are the same as us”
(Int., Mar. 6/90, Two Boys, Group A, p. 3).

The boys concerned had created a mime in which a YP had shown an OP how to
dance—the OP had tried to join in and had not been successful. Then the OP had
shown a YP how to draw and the YP is not very successful. In the end of the mime
each of the characters teaches the other how to improve in skills with which they have
difficulty.

Two girls created a mime in which a YP and an OP are brought to an understanding
of one another and into relationship with one another as a result of reading a book
together:

A. I wasn't really thinking about being brought together by a book, just doing..
[her partner interrupts].
A. We were just doing something...
Q. So it just came to you through the doing?
A. Yeah.
Q. And finally you said “Oh that's believable because books are magic” [here I am
quoting back to her what she already explained].
A. Yeah.
Q. And that was something you didn't know you knew?
A. Yes
Q. But now you know you know it?
A. Yes.
A. Oh Yes [partner agrees] (Ibid., 2 Girls, Group B, p. 2)
Later with these two girls, who were (both from Group B), I asked what they had thought of old people before the drama units. One of the girls replied,

“Well I didn’t really think about them. They were just there…. But they were friends, sort of, so I had a good feeling about old people.” She then said that she had “sort of learned some things about old people but not really.” In wrestling with this, we finally came to the statement that she had learned good and bad things about old people, in doing the drama and in seeing other drama pieces, and that some of these she knew before and some she did not. The things she did not know before were “that sometimes old people can be mean, because something happened to them in their life or something. And they’ve been grouchy ever since. And some people, like old people, are really nice and they like to be around you a lot... ummm..they can help you a lot, and understand you and...” (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 8).

My interpretation of this girl’s perspective on the work was that she had come to a more thoughtful, balanced, and realistic view of old people through the drama. Later in the interview, as I struggled toward articulating this interpretation for her in a long series of questions and repetitions back to her of how I had understood her new point of view, together we came to this summary: She gives more respect to her grandparents and now is nicer to all old people because (a) she learned more about them as people, (b) she learned to understand the way they felt, (c) she thought about old people outside the family more, (d) she realised that time is short and she should make good use of these valuable people and the time that she has with them and (e) finally, she was trying to change her behaviour of benign neglect of her grandmother by writing to her and phoning her. (Ibid., pp. 6-11)

The second girl, who had been working with the first in the dramatization unit of drama work, said that

"Now I have more enjoyment with her [her grandmother] than before we did the drama about old people" (Ibid., Girl, Group B, p. 12).

In an earlier interview (Dec/89) with two girls from the Group A, one girl offered the
following reflection on her own response:

"Well my feelings have changed just a little bit more for older people...well, uh, I used to not really care about older people 'cause I used to care about myself. But now, since I've got older, now I understand about old people—what their feelings are too...[before] I was thinking, um, old people could take care of themselves and they don't need any other people to do it, they can do it by themselves. But then when I got into it [drama] I just noticed that old people just do need other people to care for them more and stuff...When I saw one of them...the stories with the string...It made me feel like grand parents are important to you, not just little kids...And then that, um, you shouldn't just care about yourself, you should care about other people, too" (Int., Dec.12/89, Girl1, Group A, pp. 14-15).

This girl's friend, who also took part with her in the same interview, offered her own reflection:

"I, um, had this feeling in me 'cause I had this really old grandma. And I just didn't really care for her 'cause I just didn't really like old people then,'cause I thought they'd be too mean and cranky. But when I saw one of them [the story pieces], I just had this feeling that, um, maybe I should be nicer to my grandma because she's a normal person like me, and I think I should treat her the same as other people" (Ibid., Girl2, Group A).

Later on the same day I interviewed two other girls, also from group A. The first one offered her insights in the following words;

"It changed a bit. I wasn't exactly sure about old people. Like, I have a grandma and grandpa, and I like them and everything, but I found out that old people have more abilities. Like, I knew they had abilities, and everything, but I found out more about them. Like, you can come and talk to them. They're just like young people...It's hard to explain. But I, um, how would you explain this? I feel, I want to. My feelings are for them, like. If someone was hurting them I would come and stick up for them, or if they needed someone's help, or my help, I would come and do it for them...If something was happening I would come and think about their feelings and not mine...Yeah, their feelings and how they would do this"...

The second girl had this contribution to make;
"I got to grow onto old people and I still felt sorry for them. But I also knew they could be fun too—teach you something you didn't know. Uh, some people don't include them in as much as they could be included in. Like they could be included in more... Then they lose the ability of what they can do and then they feel left out, and that's when they go off more to themselves" (Ibid., Two girls, Group A, pp. 7-9).

These six children, two boys from Group A, two girls from Group B, and two girls from Group A, all felt that their knowledge of old people, their feelings for and about them, and their understanding and identification with them as persons had changed as a result of the units of drama study, that is, their account of the matter was that the drama had caused these changes, or perhaps that they had been enabled by the drama both to change and to see the change in themselves. As discussed in Chapter 3, the changes they describe could all be considered changes in attitude.

Summary of Insights into Attitude Change

The interviews demonstrate that children from both groups did believe that their attitudes had changed as a result of the units of drama study. Some children emphasized a change in knowledge, some a change in feeling, some a change in understanding, and some a change in valuing old people. With only one student was the interview of sufficient depth to include all of these changes. Nor were the interviews sufficient in number to distinguish the precise nature of the differences between Groups A and B in the changes that took place. There is a distinct feeling that Group B had more depth of understanding at the end but there were not enough interviews for this to be triangulated from within the interviews.

Limitations of interviews. The investigation through interviews into changes in children's attitudes toward old people had perforce to wait until at least two units of drama study had been concluded. Thus, they were conducted at the end of the second unit and after the end of the drama, that is, in December and March, respectively. Each of these times was a poor choice from the point of view of the number of interviews which could
be carried out. December is a difficult time because both teachers and children are busy with marking, report cards, and religious celebrations. The March period was difficult because teachers, other than the drama teacher, were tired of the removal of children from their classrooms, since the post-test (which immediately preceded these interviews) had included every child involved in the study being removed from class. As a result, I had to tread warily and, although the children wanted to be interviewed, I could actually accommodate only those who have been cited here. Although the interviews obtained provided sufficient data for triangulation of the main notions involved in the concept of attitudes, it would have been much more satisfying to have obtained triangulations on each point made in Chapter 3.

Children's Private Journal Writing

The private journals were written by the children after the three drama units were finished. At that time, the children were not aware that they would be asked to share this writing with me. When I did make the request, only one student refused her permission. The questions which the children were to answer in their journals, after the study, on the theme OP/YP were: (a) How did you make your work interesting to an audience in mime, storytelling, and dramatization? (b) What things did you learn about the theme young people/old people?

Of the 58 children in the two experimental groups, 31 completed the answer to Question B; of these, 20 were from Group A and 11 from Group B. This imbalance occurred because Group B had only the time in drama class to work on their journals and Group A had an additional 45 minutes of time in language arts class. All of the journals revealed that the children believed their attitudes, or some component of them, had changed or that they had abstracted a moral principle from the drama. For example, some children specified (a) that their respect for old people had increased, (b) that their knowledge of old people had increased, (c) that their feelings toward the old people had become more positive, (d) that they had a new awareness of the value of old people in their lives and (e) that some had encapsulated their learning in the form of
In my mime I showed the theme old people young people by how they can have fun together. And how old people have to have fun as well as young people.

In my storytelling I showed that you should respect old people and young. And it does not matter how they look.

We showed how old people and young people can work together to get things done.

Well when we did the unit of old/young people through mime, storytelling, and dramatic action, Ibelieved old people are just as important as young people.

In this unit I have made a better relationship with old people. I have learnt a lot about how old people and young people have relationships.
1. I'm minnie. I had a lot of fun. I learned that little kids can be scared of old people. First and when they get to know them more they learn to like them.

2. In storytelling I learned that old people can be very helpful. They younger people look for their help.

3. In dramatization the younger people were helpful to the old people and enjoyed their company. I enjoyed being a young child.

a moral about behaviour towards and with old people (Reflections VII, VIII, IX, X).

It was interesting that all of the journals from the Group B included a statement in the form of a moral or message. This was the group to whom the instruction to "give me a message about old people" was given in each unit. It was noticeable, too, with this group, that all students responded to this second question by dividing their notes into reaction to mime, to dramatization and to storytelling.

No such division or moral precepts were a part of the responses in the Group A journals. The writing was much more general and dealt with what they felt, what they learned, and what they had come to understand about old people. Some samples of the writing identified by group are included above, and other samples may be obtained the author. The important finding here is that all the children did claim some change in their attitude to old people or in some aspect of such attitudes (cf. Chapter 3).

Children's Pre-and Post-Test Drawings

As described in Chapter 5, both control and experimental groups were asked to make a series of drawings before and after the drama on the theme YP/OP. They were allowed to draw as many sketches as they wished in a 45 minute time period and, at the end of that time, to order the drawings according to their liking for each, with their favourite one on top. The sets of drawings were then stapled together and the child's I.D. number written on the set. The groups were then coded on the back of each set of drawings to indicate control, Group A, and Group B classifications, and to show which sets were pre- and post. The drawings were then all sent to the expert sorters with sort sheets attached (see Appendix E).

RESULTS OF SORTS OF DRAWINGS

Sorter 1 found the following categories of drawings pre- and post-test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ve=10</td>
<td>+ve=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>PREneutral=6</td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=0</td>
<td>-ve=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Exp. GP. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>+ve=3</td>
<td>+ve=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=5</td>
<td>neutral=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=10</td>
<td>-ve=6 (0 missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONG</strong></td>
<td>+ve=3</td>
<td>+ve=14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=1</td>
<td>neutral=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=22</td>
<td>-ve=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST</strong></td>
<td>+ve=11</td>
<td>+ve=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=8</td>
<td>neutral=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=1</td>
<td>-ve=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE</strong></td>
<td>+ve=11</td>
<td>+ve=14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=12</td>
<td>-ve=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td>+ve=0</td>
<td>+ve=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=0</td>
<td>-ve=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sorter 2 reported the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Exp. GP. A</th>
<th>Exp. GP. B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROL</strong></td>
<td>+ve=8</td>
<td>+ve=1</td>
<td>+ve=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
<td>neutral=2</td>
<td>neutral=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=17</td>
<td>-ve=1 (0 missing)</td>
<td>-ve=0 (3 missing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONG</strong></td>
<td>+ve=6</td>
<td>+ve=2</td>
<td>+ve=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
<td>neutral=4</td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=17</td>
<td>-ve=3</td>
<td>-ve=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POST</strong></td>
<td>+ve=22</td>
<td>+ve=0</td>
<td>+ve=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=1</td>
<td>neutral=2</td>
<td>neutral=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=4</td>
<td>-ve=0 (3 missing)</td>
<td>-ve=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRE</strong></td>
<td>+ve=13</td>
<td>+ve=4</td>
<td>+ve=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
<td>neutral=3</td>
<td>neutral=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ve=8</td>
<td>-ve=3</td>
<td>-ve=8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXP. GP. B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ve=21</th>
<th>neutral=1</th>
<th>-ve=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differing numbers of drawings missing as these sorters have reported their findings in counts of the sorts in each category is due to sorter error. The numbers are the same in both control groups, but scorer 1 showed two more missing post-test in experimental group A and seven more missing in post-test counts for group B than did sorter 2. If this is ignored it can be seen that the results, when looked at only in terms of group change, do demonstrate that both scorers have shown the same group trends. Only this aspect will be reported on, since this study was limited to whether or not the children's attitudes may be said to have changed as a result of the drama. The data acquired by this method were not intended to provide statistical evidence beyond the notion of raw counts. The counts represent one aspect of the accounts which two experts in the content of children's drawings gave of the meaning of those drawings.

Both sorters agreed on two points as they responded to the meanings present for them in the drawings of the children. They agreed that the post-test drawings of both experimental groups were much more positive in the view of the elderly which they portrayed, when compared to their pre-test drawings. They also agreed that the post-test drawings of the control group were more negative in the view of the elderly which they portrayed, when compared to their pre-test drawings. There was no evidence of a difference in the counts in the Groups A and B. The sorters had never met one another, lived in different cities in Canada, were experts in different disciplines, and did not know which drawings were pre and post, nor which were experimental or control.

Sorter 1 characterized the strong positive drawings as those which showed "strong, positive interactions between young and old." Sorter 1 characterized the neutral drawings as those which showed the elderly doing things which were denoted as characteristic of old people, for example, "knitting, rocking, using aids, or being ill." The negative
Sketch I. Exp. Group A, Pre:
Child's drawings.
Old people can do things that you can't.
Sketch III. Exp. Group B, Pre:
Child's drawings.
Sketch IV. Exp. Group B, Post: Child's drawings.

don't stare at old people.

Blooms day Race! Good luck!
finish!

old people can do anything they want, just like young people.
Sketch V. Control Group, Pre: Child's drawings.
Sketch VI. Control Group, Post:
Child's drawings.
drawings were characterized by this sorter as those which showed the elderly as “infirm, ugly, ill, shaky, handicapped, weak, rude, wrinkled, or lame.”

Sorter 2 characterized the strong positive as those which showed “happy positive interactions,” which showed the young and old, “content, helpful to each other and involved with one another in a caring way,” and also those which showed the old as “wise, teachers, adaptable, dependable, aggressive, fun-loving, capable, friendly, or showing a youthful spirit.” The neutral category was not used by Sorter 2 except in the case of weak portrayals, and was not given a characterization. The negative drawings were characterized by this sorter as those which showed the old as, “sedentary, infirm, near death, ill, requiring aides, slow, dependent, incapable, hospitalized, ugly, disobedient, grumpy, strict, or lazy.” In this scorer’s characterizations, it was possible to distinguish between the drawings from Group A and Group B. The Group B descriptors revealed more emphasis on the autonomy of the elderly and the A Group descriptors revealed more emphasis on the value of old people in the lives of the young, although the difference was slight. Both sorters reported some drawings which still depicted negative views at the post test.

In considering the interviews as a whole as one point of reference, the journals as a second point of reference, and the meanings which the drawings portrayed for two informed scorers as a third point of reference, the data obtained provided a triangulation of the view that, in the experimental groups, the children’s attitudes to the elderly had become more positive. It was also noted that the drawings showed a trend for the children of the control group to a more negative attitude toward old people.

Summary of Chapter 6

In this chapter, the qualitative data gathered in the investigation were discussed. The biography of the teacher and an account of her views of drama and of old people and aging given. The milieu of the investigative situation and of the steps taken were described, as well as the two methods employed in teaching drama to the two experi-
mental groups. Interviews with the children which inquired into their view of drama, their view of old people, and their view of their own knowledge, feelings, beliefs, and principles regarding the elderly and aging and how these had changed, were reported. From these reports of interviews, triangulations were obtained of the following viewpoints:

1. Drama is about people, about how they think, how they feel and act, and why they do what they do.
2. In drama, the participants gain insights into themselves, their peers, and into people whose lives are different from their own.
3. Drama is important to children's education because no other subject allows them to enquire into their own opinions and those of their peers, and no other subject allows them to come to understand, if only in a small way, why people behave as they do.
4. Drama allows participants to see new points of view and to cooperate in assessing them.
5. As a result of the drama children did, they have re-examined their attitudes to old people and to ageing, find themselves to have a greater understanding of the elderly as persons, and have come to reassess their position with regard to the old and with regard to ageing.

The above triangulations are within interview triangulations. In addition, the chapter included data obtained from children's journal writing and from expert examination and characterizations of children's drawings. The results of within interview triangulations triangulate with the data obtained from the journals and the drawings. This external triangulation has strongly supported the internal triangulation from interviews, that there had been a positive change in the attitudes of the experimental group toward the elderly as a result of the drama. This qualitative investigation now gives way to the empirical investigation which framed it, and a report of the data from that investigation is given in the following chapter.
EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

The empirical findings of the study reported in this chapter comprise the descriptive statistics and their interpretation and is discussed in the following order: (a) background of the study groups, (b) research instruments and the categories in statistical description, (c) a review of correlations between categories, (d) results of the pre- and post-test and (e) correlations of results with factors in the ethos of the groups. A case is then made for the interpretations of the findings.

Background of the Study Groups

When permission was sought from parents to involve their children in the study, a form was included in the package which inquired into the socio-economic status (SES) of the children (described in Chapter 5). As reported earlier, only one of the parents of the children in Experimental Group A, and two of the parents of Control Group members failed to complete the SES form. The results of this inquiry are summarized below.

(The for ease in reporting, the two groups are referred to as Group A and Group B and the non-experimental group as Control Group).

Ethnogeny

The first item on the SES requested the ethnic backgrounds of the children. This enquiry allowed the respondents to provide a description of their family ethnic backgrounds. For control group responses, the analysis revealed that: 9 (52.9%) of them described their ethnic backgrounds as Canadian; 3 (17.6%) claimed Mid-European origins; 1 (5.9%) claimed French origin; and 4 (23.5%) claimed Asian origin.

Group A responses showed 2 (8%) were in the 'other' category (i.e. they failed to indicate either Canadian, Mid European, British, French, Native Indian or Asian origins) ; 1 (4%) claimed British origins; 5 (20%) claimed Middle European backgrounds ; and 17 (68%) claimed Canadian origin. In Group B : 4 (12.9%) claimed British origin ; 6 (17.4%) claimed Mid-European origin; (c) 21 (67.7%) claimed Canadian origin.

For all three groups it could therefore be said that the majority (52.9%, 68% and 67.7%) were of Canadian origin. The second largest group claimed Middle European
origin (17.6%, 20% and 17.3% respectively). Those not covered by the three main categories were made up of: Control group, 5.9% French and 2.5% Asian origins; Group A, 4% British and 8% non-specified ‘other’ origins; and Group B, 12.9% British origin.

In examining the similarities and the differences of the groups using the criterion of ethnic origin, all three had the common feature of choosing to describe themselves as of Canadian and Mid-European origins (70.8%, 88% and 85.1% respectively), with the remaining ethnic mix being idiosyncratic to the group.

The foregoing data would suggest that the three groups exhibited strong similarities for a large number of their members under the criterion of personal description of ethnic origin. The analysis also allows the suggestion that some small amount of variance in the results obtained might well be attributed to ethnic origin with those of Asian origin in the control group and those of British origin the experimental group B likely to account for a proportion of any variance obtained. In fact, the numbers in the groups are rather small to allow the assertion that the effect on variance would, of necessity, be evident in the results of correlations.

Family Constitution

An understanding of the family background of the children was sought through items which asked about the family's constitution and about the educational backgrounds of its members. The SES instrument provided information on parental situation, education of parents and number and educational level of siblings. The findings for each group are described and discussed below.

All members of the control group had both parents present in the home. Group A had 84.6% of its members with both parents at home and 15.4% with the mother only in the home. Group B had 83.9% of its members with both parents present in the home, 12.9% with mother only, and 3.2% with father only (Summary Chart A). Thus, both experimental groups were markedly similar with regard to parental influence and the control group differed on this criterion from both Group A and Group B. This criterion then, is one which must be considered when accounting for variances in the results of the empirical measures. (Summary chart A)
### A. Summary Chart of Family Constitution in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mother &amp; Father</th>
<th>Mother Only</th>
<th>Father Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. Summary Chart of Number of Siblings in Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1 M.S.</th>
<th>1 F.S.</th>
<th>2 M.S.</th>
<th>2 F.S.</th>
<th>3 M.S.</th>
<th>3 F.S.</th>
<th>4 M.S.</th>
<th>4 F.S.</th>
<th>5 F.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Siblings**

The number of siblings in each group and the educational level of each sibling were also obtained from the SES form (Summary Chart B). The constitution of the families in the three groups were seen to be vastly different. The control group, all came from two-parent families, and 17 of the members had a total of 24 siblings who were in Grade 12 or lower. Group A had 22 (84.6%) families with both parents in the home and 4 (15.4%) families with only the mother at home. In this group there was a total of 25 siblings all below Grade 10. Group B had 26 (83.9) families with both parents at home, 4 (15.4%) families with only a mother at home, and 1 (3.2%) family with only a father at home. There were 42 siblings, 28 of whom were below Grade 12. Of these, 8 were pre-school and 6 were post-secondary students. (Summary Chart C).

The proportion of siblings in the groups, overall thus ranged from a low of 1:1 in A, through 1:1.35 for the Control Group, to a high of 1:1.77 in Group B. In this last group too, there was a greater percentage (16.2%) of single parent families, while in Group A that percentage was 14.8%, and in the Control Group was 0%. These factors may have some bearing on any variance found in the empirical results.

**Family Income**

The household earnings of each family were also reported on the SES form (Summary Chart D). In addition to the parents who returned this form blank, one parent in Group B refused to answer this question and cited as the reason: "None of your business."

For the Control Group, annual earnings ranged from $10,000 (6.7%) through $30,000 to $50,000 (26.7%), and $50,000 to $70,000 (20.0%), to the high of 46.7% for those earning over $70,000.

Group A showed a similar distribution with a more even ascension from lowest to highest. Earnings ranged from under $10,000 (4.1%), through $15,000 to $30,000 (12.5%), $30,000 to $50,000 (8.3%), and $50,000 to $70,000 (25.0%), to a high of 50% who earned over $70,000 annually.

Group B had an ascension among its member families which was also skewed to the right. the lowest group, under $10,000 (3.3%), was maintained in the second group at $10,000 to $15,000. There was then a large jump in the next category at 30% for the $30,000 to $50,000 range, and further jumps of 23.3% and 40% in the categories of $50,000 to $70,000, and over $70,000, respectively.
The financial picture in the three groups was, therefore, similar with a preservation of the skew to the right for all groups which: (a) in the Control Group was relatively smooth rise, with 67.7% in the top two categories, (b) in Group A was a more consistent rise, with 75.0% in the top two categories, and (c) in Group B was an uneven rise, with 63.3% at the upper end of the scale.

**Parental Educational Levels**

The educational levels of both parents were examined in all groups. The mothers' educational levels in the Control Group included 23.5% who reached Grade 12 and 76.5% who reached at the undergraduate degree level. This group included 17.6% of fathers at the Grade 12 level, 70.6% at the undergraduate degree level, and 11.7% at the master's degree level.

Mothers of Group A included 4.2% with only a Grade 10 education, 20.8% with Grade 12, 4.2% with Grade 13, 41.7% with an undergraduate degree, and 29.29% with a Master's degree. Father's of Group A had 13.6% with a Grade 12 education, 4.5% with a Grade 13, 63.6% with an undergraduate degree, 18.2% with a Master's degree, and 10.7% with a doctoral degree.

Mothers in Group B included 1.3% with a Grade 10 education level or lower, 26.7% with Grade 12, 40.0% with an undergraduate degree, and 18.79% with a Master's degree. The fathers Group B included 17.9% with a Grade 12 education, 7.1% with a Grade 13, 39.3% with an undergraduate degree, 25.0% with a Master's degree and 10.7% with a doctoral degree.

From the point of view of the parental educational background, the groups did differ but the mean difference was not large. However, it is a factor to keep in mind as the variance is examined in the empirical results.

**Intellectual Profiles of Experimental Groups**

Two measures may have had effects on variance in both Group A and Group B. First, before the drama treatment began, a test of comprehension (TOC) of the book *The Bernstein Bears* was administered to both groups N = 58. This same measure had been administered to a group as a pilot study of this instrument in the previous year after they, too, had read the book. (Results are available on file with the researcher.)

Second, as the study progressed, there was a noticeable discrepancy in the quality of the drama created by Groups A and B. Since the two groups were being taught by
C. Summary Chart of  
Number of Siblings with Educational Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Post Secondary</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Below Grade 10</th>
<th>Pre-School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1m;1f</td>
<td>13m;13f</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12m;15f</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>5m;1f</td>
<td>5m;2f</td>
<td>23m;21f</td>
<td>4m;4f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Summary Chart of  
Percentage Earnings of Families in Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Under $10,000</th>
<th>$10,000-$29,999</th>
<th>$30,000-$49,999</th>
<th>$50,000-$69,999</th>
<th>Over $70,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental A</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental B</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different drama methods, it would have been tempting to assume that this discrepancy was due to the difference in the methods, once allowance had been made for the sources of variance already discussed. In discussing this observed difference with the drama teacher, and in further discussions with other teachers, (notably, one who taught science), it was hypothesised that, by chance, there may have been a discrepancy in the average IQ of the two groups. This discrepancy, it was felt, might explain the differences in the quality of the drama they produced. It was further hypothesised that the IQ of the two groups was interfering with any effect which might be due to the difference in pedagogy, so it was decided to test the IQ of the two groups. Since the Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test was the official IQ measure used by the Catholic School Board, the decision was made to use this test, thus benefitting both the school and the research results. The Otis Lennon results (on file with the researcher) were used in correlation with the CATE measure to examine variance.

**Test of Comprehension**

The pilot study of the TOC with a group of 19 Boy Scouts and Girl Guides in Grade 5 and with a class of 30 Grade 5 students yielded a mean score on this test of 18.6 with a SD of 1.4 and a range of 5 (N=49). Guides and Scouts were chosen for the pilot study because (a) it was necessary to find a group which met consistently and regularly so that the tests could be carried out, (b) it was possible, since such groups met in their neighbourhoods, to select troops which came from both poor and affluent districts, and (c) it was necessary to find groups which met after school (as I was teaching full-time when the pilot study was done). Subsequently, because of the small numbers obtained among the Guides and Scouts, I tested my own class.

The total score for both experimental Groups A and B yielded a mean of 18.3 and SD of 1.7 with a range of 7 (N=58). The Experimental group A had a mean score of 18 and a S.D. of 2 with a range of 7. Group B had a mean of 19.0, a SD of 1.0 and a range of 7 (N=27). Such scores may appear somewhat high but it must be remembered that comprehension was being tested based on a story recommended for the Grade 3 reading level. Again, all groups were non-random and the test could not be "normed." Inferential statistics were, therefore, inappropriate. As a result, all that can be stated is that there was some difference in the means in favour of better comprehension by Group B, and that this group appeared to be clustered closer to the mean. Group A had a lower mean and a larger SD but the range of scores was the same in each case. The
mean difference between the two was 1 point of raw score. Scores of the pilot group fell between those of both experimental groups.

Intelligence testing

The Otis Lennon IQ testing showed a similar trend for Group B to out perform Group A. Group A had a normed, mean score of 108.1 (n=21). Group B had a normed, mean score of 109.2 (n=31). The interpretation here is that there was a slight difference in favour of Group B on measures of intellectual ability discerned by TOC and by IQ tests.

Test of Attitudes (CATE)

The CATE instrument was used to examine empirically the main concern of this study, viz., whether drama with children will change attitudes toward old people and toward ageing. A background to the instrument was given earlier and will not be reiterated here. It is necessary, however, to describe the contents of the instrument. The CATE instrument was divided into four sub-tests, a division made on the basis of the methodologies employed in the four sub-tests.

The first, entitled “Word Association Sub-Test,” consists of four open ended questions, the responses to which are scored in a variety of ways. The content of the sub-test ranges over knowledge of and behaviour toward the elderly and includes one question on feelings about getting old.

The second, entitled “Picture Series Test,” consists of three sections, a division achieved as a result of the method of administration. There are eight open-ended questions and at the end of each, the respondent is asked to indulge in reason-giving by the simple expedient of a “why?” inserted by the researcher after the respondent answers each of the question. The content of the sub-test ranges over the same topics as the Word Association Sub-test.

The third sub-test entitled “Semantic Differential,” consists of a 5-point scale between two polar adjectives which are presented first as possible descriptions of old people and then, in a reverse order, as possible descriptions of young people. The pairs of polar adjectives are in two group thus designating the content of this sub test. The two groups are (a) those which call for knowledge of old people and (b) those which call for a judgement of old people.

The final sub-test is entitled “The Child’s Concept of Age,” consists of 12 questions, each of which demands reason-giving to the response, offered in the same way as the Picture Series. In this sub-test the respondents understanding of age is examined.
In looking at the content and at the recommended methods for scoring responses, four categories were discerned across the sub-tests, excluding the concept-of-age sub-test. From the scoring procedure adopted, 55 variables emerged. For the purpose of comprehensibility, these were grouped into four categories: (a) knowledge of old people, (b) discernment of goals, means, or capabilities of old people, (c) rapprochement or judgements about old people based on other than knowledge alone, and indicating identification with their goals and means, and (d) phobia or fear of growing old or of ageing. As a result of this categorization the variables were examined both separately and grouped within the categories. This report of the descriptive statistics now proceeds with the presentation of the category analyses, followed by some account of important individual variables.

Pre- and Post-Test Results

In this section, the categories employed for the analyses are described more fully, the pre- and post-test results for those categories are presented and an initial interpretation of those results is offered.

Knowledge of Old People: The knowledge category included: (a) knowledge of the physical state of old people, (b) knowledge through contact with old people and, (c) knowledge of the behaviour of old people, either through observation or contact.

Discernment: The discernment category depended upon the child's ability to understand that there are all manner of types of persons who are old. It depends on knowledge and, therefore, should show some correlation with it but should also reflect a pondering upon that knowledge and result in a realistic judgement supported by reason-giving for the judgements offered. Discernment consists of judgements, based in knowledge of old people which demonstrate a realistic assessment of old peoples' capabilities.

Rapprochement: The rapprochement category included those judgements which demonstrate a recognition of the autonomy of old people and of the contribution that the lives of the elderly make to the lives of others. It results in a positive valuing of the old people as a group, based in what is, in fact, the case, or in what could be the case, about their autonomy and their contribution in society, and includes and identification with the aims old people pursue.
Phobia: The phobia category was restricted to those responses which consisted of positive or negative views of old age as a state. This category was referred to earlier as "gerontophobia" or fear of old age or of ageing.

Concept of age: Concept of age was not a category as such but rather a report of the result of the fourth sub-test of the CATE. It reflects an ability in the child to see the relatedness of different age groups or grades.

Control group results
The pre-test and post-test results for the Control Group are presented in Table 1, Table 3, Table 5, and Table 7. The tables are accompanied by like-numbered graphs and are represented visually in Figure 1, Figure 3, Figure 5, and Figure 7.

Knowledge category
The Control Group had a pre-test mean of 33.8 (SD = 4.1) while the post-test mean was 34.7 (SD = 2.6). There was a slight increase in the mean, a lowered SD, and a decrease of the range from 16 to 11 (Table 1).

Rapprochement category
The pre-test mean was 2.0 (SD = 3.2) and the post-test mean was 2.3 (SD = 3.1). The mean had increased slightly as the SD decreased, while the range had increased from 11 to 13 (Table 3).

Phobia category
The pre-test mean was -0.53 (SD = 2.5), and the post-test mean was -0.21 (SD = 1.7). In the phobia category, again, there had been a slight increase in the mean and narrowing of the SD was present, this time with a decrease in the range from 9 to 7. (Table 5)
Table 1
Knowledge Category: Control, Pre and Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>34.74</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Knowledge Category: Experimental A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Rapprochement Category: Control, Pre and Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Rapprochement Category: Experimental, A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discernment category
The pre-test mean was 56.4 (SD = 4.6), and the post-test mean was 49.6 (SD = 5.8). There was a decrease in the mean and a widening of the SD, while the range remained 21 (Table 7).

Group A Results - Child-Directed Drama
The pre- and post-test results for Group A are listed in Table 9, Table 11, Table 13 and Table 15. Again, the tables are accompanied by like-numbered graphs accompanied by visual representatives found in Figure 9, Figure 11, Figure 13, and Figure 15.

Knowledge category
The pre-test mean for Group A was 34.1 (SD = 3.5) and a range of 14. The post-test mean was 35.7 (SD = 3.4), and a range of 11. The increase in the mean is slightly greater than that found in the Control Group, there is less regression to the mean, and the range has decreased (Table 9).

Rapprochement category
The pre-test mean for Group A was 2.9 (SD = 3.6) and a range of 14. The post-test mean was 9.96 (SD = 2.7) and a range of 10. Therefore, the mean was considerably higher post-test and the SD had decreased, as had the range. The control group had also increased in the mean but it was much smaller and the SD had increased for the Control Group (Table 11).

Phobia category
The pre-test mean of Group A was -0.636 (SD = 1.5) and a range of 5. The post-test result showed a mean of +1.9 (SD = 2.4) and a range of 8. The difference in the two means here appears to be substantial, given the range, in spite of the fact that the SD had risen as had the range. The Control Group showed only a very slight rise in this category, with a decrease in the SD and a decrease in the range (Table 13).
Table 5
Phobia Category: Control, Pre and Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Phobia Category: Experimental, A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>-.286</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discernment category
The pre-test mean for Group A was 50.1 (SD = 5.7), and a range of 26. Post-test, the mean was up slightly to 50.6, there had been a decrease in the SD to 4.5, and the range fell to 15. For the same category in the Control Group, the mean had risen slightly in the post-test, the SD had risen and the range had fallen, but not as much as had the range in Group A (Table 15).

Group B: Teacher-Directed Drama
The results in the four categories for Group B, pre- and post-test, are given in Table 10, Table 12, Table 14, Table 16 and a visual representation of the results appear in Figure 10, Figure 12, Figure 14, Figure 16.

Knowledge category
The pre-test results showed a mean of 35.0 (SD = 2.5), and a range of 11. Post-test, the results showed a mean of 37.4 (SD = 3.5) and a range of 14. This was a substantial increase in the mean in addition to a substantial increase in the SD and in the range. The Control Group showed small increase in the mean in this category, with a large fall in the SD and smaller increase in the range. In comparison to Group A, the increase here was greater and almost equal to one SD (Table 10).

Rapprochement category
Pre-test results showed a mean of 2.9 (SD = 3.6) and a range of 13. The post-test mean had risen sharply to 9.3 the SD had only a slight increase to 3.4, and the range decreased to 12. The Control Group on this measure had an increase very much smaller than that seen in the experimental groups, the SD increase was similar, and the range for the control decreased from 12 to 8. The increase in the mean of Group A was not as great as the Group B increase but it, too, was much greater than that shown by the Control Group (Table 12).
Table 7
Discernment Category: Control, Pre and Post

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>56.37</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>49.58</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
Discernment Category: Experimental, A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>50.367</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>51.47</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Knowledge Category: Experimental Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>34.05</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>35.73</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
Knowledge Category: Experimental Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Rapprochement Category: Experimental Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12
Rapprochement Category: Experimental Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13. Phobia Category: Experimental, Group A

Table 13
Phobia Category: Experimental Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>-0.636</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Phobia Category: Experimental, Group B

Table 14
Phobia Category: Experimental Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phobia category

Pre-test results for Group B had a mean of 0.0 (SD = 1.4) and a range of 5. Post-test, the mean had moved up to 1.3, the SD had widened to 2.1, and the range had risen to 9. This result compares with a situation in the Control Group in which the mean had increased by only 0.3 with a narrowing of the SD and a decrease in range from 9 to 6. The comparison with Group A showed that this time that group had a greater increase in the mean than Group B, accompanied by an increase in the SD and a widening of the range (Table 14).

Discernment category

Pre-test results showed a mean of 50.6 (SD = of 5.3) and a range of 18. Post-test, the mean was 52.19 (SD = 5.9), with a range at 22. This represents an increase in the mean, an appreciable widening in the SD, and an increase in the range. For the Control Group on this measure, the mean increased slightly less, the SD widened a small amount, and the range fell. For Group A, the increase in the mean was less and the SD had decreased, as had the range (Table 16).

Summary of CATE Results and Initial Interpretation

The results of pre- and post-test measures for the combined experimental groups are given in Table 2, Table 4, Table 6, and Table 8, and the visual representation of those results are shown in Figure 2, Figure 4, Figure 6, and Figure 8. These tables and figures are placed on the same pages as the tables and figures which summarized the control results. The following summary of the CATE results and initial interpretations may be more effectively pursued by reference to these four pages of data at the end of this section.

In the knowledge category, the Control Group had a minimal increase in the mean of approximately 1/3 of the average of the two SDs for the group, with a narrowing of the range. Group A had an increase in the mean of >1/2 of the average SDs of the group, with a narrowing of the range. Group B had an increase of approximately 4/5 of the average SDs of the group, with a widening in the range. A possible interpretation of these results is that the drama treatment caused a greater increase in the knowledge which the experimental groups had of old people, when compared with the increase in knowledge which the control group had achieved by its constitution, family circumstances, maturation, or chance. The increase in knowledge of Group B over Group A must also be noted since these groups were taught by different methods.
In the rapprochement category, all groups had an increase in the mean from pre to post test. The increase for the Control Group was 1/10 of a SD of the average of the two SDs for the group and the range had widened. The increase for Group A was 2.2 SD of the average SDs for this group. The increase for Group B was 2.5 SD of the average SDs for this group. The range for this category had increased for two of the groups and stay constant for Group B. This result shows quite a large effect which could be attributed to the two kinds of drama treatment. Some part of that effect might have been due to the maturing of the children over a period of five months, or it could be that the instrument was not reliable for this category. An argument against unreliability of the instrument is the fact that the pre-test scores showed very similar means and that the pre-test SDs of all groups were very close to each other.

In the phobia category, there was a very small increase in the mean of the Control Group—1/10 of a SD of the average SDs for this group. Group A had an increase of 1.2 SD of the average SDs for the group. Group B had an increase of 0.8 SD of the average SDs for the group. Except for the Control Group, the range had increased in each case as had the SD. The Control Group exhibited a decrease in range and a decrease in SD—there was a regression to the mean. The resulting data in the phobia category, therefore, showed a substantial increase post-test for the experimental groups with a small increase for the Control Group. As an initial interpretation of the results, this difference in increase could be attributed to the effect of drama. Group A results surpassed Group B for this category.

In the discernment category, the mean of the Control Group fell 1.3 of the average SDs for the group. For Group A the mean rose approximately 0.01 of the average SDs for the group. For Group B the mean rose by approximately 0.3 of the average SD for the group. The range had stayed constant for the Control Group while the SD widened and had narrowed for Group A, while the SD narrowed and had widened for Group B while the widened. Again, Group B had the greatest increase. Therefore, for Group A there had been some regression to the mean. There is only a small effect possibly attributable to the drama treatment on Group A unless a comparison with the negative trend of the Control Group could be said to count as a positive result. Group B results, however, did show some effect on the discernment of those students which might be attributed to the drama treatment. This would mean that the students who had studied old people through drama which was teacher directed made more realistic judgments about the capabilities of old people.
Table 15
Discernment Category: Experimental Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>50.14</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>50.59</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16
Discernment Category: Experimental Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>50.56</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>52.19</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accounting for Variance

In all the categories of knowledge, discernment, rapprochement, and phobia differences could be discerned between (a) the Control Group which had no unit of drama study of old people and of ageing, and (b) at least one of the experimental groups which had studied this topic through drama. In addition, differences could be discerned between the two experimental groups, that is, Group B had larger increases in the mean post-test than did Group A, except for the phobia category. As noted earlier, two measures of mental ability had shown that Group B, on average, was stronger intellectually. This difference was not a large one and it is unlikely that in and of itself, it could, have accounted for the differences between these two groups in their pre- and post-CATE means. It was likely, therefore, that the difference in the methods of drama teaching was responsible for some part of the differences. Before a claim can be made that such was, in fact, the case, it was necessary to look at both the between-group differences where available, and to look at the within-instrument and within-test effects to discover if they accounted for significant portions of the variance found. Accordingly, a series of correlations were carried out both between categories and of the categories with the other measures which had been made.

Correlations between Categories within CATE

The categories of knowledge, discernment, rapprochement, and phobia, were created in order to make intelligible the large number of variables yielded by the CATE. A case will now be made here for the value and independence of these categories. The correlation between categories was therefore investigated for each group and for each of the six sets of results pre- and post-test (Table 17). Significant correlations were found between the categories of knowledge and discernment, and this correlation was found to be significant for all groups both pre- and post-test, with the exception of the control pre-test results. In the post-test results for the experimental groups, knowledge was also found to correlate significantly with rapprochement and with discernment. This latter finding represented a shift in the post-test responses in which the children’s knowledge became more closely linked with the judgements they made, and those judgements became more closely linked with the children’s identification with old people’s goals and means. Thus, this correlation reveals that the increase in scores for the experimental groups (as reported earlier), represents a closer alignment between knowledge and the feeling/judgement operation of the children. However, neither
### Table 17
Correlations Between Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>KwD</th>
<th>RwK</th>
<th>RwD</th>
<th>PwK</th>
<th>PwD</th>
<th>PwR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp. gp. (A&amp;B) N=52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.5*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.952*</td>
<td>0.658*</td>
<td>0.658*</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.492*</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=52; Critical r=0.451 : α2 = 0.001
N=19; Critical r = 0.456 : α2 = 0.05

K = Knowledge, D = Discernment, R = Rapprochement, P = Phobia

* significant correlations are denoted by an asterix
knowledge nor discernment showed large increases, although they were appreciable. The large difference among these three categories was to be found in the rapprochement category. It is possible, therefore, that since it is correlated with the other two of the three post-test the ability to identify with older people, is the factor which accounts for a part of the changes in discernment and knowledge. This possibility would then allow of an interpretation of the results which links drama to the children's ability to identify with older people. Although this interpretation makes very good sense, the data provided by this study were not sophisticated enough for such a precise claim to be made.

Since the knowledge and discernment variables were correlated with each other in all tests, apart from the pre-test of the Control Group, it was decided that correlation among the variables which made up these two categories would provide a more complete picture.

**Within-Category Correlations of Knowledge and Discernment**

The creation of correlation matrices with variables from knowledge and discernment categories yielded the following similarities and differences:

When total discernment was correlated with each of the variables in the knowledge category, consistent significance (i.e., on both pre- and post-test for all groups exhibiting the phenomenon) was found pre-test for the experimental groups on seven variables from the semantic differential sub-test. Post-test, these correlations were also present. Only 2 of a possible of the discernment variables failed to correlate with total knowledge on the post-test (Table 18). This finding is important since (a) it was not present in the post-test of the Control Group except to a very small extent, (b) the shift post-test for the experimental groups covered almost all of the discernment variables, whereas only seven were correlated pre-test, and (c) the exceptions post-test were two variables, which measured, first, the children's disposition to choose a person of a certain age to be with, and, second, the reasons for their choice in that regard.

From this analysis it would seem that variables of wrong/right, wonderful/terrible, pretty/ugly, bad/good, and sad/happy are not those which discriminate well between knowledge and discernment. This finding is an understandable and is consistent with the descriptions of the categories given, in which some form of knowledge is assumed to play some part in discernment. These results did show is that knowledge (new or old, true knowledge or belief) about Old People was increasingly employed by the children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>Corr</th>
<th>α²</th>
<th>Critical r</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>with Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Ev. of Age of Picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Choice of pictures to be with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other knowledge categories correlated at 0.001 with all discernment variables.
Table 19
Significant Correlations of SES with Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>α²</th>
<th>Crit. r</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>with Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>(1) -0.403</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>Discernment</td>
<td>Mother's Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) -0.523</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>Discernment</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) -0.501</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 0.534</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Mother's Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) -0.415</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Female Sib. 1 Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>(1) 0.666</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>Discernment</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 0.435</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Mother's Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 0.449</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Father's Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) -0.505</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>Discernment</td>
<td>Father's Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (A &amp; B)</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>(1) -0.237</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=49</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) -0.252</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Mother only in home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 0.244</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Male Siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4) 0.294</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Male Sib 4 Ed. Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) -0.247</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Male Sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) -0.236</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>n=52</td>
<td>(1) 0.238</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Ethnic Origin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to make judgements. Failure to do so was present when the children were asked to reveal their dispositions to act and the reasons for those dispositions. The categories of rapprochement and phobia were discrete pre-test for all groups. Post-test rapprochement was correlated significantly with knowledge. No correlations of phobia were found at any stage with other categories, yet, the experimental scores were much higher for this category post-test.

Correlation CATE/SES

The CATE results in each category for both experimental groups and for the Control Group were correlated with all factors in the SES instrument (Table 19). Factors found to be significant on the SES when correlated with pre-test categories were, for the control group:- (a) The mother's educational level correlated (r = -0.4) at a significance level of 0.1 with the category of discernment but showed no significant correlation with the other categories; (b) The income of parents and the category of discernment correlated (r = -0.5) at a significance level of .05 but showed no significant correlation with the other categories; (c) The ethnic mix of the group correlated with phobia (r = -.525) yielding a significance level of .05 but showed no significant correlation with other categories of the CATE; (d) Female sibling No. 1's education correlated with phobia (r = 0.4) with a significance level of 0.1. There were no further significant correlations with SES in any of the categories pre test for the Control Group.

Post-test, the Control Group showed none of the above SES factors to be significantly correlated to the CATE categories. That is, the influence of these factors did not perdure over test-retest. They could not, therefore, be consistent factors in accounting for variance in pre- and post-test results unless it is asserted that test-retest tended to nullify the effect of these factors and this could not be claimed for groups of the size dealt with in this study. The only consistent factor in SES, which showed correlation for the Control Group pre- post-test with categories of the CATE, was ethnic origin which correlated (r = -0.5) with phobia pre-test and with discernment (r = +0.7) post-test. Thus, there was no factor which could be said to perdure for this group in both tests.

The pre-test correlation results for the experimental groups showed a similar lack of consistency and stability, when examined post test in the correlations of SES factors with categories of the CATE. However, as can be seen in Table 19, the factor of ethnic origin with phobia did perdure for this group. Since this was not the case for the smaller
Table 20
Significant Correlations of TOC with Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>$\alpha_2$</th>
<th>Crit. r</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>with Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>NOT TESTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>NOT TESTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>(1) -0.251</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>Rapprochement</td>
<td>Test of Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control Group, however, no general claim can be made, although the post-correlation was less than that of the pre-test and it was negative (Table 19).

The statement which now can be made is that the differences observed in pre- and post-test results were not due to consistent and significant correlation with SES factors. Since the Control Group was not administered a test of mental capability, the between-group variance on the TOC or the Otis Lennon, if any, could not be examined for correlation with the category results obtained by all three groups on the CATE. They can, however, be examined as the variance is confronted, pre- and post which was found between the two experimental groups.

**Correlation of CATE with TOC**

No significant correlations were found between the TOC and any of the pre- or post-test scores for either of the experimental groups, except for a negative correlation with pre test scores of rapprochement in Group A at the 0.1 level (Table 20).

The differences between control and experimental results pre- and post-test were not found, then, to be consistently and significantly related to any of the SES factors and the difference between the two experimental groups was not found to rely on any consistently and significantly related SES or TOC variables.

**Correlations of CATE with IQ and Gender**

The only correlations which could be found between categories and IQ occurred post-test and, as a result, the number of respondents was not large enough for any claims to be made. Only one finding correlated gender with any of the categories in control or experimental, pre- or post-test. Phobia was correlated with gender for the pre-test of the control group only (Table 21 and Table 22).
Table 21
Significant Correlations of IQ with Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>$\alpha_2$</th>
<th>Crit. r</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>with Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>NOT TESTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>NOT TESTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>NOT TESTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (A &amp; B)</td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>(1) 0.334</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>(2) 0.326</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>Rapprochement</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) 0.273</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>Discernment</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22
Significant Correlations of SEX with Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>( \alpha_2 )</th>
<th>Crit. r</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>with Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>(1) -0.444</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>Phobia</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A &amp; B)</td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Chapter 7

The measurement of attitudes to old people and to ageing, using the CATE, showed an increase post-test in the four categories developed from the test for both Group A and Group B. The Control Groups showed some small increases, but these were much less than those observed in the experimental groups. Of the two experimental groups, Group B showed larger increases than Group A. These results are now interpreted to mean that:

1. Experimental Group B, which investigated the topic of "young people"old people through teacher-directed drama, had achieved more appropriate attitudes than Group B (see Chapter 3) to old people and to ageing and that this result could, in all likelihood, be attributed to the type of drama investigation undertaken by the groups.

2. Experimental Group A also achieved more appropriate attitudes to old people and to old age and this effect could be attributed to the child-directed drama they did but this change was not as great as that achieved by Group B.

3. Differences in the results obtained by Groups A and B were due, for the most part, to the drama method employed, although the mental capabilities of Group B may have had a small part to play in the differences observed between these groups.

4. Differences between notions of knowledge, discernment, and rapprochement merit further investigation in the study of attitudes.

Empirical evidence has thus confirmed a tendency of drama to ameliorate attitudes to old people and to ageing and has indicated that greater change in such attitudes can be brought about by drama methods which employ some teacher direction when these are compared with child-directed drama.

When the empirical results obtained in the study are viewed side by side with the qualitative insights gained in Chapter 6, the above claim may be strengthened. In the final chapter, the results detailed in both Chapters 6 and 7 are drawn together to form the conclusions of the study, and implications of the work are also offered. Within the framework of this empirical investigation, informing it, and offering criticism of it, was the ongoing qualitative study.
CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This investigation has dealt with some aspects of what drama education is, with an interpretation of what attitudes are, with the relationship between drama and attitudes, and with the relationship of both to a concept of personhood. The investigation proceeded from a theoretical examination followed by practical examination with children enrolled in Grade 5 and their teacher as co-researchers. A control group was employed, in addition, to provide a basis for comparison in the quantitative section of the investigation since the C.A.T.E. has no population norms to which group means can be compared. The theoretical examination was designed to examine the notion of attitude and drama theory.

The former theoretical examination dealt with the relationship of attitudes to personhood. Ideal attitudes of persons to each other are conceived of as based in mutual respect. Respect acknowledges a symbiotic relationship of each person with all others, demands scrutiny and reason giving, is maintained in agape, and is supported by the mutual nurture of goals and means under the principle of justice. Scrutiny, the presenting of argument and good reasons are conceived of as not achieved exclusively through the agency of word, but, as achieved in interactions within a context, and in gesture, sound and image.

In the latter theoretical examination, drama is seen as the participant’s philosophy in an action/reflection dialectic. The philosophy of the participants evolves through the examination of possible positions for imagined characters in some context on an issue of concern to them. The examination results in identification with the characters and a subsequent embodiment of them. Fusion of the concerns of characters and participants allows a persona to emerge, who, through negotiation with others in honest action and reflection seeks to embody what is in fact the case. Therefore, the effect of the negotiations is normative as they mould the positions of the personae in the given circumstances. To achieve believability in the created action, participants refer to their experiences in the real world and to real, logical sequences of events. Thus, their experience is revealed, scrutinised, argued and justified. All that is extraneous is then removed in
order to do justice to the individual and communal stances achieved. It was argued that drama's investigation is, therefore, primarily the investigation of the attitudes and values of the participants, of the norm, and of the ideal.

The attitude investigated was that shown to ageing and to old people. This attitude was chosen to exemplify the conception of attitude argued for in Chapter 3. The position taken was that children's attitudes to ageing and to old people were, today, less than ideal, and a case was made for this belief. As its central focus, the practical examination was then designed to answer the question, "What effect might a program of drama have on the attitudes of Grade 5 children toward ageing and toward old people?" The practical examination was empirical, in a quasi-experimental format, and it was qualitative, and the results from both enquiries were related to each other.

Conclusions

The results are listed first, followed by the conclusions.

1. Both qualitative and quantitative results supported the view that the attitudes of the Grade 5 children involved in the investigation toward old people became more positive as a result of a program of drama education.

2. The empirical study demonstrated that fear of ageing was also allayed for these children but, with one exception, the qualitative investigation did not offer evidence of this. The exception was the drama teacher's account of how the children related the work done in drama during the study to a subsequent unit of study on "transformations and explosions." The teacher asserted that the children had become fascinated and had demonstrated a sense of wonder about the changes due to ageing. This attitude had, in part, replaced a fear of ageing.

3. The triangulations and the empirical data revealed that the change in attitudes consisted of changes in knowledge about ageing and about the elderly, in changes in feelings toward the elderly, and in changes in dispositions to act toward the elderly. Identification with the interests, feelings, goals, and means of the elderly was also revealed as an important factor in attitude change—perhaps a central factor. This was shown in the categories of "discernment" and "rapprochement" in the empirical study, in the involvement with and interest in the motivations of the elderly (discussion of what drama is for) and in the drama interviews which linked with the theoretical perspective of symbiosis discussed in Chapter 3.
4. Children in the control group showed an increase in, or an entrenchment of, negative attitudes to the elderly and to ageing, both in the empirical results and in their drawings, post-test.

5. The notions of scrutiny of self and of others and of the offering of justifications for chosen stances, from the theoretical perspective, were observed in action during participant / observation in the drama classroom as the children expressed opinions and negotiated what their drama would be about. These notions were evident in the interviews as the children discussed what their drama meant, and they were present also in the responses to the empirical instrument post-test, as they gave reasons in responding to open-ended questions. Notions of scrutiny of self or others and the offering of justifications were not part of the pedagogical repertoire of the teacher as she led the children in the drama enquiry for this study.

6. From interviews with children and from journal writing, exploration into what drama is revealed that for these children, drama is concerned with investigating attitudes of self, of peers, and of imagined characters.

7. Equally, these data revealed that drama employed the experience and the imagination of its participants, as Boal, Heathcote, and Bolton have all claimed.

8. What the children felt as the characters and about the characters was seen to translate in Group A, to a personal application to their own lives and in Group B to a more general application. For Group A the more general reflection came later and only when questioning in interviews prompted the impulse. Translation of learnings of whatever kind from the symbol system of drama to a discursive mode as employed in interviews can therefore lead to either response. It is tempting to suggest that this was due, at least in part, to the differences in the drama methods involved in the teaching. This might have been the case. However, there is no evidence from this study to support this claim.

9. Some of the children recognized that drama caused them to re-value the people in their lives (two from Group B were interviewed on this point after the drama was over—see Chapter 6). This response was explicitly given without prompting by these children. A similar interpretation could be advanced of some of the other interviews where re-valuing seemed to be implicit in the accounts children gave of how they now viewed the elderly. This interpretation was supported by
the change in the drawings of the experimental group and by the change in attitude scores in the empirical instrument. This re-valuing was also present in the journal writings of most students.

10. Methods used by the drama teacher (who was also a co-researcher in this study) are not those which I would have employed. This position would tend to support Bolton's (1979, p. 19) view that there can be educational merit depending on the context in exercise types of drama which offer a mixture of dramatic playing and showing. The theoretical position described in Chapter 4 of this study presupposed, as the chosen pedagogy, a Type D drama or drama for understanding. While the steps of the theoretical position were not present in the teacher's methodology, they were present in the procedures which the children employed in building their drama in this study.

These conclusions have been reached as a result of the theoretical position on attitudes argued for and as a result of analysis of drama investigation carried out by a selected group of children which dealt with the topic young people / old people. Further, the conclusions result from the findings of the qualitative and quantitative examination of the drama and of the chosen attitude by this researcher in conjunction with teacher and children co-researchers.

In addition, the conclusions have been reached through a theoretical and qualitative investigation of what constitutes drama for a limited group of participants. The investigation has been one which examined drama through the study of an attitude and which examined an attitude through the study of drama. Each investigation shed light upon the other. The means whereby both were studied were qualitative and quantitative. The results which each of these means revealed supported each other, and each means expanded the insights offered by the other. There was little evidence of contradiction in the findings.

Limitations of the Study

Same limitations of the study were as follows:

1. The investigation was carried out with a chosen, carefully selected group of students in a Catholic fine arts school. The results represent what is the case for those students in that school but it may be that fine arts schooling itself engenders respect for persons. As against this, however, attitudes toward the elderly
revealed by the pre-tests of both experimental and control groups were similar, though the latter—also Catholic and of similar SES—were not students in a fine arts school.

2. The study needs to be replicated and cannot in any sense claim to be predictive of attitude change in general as a result of drama education. This has been merely a beginning.

3. Some distortion must necessarily have occurred as the students attempted to translate the symbols of drama into the common language of oral accounts. In this event, the latter must be treated with some reserve.

Implications of the Study

Perhaps some of the important aspects of the study lie in its implications:

1. The most important implication of the study is to be drawn from the relationship between the aesthetic and the moral domains and the resonances between them, in terms of the understanding of the human condition which they offer to persons involved in the creation of art. The implications of this research for the field of education seem to be of staggering proportions:

   (a) The issue of personhood and its relationship to attitude, no matter how this is dealt with in a classroom, must become a central concern for educators. The finding of the most appropriate means of investigating the relationship between attitude and personhood, through engaging in and reflecting upon drama, should be accorded a high priority. Indeed, further investigation through drama of attitudes and of attitudes through drama may reveal that they are mutually constitutive. This particular line of enquiry may indicate that attitude change achieved by participating in drama activities is likely to be far more effective than any resulting from exhortation or example. Perhaps Heathcote's (1982) notion that books are not there to be read or even (to take her notion further) to be embraced, but to be shouted at, might be applied to the notion of attitude. If the "shouting" is to be worthwhile, perhaps it should be in the drama symbol system and form, rather than in words.

   (b) Many more studies are required to elucidate further the relationship between attitudes and drama and between values and drama.
Within the field of drama education, the relationship between inter-participant negotiations and negotiations between teacher/leader and participants, as well as the variations in power distribution which these imply, require immediate attention. In such negotiations and in the management of them, the lines are fine indeed between freedom, subversion, and oppression, and must be clearly drawn for educators.

The need is clear to institute research into the dialectic between normative formulation, achieved by overt and covert negotiations, and ideal formulation, which are possibly connected to aspiration, is clear.

In connection with the aesthetic and ethical dialectic, a research program to examine the relationship within drama would be of great value to further understanding of drama education and of drama itself.

Work in both dramatic and in ethical enquiry into the dialectic between the norm and the ideal both in overt and in covert negotiations is necessary.

Central to the relationship between ethics and drama is the question of the function of aspiration in people’s lives. This relationship requires examination philosophically, psychologically, and educationally, and its relation to drama forms and to drama creation needs to be explicated.

It would seem important to distinguish between aspiration and motivation. Nonetheless, the connections between them could further extend knowledge in both ethics and drama and is of great importance to education as a whole and to moral education in particular.

Perhaps the most obvious implication of the research in this study is that the effect of drama on attitudes other than those toward the elderly and toward ageing could be examined with profit.

It is clear, too, that the use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches in this type of study, and perhaps in other types of research, is a seminal one in that each method of research informs and calls into question the results of the other.

Above all, the theoretical investigation was the core of both the qualitative and quantitative enquiry. What drama education is, what it might become, and the extent of the role it might play in the education of children is still only dimly seen. To clarify this role, today’s researchers must return to the experiences and insights of great educators (eg. Rousseau and Dewey) and, from the vantage point such a study might afford, search for valuable insights into present drama practice, into the future constitution of drama, and into its contribution to education.
REFERENCES


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Letters soliciting research participants
APPENDIX B

1. Parental informed consent release(s).

2. Socio-economic status form.

3. Confidential transmission envelope.

4. Researcher's acknowledgement form.
DRAMA and ATTITUDE CHANGE: PERMISSION NOTE

CONFIDENTIAL

For the eyes of Roberta Bramwell only

I ______________________________ give/do not give (please delete phrase which does not apply) permission for my child ______________________________ to participate in a research project which will investigate the effects of drama on children's attitudes to ageing and to old people. I understand that this permission is given as informed consent without prejudice and that any further information I may require may be obtained by contacting Roberta Bramwell at my child's school. I also understand that all information gathered in the course of the research will be kept confidential unless I decide otherwise, and that either myself or my child may decide to withdraw from the project at any time without prejudice.

(Signed) ______________________________
(Parent/Guardian)

Date ______________________________ 1989

Total amount of time involved = 60 mins. per child

Brebeuf Elementary/Jr. High School
DRAMA and ATTITUDE CHANGE: PERMISSION NOTE

CONFIDENTIAL

For the eyes of Roberta Bramwell only

I ____________________ give/do not give (please delete phrase which does not apply)

permission for my child ____________________ to participate in a research project which will investigate the effects of drama on children's attitudes to ageing and to old people. I understand that this permission is given as informed consent without prejudice and that any further information I may require may be obtained by contacting Roberta Bramwell at my child's school. I also understand that all information gathered in the course of the research will be kept confidential unless I decide otherwise, and that either myself or my child may decide to withdraw from the project at any time without prejudice.

(Signed) ____________________
(Parent/Guardian)

Date ____________________1989

Total amount of time involved = 500 mins. per child

St. John Fine Arts Elementary School
RESEARCH PROJECT: DRAMA AND ATTITUDE CHANGE

PARENTS' INFORMATION AND SCORING FORM

CONFIDENTIAL RESEARCH

STUDENT NUMBER_______

The following cultural information is requested to show the different ethnic backgrounds of families who have helped with this project:

ORIGIN: Canadian _______ Middle European _______ British _______ French _______
Native Indian _______ Far East _______ Other (please specify) ________

FAMILY MEMBERS: Mother and Father _______ Mother only _______ Father only _______
Mother's highest educational level _______ Father's highest educational level ________
Brother's age _______ Educational level _______ Sister's age _______ Educational level _______

The following economic information is requested to show the range of financial backgrounds of families involved in the study:

FAMILY INCOME: More than $70,000 _______ $50,000--$69,999 _______
$30,000--$49,999 _______ $15,000--$29,999 ______
$10,000--$14,999 _______ Less than $10,000 _______

**I understand that there is no compulsion to complete this or any other form and that either I or my child may withdraw at any time without prejudice.**

STUDENT NUMBER_______ C.A.T.E. Scores

Picture _______ Birth Order _______ Word Association _______

Semantic Differential _______ (Young) _______ (old) T.O.C. _______
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF CONSENT

I, Roberta J. T. Bramwell, acknowledge receipt of the consent form
signed by ___________________________ on behalf of ____________________
son/daughter/ward

(Signed) ___________________________ Date ___________________________
APPENDIX C

CATE Test and author's letter of permission
CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ELDERLY (CATE)

WORD ASSOCIATION

Section 1
What can you tell me about old people? Positive Negative
Frequency Count - Affective Responses
Physical Responses
Behavioral Responses

Section 2
What old people do you know?
Family: Yes No
Others: Yes No
What do you do with that person?
With-active: Yes No
With-passive: Yes No
For: Yes No

Section 3
Can you give me another name for old people?
Yes No

Section 4
How do you feel about getting old? Check one.
Positive
Neutral
Negative

(1v)

Extracted from ED 181 081, and reproduced with kind permission of the authors. See letter attached.
Section 1

Directions: Photographs are shuffled and placed in random order on testing table.

A. Which person do you think is the oldest?

Response: (Ability to Identify) Yes No

Why?
Response: Evaluative Physical-descriptive

B. Photographs remain on table.

Directions: If child has identified correctly in (A), examiner continues.
If child has failed to identify, examiner points to photograph of oldest man.

How will you feel when you are that old?
Response: positive neutral negative

C. Directions: Examiner points to oldest person.

What things would you help this person do?
Response: affective behavioral stereotype behavioral unique

D. Directions: Examiner points to oldest person.

What things could he help you do?
Response: affective behavioral stereotype

(v)
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Section 2

Directions: Photographs remain on testing table in random order.

A. Can you put these pictures in order from the youngest to the oldest?
   Response: (Ability to order) yes no

Directions: Photographs are placed in proper sequence. Examiner points to photographs, one at a time in correct order.

B. How old do you think each of these men are? Record actual age.
   Photograph 1 (Youngest)
   Photograph 2 (2nd Youngest)
   Photograph 3 (2nd Oldest)
   Photograph 4 (Oldest)

Section 3

Directions: Examiner indicates all four photographs.

A. Which of these people would you prefer to be with?
   1 2 3 4
   Why? age-related altruistic evaluative

Directions: Examiner points to photograph chosen in 3 (A).

B. What kinds of things could you do with that person?
   Response: with-active with-passive for

(vi)
### SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Harmful
- Healthy
- Poor
- Clean
- Unfriendly
- Pretty
- Terrible
- Right
- Sad
- Good
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Differential</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Child's Concept of Age

1. You will grow older, but your father will stay the same age.
   Why?

2. Your mother and your grandmother are the same age.
   Why?

3. Your grandfather was born before your father.
   Why?

4. You and your mother are the same age.
   Why?

5. If someone was born first, then they are older than you.
   Why?

6. You were born before your teacher was born.
   Why?

7. Your grandmother grows older every year.
   Why?

8. If someone is bigger than you, then they are older than you.
   Why?

9. You grow older every year.
   Why?

10. If someone is five years older than you, they will always be five years older than you.
    Why?

11. Someone is two years older than you, but you will catch up to them and be the same age someday.
    Why?

12. How old were you when you were born?
    Why?
APPENDIX D

TOC Test
TEST OF COMPREHENSION

Pilot Instrument

Instructions

On the following pages you will find a list of 20 sentences which you are asked to complete. You are offered four different endings (a, b, c, or d) to complete each sentence.

Keeping in mind what you recall of the story we have just read together, draw a line around the ending which you think best completes each sentence. Please circle only one ending for each sentence.
The Berenstain Bears and the Week at Grandma's

1. At the beginning of the story, Mama Bear and Papa Bear had decided to:
   (a) take the Bear cubs on vacation.
   (b) take a second honeymoon.
   (c) visit Gran and Gramps.
   (d) send the cubs to summer camp.

2. The little Bear cubs thought their parents' idea was:
   (a) exciting and unusual and they couldn't wait to go along.
   (b) strange and hard to understand.
   (c) a good chance for them to have friends over to play.
   (d) a boring kind of trip for their parents.

3. Mama Bear and Papa Bear stopped the Bear cubs' protests by saying:
   (a) they were going in any case.
   (b) they didn't want everyone to know.
   (c) that honeymoons were for grownups.
   (d) that writing a letter was not necessary.

4. When the Bear cubs heard this they felt:
   (a) grateful that they were going to Gran and Gramps.
   (b) annoyed that they couldn't have friends over.
   (c) satisfied that Mama and Papa were going.
   (d) afraid to stay with Gran and Gramps.

5. The Bear cubs did not want to stay with Gran and Gramps because:
   (a) their home was far away.
   (b) they would miss their friends.
   (c) they wanted to go to summer camp.
   (d) Gran and Gramps were so old.
6. The Bear cubs thought that staying with Gran and Gramps would be:

(a) a new and thrilling experience.
(b) a lonely and boring time.
(c) a chance to get to know Gran and Gramps better.
(d) just as good as going with Mama and Papa.

7. The main problem with Gran and Gramps was:

(a) They lived far away.
(b) The Bear cubs did not know their house well.
(c) There would be no friends to play with.
(d) They were sort of old.

8. When Gran waved goodbye to Mama and Papa Bear, Brother Bear thought:

(a) that she must be a very kind lady.
(b) that he was the one who was young.
(c) that she was not making any sense.
(d) that now he would have lots of fun.

9. After the Bear cubs ate their cookies, Gramps:

(a) took them for a walk.
(b) showed them his stamp collection.
(c) arranged for them to have little friends to play with.
(d) gathered them up, bags and all, and carried them upstairs.

10. Gramps surprised the Bear cubs because:

(a) he was strong for someone so old.
(b) there were many beautiful places to see.
(c) they were glad to have young friends to play with.
(d) Gramps had stamps from all over the world.
11. While they were at Gran and Gramps' house, the Bear cubs:

(a) made their own fun by playing together.
(b) spent a lot of time exploring the neighbourhood.
(c) found out how special Gran and Gramps were as people.
(d) were very lonely and missed their parents.

12. The most unexpected thing about Gran and Gramps was:

(a) that they won a prize as the friskiest couple.
(b) that they played with the Bear cubs.
(c) that Gran was a good cook.
(d) that Gran and Gramps knew so much.

13. The Bear cubs' big discovery about a visit to Gran and Gramps was:

(a) that there were lots of things to do.
(b) that their grandparents could not do much because they were so old.
(c) that they missed their friends.
(d) that they had so much fun with their grandparents.

14. The Bear cubs had learned that:

(a) they would like to go back to Gran and Gramps.
(b) their parents had enjoyed their second honeymoon.
(c) all bears can enjoy honeymoons.
(d) they, too, would like to go on a honeymoon.

15. At the end of their visit, the Bear cubs suggested to Papa Bear:

(a) that next trip they would all go together.
(b) that Gran and Gramps should go on a second honeymoon.
(c) that Mama and Papa should go on a third honeymoon.
(d) that it was better for all of them to stay at home instead of going on a honeymoon.
16. After their visit to Gran and Gramps, the Bear cubs realized:

(a) that their parents needed a break.
(b) that they looked forward to visiting them again.
(c) that Mama Bear and Papa Bear were glad to see them.
(d) that they couldn't wait to get home.

17. Gramps had explained that he knew a lot because:

(a) he had gone to school and university.
(b) he had read many books.
(c) he had friends who taught him a lot.
(d) he learned something new every day.

18. Gramps and Gran had learned during the Bear cubs' visit that:

(a) children can be very tiring.
(b) they wanted Mama and Papa to have a rest.
(c) it was wonderful to be grandparents.
(d) they liked their home when it was quiet.

19. The Bear cubs learned that:

(a) old people can teach you and can be fun.
(b) Mama and Papa Bear had missed them.
(c) they did not want to come back to Gran and Gramps' house again.
(d) it had been just the sort of visit they expected.

20. This book was really about:

(a) how valuable old people really are.
(b) how useful grandparents can be to parents.
(c) how easy it is to visit relatives.
(d) how much parents need a time to themselves.
APPENDIX E

Typical children's interviews
INTERVIEWS: CHILDREN [John & Paul]  
12 December 1989

Tape I  
[Side A,  
#1-234]

Q: Okay, John, now can you tell me about the ideas that you had for your story?  
A: Well, first, um, first, this guy went out onto his balcony to look at the, um, this guy. And, um, this taxpayer came along and asked if, um, he could pay his dues. And he said,"no,no,no." So the guy got mad and he went off. And while he was walking away he tripped over a ladder. And that's the end.

Q: And that was the end? Who were the young people in the story?  
A: Ummm, the taxpayer.  
Q: The taxpayer was the young person? Who was the old person?  
A: The old, the man, in his house.  
Q: On the balcony?  
A: Yep.  
Q: And what was the reason why he didn't want to pay his taxes?  
A: Well, because he hardly had any money.  
Q: Right. So you were thinking about, when you were trying to make your story, people who were older not having much money? Is that right?  
A: Right!  
Q: Right. Um, what might have happened, do you think? Did you want the guy, the taxman, to trip over something so the old man wouldn't be bothered anymore?  
A: Yeah.  
Q: Yes. Do you think--can I ask you, John, what happens if someone, a tax man, comes to bug you about your taxes, and then he gets sick, or something? What happens then?  
A: Well, uh, somebody else takes his place,
Q: Right. So what would be the good of him tripping over a ladder? Is it just what you wanted to happen?
A: Yeah.
Q: Yes. But it doesn't really change things, does it?
A: Nope.
Q: Why do you think old people shouldn't pay taxes?
A: Well, . . .
Q: Really, that's very interesting, that idea you had! But why is it that you think old people shouldn't pay?
A: Well, because they might be slow gettin' to the bank, and that.
Q: Right. It's a lot of effort for them?
A: Yeah.
Q: But you said the old guy was poor, right?
A: Yeah, a little bit.
Q: So that might be a reason, do you think?
A: Yeah.
Q: Do you think that people sometimes are taxed when they can't afford it?
A: Yeah.
Q: Yeah. So, I wonder--can I just ask--how did you get to know about old people and taxes and things like that?
A: Oh, I didn't really.
Q: But you must have known it! Do you think it was something to do with the drama that made you think of it?
A: Yeah.
Q: What do you think it was?
A: The mime.
Q: The mime! Oh! What did you see in the mime?
A: Well, (long pause) . . .
Q: Just take your time and try and think what it was that brought it to your mind.
A: It was how the actors moved and stuff.
Q: Yes.
A: And, (long pause) . . .
Q: Don't worry about it. You can't remember what it was, but it just came to you because of the mime, you think?  
A: Yeah.  
Q: Okay, okay. Good. Paul, John just told us about his story. It was very interesting because he thought about taxes and about old people and the amount of money they had. And also, he thought about getting to the bank, the difficulty-- because some of them don't drive, right?  
A: Yeah, yeah.  
Q: It takes them a long time to get to the bank,  
A: Yeah.  
Q: Those are very interesting things, right?  
A: Uhuh.  
Q: What do you think may have brought it to John's mind? Do you remember anything in the mime that brought those ideas to John?  
A: Uh, the . . .  
Q: You see, my problem is that I don't remember a mime about taxes, but it could have been maybe one I missed.  
A: Uh, it could be, um, one about Patrick's--uh, the, motorcycle one, It could be that, that, um, that old people could, um, do have a lot of money, and then, he just thought, oh, and then when he watched it he just thought of the opposite! And so . . .  
Q: That's wonderful! Is that right, John? How could you ever have thought that? That's excellent! Of course! Could I ask you something, John?  
A: Yes.  
Q: Do some times the things you see in drama bring up to your mind the opposite things?  
A: Yes.  
Q: When you think,"They haven't got that right!" [chuckle] Eh? Is that what you were thinking?  
A: Yeah.
Q: Yeah, that's neat! Good for you!
So you're really thinking for
yourself, aren't you?
A: Yep.
Q: Yes. So, could you tell me,
then--you don't think the other
guys were wrong with the
motorcycles, do you? Were they
totally wrong?
A: I thought it was kinda weird!
Q: You thought it was weird? Why was
that weird?
A: Well, I never even did see an old
man on a motorcycle before!
Q: Right! Right! But do you think
it's possible?
A: Ohhhhh, yeah, I think so.
Q: We had some talk, didn't we, some
discussion about old people on
motorcycles?
A: Well, uh, one time in California,
54 years old, and so, there was a
big king. There were lots of
motorcycles in California. I
think they have it still.
Q: So you knew about that.
A: Yeah.
Q: So you were more believing than
John was.
A: Well, I thought, um, that,
Patrick's was, um, pretty, um,
that the man was pretty rich, um,
the old one, and so John would
make it opposite and poor.
Q: Right. You wanted to show that
there are some old people that
are poor? Is that right?
A: Yes.
Q: Yes. So, old people are sometimes
rich, sometimes poor, sometimes
able to do things, sometimes not.
But isn't that the same as people
your age?
A: Uhhuh.
A: There's a lot of it in Ireland.
Q: In Ireland? Tell me about that.
A: Oh, there is a lot of poor people
in Ireland. My mom used to live
in a -- my mom's Irish, and she
used to live on an old street
and, um, so, she didn't have much
money, and she had a really, very small house. And I looked in this magazine one time, and this girl was about five years old and when she went to school she didn't have enough money for a lunch. And then the government let her have a free lunch at school.

Q: Yes, there's a lot of hunger around, . . .
A: I used to think that old people were really rich because when they retire they have a lot of money, because they might save up all the money that they get paid from their jobs. So they have enough money to pay their taxes and everything.

Q: Right. But now, what do you think?
A: Well, in John's story he might not have had, that man might not have had a job or anything . . .
Q: Maybe he was too old to work.
A: Yeah. He didn't have enough money I guess.
Q: Right. John, what was the situation with your old man? You saw him in your head, didn't you?
A: Yes.
Q: Yes. What was going on with him?
A: He was like, um, he had too much work to do, like pay his taxes and stuff.
Q: Uhuh. So he wasn't getting much money from his work?
A: No, he wasn't.
Q: No? Oh. Even though he worked hard? What age was this man, about, do you think?
A: Seventy.
Q: I see!
A: He could have worked in a construction job or something, cause most of those people don't get much money for pay.
Q: I see. Okay. Paul, could you tell me about the story you made up?
A: Okay. Um, what I did is that, um, I made this, it was called "The Broken Cradle." So what happened
was this, um, little two-year-old kid was in the cradle, and he always sings. And he sings himself to sleep, and he's singing "Rockabye Baby." And then his cradle fell over upside down, and then his mom comes through and opens the door and she sees him. Then she turns it over and she breaks one of the legs off. So then she tries to fix it and she breaks another leg. And then she gets the bottom of the crib all broken, and so she has to get a new cradle. So she asks her older daughter to babysit Terry while she goes out. And then she went to the store and she got the cradle in the shape of a Jacob's ladder. And so she thought that was perfect, but the baby didn't like it, at the end.

Q: Didn't like it?
A: Yeah. He sang, "I don't like this little cradle."

Q: Oh, I see. That's great! What do you think, Paul, was the main idea about old people and young people that was in your story?
A: Uh, I, uh, I like babies a lot, and I think they're really cute, and so I thought to do one on a baby that could talk, and sing, because . . . my mom has this record, and it sounds like a boy that's singing like a little kid, and so, I thought of doing something like that. So I wrote it! I did it with the strings.

Q: Right. And the strings gave you the idea of a cradle, instead of a ladder? Which was very interesting? Right! And, do you know what I like, the idea that the baby was so smart and could talk, but the older person, the mother, was not so smart! (chuckle) Isn't that right?
A: Yeah. Right.

Q: So sometimes you can get older people who are not very smart, right? And you get young, young,
young people that are really really smart! Right!

A: Like, yeah, like my cat she used to have a real long name, it was Topsy, and I could spell it when I was three.

Q: Isn't that wonderful? Gosh, what does that mean about people? Those two stories are wonderful! Because they tell us something really important about people. What does it tell us?

A: It tells us that, um, sometimes young people can be richer than the young people, and . . .

A: And sometimes old people aren't that smart, than young people.

Q: Right. And sometimes old people are poor?

A: Yeah.

Q: And sometimes young people are really really smart, and sometimes it's the other way around.

A: Yeah. Well, it's like, uh, "that baby's gonna be a teacher at DeVry, or something."

Q: Right. That's beautiful. Do you know what's interesting? Is that you guys get all these ideas, and really super ideas in drama, Why do you think that happens in drama?

A: Well, um, I think that, uh, TV, I watch a lot of it. And movies. I like watching them. And, um, I get ideas from all of those and mix them together. And then I put them to make sense and, uh, . . .

Q: So drama helps you make sense of all the ideas you get?

A: Yeah.

Q: Is that what you're saying?

A: Yeah. I got that one from Ghostbusters II.

Q: Yes, but you also got an idea from the string,

A: Yeah.

Q: That was the main idea! Wasn't it?

A: Yeah.

Q: And where else did you get an
idea? Remember, you said to me about the baby being smart? Where did you get that idea?
A: From myself.
Q: Yes. So, you're using your own experience, right?
A: Yep.
Q: And you're using things you have noticed in the world, like TV and movies, and funny things at school, and all those things, and you're using your imagination. And the thing that you're given in drama was the string? Right?
A: Yes.
Q: So you used drama, didn't you?
A: Yes.
Q: Why do you think drama is a good thing? Why is it enjoyable?
A: Hmmm. Well, I think . . . (long pause)
Q: Why do you think drama is valuable?
A: Well, um, in my old school I didn't have much drama, so I was pretty excited when I came to this school and had drama, so, I like it!
Q: What do you like about it? What's good about it?
A: I like, well, you get to do , . .
Q: Okay, so what do you think, now, Paul?
A: Well, I think when I learned that um, in drama, you're, you begin to, um, like you could be a real good, um, player, or actor, when you grow up, or something like that. And, then, well, when I was in kindergarten I thought well, um, we had music and I was right in the middle of it, and then I would put up my hand, and I would say, "I'm going to be an actor when I grow up." And the teacher, she puts away the music book, and says,"that's a good idea, let's hear about what you want to be when you grow up." And that was a school that we didn't have drama, so . . .
Q: Ummm. You said to me, you put it
all together, didn't you?  
A: Yeah. Like puzzles.  
Q: Like puzzles! So drama's like a puzzle, but what is the puzzle about?  
A: Um, I think the puzzle's about, um, the ways that you can, um, think of what your experience is? Like . . .  
Q: Yes, What do you think happens in drama, for you? Is it different from Paul?  
A: It's the same.  
Q: It's the same?  
A: Yeah.  
Q: Oh. Can you tell me about the kinds of things we're talking about here? What kinds of things have come to your notice in drama?  
A: Well, . . .  
Q: You don't really like going in front of people, do you?  
A: Not really.  
Q: Not yet, What do you enjoy about it, then?  
A: Well, I enjoy that I can just, um, listen to people's stories, and stuff.  
Q: Why? What good is that?  
A: Well, it helps me get ideas and stuff.  
Q: Right. So you're thinking that something happens in here, in drama, that's "idea-making" (chuckles). Is that what you're saying?  
A: Yes.  
Q: Yes!  
A: Well, um, I'm in the Calgary Boys' Choir so I'm used to doing things in front of people.  
Q: Yes, yes, of course. But it really doesn't matter whether you do things in front of people, in drama. It's just doing them that's important, isn't it?  
A: Yes, There's a lot there that . . .  
Q: Because you worked all that out, that story, even though you didn't tell it. Yes. And now you
have that story for the rest of your life to think about.
A: Yeah.
Q: And it tells us a lot about people.
A: You're nothing lasts forever!
(chuckles)
Q: (laughter) Oh, inside your head it does, sometimes!

TAPE I
[Side A, #234]
[Interview with two boys ends.]
[Interview with girls (several children) from Sides A/B of this tape, is continued on new page, also dated 12 Dec 89]
APPENDIX F

Atypical children's interviews
INTERVIEWS: CHILDREN (girls: Jenny & Diane) 12 December 1989

TAPE I [& other children] [Side A cont'd. #235]

Q: Okay, do you want to tell me about your storytelling that you did about young people-old people?

A: Ummm

Q: What was your story about?

A: About Santa and a little girl. The main point was that if you help somebody they'll help you,

Q: Right. Well, what did Santa do to help?

A: He gave the little girl a ladder so she could get into her grandfather's tree-house which was broken for a month.

Q: Okay. And what did the little girl do to help Santa?

A: She helped him into the house and, um, got into the chimney, because he got stuck.

Q: Right. But wasn't there something about giving back the ladder, or something?

A: I think that was another one.

Q: Oh, I'm confused. I beg your pardon! So what did you want to tell us? Was it about just young people and old people, or all people?

A: It was about all of them, I guess, young people and old people.

Q: They can help each other?

A: Yeah.

Q: Yeah. But isn't that true about other people too?

A: Yeah.

Q: Even if they're middle-aged, like me? (chuckles)

A: Yeah.

Q: Yes, I guess so. Can you tell me about your story, Jenny?

A: Okay. Mine was about a tortoise, the tortoise and the hare. Well, a tortoise and the rabbit. The point of my story was that old...
people can be heroes, too,

Q: Oh, yes! Uhuh. And how was your
cold person a hero in the story?

A: He saved little Miss Jackrabbit
from the watchdog in Farmer
John's farm.

Q: Yes, I understood that. That
message was quite clear in both
your stories. They were quite
different, though, the two
stories, weren't they?

A: Yeah.

A: Yeah, she's got Santa Claus and a
little girl, and I've got little
bunnies--a little bunny and a
tortoise, and animals.

Q: Yes, but you know what? Although
they're so different, they're
kind of the same. What ways are
they the same?

A: We both have old people and young
people,

Q: But more than that, I think!

A: And they help each other! They
both help each other!

Q: Isn't that right! So really,
what's important about thinking
about this is that they're all
able to help each other, isn't
it?

A: Yeah.

Q: You showed that, too. Because
even although it was super
difficult to help, your people
managed to do it, didn't they?

A: Uhuh.

Q: Yes, right! And so we should
always help each other to be
helpful; that's right. Good! Now,
one of the things I want to know
is, how come you think of those
stories in drama?

A: (chuckle) The reason why I
thought of mine was because all
these people are using Joe and
Jacob, and they're using human
beings, I thought it may be
different to use animals instead.

Q: Right. And what were the animals
standing for in your head?

A: Human beings!

Q: Gees! Wonderful! So, really, you
made your story more interesting by introducing animals, didn't you?

A: I don't know. (embarrassed chuckle)

Q: Well, it was different, at least! Right? Now, what do you think your ideas came from?

A: Well, it was getting close to Christmas and I thought to make it more interesting I'd use a character that was from Christmas.

Q: Yes. Good! Because you knew that the people you were telling it to were all interested in Christmas, didn't you? (chuckle) So you thought you'd get their attention, eh?

A: Yes.

Q: That's true! And don't we see a lot of little animals around about Christmas--don't we?

A: Yes.

A: Yeah, sort of. One day I'm going to use the school grounds.

A: I've noticed that there is not very many animals hibernating during Christmas, I've seen lots of, I've seen, um, bears.

Q: Really!

A: ... bears, deer. You know, um a couple of, I think it was last month, there was a bear attack. I live right by there! And ...

Q: Yes, strange behaviour.

A: There are coyotes ... I can hear coyotes,

A: We are building a house in Springbank right now, and we were driving up there and one day we saw deers. And the other day we saw coyotes.

Q: Really?

A: And it's right by where our house is. So there are lots of animals out there, ...

A: Did he run away? They're scared of people.

Q: They are, yes, yes. At this time of the year. And of course, the other thing I wanted to ask about
was: What do you think drama's for?
A: Probably for entertainment.
Because, you know, in the days of knights in armour they had Jokers and they did drama for the kings, and that was mostly their entertainment because they didn't have radios, they didn't have TVs, they didn't have anything like that.
Q: So do you think it's sort of natural.
A: Yeah, probably.
A: I think it's from, uh, 'way, 'way, 'way back ...
Q: Just a moment, I think she wants to say something. Yes, you're right, it does go away back. You were going to say something ...
A: I think it's for learning in different ways, maybe.
Q: Uuhh.
A: For, maybe you don't always have to learn reading and writing, you can learn ...
Q: What are you learning about, though, in drama?
A: Well, right now I'm learning about old people and young people.
Q: I think you've got a great idea there! When you're doing drama in the room, before you show your work to anybody, you spend more time doing it than you do showing it, don't you?
A: Yes.
Q: So what is happening when you're doing it? What's happening inside yourself?
A: You're sort of growing.
A: Like, it's, gets more familiar with you each time you do it, and, I'm not really sure. It's sort of gets familiar with you, so you can, it's simpler each time you do it,
Q: Good! So it's making more and more sense?
A: Yeah!
Q: Do you think that's what happens?
A: Yeah.
Q: What are you playing with, inside your head?
A: Oh, we also learned that we learn better if we're using string, because before we never knew how to do anything. Now, I can do "Jacob's ladder" and the "mosquito" and the "broom."
A: It's so funny, I just learned the "mosquito" from her, and I learned the "broom" from Jennifer, and I learned the "Jacob's ladder" from Mrs. Hunter, and I...
Q: But what did those help you do, though?
A: It helped... if you're bored, you just take out a piece of string and... it's like you're in a different world! You're in a totally different land, a totally different world, and you're, you sort of go back into the future, or up to the future into the future.
Q: Good for you, yes!
A: It's also like stepping into another character's shoes, and having fun, and seeing what they're like,
Q: Seeing what they're like, yes, Why is that important? It is very important.
A: Because then you'll know what other people feel like, and not just yourself but other people!
Q: Great! That's a wonderful answer! You're really thinking. Okay, Diane, what was your story about?
A: Well, my grandpa died before, so I sorta got my idea from that, When both parents died in the aeroplane, and my grandpa died from cancer, and the kid had to stay with, uh, the grandma,
Q: So, actually, you had had the experience of your own grandfather dying, so the people in the story--what happened there? Their parents died?
A: Yeah.
Q: So the little one, the child.

A: Yeah, had to go to the grandmother's.

Q: Yes. And how did the child feel about that?

A: Well, he was really young so he didn't really know anything about it.

Q: Uhuh. So could you tell me what happened in your story, at the end?

A: He lived with his grandma from that day on, and lived happily.

Q: And lived happily?

A: Yeah.

Q: So even though the grandma was old she could take care of him and help him and do all the things that parents could

A: Take care of him, yeah, uhuh,

Q: That's a wonderful story. Um, what was your story about, darling?

A: Um, mine's about where I was watching a weird movie where, uh, about a monster, and it was just about a bit of a bad dream. And then, all of a sudden, this magical hole came in at night and it opened up so I could go in. And when I went inside, there was these creaks and everything, and then I saw this old rat. He was stuck in a hole, and he wanted me to help him get out. So I thought a bit about helping him get out; so maybe he, like, because he was old and maybe I shouldn't help him and everything, But I decided to because he would have been nice from the lesson. So I helped him get out from this hole and I got to keep the ladder at the end.

Q: Where did the ladder come in?

A: Well, where he was stuck in a hole, so I went and I got a ladder and, we built a ladder actually.

Q: Right, right. But he told you how
to do it.

A: Yeah.

Q: Right, So the rat was standing for the old person. Right?

A: Yeah, the rat.

Q: And you were really a young human being in a dream?

A: Yeah, that's right.

Q: Did the dream go on all the time? Or , . ,

A: Yeah, but it was only about five minutes, and then

Q: So the whole story was a dream, then?

A: Yeah, except for the beginning.

Q: Yes, of course. And so, you had the idea that this old rat--what did he do for the young kid in the story?

A: He, um, he helped him learn a bit, and told him how to build a ladder and let him keep the ladder.

Q: Right! So he was generous, too,

A: Yeah.

Q: And thoughtful, so you helped him, so the young person really learned, and the old person really learned . ,

A: Yes.

Q: . . . that young people could help them, too,

A: Yeah.

Q: So it was kind of a give-and-take, wasn't it, your story?

A: Yeah.

Q: Where did you get the idea for that story?

A: Oh, well, I was playing in the garage with some mouse traps we were fixing up, and my grandfather came in to help me with it. And we used a ladder to climb up and put them into these places, and that's how I got the story,

Q: Good! So you actually used things that happened to you!

A: Yeah.

Q: In real life! Isn't that neat? Yeah,
A: It was really like mine, like, I used when my grandpa died.
Q: Exactly.
Q: That must have been really hard for you when you lost your grandpa.
A: Well, I was only about 7 years old at that time.
Q: But you still remember it?
A: Yeah.
Q: You obviously loved him very much.
A: Yes.
Q: And I think, too, that both of you used not only the things that really happened, but you used something else, too. Because your stories weren't really exactly the same as real life, were they?
A: No.
Q: What did you do to make them different?
A: We changed them, like, to make them more exciting and make them sound more interesting.
Q: What do you think you used inside yourself to make them more interesting?
A: I don't know. I just thought of the grandpa dying, and the people died in the story, too.
Q: But you had a whole world for that little boy that you created... It was quite different from your own world, wasn't it?
A: Yeah.
Q: Yeah. That's right. What do you think drama is for?
A: For acting, and talking together, and it's for story telling, and mime, and things like that.
Q: But what good does it do? What do you learn?
A: You learn how to tell stories. To make up stories with your imagination.
Q: Right!
A: You also learn that uh, lessons, and things like that in legends, and things like that, too.
Q: Yeah, yeah. But you know what I noticed? All of the stories, all
of the mime, they were all about one thing. I don't know if I'm right in thinking that.

A: About the ladder?
Q: Oh you didn't use the ladder in mime, did you?
A: No, not in mime.
Q: They were all about people?
A: Old people?
Q: Don't you think--isn't drama always about people?
A: Yes.
A: Yes.
Q: So what do you think you might be learning?
A: About people, I guess, Different things people can do.
A: Learning about emotions?
Q: Emotions-- good! And?
A: Things that people can do?
Q: And you told me something just now--that you were using your imagination! So maybe it's about learning to use your imagination, what do you think? Do you usually use your imagination?
A: Yeah.
Q: You do?
A: Yeah, most of the time.
Q: Even when you're doing mime--when it's not a story?
A: Yes.
Q: Okay. So, this is interesting now. I'm just wondering you see, because I really need to know what children think, Do you enjoy drama?
A: Yes.
A: Yes.
Q: Why?
A: It's fun.
Q: What's fun about it? You don't carry on and punch each other the way you do at recess?
A: No, it's fun because you get to tell stories and act and things like that . . .
A: And you can show your emotions a lot about stories and about things you think of.
Q: It seems to me it's awful different from your other
classes.

A: Yes.

A: Yeah. Especially math.

Q: So what makes it so different, do you know what it is?

A: Well, acting out instead of writing it on a piece of paper.

Q: I've watched you guys, and a lot of times you weren't acting. It was only when you were showing your work that you had already created that you were starting to act. Most of the time you were building the drama.

A: Yes.

Q: So, that's kind of different, isn't it?

A: Yeah.

Q: That's true. So you make a real connection? . . .

A: Yeah.

Q: with other people, through their stories, and through their drama.

A: Yeah.

Q: And also you would work things out for yourself. That's wonderful!

NEW VOICES [Girls?]

Q: Can you tell me, first, what was your story about?

A: Well, um, it was about, um, a little kid going over to his grandpa's house because his parents were going out for about a week. He had to stay with someone, and he was very naughty, and nobody wanted to take him. But his grandpa offered to take him and so Jeff was getting really bored at his grandpa's house, and he asked what he could do. His grandpa told him to go
out and find somebody to play with. So he went out, and nobody wanted to play with him. He came back in and him and his grandpa went out and they built a treehouse. When his parents came back he didn't want to go [with them, he wanted to stay another week [with his grandpa].

Q: What do you think is the idea behind that story? There's a really important idea there!

A: It's, uh, you could have fun with your grandpa, if you don't really know that, or with your grandparents.

Q: Yes. What were those two people in the story busy with, when they were having such fun together?

A: Ummm . . .

Q: What was it that the young boy discovered that made him enjoy his time at grandpa's so much?

A: Ummm, that they built a treehouse together, and . . .

Q: What's the important word in that sentence?

A: Ummm, they had lots of fun together,

Q: Together!

A: Together!

Q: Because they were?

A: Building?

Q: Another word for building?

A: Um, making?

Q: Creating, doing, changing the world! Right? When we're building, making, changing things. The old man and the young kid in your story were doing that.

A: Yeah.

Q: Yeah. It's very exciting, and I think it's also very important. Why is it important, do you think? Why is it important to create, to build, to make?

A: Maybe to, um, create something inside you that, that attaches you to your grandparents, or . . .

Q: What do you recognize that you
said in that wonderful answer?

A: Umm, the fun you can have with your grandparents?

Q: Right. And that they can . . .

A: Have fun with you.

Q: Have fun with you--build, make, create . . .

A: . . . things with you.

Q: All right! What kinds of things are there in the world?

A: There's people, your grandparents, there's friends, there's . . .

Q: Those are all human beings. Right?

A: Yeh.

Q: What other kinds of things are there?

A: Animals.

Q: Anything else?

A: Yeah. Buildings, and tables, and all kinds of . . .

Q: Okay. Now, of all those things that are in the world, what things make, build, create, change things?

A: People.

Q: Only people?

A: Animals, too.

Q: What do animals make?

A: Well, they provide us food, and they keep us alive.

Q: Yes, they do, but do they use their imaginations to create new things?

A: No. Only people do.

Q: People do? In your story, what was very important about it was it wasn't just the young person.

A: Yeah, I guess that old person, too.

Q: And the two of them?

A: Together!

Q: Right! They were using their imaginations and creating a building. It is a very important part of being a person. Isn't it?

A: Yes.

Q: What was your story about?

A: It was about Norabelle and her grandma, and they just got this
Christmas tree and they didn't know how to put it up.

Q: Right.
A: And so, she didn't know how to put it up at all, so her grandma gave her some advice. She told Norabelle to go and build a ladder, but the ladder always kept on breaking on her, until sooner or later the tree finally got put up.

Q: Yes. Right.
A: Yep.

Q: So really you're talking about a very important thing about people. It doesn't always come out right the first time, does it?
A: Right.
Q: So what was the story really about?
A: Well, . . . . (long pause)
Q: No idea?
A: Well, that grandparents still have good advice. Like, sometimes they can have good advice like other people?
Q: What do you think was important about your story?
A: Ummm, the grandmother always kept on trying, and trying, and trying with her granddaughter until they got it right,
Q: So, two people working together may make many tries and eventually get it right?
A: Yeah,
Q: So that's really what is a very important thing, Why do you think that's so important?
A: Well, I think it's so important of trying and trying so then you can know that it's . . . easier?
Q: Yes, the more you try, the . . .
A: The better you can get at it?
Q: Right. Right. But these two, the little girl and her grandma weren't going off and trying by themselves, were they? What was important about that?
A: Ummm. . . .
Q: I think that was a very important idea, too, as well as idea of trying.
A: Them together!
Q: Yes. And working together, failing together, trying again together, failing again, trying again together. Isn't that the way . . . I thought that was very true of life.
A: Well, it is, because grandparents always try together, cause they never say that we should quit, so they always try, and try, and try. And the little person goes with them.
Q: Yes. When the little person goes with them like that, what good does that do for the little person?
A: Makes them feel good inside, And makes them feel like they did a lot.
Q: Right, It's satisfying, then,
A: Yep.
Q: That's great!
Q: Now this term you've been studying, in drama, youngpeople-old people. I want you to tell me how have your minds, or thoughts, or feelings, or anything changed since the beginning?
A: Ummm, well my feelings have changed just a little bit more for older people.
Q: Could you explain that, dear?
A: Well, uh, I used to not really care about older people 'cause I used to care about myself. But now, since I've got older, now I understand about old people--how they're feelings are, too, and . . .
Q: So what were you thinking before that is different, before we started the drama this term, that is different?
A: I was thinking, um, old people could take care of themselves and they don't need any other people to do it; they can do it by
themselves. But then when I got into it [drama] I just noticed that old people just do need other people to care for them more, and stuff,

Q: Now you said,"I noticed." What kinds of things brought that to your attention? What did you experience in the drama?

A: Uhm... (long pause) ... .

Q: You said your thoughts and feelings were changed by the way that you've investigated this idea in the drama.

A: Uhuh.

Q: Now, can you tell me what could you guess at what parts might have changed those thoughts and feelings?

A: Ummmm [long pause] ... .

Q: What do you do, or see, or hear in drama, or be involved in, that changes the way you think about old people?

A: Well, when I saw one of them, it made me feel...

Q: One of what, dear?

A: Um, the stories with the string. It made me feel like grandparents are important to you, not just little kids.

Q: Right.

A: And then that, um, that you shouldn't just care about yourself, you should care about other people, too.

Q: Right. And I think you thought quite deeply about that, didn't you?

A: Yeah.

Q: So you saw something in someone else's work and then you, yourself, started to think?

A: Yeah.

Q: That's very good. Can you think of anything else as a result of that that makes you say,"Hey, that's interesting!"

A: Yeah, when I saw, um, when I saw one of those mimes in, well, the mime, no, it was the string, in drama, I, um, had this feeling in
me 'cause I had this really old grandma, or great-grandma. And I just didn't really care for her 'cause I just didn't really like old people then, 'cause I thought they'd be too mean and too cranky, But when I saw one of them, I just had this feeling inside me that, um, maybe I should be nicer to my grandma, because she's a normal person like me, and I think I should treat her the same as other people.

Q: That's wonderful! And that really came to you when you heard the story, then? Where did the ideas come from that we use in drama? You know when we're working as drama people, what kinds of ideas did you get?

A: Well, I used this one experience I had with my grandma. Well, I had to go over to her house for the summer . . .

Q: You went to stay with your grandmother?

A: I didn't really want to stay with her because I didn't think I would have a fun, fun time. I thought it would be just, we'd just sit around the house doing nothing, I wanted to stay with my cousins but they had to go somewhere, too. So I stayed with my grandma, and she asked me if I wanted to go to the West Edmonton Mall with her. And, I don't know why, but I was really mad at her for some reason, and I got really mad at her, and I wouldn't talk to her. And then, that night, my grandma came down and wanted to know if I was okay. And I was okay, and I had this feeling inside me that I shouldn't be mad at her 'cause she didn't do
anything mean to me, or anything. The next day we had lots and lots of fun.

Q: Yes. So a real experience started off your story. Did you have any real experiences in your story?

A: Well, yeah. When my grandma came over, um, this is how I started having my idea with my story. I didn't how to put up this picture that my mom wanted me to put up. And, I, like, I thought I was just going to use a chair, but she said a chair wouldn't work. So she said, "go and use the ladder," but the ladder was broken. So, this is sort of true. We sat down and we planned how to make a ladder. So that's how I got a sort of idea.

Q: Yes. But there were some things in your story that were different from the way it happened.

A: Yeah.

Q: So where did you get the ideas for the different things you put in?

A: Well, I remember when we first got our Christmas tree last year that my dad didn't know how to put it up because the ladder was broken, so I got my idea from Christmas last year, and also to put up the star angel.

Q: Also you were thinking about Christmas at this time of the year, that's for sure,

A: Yeah. Well, I had my grandpa who died, but I had a grandpa, and I was young, really, I was about five years old. And he was asking me if I wanted to build a treehouse with him. And I built a treehouse with him. And so I combined those two ideas together.

Q: So actually you weren't really imagining things were you?

A: No.

Q: You were really using your experiences, mostly, Was there anything you imagined?

A: No.
A: No.
Q: For you, were the older people really your grandparents or were they other characters that were older?
A: Well, I used some other characters, but I could have used my grandparents.
Q: What about you?
A: I used myself and my grandma.
Q: Really! That's wonderful. Sometimes we do a bit of both. You know, sometimes we do all imagination. My kids did, too. Do you think some people didn't use just their experience for it?
A: Well, one of them, he claimed he went to this swamp and there was this rat, and he was in it. And there were all these golden ladders. And his teddy bear talked to him and they went through this hole, and he went in there and he went through the swamps and everything, And he met this rat when he went in, and he didn't know how to get out, so they made a ladder, and they got out.
Q: So that was mostly imagination, A: Yeah,
A: And there was another one that.
Q: Excuse me, you seem to really be inside that story as if you were actually there.
A: Well, yeah, I had a dream once like that, or something like that. I sometimes I have a funny feeling that maybe that might happen in real life, and maybe it won't.
Q: Right! Very good. You were going to say something.
A: Yeah, I don't know who it was, but he did this one that he went into the hole and this guy, he wanted out, but he couldn't get out, so there was this whole row of golden ladders, and so they got out.
Q: Right, That was really a lot of
imagination, too, wasn't it? You sound as if you were almost there with him, too! (chuckles) But I think the imagination ones get our attention, don't they? Quite a lot, because they're unusual. A: Yeah, and they're a little bit funny, too.

Q: They're a little bit funny. Can you tell me about your story that you made up? What was it about?

A: Uh, like it was just about this hole in the middle of a sidewalk.

Q: What happened to the hole?

A: Well, the boy got inside the hole and . . .

Q: Did he fall in?

A: No. He crawled in.

Q: He crawled in. What age was this boy?

A: Um, I don't know. He was 7 or 8, or something.

Q: Yes, and what happened then?

A: There were people down there and so he got them out.

Q: In the hole? There were people?

A: Yeah.

Q: So what did he do with them?

A: Like, he took them out of the hole and they went back to their homes, 'cause they were stuck down there.

Q: They were stuck.

A: Yeah.

Q: And so he got down into the hole and helped them.

A: Yeah.

Q: Who was the old person in your story?

A: Well, his grandma was at home because she was the one who told the boy about the hole, and everything,

Q: And what else did the grandma do? Anything else?

A: She told him what to do, like, how to save the people.

Q: So really, his strength and her brains got the people out of the hole?

A: Yeah.

Q: So what was the important thing
about your story? I think it's very important, your story.
A: That, um, old people can be very wise and helpful to young people.
Q: Yes. And vice versa.
A: Yeah.
Q: It was the little boy who had to do the dirty work, sort of.
Q: Yes, so we all make different contributions don't we?
A: Uhuh.
Q: That's right, very good.
Q: Do you want to tell me about your story?
A: Well, see, there was this little boy, he's about, well he's not really little, he's 10, and his name's Nathan. And about two days before Halloween he decides to go over to his grand-dad's and help him mow the lawn. And so he runs over and his grandpa is pretty old, so he can't do much things. So he decided to help him, but when he got there he finds out that the grandpa had already done all the garden work. He had mowed half the lawn!
Q: Goodness!
A: And so, he was very surprised at that. He was really surprised at what [grandpa] had done, so then he said he wanted to use the weedeater to get close to the fence to make it look neat. So the grandpa got it down, and when he was using it he couldn't get it to work right, so the grandpa came over and he helped him to do it better.
Q: Right. So the young boy really thought the old man was past it, and he got a shock when he found out all of the things grandpa could do.
A: Yeah, yeah.
Q: Could I ask you both, what made you think of those stories? Where did you get your ideas from?
A: Uhuh, I got mine 'cause I usually go over to my grandpa's to help him fix cars or shovel the walk
or help my grandma in the garden, or something.

Q: Right.

A: So I just decided to . . .

Q: . . . use that idea of going over to help. But, where did you get your idea?

A: I ummm, I don't know. I guess I was just sitting at home and it just came to me,

Q: So it was really a lot of imagination that you used?

A: Yeah.

Q: In your drama class, since we started this work, what kinds of things I've noticed happening is that people talk to each other a lot in the class, And they try out things, ideas, and they move about, and they do things, and then they talk again, and then they watch each other. And then they try again, and so they keep on doing these things, right? And then, at last, when they're ready, they show what they've built in the drama.

A: Yeah.

Q: Now, what I'm going to ask you is a really hard question, What do you think goes on in drama that gives you ideas?

A: Oh boy!

Q: Have you noticed any things that said to you,"Oh, that's interesting! Oh, I never thought of that! Oh yes, there's something else!"

A: Well, one time, last year when you had to make up stories, I saw some kids and they had a really neat idea, so I kinda made it fit into our story.

Q: Good. So you use things that you've noticed before?

A: Yeah.

Q: Do you do that, too?

A: Well, um, sometimes I look around the room and there's some hats around the animals, and there's some ideas. Maybe.

Q: But you've got you?
A: Yes, kind of.
Q: Yes. It seems and not much of your room, and then there's, like, these pictures. Some of those can give me an imagination that's very busy, haven't to be that you used a lot of imagination own experience. Is that true? Or was there something of your own experience in there?
A: Umm, I don't think so.
Q: No? But you used a lot of your own experience and some of your imagination?
A: Yeah.
Q: So they were kind of balancing each other? It's interesting, isn't it?
A: Yeah.
Q: But sometimes it might be the other way around, in drama, wouldn't it? Sometimes you would use a lot of imagination... 
A: Yeah.
Q: and very little experience; and you would use the opposite, a lot of experience and a little imagination. Because when you see those masks, and so forth, you use those but they start your imagination going.
A: Yeah.
Q: Isn't that right?
A: Yeah.
Q: Yes, and then you're off in your own wee world that you've built. That's very interesting. Why do you think drama is worth doing in schools? What do you learn?
A: You learn how to become comfortable in front of an audience, talking right to an audience, sometimes.
Q: That's true.
A: You learn to focus, and maybe when you're older, if you have to, like, maybe if you have to meet in front of a whole bunch of people, or something, so you won't be so nervous.
Q: I'm thinking more about the actual work that goes into it
Because really, the number of times you perform is not very often.

A: No.

Q: It's only after you've done all the work that you show it to people, right? What goes on in that "work doing" that you think is good learning?

A: [long pause] Well, we share ideas.

Q: Good. About...?

A: About, well, if we are doing stories, or if we have to, like, do the same as the other person, the other person might say, "Well let's do this, "and then add in that.

Q: So you talk about between you what you want to do?

A: Yeah.

Q: Right. What do you think is valuable, apart from sharing ideas with other people? What's going on inside you? When you're doing the work; not when you're performing. You like the work better than the performing, don't you?

A: Yeah.

Q: Yes, you do. So you probably can tell me a lot about what you enjoy better.

A: Yeah, like, um, you learn to use your imagination more. And, um, .

Q: But you told me a story that made a great deal of sense.

A: Yeah. I guess,

Q: So, there's two things going on—right?

A: Yeah.

Q: What are they?

A: Uh, use, your imagination and, um, . . ., [long pause]

Q: What's the imagination about, though? What are you working with? Ideas about . . .

A: Uh, young people and older people.

Q: Yes. And even before this. In the other drama you did you were
working on ideas about what?  
A: About, um, everyday life,  
Q: Everyday life, yes. And how we  
all get on, or don't get on, and  
all that stuff. Right? So, it's  
really interesting that making  
it. Actually, I think it's more  
interesting than the performing,  
I agree with you. A lot of people  
enjoy the performing, and they're  
glad to be able to do it to give  
themselves more confidence, but I  
don't think that's really what  
it's for. I think it's really the  
learning you do while you're all  
Okay, thanks a lot. That was  
wonderful. I really appreciate  
it.  
A: Okay, you're welcome.  

"END TAPE I,  
side B,  
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Informal Interviews [Mar. 1, 1990]  
Reflections: Two Girls  
Q: Can you tell me what went on in your heads during all the time you worked on your drama?  
A: Okay.  
Q: If you can think back to when you did the mimes . . .  
A: Uhuh.  
Q: What kinds of things did you deal with?  
A: . . . the kids started to get used to them because the grandma brought stuff out that they would like to see, and asked the kids what they would like to do. And the kids came more to like her more, because before, like, they wouldn't go near her too much because they were nervous. And then at the end they were all laughing together and the little kids found out that old people were much nicer, 'cause the kids were, like, okay. . .  
Q: Were they afraid of her at the beginning?  
A: Yes, they were afraid of their grandma, because their mom left and they weren't sure about her. And then they got used to their grandmas and found out that they were really normal.  
Q: What kind of ideas--where did those ideas come from?  
A: Well, my friend Susanne--and I, we were just thinking of it and showing how children don't like old people, and how they can get used to it. And that's how we got our ideas.  
Q: Good. That's good. What was your mime about, dear?  
A: Well, my mime was about, okay, I was just having fun in the playground and there was this old person, and he was golfing, and I started tripping him,  
Q: Uhuh.  
A: And I was sort of scared, because
he was threatening me, until my mom, Anne, came in and they were talking and I wasn't afraid of him anymore.

Q: What was he threatening you with?
A: His golf stick.
Q: Why?
A: Because I was tripping him.
Q: Oh, I see. So you started to tease the old person first, and then he threatened you with the golf stick, and then you got used to him as a person?
Q: Where did you get the idea of tripping him up?
A: Well, I was just mad one day, just fooling around and [Mr. Johnston] kicking my feet around and I tripped him (my friend/ the caretaker) and I thought "Hey, I can use that in our play!"
Q: Do you think, sometimes, people do tease old people?
A: Yes, a lot of times. And I feel sorry for them because they're the same people and they can't, . . they just move slower sometimes and that. And then people make fun of them, or they don't talk to them, or, you know, when they need the help they don't get it.
Q: Uuhh. And both of yours seem to be a wee bit alike, Why do I say that? Although the stories are different, they have something to do with the same idea, I think.
A: Yeah.
Q: Because the children in your mime . . .
A: Didn't know about, didn't like them . . .
Q: Didn't know enough about old people . . .
A: And then these ones did.
Q: Did you know a lot about them before?
A: Yep.
Q: Was he an old person that you knew at the beginning
of your mime?

A: No, no,

Q: But you got to know him and then you didn't feel the need . . . I think sometimes when we're afraid of things, what are the ways we show we're a little bit scared?

A: We act different. We act more mean.

A: We stand back and get--our faces get lower and lower.

Q: And sometimes we act mean?

A: Yeah. Because we don't know how to . . .

A: We blame others because we're afraid.

Q: That's true, Now, the next thing you did was tell stories. When you dealt with the stories, remember with the Jacob's ladder?

A: Yes.

A: Oh, those ones? Okay.

Q: You did your story-telling. What was your story about? I didn't know the point--

A: Mine? Well mine/was about young-people, old-people.

Q: Tell me about your story.

A: So what happened was, there was this little girl and she got a dog for Christmas and this boy had his exact same one as me. And one day they met and the girl said "You have the exact same dog as me." And so they threw frisbees tosee whose dog was best. And the dogs got lost in a haunted house--the kids thought it was a haunted house. But at the end they found them. But I didn't know what you were supposed to do, a theme about that young-people, old-people.

Q: Well, then, when you saw other people's stories--they were all about old people/young people.

A: Well, some of them weren't because they didn't know either.

Q: Oh, who else . . .

A: Kim, didn't . . .

A: Uhuh, Kim did, 'cause she did the Santa Clause to the rescue,
Q: Okay.
A: Uh, mine was about, okay, there was a little boy and he was playing ball with his friend. And then they hit the window and they were scared. So the other boy, who didn't live there, ran off and the boy was stuck trying to fix this window, but he couldn't reach it, So he ran over to his grandpa's and he asked the grandpa to help him build a ladder because he knew his grandpa was really good at it, So, then they started getting along together, and that. Then when they finished the ladder they fixed the window, like, cover it. And then the mom comes home and she finds out, but then she kind of knows that it's nice because grandpa helped this boy, and how to deal with old people-young people.

Q: Yes. It did, I think. The mom didn't mind the broken window. Why?
A: No, because she knew that the boy went to his grandpa's and...

Q: That they tried to solve the problem together.
A: Uhuh, right.
Q: So the boy had made the effort and . . .
A: Yes, because he could have just left it, and . . ,
Q: Sure he could, and blamed it on someone else, or lied about it . .
A: Yeah, even his friend! But he went over to his grandpa's instead.
Q: Yes, that's good. So he felt that . . .
A: Uh, that they're good and lots of help, and they can give lots of advice about what to do , . .
Q: Right! Right!
A: and they can build stuff.
Q: And they can support you . . .
A: Uuhhmm, yes.
Q: When you need to face some trouble!
A: Yes.
Q: Yes, that's great! Now, what about the last step. We then went in and you did the dramatization . . .
A: the dramatization, yes . . .
Q: And you had--Mrs. Hanrahan gave you a story to work on, remember? What story did you work on?
A: I did, okay, Steph and I were old people, and we had to plant this turnip, and when we got going we couldn't pull it out. And, uh, we had these two cats and the little mouse, and we wanted them to help us to pull this out, okay. So, he started off, the grandpa (Stephan) to try to pull it out, but he couldn't. So then I tried with him, and we still couldn't. So we asked the little cat to, and the other cat came, and then the mouse came, and then we all pulled it out and we all had a piece of it! and then we had a big party and supper.
Q: That was really quite an important story!
A: And, um, our little nephew, Michael, he was there, too, and he helped us, and then we had a big reunion, sort of, because we pulled out this thing for supper, and they all helped us out.
Q: So everybody helped everybody else?
A: And then we got it out, right,
Q: And as a result you were able to do something.
A: It worked! Uuhh.
Q: And also, they were then able to share in the satisfaction at the conclusion.
A: Right!
Q: All right, so what is that telling us about young people and old people?
A: Well, that you still need other people, and cooperation will work, even though they're older.
Q: So you need everybody, no matter what age they are.
A: Uhuh. Right.
Q: One person is as valuable as another, no matter what age they are, they work together,
A: Right.
Q: And what was your dramatization about? What story did you pick?
A: We didn't pick a story, we picked a poem.
Q: What poem did you pick?
A: we did "In Just."
Q: I don't remember that one, tell me about it.
A: "In Just,"--spring the flowers grow and, um, So me and my friend--I was a boy--me and Zack. He came out and we started playing marbles, right?
And then the other two girls, they just came and started skipping around because it was spring, and we started teasing the girls, And we had a squirrel in it, too.
Q: Wasn't there a balloon man in that story?
A: Oh, yeah, yeah.
Q: What was he doing?
A: Oh, well, we went up to him and we, uh, actually he sort of got blocked out of the story more like it.
Q: Oh, did he?
A: Yeah, because what she did was call"Balloons for sale."
Q: And she didn't become involved in the story at all?
A: No!
Q: Okay. So it looks to me like you didn't really--there were two of the three sections that you didn't get involved in the idea of old people.
A: Yeah.
Q: Is that right?
A: Yeah. The only old person was the old balloon man, and the
squirrel. Right.

Q: You didn't really deal with it. Tell me, though, how do you think your feeling and attitude to old people changed from before you started, to the end? Did it change at all, or not?

A: It changed a bit. I wasn't exactly sure about old people. Like, I have a grandma and grandpa, and I like them and everything, but I found out that old people have more abilities. Like, I knew they had abilities, and everything, but I found out more about them. Like, you can come and talk to them. They're just like young people.

Q: So you got knowledge about them?

A: Yeah.

Q: So you came to know more facts about them, as people?

A: That's right. Yeah.

Q: What else? Was there anything else? How about feelings, the old people's feelings?

A: Um, I feel more—it's hard to explain. But I, um, how would you explain this? I feel, I want to, my feelings are for them like. If someone was hurting them I would come and stick up for them, or if they need someone's help, or my help, I would come and do it for them.

Q: Yes.

A: Like, I would--there's a word for it--

Q: Yes, well, um, before you did all this drama, did you ever think about old people's feelings?

A: Not as much as I learned.

Q: No. But now you learned more about the way they might feel. Is that what you're trying to say?

A: Yeah. I don't know . . .

Q: So now you're going to try and understand, I don't want to put words in your mouth . . .

A: No, you're not! Um, like, if something was happening I would come and think about their
feelings and not mine.

Q: Not just yours?
A: Yeah, their feelings, I would listen to their feelings and how would they do this, and if they need someone's help, or . . .

Q: I want to ask you because you only did really the one thing that had to do with old people. How did you think about them beforehand?
A: Oh, in "Just"?
Q: No, about old people?
A: [long pause] Uh, actually, during that time I didn't think about them.
Q: You didn't think during the drama time?
A: No.
Q: Had you thought about them before, at all?
A: Yeah! Uhuh! I thought, well, like, I'd help the old man a lot, so . . . sometimes I feel sorry for them because they don't get to have as much fun as we do, because they're old people now.
Q: Maybe different things are "fun" to them. Like you grow out of things, and you grow into other ideas.
A: Yeah.
Q: So you didn't pay any attention to what was going on in the drama? I mean you didn't think about the ideas at all?
A: No. Not much.
Q: Not very much?
A: I'd just sit and watch.
Q: You just watched.
A: I didn't!
Q: No. But what about later on?
A: Oh yeah, I got to grow onto old people, and I still felt sorry for them. But I also knew they could be fun too-- teach you something you didn't know.
Q: Yeah. Was that new for you?
A: Yeah.
Q: It was. Yes, Okay, that's interesting, yes.
A: Uh, some people don't include
them [old people] in as much as
they could be included in.

Q: Isn't that true?
A: Yes. Like, they could be included
in more, but people just
think "Oh, they're too old, they
can't do that!"

Q: That's right!
A: Some people do get to help them.
A: Then they lose the ability of
what they can do, and then they
feel left out, and that's when
they go off to themselves more.

Q: Yes. Another thing that interests
me, too, is, what do you think,
now, old people want out of life?
A: Well, now people--like, when I
saw the other kids' plays, like,
--they had, they're happy that
they're old, right? Some people
are; but they also like peace and
quiet 'cause they're not going to
be living that long! But some old
people are still pretty active!

Q: Well, what do they need the peace
and quiet, sometimes, for? That's
a good thought.
A: They have a hard time, and they
can't stand all the racket and
noise?

Q: Why do you think that is? What do
they want to do that racket and
noise stops them from doing?
A: Pardon?
Q: What do you think they're doing
when they want peace and quiet?
Why do they not need noise?
A: Well, because, like, if it makes
too much noise . . .
A: And it may be hard on them
because they're getting a bit
older. Like, they can stand as
much, but they can't
cope with as much, and they need
a little bit more quietness, and
then they kind of want more to
themselves, but not as much.

Q: No, not as much as we think they
do, eh?
A: Yeah.
Q: So maybe we shouldn't assume that
they always want us to be out of
the way?
A: No.
Q: Right!
A: Some of them are still hyper and
go to the bars!
Q: Yes, that's true. And what kinds
of things do you think old people
might want out of life? What do
you think their ideas are about
that?
A: I think they might want out of
life, when people are not being
good to them, like, they just
want to be left alone because
they aren't--because the other
people are not acting nice to
them. And so they just want to go
by themselves, now, because their
feelings are hurt, Or they do
want a little bit more peace and
quiet, and, but they don't want
to be left out too much.
Q: No. So what's the word about not
being left out?
A: Uh, participating?
Q: 'participating" or "involved"
right?
A: Involved, yeah.
Q: With other people, right?
A: Yes.
Q: And they might want to know
what's going on more, and people
don't really tell them.
A: Uhuhumm.
Q: Yes, that's great. Now, one of
the things I'm really trying to
puzzle out in my head, is what
goes on inside you guys heads,
when you do the drama. Like, what
happens? What's it for, drama?
What is drama for?
A: Oh, it's to learn to act. But
when I do dramatizations, or
whatever I'm doing, I know, like,
old people--it's not like,
usually kids will put their hands
on their backs and act like it
[old people]. But old people can
walk fine, they can do lots of
tings fine, so I just guess!
Like, I take, for example, the
guy, the old person like Mr.
Johnson, I take him for example,
Like, I act like him in a play.
Q: So you use your own experience
and you're also using guesses. Is
that what you're saying?
A: Yes.
Q: So what do we usually say when
we're guessing about it? We say
we imagine what it might be like, right?
A: Yes.
Q: So you take what you know is true
from your experience and what you
imagine. That's good! That's two
things we've got. What happens in
drama when you're talking about
it, and working it out with your
partner?
A: Oh, um, well, . . .
A: I don't get what you mean!
Q: Sure you do! Some fighting goes
on!
A: Well, some fighting goes on!
Because you're not--you might
want something different, You
might not want to participate.
Like me, I didn't want to be an
old, like . . .
A: We worked out good 'cause we kind
of all wanted to be old. I had my
mime and my dramatization--we all
found our parts People. And we
agreed to really cooperate really
good.
Q: What did you do when you were
cooperating?
A: Uh, well we got along better. And
when we were in mime I found it
more easier because there's all
girls. I was the only girl in
dramatization, so it was a bit
harder. But it still cooperated
when we were putting on the show.
But when we started getting
everything organized it was a bit
different, because I wanted all
the different ideas!
A: Yeah, then is when we fought.
Q: Then you have to get it
organized.
A: I wanted to be an old person,
right, in the play. And
I was a boy, and I don't really care who I am, but it was sort of hard for me because I couldn't pick out the clothes I needed for that play! And one day I totally forgot about the play and the next day I wore a skirt!

Q: [chuckle] Well, those things happen! But, everybody was giving their ideas at first, and then you had too many ideas!

A: Yeah, that's what happened to us because we were all boys and I had to calm everyone down, and then when we found out, it worked out really good. But when we were doing mime, there was just the three of us, so it was a bit easier because there weren't so many!

Q: So the bigger the group, the harder it gets to get organized.

A: Yes, especially if there is only one girl.

A: But if it's small, it's harder to find things to...

A: Well, actually, with less people it's not as good, because in a big group you can have more parts for people...

Q: And more ideas!

A: But with small [numbers] of people...

A: Yes, but if you wanted a dog in a play, and everybody wants a part...

A: But it is harder to organize.

A: That's what I found.

Q: Now, tell me something, Supposing they said there was to be no more drama in any of the schools and it's to stop altogether because it's no use to your education?

A: I wouldn't like it! I love drama!

A: Neither would I!

Q: What would you say to them?

A: I would go up to the Catholic Board of Education or the Board of Education, and I would say, "We're learning how to do things just in case it wants to be our
Q: Do you think maybe everybody wants to be in drama when they grow up?
A: No, some people would like to be in "General Hospital" or something like that, but . . .
Q: Well, they'll say to you--I'll pretend I'm a school board member--"Don't be silly, most children don't become actors and actresses. It's not needed in school."
A: Then I would say that they should keep drama because it keeps you--you learn how to act with big groups and small groups, and how you can change your voices, and how you can become other people, and how your mood changes, and when you act with bigger groups and small groups you learn more, because, um, you might think big group, you might think that it would be all chaos, or it might be all so good. But in it you find different opinions and that helps in drama, because in other classes you don't learn that. Like how to work with big groups and small groups.
Q: You don't learn about other people's opinions?
A: Yeah, because it's not like that.
Q: So you're really bashing opinions off each other and getting ideas, is that right?
Q: What are those opinions usually about, in drama? What kinds of things do you talk about?
A: Um, what ideas we want to put on, and how we want to act,
Q: And those are always about what?
A: It depends what we're doing, If, . . .
Q: Are they about the same things as in science or math?
A: It's about in drama, like, if we're putting on a play or
Q: But what's in the play, when you put it on?
A: Well, it depends what the play is, like, . . .
Q: But every play has the same things in it, doesn't it?
A: Oh, characters and that?
Q: Yes, and if they are characters, what are they standing for?
A: Yeah, they're the people who are acting, different people, like, they act different from what they usually act. - But when you're in the different groups, and that, drama is good.
Q: So you're learning about other people in real life, in your groups, as you . . .
A: Yeah, and then when you act out, you act someone different, and you learn how other people may feel besides what they're really acting.
Q: Yes, that's wonderful. I think that's very important, to come to understand what it is to be a person?
A: Yeah, because, say, if you're this one person, and you're your normal self, and then you act this other person who has deeper feelings 'cause you're acting for them in the play, and then when you watch it, you'll find that other people do act different. So if you see someone like that you'll know what's bothering them; how they're maybe feeling, and that you can always come and help them. But in other classes you can't have that really.
Q: I see. Right. But we're always dealing with people and their problems, in drama, aren't we?
A: Yes, but not quite as much as in drama.
Q: Right. Right. And in drama you deal with . . .
A: Yes, because you have nothing else--you're all working together.
Q: That's right, that's right, you're just working with yourselves. Thanks very much, girls. That was wonderful!
APPENDIX G

A teacher interview
Interview IV  Feb. 18, 1990
Teacher 'K'

Q: What are your memories of the children at the end of the mime section, and also, I'm wondering, what are your memories of that section with each of the groups?

A: I felt that the drama was weak. [chuckles] Looking at the end performances, I did think they addressed the skills, though, that I kept pushing. Right?

Q: Uhuh

A: The ones about expressing emotions through your faces. Most of them really made an effort to do that, and they were staging themselves fairly well. They were thinking about posture and the way these characters would carry themselves. So, if that was my criterion for evaluation they were fine, but I was feeling that the content was weak and that they hadn't explored "young people-old people" in the depth that I wanted them to. Now hearing these interviews, I feel so happy!

Q: Yes, but what I want to know, though, is, between the two groups where you had one where it was more teacher-directed than the other.

A: See, I feel that, for the teacher-directed one, I didn't direct their thinking as much as I was imagining you wanted to see. Like, I was ...

Q: I had no preconceptions. I didn't want to guide you at all.

A: I wanted it to be crisper, in terms of the differentiation between the two methods, though, I wanted it to be a little clearer. Now, on the mime, actually, I think I was more successful than in the story-telling. For the mime, I did do a little bit more intervention into the small-group work,
and also in getting the whole class together often. to discuss- Yes, there was more of that going on.

Q: Yes, I would agree with that. I think that would be my observation, too. But nonetheless, even without direction and without intervention, the other croup has, in their own negotiations with each other, worked out quite a few deep thoughts in their minds.

A: Yeah! They worked out quite a lot on the side that they didn't share with me, and maybe that's where I got shortchanged!
[chuckles] That's why I would like an extension in terms of time, in getting them to feed back to me, and see what could be done in each of those sections--mine, story-telling, and the dramatization. You could then say,"Okay, this where we started, Now, let's really discuss what we did here, and let's really develop these ideas!" I would like to help them develop these ideas that you've heard about in the interviews. Let's get get that message across about the "beer story,"...

Q: Yes, all the complex feelings and thoughts of those two characters.

A: Because obviously, if I missed some of those ideas, so did the rest of the audience! [chuckles]

Q: Yes, I think so.

A: So, I feel like I'd like to go another round with the.. But maybe that would be too much for them.

Q: No, no, they're not ready ... you can't do it now!

A: Like, they're Grade 5s, right?

Q: Yes. I think what you could say, though, was that in future if you take something like that theme,
you would then spend time . . .

A: Yes, even at the Grade 6 level, then you take that theme again, and you rework your ideas and keep developing it throughout. That would be a new project, though.

Q: Yes, but the trick is, of course, is to do it (a) faster, and (b) get into the discussion quicker and get into the refinement quicker. So that there's a sort of rising up to the surface of the important things that they consider, more quickly. And then, we say "let's concentrate on these."

A: Yes. Maybe it's because it was the first time they had dealt with this that there was all this other garbage that had to get out of the way, first?

Q: Yes, that was their previous attitude to old people. That we got out of the way!

A: Yes, the stereotypes had to get pushed out of the way first, and it was hard to . . .

Q: You bet! And they did it themselves! You didn't do that for them.

A: No, no, no!

Q: You know what I mean?

A: Uhuh.

Q: So we could, perhaps, make a statement about the drama procedures, with regard to the whole business of any kind of prejudice.

A: Uhuh.

Q: But I don't know what you think of that. You know, looking at it from where they started from and all the garbage that was coming out at the beginning . . .

A: Uhuh.

Q: And where they gradually ended up over the whole three units.

A: How much comes from their thinking of you as this adult, this authoritarian figure? How much of their drama is affected
just by your presence there—too?  
You kind of wonder just how much  
gut-level stuff they could deal  
with if you weren't there?  
Because I still have the feeling  
that some of that, you know, is  
given for the audience.  
Q: You mean for the purpose of  
pleasing teachers?  
A: Right! Right!  
Q: I think there may be some of  
that; yes, you couldn't ever  
gauge that; how would you gauge  
that?  
A: No, no. You see in "Family Life"  
right now we're teaching  
sexuality, and the children have  
already told me they feel more  
comfortable asking me questions  
and talking to me about these  
things than they would to their  
parents. And they're very free in  
their discussions. So, maybe, you  
know— I'm assuming the worst  
here— maybe they feel quite  
comfortable expressing their  
point of view . . .  
Q: But they'd never ask you if they  
feel about you as an authority  
figure! Maybe that's something I  
should ask them in the next set  
of interviews.  
A: Yes, it might be interesting to  
see how much they want to show me  
that they have this attitude  
toward an old person because I  
might regard them in a better way  
if they do; but that that's not  
their honest feeling. I'm kind of  
curious about . . .  
Q: That may be true when I ask them  
to give me accounts they might  
want to please me, too.  
A: Yes!  
Q: They might want to give me  
appropriate answers, rather than  
how they think and feel, you  
know.  
A: Yessss. I suppose it's always a  
factor, but it would only account  
for a certain portion . . .  
Q: But they were talking about
school drama, you see, and school drama presupposes the teacher and the students... So we have that built in. It's part of school drama.

A: Right.

Q: And you did step back--in one group you stepped back completely, and let them just do.

A: Yes.

Q: The only thing you stopped them from doing was high levels of noise, or fighting. That was it!

A: Right. Right. I tried to just manage the class. I was the manager.

Q: Yes, that's right.

A: Yes.

Q: And that was all!

A: Yes, I tried to do that.

Q: But you did! And you asked for the skits.

A: I tried to, and then I looked at this drama and I went "Ahhh, yuck!" Laughter! But anyway...

Q: But we may not be right to go "yuck." Do you know what I'm saying?

A: I've learned that through reading over that interview.

Q: So what they're doing is what's meaningful to them!

A: That's important! To give them ownership for their experience.

Q: That's right,

A: Yes. Yes. That's great.

Q: It's really interesting! But, on the other hand, with the other group, where you directed and you asked for a message, and you didn't specify the message...

A: No, I still tried to give them some freedom.

Q: Yes, you gave them enormous freedom, too, with content.

A: I tried to.

Q: Yes. Now, do you think... suppose we make the hypothesis that they're trying to please the teacher, the whole lot of them, no matter how they were taught,
then which of them would have the opportunity to please the teacher? The greater opportunity.

A: The one where I was more honest and shared more; like, the group that was teacher-directed, I tried to tell them how important some of these issues were to me. I told them I was upset about beatings of the elderly. I told them that it wasn't right for that little girl to make me scared of that old lady, when that old lady was my friend in the hospital, or could be my friend in the hospital. You know, I did try to tell them things like that, so I was hoping they would respond to my feelings there. I was hoping they would try . . .

Q: So they had a more clear focus of the kind of thing you expected?

A: Right.

Q: But the other group had not!

A: Right.

Q: So, even thought they wanted to please you, they weren't quite sure how to go about it.

A: Right. Because I wasn't giving them clues, whereas the other group did have clues, Right.

Q: So maybe there's something to be said for both methods.

A: Uhuhh, if you can be a risk-taker as a teacher, and not expect that the audience is always going to understand the drama. I think the second group's drama was more easily understood.

Q: By the other groups as they saw it presented?

A: Right. Right.

Q: I agree with you there. Yes. But, nonetheless . . .

A: One form of drama wasn't less than the other.

Q: It seems not, now that we've interviewed them, but in looking at it . . .

A: If you were evaluating their work just based on their presentation
of ideas or content, one would definitely score lower than the other, and isn't that too bad?

Q: It is, in a sense, but it's not in another sense, because in fact, you are teaching them a general skill when you teacher-direct them. In their handling of content, you are teaching them the general skill of focus on content whereas the other group is not getting that kind of teaching.

A: Right.

Q: They have to find their own focus. However, in spite of that...

A: Elementary drama should be both, though.

Q: Yes, perhaps. You feel it should be both?

A: I feel it should be both, yes.

Q: I'm tending to agree with you. I'm, I'm--this is something we're wrestling with! Right? Maybe you take occasions to operate in both modes, and maybe you also take occasions to push it further, as you said,

A: Oh yes! I would definitely do that! Especially since the unit has been over. I mean, the last month has shown me more about that unit...

Q: Tell me about that.

A: Well, it was the A Group that I had, the group that was not teacher-directed; the group that I thought had all the unsuccessful drama presented, performed; the group that I thought had the depth of, you know, a sheet of paper...

Q: ... thought and understanding

A: Right! [chuckles] ... and I presented the beginning of our third unit which is called "Explosions and Transformations." First off, I presented it in the Drama Room, because I wasn't ready in my Language Arts experience to teach.
it to that class. Right away, we were discussing what an explosion is, and what a transformation is. And they were in their own space, and they were to show a journey of something transforming. Through feedback with the kids, it came up, you know, that there are beginnings and middles and ends, and a transformation of their body parts could happen from a middle to an end, or a beginning to a middle, or a beginning to an end. Like, you could show any part of a transformation. There was a discussion about butterflies transforming. There was a discussion about the toys called "transformers," And they said "all of the parts are already there, and that they move to transform: it's not like puzzle pieces where you add on to transform. The parts are there no matter how tiny it is, to start." Then they started giving me this stuff about people. And all of this "young people-old people" stuff just came to this head! I mean, we were—for 15 minutes—they weren't even, you know, anxious to get into moving or doing their drama! It was just this realization for the whole group! Especially with me being pregnant, which was an interesting thing! They said, "Look at you, you've changed so much, Mrs. Hanrahan, this year, you know; you have this big belly now." And they talked about growing old, and then they talked about—they got to the middle, you see of the journey, and they said "Then the parts start to disappear." Like, "it's your adding and growing on, up to the middle of your journey, and then the parts start to fall apart slowly." I said, you mean, like, "I'm getting wrinkles now;
so am I on the downward trend?"
Because they were talking about
skin cells, and they were talking
about muscle cells, and they were
into all this stuff, and then,
you know,"you wrinkle up." And
someone was talking about their
grandfather getting shorter; you
know, he was always tall but he
was getting shorter, and all of
that, and "shrinking up until you
just wither up and die." It was
just amazing! And then someone
raised his hand and said,"But we
don't say--like, you just don't
die! Right, Mrs. Hanrahan?"
Because then they got worried
about that, and I said, "Well, we
know, as Catholics, that there is
going to be more, and I don't
know how we transform after that,
but I'm sure something really
exciting happens." So they were
really pleased to know, you know,
that they didn't just shrivel up.
because his idea of building,
like, bricks. And then they
started doing their
transformations. One child was a
"brick" to begin with, and built
into a building. And then the
transformation was out of the
building's control because some
big boom came and knocked it
over. But it was just a
fascinating--I was just excited
about that!
It was just amazing!

Q: Yes, yes.
A: Now with the other group that had
been self-directed, I initiated
that conversation more. Like, it
didn't come from them, but it
came from those kids in the Group
5A. But from the Group 5B, I
initiated that topic.

Q: The topic of the people's
transformation?
A: Of people transforming, yes. Then
in Language Arts, my children are
writing reports, and you remember
Erin Sanderson, with the active
grandmother who's just had a heart attack . . .

Q: Yes, with the grandmother doing aerobics and then she had a heart attack.

A: They can research any topic of transformation or explosion, and they're finding topics. And, of course, you have nuclear bombs and thunderstorms and earthquakes and all of this. She's going to be doing one on old age. and she said "I'm not sure what part of it but I'm going to go to the library and find out what topics I could do. And I'm going to interview my grandma or my grandpa, for one of my research papers." So I'm . . .

Q: How is her grandmother now?

A: She's out of the hospital, but she [Erin] said it really scared her grandmother. She said they found it wasn't a massive heart attack, but now her grandma's scared, you see? So she'll now act differently.

Q: So this is a new thing . . .

A: Well, she might act differently, or behave differently now because she's afraid. But what is interesting is that they got some "meat" out of this! I feel like they're thinking about these issues, because we dealt with it in their drama. And I was kind of wondering if any of that would happen. You know, you wonder what happens at the end, while you just go on, right?

Q: Yes. So it actually carried on, although you didn't plan for it?

A: Right! It carried on! But I was wondering, I did wonder, gee, if this unit didn't mean anything to these kids but it did! Yes, it did. It really made them think.

Q: Right. I'm wondering about the business of transformation. Did any of them think about the kinds of bits that they lost as they
were going toward the end—were 521
maybe not the important bits? 522
A: What bits? Oh, the part where you 523
go . . , 524
Q: As people move toward the end, 525
eye lose these bits, they get 526
shorter, muscles are shrinking, 527
and skin cells, .... 528
A: Well, I think they thought the 529
whole thing was remarkable! I 530
think they're very excited, 531
though, about the building up 532
that's happening in them, right 533
now. 534
Q: Of course. 535
A: They were really focusing on 536
"now." 537
Q: They're egocentric. 538
A: And I did say to them,"It's 539
really exciting for me to sit 540
here and witness you people 541
transforming right in front of 542
me, right now! And when you leave 543
this classroom--and someone said 544
'we're going to be different,'"-- 545
and I said,"You are going to be 546
different, not only physically, 547
but think of how your minds are 548
transforming, too, while you're 549
here." So it's so neat! They're 550
looking at themselves, and one 551
little girl said,"Oh, it gives me 552
the creeps!" And I said,"What's 553
interesting is that my baby 554
started with two cells, and 555
became four." And someone said, 556
"And became eight," and someone 557
else said -- they're proving 558
their math, right?--"sixteen." 559
And I said, "Do you know that 560
that's still happening in you?" 561
And they were just so, really 562
captured up in where they were now. 563
They weren't really projecting, 564
or worried, they were just so 565
excited to be a part of the now 566
which was really neat! 567
Q: That's right. That's good. That's 568
really good. 569
A: 0 God! It was exciting . . . 570
Q: We're going to talk about the 571
"story-telling unit," now. 572
A: And how I feel about the "story-telling unit." Well, I didn't feel that it was as successful as I would have liked it to be. I think, maybe—the string had worked—I did string games with the children, and I taught the Grade 5s "Jacob's Ladder," first of all, I thought I taught it to them so they knew it well, but the string became a hang-up.

Q: In what way?
A: Physically. They just, their motor skills weren't up for performing the string games, so they tied themselves into knots [chuckles] while they were telling their stories. Caw with Grade G, I had done another one, and the stories were so successful! This is why I endeavoured to do this with Grade 5, but actually the manipulative was more difficult for the 5s.

Q: So you feel it interrupted the flow of the story?
A: It interrupted the flow, yes. I thought that they were more focused on the string than they were on their story.

Q: Was that true even with the people that had teacher-directed stories? Like where you had said "I want you to give me a message about old people in a story"?
A: Well, the stories were definitely better . . .

Q: In the B group?
A: B group. And more ideas, and more creative, and definitely loner. The children in the A Group—when their string ladder was built—you know, they could hardly wait to go and sit down again. I'm not sure how much the A Group thought about a story at all.

Q: So you think they were preoccupied with the string?
A: Very much so. And because it was not teacher-directed, they had no
reason to deal with the content. Right? But the other ones got past the string . . .

Q: Right.

A: And dealt with the content. Now in the A Group, I would say there were probably five children--I remember Julie Labonte--there were probably five children who got the motor skills down and were able to build the string readily. And then their stories were all right, It was like they got over the string and they were able to be creative in their drama. But you have no way of knowing that, because it's like an experiment, right?

Q: No, no, not ahead of time. Were there any children that you would say the string game was a definite help in the building, the structure, of the story?

A: Well, I think in the B Group, several of them used the steps of building this ladder with their hands to go from event to event . . .

Q: So the logic of the story was . . .

A: Yes, the sequence of building this object right. But I wouldn't say it happened enough that I would venture to use it again. I think that particular string game would have to be used with an older group of children.

Q: Right.

A: But this was the first time I had done that, so if I chose to use string again for story-telling at this grade level, I'd choose a simpler shape, and then they'd probably be just fine.

Q: Yes. Because I certainly noticed with the B Group that they seemed to have gone 'way past the string, and they were working on story and on message and . . .

A: Right! Right!
Q: It certainly seemed like that to me, and uh . . .
A: Uhuh, definite distinction between the two groups.
Q: And we'll have to see if that's due to a difference in intelligence or maturity. We don't know yet, do we?
A: Well, like I said, I think that they were very absorbed in the wool and the string. And because I wasn't pushing for content, trying to draw it out of them—why would you, as a child—with this wonderful toy in front of you—why would you deal with the nitty-gritty? Do you know what I mean?
Q: Yes, I do.
A: If you're given that freedom . . .
Q: Yes, that's very perceptive. I'm wondering if . . .
A: It doesn't take much to perceive [chuckles] . . .
Q: Oh, I think it does!
A: When you observe, you know, 50 stories, and one-half of them are just, step, step, step, end. That was the whole construction of the story. And the others just were yakking away. up there. The string was secondary.
Q: That's true, But I'm wondering if . . .
A: So don't say "it's very perceptive" [laughter] . . .
Q: No! It is! Because I'm wondering if the A Group got the impression that what you wanted from them was a cleverly built ladder!
A: [hearty laughter]
Q: You know?
A: But is that a part of drama? I don't know.
Q: It could be, in the sense of skill.
A: Maybe they're thinking of the Buskers, or the street entertainers, and how you can
perform magic tricks, or juggle some balls, that that's drama. You see, I've taught them over the last two years that story-tellers will often wear something to grab an audience's attention, or they hold something in their hands... Or they do tricks... Or have a rubber chicken, or whatever, and they get their audience involved visually, as well as just through the story...

Q: Or they do tricks...
A: Or have a rubber chicken, or

Q: So they may very well have thought that...
A: So they thought that was entertainment enough [laughter] so why would you want to hear anything about an old person, anyway!

Q: Okay.
A: I felt like I couldn't do anything about it,

Q: No, you couldn't!
A: If I wasn't going to...

Q: We had to know that, but we didn't know that before we started, did we?
A: But I was sure wishing I could teach them something more About... So I did feel that it was a failed experience in story-telling for the Grade 5s this year. Not for the B Group. I thought that was a good experience. But it's not like the mime where we could both say that both experiences were fine, and important. I would say that this experience for 5A was a total wipe-out! [chuckle]

Q: But some of them have said in their interviews that they used a lot of their own experience when they were planning their stories, even if they didn't use it in their performance.
A: So, is this like the mime where we should say that...

Q: Well, I think it's a part of it, less so; I think less so.
A: Yes.
Q: I think it was less obvious to the children, what they had learned.
A: Yes.
Q: Now, about the dramatization. How did you feel?
A: Uhuh. I wish you had seen the Bs!
Q: I'm sorry I didn't.
A: Very interesting, very interesting!
Q: I've got them on tape. I haven't even looked at them yet; I haven't had time.
A: Yes, you have to look at those, because they were . . .
Q: Now apart from the string business, which you felt was an impediment in some regard, if you were doing the story-telling, again, how would you do it differently?
A: Well, I wouldn't limit their characters, I don't know if I did limit their characters—old-people, young-people. I'd say I wanted a story again with an old person and young person in it. Somehow, I felt that they thought that's all that could be in their story. Did you find that? There are only two characters in every story. So I found a lot of the stories were "one person helps out another." So, I would tell them that they could have as many characters as they wanted in their story.
Q: Right.
A: And, if you didn't have that darned ladder that they always built, you know, then you'd get a variety of stories coming out about relationships between old people and young people . . .
Q: Right.
A: Because you wouldn't have to have that final . . .
Q: Right. That's a good point. You'd get greater width.
A: Right. I wanted to learn more
than what I learned in those stories, about their ideas and thoughts.

Q: That's right. That's important! Okay, I want to get on now to the dramatization. Could you describe the steps in that process? Because I wasn't able to be there to observe the steps in the dramatization process. I was there when you gave out the stories and poems, and they had started to work on them. And then we had one more day when I was also there, and I took notes on how the children were working on them and how they were looking for ways of doing it, but that was as far as I saw, because then I had to leave for Scotland.

A: Well, I think I had only given them another two periods.

Q: Two periods. That's right.

A: Yes.

Q: It was to be a total of four periods.

A: Yes, and it was just continued in the same way.

Q: Okay.

A: No differences, except that things were becoming clearer for the children. Remember, some of the groups were a little bit frustrated . . . about, uh, in the B Group, the teacher-directed one, they were frustrated about how to handle this theme "old people, young-people" because remember I told them that they needed to teach a message . . .

Q: Uhuh.

A: . . . and they didn't see how these kooky poems or stories that I had could possibly teach a message about "old-people, young-people."

Q: So you were a lot of the time involved in comprehension of the actual story . . .

A: Right! Clarifying the story:
"What does this story tell us?"
you know, "How are the characters involved?"—that kind of
clarification kept happening, I would say, during the third
period. By the fourth period they were down to really solid work.
Q: Nitty, gritty.
A: Yes, practicing,
Q: Was that true of both groups?
A: Umm, see, I was trying not to, uh, what I was doing with the A Group was, they were coming to me and saying "What does that have to do with old people?" And then I would say, "What do you think this has to do with old people?"
Q: Great! Great!
A: So that's . . .
Q: So you were helping in one group, helping them clarify what it had to do with old people . . .
A: Right.
Q: . . . in the other group, you were not?
A: That's right. So that was the difference.
Q: Great!
A: And so, therefore, the A Group remained a little bit frustrated right to the end,
Q: Right to the end. But what was their work like?
A: Their work, I would say, was comparable again, to, um, the mime and the story telling.
Q: Was it? That's interesting.
A: Yes. They had a little bit more licence, because it was dramatization. They explored the stories literally, a lot more than what the B Group did.
Q: So we're getting into metaphor and symbol?
A: Retelling, retelling the story. The other group was bringing in more metaphor. But didn't you see a couple of the dramatizations from the A Group? There was Paul Williams, balloons, . . .
Q: I saw the beginning of their
work.

A: . . . necklaces, there was the poison shooting out of the gutted animal! [chuckle] . . . etc.

Q: That's right, that's right.

A: That one sort of started developing--there was a little bit of extension, See Patrick was in that group, too, and Chris Steffanson. A lot of those children were caught up in death scenes, and gore, and things like that. Do you want me to talk about performance, yet, though? Those two lessons, anyway, we continued on.

Q: Yes,

A: And then on the next . . .

Q: I just, no, all I needed to know was the difference between the two strategies.

A: Yes, the strategies.

Q: And that's quite clear, for me, now. So, what did they actually produce? You feel, you said, there are the same differences in the two groups. That they dealt with superficial story re-telling in the A Group, but in the B Group they were getting down to metaphor and symbol? Did any of them reach symbol?

A: Uhuh, and dealing with feelings of young people, feelings of old people in their stories.

Q: Good, So you didn't get that in the A Group, but you got it in B Group. Is that what you're saying?

A: Yes. Generally, I'm saying that. Now the girls--can I make a distinction between girls and boys?

Q: Sure. Yes!

A: Can I go ahead?

Q: Go ahead, make a distinction between boys and girls!

A: So I can? I don't like to do that, ever!

Q: No. But actually, the way children learn and the rates at which they learn, are different
between boys and girls.

A: Yes, well, I have to say . . .

Q: So you're not being sexist by observing something!

A: See, I just . . . this was the first time I observed that, in the A Group, the girls did very much what the whole B Group did. And that was really, really important, because I noticed, like, there was a group of all girls in "Millions and Millions of Cats," And they really dealt with the issues of old and young, and the image had changed from stereotype in their old grandma and grandpa.

Q: Yes!

A: They were different characteristics from what, say, I had been picking up from them in the mime.

Q: Right.

A: So there . . .

Q: So you saw real growth there.

A: I saw real growth. I also saw real growth in the group— "The Turnip group-- with Stephan . . .

Q: Zack was in that?

A: . . . Stephan Peterson was the grandpa, and Nicole Haley was the grandma, And even the props that they brought in for that piece. And Stephan had been working on his voice, you remember, . . .

Q: Yes, I do.

A: . . . because he had been making his voice this phoney, "Well, dear, would you please go and plant the seed?" You know, he was doing that? He created a voice that was really true, and very genuine for his old man. And he didn't have one bit of . . . he wasn't laughing at himself, anymore, as the character. He was behaving very much the way an old person would act, in that situation. They did very good character acting, But the females I found particularly more aware of the characters in these
pieces, than the boys. The boys were still on . . .

Q: The superficial.
A: Yes, yes.
Q: I should tell you, actually [it doesn't matter if it's on the tape or not], is there anything else you would like to tell me about the dramatization as compared to the first performance--like the mime?
A: Oh, a lot of growth! And I think--dramatization is such that you're putting a lot more on the table to observe! So it's a lot easier to pick up the messages that the children are giving you . . .

Q: Right.
A: Um, as compared to the mime, because you've cut out speech. But I also think their interpretations of characters were so much more honest, sincere, . . .

Q: Was that because of additional knowledge, or understanding, or what?
A: Yes, and I think that they felt it was more important to portray these characters the way they had learned that they are.

Q: So you're saying that you didn't demand characterization? It just happened?
A: It just happened. Yes.
Q: And you feel . . .
A: You see, because the drama skills taught that they were marked on, were "on-stage focus," "staging," -- just something like that. I wanted them to be aware of their backs and . . .

Q: And their sets?
A: . . . how they would organize their set, how they would set up. That was of most importance to
Q: Right.
A: And then I did give them marks for portraying character, but I did not push that as a skill. I just wanted to see if they were able to. It was very closely connected to on-stage focus, right?

Q: Right.
A: I wanted them to not be so aware of their audience . . .
Q: So you were really looking for concentration in the creation of the character.
A: Concentration—that's right.
Q: Rather than the adjuncts of characterization, of the skills of characterization, per se.
A: That's right. That's what I was pushing for.
Q: Good. Right. So you got the skills of characterization?
A: Uhummm. Oh yes! Especially in the characters who were portraying old-people, young-people! They had supporting characters, as well.
A: But I found they really dealt with these key characters, like the old people and the young people were very sensitively . . .
Q: Portrayed . . .
A: Portrayed. So I was pleased with that. But I didn't find that so much in the A Group, except . . .
Q: Except for the girls. Right.
A: For the girls. That's right. And Stephan.
Q: And some boys.
A: One or two boys.
Q: Yes.
A: I would say ct was one or two boys.
Q: Well, that's a good description, Thanks very much.
A: And please watch the "Balloon Man"; that, and just chat difficult poem . . .
Q: Yes, very difficult. That would
be e. e. cummings, wasn't it?
A: Yes.
Q: That's very difficult for Grade 5.
A: Yes, and those two pieces ended up so different--in the A Group and the B Group were so different.
Q: Yes. Right.
A: So you need to really observe those and . . .
Q: I will certainly do that, and I'm grateful for the clue . . .
A: see how they're different.
Q: For cluing me in. You said that in the first interview that drama gives the children a sense of their own spirit. What I wondered was, if you could explain to me what you meant by "spirit"?
A: I think what I mean . . . like, I'd like the child to develop, or give them a sense of their own spirit, I mean to enable them. I want to be an enabler. I want to empower them. I want them to believe in their own intuitions, and their own ideas; to believe that those things are important to express, and they're a basis for developing and growing and broadening their own insights. It has to do with--I'm talking "spirit" in the sense of the "human spirit."
Q: Yes. It is a question of them--what they are now and what will they develop to be the core, the essence, of what they are as people?
A: Well, I think that they need to know that now they have that! If they're to go tonight, or go tomorrow, they are. You know, with their little, wholesome selves. you know.
Q: Yes. So it's really a kind of essence, the being, inside of them.
A: It's the absolute being. That's right! That's right— which we have at any age and any point of development, we always have it. It's the same thing that makes a newborn cry, you know, it's just the very essence of the being.

Q: When you said that "drama is practical learning; it is something that the child can apply to its own life," did you mean to imply that he/she would do that?

A: It's very important to me that children do. I think that's why, in this unit, I was so excited to see a carry-over. To see that they took ideas and then could insert them into other areas of thinking, you know. In report-writing, or in here or there, that they have expanded.

Q: Yes. So the application might be intellectual... A: Uuhh. It might be...

Q: Or it might be behavioural?

A: It might be something on the playground that I would see, and it would click with me how they've picked this up through the drama experience.

Q: Good. That's great! I want to ask you about "understanding their own sense of self and their place in their own space, and their place in greater space,"— whether it is "space" you mean, or do you mean "time and change"? I don't know what you mean, so I guessed that maybe it's time, maybe its change, maybe it's all three, I don't know, but I'd like...

[End side A]

[Side B]

Q: What's it called?

A: It's a John Denver song, called "Looking for Space." Anyway, I guess it's one of my metaphors, because...

Q: Yes. Can you open it out--the
metaphor, and deconceal---

A: Yes. 'Uhm. You see, first of all, to understand their own sense of self, that is the over-riding objective there, for me. But that takes place, you know, when they [the children] are on their own. in their own place, by themselves, unconnected to anything except for themselves. And you can have sense of self when you're in a room full of people, and you're dealing with social issues, and you're dealing with what life is bringing you, and you're dealing with things that are out of your control. Like, these children are going from my Drama room and they're going somewhere else, and they're going to take a bus, and they're going to go home. And what I'm hoping is, if they have a sense of self when they leave me, that they can carry it wherever they go, and that it's going to help them there,

Q: So they're dealing with, in the Drama room . . .

A: It's place and it's time.

Q: Yes.

A: And it's space.

Q: What you're providing them with in the Drama room is change, isn't it?

A: I'm providing them with, uh, well, I hope that something has either changed, or, if they've had healthy attitudes and they feel good about themselves and they already have the "me" in place--the essence in place--that I have reinforced for them, so that . . .

Q: Great. Great, but you're offering them the exploration of many stances as situations and events change in the Drama room.

A: Right. Right.

Q: And you're allowing them types of rehearsals . . .

A: Uhummmm
Q: Of "me."
A: Uhummm--that they can practise everywhere,
Q: So that's what you're really
getting at here. is it?
A: Yes, yes.
Q: You're satisfied with that . . .
A: Are you satisfied with that, . . .
Q: Yes, I am.
A: Or does that sound . . . do you need clarification . . .
Q: But it doesn't matter. It's what you want to say that's important. I don't know what you mean by "skits," and I just want you to tell me! [laughter]
A: [laughter]
Q: I know what I mean by "skits" but I want you to tell me what you mean by "skits."
A: Brownies and Guides do skits.
Q: Do they? I've never been a Brownie or a Guide.
A: And some classrooms do skits. It's when you take drama--I don't even think it's drama. You call it "drama," if you're the leader of these situations. And it's taking drama out of context. It's taking, uh, there are no goals, there are no guts to what's done. It's, um, God, how can I describe a "skit"!
Q: Is it lacking in content?
A: You know, the sun is shining over Colorado and two cowboys come along and one is named "Joe" and one is named "Barney," and there's absolutely nothing about Joe or anything about Barney we learn. We don't learn anything about Colorado. We don't learn anything about the sun. We don't feel the sun. There's a lot of lacking in feeling, emotion, you know. deep-level thought. Children love doing skits! [chuckles] It's, um, . . .
Q: It's practice play instead of operational?
A: It's practice play, that's right. That's what it is.

Q: That's what Gavin Bolton called it—

A: And kids like to play, so of course they like to practice play. Give them...

Q: And you have to force them to that deeper level.

A: Yes.

Q: Can we go back to the A and B Groups, now?

A: Yes, and skits! [chuckles]

Q: And relationship to skits.

A: Well, definitely A Group was more into skit-making, towards the end, even.

Q: And relationship to skits.

A: Well, definitely A Group was more into skit-making, towards the end, even.

Q: Even?

A: Even. They showed some growth. Like I said, certain performance groups, or girls. But the Bs' was something quite different. Drama, yes.

Q: But I heard you say earlier that there was some function in that.

A: In what the A Group did, because they—in their planning and working through, I don't believe that kind of thing happens, in skit-making, even. When you do a skit...

Q: No, no, so they weren't really doing skits?

A: Right. Because they were doing the pre-planning and the talking and the gnashing of teeth, and...

Q: Negotiating of meaning.

A: Lots of negotiating, and things that I didn't even know were occurring were being said. And a skit, you see, would say...

Q: Just get up and do it, like charades almost.

A: let's get up and make a skit, that's right.

Q: Okay, thank you.

A: Lord help us, let's not do...

Q: Okay, you said here that "always start with structured, dramatic play activity; something that takes the child—ren right from
play to a little bit more
structure."
Now, how do you begin the play
that leads to more structured
play?
A: To begin with, you didn't get to
observe this. Because I was...
Q: No, I didn't.
A: Under—I felt like I didn't have
time to do that part . . .
Q: Right.
A: Because I felt like I wanted to
move this along . . .
Q: Right.
A: But normally, when the children
would come in, I would
do a full-group activity such as
I think I might have demonstrated
something like that when I had
them all walking around the room
being 60-year-olds, or whatever.
You know, they get to play with
the character and move around;
nobody's watching them and
they're in their own space, and
they're doing something . . .
Q: Right— So you're dealing with the
main ideas, . . .
A: That was structured, though.
Right?
Q: Right.
A: They come in, "off-the-wall"
basically, you know-- "Here we
are in the Drama room." And other
than sitting in their circle,
normally they're yak-yak-yakking
away. But by structuring some
kind of mini-activity like that
for them, you're bringing them
into focus of what the theme is,
and what you're going to be
working on today—
Q: Right.
A: And you always try and make that
activity relevant to what they
are going to be working on, you
know?
Q: That's right. Yes, yes. Okay,
that was all I needed there. As
you watched the children do this
structured, dramatic play, what
is it that you look for, in what
they do, that tells you what the  
next step is, do you think?

A:  I think, they actually switch  
channels once they've  
moved into the full-group  
activity, or even paired activity  
if I have them moving around as  
two people. Uhm, when they're  
all into that channel, they I  
feel like I can talk to them  
about the next activity. "We will  
now be working on our mime,"you  
know, and "we'll be dealing with  
the emotions that you've started  
to explore here,"

Q:  Right. So that really . . .

A:  So then I have them walking  
"sad," like: "You're being sad;  
show me 'sad-'" And they move  
around sad, Then,  
"See if you can deal with that  
emotion and other emotions in  
your group." . . .

Q:  So the structure that you've  
already built in, as to the  
people that they are to be, and  
the kinds of feelings or thoughts  
that they [the people] might  
have, allow the children to  
switch into the exploratory move  
. . .

A:  Right, into the most . . .

Q:  the exploratory mode. In other  
words, they're thinking  
themselves into that . . .

A:  Yes, right.

Q:  and you are then able to lead  
them.

A:  Yes. Because it was hard doing  
it "cold turkey" all the time.  
Like, I feel that you're bringing  
them in "cold turkey, "throwing  
them from science or math or  
wherever they were, into this  
mode of . . .

Q:  Yes. I understand. That's  
clear. What is your perception  
of group drama that you  
talk about?

A:  What is my perception of it?

Q:  Yes. Group drama. Either whole  
group or small group.
I mean whenever you are talking about group drama, what do you mean?

A: Well, in the group drama I'm no longer a teacher, and I do enjoy group drama, and I do encourage it. Like I just said to you, I haven't got the guts, though, to have the expertise built up yet, to involve myself in small-group drama. I don't know if that makes me more vulnerable, or why I stay away from ct. But large-group, like a whole-class group-drama, I feel comfortable stepping in and involving all of them in me in role- And I enjoy relating to them [the children] when I'm on that level. It frees me up. I don't feel so responsible for them and they relate to me on a different plane, too.

Q: Do you think you're giving away power when you do that? To them?

A: Oh, definitely! You're empowering the children and they in turn try and empower you, because they have a sense, in a way, that you are, um, I don't know, I was going to use the word "younger." They have this sense that you are a friend that they can empower. That you can trust them. They're sort of approaching you, like,"It's okay, we'll help you do this. You want to build a highway, we'll help you do it." You know what I mean? [chuckle]

Q: Yes, right.

A: It's really a strange experience! And you can just do it with one line, and . . .

Q: Yes, I know.

A: Just start moving a different way, or something, and all of a sudden, they're all relating to you differently. But see, I feel, I wonder in a small group if somebody would reject me, if they would not see
me in role? You're more 
vulnerable with a small group who 
can really look 
at how you're acting and 
behaving. I was once, though, 
some kind of person from the 
past, and they were often groups 
designing refrigerators and 
computers for me, because I had 
come and I only had a box loaded 
with salt to keep my food 
preserved. So they were showing 
me that they could design a 
'fridge that I could use instead. 
And they were coming and 
reporting to me in small-group 
about these things that I could 
use . . .

Q: So it did work very well.
A: And the small-groups were coming 
to me, but I wasn't-- see, I feel 
too shy to go up to them . . .

Q: You weren't jumping into their 
drama?
A: Right! They were bringing their 
drama to me!

Q: That's great. That's great. Okay, 
I'm talking about "reflection" 
now. It's on page 12 of the other 
tape we recorded. You said you 
reflect orally in discussion 
and stuff. Right? But you think 
it's important for them to 
reflect in writing. Now, do you 
do reflection in any other ways?
A: . . . you might want to read 
those.

Q: I'd love to!
A: Yes!
The [children] sat down and wrote 
down--I asked them the question, 
"What did you learn about the 
relationships between old people 
and young people through mime, 
storytelling, and dramatization?"

Q: Oh, that's wonderful!
A: So, you know, you only have a 
certain percentage who really, 
you know, did that well, because 
I'm not heavy into evaluating 
those. I just wanted to provide 
them with the time to do that, so
Q: Right. Now in addition to oral
and writing, what other kinds of
reflection do you use?
A: I don't know!
Q: Okay, I just wanted to ask.
A: Tell me...
Q: When you say that "there is a
change from dramatic play to
creating drama and a bright light
goes on over their heads," and
you acknowledge that there's
something different about what
they are doing, what exactly are
we talking about there?
A: I think what it is in the word
"meaning." They give meaning to
their drama. And I haven't given
it to them.
Q: Right.
A: They have found meaning and
purpose for their drama.
Q: Right.
A: And from one child to the next it
can be different.
Q: Right.
A: You know.
Q: Yes. And when that meaning
happens in a group, a small group
or a pair, um, what process do
you see happening in front of
you?
A: I see a lot more interaction
verbally. I see a lot more
experimenting. I see them try
things out and then toss them out
the window and try something
different.
Q: Yes.
A: It's like they're building, and
tearing apart, and rebuilding,
and making . . .
Q: Making hypotheses and
A: That's right, and
Q: then rejecting them.
A: That's right.
Q: Okay, thank you. When we were
talking about "the importance of
performance in the range of drama
procedures that we carry out as
drama teachers," I had a feeling I
cut you off, so I wanted to ask
you: Were there any other reasons why some kind of a performance is important to the drama itself?

A: Well, see, now you just blew it by adding "for the drama itself." I was going to say, . . .

Q: All right, for any reasons. [chuckle]

A: look, I feel really bad about everything I said. [chuckle] No, I was going to say, I love going to watch drama! And I love theatre! And I always get--like what you shared about what happened in your "360" class--I get so excited even getting to observe something that someone else has created. And in a formal setting like that, I like to be audience. Now let's put it this way: if there was no performance of drama, you know, you wouldn't have that experience as "audience." You wouldn't get to mull over these ideas and these interpretations. But not just from the audience point of view, but it's wonderful to work really hard at something that means so much, in terms of your own spirit, to express. It's so rewarding to give that to someone!

Q: Right.

A: So, like, I still don't feel that that is the important component to elementary drama.

Q: No. But you are seeing two things, and I think they're both very important. One of them would seem to indicate that drama isn't, in a sense, always public. It is too dear to make public--the insights that you have.

A: Uhuhmmm.

Q: And to share those. And that, therefore, the "audience-moment" of time, which we call performance, is fulfilling the responsibility of the art form.
A: That's right. I think that you do have to be responsible for that.
Q: For what you've created.
A: Right.
Q: In other words, it's like carrying a child. You have the responsibility to bring it to birth.
A: Uuhh. And to introduce it to the world.
Q: To the world. Right.
A: And to introduce the world to it.
Q: Right.
A: So there's an interchange there. But I guess when I'm dealing with elementary [school children], I'm just saying that they're the babies there, and .
Q: That's right.
A: You feel like you need to protect them a little bit . . .
Q: That's right.
A: And you want them to be ready before they take the dive into the cold water . . .
Q: That's right,
A: You want them to have everything they need . . .
Q: In place.
A: To be able to swim.
Q: But I also heard you saying something about the "satisfaction of ideas created, put together in a satisfying way, and working on them [the children] to make them as good as they can be, and the reward that is offered to the creators of that."
A: Uhhmm.
Q: So, it's really a two-way street, isn't it?
A: And in the movies, I mean, you hear during interviews with these performers that it was that applause, you know, that really made it for them? But that's not what makes you cry there in your last "curtain call." It's not that; it's the camaraderie that happened between all of the people who worked, and the tears
shed, and the agony about working something through. It's just that you solved a piece of work together, that you're celebrating.

Q: That's right!
A: So, if you didn't perform, you wouldn't have that—what do you call it?—"catharsis." You wouldn't have that.

Q: You have a moment of celebration of your self, extant in the work.
A: Uhuhmm.
Q: Yes. And you also have the responsibility, which is public acceptance of your work.
A: Right.
Q: And the verification of your work.
A: And reading about it in the reviews, or whatever.
Q: Right, right.
A: Yes, that had to be said.
Q: That's great. So, on page 21, I was wanting to know why "the children come pouring to you with excitement after a performance"?
A: I think they're excited by their parents' positive reaction, for one, and that their parents have shared in something that they've worked really hard towards. And they haven't really been able to share that with mom and dad until then. They're really pleased about the pats on the back from their teachers, and being recognized, you know, as doing something well, and important and beautiful, and ...

Q: Yes. Great! That's all I needed. Thank you.

On page 23, we were talking about drama helping children to use language, and to speak to each other more freely. And I think the question that I want to address is: What do they speak about in the Drama room, and are more free about than they would be, say, in recess or Social Studies?
A: See, I was just going to say, it broadens their content. For example, "old-people, young-people," how often do they take an opportunity with their peers to talk about their feelings about grandma or grandpa, or mom or dad, or things like that.

Q: Right.

A: So when they get together in the Drama room, they're introducing uncommon topics. When they're on the playground, they're not going to be talking about . . .

Q: So they could be talking about medieval stonework or Knights and dragons--right now they are talking about that! That's right!

Q: And they wouldn't dream of talking about that in their social life. So their use of language is being pushed into another direction. What is the purpose of that language use that they're beginning to see in the Drama room? What is its objective? What do the children see as the objective of that talk?

A: Well, they use that talk to work through their ideas, to apply them to their performing, right?

Q: Uhuh.

A: They get the language out, and . . .

Q: So they're really using it in their investigations?

A: As a part of the beginning process, in this--investigating, right. Organizing.

Q: So they come to look on talk as a means of investigation.

A: Uhuh.

Q: Do you think that's peculiar to drama? Or does it happen in other subject areas?

A: Hmmm. Well I know in our school it happens in Art, a lot. And it should happen for writing. It's
like a brainstorm phase, actually

Q: Yes, in preparing for writing--pre-writing.
A: Yes, and building vocabulary and building up on experience, and recall. It's a time when you recall things you've heard, things you've seen.

Q: Yes, right. Tell me, what do you think your grandpa's old sense of self was, in the days that he was at the mill?
A: That he was strong, and virile, and, uh, full of future, full of hope. That his work gave him, you know, a sense of meaning. That's what his old sense of self was.

Q: Uhm, yes.
A: And he could walk tall again with long strides.
Q: Wonderful!

[End Side B]
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APPENDIX H

Field notes: Participant observation
Participant Observation

Context

The first participation in a drama class took place on the 16th of October 1989. The main concern was to get the children used to the idea of my presence as observer, commentator and seeker of accounts in the drama studio so that I became as invisible as possible for them. It had previously been explained to them that they were co-researchers with me in discovering what kinds of things took place for them as a result of drama activities and that our particular concern was to see how drama worked for them as they investigated attitudes toward the elderly and toward aging using drama enquiry.

They had also at the time of this first participant observation carried out three steps in the preparation for the research: they had obtained parental consent, they had taken a pre-test and they had made drawings on the theme "young people old people". The experiment had then begun with the reading of the story the bernstein bears and the taking of a comprehension test on that story.

Contrary to the plan for the research, the first interview with the teacher had not yet taken place when the first drama lesson took place. This was because the teacher concerned was pregnant and was not very well, because the pre-testing was protracted and she needed to get on with the term's work, and because the numbers in each of the drama classes she would teach were much larger than expected. (The two drama classes were made up of two grade five classes and those members of a 5/6 split class who were in grade five.) The teacher had however read the research proposal, had found it interesting and was very positive about cooperating in it. Since, unlike the original plan for the research, this drama teacher would be teaching the two drama experimental groups she was at this stage rather unclear about how she would implement the teacher directed methodology as opposed to student directed methodology. In our brief discussion on this point neither of us had come to a clear articulation of the precise distinction which would be made. I was at this stage and throughout unwilling to offer any very strong views in this matter as I did not want any imposition of what I believe constitutes drama to interfere with the teacher's preferred methodologies. The teacher had at first expressed herself as willing to and interested in comparing the two methodologies. As more precise lesson plans were constructed she expressed the view that she was not quite sure what constituted teacher direction and that she was afraid of imposing a drama on the children rather than eliciting it from them. From this I inferred that she preferred to teach drama by eliciting the drama from the children. When the day of the first lesson dawned she made two remarks to me just before the lesson:

"I have no ideas. You know two and a half weeks ago I had so many ideas. Well they are all gone. What I say and what I do I don't know"

The drama room is large with grey carpeting on the floor. In the centre of the ceiling space there is a square
lighting grid with three spotlights suspended from each side of the square. There are triangular risers of varying heights arranged at one end of the room and next to them a larger than life size rod puppet. Beside the puppet is a cupboard with a mirror on its outer door face. Along one side of the room there is a series of shelves which hold an assortment of full head masks in bright fluorescent colours and sets of exercise books in stacks by class. Beside the entrance is a chest high wall which allows a four foot area for the storage of shoes and book boxes during the drama class. Two of the three bulletin boards are decorated, one with figures in various drama attitudes and another illustrating a legend. There is an arrangement of artifacts near the legend board arranged in the manner of a still life on the top shelf. Beside the blackboard is a collection of hats, including a sombrero, hung from a nail. There are also two xylophones on one of the shelves. Apart from these items the only objects in the room are two black boxes, one two feet square and one one foot square, and four black high stools.

On this first day the children entered rather noisily, some sat on the floor while some got into groups to chat. When the teacher arrived she switched off the lights and asked them to sit in a drama circle. The teacher uses a music stand to hold her notes and materials for the lesson.

The lesson began with a warning about the importance of drama posture. Some time was spent clarifying the need when in drama rows to be quiet so that they know how they are to work together.

T: "What you choose to do in SA will carry the drama of young people/old people that you have started to explore. You will explore this in three ways: Mime, Storytelling and Dramatisation. The (string game) Jacob’s Ladder is to be a tool for the storytelling which will have an independent mark. In mime you will work with a partner. In dramatisation you will work in groups of four or five."

Q (T) Who remembers what we mean by dramatisation?

A1 We had the story of St. George and the Dragon. A2 and we were acting through the story. A3 We were speaking and moving and we used costumes, A4 We had props and sets and could use lights.

T: Yes it depends on how much you want to do.

T: NOW mime is to focus on showing feelings through exploring the senses. The emphasis is to be on characterisation, facial expressions and posture.

The children were asked to vote on which of the drama three genres they should use to begin their exploration. Mime was chosen unanimously. Children were then asked to get into pairs in a count of five and to sit down with their partner facing the teacher. The teacher reminded them that they had read the Hernstein Bears and said that they could use these ideas if they wished or they could use their own ideas. She also told them that she would not be directing their
thoughts and asked who had ideas already that they would like to work with. Nearly all the boys signified that they had ideas. The teacher reminded them once again that they were to work on exploring emotions and senses using mime, the piece had to be ready to share with others in four periods (180 min. of class time)

Q(s) Can we use props?

A(T) Let's say you can use one important prop, and you can use the black boxes. Now remember to focus on young people/old people. Go ahead and work.

The children spread out into their own space. Some took stools and boxes to work with. There is a lot of talk, some walking and waltzing, while others discussed seriously. Some pick materials or props immediately. The teacher went round the room dealing with individuals who were having difficulty on a one to one basis. I inferred that some of the questions had to do with the length of the mime because the teacher suddenly stopped individual conferencing and issued the general instruction, "There will be a 3 min. maximum on the piece." Six girls are spending most of their time rummaging in the cupboard, trying on hats and scarfs. The teacher calls out "you may only use one prop." The class is very noisy with most of the noise issuing over disagreements about props and from the group by the cupboard. Then lights out and on again by the teacher. Quiet descends. Instruction "Sit facing your drama partners in drama posture. Now you will have a quiet formal conference about what you are going to do and you will not move until I tell you" This instruction is carried out. When the teacher announces "get up focus -- now everybody begins in silence," the children begin to work seriously. They are then instructed to sit down again and watch a few of the ideas. A pair of boys volunteers to show what they have come up with. They are very aware of me and keep glancing at me and smiling as they perform. The older person has a cane and is followed into a store by a younger person. As the older person points to items on the shelves with his cane the younger person reaches for them and puts them in the shopping cart. Every so often the older person will knock goods off the shelves and the younger person will replace them. The teacher talks to the class about what they have seen and zeros in on the performance skills and on the genre of mime in her remarks. She reminds the class of the emotions she wants to see of the posture of the character and of the senses that they must use.

Next two girls show their idea. The older person is in a mother role, the younger person that of a child. The child is sent to visit an older person. She does not want to go and is afraid of the older person who is shown as being violent. After the children stop the teacher makes no comment on the content of the mime but reminds them that when they want to show their work they must face their audience. She then talks to the class about the art of mime as a silent art. This talk leads into an exercise session where they are instructed to walk, jump, turn and twizzle as a whole class as silently as possible. They do this several times, with great concentration, until the noise from the movement is minimal. The teacher
instructs them to attend to what it is that they want to show—emphasis on skill and on showing. Some groups at this point called the attention of the teacher to an inequitable use of space and of props. The teacher deals with the particular space problem while many children are either choosing or trying on hats. The children are told to freeze, find beginning position for their mime, move through and bring it to a conclusion. All children work through their mime during this with care. As they do this the teacher side-coaches reminding them to focus, to bring senses into it and then at the end gathers them round the board to make a list there of the emotions they wish to show. They are reminded that the facial expression must show the emotion, and are instructed to put away their props.

Informal interview with children as they change classes.

Q. Can you tell me about your mime? (boys in first group who showed their idea to the class)
We had people in a supermarket small kid and an old person who points at things then sometimes knocks them down and the young person picks them up. We didn't like it—it was too long and too complicated so we changed it.
We were two neighbours having a cup of tea. Older person has a biscuit and offers it to the younger person and he didn't want it. I (older person) take a biscuit, dip it in my tea. I am enjoying it—then I choke. My neighbour is a student of C.P. R. and manages to save me. At the end he thought I was giving him a biscuit but I gave him money. (other student) When I knew he was giving me money I first of all gave him my bill (1st student) yes he gave the bill and I gave him money. I paid him.
Q. When you started and you were in the store who paid for the goods you bought. (1st student) We paid.
Q. Whose money was it? (2nd student—young) I had the money.

Informal interview with Teacher after 1st P.O.

Q. I noticed the emphasis on feelings of the characters and also on showing in mime. Could you explain that to me?
A. Showing in gesture, in posture and in facial expression.
Q. Facial expression at the end
A. You know where. If you think about standing at your grandpa's grave—Grandpa Norris. If you hold the thought through the drama then it is focused and sincere. I've had kids do that. Your mother's told you off—is angry with you. one kid is sincere—I want them to enter the character—but some are insincere. I want them to know the different appearance of what they portray by modeling so that they can pick out the sincere. Last year Shawn Barry doing a grave scene did exaggerated and completely sincere work. Older children should have some sense of responsibility for the image you do project. Because it is sacred. I'll often, if I get frustrated— I will gather the kids around and tell them about experiences that are real. And sometimes you know I'll get emotionally invested.
Q. Do you think that is a bad thing?
A See I lost my Grandpa two years ago and being from an Air Force family he was the only one I was close to. And I used to go to the nursing home to visit the old people—the Edith Cavell—and I'm really emotionally involved with this thing. The other thing is perhaps you have a better idea of where they (the students) are from the interviews. Do they have quite a good idea about old people?

A. No well there is only one child who has what I would call a well developed concept of person. There are some who will see capacities of listening, of wisdom or of knowledge.

T. The one I am struggling with is the next one because it is teacher directed. I have to lead them on a walk. Some will be strong. I will have to let them go. But I don't want to let them go. They are the toughest kids in the school these grade fives. I'd like to change them but I guess....

Q. Why Don't you There's...

A. But you wanted teacher direction. I'm afraid I'll take over

Q. That would be fine too.

A. Well... (makes a face... uncertainty?)

FIELD NOTES

Children enter and sit in a drama circle. Teacher enters, “Make three drama rows facing me”. Four counts are given to accomplish the move. The children do not succeed in so arranging themselves and so are instructed to return to the drama circle then the instruction is repeated and this time the children succeed. The children are warned that this week a mark will be awarded for posture, for self control and for focusing. The teacher states, “This term we are going to explore mime storytelling and dramatisation”. She reviews the relation of attitude to posture, the idea of telling stories with gesture—of expressing feeling with the use of facial expression and emphasises that mime is a silent art. The teacher then recalls for them the main point of dramatisation as a combination of moving and speaking where you start with a story frame, make up improvised dialogue and add costumes and props. She contrasts their grade four experience of storytelling with what they will be doing in grade five. Before they were retelling a story written by someone else but this year they will be making up their own stories. She asks which of the three forms they wish to begin with. The vote for mime is again unanimous.

The instructions for the mime work are now given. They are going to work with a partner. They are given a count of five to move alone into their own space. The teacher asks them to think of an event or a character in the Bears story and
informs them that they are going to have fun with the character of the grandparent. Instruction: Until you hear the sound I
want you to explore the grandparent in mime. Comment: Many different events from the story were portrayed—grandpa
fishing, making a boat in a bottle carrying twins, cases and all up the stairs and dancing at the Friday night dance.

Teacher calls freeze, asks them to sit facing her and asks:

Q. How can we show feelings?

Ans. In our faces, in how we move, in our posture. Showing walking angrily in a situation. Teacher emphasises these answers by repeating them and moves on to the next stage of the lesson.

Instruction: Let's walk as the little cubs thought the gran and pappu would walk before they went to stay with them and their parents left. Here the majority of the portrayals were slow and sad with frequent use of canes etc.

Instruction: Let's now move as gran and gramps once the cubs got to know them. Here there is a distinct speeding up of movement and less sadness and more confidence in the movement.

Instruction: Gran and gramps have just got a letter from Mum and Dad to say the cubs are coming. They are waiting for the cubs to arrive. How do Gran and Grampa expect the cubs to behave? Lots of vigorous movement, playing of imaginary games etc.

Instruction: Now show me how the cubs do behave when they do arrive. The movement slows, the cubs are portrayed as shy, hesitant and in less than happy mood.

Instruction: Sit down, curl up. Get in your mind an old person that you know—pause of about 1.5 mins—Then an instruction: Three audience rows please with your backs to me. Now I am going to ask for some volunteers to show me the old characters that you know. Now when you show me these characters I want you to concentrate on the emotions of the characters. And audience I want you to tell me the emotions that you see. Six people show their old characters and the audience offered the following interpretations.


As the audience offered these comments the performer was nodding his head to each one.

Q. T. How did you feel? Did your back hurt?

A s Yes awful.

Audience interp. of second character.


Q. T. Who were you showing us?
A.S. My grand father who is 67 He is always happy.

The teacher decides it is time for the whole class to get to work without showing any more of the characters who volunteered.

I want you to get into pairs to start your mime. One of you is to be an old person and the other a young person. We are going to concentrate on showing the feelings of the characters in the mime. After some short practice they show a few of the situations to the class before it ends. The first one shows the Y.P. in a rush with the O.P. trying to keep up. Another shows a grandpa happy to buy his grandson an ice cream.

Q. T. How old were your old people?

A 13 to 65.

Teacher asks them to move up the ages as she calls them out. All portrayals stay businesslike up to about 40 when they start to slow down until at 80 every one is moving into stereotype and has bad vision, is immobile or walking with a cane and has difficulty hearing. Some children moved into this stereotype at 60 some later. Only one boy continued at the same pace throughout. I talked to this boy later. He said, "My great aunt is 106 and she walks like a normal person. I was surprised when I saw how the others were walking.

Participant Observation 23rd Oct. S.A-less structure

Note the drama teacher was off sick from the 17th to the 23rd.

The teacher began the class by reminding the children that at the end of the class they would be asked to evaluate their behaviour in the drama room. "You will be marking posture, self control and focus. I want you to ding yourselves when you do not have those things" She then asked for a sub report from the children.

A. We went on with our partner work in mime. Then at the end we were going to do our mime but she played the drama self control game and we didn't get to do it.

T. Now we are going to perform our mime and move on to story telling. Three drama rows please. Count of five. Teacher with mark book at the music stand sitting on a high stool behind the rows of children.

In the first group called "In my group we have four people and Josh is sick"

T. You eliminate that character.

S. We need another person.

T. Sometimes we can imply a character who is not there. You have to solve the problem without another character.

One girl did not have a group and was assigned to one.
T. To make it clear. There should be one prop and what is the theme for your mime?

A. Young people/ old people.

T. yes and we are dealing with emotions with gut level stuff and how you can show those emotions. I want you to use your senses and facial expressions with clear action. How can you convey feelings?

A. The way you walk, move and travel.

T. the gestures- the way you position yourself. One other thing was the focusing on a thought of the character. Lots to ask you to do. Think of where your eyes are, focus at the beginning and at the end on a fixed spot. Any questions?

Q. Are we supposed to show young people/old people?

A. Anything that you want to show us about that theme

Two girls discuss their idea with the teacher. She says, "is it about young people/old people? If it is then it is all right with me.

The children all work in their own space. Some children are immediately involved, others are discussing intently. Teacher moves about the room, she side coaches" remember the feeling" Some boys are wasting time. Teacher attends to a group whose work is superficial, reminding them individually of the identifying of feeling and then the expressing of it. The lights are switched off and on again. Some children continue to move. The teacher says "stop" loudly and goes from child to child with the question: "what was the feeling you were expressing when I turned off the lights? The children take the position they had been in when the lights went off and show the feelings which they feel to be appropriate. The rest of the class are required to watch and see if they can identify what the individuals are trying to show. The teacher side coaches "How many are showing in their face, in their posture in their movement. This series of highly specific questions achieves silent and highly concentrated work throughout the room. However as soon as the teacher goes to help a student needing advice the others begin to talk as they work. The student seeking advice is sent back to her partner with the direction to come to a decision about the idea giving difficulty.

I watch three boys: they have a piece in which the Y.P. shows fear of the elderly person then after getting a chance to know the older person the fear changes to interest.

T. Some new children to the school are showing in their faces and in their movements that they are enjoying the drama. If therefore you want to show that your character is happy you must exaggerate that expression so that we know it happy appearance is not just you enjoying the drama.

There are two groups who are doing work with teenagers as the old people. One group which needs constant reinforcement creates many occasions when they can seek help, search through the props, do anything but address the theme.
The teacher asks for volunteers—7 offer. She asks the class, “What things are you looking for?” A. Feelings, Posture, Travel. Facial expression And the theme young people old people.

**FIRST GROUP TO SHOW—2 GIRLS**

*Mime to do with conflict over T.V.* The young person loses out and is ordered to go to bed and the T.V. is switched off. The young person reads a book in bed but is ordered to go to sleep and left. As soon as the older person is gone the Y.P. sneaks out to watch T.V. again and in anger scribbles over walls. Teacher asks, “How old were your characters?” A. an 8 year old and a 16 year old. The children comment that a 4 year old would have been a better choice because of the scribbling. The class ends as the teacher asks a child new to the school about the feelings.

**Comment**

My question at this stage is how much good would it do to (a) have a discussion of the mime ideas shown in class, (b) show and discuss these ideas, (c) keep a record of each others ideas? Right now it seems to me as if the the mime ideas are totally within group negotiations and therefore limited because of the small numbers in each small group. Without changing the autonomous nature of each mime piece the class as a whole might be moved in more thoughtful directions by one of the above strategies.

---

**Participant observation: 23rd. oct. 5B lesson 2 directed.**

Drama circle with posture at the beginning of each class. Teacher begins, “A week ago we were about to break into groups of two. How do we form groups in drama?” A. We walk and whoever we end up close to we pair up with. T. Good to learn to work with those who you don’t know or like. Now we are going to be working on the young people old people theme. We are going to be using our senses—see touch taste smell, hear. We are going to show the action of our senses in mime. We are going to show the emotions. Remember we did pride at different ages? Now how can you do that. Remember express on your face, in your movement and in the posture of your body by the size and speed of your gestures.

I want to share some things from personal experience. I saw two little children in the 3a mime and one old person. The young people did a good job showing fear of the old person. It reminded me of an experience. I was 5 years old and Mum and Dad took me to the hospital, far from home. Mum and Dad couldn’t visit and there were lots of scary tests. I ran away once. At the end of the hall there was an old lady we peaked around her door she offered us butter mints but we wouldn’t go in because the friend who shared a room with me said she had black feet. One day I went down because I was lonely—my friend had gone home so I went in. She gave me butter mints. “Do you have black feet?” I asked. “Yes, I have a problem.” She showed me her feet and it was not as I had imagined. Why am I telling this? What do I want you to think about?” Sczasny
things might not be as bad as they seem

Ans.

(1) Old people - What you think of them might not be true.

(2) You should never judge.

(3) Everyone has feelings - all are persons.

(4) Never judge a person by what they have.

(5) Don't make a fool of old people. They might do it to you when you are old.

(6) It has nothing to do with being old.

T. What was I afraid of?

K. Black feet

T. It helps to get close to people

K. She told the truth but in a scary way

T. It is very important to look at why we are acting in a certain way - at the emotions we have - use your own experience. Talk to partners about your plan - come up with a situation - something very important - to give an important message - you may use one prop to help to tell your story.

The children go to the prop cupboard and choose - coat, spectacles, cape, shawl, cane, stole. I want you to do the meeting part today. Have a meeting with a strong focus. T. "How many are ready to start experimenting? Be sure you are dealing with real honest feelings of the characters" At this time half are already practising, half are discussing.

T. I am shocked by some of the discussions. I'm hearing about Granny bashers. That teens are doing this in Calgary. I heard Debbie say that she would be a young person on drugs and would take a cane and hit the older person. How many groups have violence happening in their mime?

There are four groups who have violence in their work all against old people.

K. How can an 8 year old hurt an adult?

K. There is teasing which leads to violence.

T. Why would you make fun of the elderly?

K. Because they can't make fun back. We were waiting for the bus and we were making fun of an old woman.

K. I saw a movie where an old person was picked on by teens.

T. Why should you not make movies like that?

K. It's fun.
T. What about their effect on sau a grade two

K. They would initiate the grade twos. They might think its O.K.

I want you to plan your mimes before you come to class next day

Child goes up to teacher and says as the class is leaving, "I saw in the news in Toronto that an old man was beaten up by a gang."

24th. oct-----5A------Participation Observation ---less directed.

Teacher announces that the children will be asked to do a self-evaluation of their own self control. We are going to use the beginning of the period to take a look at a little piece of drama from yesterday. I was interested in the ages of the characters you were using. All old people will do some travelling in mime in front of the old people as audience. For this section the audience will observe the posture, facial expressions and activities of the Y.P. The children perform. Those children who use strong facial expressions and good activities are commended by the teacher. Then the old people perform. The class is asked his time to attend to working out the age of the old people. One guess of 90 which is correct. A guess of 64 which is wrong and guesses of 76, 45, 23 and 82 which were correct. Paul is 45 and his partner is 17 and therefore is not the oldest person in the mime. But another says that 17 is old to Zack who is 4 years old. John is 90 to 97 and is in her 60's. One student says, "2 is old to a person who is one but is not therefore an old person."

No one guessed at Robert's age correctly. When asked Robert stated that he was a rich 31 year old.

T. I thought you were near retirement because you had all that dignity.

Erin shows a character and is closely guessed at 84T. Who were you thinking of? A. My grandad. No one guessed Patrick's character's age. Patrick informed them that he was 71. Most of the class expressed surprise at this age because the character was riding a motorbike. In rebuttal the following remarks were offered:

(1) I've seen people about 80 riding motor cycles

(2) If you pass this town one week of a year you would see the people in these gangs. They were about 65-71.

T. How many were

K. My Grandad goes swimming every day and his tummy is real hard. He is so fit.

K. My grandad is in perfect shape for 72 except for his teeth. There is this old gang and this woman she was about 80 and she had spiked hair.

K. Old people can be in 100% shape.

K. I saw an old lady in a show who robbed houses and rode a motor cycle. She looked 65-70 I guess.
T. But she says she is 90 and Amy's age was guessed at 65 and she is 22. What made you guess she was 65?-(shake of head from guesser-- Another kid says of this character that she looked like she was 45.)

K. Ashley was about 17 but my partner is K. I think Patrick was 43.

K. He looked as if he worked at Consumers.

The last three remarks were made as the children were leaving the room.

27th. Oct.----Participant observation------SB--more directed.

We are going to see the mimes today. I want to see authentic characters. You are to deal with how they feel.

K. Not everybody hurt the old person

T. But why is violence to the old people chosen.

K. What do you think about Y.P. beating up O.P.?

T. I have a need for you to think about other things about O.P. Audience you will mark self control, posture and focus--mark yourselves as audience.

1st. Group performs.

The mime shows Y.P. teasing O.P. by ringing door bell and running away and by throwing ball repeatedly at their window.

Another Y.P. after seeing this brings the O.P. a basket of fruit, is invited in and has some soup with the O.P. The teacher asked about the facial expressions, emotions shown, the posture of the characters and the gestures used. The children gave positive feedback about these items.

T. All right What do you think audience about the theme in this mime?

K. I think they showed it well.

T. Why?

K. They showed the facial expressions

K2 They expressed different ages well. The first girl the teen doesn't like O.P. The second girl is younger and kinder.

2nd. Group.

An O.P. with a cane visits a Y.P. The y.p. steals and hides the cane. The O.P. has brought a gift but refuses to give it until the Y.P. returns the cane. The Y.P. refuses to return the cane and demands the gift by increasing bad behaviour until the gift is offered to calm them down. This is repeated as the child breaks each gift given by mistreating it and showed the y.p. in a strong manipulative role. The audience laughed when the o.p. got poked or hurt.
K. It was a little on the comedy side. Two children say they hit their grandmas.

T. When the child broke her gifts why did she get angry?

Y.P. Because I always wanted more.

T. What was funny?

K. When she... the O.P. was crying.

T. Do you think that children manipulate old people like that?

K. My brother does that.

K. With grandmas I don't but with Mum I do.

K. That's only because you spend more time with Mum.

K. I expect Grandma to bring me a present.

K. With Mum you don't have to be polite. I want to ask for a present from Grandma but it isn't polite.

K. With my Dad my little brother threatened to run away if Dad did not bring presents.

Group 3

O.P. and Y.P. running. The O.P. is in better shape than the Y.P. and exhausts the y.p.:

T. O.K., The older person can win fair and square over the younger. They may not be as old as they look.

K. You shouldn't judge a book by its cover.

The O.P. says her character was in her 50's.

K. There is no way you could win.

K. My baba is 60 and exhausts me.

K. Why would you give a medal to o.p.?

She got a medal because of the Y.P. admiration.

O.P. I tried to give it back to Y.P.

T. Generosity?

O.P. Yes but she insisted I deserved it.

Group 4

Two people in a car. The o.p. is teaching the Y.P. to drive. Y.P. is reckless goes too fast does not pay enough attention to the road. The O.P. shows how it should be done.

T. Were you the y.p.

K. Yes I was 16.
The O.P. was 30
There was no Y.P. O.P.
There was a 16 to 30 difference in age.
There wasn't really an old person there was a older person
T Is there a difference
I am Older and I do know more
You look up to older people
T to the younger person they seem old?
T. What is old?

30th. October——Participant observation——5A less dir.

Group 1
One 70 year old and one 19 year old. The 19 year old is living in a trailer and the 70 year old comes to visit him. When the 
y.p. sees who is at the door he closes the door in his face and rushes to tidy up his room. When eventually he lets the o.p. in 
the o.p. is offered a drink. Then the y.p. discovers he only has beer to drink. He offers it tentatively and the o.p. tells him 
off. Later the o.p. goes into the kitchen and finds lots of beer there. The o.p. resigns himself to reality and joins the y.p. in

Group 2
A 62 year lady is playing a game with a 12 year old. The o.p. wins the game and shows her pride in that accomplishment.

Group 3
Y.P. afraid of o.p. When the O.P takes an interest in what the y.p. is attempting the Y. P. tries to please the o.p. by 
learning. As a result the y.p. leaves having come to love the o.p.

Group 4
The y.p. is afraid of o.p. because the o.p. was different. The ages were 5 and 80. The o.p. wants the y.p. to feel
comfortable.
T. Why did the o.p. not show any emotion?
K. She was too old to stretch her face into the expressions of emotion.

Group 5
There are three in the group. Two are old and one is young. One of the old people is driving the motor cycle while the y.p.
and the other o.p. are passengers. The y.p. and the driver enjoy the ride but the other o.p. is afraid. When they arrive at the movie house one o.p. has money which he gives to the y.p. who pays for the tickets and all three go in and enjoy the movie together.

The teacher asks what the relationships are. k. I'm the Dad I'm 40 they should have respect for me. T. Is that because he is old? nod of head.

30th. Oct. --- Participant Observation --- 5B -- more dir

Group5

A 65 year old and an 8 year old. The o.p. and y.p. are playing ball with a ball which the o.p. has given to her granddaughter. The y.p. throws the ball hard and the o.p. fails to catch it as a result. The o.p. makes the y.p. go and fetch the ball. The o.p. then bounces the ball hard so that the y.p. fails to catch it. Then they both play happily. Suddenly the o.p. throws it up really high and neither of them can get it. The performers when asked stated that they wanted to show that o.p. can have a good laugh and enjoy being silly if they want

K. I thought the message was o.p. and y.p. compete.

K. no we were having fun together.

We wanted the o.p. to tumble the ball purposely

K. Why did you hug each other? To show we can enjoy o.p.

K. Why not hug if you were younger?

K. No we wouldn't but we do hug o.p.

K. Some people think they are better because they are y.p. and they want to win. Y.P. want to be recognised as more mature.

From the 30th of Oct to the 20th of November the children of both classes performed their mimes which they had created for the drama teacher to mark. I video taped the mimes and therefore there are no p.o. notes for the intervening dates. The classes also had a sub for two of the drama periods when the regular drama teacher was off sick i.e. it took three periods for each class to perform their mime in its final form and there were two missed days for each class when a substitute took over and they got themselves more proficient in their mimes. Three periods of drama (for each class) covers 10 school days at its maximum and a Friday, Monday and Tuesday at its minimum as it was in this case.

20th. Nov. --- Participant Observation --- 5A less directed
T. let me know what the sub. did with you.

A. She put a question on the board which we copied into our journals. We had to make up a story with the string using Jacobs ladder about y.p./o.p.

T. You had to have at least two characters--more if you like--you can name them. Did the sub give you a demonstration--no--well will one of you go and fetch Erin Bergman and one other grade six to come here and tell their mosquito story. While we are waiting I want to go over what I expect to see in your stories. I need to hear expressive voices--the emotion in the voice -you can use interesting sound effects--now find your own space--think of a title--say the title--announce it at the beginning of your story with your name as author. Everyone try to get a start on the story --at least get the beginning.

Erin from grade six arrives. She positions herself at the centre of one side of the room. The teacher asks for drama posture facing the performer but remaining in their own space. As the story teller tells her tale her hands are busy of their own accord building a shape with the string. Thus the audience is listening to the story and at the same time trying to work out where the string figure fits into the story. The children listen intently and applaud when the story is done. The teacher does not discuss the story or the idea of the string but asks them now to get busy in their own space ignoring what the people around you are saying and say your story out loud to yourself.

K. In an Indian story book it said that the Jacob's ladder was three shrimp caught in a fishing net.

T. Your stories can deal with any idea and think about a message that you can give through your story. The class tries the saying all at once of their stories. T. It is too quiet I want you all to begin speaking at once. Comment: the children have to shut out everyone else to concentrate on their own stories. They are also able to try out the sound of their own voices secure in the anonymity that the noise gives them. Also since they are sitting on the floor and at a distance from each other the voices are not at first compounded by movement so that although the volume is considerable it is not uncontrolled.

The teacher calls out one boy to speak to privately whose story is derivative of one she knows of in another class and gently explains that he must create his own story. The boy returns happily to his place and gets to work at once. The teacher stops the work and asks everyone to go back to the beginning and add sound effects. They all start to speak on a teacher supplied cue. The children are all absorbed even though close to others. Only two children could be observed who in any way related to others. Occasionally some students were momentarily distracted when someone near them uses a very dramatic or expressive voice. They then quickly return to their own ideas. T. I want to hear about some of your characters please:

A. George and Fred; Explorer and disobedient kid; Rabbit and dog and tortoise; Santa Claus and girl; Henry and Mommy; Bobby, Joey, Mommy and Grandpa Shrimp; Grandpa and Jamie; Jimmy, and Grandma and the robbers; Rob and Julie; Nathan
Grandpa and John.

T. all right - begin again - Children work for about 4 mins. - T. What is the first event in the story? George and Mr. Bo go to get the mail and bump into each other and then they go to get the ladder. Jo and Jacob go sailing. Explorer and Nathan together but Nathan, a teenager doesn’t want a coke. He wants a beer. The explorer won’t give it to him. Terry is singing a song in the cradle and it breaks in the middle of the singing. Colin and Grandpa go to the black market to buy a bomb.

Grandma gets robbed of her cookies. A little girl is afraid of the baby sitter so she goes to her grandma’s with her teddy bear. T. O.K. now sit in twos and listen to each other’s stories. Help each other to speak clearly and expressively with sound effects. Help them to focus on audience not on the string. The children rehearse the stories to their partners.

T. Sit in your own space. Show me who is in the middle of their stories. Who is at the end? Tell all the stories together and try for an end-give titles. I hear the following titles. Mr. Tortoise-- a Hero; The Ladder; The Broken Cradle; George Fred and The Orange Juice: The prince and The Hag

The Lost Weed Eater; Poor Grandma; The Computer Ladder; The Dog Fight; The Alive Ladder.

T. Remember I want to hear the titles and the authors. Comment No lack of enthusiasm the children continue to tell stories and ignore others. There is now much more moving and some children are on their feet there is some evidence of effort to create the action of the stories using bodies and sound effects. Some get into pairs to tell stories to each other. There are three groups like this. T. Can we rehearse in front of each other?

Who wants to tell a story. All boys, or at least two thirds, offer to tell. Only one girl offers at this stage. We hear the story of Poor Grandma. T. asks for suggestions to improve the story.

Informal interview with teacher.

Is this any different from the other group? I am Giving a lot of direction in my teaching but I try not to direct the content. I try to get them to tell me the content and then I will interfere and try to get them to consider the values and attitudes more deeply. I have been known to interfere in content when some thing is personal to me or when the drama deteriorates into fights all over the room.

I then went over again with the teacher how the joint creation of meaning would proceed using my notes. I told her that when the notes were typed up I would come to check them with her to see if I had missed anything or got anything wrong. Later I would analyse what we had both agreed on and then bring the analyses to her to see if it truly represents her, her
teaching and the observations she has made of the drama.

SB - 20th. Nov.

JAud. Rows facing the teacher. Housekeeping. If you knot strings they are not going to be unknotted by me after you leave the drama room. We have started planning our stories. She reviews the criteria and warns that they won't be able to use the string if they can't follow directions. The teacher follows the same procedure used in the other class to determine that they are all on task and to give herself a picture of the extent to which the stories have developed. How many at the middle? -- 1/2 the class. How many at the end? 5. Give me your titles: Natalie, Dad and Jacob; Mum and Jacob; Jacob, Grandmother and Mum and Dad died in a plane accident -- Got idea from the beginning of the Bernstein Bears; Santa Claus and Lucy; Jake, Gramps and Grandma -- dreams of building a ladder with Grandpa to mend a hole in the roof -- wakes up disappointed. John Family and my Dad (o.p.) George meets a big old rat called Jacob; Rosie and Timothy -- Rosie is the Grandmother who comes over to pick apples; The Daydreamer -- This is the ladder that Jacob built.

T. See if you can solve something -- teach something that has to be taught -- Respect -- concerns of y. p/o/p. Think -- If you tell your story to grade three class. Substitute the problems. Change things to give it a meaning for them.

Unlike the other class, three pairs are telling their stories to each other although they were told to work alone -- there is also a group of three engaged in mutual telling. Children in this class are more inclined to (a) seek teacher help, input and to demand attention and reinforcement from their peers. One child who intends to leave the school is doing nothing. 11 children altogether are working in groups.

T. Build on your story events. Spending time on gimmicks to get us interested in you the storyteller. Remember the value of sound effects and of repetition. Stories should always change but you need to strengthen the meaning. The next time I stop you I am going to ask you for the message of your story. The message is to be your secret goal. I don't want you to work in partners. Talk out your story on your own -- 6 children doing nothing -- 3 round teacher. One boy still with partner listening. One boy alone watching the teacher and not working on his story overtly. He slowly withdraws his attention from the teacher's interaction with three other students and slowly and quietly begins to say his story to himself.

Messages of Stories as given to the teacher.

O.P are not all frisky but some can do things others can do.

Don't be greedy of their time because o.p. sometimes can't make time for you.

Old people's memories are part of themselves.

O.P/Y.P. can still be best friends.
O.P. should try to make Y.P. T. you mean when you lose your spirit sometimes someone comes into your life and lights it up. Yes.

O.P. and Y.P. can build things together.

Not all old people are mean and grumpy.

O.P. can teach.

O.P. can do and know a lot more. They have more experience of life if they have been practising.

O.P. are just as nice as Y.P. The next six periods were taken up with videotaping the stories which the children had created.

The drama teacher was ill for four other lessons. While I video taped the teacher marked the work for the first report card.

11th Dec. . . . . . . . Participant Observation . . . 5A - less structure

Dramatisation. "Dramatisation Oh Boy!" remark by one boy on entering the drama room. Teacher to me, "Here I am not..."

T. I feel sorry that I did not take the time to work on your story telling skills - i.e. articulation. Was the string difficult?

K. yes we were concentrating on the skill of string and could\'nt on the story. T. My apologies for making that difficult.

Now our dramatisation will be done in groups and I have chosen some stories for you to dramatise. First what is dramatisation?

K. Speak clearly and make actions. Acting out a story with sound. Move. Speak, sound improvising. The story can be different every time.

T. Something you have to know is when I give you a story it is only to give you a structure. You can insert your own ideas but keep the beginning, middle and end. Take the theme Y.P./O.P. and do with it as you wish. We lost it in storytelling. Pay more attention to it. If you fall short of characters remember it is the group which must solve the problem. Stories are assigned. There are 2 groups of 5, two GPS of 4, two GPS of 2 and one GPS of 6 and another group of 4. Within 3 mins 2 GPS are started to act out. The lights go off and on. All freeze. Children are directed to read the stories together, to conference and to plan.

5B . . . . . . . . p.o . . . . . . . . more directed . . . . . . . 11th Dec.

Teacher to me. With this group I want to explain the stereotypes and ask them to rebuild a more honest picture.

The teacher reviews what dramatisation is and repeats that they are still dealing with the theme Y.P. O.P. The children are
less than positive. Teacher asks if they feel they know enough about that theme already. Some say yes some no some say
thet knew all that already. The teacher asks how many have honestly learned something about the theme have grown in
ideas and understanding of old people. 13 children raise their hands instantly. Teacher asks what we mean by a stereotype.
K. Old women get grumpier.

Old men are nicer or are scary figures
O.P. have canes to hit little kids Old ladies are unreasonable
o.p. are seen as unrealistically happy
Old women always do what their husbands tell them.
T. Some of the stories I have chosen to work with do contain stereotypes. I want you to look at the characters very carefully
and try to perform the characters in a very sincere and honest way. Oh yes you can change the stories. You can make them
more genuine and true. Scripts are given out and the children split up into groups to read them for the rest of the period.

Teacher announces the goals for the day--They are to begin on acting the story. The teacher asks for a purpose for the drama
K. enjoy performance Y.P./O.P. to show theme.
K. We just accept anything in the drama we see except boredom and sometimes even that.

T. What do you hope to give or cause by your drama?
K. If it is a sad one then we hope the audience will tell it to others and remember it
K. Teach something about Y.P./O.P.
K. We want the audience to be afraid of getting old
K. Things you perform can have an impact on people
K. I was scared for a long time by a skeleton I saw in a drama. Dont want people to be scared of getting old
T. We must define what we want the audience to feel or think about or to understand and to take away.
K. We want them to feel bouncy. We want to entertain.
T. Maybe the material will help you decide if you have not already what it is that you want to do.

Groups are formed and spend sometime in reading and planning the dramatisation
T. Then asks each group to determine the roles as to who will best suit the part.
I then went round several groups asking them what they wanted to give to their audience.

Answers
O.P. and Y.P. cooperate to get something done.

Millions of cats: Ugliness can be turned to beauty. Ugly outside does not mean ugly inside.

Mr Fox: Make audience laugh themselves to death.

loon's Necklace: Even disabled people have inner strengths.

T. I want it to be clear what you are doing in the main part of the story. If there are animals in your story remember that you can think of them as standing for people and we don't have to go on all fours to create a cat character. Show me how you can move as different animals and still move on two feet. The class ends with several children demonstrating to the
class how to move as different animals on two feet.

..............................

5B. P.O. 15th. Dec. more Structure

Teacher slightly late. Children in drama circle waiting and ready but some wriggling and talking. "oh look," says a boy, 'she is writing notes about how beautiful we are.' Teacher enters and asks for three rows facing her for a moment. "Just a review. I think we left people spots in groups if they were absent. Would someone like to explain to those who were absent what we are endeavouring to do? K. Props, costumes and set if we want it are to be brought in. K. We are to deal with Y.P.A.O-P. T. One Group has discovered that in one of the stories there is one o.p. and all the other characters are animals--but they can stand for people. You don't have to be on hands and knees but they are o be personified and can speak. Q.K. How are we going to choose how the extra people go in the groups? T. you solve that. Qk. Do we have to learn lines. T. No you can change the story if you keep the structure--improvise the lines. It will change each time. Do not Narrate. K. Can we add a person if there is only one person in the story? T. Is there a story with only one person in it? A. Well there is a weed but...T. Tell me about that character. tell us what that character says. the child mutters, inaudible) T. Well you have more than one character.

Teacher gives out scripts. Children get into groups noisily. Two groups of two start work at once. One group of 4 and one group of 5 start discussing and reading. The children who were absent go round looking for a group to join. The group of 6 take time to get organised. one group of three has two members discussing carefully while one child looks round him doing nothing and paying no attention to what his group is talking about. One group of five has the immediate assistance of the teacher as she completes the distribution of the stories. This is because this group of five has been given as their basis a difficult poem by e.e. cummings. The teacher asks them the main idea of the poem. they discuss this with her in voices that are too low for me to hear. As she leaves them they get closer to me and discuss carefully. The teacher calls over another group and asks, "Show me how you can be ducks and still walk." They experiment with duck walks. One group of five girls has advanced movement work going on for four of them while one sits on the teacher's chair watching. The group of 6 are now developing a coordinated movement piece. There are difficulties in one group in working together. One child complain in front of the class. Another says he has been excluded by the complaining child. The teacher directs the group to solve their problems. After some more rehearsal time the teacher asks to see how far they have got with working out their ideas. The class watches the loom's necklace group. They have inserted a dog and the animal takes the focus away from the family's dilemma of the lack of food and from the blindness of the old man. The teacher asks, "What is the point of the dog?" She asks the group to think about this for next class.