Introduction

The significance of drama as an art form is stressed by Jerome Bruner when he reminds us of the 'drama ... is an invitation to reflection about the human condition' (1). We are reflecting, for example, when we think about the important questions which are raised in plays, muse on the complexities of answers posed, wonder about the actions of characters and consider how we might behave. In a similar way our students in the classroom can think about humanity as they reflect on the events and actions of any informal drama they create together (2).

As a teacher in both England and the United States, I have worked hard to learn how to create drama with students and to use it as a medium for reflection and learning (3). The research described in this article was a seminal part of that process. Lawrence Stenhouse has noted that for teachers, 'the refinement of professional skills is generally achieved by the gradual elimination of failings through systematic study of one's own teaching' (4). He was an early advocate of 'teacher-research' which is aimed at improving practice through careful, systematic, and rigorous methods going beyond those everyday methods teachers use to study their own practice.

Reflection on our experiences is part of the process of learning. When we reflect we create meaning and develop understanding about our experiences. The need for reflection is widely accepted: it is central to Piaget’s and Vygotsky’s theories of development, to Dewey’s philosophy of education, and is essential for creative, and critical thinking (5).

In the field of drama and education the need for reflection has also been widely noted. Dorothy Heathcote has consistently stressed that students will only learn if they reflect. She argues that ‘without the development of the power of reflection we have very little’ and emphasises that it is not only ‘the experience arising out of the action which enables them to learn [but that] ... without [reflection] there is no learning from the experience’ (6).

Though the necessity for reflection by the students has been acknowledged by most drama practitioners and theorists, little has been written to justify the claim that reflection is essential. In addition, comparatively little attention has been paid to how the teacher may structure a drama, for example by setting tasks or interacting with the students, in order to facilitate reflection (7). My study was a first step in understanding the place and practice of reflection in classroom drama.

When arguments have been made for including the arts as a whole in education, it has been repeatedly noted that students should be involved in a variety of different activities which include reflection. It has been argued that students need to make their own art, as well as present it to others; they should also reflect and respond to art and thereby critique, interpret and evaluate it (8). However these processes are too often regarded as being separate pursuits and this separation has unfortunately been prevalent in classroom drama work where the making of drama, the performing of drama, and the reflection on drama have too often been regarded as separate activities (9).

A central argument in my study is that these processes are actually inextricably interconnected in the improvisational structuring of informal drama with reflection being an integral process. As the students interact publicly in drama they are, in one sense, 'actors' as they 'perform' within the group setting. They can, in another sense, be considered to be functioning as 'playwrights' and 'audience'. The students are playmaking as they collectively create an imaginary world which they treat as if it is objective reality. They can, in addition, become an 'audience' to their own work as they interpret the drama and construct what are actually individual subjective realities in response. Reflection will be shown to be integral to the processes of both playmaking and interpreting.
Methodology

Background
Learning how to use drama more effectively is an ongoing journey. The process has been rewarding, but it has also been long and difficult as I have struggled to recognise and change patterns in my teaching. In my early years as a teacher I fumbled around and used drama with varying degrees of success as I explored themes in literature and social studies with students. My practice was gradually transformed during a year with Dorothy Heathcote, through graduate studies, my work with Cecily O’Neill, and especially by teaching. However, I still regarded my planning as too arbitrary and I realised that I was often unaware of why I was being successful or unsuccessful with a group. I felt that I needed to study my own teaching more systematically.

When an opportunity to return to the classroom full-time arose in the summer of 1987 in an innovative suburban school in Ohio, I took a position as a teacher of 29 eight to ten year old children.

Data Collection
By October, 1988, I was ready to begin data collection of my own teaching as part of a teacher-researcher study (10). This became the first of two years of classroom data collection, the second year of which took place in 1989-90 when I was a full-time lecturer in drama at Ohio State University and taught regularly in other teachers’ classrooms.

Sixty-eight sessions of my drama teaching were videotaped over the two years of formal data collection. I taught grades 1-9, in classes of varying size and ‘ability’ on a variety of topics, in sessions ranging from single lessons to ones lasting several weeks.

My two main ways of recording data in the classroom were video taping and keeping field notes. The videotapes were an ongoing record of my teaching. It was much easier to videotape than I had expected. I had few technical problems and other teachers were willing to video tape if I was teaching. The students largely lost interest in the camera if they were given an opportunity to look at it before taping began and were asked to ignore the camera. Its presence did not seem to affect their behaviour.

Hopkins’ description of field notes fits with my use of them as a tool for tracking my work with students. He states that fieldnotes are, ‘a way of reporting observations, reflections, and reactions to classroom problems ’ and as Hopkins suggests, I tried to write up my field notes as soon after a lesson as was possible (11). These were more often hand-written though sometimes written on a word-processor. I recorded my plans for all sessions and kept post-session notes. Though I always thought about previous lessons, my actual written field notes ranged from a few scribbled notes on a particular student to extended reflections over several pages on a structuring decision I had made. I also used my field notes for planning. I always reviewed a session as part of my planning for a subsequent session.

When possible, I reviewed the videotapes during the course of the data collection and kept notes of my reactions. I also kept extensive notes of my changing understandings about drama teaching; these were compiled as responses to my reading, my experiences as a student in graduate classes in drama, and my thoughts as a lecturer in drama.

It is important to realise, however, that the collection and analysis of data in this study went beyond my own classroom practice. There were three major sources of data. In addition to reflecting on my own experiences as a teacher using drama, my data included the practice of Dorothy Heathcote and Cecily O’Neill as well as the writings of practitioners and theorists. Reflecting and analysing both the practice of these two leading practitioners of drama and their ongoing reviews of their own teaching was part of the analysis process. There were also many books of theory and practice (especially the work of and about Heathcote and Bolton) which I read and reread several times during classroom data collection and analysis. My analysis of others’ writings and practice informed my understanding of my own teaching and vice versa.

Data Analysis
I need to emphasise that data analysis did not only happen after the collection of classroom data. There was no neat distinction between the collection and analysis of data; analysis was ongoing. It is also important to realise that my analysis of my own teaching, others’ practice, and theoretical writings, all affected both what I did in the classroom and how I subsequently analysed my teaching.

I systematically analysed the sixty-eight hours of teaching I had on videotape. As Hopkins notes, video not only shows unedited behaviour of teacher and students, it also allows for review and patterns to be established in retrospect, both within sessions and over time (12). It was important to look for patterns because they allowed me to see beyond specific examples to underlying structuring trends, for example, in the way I established tasks and interacted with students.

Initially I sampled over time and watched about ten hours of my teaching. I looked for moments when the students seemed to be reflecting and took notes on what the students were doing and what I seemed to be doing as the teacher to enable this to happen. I was both describing and evaluating my teaching as I reviewed it (13). Patterns began to emerge which were initially based on assumptions which I had developed during the collection of my teaching data (14). These patterns led me to look for further examples in other video tapes. I discovered that there was a broad distinction between my first and second year of teaching and that I had significantly improved during the second year. Consequently, I viewed several more tapes from the first year but nearly all the tapes from the second year. I analysed several drama sessions task by task and in some cases phrase by phrase. I looked both for examples of the emerging patterns and for ‘negative evidence’ (15).

For others who might contemplate such data analysis it may be important to
note that I found reviewing my own teaching a frequently humbling and often painful experience. It was often extremely difficult to watch myself and feel myself cringe when I said or did something which in retrospect I wished I had not done. At first this seemed to be almost masochistic but as I forced myself to continue my analyses I gradually began to realise aspects of structuring that effected whether or not a drama ‘worked’. One technique which was particularly useful was talking and especially writing about myself as ‘the teacher’. This gave me the distance I needed to be able to separate myself ‘the watcher’ from myself ‘the teacher’ and begin to honestly critique what I saw on the tapes.

In my analysis of my own planning and teaching I gradually became aware of interaction patterns both positive and negative of which I had been unaware and which I was then able to compare with the teaching of Heathcote and O’Neill. As I struggled to synthesise these patterns and reconcile them with the literature about drama, I gradually constructed the model which is presented in this study. I also became more conscious of my decisions in planning and interacting with students.

The process I followed is similar to that described by Kemmis and McTaggart in their explanation of Kurt Lewin’s now classic model of ‘action research’ (16). Lewin described action research as a spiral of steps or ‘moments’ each of which is composed of planning, action, observation and reflection with action and reflection overlapping to allow changes in plans for action as the people involved learned from their own experience (17). This was what was happening as I read and planned what to look for in the videotapes, observed parts of lessons, and reflected on what I had seen.

As I found that my understanding of structuring for reflection became more complex I decided to analyse in detail a film of a lesson taught by Dorothy Heathcote, Building Belief, for examples of teacher structuring for reflection (18).

I chose this tape because it is widely available, many teachers in the U.S. have already seen it, and it is a short edited example of a complete lesson using drama.

I then returned to the tapes of my own teaching and analysed six representative sessions in more detail transcribing sections of each example. I chose as examples those points where teacher structuring seemed to be enabling at least some reflection. These detailed analyses led me to amend and extend my tentative findings.

I had drawn diagrams throughout my analysis and continued to attempt to capture the complexity of teacher structuring on a single page. I returned to examples from the Heathcote example, the six sessions of my own teaching, and to the theoretical writings of others in order to describe the model in more detail.

For the purposes of presentation of analysis and results I decided to continue my analysis of only two examples from my own teaching as well as the example from the teaching of Dorothy Heathcote. I felt that more than three examples could be difficult for the reader to follow and also realised that by selecting the examples from my own teaching carefully and adding some brief examples from other sessions that I would still be able to illustrate the model effectively.

I chose the two examples from my own teaching for the following reasons. Both examples had:
- a variety of different tasks in a comparatively short period of time;
- could be considered independently of sessions which followed or preceded them;
- had been planned and had educational aims; and
- had been recorded in full without any technical problems. One was representative of sessions which were ‘unsuccessful’, another was representative of sessions which were ‘successful’ in terms of structuring for reflection and learning.

Each example was initially described in detail and then presented in a table with an additional column for analysis.

Teacher structuring in setting tasks and interacting with students was analysed in particular. Each example was then analysed for teacher structuring in relation to educational aims. Examples of reflection before, during and after each drama session both in and out of role were identified and used to analyse the examples. Various tables of results were presented including summary tables.

A Model Of Structuring Drama For Reflection

The Dungeon Drama

To begin, I am going to analyse an example from my own teaching in order to illustrate the absence of significant aspects of structuring for reflection in drama.

In my own classroom, as part of a unit on medieval life, the students were for a time in role as knights and ladies in a castle. My aim for one lesson (which I have called the ‘Dungeon Drama’) was for the students to consider how to deal with a king who used his power arbitrarily and put people in the dungeon. The students had already encountered the role as the king and had enjoyed the game of setting up a banquet while at the same time avoiding being sent to the dungeon if they displeased him.

In the session from which this example is taken I took on the role of a servant to the king who tells the knights and ladies that the king is so pleased with the banquet that he is rewarding them and taking them to his new castle. Before leaving, however, he wants them to move some prisoners to a new dungeon. The knights and ladies agree and set off with the servant through a secret passageway and down a stairway to where they find the prisoners asleep. The servant says that the king wants the prisoners chained before they are moved and asks the knights and ladies to put on the chains. After moving the prisoners, someone discovers that the door is locked. Someone else thinks that it is the new jester who has done this, takes on his role, and talks to them through the door.
In retrospect, I realised that I was both too worried about 'losing control' as I interacted with the students and also that my planning was not flexible enough since I had a rigid agenda in mind. I saw many of their ideas as irrelevant or as distractions in the way of what I had already planned they would do: move the prisoners and then reflect on what to do about them and the king. At that time I was not able to see that having preplanned exactly what would happen and then telling the students what to do, I was in fact undermining their own work. Instead, I could have worked with the students to enable their ideas to be generated as we expanded on or superseded my initial ideas.

It seemed as if the students were creating their own 'play' whereas in actuality there was almost no group decision making happening. I used my power as teacher to control the ideas that were being generated and became the arbiter of what was or was not acceptable. I did this in several ways. I required them to agree to my ideas, I blocked or ignored many of their ideas, I allowed one student's ideas to be performed without group approval, and I did not enable the group as a whole to agree on what happened in the drama.

Rather than allowing them to suggest what would happen and enabling them to perform with tacit or explicit acceptance by the group, I was continually telling them what to imagine. For example, I told the students specifically, 'Turn and get the chains ... and gently without waking them put on the chains; put the key in your pocket.' I am not disputing the usefulness of narrating action at times, but pointing out that in this example the students had little individual and almost zero group ownership of the plot.

Blocking ideas happened without me realising that I was doing this. For example, I was unaware of the ridiculousness of suggesting that the prisoners would not wake up when they were moved! Then, when a student volunteered that one prisoner was waking up, I blocked this idea by saying, 'He'll go back to sleep, don't worry.'

By ignoring the person who whispered that there were bones in the dungeon, this idea was never shared and few heard this. Rather than proceeding with my description of the dungeon, the students could have generated their own dungeon. Who knows what else they might have found along with the bones!

When one student said that the door was locked I allowed her to become the jester who said she would not release the knights and ladies because they were mean. I did not check to see if the group wanted this to happen. I had become the arbiter of content: the jester was appropriate, but the bones were not. In addition, rather than creating a space in which the students could together realise what had happened, and consider a response, there were chaotic, multiple and conflicting responses which precipitated an ending of the session.

I have just described examples of teacher structuring of tasks and interactions which undermined what I now call the 'Playmaking Cycle' of the drama. If students are to have ownership of their work they must create or at least actively support what happens in the drama. Teachers can initiate an activity and interact with the students, but unless teachers enable students to share their ideas, in or out of role, and then create opportunities for the class as a whole to agree to ideas for the plot, the teacher will be the only playwright of the drama.

Alternatively, the teacher can enable the group as a whole to agree to what happens in the drama world they are creating together so that the students as 'playwrights' will in effect 'write' what can usefully be called the 'drama text'.

Some of the students will want to 'perform' ideas as 'actors' as they move and talk in front of the others in role. Others will share out of role as they publicly share their ideas. However, all students as 'audience' can respond to what happens or what is said in the drama. If they are given opportunities to think about what happens in the drama the students will be reflecting together. Because they are concerned with the external world of the drama which they treat as objective reality, this can be called 'objective reflection'. If students are repeatedly engaged in objective reflection they will be creating the drama text together and the Playmaking Cycle of the drama will be operating.

Tight control over the action in a drama can be justified on occasions depending on one's purposes and the social health of the class. It may well be quite appropriate to do most of the work so that the class will have a dramatic experience rather than allowing them to destroy their own work.

However, if we want our students to find their own meaning in the work, they must be enabled to interpret what is happening in the drama, whether or not they have had much involvement in creating the drama text. If students are given opportunities to interpret the drama text then what can be called the 'Interpreting Cycle' of the drama will be operating. As they consider how they respond to the events of the drama they will again be reflecting. However, since their attention is now on their personal response this can be called 'subjective reflection'.

The Dungeon Drama can also be used to illustrate how the teacher can undermine the Interpreting Cycle. As an example look at this transcript from a moment just after the prisoners had been chained up.

Leslie: It isn't right treating prisoners like that.
Servant: Well I'm not very happy either, but it's just what we've been asked to do...
Leslie: But they're babies. Can we feed them?
Servant: I know they are babies.
Leslie: But they didn't do anything.
Servant: They'll be with their parents. They'll be alright.
Leslie: No they won't.
Servant: The king is leaving this afternoon, we've just got to get this done. We're just going to move them from here into this area here through the secret passageway, put them down, and they turn round and come out again. OK?
At this point Leslie no longer responded and began to play with a friend’s hair.

Not only were Leslie’s ideas for plot being denied, her interpretations were too. At this moment, I was getting the class to be quiet and was trying to get them to complete the task of moving the prisoners. Our exchange was over in a few seconds and was only overheard by a few students. I was unfortunately too preoccupied to notice it at the time, but Leslie was in fact doing exactly what I had hoped the students would do: she was questioning the wisdom of the king’s actions.

Rather than blocking her response, I could have enabled Leslie to perform her idea so that the whole class could have heard and then also had an opportunity to think about the fairness of what they were being asked to do. If this had happened the class would have been reflecting ‘objectively’ if they had accepted explicitly or implicitly that there were babies in the dungeon and the Playmaking Cycle would have been operating. They would also have been able to reflect ‘subjectively’ as they thought about how they felt about what they were being asked to do and the Interpreting Cycle would have been operating.

**Explanation of the Diagram**

The diagram opposite summarises much of my thinking about how the teacher can structure the drama to facilitate both objective and subjective reflection by the students.

The diagram shows the interface of the Playmaking and Interpreting Cycles. These two ongoing interconnected cycles need to be present in any drama if learning is to happen. The Playmaking Cycle illustrates how the events of an improvised drama are created by agreement among the students. The Interpreting Cycle illustrates how individual students can interpret the events of the drama differently. Surrounding the cycles are the educational aims of the teacher, stressing that all structuring decisions are made in the light of the overall aims for the work.

In the centre of the diagram are the public actions of teacher and students which become objects for reflection by the students. Throughout the work the teacher’s or student’s public actions will be in role (when they are ‘performing’ and functioning as ‘actors’) or not in role (when they are ‘publicly sharing’). When the teacher or a student has spoken and/or moved, with others watching, there is usually an implicit acceptance of these actions as being part of the drama. If this is the case then the group has effectively ‘written’ part of the ongoing improvised text of the drama. Sometimes such acceptance can be formalised in a particular agreement out of role when the group may well disagree about the unfolding drama text. In all cases, however, the students are reflecting on the actions (or possible actions) in the drama and making decisions about what happens.

Students’ individual ‘objective’ reflections will create drama text if their ‘objective meanings’ are shared or performed and there is general agreement about the details they have imagined in the shared imagined world of the drama. Just as in improvised play or in the theatre (19) there has to be an agreement about details of the imagined world which are in effect regarded as ‘objective’ reality by the participants. When there is such agreement by the whole group then ‘drama text’ is created and the Playmaking Cycle is operating with the students functioning as playwrights. In contrast, students’ ‘subjective’ reflection may lead them to very different interpretations of what is happening in the drama. When they are reflecting subjectively then the Interpreting Cycle is operating with the students functioning as members of an audience to their own work.

The diagram represents the teacher’s structuring of the drama. Though clearly the group can and does work together without the teacher, every decision by the teacher (including decisions not to intervene) influence the drama and are structuring decisions. These include, how a task is set up, what questions are posed directly and indirectly, what the teacher says and does in role, and what the teacher does in response to a student’s idea. The solid lines all represent structuring decisions by the teacher which will influence the playmaking and interpreting by the students. The thick solid line represents agreement by the whole group as drama text is created, and the dotted lines represent unplanned for connections which students may be making but of which the teacher is unaware.

**The Heathcote Drama**

For examples of how the teacher can enable the Playmaking and Interpreting Cycles to function let us now look at an extract from Part 1 of Building Belief (which I have called the ‘Heathcote Drama’). If you have seen this film you may recall that Heathcote’s stated aim was for the twenty-nine 9 and 10 year old students to reflect on the meaning of the words ‘A nation is as strong as the spirit of the people who make it.’ They were in role as people who were trying to survive in a dry, barren, rocky, new land. The students were mostly in role remembering what happened and were only briefly actually making it happen.

Heathcote assisted students in sharing their written and spoken narrations of events and required the students to listen to each other and reach agreements. These included, the state of the land, the hardships they endured, their intention to ‘trust, communicate, and share’ and their decision to divide up the land. This enabled the students to reflect objectively together and create drama text.

At the point at which they agreed about dividing the land she removed herself in role from the group, presumably to see how this rather passive group would work together without her to make some drama. The students talk together, disagree about the size of groups to form, and try to shout each other down. Some force a vote, others passively go along with dividing the land into six segments. Some students are ‘performing’ but it is unclear if any drama text had been agreed to since there
Derek: Yes. (He comes to stand facing the group). Everybody raise their right hand. (The teacher and students all raise their right hands.) (Derek laughs so does the Teacher)

Teacher: (to Derek) You have to be serious that’s the important thing.

Derek: (stumbling over the words) We, the people of the planet Jeridian...

Teacher and students join in: We the people of the planet Jeridian...

Derek: Swear that we will not vandalise....

All students: Swear that we will not vandalise....

Derek: ... or disturb the sacred tablets.

All students: .... or disturb the sacred tablets.

Teacher: Was it enough that we said that?

All students: (General agreement)

I did not use my role to dominate the drama but rather, in and out of role, assisted Derek to perform his ideas. I was watching to see how the rest of the group were responding to his ideas. As they recited the oath they implicitly accepted what he performed. I then directed the group’s attention to objective reflection to see if all were agreed and to see if anyone else wanted to add to the drama text which had just been agreed. Significantly, the oath was then used later in establishing a mood of thoughtfulness before encountering the tablets.

I will now discuss two brief examples in order to illustrate the Interpreting Cycle in operation. Immediately before the previous example of reciting the oath, the students created drama text as they reflected on what they should be allowed to go to the time capsule to see the tablets. I structured their discussion so that ideas were shared and so that everyone was able to listen and had a chance to reflect. In objective reflection they created drama text as they agreed that every generation would go to the capsule to see the tablets which had to be preserved. They also agreed that people should go down when they would be, as Michael said, ‘old enough to understand but not too old to forget’ and also that the people should be ‘knowledgeable enough’.

I pressed them to interpret what it meant to be ‘knowledgeable enough’. Rather than allowing this idea to pass I encouraged their subjective reflections by assisting students to perform their ideas and listen to others. Their interpretations of what it meant to be ‘knowledgeable enough’ are particularly interesting since these students had been labelled as ‘gifted’. Different suggestions about how this would be decided included: the CTBS test (California Test of Basic Skills); IQ tests; not being ‘dumb’; watching how the people acted; choosing them if they are ‘willing to learn’; choosing only the ‘smart’ or ‘qualified’ people who would then pass on what they found out to the ‘dumb’ or ‘unqualified’ people. Their heated exchanges contrasted with their earlier reticence to share and led to a protracted period of interpretation.

They agreed that they would be people who were to go into the capsule to read the history of the planet, which was actually their own stories. Their stories became part of the drama text as they were read aloud. I structured the task so that they would have to listen, since the stories were read aloud individually as if written in stone. They were also enabled to reflect subjectively as they pondered what important ‘truths’ the stories contained for the people. They shared whatever truths they discovered as they interpreted their own work. They identified the ideas that without friendship ‘we would not have made it’, that ‘People do things differently’, and the need to write down and remember the past in order to pass it on to their children.

Conclusion

In Building Belief, Dorothy Heathcote asks the students at one point, ‘What have you travelled?’ In my journey as a teacher and a researcher I have travelled widely and often to places I had not imagined. In this paper I have outlined some of the results of my journey - the major findings of my teacher-researcher study of structuring drama for reflection and learning.

As students and the teacher perform and share ideas during a drama, the students can create drama text and interpret it. In doing so they reflect objectively, when the function as playwrights, and reflect subjectively, when they function as an audience to their own work. The teacher can undermine these processes and thereby frustrate the learning of the students. Alternatively the teacher can enable the students to create work which is meaningful to them both in the content and direction of their work and how they personally interpret what happens.

There is much detail and many findings from the study which have had to be omitted here. In particular, I would have liked to discuss the significance of how the Playmaking and the Interpreting Cycles are interrelated, some of the different occasions for reflection, how reflection is promoted through teacher questioning, and how the teacher can protect students to assist them as they perform.

This study is significant for a number of reasons:

• it is research which addressed questions related to the practice of drama teaching;
• a teacher critiqued both his own ‘unsuccessful’ and ‘successful’ teaching;
• an extended example of Heathcote’s work was analysed; and
• methodology for studying one’s own drama teaching was presented.

Dewey has provided me with a final statement. Please pardon the gender specific language. ‘He has to see on his own behalf and in his own way the relations between means and methods employed and the results achieved. Nobody else can see for him, and he can’t see just by being “told” although the right kind of telling can guide his seeing and thus help him see what he needs to see.’ (21)

My hope is that this study has provided ‘the right kind of telling’ for us as
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My hope is that this study has provided 'the right kind of telling' for us as
Drama and Reflective Learning

In 'Why Reflective Thinking Must be an Educational Aim' [anthologised in Reginald D. Archambault, ed., John Dewey on Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974)] that "reflective thinking" must be an educational aim because without it we do not learn from our actions. The centrality of reflection in creative and critical thinking is considered in Robert J. Mazano, et al., Dimensions of Thinking (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1988).

I am using the term 'structuring' to refer to any decision made by the teacher which influences what happens in either the actual context of the classroom or the imaginary context of the drama. In particular I use the term to refer to how the teacher sets tasks, and interacts with the students in and out of role. Some structuring decisions can be made in planning while others must be made during the process of creating the drama. Cecily O'Neill and Alan Lambert, Drama Structures (London: Hutchinson, 1982) is one of the few texts which actually analyses drama lessons for the thinking behind teacher decision-making. The term 'drama structure' has come to be used to refer more specifically to a mostly preplanned sequence of activities like those outlined in Drama Structures.

Drama as Education (London: Falmer Press, 1987) notes a spiralling between exploring, expressing and interpreting in reflection which can occur as drama is being made in the classroom where there are no separate spectators, students still work with a sense of audience. Gavin Bolton, Drama as Education (London: Longman, 1984) has extended this to note that there is still a performance element even within the most informal activity of dramatic playing. However, 'Discipline-Based Art Education' in the United States assumes the distinct activities of creating and responding to art and in the U.K. the Arts Council publication Drama in Schools may inadvertently encourage dichotomization with their separate categories of Making, Performing and Ap-praising.

Though I had planned much of the study before I began collecting data in the classroom, much of the research design emerged as the study progressed, which is frequently the case in a teacher-researcher study. See, for example, Gail McCutcheon and Burga Jung, Alternative Perspectives on Action Research, Theory into Practice XXIV (3) (1990): 144-151.

Notes

2. I discussed reflection in detail in my study, 'What Have You Travelled?' A Teacher-Researcher Study of Structuring Drama for Reflection and Learning, diss., Ohio State University, 1991. Reflection is also a major concern of my article 'Structuring for Reflection: The Essential Process in Every Drama,' Drama Contact 15 Autumn 1991 : 5.
3. As I argued in, 'The Dramatic Art of Theatre and Drama,' The Drama/Theatre Teacher Vol. 1 No. 4 Winter 1992: 21-24, provided we are not talking about didactic teaching, I see no contradiction between a desire to educate students and an intention to create dramatic art with them.
4. Lawrence Stenhouse, An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. (London: Heinemann, 1975) 39. Teacher-research is synonymous with action research, it's a type of qualitative research whereby a teacher or other professional engages in a recursive analysis of his or her own practice pursuing a research question of interest to the practitioner. This type of research is well established in Great Britain and Australia. A readily available overview of teacher-research can be found in Theory Into Practice, XXXIII (3) (Summer 1990).
5. In this study 'learning' was regarded as the construction of meaning and understanding. Central to Piaget's work [see especially Howard E. Gruberand Jacques Voneche, The Essential Piaget (New York: Basic Books, 1977)]is the observation that we actively construct our understandings of the world. This requires us to reflect upon our experiences. Lev Vygotsky in Mind in Society (Cambridge Mass: Harvard 1978), similarly argued that in play, and thus by extension in drama, participants attend to the meaning of their actions and are reflecting as they actively construct their imaginary world. Though Dewey has been simplistically seen as the champion of a theory of learning by doing he actually argued in his Essays in Educational Thought that "human beings learn by acting upon the environment and by giving expression to their thought."
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