

Drama-in-Education and Henry Caldwell Cook

Manami YODA*

* Graduate School of Human and Environmental Studies,
Kyoto University

Summary The 1988 Education Reform Act of England excluded theatre from the national curriculum and thus, theatre was deprived of its position as an art subject. Before the Reform Act, it was recognized as one of the art subjects and at the same time, was used as a teaching medium. After the Reform Act, however, drama was used only as one of many teaching techniques in English education. Denying the autonomy of theatre became a real problem. DIE (Drama-in-Education), which appeared in the late 1960s, also used theatre as an educational means. However, the problem of DIE was that it was applied adhering too closely to drama as an educational means and its advocates gradually forgot the nature of theatre, in spite of its pioneers' strong consciousness of the theatrical genre. It seems to be going virtually in the same direction made by Henry Caldwell Cook who introduced the theatrical way into English education. In Cook's Play Way, however, performance was considered as the final goal and theatre, thus, became autotelic. What was characteristic of Cook was that he not only used theatre as an educational means, but also was conscious of the theatre proper itself. Behind Cook's view of theatre as an educational end itself was the philosophy of *Theatrum Mundi*. For Cook, there is a well-balanced coexistence between the use of theatre as an educational means and the recognition of the nature of theatre. We must keep this proper coexistence in mind in the use of theatre for language education.

1. The 1988 Education Reform

The year 1988 marked a large historical change for the position occupied by theater in education in England. This change was caused by the Education Reform Act, which replaced the former Education Act enacted half a century before (Hornbrook, *Education in Drama* 7). In the new Act theater lost its position as an independent subject in the curriculum of primary and junior education. At the primary level, for instance, theater came to be accepted in the form of drama only as a part of the subject of English. This meant that the obligation to conform to the national curriculum began to threaten the prosperity of theater

education in England, which had been supported thus far by local authorities in the form of DIE (Drama-in-Education) and TIE (Theatre-in-Education). DIE and TIE had been built for over thirty years since Peter Slade published *Child Drama* and started drama education, putting an emphasis upon child spontaneity. Here the word 'drama' —in contrast with 'theatre'—refers to the definition which Brian Way appropriately describes in his book. According to Way, "‘theatre’ is largely concerned with *communication* between actors and an audience; ‘drama’ is largely concerned with *experience* by the participants, irrespective of any function of communication to an audience" (2-3).

It was in this context of theatre education in England that New Wave Drama, a new educational approach, was introduced into primary education. As Suzi Clipson-Boyles defines: “New Wave Drama embraces theatre arts in ways which have rarely been seen before in primary education, combining with the more traditional experiential drama approaches to provide a balanced and integrated approach to drama” (36). To sum it up, the new approach maintains the focus on child experience quite different from the former child drama while adding a new educational viewpoint of theatre arts. Clipson-Boyles refers to guidance terms of the Order for English in the national curriculum, such as “talk for a range of purposes. . . including imaginative play and drama” (6) and “participat [ing] in drama activities, improvisations and performances of varying kinds.” It assigns to schools a duty to make students experientially participate in drama activities, improvisations and other performances using proper words for their roles or situations. At the same time, Clipson-Boyles also takes up the Order for English which compels schools to make students at Key Stage 2 (7 to 11 years old) “communicate to different audiences (*simulated meetings*)” and “distinguish degrees of formality in writing for unfamiliar audiences (*audiences provided through role-play*)” (7), as this is believed to be indirectly connected to the acquirement of language skills. In these two aspects of the Order for English, the interconnectedness between English learning and drama education is clearly noticeable. The Order for English focuses on plays, performance and theatricality on one hand and focuses on experiential language learning through drama on the other. In education at the secondary and advanced levels, drama or theatre has also vigorously survived the turbulent years after the Education Reform. As Toyoko Shimizu reports on the present situation of theatre as an art subject in England, “Drama” as a subject for GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education (ages 11–16)) and “Theatre Studies” as a subject for GC · A-level (General Certificate of Education Advanced-level

(ages 16–18)) have prospered as optional subjects and actually attracted more and more students year after year up to the present time (Shimizu, “The Reason” 102–104). Because of the Education Reform, drama education in England, which had remarkably developed through DIE and TIE supported by the theatrical tradition and local authorities, lost its position as an art subject and accepted under protest a minor position as part of the larger English subject. However, in spite of this adverse fortune brought about by the Reform along with the apprehension of educationalists engaged in drama education, theatre has maintained its tenacious existence in the educational history of England.

Before the creation of the national curriculum, the methods of introducing drama education into teaching were entirely committed to the care of local governments and schools. In other words, drama education and local societies had been closely linked. Predictably, the Education Reform that ignored the close association between the two gave rise to a storm of opposition among educational scholars and teachers (Hornbrook, *Education in* 7). When taking into account the English people’s passion and devotion for theatre and theatre education as well as the large influence of England’s traditional theatre education upon the education of America, Canada and Australia (Wearing, “The Australian Scene” 72), this rebellion against the national control of drama education should not come as a great surprise. For instance, in his book *Education in Drama* published in 1991, David Hornbrook, who at the time was occupying a position on the Inspectorate of London’s Board of Education in 1988, severely criticizes the exclusion of drama as a regular subject from the national curriculum (1). In the 1980s, drama was considered as one of the art subjects. While maintaining this identity, drama also flourished spectacularly as a teaching means. However, the new national curriculum denied drama’s autonomy and independence as an art subject. In the new curriculum, mathematics, English and science were chosen as core subjects, and history, geography, technology, physical education, music, art and a

foreign language were designated as foundation subjects. Hornbrook indicates the absurdity of the 1988 Education Reform, which took up only visual art and music as subjects in the national curriculum and put drama and dance in the non-national curriculum, thus failing to provide a comprehensive and well-balanced arts education. He also questions the provision that drama be adopted as a means of teaching only in the category of English education. He did not even express satisfaction with the educational history in which drama had been admitted as a regular subject in curriculum over the past few decades. Hornbrook asserts that the seemingly robust education history was not a result of admitting drama as a composite art, but that of new government policies and its influence on English education (19). To put it concretely, in the 1950s and 1960s, English education in England gave up placing drama in the center of its program for the acquirement of grammar knowledge and literacy skills and adopted instead other language activities such as improvisation and role-playing, aiming at Creative English with personal growth as its main purpose. Hornbrook does not mention though, that *Growth through English*, which John Dixon wrote on the basis of the results of the Dartmouth Seminar in 1966 helped change the target of English education from teaching reading and writing skills to encouraging children's personal growth through lively language activities including improvisational theatrical work (2). Hornbrook suggests that there are at least two more reasons for drama as an art subject: the necessity of a wider educational curriculum demanded by the raising of the compulsory education age; and the government financial support to child-centered drama education as one of the policies to cultivate their abilities. In any case, drama, which had been admitted as an independent art subject, came to be deprived of its art educational value and is seen only as an educational means working across the multiple subjects. We must note the fact, as Hornbrook suggests, that the ambiguity of the nature of drama as an art subject in some measure had something to do with this

reappraisal of the value of drama in education (*Education in 7*). The more pedagogic DIE became, the more distinctly drama had to separate itself from theatre. Slade and Way themselves could not theorize and practice drama education for children without distinguishing 'drama,' from 'theatre,' the latter being based upon concrete communication with the audience. These two facts themselves suggest the very ambiguity of the nature of drama.

Thus, because of the 1988 Education Reform, drama lost its 'art-as-education' value and came to be admitted mainly as an educational means. In this process, drama, on one hand, rapidly developed as DIE which is aimed at the empowerment of children's spontaneous expression abilities and the nurturing of their personalities. On the other hand, it also became devoid of substance. We are presently going to examine the successful development of DIE, which, over time, gave rise to confusion in school education.

2. DIE and its problems

During the 1960s drama education showed its rapid and conspicuous growth. This growth made it an urgent necessity to train teachers in theatrical knowledge and experience. The teachers' training was done mainly at colleges of education and theatre schools. Many people involved with the theatrical world privately contributed to the training of teachers. For instance, Slade and Way opened their respective teacher-training classes at a new theatrical center in Birmingham and at the Theatre Centre, the latter founded in London, which Way himself founded. The educational training period at the college level was usually two years in the first half of the 1960s, but it varied with each year's birthrate (Allen 14). In the extreme case of the baby boom era, the educational training had to be completed almost overnight. From this, we could surmise the reality of the cursory way of training to supply teachers in response to the demand of a rapidly expanding drama education program. For teachers already in service, preliminary exercises and

casual short-courses or conferences were held. The content of the training was no more than a formal introduction of the subject's purpose and its various methods (Bolton 15; Shimizu "The History" 41). The basic training was therefore clearly inappropriate for helping teachers acquire the leadership skills necessary to realize DIE's purpose of nurturing children's freedom of expression and personal growth. Gavin Bolton, who was engaged in a variety of training courses in those days, rang an alarm bell to the baneful influence of such a perfunctory understanding of drama upon the subject itself. He insisted that only training done with an effective-grasp of drama's nature and function could lead to the achievement of the highest level of education.

Bolton's proposal was group training using dramatic situations in order to make students conscious of "the heart of drama" (12) and of relevant themes while leading them towards "a deeper understanding of a fundamental human issue" (13). Let us examine a concrete example of his method. Initially, the teacher gives his students a dramatic situation, for instance "robbing a bank," as a framework for a theme they have to deal with. Then, the teacher makes students verbally clarify things that they have understood through dramatic action, such as reenacting the life of a robber as a member of a gang, as a part of a family, and as part of a community. Bolton's educational way was consistent with the type of drama education that another leader, practitioner and scholar of DIE, Dorothy Heathcote advocated. Her purpose was to encourage children to discover their real nature through fundamental drama experiences. Heathcote points out that improvisation, the central training means of DIE, must be a stimulating activity in which children discover themselves by "liv[ing] through" (the etymological meaning of the Greek word 'drama') situations (80). She also asserted that "dramatic improvisation is concerned with what we discover for ourselves and the group when we place ourselves in a human situation containing some element of desperation" (44). Here Heathcote

adheres to the nature and purpose of improvisation that occupies the central part of DIE. She hoped to call everyone's attention to the inclination of teachers to use improvisation only as an instrument without any real understanding of the nature of drama.

The same kind of inclination is also obvious in role-playing, another of DIE's main educational means. Role-playing is an activity intended to enable one to put oneself in others' shoes—through the power of imagination and to feel and think in their way. It is not exactly the same thing as acting in the strict sense, which refers to identification with fictional and properly rounded characters. In spite of that, we cannot deny the fact that, as far as its basic nature is concerned, role-playing has a close relationship with theatre. However, it was used only as a convenient means to predict or guess others' thoughts and action. In such cases, spontaneous playing was apt to naturally focus on thematic dilemmas rather than on the mind and feelings of the characters portrayed. In more extreme cases, role-playing was used as an effective tool in management training and psychotherapy (Hornbrook 8-9). These facts suggest that role-playing was likely to turn into a readily accessible technique, severing the original connection with theatre.

Drama education in England, carrying on the tradition of child drama which dates back to the end of the 19th century, had been developing constantly. However, even as it made significant advances in step with the evolution of child-centered education at the beginning of the 20th century, it is ironic that, as in the case of DIE, its theatrical nature was left behind and the method became deprived of genuinely theatrical substance. Yet DIE still demanded of its teachers, who used improvisation and role-playing as educational instruments, qualities such as leadership, psychological knowledge, a sense of morality and charisma, as opposed to acting techniques and directing abilities necessary to teach theatre as an art. This precipitous development of drama education and the exceptionally brief training of teachers led to a distorted form of

education, losing sight of the true nature of theatre. This brought, at least in some areas, much confusion in school settings.

Thus, DIE, originally designed in order to bring out the spontaneity and creativity of children in the latter half of the 1960s, wound up giving birth to a variety of problems that had to be solved in school education. It was the 1988 Education Reform that, at least officially, urged drama education in England (with DIE as its central element) to take concrete steps towards solving those problems. The phrase “at least officially” was used in the preceding sentence because what actually happened was that drama education still continued along its established path, its contents committed to local areas and schools. The main reason for this was that the new national curriculum presented under the Education Reform lacked concrete plans for carrying out its ideas. For instance, the statutory Order for English, one of the principles guiding the practical use of drama in English teaching, was only issued in 1995, seven years after the Education Reform (Clipson-Boyles 36). Naturally, training courses and guide-books on how to carry out the new plans were prepared several years after the statutory Order. It can be deduced that it took a lot of time for the reformed curriculum to get firmly implemented in each and every school. DIE continuously exerted a great influence upon the education of England for thirty years, including its most flourishing decade from the latter part of the 1970s to the latter part of the 1980s, but it met with difficult problems, especially concerning the training of teachers for drama education. Thus far, we have described how DIE brought about practical predicaments into the schools of England. Here we have to ask what kind of problems DIE originally had as an educational approach. We would like to use Hornbrook’s criticism as a starting point towards clarifying DIE’s problems.

In his book (1991) previously mentioned, Hornbrook tackles the problems of DIE from multiple viewpoints and, at the same time, suggests goals for future drama education to aim at. As the book’s title

suggests, he believes that education should be part of drama and not the other way around. From such a viewpoint, he levels caustic criticism at the removal of drama from the national curriculum. Hornbrook uncovers the main cause of the improper treatment of drama in the history of DIE and the ways in which it had been widely adopted as the core of theatre education in England for nearly forty years before the 1988 Education Reform.

According to Hornbrook, the debate about drama in schools in those days was between “learning *in* drama” and “learning *through* drama” and that “*drama itself*” (*Education in 7*) was never taken into consideration. This was the very cause of the confusion in drama education. While it is true that DIE introduced valuable themes and solid teaching and learning strategies into drama classes, on the other hand, it hardly gave consideration to how children were able to substantially benefit from drama itself. This mistake of the DIE method, Hornbrook remarks, is the reason why drama was dropped from the national curriculum. More concretely, Hornbrook indicates a critical problem of DIE, which purportedly attempts to cultivate children’s creativity and spontaneity through drama, as follows :

... one of the problems with drama-in-education in the past was that a ‘desire for immediate spontaneity of expression ousted stylistic constraints—and, hence, the formal possibilities—of inherited culture.’ In fact, experience suggests that sensitive induction into a culture of theatre with its conventions and accepted body of knowledge and skills is likely to stimulate rather than inhibit creative autonomy. Mastery of form goes along with the ability to express content, and form is only learned through experiencing a rich variety of options. Exposure to theatre culture should begin in the primary school. (*Education in 2*)

Hornbrook severely criticizes the fact that DIE

focuses mainly on the cultivation of children's spontaneity, neglecting the formal elements of inherited culture. He asserts, in the context of theatre, that children's "creative autonomy" is richly cultivated only by allowing them to have contact with a culture of theatre containing its "conventions and accepted body and knowledge and skills" (*Education in 2*). Behind such an insistence lies Hornbrook's belief that children's spontaneity is like an innate human artistic nature, so it is not stimulus from outside, such as improvisation, but only proper art education focusing on teaching inherited theatrical methods that can elicit and heighten their spontaneous self-expression. His criticism highlights the distinctive qualities and defects of DIE that denied performance dependent on the existence of an audience and inspired children's imagination and creativity through physical and linguistic expression in improvisational drama activities. Here we must inquire, where did DIE philosophy, which Hornbrook calls into question, actually originate? By tracing the DIE method back to its source, we are naturally led to Slade and other pioneers of DIE. Before taking up what their consciousness of theatre is about, let us briefly examine the dramatic methods used as an educational means at the beginning of the 20th century by Henry Caldwell Cook and Harriet Finlay-Johnson, a contemporary of Cook's. We shall compare Cook's Play Way with Finlay-Johnson's approach.

3. Henry Caldwell Cook's Play Way

Cook took over W. H. D. Rouse's theatrical method in teaching classical languages. He further developed the Direct Method that Rouse had established, and applied it for the first time to the teaching English (as a first language). At Perse School where he was teaching some classes were being offered making use of the Perse Playbooks, which were produced based upon the educational idea that "acting is one of most potent means of learning" (Coggin 232) and Cook's English class was one of them. He called his special

teaching method "Play Way." The name of his method was to be adorned as the title of his book published in 1917. In his book, Cook criticized contemporary education of that time, both knowledge-centered and utilitarian. Defining school education as children's preparation for a proper life as citizens of a modern society, Cook conveyed his original ideas on education, as well as the accumulated results of his three years' teaching practice (342-349).

Cook's fundamental idea of English education through "play" is that Play Way (meaning practical acting) enables teenage students to deeply consider realistic social, political and economic problems and to cultivate the skills necessary for living in a knowledge-oriented, commercially-minded society. It could be interpreted as an amalgam of an educational and a theatrical approach; the former emphasizing the value of school as in Cook's own words "*a little world in itself*" (349) where students learn what is necessary in society, while the latter seeing school as an epitome of *Theatrum Mundi*. In fact, Cook insists that children's play is closer to reality while quoting Hamlet's words "the purpose of playing, both at the first and now, was and is, to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature" (*Hamlet*, 3. 2. 18-19). On the other hand, he shows his consciousness of the theatricality of the world, referring to Jaques' line "All the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players" (*As You Like It*, 2. 7. 139-140). Cook points out that the play of children who can also act very naturally is similar to real life. Behind Cook's idea was his conviction that, as an integral part of the process of improving social conditions in England after World War I, it was necessary to propose a proper form of education through living practice (5).

Cook tried to have students experience social life, if only in preliminary acting and imitation, and his method bore a near resemblance to that of John Dewey who advocated the importance of experiential learning in education. Dewey published one of his chief works, *Democracy and Education*, in 1916, a year before the publication of Cook's *The Play Way*. In his book,

Dewey insists on the importance in education of active and experiential learning as well as of democratic responsibility. A close examination of Cook's stance reveals that the significance of social and experiential nature in education as emphasized by Dewey affected Cook's own idea of innovative theatrical education (Bolton, *Acting in Classroom* 31-32). Cook wrote *The Play Way* with the belief that "a natural education is by practice, by doing things, and not by instruction" (1). More concretely, after criticizing traditional education in which the teacher forces students to read texts and do drills, he asserts that children's practical and experiential learning should be the core of education. For Cook, the content of students' experience consists of the preparation for and the performance of plays through discussion and cooperation inside a group. Each group takes charge of the different aspects of production, such as "the adaptation of the story, or the working out of the characters, or the allotment of the parts, or the staging, or the provision of make-shift costume and properties, or the actual writing of provisional parts in the form of notes giving cues and a rough suggestion of the dialogue" (302). Students staged plays based on, for example, the porter scene from *Macbeth* or the grave-digger scene from *Hamlet*. The teacher whom Cook called the "playmaster" had to keep control to a minimum and put spontaneous theatrical activities to the forefront of students' education in order to cultivate a spirit of self-government (41). As far as students' self-government was concerned, Cook discusses the importance of autonomous learning by heading one of the chapters of his book "Self-government." After defining self-government as "not a matter of discipline only, but a condition which makes it possible for the boys to learn by themselves in actual lessons" (31), he emphasizes not merely the self-government of students as a group but also the individual student's government of himself and his responsibility for his own learning. We can find this same educational thought in Finlay-Johnson, who is well known as another pioneer of drama education using classroom drama.

4. Harriet Finlay-Johnson and the Progressive Movement

Finlay-Johnson was a master-teacher at Sompting School, an elementary school in East Sussex. She published her book, *The Dramatic Method of Teaching*, in 1912. Finlay-Johnson, after insisting that the principle of game practice should be extended from kindergarten to elementary school, emphasizes the importance of children's autonomy but referring to a difference in condition :

Why not continue the principle of the kindergarten game in school for older scholars? I did so, but with this difference : instead of letting the teacher originate or conduct the play, I demanded that . . . the play must be the child's own. (7)

Thus, we see the idea of the autonomy of students as shared by the two pioneers of classroom drama education. However, this educational thought is not original with Cook and Finlay-Johnson. It reflected the contemporary educational climate dominated by the progressive movement in education that originated at the end of 19th century with the main idea of child-centered learning. Many psychologists and educators, including Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Carl Rogers, Maria Montessori, and John Dewey, who was mentioned above, contributed to the advent and development of this progressive movement.

Actually, the progressive movement itself is said to have started in Cecil Reddie's establishment of Abbotsholme School in Derbyshire in England. The movement rapidly spread worldwide. It was Ellen Key's book, *The Century of the Child* published in 1909 that substantially popularized progressive education. The title of her book symbolically suggests that educational focus should be on children as the learners, and she actually stresses the importance of education in the natural and autonomous development of children, especially in the context of the home. At the beginning

of the chapter of “Education,” she quotes and actually shares Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s insistence that every child has good nature at birth. Key clearly expresses her thoughts on education: “... allowing nature quietly and slowly to help itself, taking care only that the surrounding conditions help the work of nature; this is education” (107). Key reiterates her insistence at the end of the chapter:

Try to leave the child in peace; interfere directly as seldom as possible; keep away all crude and impure impressions; but give all your care and energy to see that personality, life itself, reality in its simplicity and in its nakedness, shall all be means of training the child. (172)

Key’s views on education can be traced back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s in the 18th century, which is the same source she affirmatively acknowledges. Rousseau believes in the natural goodness of children, whom he sees as innocent and vulnerable and quite different from adults. In *Émile*, arguing about the proper education of children, Rousseau definitely denies the Christian sinfulness of the human: “Let us lay it down as an incontrovertible rule that the first impulses of nature are always right; there is no original sin in the human heart” (56). Natural growth, according to Rousseau, motivates children’s learning and, as a necessary consequence, the teacher has to only accelerate their learning opportunities.

We can also trace the origin of educational thoughts such as Key’s further back to Michel de Montaigne in the 16th century. Although Key does not refer to anything about Montaigne in the chapter on education, she actually names Montaigne along with Rousseau as noteworthy thinkers on education in the following chapter, “The School of Future.” In his book *The Complete Essays*, Montaigne, like Rousseau, urges the necessity of natural education, putting emphasis on children’s “character and intelligence before knowledge” (168). In addition to this insistence, Montaigne describes the place of education in daily lives and

insists that corporal punishment in education be prohibited. The fact that Key shares the same educational views tells us Montaigne’s far-reaching influence on her. Here we have to take note that Cook and Finlay-Johnson were engaged in teaching in child-centered educational atmospheres similar to the Progressive Movement in Education as was popularized by Key.

Finlay-Johnson shared a common element with Cook in terms of their teaching environment. They both taught pretty much the same age group, children in the junior form aged 11–14 and children aged 8–13, respectively (Cook 8). However, there was a great difference between Cook and Finlay-Johnson as to their academic positions. Unlike Cook who was teaching at an elite public school in Cambridge, Finlay-Johnson taught at an elementary school, as previously mentioned. This meant that it was Finlay-Johnson’s responsibility to teach all subjects and this enabled her to use her dramatic method of teaching across the whole curriculum. For her, theatre was a means to the end of teaching subjects. In contrast, Cook, as an English teacher, could give undivided attention to using drama, as an art and a language art, solely for language teaching. It was therefore natural that Cook’s attitude in education toward drama was fundamentally different from Finlay-Johnson’s. Cook believed that “Play is the one means that is an end in itself” (8).

Taking into consideration that Cook introduced drama for the first time into English education, it is naturally expected that Cook’s educational belief in the “Play Way” was also backed by a very critical stance towards the contemporary reading- and grammar-centered English education of that era, which focused on reading texts and completing drills. At the beginning of the 20th century, Cook pointed out several problems of knowledge-centered and utilitarian education. He considered school education as an opportunity for children to prepare for living honestly as citizens in society and insisted that in English education, children should practice and experience

what they learned from books. This is why that Cook chose theatre as the basis for students' experience. That is to say, he used theatre as a means to break down the existing conditions of English education. Concretely, he presented the "Play Way" as a practical experience in which students verbally expressed what they read. It was here that acting, a theatrical element, is used as a tool to understand and truly appreciate literary works written in words. It is obvious that Cook had faith in the effectiveness of theatre as an educational means. His theatrical education method seems to be similar to the DIE method. However, there is, in fact, a huge difference as seen in Cook's treatment of theatre. Cook made students appreciate written literary works through their experience of acting them out and furthermore, he made them perform the plays that they created in "Playmaking" (267) based on Shakespeare's plays or other literary works on the stage of an Elizabethan-styled theatre called "The Mummery" (189) located in the school site. This shows that Cook considers his students' performance as his educational purpose. Theatre, thus, became autotelic. Such an idea of theatre as an educational end in itself is based upon Cook's belief in the philosophy of *Theatrum Mundi*.

5. The Pioneers of DIE and their Consciousness of Theatre

Cook views theatrical activity as an end owing to his teaching environment, an elite public school. This view is very characteristic of Cook's educational way. Nonetheless, much attention has been paid to his introduction of theatre as an educational means. Thus Cook's way, like Finlay-Johnson's, has been combined with that of Drama-in-Education (DIE) which also uses drama as a teaching medium.

Drama education in England had been supported by DIE and TIE. DIE appeared in the mid 1960s, as a program aimed at the development of children as a whole person and for the promotion of their growth as human beings through drama. TIE, appearing in the

same decade, was an educational program in which the school educational system and theatre are fused. In DIE, following Way's idea, the word "drama" in its name means that the action is based largely on participants' experiences, cutting off communication with the audience, which theatre depends on as an artistic genre. That is to say, DIE was a program in which drama, one of theatrical elements, was used as an educational means. In clearly distinguishing drama and theatre, Way remarks that "education is concerned with individuals; drama is concerned with the individuality of individuals, with the uniqueness of each human essence" (3). He does not acknowledge the idea of traditional intellectual education, which seeks sameness among children. Way insists on the necessity of drama education in which children experience art through activities. This kind of view was the basis of drama education in DIE, which used drama as a means to develop the human growth of children as well as to teach other subjects.

Slade, along with Way, was engaged as both director and actor in theatrical activities of children's theatre. In his book, *Child Drama*, Slade advocates the necessity of the establishment of drama as an art form, unlike Way who does not adhere to drama as a subject. The founder of improvisational drama education asserts that children naturally try to act characters appearing in their imaginary play world. Calling this children's play "dramatic play" (2), Slade insists that children's spontaneous drama activities should be respected in drama education. Here we must note that he places emphasis on children's spontaneous drama activities and recognizes the dual nature of children as actors and as audience in their play. This means that Slade, as a theatrical professional with a long career in child drama, thinks highly of drama with action as its main element, thus hearkening back to the etymology of the Greek word *drao*. However, on the other hand, he recognizes the importance of theatricality based on the common experience of actors and the audience. Slade's innovative method of drama education is unique in paying attention to the educational value of

the dramatic process itself and not necessarily to traditional theatre education, which considers performance as its purpose. Yet the point is that Slade pushed for the introduction of theatrical elements for older children. In *Experience and Spontaneity* published in 1968, Slade notes that a child's spontaneous expression cultivated from an early age through drama activities, such as dramatic play and improvisational conversation practice, becomes the basis of theatre for ages 7 to 11 (juniors). This introductory dramatic education smoothly continues with secondary level children. It makes use of the changes in their interests, eventually leading to the proper education of stage art aimed at performance. Slade saw child drama as play, not as theatre. In spite of that, he still provides opportunity for the introduction of theatrical elements in his methodology. We can readily imagine that his methodology was influenced by his career in children's theatre.

Slade was not the only pioneer of DIE who did not completely exclude theatrical elements from drama education. Way and Heathcote, herself the central practitioner of DIE, also shared Slade's view on theatricality. It is because of his sharp consciousness of theatricality that Way, who has especially established a strict distinction between theatre and drama, stuck to this distinction. The practical theatrical experiences of Slade and Heathcote likewise suggest that they have a strong consciousness of theatre. The pioneers of DIE had the same nature of theatrical consciousness that Cook possessed in using theatre for English teaching.

Similarities between Cook and the pioneers of DIE can also be found in their goals in drama education. For instance, Way insists that both drama and education are used "to practice living" (6) and like Cook, he sees students' theatrical activities as preparation for life. In the same way, Heathcote remarks that the ultimate object of drama education is to have students discover "the universal human experience" and consider and examine what they experience in life (Rosenberg 37). She adheres to the

nature and purpose of improvisation, which occupies a central part of DIE. Heathcote asserts that "dramatic improvisation is concerned with what we discover for ourselves and the group where we place ourselves in a human situation containing some element of desperation" (44). As mentioned earlier, she believed that improvisational role-play, another of DIE's main educational methods, enables one to put oneself in others' shoes and think and feel in their way through the power of imagination. Role-playing also aims at preparing students for practical social lives. Again, we can reiterate Heathcote's observation regarding the inclination of teachers to use role-playing only as an instrument, without truly understanding the nature of drama. According to Heathcote, teachers have the tendency to naturally focus on thematic dilemma rather than the psychologies of characters portrayed. This suggests the danger involved in the original teaching method that the pioneers of DIE developed and established, in recognition of the existence of theatre as its background. An example of this danger can be found in one of DIE's characteristic teaching techniques, the teacher-in-role. In this technique, the teacher is a leader who controls students' drama activities and simultaneously portrays one of the characters in a class drama staged by students. Often too much concentrating on working as a leader as well as a controller of students activities, the teacher is liable to make light of theatrically presenting a fictional world.

6. Conclusion

The 1988 Education Reform Act of England excluded theatre from the national curriculum and thus deprived theatre of its position as an art subject. Before the Reform Act, theatre was positioned as one of the art subjects and at the same time, was used as a teaching medium. After the Reform Act, however, drama was used only as one of many teaching techniques in English education. It became a real problem when the autonomy of theatre was denied.

DIE appeared in the late 1960s in England and was

at its peak—from the 1970s to the 1980s. The purpose of DIE was to evoke spontaneity and creation from children through drama, but its rapid implementation and insufficient teacher training programs caused confusion in classrooms. In DIE, improvisation and role-play were used as convenient teaching media. Although the pioneers of DIE were strongly conscious of the theatre proper, before long, drama completely divorced itself from theatre and became independent merely as a means for teaching. Thus, removed of theatrical elements, drama was confined as a convenient instrument for education.

DIE was virtually going in the same direction made by Cook who introduced the theatrical way into English education. Cook attempted to break down the contemporary knowledge-centered and utilitarian education of the time by introducing theatrical method as an educational means. It was theatre, not drama that Cook used. Through acting, Cook not merely made students understand and truly appreciate literary works; he did much more. In fact, he built The Mummery and had students perform plays that they produced based upon Shakespeare's plays and other literary works. This shows that Cook considered students' performance as the final purpose and did efforts to make theatre autotelic. Needless to say, behind such a view of theatre as an educational end in itself is the philosophy of *Theatrum Mundi*, that the world itself is a stage on which human beings act as actors and actresses. Cook's theatrical teaching tells us that when using theatre as an educational tool, we must first correctly grasp its nature.

Works Cited

- Allen, John. *Drama in Schools*. London : Heinemann Educational Books, 1979. Print.
- Bolton, Gavin. *Acting in Classroom Drama*. Portland : Calendar Islands Publishers. 1998.
- . "Drama and Theatre in Education : A Survey." Ed. Nigel Dodd and Winifred Hickson, *Drama and Theatre in Education*. London : Heinemann Educational Books, 1971. Print.
- Clipson-Boyles, Suzi. *Drama in Primary English Teaching*. London : David Fulton Publishers, 1998. Print.
- Coggin, Phillip A. *Drama and Education : An Historical Survey from Ancient Greece to the Present Day*. London : Thames and Hudson, 1956. Print.
- Cook, Henry Caldwell. *The Play Way*. London : William Heinemann, 1917. Print.
- Courtney, Richard. *Play, Drama and Thought*. Toronto : Simon and Pierre, 1968. Print.
- Dixon, John. *Growth through English*. Oxford : Oxford UP, 1967. Print.
- Finlay-Johnson, Harriet. *The Dramatic Method of Teaching*. 1912. Ed. Ellen M. Cyr. London : Ginn and Company, 2008. Print.
- Heathcote, Dorothy. "Drama as Challenge." Ed. Liz Johnson and Cecily O, Neill. *Collected Writings on Education and Drama*. Evanston : Northwestern UP, 1984. Print.
- Hornbrook, David. *Education and Dramatic Art*. 2nd ed. London and New York : Routledge, 1998. Print.
- . *Education in Drama : Casting the Dramatic Curriculum*. London : Routledge Falmer, 1991. Print.
- Key, Ellen. *The Century of the Child*. New York and London : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. Print.
- Montaigne, Michel de. *The Complete Essays*. 1580. Trans. M. A. Screech. London : Penguin Books, 1991. Print.
- Rosenberg, Helane S. *Creative Drama and Imagination*. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1987. Print.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacque. *Émile*. 1762. Trans. B. Foxley. London : Dent, 1911. Print.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. Ed. Michael Hattaway. Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 2000. Print.
- . *Hamlet*. Ed. Philip Edwards. Cambridge : Cambridge UP, 1985. Print.
- Shimizu, Toyoko. "The Raison d'être of Theatre as an Art Subject : On the Public Examination of 'Theatre Studies' in England." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, Chiba University* 2, *Humanities and Social Sciences* 48 (2000) : 101-117. Print.
- . "The History and Present Situation of Theatre Education in England." *Theatre Studies* 29 (1991) : 37-45. Print.
- Slade, Peter. *Child Drama*. London : University of London Press, 1954. Print.
- . *Experience and Spontaneity*. London : Longman, 1968. Print.
- Way, Brian. *Development through Drama*. London : Longman, 1967. Print.
- Wearing, Max. "The Australian Scene." Ed. Hodgson John and Martin Banham. *Drama in Education* 3. London : Pitman Publishing, 1975. Print.

Drama-in-Education と Henry Caldwell Cook

依 田 真奈美

京都大学大学院 人間・環境学研究科 共生人間学専攻

〒 606-8501 京都市左京区吉田二本松町

要旨 イギリスの 1988 年の教育改革は、国定カリキュラムから演劇を外し、芸術科目としての地位を奪った。改革以前には、演劇は芸術科目として認知されると同時に、教育の手段として使われていた。しかしながら、改革以後は、演劇はイギリスの教育においては国語科における教育手段としてだけ使われるようになった。演劇の自律性が否定されたわけであり、そこにこそ問題があった。1960 年代の後半に現われた DIE (Drama-in-Education) は、演劇から観客的要素を取り除いたドラマを教育の手段として使った。けれども、DIE の問題点は、ドラマを教育の手段とすることに専心するあまり、そのパイオニアたちが演劇というジャンルに対する強い意識をもっていたにもかかわらず、演劇の本質を次第に忘れるようになっていったことである。教育におけるドラマの手段化を試みた DIE の方向は、英語 (母語) 教育に初めて演劇的手法を導入した Henry Caldwell Cook によって目指された方向と事実上同じもののようにみえる。しかし、Cook の手法である Play Way においては、上演が最終目的として考えられており、従って演劇が自己目的化される形となっていた。Cook において特徴的な点は、彼が演劇を教育の手段として使っているだけでなく、演劇それ自体を意識していることである。Cook のこうした演劇を教育の最終的な目標とみなす見方の背後には、「世界劇場」の考え方が存在している。Cook においては、教育手段としての演劇の使用と演劇の本質についての認識との間のバランスがよく保たれている。言語教育に演劇を使用する際にも、我々はこの両者の適切なバランスに気配りすることを忘れてはならない。