DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 059 207   TE 002 788

AUTHOR   Downer, Alan S., Ed.
TITLE   Conference on Theatre Research. A report on the
              Princeton University Conference (November 20, 1965 -
              April 29-30, 1966; October 7-8, 1966).
INSTITUTION   American Educational Theatre Association, Washington,
              D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
              Cooperative Research Program.
BUREAU NO   BR-5-0240
PUB DATE   Jun 67
CONTRACT   OE-6-10-152
NOTE   80p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Theatre Association, John F. Kennedy Center,
              726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20566
              ($2.50 for ATA members, $3.50 for nonmembers)
JOURNAL CIT   Educational Theatre Journal; v19 n2A p235-309 1967

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Behavioral Science Research; *Conferences;
              Educational Technology; Graduate Study; High School
              Curriculum; Literary Criticism; Literature;
              *Research; *Teaching Techniques; *Theater Arts;
              Universities
IDENTIFIERS   Princeton Conference

ABSTRACT
        A series of conferences on theatre research were held
with the following specific goals: (1) to establish the limits of the
major areas of theatre research and to determine the nature of the
several theatre disciplines; (2) to arrive at preliminary statements
affecting methodologies, areas of specialization, research materials,
centers of research activity, and fundamental conditions for research
activity; (3) to initiate discussions which would lead to more
general and more formal standards for theatre research; and (4) to
publish and disseminate a collection of papers about the nature of
research in the major theatre disciplines. The eight chapters of the
document are as follows: I. Introduction: History and Procedure of
the Conference; II. Historical Backgrounds to University Research in
Theatre; III. Consensus of Conference Opinion on Research Areas; IV.
Behavioral Science Research and Theatre; V. The Teaching of Theatre:
A Challenge to Education; VI. Research in Theatre Architecture and
Design; VII. Research in Theatre History; and VIII. Theatre
Literature and Criticism. Appendix A presents 15 selected papers, and
Appendix B lists the members of the conference and their positions.
(DB)

Educational
Theatre Journal

Special
Issue

CONFERENCE
ON
THEATRE
RESEARCH

CONFERENCE

on

THEATRE RESEARCH

A Report on the Princeton University Conference
November 20, 1965—April 29-30, 1966
October 7-8, 1966

ALAN S. DOWNER

SPECIAL ISSUE
June 1967

THIS SPECIAL ISSUE OF THE *Educational Theatre Journal* HAS BEEN PUBLISHED BY the American Educational Theatre Association in cooperation with the Arts and Humanities Program of the U.S. Office of Education. The Princeton Conference reported herein is a major step forward. Ever since its founding nearly thirty years ago, AETA with far-sighted leadership has sponsored panels and projects of one sort or another that have examined and argued over the many problems in theatre research. Regional organizations have also made contributions. This spade work has resulted in the growth and intensification of graduate theatre study, a substantial body of significant publications in criticism and history, experimentation and development in technical theatre, and an improved production program in the colleges and universities. Thus the progress has been determined and continuous. An assessment of where we are and where we need to go has long been needed, and this the Princeton Conference supplies. As the first conference in the history of educational theatre to focus its entire energies on theatre research, it provides a firm and broad basis for future developments, thus anticipating and declaring directions in educational theatre. *ETJ's* editors therefore decided that the report was of unusual significance and should be made readily available to members of AETA and other *Journal* subscribers.

Technical assistance in publication was contributed by *ETJ's* Associate Editor David Schaal and Editor Francis Hodge. Others participating directly in arranging for this Special Issue were Henry B. Williams, *President of AETA*; H. Beresford Menagh, *Executive Secretary of AETA*; and Irving Brown, *U.S. Office of Education*.

Extra copies beyond this printing of this Special Issue of *ETJ* may be purchased from the AETA Executive Office, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20566.

Contents

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION: HISTORY AND PROCEDURE OF THE CONFERENCE

THIS SERIES OF CONFERENCES ON THEATRE RESEARCH GREW OUT OF A DISCUSsion between Dr. Esther Jackson, then Theatre and Dance Education Specialist, Arts and Humanities Branch, U.S. Office of Education, and the Executive Board of the American Society for Theatre Research. A subsequent discussion in Washington between Miss Jackson, and Kathryn Bloom, Director of the Arts and Humanities Branch, and Alan Downer representing ASTR resulted in a definition of the areas to be investigated and the program to be followed. During the later development of the project, Miss Jackson's successors, Jack Morrison and Irving Brown, gave generous assistance in its progress and completion.

The specific goals of the project were:

1) To establish the limits of the major areas of theatre research and to determine the nature of the several theatre disciplines.

2) To arrive at preliminary statements affecting methodologies, areas of specialization, research materials, centers of research activity, and fundamental conditions for research activity.

3) To initiate discussions which would lead to more general and more formal standards for theatre research.

4) To publish and disseminate a collection of papers about the nature of research in the major theatre disciplines.

The first step toward the achieving of these goals was a meeting of five eminent scholars in Princeton on November 20, 1965. Each had agreed to serve as a chairman charged with developing a report for an assigned field; the reasoning behind the selection of fields is discussed in the body of the report (pages 238-41). The chairmen and their fields were: James H. Butler (the teaching of theatre, materials and new media, and the problems of distribution), Oscar G. Brockett (research in theatre history), Edward Cole (theatre architecture and design), John Kennedy (theatre and the behavioral sciences), Gerald Weales (theatre literature and criticism). Jack Morrison was also a participant as a representative of the Washington office.

The meeting, which took place against a background of cries of anguish and triumph from Dartmouth and Princeton fans in the football stadium, not only initiated the exploration of the individual fields but provoked much interesting

discussion of their interrelationships and common interests. Each chairman nominated other specialists in his field to be consulted in the preparation of a formal report on the nature of the field and its special problems.

The second phase of the project was a conference of the chairmen and their full committees convened at Princeton on April 29 and 30, 1966. The evening of April 29 was devoted to meetings of the separate committees; on April 30 each chairman presented his committee's report, which had been circulated in advance. This was followed by a supplementary presentation from each committee and by open discussion among all present at the conference.

The final phase of the project was to have been a general meeting for the dissemination of results. The committee chairmen, however, found the discussions at the April conference so stimulating that it was decided 1) to rework the formal reports in the light of those discussions and 2) to invite participation of a larger and more varied group of specialists at a final conference before the full report was prepared for dissemination.

The third meeting on the project was held in Princeton on October 7 and 8, 1966. It was attended by the chairmen, the members of their committees, and an equal number of experts in the various fields who had not previously participated in discussions. Among the latter was Kenneth Graham whose project on *Relationships between Educational Theatre and Professional Theater* (V-012)[1] proved to have particular relevance to several aspects of the present project. Again, the separate interest groups met individually on October 7, the reports which had been previously circulated were revised, in one instance radically. On October 8, the full conference assembled for an extended discussion under the direction of the individual chairmen of the issues raised by the revised reports.

The document which follows is in part a summary, in part a paraphrase, and occasionally an interpretation of the proceedings of the final conference. Since this is presented as a report of the conference as a whole, no systematic attempt has been made to identify particular contributors or points of view. Committee reports have been incorporated in the text or summarized. The full text of summarized reports will be found in the appendix, together with several documents submitted by individual participants which deal at greater length with specific issues raised by the conferences.

It is perhaps useful to define research in general before examining research as it may apply to theatre arts.

Research is finding new knowledge. Pure research is finding new knowledge for its own sake; directed research is finding new knowledge with the purpose of applying it to the solution of a particular problem. Pure research is a manifestation and expression of human curiosity. Directed research is the response to a discovered specific need. There is no clear separation of pure and directed research. The principle of serendipity has prevailed in many instances: a researcher presumably attempting to find knowledge to help solve a specific problem may find new knowledge unrelated to his problem.

Scholarly research is the recovery of knowledge, artistry, or artifact, which once existed but which has been lost or obscured in the passage of time and

[1] Hereafter cited as the "Graham Report." It has been published as a supplement to *ETJ*, XVIII (November, 1966), 309-380.

the formation therefrom of new knowledge of the past and new concepts regarding humanity.

Research under legislation administered by the United States Office of Education is directed research for the purpose of improving education. The research-related activities supported by the Office are designed "to expand knowledge about the educational process, to develop new and improved educational programs and techniques, to disseminate the results of these efforts to educators and the public, and to train researchers in the field of education."

The following report of the Conference on Theatre Research should be read in the light of that quotation. Whatever was said or done during its lifetime, its initial, constant, and ultimate purpose was to set forth suggestions that may be directly taken up for development by researchers in the several fields of theatre, and to encourage the designing of related or completely independent projects. Portions of the report, or of the papers in the Appendix may seem obvious, limited, even biased to specialists in a particular field; they are invited, nay, encouraged to disagree, to develop their own definitions and initiate their own projects. The report is intended, in part, as an attempt to see many areas through one glass: the man who has climbed a particular mountain will know it more intimately than the distant observer; however, the distant observer may have a better sense of the whole range than the solitary climber.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS TO UNIVERSITY RESEARCH IN THEATRE

IF STUDIES IN THEATRE ARTS PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE AND CURRICULAR PROBLEMS for the American university, it should be recognized that their appearance followed a well worn and conventional pattern. They began in departments of language and literature with courses surveying the history of drama in a particular country or a particular period. Out of such academically respectable courses came studies in the history of the theatre and of the arts of the stage, more radical perhaps than literary analysis but not unallied to such acceptable academic subjects as archaeology, art history, and musicology. Finally came what might be called practical courses in theatre arts, in acting, design, direction, and theatre technology, scene construction, architecture, lighting. Thus the common ancestor, dramatic literature, produced curiously antagonistic descendants. The creative branch of the family ("theatre arts") has been notoriously indifferent to its heritage; theatre artists trade anecdotes about the past but they (properly?) do not see them as admonitory. If the professional theatre worries, it worries about tomorrow. The scholarly branch of the family (theatre history and criticism) does not ignore what is happening, but emphasizes knowledge and therefore is indifferent to the future, the unknowable.

Because it emphasizes knowledge, stage history is the most academically familiar of the topics considered by the project, with criticism a close second. Both are aligned with the humanistic studies customarily pursued in universities. Stage history began outside the university and has been drawn into it. It originated in the enthusiasm of amateur antiquarians, and it is now being subjugated by the principles and methods of social and cultural historians. Dramatic criticism, on the other hand, began in the schools with Aristotle lecturing to Athenian teen-age intellectuals. Until very recent times, however, dramatic criticism has generally been pursued outside the university by journalists and men of letters.

Although most schools and departments of drama offer courses in play writing, acting, and directing, the creative aspects of the field were excluded from the conference as having special problems to which the techniques and needs of formal academic research did not apply. Their absence was several times noted with regret, most particularly in an eloquent statement by Professor Cole:

To the Absent Ones

The four essential theatre workers who are concerned with the most important research in theatre were *not present* at the conference: the playwright, the actor, the director, and the producer. The most important research in theatre is *writing a new play, finding a new play,* and *producing a new play.* The greatest unsolved problem in theatre is the recurrent one: *Is this a good play?*

All persons present at the conference represent fields of artistry in or related to theatre which are, in a sense, parasites on the work of the playwright, the actor, the director, and the producer. They live either by helping the playwright to write, the producer to produce, the actor to act, and the director to direct, or by commenting on the writing, acting, producing, and directing after the fact. Their efforts may be highly motivated, and they may in effect make meritorious contributions to the art of the theatre, but the fact remains that the art of the theatre reposes with the playwright, the actor, and the director, sponsored by the producer.

Since these artists are not present to speak for themselves, it may be appropriate to attempt an approximation of what they might have said. The playwright might have said, "Research is what I do when I try to find the best way of expressing my idea, the best performance form, the best dramatic structure, the optimum assemblage of *dramatis personae,* the visual and auditory stimuli, signals, symbols, to present to an audience so that they will get my meanings and my emotional connotations and overtones as I think them and feel them. If research can help me do this, I'm for research."

The actor might have said, "How can I tell in advance whether a speech, a sound, a movement, a gesture, an expression or any combination of these will affect an audience as the playwright, the director, and I, separately or together, think they will? This is my constant research, my continuous application of multi-variate analysis to my professional problem—though without benefit of statistical predictions. I must try and try and fail and fail until I succeed. Can you help me with this?"

A director might have said, "O.K., so I know all that has been written and spoken about historical styles; about dramatic values according to Aristotle and Alex Dean; about the strengths and weaknesses of areas, levels, and movements; about pictorial compositions, and about Stanislavsky's theories and the theories about his theories. When I apply this and additional knowledge to the preparation of a new play, by a new (or old) playwright, who has a new idea or a new orientation of an old idea, or a new variation of an old vehicle of an old idea, with new actors in newly designed settings, I have *no* idea how the audience is going to take it, and how the critics are going to appraise it."

And the producer might have said, "It's a gamble and a shot-gun technique. If I produce enough shows, I can get an occasional hit, but I can never be sure."

All four might have said, "How we got into this crazy business we'll never know or we won't say, but we're in it, we love it, we believe in it as a high form of creative expression which people have valued for five thousand years, and we hope to continue in it despite its multi-variate vicissitudes and uncertainties."

It is my personal opinion that the variables are so numerous and their variations so wide-ranging with such small increments that a statistical model to produce effective predictions cannot be made; nor, even, can reliable data be compiled to construct a model which will contribute significantly in predicting the effect in either audience reception, critical evaluation, or commerical success of any new production of any new play which is serious in purpose and original in idea, form, and expression. Therefore, the *prime item research* in theatre is the writing and production of a new play: the *creative act* which is the basis of continuing theatre as a valued adornment of civilization worthy of private and public support and subsidy for its own sake and for the sake of civilization. *To support the creative act of writing and producing a play is to support the most essential research in theatre.* But is it EDUCATION? Where would English Departments be without Shakespeare?

Would that our absent ones had been present. Perhaps there can be developmental con-
ferences at which they may speak for themselves.

On the other hand since the teaching of theatre arts is an accepted part of
the academic curriculum at all levels, it did seem proper to include it as an
area of research analogous to that in history and criticism. But while specialists
in the teaching of theatre arts recognized the need for research and were con-
cerned with it, they immediately made it clear that they were equally (or
perhaps more) concerned with the creative aspects of their field.

Theatre is a process, an engaging act, a creative act, a confrontation of actor with audience, and
its proper academic discipline is to study it, experience it, and practice it in this context. All
elements which comprise the act of theatre then become worthy of study and need to be
evaluated in proper relationship to the fundamental process of theatre. If theatre is approached
in this manner, the student needs an education which is grounded in a deep understanding
and practice of the art form, and all facets which contribute to this end must be sought out
and used. The theatre student must pursue his work with the same intensity, purpose, and
dedication which has always been part of the makeup of the successful artist. The primary
subject for teaching theatre is the act of making theatre, and all the related areas cluster
around this basic purpose. Those closest to the center are the ones most directly involved:
playwriting, acting, directing, costume, lighting, stagecraft and design. The areas of theatre
history, dramatic literature, and criticism should feed into this process as directly as possible.

Somewhere between the proponents of scholarly research and those con-
cerned with developing creativity were the specialists in technology and the
behavioral sciences. If the technologists were frank to admit that their prob-
lems lay more in engineering than in pure research, they were, on the one
hand, ultimately concerned with "what makes a good show?" and, on the
other, with the depressing slowness of "feedback" in theatre: the failure to use
experience from the immediate as well as the remoter past for the benefit of
the future in architecture and stagecraft. As the dialogue continued, there
were occasional admissions from one speaker that other fields had something
to offer to his field of interest; more frequently there were sturdy proclama-
tions of the importance of his own field as a thing apart.

The conflict derives in part from the Topsy-like development of theatre
studies in the academy. Some departments took their function to be the train-
ing of professionals. Jack Morrison found an analogy for such departments in
graduate studies in science: the ultimate product of the study of science is
the scientist, not the historian of science. Other speakers referred to the historic
goal of humanistic studies: through scholarly discipline to add to the accumula-
tion of knowledge and to the understanding of man.

To anticipate one of the conclusions of the conference it might be said at
this point that theatre is an area of knowledge *and* a performing art. The study
of dramatic literature belongs in theatre departments whether or not it contrib-
utes directly to performance. The study of theatre history belongs in theatre
departments whether or not it contributes to performance. The study of the-
atrical criticism belongs in theatre departments whether or not it contributes
directly to performance. These are, that is to say, separate, but equal and depend-
ent fields. Since the main function of the conference was to explore the param-
eters and needs of the several fields, the formulation may stand; but the di-

alogue is important and it should be continued until a satisfactory resolution is reached.

> True is it, my incorporate friends . . .
> That I received the general food at first
> Which you do live upon; and fit it is,
> Because I am the storehouse and the shop
> Of the whole body. But, if you do remember,
> I send it through the rivers of your blood
> Even to the court, the heart, to th' seat o' th' brain,
> And, through the cranks and offices of man,
> The strongest nerves and small inferior veins
> From me receive that natural competency
> Whereby they live.

CHAPTER III

CONSENSUS OF CONFERENCE OPINION ON RESEARCH AREAS

IN SPITE OF THIS ULTIMATELY UNRESOLVED DISAGREEMENT, THE CONFERENCE DID identify areas of common concern to which future specific research projects could be addressed.

I. Perhaps the most important was the question first posed by the technologists: what makes a good show? A successful performance of a good play is too often a happy accident. Basic research by physical and behavioral scientists might discover the elements, or the combination of elements, which make important contributions to the relation of what is happening on stage to the people out front.

From a somewhat different viewpoint, the question is also of primary concern to the theatrical critic. If it is impossible to suggest that there are hard and fast ways of establishing the quality of a theatrical experience, it is important for the critic to develop an understanding of the play as a working mechanism. The playwright, for his part, begins with certain assumptions about audience reaction, about what has worked for other playwrights, and the critics therefore are increasingly interested in a technical sense about the elements within the play. As for ultimate standards and final values, it was pointed out that the "scientific method" could be applied to the evaluation of the arts, if the scientific method is understood to be consensus or agreement among peers which makes acceptable a diversity of opinion. The critic must be willing to recognize as a measure of value the length of time such opinion persists in the forefront of the attention of a variety of people.

In relation to this question, the theatrical historian was invited to go beyond documentary evidence and to make evaluations of why things happen in the context of a particular theater and its audience, to try to analyze both events and results. The effective theatre historian, it was said, suggests to his students, whatever their special interests, that the issues which confronted people in the past as artists, business men, and administrators in the active theatre are centrally the same issues facing them today, the problems that the theatre of the present must also solve.

· Although the behavioral scientists were felt to be of primary importance in identifying creative talent, there was general agreement that their techniques would be of value in ascertaining the relation of performance to spectator. If the theatre is considered a process of communication, there is a sequential ar-

13

rangement of elements: communicator, channel, message, audience, etc. All concepts of dramatic criticism imply things about human behavior, about human beings behaving in the theatrical situation. The scientists could study the ways in which people tend to behave in response to certain events on the stage as well as to elements within the message itself.

II. Three of the five committees recognized the need for a national center or regional centers for the collection, classification, and distribution of information and materials.

The issue was first raised by the committee on Research in Theatre History which was concerned not merely with the lack of communication among existing theatre collections and the unpredictable nature of their holdings, but with the haphazard way in which records of present activities are being assembled and preserved. In particular, it was felt that much could be learned from the examples of the various projects in "oral history," the systematic tape recording of interviews with people who are working and have been working in the theatre over a long period of time, those artists who have not the time or the motivation to write out their experiences. While it was recognized that local interests and individual autonomy are involved in the procedures of established collections, it was suggested that some degree of cooperation in their future development, and in the establishment of new collections, might come from an agreement on a division of responsibilities instead of the present competition for whatever is available. It should be possible to develop guide lines as to what collections might assume responsibilities for what areas.

The use of historical collections is also a necessity for theatre technicians who must frequently seek out sources for the design of costumes, properties, and scenery. The centers proposed by the theatre historians could readily assume the responsibility of supplying production staffs with information about the resources necessary to their work. This would include technological developments as well as specific historical information.

The same information and dissemination centers would be of direct use to teachers of theatre and the theatre arts who must be kept abreast of new developments in methodology and the materials available for increasingly effective teaching.

The Graham Report calls for "a central office of research that covers the complete spectrum of the theatre" (p. 327) and "a central clearing house of theatre information which can be dispensed to the general public without membership restrictions." With these proposals the present conference is obviously sympathetic. We are particularly concerned that "theatre information" should specifically include theatre history, theatre technology, and materials for theatre teaching. While a central office or clearing house might be the first step in providing such information and dissemination service, the development of a number of regional centers, closely coordinated, would ultimately contribute more directly to the life of the theatre.

III. In the past, theatre has been approached as a creative art or as a humanistic study. But much of the discussion of the Conference was concerned with the uses of the sciences, both physical and social. Research in the various fields of physics and engineering has, of course, increased the flexibility of the modern stage and should be used more widely in the planning of auditoriums.

In addition, the reports of the various committees and the discussions which followed indicated that the techniques of the behavioral and social scientists could contribute directly to the improvement of research in theatre history, the writing of dramatic criticism, and the selection and training of creative personnel.

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESEARCH AND THE THEATRE

The Committee:

ROBERT BOGUSLAW, Sociology, *Washington University, St. Louis*

NORMAN FREDERIKSEN, Director, Center for Psychological Studies, *Educational Testing Service*

GEORGE GUNKLE, Speech and Dramatic Art, *University of Iowa*

JOHN L. KENNEDY, Psychology, *Princeton University*, Chairman

CHARLES H. PAGE, Sociology, *University of California, Santa Cruz*

MARVIN ROSENBERG, Dramatic Art, *University of California, Berkeley*

I. *Two Points of View*

THE COMMITTEE WAS NOT IN FULL AGREEMENT THAT THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES *should* be applied to the theatre. One member advised the behavioral scientists to "keep their bloody hands off the theatre" and to resist the temptation, for example, to propose research to select and train artists via such educational methods as the selection test and the achievement test. The majority of the committee, however, did not agree that a liaison between the behavioral sciences and the theatre was either bound to be harmful to the theatre or to be a mis-allocation of resources of the U.S. Office of Education. But we shall return to the value issue again.

II. *Some Possible Programs*

George Gunkle and Marvin Rosenberg most actively espoused behavioral science research both *in* the theatre and *about* the theatre. Both of them pointed out that the theatre provides an excellent "arena" for the systematic study of human behavior. We might call this "behavioral-science-centered" research, which uses the theatre and its people as an institution in which to test general hypotheses concerning behavior. "Theatre-centered" research, on the other hand, would involve the behavioral scientist in formulating hypotheses and devising methods for testing and conducting research studies on uniquely *theatre* problems, issues and practices. If there is anything to the basic research-applied research dichotomy, the first variety would be more "basic" than the second. The second would aim to build up a body of more general knowledge than now exists about theatre issues. Gunkle sees two kinds of theatre-centered behavioral science research, namely, what he calls "measurement" research and

"language" research. Measurement research makes more precise existing knowledge, an example of which is "does stage lighting really have an effect on an audience, what kind of effect and how much?" Language research attempts to give operational or behavioral definition to hazy theatrical terms, such as empathy, overacting and stress. Rosenberg cited several examples of successful collaboration between behavioral scientists and theatre arts people in both basic and applied research enterprises but cautioned that the different languages make collaboration a difficult problem. The same words are given different meanings. Frederiksen underlined the necessity for agreed-upon definitions of criteria, such as the "goodness" of a performance, before the behavioral technology of psychological testing could be brought to bear on personnel selection problems for the theatre arts.

Clevenger ("Behavioral Research in Theatre," *ETJ*, XVII (1965), 118-121), summarizes a similar discussion in the following words:

I have discussed three approaches to behavioral research in the theatre along with the consequences which may be expected to flow from each. First, we may use the technical methods of behavioral science to test extant theatrical hypotheses which will ultimately produce a miscellaneous assortment of facts about the theatre. Second, one may may import concepts and variables into theatre from the more well-developed behavioral sciences, with the effect of adding a potentially infinite body of extrinsic knowledge about theatre. Third, one may assume the philosophical position of behavioral science with respect to theatrical concepts, which would lead to the development of partially-formalized theories of theatre and drama. (p. 121)

III. *Organizing Behavioral Science Research on and in the Theatre*

The committee devoted a good deal of attention to the special problems of interdisciplinary communication created by a possible collaboration between behavioral scientists and theatre specialists. It noted that many interdisciplinary enterprises in the past have not been routinely productive or successful. On the other hand, it was attracted by the idea that the "two cultures" of the sciences and humanities might find a way of *working together on* rather than just talking about mutually interesting problems in the theatre context.

The success of such an enterprise will depend heavily on the design of the decision-making and resource-allocation mechanisms in the U.S. Office of Education. Here, some behavorial science research results may be applied directly. The first concern in the design of such a committee or study group, should be *sufficient diversity*. Two kinds of diversity are important ingredients, a) diversity of skill specialization and b) diversity of personality and value positions. With respect to a), it would be highly desirable to have a behavioral scientist on the study group to ensure adequate consideration of behavioral science in the design of theatre research programs. Diversity with respect to personality and values must also be specifically built into the decision-making or advisory group, often at the expense of "efficiency" of meetings and the blood-pressure of the participants.

When the study group or advisory committee is constituted, it should be encouraged to take an *active* role in generating ideas and projects, rather than to confine itself to judging and evaluating the proposals of others in a reactive way. The advisory committee should meet often enough and for long enough so that the knotty value problems of collaboration between behavioral scientists and theatre people can be confronted in an orderly fashion.

The present committee found it much more profitable at this stage to talk about the design of a future advisory committee to the U.S. Office of Education than to get involved in any specific content area of the theatre arts. It felt that content issues and priorities with respect to problems and areas of theatre should be the proper concern of a more permanent advisory body.

IV. *Creativity*

Behavioral science research on and in the theatre will almost surely make contributions to the understanding of the complicated problem of creativity. Our conversations on this subject revealed that we were rather sure that many different *kinds* of creativity were involved in the theatre. We were impressed with Frank Barron's ingenious experiments on creativity in the visual arts, and his fruitful collaboration with people in the humanities at the University of California was cited as an example of the kind of program the U.S. Office of Education should encourage.

Commentary

In the discussion of the report of the Committee on Behaviorial Science, several points related to the other interests of the Conference were singled out for emphasis and one or two new issues raised.

It was pointed out that the usefulness of the methods of behavioral science to the theatre was presently limited because the objectives of theatre education were vague and poorly specified. The first step in increasing that usefulness is to formulate statements of objectives in terms of measurable things; behavioral science can do nothing without specifications of expected outcomes in behavioral changes.

It is important to formulate these statements in the specific terms of the various fields c: theatrical activity, and not to employ tests relying on verbal ability alone. Academically oriented tests involving a heavy verbal content are excellent for predicting the kinds of grades that a candidate will receive; they have virtually no validity in predicting either success in later life or ability in a professional career in theatre.

The Graham Report (p. 332) formulates the prediction of professional promise in acting as based on tests of "imagination, responsiveness, concentration, flexibility, likely vocal range, and professional reliability." The present committee would establish standards for evaluating creative potential in the whole range of theatrical activities based on criteria dealing with independence of judgment, complexity of perception of the self and others, general cognitive complexity, preference for challenging and complex to nominal fields, liking for contradictions, a high evaluation of the aesthetic and a low evaluation of the economic factors in life.

In framing the standards and determining the answers to be sought, close attention must be paid to the questioner. For example, it was suggested that criteria might be evolved from a close study of successful members of the profession; this raises the possibility of formalism, the iron maiden to the creative impulse. If the work of a group of writers, say of the 30's, is analyzed and from it a set of variables is developed by which admission to theatre programs is

determined, will the end result be Kaufman and Hart or the "Brustein play-
wrights"? Those who evaluate must be aware of the constant need for asking new
questions and avoid the artistic rut of what works today.

It was also suggested that behavioral science might have a contribution to
make to the unforeseeable relationship of theatre to the impact of increased
leisure on society. Theatre is a technique for community development, for in-
volving the emotions as well as the intellect of the society. The medieval church,
the Tudor monarchy, the Soviet Union and other emerging states successfully
employed theatre as an agent for the unification of society. However, as the
result of a general (if not exclusively cultural) explosion in human activities
a radical change in the interrelationships of men can be anticipated within the
next two decades. In an older society leisure was conceived as the freedom to
do something; in our industrial society leisure has been conceived as the free-
dom to do nothing. Can the behavioral scientists aid the theatre to reassert its
old usefulness as a cultural entity in a society that has increasingly less to do?

CHAPTER V

THE TEACHING OF THEATRE: A CHALLENGE TO EDUCATION

The Committee:

JAMES BUTLER, Drama, *University of Southern California*
JUANITA D. FLETCHER, English and Speech, *District of Columbia Teachers' College*
ROBERT HEINICH, Instructional Technology, *University of Southern California*
BURNET M. HOBGOOD, Dramatic Art, *Southern Methodist University*
MONROE LIPPMAN, Speech and Theater, *Tulane University*
HAROLD S. MARIENTHAL, Theater Arts, *University of California at Los Angeles*
WALLACE SMITH, *Evanston Township High School*
HENRY WILLIAMS, Experimental Theater, *Dartmouth College*

EXPOSURE TO THEATRE IN SOME FORM (TELEVISION, MOTION PICTURES, LEGITIMATE stage) is a significant part of our daily living. It affects the perception, behavior and evolution of each of us from an early age to death. Therefore the teaching of theatre at all levels—childhood through adult life—shouid have the following objectives:

1) To increase the availability and improve the quality of theatre for all.
2) To increase the capacity of doing theatre effectively for some.
3) To heighten the perception of and sensitivity towards theatre in all.

Theatre is essentially a humanistic study. In the spectrum of academic disciplines it is one which defies clear classification with customarily accepted educational compartments. Unlike most disciplines, it is an artistic, cultural, and intellectual pursuit which continues at all age levels and with ever-increasing depth and breadth. Theatre is also one of the most complex of the academic disciplines and may be profitably approached, studied, and practiced in a variety of ways. For all students—majors and non-majors—it is one of the best means to relate, unify, and reach out to other arts, languages, literature, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and religion. In this context theatre educates people in the broadest sense for there is nothing more humanizing than our perception of the arts. Theatre might well serve as the most important hub of any liberal arts educational program for it ranges from entertainment of the masses to scholarly discipline for the few.

The specific challenge, then, is to design educational procedures for the teaching of theatre so that they will meet the needs and capacities of each human being in our society.

In its most pristine form, theatre is only *fully* realized as an art when it is happening on the stage. The student must primarily, therefore, have an opportunity to study and practice the art form under the guidance of skilled, highly trained, and liberally educated theatre teachers, as well as qualified specialists in the various areas. Students of theatre should also have the fullest opportunity to study all phases of theatre arts, to practice them, and to be exposed to the best models of the art form.

Without denying the usefulness of conventional knowledge to the theatre student, it is important to assert that the learning process in art can be effective only when meaningful self-development takes place through the sharpening of sense perceptions and increasing ability to express inner realizations. The necessary synthesis of all the appropriate bodies of knowledge can be accomplished only in this context of self-development.

Therefore, theatre should be placed within the academic structure where it can realize its inherent potential as one of the arts, and where it can function without disguise, without apology, and without interference.

Although there is general agreement among theatre educators on the philosophy expressed above, there has been little opportunity for them to pursue, in depth, its full implications. Moreover, as an academic discipline theatre has only recently come to be generally regarded as a "performing" art, as opposed to the older, traditional view of drama as a "literary" art. We urgently propose that planning conferences similar to the recent one which resulted in The Graham Report be held to further define and to clearly establish the practical applications of sound educational theatre teaching for all levels of instruction.

With the above as a statement of objectives in theatre education, the following projects are included as a suggestion of significant proposals, relevant to the development of educational theatre.

I. *Survey of Recent Developments in Theatre Education*

1) Purpose and Justification:
   A) To examine comparatively the many instances of program self-study and revision in American college and university theatres, in order to identify the problems that have prompted changes and to discover the nature of solutions attempted, as a means of describing the specific directions being taken by this field.
   B) Because it is apparent that basic changes are taking place in theatre education at the college and university levels, which have to date furnished the leadership for theatre education at all levels, it would be most useful to have a detailed analysis of emerging trends and successful practices.

2) Areas of Investigation:
   A) Relation of theatre and arts programs to the several kinds of educational missions acknowledged by U.S. higher education.
   B) Comparison of previously established norms in curriculum structure, pedagogy, and play production with newly proposed objectives.
   C) Specification of typical rationales for theatre programs, in order to describe appropriate criteria by which they may be evaluated.

3) Structure and Procedure:
   A) A task force of seven or nine experienced theatre educators, probably named through AETA, who would set policies of investigation and evaluate the results; working with a chairman, three executive assistants, a clerical and secretarial staff (of five) at a central office for the study.

B) Compilation through questionnaire, visitation to selected situations, and reviewing conferences of data on program self-studies, curriculum revisions, student and teacher attitudes in both revised and unrevised theatre programs.

4) Duration of Study

Since some data have been collected that would assist this study and the principal problems would be (1) the collection of more detailed exhibits and information, and (2) evaluation of collected materials, it would seem possible to complete such an investigation within eighteen months or two years.

II. *Suggested Support Projects for Theatre Teaching on the Graduate Level*

1) An investigation of the qualities of potential theatrical talent, intended as a guide both to interested students and to theatre departments in determining admission for those students who wish to pursue a career in the theatre.
2) A study of the viability and means of an internship with professional companies for qualified products of professional training programs. This is explored to some extent in the Graham Report.

III. *Suggested Support Projects for Theatre Teaching on the College and Secondary School Level*

1) Investigation of the means of identifying talent in theatre to bring forth those who might be missed by present verbal tests, and to aid in the identification of subject matter and skills to be taught. This is especially important in dealing with the disadvantaged.
2) Determination of what happens to students in theatre study. What do they actually gain? How do we know they gain it?
3) The relationship of performance to study. Should performance for the general public be part of secondary school theatre programs?
4) Study of the content of theatre courses on the secondary level. While this is related to several of the above areas, it really resolves to "What should be taught to high school students in theatre?" and "How do we do it?" (See, The Course of Study in Theatre Arts prepared by The Secondary School Conference, published in 1963 by AETA.)
5) Development of a training program for theatre teachers at the secondary level.
6) A study of the relationship between the theatre profession and "educational" theatre. The initial step in this direction was made in The Graham Report. (One certainly doesn't have to do something to theatre to make it education. Is the best training professional training?)
7) Finding of more objective methods to measure achievement and values in theatre study.
8) Determination of the relationship of technical skills to theatre study in high school. (Stagecraft as part of a theatre course, or as a separate course. How deep does one go in this study?)

IV. *Suggested Support Projects for Theatre Teaching on the Elementary Level*

1) A pilot training center for developing and establishing the philosophy, objectives, methods, and techniques of teaching theatre to children. This is a most critical area.
2) Workshops in creative drama, with demonstration lessons using children in order to improve the competencies of the teachers, based on procedures established in the pilot training center.
3) The feasibility of using consultants in theatre to assist elementary teachers with the presentation of special programs, plays, and assemblies and to give special theatre workshops in in-service training programs for elementary teachers.

V. *Suggested Support Projects for the Changing Aspects of Instructional Technology in Theatre Training*

A critical assessment of all educational media now available in the area of the theatre arts. These listings would be evaluative rather than annotative because theatre arts teachers not only need to have more effective appraisals of media available, but researchers in the field

are needed. These evaluations would be published in booklet form for distribution to all teachers of the theatre arts.

VI. Suggested Support Projects for the Use of Instructional Materials in Theatre Arts:

Proposal for a "Theatre Arts Pilot Center"

The most expedient way to implement the accepted theory of audio-visual techniques with a practical application is the creation of instructional materials centers. At the outset, one such center would serve as a pilot to investigate the problems connected with audio-visual equipment and materials.

Audio-Visual Equipment

1) *Research and Testing.*—Not all projection and recording equipment is suitable for the classroom. To determine the best equipment for every use and on every educational level, a committee of theatre educators and instructional technologists together with representatives of industry should join for a predetermination of basic equipment best suited to the classroom. After a determination of needs and the selection of basic equipment such modifications as would make the equipment more useful to the educator may be suggested to the manufacturer. A final determination could then be made as to the equipment which best serves the majority of educational needs, together with cost structures on a volume basis.

2) *Training.*—Preliminary investigation suggests that manufacturers of instructional technological equipment would cooperate (physically and financially) in the establishment of a centralized instructional center to which all educators concerned could come for thorough training in the approved equipment. Such a center would serve as a clearing house for complaints, suggestions as to modifications, and display of plans for new equipment. This center would also be responsible for producing a detailed, practicable guide to the use and maintenance of all equipment displayed and recommended for use.

Audio-Visual Materials

1) *Basic Organization.*—Three committees should be established to determine the needs for materials, one each for the elementary, the secondary, and the college and university level. The recommendations of these committees would determine the materials to be: (1) collected, (2) produced, (3) distributed, (4) retrieved.

2) *Collection of Materials.*—The initial task would be a determination of existing materials and their availability for general distribution. Supplementary collections on all three levels should be initiated in all media suggested in the analysis of educational materials above.

3) *Advising on the Production of Needed Materials and Producing Certain Materials.*— This is the most important of the center's functions. In the pilot stage, the center might:

> A) Create a definitive library of motion pictures dealing with the theatre arts. These could be short films, produced for flexibility and comprehensiveness, and prepared for various educational levels.
>
> B) Create a limited series of cartoon films, exploring the theatrical arts on the levels and for the purposes previously explained.
>
> C) Explore the possibilities of stop motion pictures for each of the three educational levels, in a basic area, to determine impact and flexibility.
>
> D) Develop three filmstrips (perhaps on Shakespeare) each with the subject on a distinct educational level, determining the final product for impact, flexibility, and extension into other theatrical areas.
>
> E) Develop self-instructional 8mm films in certain skills and techniques needed by students in the theatre arts (for example, on the application of various kinds of make-up; and scenery and stage construction). Such films would free the teacher for more complex matters.
>
> F) Establish a centralized, indexed and cross-indexed, collection of slides in all areas of theatre.

Distribution and Retrieval of Materials

A committee of theatre educators and experts in instructional technology should be formed to determine the most effective way for the pilot center to maintain accurate records of all use of materials, to insure an in-flow of new materials, replacement of worn-out materials, and retirement of out-dated materials, and to direct the publication of catalogues of the materials stored. Most importantly, this committee should be responsible for maintaining an up-to-date file on the most effective systems for distribution control and retrieval systems, so that expansion of this pilot project may proceed on an orderly basis as funds become available.

Commentary

Of primary concern both to the committee and the members of the Conference was the kind of relationship to be established between the study of theatre as a performing art and the general programs of the university. It was clear that few disciplines rely more on the total resources of the university than the theatre arts. The dimensions of this problem may be imagined from the disagreements earlier reported about the relationship between the performing and research fields within theatre departments themselves. As Professor Butler commented, "to set before the house the problems of theatre as an academic discipline is to hit a sensitive nerve."

It was pointed out that students tend to major in theatre because of an initial interest in performance, and must be shown the relevance of such fields as history, criticism, and literature to their interests. The problem of teaching dramatic literature, it was indicated, is to get the dramatic imagination going. If the student has some knowledge of what goes into the business of production, the study of criticism and history will be valuable; without that knowledge, it will be nearly useless.

There is also the problem of theatre as a liberal arts major without a professional commitment. Students with a major interest in any of the liberal arts may achieve fuller understanding of it by including a study of drama. Students with impelling interests in drama may reach out to other liberal subjects for enrichment of their creative pursuits. Drama as a major in the liberal context, at any rate, can bring together different but meaningfully related interests.

Perhaps the greatest justification for the general educational function of theatre, even for those who will never practice it as professionals or amateurs, is its central power of stimulating the imagination. In the present cultural situation, nothing is more important from the earliest levels in school than the stimulating of the imagination. The child enters school with his faculties stultified by the repetition to which they have been subjected by the popular media. Theatre, taught as a creative art and/or as a literary exercise, provides the opportunity for imaginative maturing. Again, it is possible to refer to the Graham Report (pp. 341-43) where the particular values of education in theatre are cited: to contribute to the development of the entire human being, to the development of the child's creative, imaginative, and mimetic powers; to the development of some protection against negative regimentation; to make the individual "knowledgeable about, and responsive to, the expanding world of which he is a part."

24

RESEARCH IN THEATRE ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

The Committee:

HAROLD BURRIS-MEYER, Architecture, *Florida Atlantic University*
PATTON CAMPBELL, Costume Designer, *New York*
EDWARD C. COLE, Drama, *Yale University*, Chairman
ELDON ELDER, Scene Design, *Brooklyn College*
CHARLES ELSON, Lighting Design, *Hunter College*
GEORGE C. IZENOUR, Theater Engineering, *Yale University*

THEATRE ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN, LIGHTING, TECHNICAL PRODUCTION, AND ENGI-neering are the functions of furnishing the site of the theatrical performance and the practical and aesthetic visual and auditory supports and embellish-ments of the play which are either prescribed by the playwright or contributed, with his advice and consent, by artists, engineers, and technicians. Specialists in these areas generally consider themselves to be subservient to the play, the playwright, the producer, and the director and try to aid and enrich the per-formance by the knowledge and means at their disposal. They can imagine a play existing as "two boards and a passion" but they do not admit that such a stripped-down performance is as capable of affecting an audience so thor-oughly and so powerfully as is a performance which has the benefit of their expertise.

Dealing as they do in physical materials, phenomena, and principles, they tend to think practically and to be in close touch with the industrial and mer-cantile world outside the theatre; being, in general, idealistic and ambitious for improvements in the quality of theatrical performance as well as desirous of having their work in theatre express the body as well as the spirit of the modern civilization in which it exists, they often press for change and improvements in both the art and technology of the theatre.

They tend also to become impatient with playwrights and directors who *must* let inspiration follow its own unique timetable (ideas do not arrive on any fixed schedule) and who cannot always state at a pre-arranged time what they want, or who, having stated it, subsequently change their minds in response to inspiration. They are more aware of the temporal limitations in the efforts of production and are zealous guardians of the usually too-short time for preparing any production.

These specialists have seen great strides made in the technology of civilization

outside the theatre by pure research in the sciences and by the application of the findings of research in the manufacture of devices and materials for human use and benefit. They have seen government support pure and directed research munificently and have seen all industries but theatre establish divisions of research and development while a mere driblet of money has come to them for research of any kind and only a few of the manufacturers who produce for theatrical use have undertaken or supported research.

The Council for the Living Theater, the organization which is dedicated to the welfare of the owners of New York theatres and of the producers of plays which occupy them, is apparently solely concerned with persuading more people to buy theatre tickets and not at all with the quality of the theatres, of the equipment of the theatres, or of the capabilities of the theatre artists and workers, nor with the fact that the technology of the New York theatre is as anachronistic as a sailing merchant ship. This is in a way understandable. Theatrical producing organizations have no future. They exist in the present, for the production of one play, then another, then another. They lack corporate structure or continuity requiring any thought for the future: no stockholders, no large capital investment in plant, no ongoing labor force. A theatrical producer can get in, get it, and get out, and as long as there are enough producers to occupy a dwindling number of theatres—which are occasionally "modernized" with new marquees and coats of paint—their owners have little cause to take thought of the future.

Teachers of theatre in colleges and universities find themselves in an environment which is congenial to research. Scholarly historical research, subsidized by foundations, endowed professorships, publishers, and miscellaneous donors, occupies the faculty in the humanities. Grants from government agencies and industry support research in the physical sciences, the social sciences, health, and medicine. Scholarly historical research in theatre has very little support; pure research into the nature of theatre, either as a phenomenon of psychology or of sociology, is nonexistent, and research directed toward the application of scientific discoveries to theatrical production is meagerly supported. (The invention of a successful electronic intensity control for stage lighting was the result of a totally anomalous grant by the division of humanities of a foundation to a theatre designer to do research in physics [electronics] in a department of drama.)

The usual small drama or theatre staff of an institution has been hard at work doing three things: constructing valid courses in theatre, imparting knowledge by way of these courses, and producing and directing plays. Whereas the professor of English can prepare his material, meet his classes, confer with students, and grade papers and examinations, the teacher of drama has to do all this and additionally produce and direct a series of plays for the campus community. While the English professor can depart to the library or his study at 3:30 or 4:30 p.m., the Drama professor finds that this is when a rehearsal starts, or when he must work on the script in preparation for an evening rehearsal, or confer with designers and technicians about aspects of the production. These pioneer teachers of theatre have had little time to think about research. They have been running hard, first to catch up in terms of academic respectability and second to stay in place in terms of combined teaching and production loads. And there was little incentive to think about research

when there was little promise of either money to support it or of released time in which to do it.

Consequently teachers of theatre, now offered support for cooperative research, are confronted with a situation which is something like being handed a hammer by a cop in front of Tiffany's window, and the cop saying, "Go ahead, smash it and help yourself, it's perfectly legal." The offer of subvention for research is an *unbelievable surprise,* for which they are ill-prepared. Some of them are so solidly and completely engaged in what they are doing—teaching and producing—that they can't think of anything they'd like to investigate. Others are so busy doing what they are doing that they can't even find the time to fill out applications for support. And unless someone can relieve them, in part, of what they are doing, there will not be applications filed, and needed research will not be done.

Finally, teachers of theatre are not psychologically oriented toward research beyond that necessary to their teaching and play production. They are artists-teachers but not artists-scholars or artists-teachers-scientists. They produce plays avidly, they teach willingly, they face research and investigation reluctantly. It is not what they like to do.

Assuming that there are some teachers of theatre who have time, or. that a benign development will somehow give them the time they need, and that they are disposed toward research, there is research to be done.

The members of the Committee on Architecture and Design in their papers enumerated many areas wherein they thought that present knowledge is incomplete, inadequate, and empirically developed, and wherein potential improvements are patently evident. Their expatiation and discussion on April 30 revealed considerable agreement on what is needed.

A weakness in the present situation regarding the development in theatre technology is that there is insufficient opportunity and support for testing new devices before putting them to use, and buyers are understandably reluctant either to accept and install untested apparatus or to pay all the development costs of a new device along with a reasonable purchase price in order to acquire it. In industry and commerce, development costs are usually spread over a number of units of product as an acceptable portion of the selling price, but the demand for theatrical devices is neither sufficiently voluminous nor standardized to allow the manufacturer to predict recovery of R & D costs from a mass market.

There is a need for adequate funds for the construction of full scale prototypes of apparatus and adequate testing situations accurately simulating, but divorced from, theatrical performance. There is the admitted possibility of making the performance a true testing situation, provided the audience understands its function as an integral factor in the equation of experiment.

II

Each member of the Committee on Theatre Architecture and Design submitted a paper on his field of specialization; these papers are printed in full in Appendix A of this Report. Following is a digest of the papers, prepared by Professor Cole with the addition of several observations of his own:

A. Harold Burris-Meyer, speaking as a general theatre consultant, urges that distinction be made between research and engineering developments.

In a theatre building project he sees *research* as the development of the design objectives of the project and *engineering* development as the process of satisfying those objectives materially.

Cole: I suggest that to encourage determining the feasibility of ideas which occur randomly we loosen the definition of research to include experimental testing.

Burris-Meyer points out that there is room for time and motion studies of theatre audiences and that we have only empirical knowledge of audience behavior in response to performance stimuli. We may be able by psychophysical measurements to determine objectively the effectiveness of various architectural theatre forms and the relative value of seats in various locations.

He also states that there are many possibilities for research in the applications of recent scientific research findings to theatre techniques.

B. George Izenour, Theatre Engineer and Designer, describes—substantially defines—the theatre building as a machine for production and states that man-machine relationships are the unique province of the engineers, since any machine is a logical extension of man's capabilities. Today we see manifestations of this idea in communications, control of function, and the applications of power which, if they were not completely physical, *and logical,* would have to be called phenomenal.

He states that there is almost no research in theatre equipment engineering and less in the engineering of the theatre building itself.

Izenour pleads for broader understanding of the basic principles of engineering among theatre people, especially those who operate at the technical level, and for theatre engineering research laboratories in every graduate program in theatre arts.

He sees the areas of research from which knowledge of value to the art of the theatre will be derived as being structural design, mechanical design, control systems design, acoustical design, and cybernation.

Cole: There appears to be need to discuss and achieve a working relationship between the engineer who applies the knowledge found by the research scientist to human uses and the theatre artists (playwright, actor, director, designer) who by their activity define the functions which the theatre building and its equipment must perform. If the engineer is *unaware* of what the theatre artists *want to do,* or if the theatre artists are *unaware* of what the scientist and engineer have made it possible for them *to do,* the theatre engineer on the one hand may apply scientific knowledge to buildings or apparatus which no one wants and the theatre artists on the other hand may be blindly ignoring possibilities to take full advantage of the total theatre machine, which is or can be an integrated component, even an active environment, of performance.

The theatre architect, standing as he does between the technical expertise of the theatre engineer and the productional specializations of the theatre artist, has a particular burden to know on the one side what the theatre artist wants or may in the future want to do, and on the other side what the theatre engineer has made or can in the future make available in the physical environment of theatrical performance.

C. Mr. Eldon Elder, professional designer and teacher of scene design, believes that a combination of expansion and change has made research and de-

28

velopment necessary to prepare enough scene designers to satisfy the growing demand and to equip them artistically to work in this changing theatre. He thinks that research is seldom pure research but is rather of the nature of practical experimentation to test theories, to try new materials, to develop new methods, and must therefore be done in situations which are congenial and compatible with this kind of work. He considers the dissemination of findings to be important.

Elder suggests as specific topics for research and experimentation: Designing for Repertory, for which we can learn much by studies of European practices; Training to be Consultants, wherein designers must be capable beyond the limited area of the stage; Studies of New Materials and Methods; Clarification of the Professional Qualifications of Scene Designers and the concommitant wider acceptance of these qualifications as requirements for entry into the profession whether in the New York City theatre, the regional professional theatre, or the educational theatre; and Improving the Quality of Scene Painting across the nation.

D. In the area of costume design two kinds of research are possible, according to Patton Campbell: research into sources of information about the dress of times, places, and stations in life, and research into sources and properties of the materials for costume manufacture.

To improve the sources of information, he suggests that we must: encourage and foster the work of costume historians; gather and *preserve* visual sources; improve methods of preservation; organize, expand, and multiply collections of visual sources such as the New York Public Library Picture Collection; collect and preserve such actual historical garments as can be found, develop methods of preserving them, improve the methods of displaying them, and make color photographs of them arranged on models or dummies.

To improve the execution of costumes for the stage, Campbell suggests: publication of lists of sources of the materials which are suitable for stage costumes; publication of lists of sources for costume accessories; conduct research into fabrics which are visually and functionally suitable.

In costume design, then, research has two values, the scholarly and the practical, both of them equally contributive to the art.

E. Charles Elson, scene and lighting designer and teacher of both, poses a challenge: research in lighting as an art expression. Admitting that "it is most difficult to understand and translate into tangible or should we say visible evidence the subtle *aesthetic* virtues inherent in lighting," he nonetheless urges that research be directed to an attempt to understand how this can be done.

Cole: This is a challenge since it seems to me to involve the attempt to identify the psychic ingredients of creative ability, something which a few educational psychometricians are now daring to undertake.

It is no doubt true that we are not giving the aspiring designer of lighting very well-honed tools of *understanding* and that much of present instruction is in the basic craft of manipulating lighting equipment. I recall one experiment by a student who attempted to determine the least perceptible increment of difference between two hues of like fabric by having several subjects view two girls wearing a series of garments under rigidly controlled similar lighting. She discovered that the least increment was often zero, since several of her subjects saw differences when the identical hue of the identical fabric was worn by both girls. The problem of measuring perception of lighting changes is a difficult one; how much more difficult is prediction of an aesthet-

ic experience as a result of the exercise of design on the four "McCandless" qualities—intensity, color, form, and movement—of light. How much must it be left to the creative imagination of the artist using craft knowledge of lighting?

Commentary

Members of the committee united in agreeing on the need for a subsidized laboratory, the only possible place for research and innovation. The American theatre as presently organized is improvisational and allows no margin for failure. The laboratory permits failure; allowance for failure is necessary for successful innovation. The innovation must be full scale; models are insufficient: full account must be taken for the essential presence of human beings in whatever is being developed.

Burris-Meyer re-emphasized the need for a theatre itself designed as a laboratory for experimental purposes. It is only in such a theatre that the basic problem of theatre research, how emotion is successfully communicated, can be investigated. The measuring devices currently employed (for example, the box office) are crude and inexact.

The planning of new auditoriums frequently results from the collaboration of an architect who believes that design is holy and a client who has little knowledge of the problems of theatre production or the relationship between spectator and performer. The most successful buildings have resulted from the collaboration of knowledgeable clients working closely with knowledgeable architects. This kind of collaboration, for example, led to the building of the Shakespeare Festival Theatre in Stratford, Ontario. The knowledgeable client in this case was Tyrone Guthrie who had been inspired by an earlier experience in a makeshift assembly hall in Edinburgh. The knowledgeable architect never designed a theatre but knew about footings, foundations, structures, air conditioning, temperature swing, and stresses.

CHAPTER VII

RESEARCH IN THEATRE HISTORY

The Committee:
  RALPH ALLEN, Theater, *University of Pittsburgh*
  O. G. BROCKETT, Speech and Theater, *Indiana,* Chairman
  ROBERT MACGREGOR, Publisher, *Theater Arts Books*
  MARGUERITE MCANENY, Curator Emeritus, William Seymour Collection, *Princeton University Library*
  CHAP' ES SHATTUCK, English, *Illinois*

THEATRE HISTORY CREATES A RECORD OF THE PAST, BUT IT IS ALSO COMMITED TO interpreting that record in a multitude of intellectual contexts. Primarily a humanistic discipline, it impinges on nearly every aspect of cultural and social experience, and can serve as a guide, an inspiration, or a warning to the present and the future.

As in any historical field, research in theatre involves the discovery and collection of pertinent evidence, the criticism of evidence, and the communication of results. The committee report, printed in full in Appendix A, discusses each of these points. Most relevant to the developmental aspects of the conference were the problems associated with the collection, classification, and housing of research materials.

The theatre historian's problem of assembling pertinent materials can never be completely solved since it is impossible to anticipate every research project, for each of which the appropriate evidence will necessarily vary. Nevertheless, the task could be minimized considerably.

A. First, more adequate cataloguing of collections is needed. For example, one of the best theatrical collections in the United States is that in the Library of Congress, but the material is scattered and much of it is not catalogued with the needs of the historian in mind. The situation at the Library of Congress is not unique, since most collections are inadequately indexed. Consequently, projects which would eventuate in (1) the better training of library personnel in the handling of theatrical materials, and (2) a more complete cataloguing of collections should be encouraged.

B. Second, more complete collections would be helpful. There are now a number of excellent theatre collections in this country, but there are few that have systematically assembled materials according to pre-established standards of inclusiveness. Many have grown from random gifts or the interests of individuals and thus are erratic in their holdings and obscure as to the guidelines for collecting. Therefore, libraries should be encouraged (1) to formulate more carefully their guidelines for collecting materials and (2) to round out areas of strength.

Additionally, (3) if the existing collections would cooperate, or if a number of research centers could be established, each might concentrate on a specific period, movement, country, or type of material. (4) It might be possible for specified libraries to compile lists of materials (such as American diaries or memoirs of actors, American theatrical periodicals, and so on) and serve as bibliographical centers for scholars, or better yet, (5) they might make a systematic effort to assemble (through microfilm and other processes of reproduction) all of the materials in given categories.

The problem of assembling materials is complicated by the competition among collections. The creation of numerous new libraries in recent years has increased the demand for materials and thus has scattered them, making it increasingly necessary for the scholar to travel extensively. A few major libraries would serve historians better than a great number of small collections, none of which can hope to obtain more than a few truly significant documents. (6) Many local libraries, such as public libraries or those of historical societies, should be encouraged to make their materials more widely available and perhaps to consolidate them with larger collections. A cooperative scheme might reduce the competition for materials.

Most of what has been said up to this point concerns materials from the past, but for the sake of future historians (7) a more concerted and systematic effort should be made to collect records of our own times. Unless this is done our successors will have as much reason to deplore our negligence as we have for wondering at past indifference to the preservation of records. We have a special responsibility to collect materials about the American theatre. (8) To insure the collection of contemporary documents, the task might best be divided among a number of centers, each making an effort to assemble materials about one of the theatre arts or according to some other pre-arranged principle. This would require careful planning and prior agreement among the participating centers. Obviously everything cannot be preserved, however, and principles and priorities would need to be established.

(9) More should also be done in the way of "oral history'—that is, recording interviews with important living theatrical figures both here and abroad. This kind of program should be (10) extended to include films of outstanding productions and of audience reactions. The United States government has supported programs for recording folk music, poets reading their own works, and similar activities, and might reasonably extend the support to include theatrical performances.

C. Third, more adequate guides to existing collections of theatrical materials would be enormously helpful. Some progress has already been made in this direction. In 1960 the International Federation of Library Associations published *Performing Arts Collections; An International Handbook,* which describes collections in museums and libraries in thirty-seven countries including about fifty major organizations in the United States. There is as yet no comprehensive guide to materials in the collections of this or other countries.

To be most helpful, a guide should not be too strictly confined to a survey of theatre collections. Pertinent sources of information are also to be found in collections in such related areas as music, dance, architecture, graphic arts, and popular entertainment. Furthermore, the records of historical societies and professional organizations and the holdings of local libraries should not be overlooked. (1) The United States government might legitimately sponsor a survey of the holdings of collections in the United States.

As another answer to the problem of finding materials, (2) a center might be established at which information about research materials could be placed on cards keyed to a computer capable of indicating instantaneously the location of items on any given subject. Setting up such a system would obviously be an expensive undertaking, although its operation would probably be relatively simple once established. Such a system already exists for the field of Education.

Much of what has been said (3) indicates the need for better financial support of theatre collections. Most curators are anxious to catalogue their materials more adequately and to give the best possible service to historians, but a lack of staff hampers their efforts. Often this problem is most acute with the major libraries, since they are called upon to serve many persons having no connection with the collection (that is, scholars from other universities, countries, etc.). Such libraries are in the paradoxical position of being able to do less about developing their collections the more they seek to serve scholars day by day, for the time spent in giving aid cannot be devoted to enlarging holdings or cataloguing materials.

Financial aid to permit the employment of adequate staffs at the major collections would do much to aid the theatre historian.

D. Furthermore, (1) much could be accomplished by the more systematic training of librarians to cope with the problems peculiar to theatre collections so that these might be better organized, catalogued, and made more readily available to historians. A program for the training of librarians (2) might also include special work in the authentication of materials. For the sake of probable future developments in automation, (3) theatre librarians should also be trained in the techniques of information retrieval.

E. More attention should be given to the teaching of theatre history and the training of theatre historians. (1) Experiments should be made with curriculums in theatre history at various levels (including pre-college) in an attempt to meet the differing goals of the theatre program. The prospective theatre historian needs a chance to develop both a wide acquaintance with the overall history of the theatre and an area of specialized knowledge. He needs to be familiar with social and intellectual history; he must develop skills in the location and authentication of materials and in the methods of historical research; and he should have some acquaintance with the practical problems and methods of theatrical production.

The American theatre historian would also benefit from (2) a program of exchanges with theatre historians from other countries. A very large proportion of the artifacts and other primary source materials are located in other countries and firsthand acquaintance with these is essential. Furthermore, the approaches to theatre history differ somewhat from one country to another and exchanges would be an important source of enrichment and education for the historian.

Perhaps more should be done (3) to encourage cooperation and interchanges of ideas with historians in other fields. Since specialization has separated history into a number of limited areas, more cooperation should be stimulating and enriching to all.

F. There are a large number of specific research projects which if completed would benefit theatre historians in general. It is, of course, impossible to list all of them or even to anticipate all of the legitimate kinds that may be proposed. (1) Some needed works are: reliable biographical dictionaries and guides to theatrical personalities (actors, critics, designers, etc.); critical editions of theatrical correspondence and memoirs, studies and indexes of theatrical periodicals; a continuation of *The London Stage, 1660-1800*; the compilation of annals for various cities in the United States; indexes to memoirs, autobiographies, and non-indexed historical studies; guides to iconographical materials; and so on. In addition to such reference works, (3) almost any good historical study would be welcomed by theatre historians.

G. The recommendations made here are diverse and raise complex problems. Consequently, the implementation of many of them would require careful planning if the desirable results are to be achieved. Perhaps the best insurance of success would come from (1) the creation of an "institute" to establish principles and priorities for the collection of materials for research, to work out agreements for cooperation among collections, to make recommendations for the training of theatre librarians and historians, to recommend priorities for specific research projects, and to consider the various other problems which will inevitably arise.

Commentary

The interrelationship of theatre history and other fields in the discipline of theatre was discussed at length. Students of dramatic literature turn constantly to theatre historians for necessary information; many of them, indeed, become theatre historians. Meetings in which both fields are represented would be mutually beneficial. A conference, for example, on Ibsen in the twentieth century, or conferences with geographical or cultural focus should create a dialogue between theatre historians and specialists in dramatic literature in a most effective way.

More effective relationships could be established between theatre historians and those involved in production and the training of actors. The chief difficulty for the architect is that he should be creating a house for contemporary

drama and the wholly unpredictable directions that the future may take. It was, however, pointed out that historical theatres, the ones most frequently cited as the successful buildings of past ages, can be used with equal success by contemporary producers. Unsuspected positive values sometimes emerge from the performance of a play in a theatre for which it was never intended; such experience is valuable in teaching both directors and creative artists, developing an awareness of the relationship of the architectural envelope to the effect of the play. Teachers of acting should make more constant reference to the continuity and tradition of the art. There is little to be said for the teacher or the performing artist who pretends that the theatre exists only in the present. On the other hand, there is little to be said for the historian who refuses to go beyond documentary evidence to make an analysis of events and their contexts.

Theatre history is as extensive a field as political history. The political historian may be expected to become expert only in one period or one country. The curriculum in theatre history has tried to make everybody equally good in everything. The usual general historical course, with visual examples, provides only the background for the theatre historian; confronted with special fields or periods he is inadequate. He may not be able to evaluate, for example, seventeenth-century stage design because of insufficient knowledge of the aesthetic and cultural context. Once again, the problem is the breadth of the field, the masses of information, and inadequate time for training. As a result, doctoral dissertations are frequently attempted by students with impoverished backgrounds. An editor cited a long manuscript on an experimental theatre in New York City which showed no knowledge of the European background which inspired it or the ambience of the decade in which it struggled for existence. Here it was felt that the behavioral scientists had much to offer to theatrical historians, not just measuring techniques, but aids to insight and interpretation. The theatre historian needs a background in both anthropology and psychology, fields which are making major contributions to modern historical methods in general.

Theatre collections, in addition to serving historical research, can contribute both directly and indirectly to student production, even to that outside the theatre arts curriculum. Student producers and designers should be free to consult the holdings of such collections to evolve ideas either of what they will or will not do in their own performances.

The theatre of today is based on the theatre of yesterday, and the theatre of tomorrow will be based on the theatre we all know. The theatre historian discovers information about the theatre of yesterday, preserves information about the theatre of today, and thus prepares for the theatre of tomorrow.

CHAPTER VIII

THEATRE LITERATURE AND CRITICISM

The Committee:

HASKELL M. BLOCK, Comparative Literature, *Brooklyn College*
JOHN D. HURRELL, English, *University of Minnesota*
MARTIN MEISEL, English, *University of Wisconsin*
WALTER MESERVE, English, *University of Kansas*
GERALD WEALES, English, *University of Pennsylvania*, Chairman

IN THE PUREST SENSE, DRAMATIC CRITICISM IS CONCERNED WITH ILLUMINATING THE play as a work of art. The critic may often turn to biography, history, aesthetics to assist him in his work, but his primary concern must always be dramaturgical: *how* rather than *what* the play means. Dramatic criticism, as presently practiced, is largely the province of dedicated amateurs, trained, if at all, in the analysis of literature but without the equipment for evaluating the special characteristics of a work which is designed for performance.

Theoretical works on the art of the play are abundant, but few of them are sufficiently aware of the process by which the drama achieves its ends. To provide the dramatic critic with the tools for improving his own performance disciplined research needs to be carried out in such subjects as the following:

(1) *Language.* We really know very little about stage language—its relation to the actor, to the character, to the audience. How many of its effects come from conventions outside the play, how many are dictated by the play's action? How does the speaking of a line alter its meaning? To what extent are the implications of a line—clear enough on the page—lost in the theatre where there is no time to ponder it? Are repetitions pedagogical or aesthetic? Are echo effects supposed to be recognized or simply responded to? In fact, how much of the language is calculated for emotional rather than intellectual response?

(2) *Gesture.* The same kinds of questions need to be asked about the silent language.

(3) *Spatial relationships.* Where are the people on stage? How does the action dictate their positions and how do their positions modify the action? In a television production of *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray,* the scene in which Mrs. Cortelyon comes to take Ellean away was played with a great many close-ups. The total effect of the scene was lost. Paula's realization that Mrs. Cortelyon's kindness is an insult and her reaction make dramatic sense only to a total social context; seeing the scene fragmented by the jumping camera revealed how much Pinero depended for the effectiveness of his scene on the audience's seeing all the characters at once.

(4) *Temporal relationships.* Why do the scenes in a play fall into a particular sequence? Can the play retain its central action if the order of scenes is changed? If the sequence of lines within a scene is altered? How much is the audience expected to remember? At what point can an insignificant detail be introduced, at what distance from the moment in which it becomes significant?

(5) *Character.* Although much has been written about theatrical stereotypes (stock characters) and social stereotypes, there is still work to be done on the playwright's dependence on them. Research into off-stage role-playing and the player's consciousness of his role should contribute to our understanding of stage characters from the standpoint of the playwright, the audience and the character himself. There is work to be done on mannerism as a reflection of character and as a creator of it. Laurence Olivier's recent statements about building a character from the outside in, about beginning with voice and gesture, should interest the drama critic as more than an indication of how one actor works. To what extent does the playwright and the audience act as though the interior man is defined by (even made by) his exterior behavior.

(6) *Sets, costumes, lights.* These are, of course, related to the problems of spatial relationship. A knowledge of the available mechanical techniques at any period is necessary to our understanding of how a playwright used or avoided them in achieving his total effect. Research into the production or the proposed production of a play, however idiosyncratic its conception, may contribute to our reading of the play. When Shaw told Ellen Terry that if he were directing *Hamlet* at the Lyceum, he would have her play Ophelia's mad scene in an English garden, was he making a serious critical point or only conversation?

Dramatic criticism will also be stimulated by the more ready availability of certain materials. Commercial publishers can take little responsibility for keeping the vast repertory of the theatre in print; consequently critics are tempted to write over and over again on the few playwrights who are "in the market." To enlarge the field of activity they need extensive bibliographies of published plays, and union catalogues to direct them to the location of unpublished manuscripts. The great collections of the latter should be carefully examined with the purpose of making accessible texts of historic or aesthetic interest. A systematic program of reprinting works that have been allowed to go out of print and, particularly, responsibly edited collected works of important playwrights would be of major value.

The bibliographical and publishing projects as well as the research studies proposed above would be of direct use to the practicing critic, but they would also play a significant part in the education of students with interest or talents in the field. Students would also benefit by free access to the work of production departments and much greater opportunities to experience live theatre. Playgoing fellowships to enable students to study performance in this country and abroad, as observers and participants, are as important as the internship of a doctor of medicine, combining a specific and concentrated experience of theatre with the stimulation of the unfamiliar and the unexpected.

Commentary

Criticism as an approach to the arts in our society and in past societies is a form of knowledge, a thing and a value in itself. The critic does not address the playwright, nor is it his function to say what kind of plays should be written. His primary job in the university is to create audiences rather than to train creative talents.

The ideal critic reacts to the performed play. He must make certain assumptions about what a play is trying to do, as well as observing what it does, and from the difference between the attempt and what is actually delivered comes a value judgment on its mechanism. The important questions he must ask himself therefore are 1) what particular response is being created at a given point;

2) what particular aesthetic value does this particular structure have; 3) can it be repeated; 4) what happens when a familiar play is seen a second time?

The real problem for the academically trained critic is that today for the ·first time an unstable society and strange far-out forms of literature have come together. There is a genuine communication gap between what playwrights are creating and what certain trained theatregoers expect to see. The same combination increases the difficulty of making students understand the values on which older plays are based.

Hitherto students (and scholars) have drifted into dramatic criticism as into theatre history. They have come to both through their experience in the study of the history and criticism of literature. There are no established methods for training specialists in dramatic criticism, no existing curriculum to answer the special needs which the present situation has created. A summer institute in theatre history *and* criticism might have the same fortunate outcome as the institutes in linguistics, for example, converting a peripheral subject into an independent discipline.

APPENDIX A

Selected Conference Papers

Research in Theatre History

By O. G. BROCKETT

I. *Nature and Scope of Theatre History*

The purpose of theatre history is to describe and explain the theatre as it has existed at specific times and places and to trace its successive changes. Like other branches of history, it seeks to provide a record of the past; in addition, it explores the causes and significance of events and seeks to set them in the appropriate artistic, intellectual, social and economic context, and to relate them to the total development of the theatre.

Theatre history has had a varied career. It attracted a number of scholars in the ancient world. Aristotle, for example, is known to have assembled a relatively complete record of the Athenian theatre from the beginning to his own time. In the Hellenistic Age, Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote numerous volumes of commentaries on Classical Greek drama and its production, and King Juba II of Mauretania is reported to have compiled a seventeen-book history of the theatre. Unfortunately most of the ancient treatises were lost, and thus in Renaissance times theatre history emerged as an almost completely new enterprise. The aim of the Renaissance historians was essentially to recreate Roman theatre and drama and to establish a guide for the production of plays in the ancient manner. Many of the treatises seem to us now narrowly pedantic, though at the time they were extremely vital to their audience of classical revivalists.

It was not until after 1700 that works attempting to record the history of post-Classical national theatres began to appear with some regularity. During the eighteenth century such ambitious works as the Parfaicts' several-volume record of the French theatre were compiled, and in England Chetwood and others published histories of the British theatre. Following Colley Cibber's example, actors and managers began to write their memoirs. As the sense of history developed more fully after 1750 and as the potential reading public expanded during the nineteenth century, such works appeared with increasing frequency. These books were for the most part addressed to the general reader and were often more anecdotal than scientific, their aim being rather to entertain than to establish facts.

It was not until the late nineteenth century that theatre historians began to make use of scientific tools of research and to apply rigorous tests of accuracy to materials and their interpretation. Such scholars as Dörpfeld, Petit de Julleville, Gustave Cohen, E. K. Chambers, and W. W. Greg established standards for those who were to come after them. The introduction of more rigorous tests of accuracy, while producing works of far greater reliability, made theatre history increasingly the province of specialists, for the desire to establish the accuracy of

their conclusions led historians into technical discussions which alienated the general reader. The emphasis upon accuracy and scientific method also served to popularize the conception of history as a purely factual study.

In recent years, as our faith in the possibility of achieving absolute certainty has waned, we have come to view theatre history as an interpretative as well as a factual study. Although the aim of history is still to reconstruct a true picture of the past, "historical truth" is now thought to include a greater awareness of the enormously complex context in which "facts" appear, as well as of the influences which color each historian's interpretation of it. Furthermore, since history is most interesting when it views the past in the light of modern interests and problems, each generation finds it essential to reexamine subjects previously thought to have been adequately covered. This continuing need to reassess the past has increased the demand for knowledgeable and sensitive historians.

Although there is a trend away from the overly-technical approach in the writing of theatre history, it will probably not return to the popularizing form of the eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Nevertheless, there is now a larger potential audience for theatre history than at any time in the twentieth century. The study of theatre in colleges and universities has stimulated interest and provided basic knowledge in the field. Thus, theatre history is now in a position to serve not only specialists but a wider and more sophisticated audience.

Theatre history may appeal to many interests. First, and perhaps most fundamental, it may satisfy that basic human desire to understand more fully an important institution. Since the theatre is one of man's significant creations, its history is an important humanistic study. It may also serve more specialized needs. It aids in the understanding of the present theatre by showing the conditions out of which it has come, and may give insight and guidance for the future. It can also be a source of inspiration for practicing theatre artists by providing information and suggesting possibilities which may be adapted or transformed for modern audiences.

The scope of theatre history is extremely broad, for there is scarcely any aspect of human experience that is not at times relevant to it. Furthermore, the theatre itself is extremely complex, incorporating as it does so many elements from other arts: literature, the visual arts, music, and dance. Thus, a vast number of interests may be included under the general heading of theatre history: attempts to define the place of the theatre in various societies and cultures, to describe the theatre arts as they have been practiced in successive periods, to trace the major movements and styles and their interrelationships, to study individual artists and their contributions, to outline the artistic, social, intellectual, and economic milieu, and other similar topics. The scope may be further indicated by listing some of the typical areas of research: playwrights and plays, theatre architecture, theatrical management, directors and directing, actors and acting, scene designers and scenery, stage properties, machinery and special effects, costume designers and costumes, lighting, stage make-up, audiences, and theatrical criticism.

Theatre history should be extended as well to include such popular entertainments as variety and music halls, vaudeville and burlesque, pantomime, motion pictures, radio and television, since concentration upon the production of the "literary drama" has often obscured the importance of these activities to the history of the theatre. Studies of music (especially opera and musical comedy) and

dance (especially ballet) also contribute much to our knowledge of the theatre.

Thus, the nature and scope of theatre history are such as to require both learning in the broadest sense and very specialized knowledge. As in other types of historical research, theatre history involves three basic steps: (1) the discovery and collection of pertinent evidence, (2) the criticism of evidence, and (3) the communication of results. Each is essential, and all require special skills.

II. *Materials for Research in Theatre History*

The first task which faces the theatre historian after he has formulated a line of inquiry is the discovery of pertinent information. Unfortunately, a large share of the materials for theatre history is of unusually ephemeral nature. The theatrical performance exists briefly and then is gone forever; when we seek to define its quality or to reconstruct the process by which it came into being, we must depend principally upon accounts which are partial and personal.

As in other types of historical research, the materials for theatre history may be divided into primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are those which form a first-hand record of the original event: the prompt script, the stage upon which the play was performed, the scene and costume designs, photographs, engravings or other visual records of the production, reviews of the performance, and so on. It is such primary materials that the historian must seek out whenever possible. When he cannot find such records he may have to depend upon secondary sources, or accounts removed from the event itself: the playscript without any indications of how it may have been adapted for performance, descriptions of the stage and visual elements, second-hand reports of the performance, and so on.

The kinds of materials needed by the theatre historian are as diverse as theatre history is complex. Some of those which must be available are:

1. Scripts
   Playscripts (especially as altered or adapted for a specific production)
   Prompt books
   Actors' "sides"
   Motion picture scenarios, radio dramas, television scripts

2. Music
   Musical scores for theatrical pieces (operas, musical comedies, ballad operas, melodramas, etc.)
   Incidental music used for specific productions as indicated in play scripts, prompt books, motion picture scenarios, etc.

3. Dance
   Dance notations (or scores) for specific productions
   Other indications of dances (types, descriptions, etc.) found in scripts or in separate form

4. Legal Documents Relating to the Theatre
   Deeds of property or assignments of rights
   Contracts (relating to buildings, actors, designers, dramatists, etc.)
   Decrees, laws, or regulations promulgated by rulers or governing bodies designed to affect the theatre or theatrical personnel
   Probated wills

5. Official Records
   Records maintained by governments: didaskalic records of ancient contests; Office of Revels accounts; Lord Chamberlain's records; copyright and patent records; licenses for theatres and plays; records of payments or production arrangements by guilds, municipal governments, court officials, etc.

Accounts and day books of theatrical companies and producers
Correspondence of producing groups, government officials, etc.

6. Advertisements and Playbills
Posters   Playbills
Programs   Other forms of publicity
Newspaper advertisements and announcements

7. Original Designs, Sketches, Plans, Elevations
Buildings   Costumes
Scenery   Lighting
Machinery   Properties and special effects

8. Other Pictorial Materials
Photographs of productions, actors, dancers, settings, costumes, buildings, etc.
Engravings
Easel and vase paintings
Sculpture and bas reliefs
Frescoes and other wall paintings
Floor plans and diagrams for buildings, machinery, special effects, etc.
Motion Pictures

9. Artifacts
Architectural remains   Machinery
   of theatre buildings   Recordings and tapes
Costumes and masks   Prompt books
Settings   Tickets
Lighting instruments   Programs
Properties

10. Personal Accounts
Autobiographies   Diaries
Interviews   Memoirs
Reviews   Letters
Contemporary novels, plays, etc., which give details of contemporary life

11. Theoretical Treatises
Playwriting   Properties
Directing   Theatre music
Acting   Theatre architecture
Scenery   Theatrical dance
Lighting   Audience and audience psychology
Costume   Theatre aesthetics
Makeup   Motic . pictures and television

12. Historical, Biographical, and Critical Accounts
Compilations of theatrical annals
Accounts of specific events, periods, and movements
Biographies of persons associated with the theatre
Critical evaluations of the work of playwrights, actors, directors, and other theatrical per-
   sonnel
General histories of the theatre
Cultural and social histories

This summary of appropriate materials might be rearranged in a number of
ways to indicate more specifically a relationship to each of the theatre arts, to
particular periods, movements, countries, or personalities. The compilation as
given, however, should be sufficient to indicate the wide range of materials re-
quired in theatre history and the difficulties likely to be involved in gathering
evidence.

41

Although the kinds of materials needed by the historian for a specific project may be easily identified, it is no simple task to locate them. There are now a number of excellent theatre collections, but few have systematically acquired materials according to pre-established standards of inclusiveness. As a result they often have extremely wide ranges with little depth of coverage, or may have excellent primary materials in a limited area without adequate supplementary items. Because of the haphazardness with which many collections have grown, it is extremely difficult for a scholar to determine the location of the materials he needs for his research, or even if the materials have been preserved. The size and reputation of some collections make them obvious sources to consult; clues can also be gathered from the footnotes, bibliographies, and prefaces of scholarly works in the same general area of inquiry; much time can usually be saved by consulting such works as *Performing Arts Collections; An International Handbook;* and researchers through experience develop many short-cuts of their own. None of these methods is very precise, however, and sometimes scholars spend as much time in locating the appropriate collection as in using the materials after it is found.

Furthermore, the materials in theatre collections are often inadequately catalogued, in large part because so many of them are not in the form of books and periodicals, the typical content of libraries. Ephemeral items, such as programs, posters, engravings, designs, scrapbooks, pose difficult and time-consuming problms for cataloguers. A single engraving, for example, may be pertinent to a specific author, director, a number of actors, a scene designer, and so on. Seldom, however, is it indexed under all of these. The researcher consequently cannot assume that the catalogue of a collection will guide him to all of the available evidence and thus he may need to undertake independent searches in order to uncover the material he is seeking.

Regardless of the difficulties, it is one of the scholar's responsibilities to judge when he has acquired sufficient evidence for his particular research. It is seldom possible to know with certainty when all of the pertinent evidence has been found, but it should be an article of the historian's faith not to be content until he is reasonably sure that his search is complete. If adequate evidence cannot be assembled, then either the historian must content himself with essaying tentative judgments or abandon his topic for another which can be answered more satisfactorily with the available information.

III. *The Criticism and Use of Evidence*

Although the discovery of evidence is indispensable, it is merely preliminary to the historian's principal task, the intelligent use of the evidence. At this stage, the scholar's critical faculties must be exercised in a number of ways.

First comes the task of authenticating the documents which have been discovered. Historians have often gone astray through the indiscriminate use of evidence without due regard for the possibility that documents may have been forged, altered in some way, inaccurately dated, or that they may be faulty in some other way. The historian must establish as clearly as he can the authority of the materials he uses.

The authentication of documents often requires quite specialized skills

or knowledge. As examples, the authentication of engravings depicting stage
settings may require considerable knowledge of the history of engraving and the
styles of various engravers, whereas the authentication of prompt books may
call for knowledge about particular prompters, their handwriting, and so on.

It is unlikely, however, that a single researcher will have all the skills or in-
formation required to meet every situation. Consequently, he must often de-
pend upon others in this phase of his work. Most frequently he relies upon
the curators of theatre collections to determine the provenance of the materials
in the collections. The accuracy with which this task is done depends in large
part upon the available personnel, and those collections which can offer trust-
worthy aid to the historian do much to simplify his task. It is important that
the scholar receive reliable help, for the value of his research depends in
large part upon the validity of the documents he uses.

Second, the historian must make some estimate of the reliabilit; of the
information contained in the documents, since even authentic materials may
contain completely inaccurate information. In dealing with a written descrip-
tion of an event, the scholar needs to ascertain whether or not it is an eye-wit-
ness account, how much time elapsed between the event and its recording,
whether the witness had any reason to distort what he saw; in looking at a
painting of a theatrical scene, he needs to know whether or not the artist was
setting down what he saw on the stage or merely creating from his own imagina-
tion; for a theatre building he needs to know whether the structure has been
altered since it was built; and so on.

The processes involved in testing the reliability of evidence are too complex
to describe here, but are outlined in a number of works on historical method.
Nevertheless, it is pertinent to point out that they often lead the historian
through mazes of biographical, economic, social, legal, political, philosophical,
religious, and other materials and that he must be capable and willing to pur-
sue the path wherever it leads. The degree of confidence with which the his-
torian can speak and the reliability of what he has to say is largely dependent
upon the care he has taken to verify the evidence he uses.

Third, the historian must interpret his evidence. Even if he is sure that he
has authentic documents and reliable information, in most cases he must
still seek to discover the significant patterns which lie behind the evidence.
Occasionally a historian may merely record the facts he has uncovered, but
ordinarily facts are merely the foundation of historical writing. The historian
aims nct only to describe a particular event but to explain its meaning in its
own time and for theatre history in general. He is ultimately concerned with
causation and significance, the most difficult questions one can pose. Con-
sequently, it is in the interpretation of evidence that the historian's personal
qualities of mind and training are of maximum importance, for it is here that
he enters the realm of value judgments.

The interpretation of evidence requires that it be placed in a relevant
context. Unfortunately it is no small task to decide upon the relevant context,
for in any period it may include the literary and artistic movements of the
time, the social, political, and philosophical interest of the day, the psychologi-
cal states of the participants, and so on through a multitude of possible de-
terminants. Although one may say that all of the relevant factors should be

considered, this is seldom possible in a single work and one or more of the elements are usually emphasized above other possible ones. No historian can· treat every aspect of a question and his work would probably become an endless and repetitious treatise if he attempted to do so. The clear definition of the questions being asked is the safest guide in determining which aspects are essential and which merely peripheral.

Although the ideal of objectivity in historical writing is often stated, it is an extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, one to achieve. Nevertheless the historian can learn to be aware of his own prejudices and to take them into account in his evaluations. While a degree of subjectivity may be inevitable, it cannot excuse the deliberate suppression or distortion of evidence in order to bolster a prejudice or to prove a thesis.

Good historical writing gives exciting and perceptive views of the past, but not even the best can recreate an event in its entirety. Consequently, no historical account is apt to satisfy all readers or to retain its admirers more than a generation or two, for history is a dynamic process in which the past is constantly being reexamined in light of present interests; its attraction lies in large part in its relevance to our own situation and as interests change so do the interpretations of past events.

Historical writing, therefore, depends as much upon the interpretation of events as upon the factual evidence which forms its basis, and it needs to be read with a critical eye both for the view which has shaped it and the evidence which is used to support that view. Although the interpretation of evidence differs somewhat with each historian, a few basic patterns are discernible.

First, the historian may place primary emphasis upon the theatre as a social and cultural institution and thus may concentrate upon the theatre as an expression and outgrowth of social, political, economic, philosophical, or psychological forces of a particular time and place. Other antecedents, such as myth and ritual or national and racial characteristics, may also enter into such accounts.

Second, the historian may emphasize that the theatre is a product of individual artists. Thus he may adopt a biographical approach and describe the lives and works of those persons who were most prominent in the theatrical activities of specific times and places.

Third, the historian may emphasize the process by which theatrical performances come into being. He may seek to describe how the various theatre arts have been practiced in different periods, concentrating upon the procedures followed from the origin to the completion of a theatrical production.

Fourth, the historian may seek to describe and analyze the product—the performance in the theatre as seen by an audience. Here the principal concern is with the art object, and consequently considerable attention may be paid to stylistic, formal, and aesthetic questions.

Obviously few historical accounts stay within the limits of any one of these approaches, for most incorporate elements from all. It is impossible to designate one approach as more fruitful than another since the value of each is determined by its usefulness in answering the particular questions being pursued.

Historical accounts may also be classified according to whether they concentrate upon a limited topic or attempt to cover a wide sweep of time and place.

Both are important. The limited, specific study is essential to provide a firm basis for the broad, synthesizing study, and in turn the general study can supply background and perspective for the limited study.

In the use of evidence, then, the historian must bring all of his critical faculties to bear on the authentication of documents, the verification of their contents, and the search for significant patterns of meaning.

IV. *Communicating the Results of Historical Research*

Although a scholar may undertake historical research merely for his own enlightenment, a much wider audience benefits when the results are put in a form which can be transmitted to others. Ordinarily we accord the title of theatre historian only to those researchers who have published accounts of their work. Thus, the ability to write well is one of the skills needed by every historian.

We have come to recognize that the emergence of the professional historian near the end of the nineteenth century was accompanied by a marked decline in the popularity of historical writing with the general public. History became, and to a large extent remains, the output of specialists intended for an audience of other specialists. It is perhaps inevitable that a large proportion of historical writing will appeal only to a limited group, but it should not be accepted as inevitable that historical accounts must necessarily be dull fare. We have a right to expect clarity, precision, and stylistic excellence from our historians. It seems especially unfortunate that an institution so inherently exciting as the theatre should so often become soporific in the histories written about it. The ability to write well should be considered as much a qualification for the historian as the other skills demanded of him.

Even the best of writing, however, will not make certain types of works interesting to the general reader. Some of the most useful of existing works and others which should be compiled cannot attract a large public for they are essentially reference works designed for specialized use. Nevertheless, we should still demand of them clarity, accuracy, and an efficient format.

V. *The Training of Theatre Historians*

Little conscious effort has been made in the United States to train and develop theatre historians. Traditionally they have been educated in literature. Departments of theatre, with a few notable exceptions, have done little to provide leadership, and for the most part the major historical works have been and continue to be written by persons other than those trained by or working in theatre departments.

The problems of training theatre historians are intimately bound up with curricula. In the majority of colleges and universities, the entire history of the theatre is compressed into a single semester of study. Furthermore, it is often taught by an instructor whose major training and interests lie in some other aspect of the theatre. In small departments with limited staffs, this may be inevitable, but even large departments often do not have an instructor who has been trained specifically in theatre history and the number of courses in the area is usually woefully limited.

Planners of curricula should recognize that there are at least three major reasons for teaching theatre history. First and most basic, it can provide an overall view of the theatre's development as an institution. Approached in this way, theatre history may be relevant to the education of all students regardless of their goals. Second, theatre history may provide a foundation for the theatre arts. Currently courses in theatre history and theatre practice are clearly separated and, though it is often stated that each is relevant to the other, little is done to demonstrate in what ways this is true. As a result, theatre education often proceeds along two distinct paths—the "academic" and the "practical." Adequate curricular planning should break down such barriers rather than encourage them. Third, theatre history may be approached as a field of learning to be mastered through the study of each period in depth. These three goals may be achieved in a single program, but each requires a different approach and, if all three are to be pursued, a series of courses which progresses from the general to the specific is needed. Too often the goals are not differentiated and none is adequately provided for.

In comparison with historians in other fields, those in the theatre now have little opportunity to develop an area of specialization, either as students or as teachers. In art or literature it would be thought absurd to train persons as historians of an entire field, the typical approach in the theatre. Art and literary historians traditionally specialize in a period or country, and, though this may not be the answer for theatre, specialization of some kind is essential if a scholar is to produce works of distinction.

An efficient scheme for training theatre historians has yet to be validated and probably cannot be standardized. Still, more thought and care must be devoted to the attempt if historial research is to make significant advances. Revision in the teaching of theatre history and in the training of theatre historians is needed if the field is to attain that excellence which the subject merits.

Behavioral Science in Relation to the Theatre
By NORMAN FREDERIKSEN

In considering possible contributions of behavioral science methods to a study of the theatre, I think first of the application of testing and personnel procedures to selection of students, prediction of success, evaluation of various kinds of instruction, and so forth. These all seem to be very reasonable things to do. But such approaches require a criterion, some measure (or measures) of success as a student, actor, playwright, director, or whatever. Judging success in such areas is a highly subjective business, and one can be sure that judges will not always agree. But apparently we must use subjective evaluations, since the performance of an actor doesn't yield a product that

we can count or weigh. Whose judgment should we choose to employ as a criterion in work on selection, prediction, and training evaluation?

The first step might be to study the domain of subjective evaluations of dramatic productions or performances, with the aim of identifying various "schools of thought." One might, for example, ask judges who represent a variety of backgrounds and points of view to evaluate a number of performances of some sort, perhaps recorded on videotapes. This procedure would yield a matrix of data, each row of which would be the evaluations made by a judge of all the performances. Comparisons of the correlations between rows would probably reveal the existence of clusters of judges who tend to agree with each other and to disagree with other judges. One can then look to see if the members of a cluster have something in common (e.g., all young or all English professors or all plumbers) or to see if the performances that they agree are good (or bad) have something in common (e.g., restrained performances or clear enunciation). On the basis of common characteristics of the members of a cluster or of the performances they like, one can make an interpretation of each school of thought. The next step might be to choose one or more of the points of view as worthy of study, try to develop improved methods for evaluating performance on the basis of each, and proceed with the work on student selection, prediction, and so on, using not necessarily one but several criteria of goodness or performance. Such studies have been successfully done in the areas of artistic production and creative writing.

A problem of importance is that of the nature and generality of "creativity." An opportunity to study creativity in a setting where the advice and help of scholars in the field of drama would be available should be welcome. The criterion problem is similar to that discussed above, and it might have to be solved before going on to a study of correlates. Once one or more criterion measures are available, correlational studies could be undertaken to find out what traits or abilities characterize those who are high on each particular criterion of creativity. Similarly, one can investigate the extent to which those found to be "creative" in one aspect of drama are also creative in other aspects of drama and in completely different areas such as science. In such work it would be important to investigate the extent to which the phenomenon of creativity can be accounted for in terms of cognitive abilities that are already known, such as verbal and reasoning abilities, perceptual speed, ideational fluency, cognitive rigidity, etc. Multivariate statistical methods are available for attacking such problems; the principal difficulties would be in developing suitable ways of measuring "creativity."

There are no doubt many theories about the qualities of a good performer or playwright. For example, it might be supposed that the good actor may be exceptionally good in social perception or social sensitivity—in abilities to empathize with others, to understand others, and to make accurate predictions about how others will respond in new situations. Or it might be hypothesized that a good actor would be able to perform with "abandon"—to temporarily discard social constraints and taboos in giving a performance. One might expect a "constricted" person to be a poor performer. Such theories might be especially interesting to psychologists because of their implications for personality theory or even for therapeutic methods. Will training a person as an

actor affect his personality in other situations—will he become less constricted or better able to size up others? Can acting "with abandon" be taught? Would improvement in ability to act with abandon be associated with a similar change in tendency to overcome constraints in painting, music, social interaction, even scientific thinking? In other words, how much transfer to other areas would take place? Investigations of such questions are feasible provided satisfactory methods for measuring the appropriate psychological attributes can be found or developed.

Possibilities for Experimental Research in Theatre
By GEORGE GUNKLE

I. Communicator Processes (Actor)

The actor may be looked upon as playing at least two clearly distinguishable information games: one with the script, during the rehearsal period, with the emphasis upon decoding techniques; one with the audience, during performances, with the emphasis upon encoding techniques.

A. Encoding Problems
  1. Use of Feedback
    a. kinesthetic
      A seemingly universal problem among actors in performance is that of knowing where the body is in space and what it is doing without, of course, the benefit of some external device, such as a mirror. The degree to which an actor is able to utilize this form of feedback with respect to his spatial relations may have some bearing on such problems as: making adjustments to improve stage compositions without direction; making adjustments to the relation of himself to the audience ("cheating," "staying open") without constant comment from the director. I suspect that some such ability to use kinesthetic feedback influences vocal behavior, as well, insofar as the sound about to be delivered must involve some vocal musculature anticipations in order to insure as much as possible that the right thing will emerge when the time comes. Until such muscle positionings are habitual, kinesthetic feedback is probably used (largely during rehearsal).

    b. auditory
      The actor's ability or inability to hear, for example, differences between a rising inflection and a falling inflection, is a learning problem. In general, any checking of his own sound during the process of making it so that subsequent adjustments can be made may well be a part of an actor's equipment.
      Making adjustments to audience reaction (such as loudness and duration of laugh responses in a comedy played before an audience)—such adjustments as how long to delay before the delivery of the next line or movement—seem to depend in part upon an ability to use auditory feedback from the audience.

  2. Co-ordination
    The execution of vocal delivery in a pre-planned pattern which has been timed with movements of various sorts (place-to-place; "business") must become standard technique

48

for actors. Involved here, too, is the proper execution of line delivery, business, and move-
ments in ensemble with other actors on the stage (such as "picking up cues"). One of the
things underlying the degree of success a person is likely to have is, in some sense, his
"co-ordination," his ability to independently control various of his information modalities
(a multiplicity of vocal and visual variables) in time. It would be useful to devise a way
of estimating "co-ordination" for entering drama students, those who audition for plays,
etc. Of even greater importance would be development of some estimator of the degree
to which individuals can be taught to improve on this dimension, the amount of time
it would take, etc. (See #7: Rigidity-Flexibility.)

3. Inventiveness

This should be distinguished from "creativity." I use the term "creativity" to refer to
the multiplicity of decisions made by theatre artists in the choice and combination of
elements (representing manifold decisions) which eventually become a production (the
script, the behavior of actors, the influence of directors, the additions of lighting, setting,
costume, make-up, etc.). Here, creativity = choices.

Inventiveness (with reference to the encoding process of actors) may be summarized as
the avoidance of stereotypes. There would appear to be a fruitful field of research here.
The stereotype (statistically, perhaps the "mode"; behavior which is overwhelmingly
expected, given the circumstances of the script) might well communicate with the highest
reliability and the least satisfaction. Too great an avoidance of the stereotype may pro-
duce in an audience a sense of bewilderment or confusion, though it may hold interest.
If there is a continuum, then inventiveness would lie somewhere on it in a direction away
from stereotypes, bounded only by the desire to still get the information across. A success-
ful choice here might result in a reaction (from sophisticated observers) of "Well, yes,
of course! In such circumstances, persons do that, but I had forgotten that they do."

4. "How much to do" (synchronic redundancy)

It seems clear that successful acting involves some sense in the actor of the total context
of information as it accumulates for the audience during the unfolding of the play in
time. When a point is made sufficiently clear by the dialogue (at a particular moment),
good actors exercise considerable economy in their choice of what visual and vocal be-
havior should accompany it. When a moment is ambiguous, often good actors will "do
more" with their behavior to reduce ambiguity (unless ambiguity is desired). One sense
of the common use of the term "overacting" seems to refer to an actor who "does too
much," i.e., the point has already been made by the dialogue and seems to require "less"
from him in behavior than he gives. On the other hand, there are occasions when the
dialogue (and/or the accumulated information possessed by the audience) is quite clear
yet it is expected the actor will produce "much" in the way of behavior. In these latter
cases, it may be simply that the language is of high intensity and the actor must do some-
thing to be consistent with it.

In short, this variable seems to be indicated by the general feeling in the field that it
isn't only what an actor does that is important, but also that he know when not to do
anything—or to do very little.

5. Memorization

A standard task for actors. What facilitates it? (the rhythm of lines, for example? other
characteristics of the message?) What makes it difficult? (change-of-sequence points in
the dialogue?) These, of course, are message variables. Perhaps there is something about
persons which varies here. (Theatre jargon will classify one actor as a "rapid study,"
another as a "slow study.") What is the best approach for actors to the memorization of
lines? What makes the delivery of them sound memorized? How can this be avoided?

6. Tolerance of Imprecision

This may not be very important. When actors have a "mental block" either in rehearsal
or in performance, or when directors try to tell actors too much too soon, something like
"tolerance of imprecision" may be operating here. There are times, particularly in rehear-
sal, when an actor simply cannot go on until exactly the right word comes to mind; or

the actor will repeat compulsively a particular line until the exact rendering is found. There are tremendous anxieties aroused at such times and a great waste of time.

7. Rigidity-Flexibility

How rapidly can a person "set" habits? How strongly does he tend to cling to them, once set? How readily can his habits be relinquished and new ones developed? If the rehearsal period is to be looked upon as a climate for trial-and-error and the subsequent develop- ment of habits, such questions are of paramount importance to a director, who usually has only 5-6 weeks to work with the actors he is casting. If a director is concerned with, as he may be, "how well an actor can take direction," *some part* of this may have to do with a far more general syndrome of rigidity-flexibility. What already exists in an actor's repertoire of responses is also of tremendous importance, and depending upon his "rigid- ity," may take on even greater importance. ("Type-casting" is often looked upon as an undesirable way of coping with this problem.)

8. Imitativeness

There may be some overlapping here with the immediately preceding variable. There is some disagreement in the field as to whether, for example, actors should listen to pro- fessional recordings of the plays they are working on. Also, some disagreement exists as to whether and to what extent a director should "show" an actor what is desired. The general feeling seems to be that this will stifle an actor's inventiveness; yet perhaps a distinction should be made between *decoding* inventiveness and *encoding* inventiveness. To imitate a bit of encoding behavior at the level of "basic technique" seems hardly to have anything to do with inventiveness. Surely much of one's behavioral repertoire has been acquired through imitation of some sort. Yet: if the total vocal behavior of a re- cording were imitated by an actor, this would imply no *decoding* decisions on the part of that actor. This, I think, is what is generally objected to in the field, but since the distinction has not been made clear, directors become inhibited about showing actors *anything*, which I think is a limiting factor in the speed with which an actor acquires a repertoire of conventional *basic* encoding techniques in the theatre.

If, on the other hand, much of what an actor learns *is* learned through imitation, then his ability to do it may be an important variable.

9. Anxiety (arousal)

What are the independent variables which relate to the internal arousal state of an actor in performance? Example: work collected by Donald W. Fiske and Salvatore R. Maddi, *Functions of Varied Experience* (Homewood, Ill., 1961, pp. 17-54), would suggest an op- timal arousal state in performance; less than this, and an actor goes "stale"; too much, and his "complex" behavior breaks down. In what ways does the arousal state influence external behavior?

B. Decoding Problems

This is related to Person-Perception in psychology. The actor's problem might be termed "person-perception through limited information channels." He must (we think) come to know a character in a script, probably approaching the problem as he would in knowing a person in everyday life. However, his only channel of information is dialogue (like tran- scribed conversation) plus some occasional stage directions by the playwright. Tendencies to cluster personality traits may be of significance here. The whole matter of the language used in talking about others becomes significant (as Heider has called it, our "naive psychology"). Psychological projection may be a variable accounting for uniqueness of interpretation (for actor *and* director) and may be perfectly "legitimate" in "art" games (vs. "life" games).

Perhaps most importantly, just what is the relationship between the actor's decoding ac- tivities (script analysis; interpretation) and his encoding activities (technique, i.e., what to do with voice and body as instruments of expression)? Is it necessary to utilize a method or approach to decoding? Can this be bypassed? After all, the audience never *sees* the decoding process; only, presumably, its results in performance behavior. Perhaps, for some actors, there is *only* script memorization and performance behavior (with minimal attention by the di- rector) and no awareness by the actor that he has engaged in any decoding process.

II. Message Characteristics

This should be of particular interest to those with a playwriting orientation (i.e., message, here = play). What are the components of suspense? What makes an "obligatory" scene *obligatory*? What in the play contributes to the arousal of sympathy or antipathy in the audience towards one or another of the characters? How does punctuation (and other orthographic conventions) contribute to influence performance behavior? What makes a character seem "life-like"?

In another sense of message (message = totality of information transmitted from the stage to the audience), we may inquire to what extent the various channels of information can be made to work together for an effect (synchronic complementation)? In what ways do they compete (synchronic conflict)?

III. Audience Variables

A. Social Facilitation (relation of audience to itself)

More specifically: number of persons in audience and seating arrangements (close together, far apart, etc.) may be variables for study. Of particular interest is the frequency and loudness of laugh responses to a comedy. (Laughter in the theatre, as a dependent variable, may be influenced by so many things that it may form a research subject of its own, with audience, message, and actor variables particularly relevant to it.)

B. Physical Relationship of Audience to Action

Specific variables here are *distance* of audience from action; *angle* of audience in relation to action. But what *dependent* variables should be chosen?

In general, it may be well to note that so-called "audience response" studies are still rather virgin territory; there has never been a really good and useful determination of what *dependent variables* are measurable, relevant, significant. What are the significant parameters of "audiences"? Or: what *do we want to have happen* in the audience when a production is taking place?

Research in Theatre Architecture

By HAROLD BURRIS-MEYER

There is a lot of confusion in the thinking of theatre people, particularly our academic brethren, about what is research and what is engineering. I suggest that we undertake to clear that up. For a starter I submit that research in theatre architecture and design embraces but is not confined to the defining of the problem. It is the wrong definition of the problem—which could have been set right by rigorously tested research—that has gotten us much tragic non-

sense: the theatre mechanized to economic and artistic absurdity, the pliable or boil.r plate band shell, and other discredited but still arrogantly prompted concepts.

Also, almost every theatre project requires some research to develop the design objectives from the postulated, assumed, studied, and projected local needs and functional requirements. So theatre research becomes a function of planning the individual theatre. It cannot be limited to the development of general principles. The general principles in theatre architecture and design which are universally applicable are not very many. The parameters are established by people. We might well, therefore, seek a research pattern or check list to be followed by people who want to build, rebuild or adapt theatres.

There are many straight technical phenomena which it would be good to know more about, if you can call that research: flexible orchestra pits, parking, panel curtain rigging, portable theatres, air-supported roofs, paste-on lights, to name a few.

We could profit by some instrumental study of audience behavior under varying acoustical conditions in areas where the showman now works on the basis of tradition or unverified theory, and we ought to study presentation techniques on the basis of audience response. This might give us some solid facts to help evaluate the bear pit stage or the cafetorium. Further, time and motion studies of audience behavior would help in providing design objectives for all audience requirements.

All of which leads to the conclusion that anything new that is discovered about audiences or technical devices has a bearing on theatre architecture. A few subjects for research are: new light sources and luminous and luminescent panels; 3-dimensional projected scenery from laser; portable theatres (the theatre as well as the stage and equipment in a truck): time and motion studies of audience traffic—tickets, coat room, parking, street to seat; air-supported domes —their economics, technical advantages, and limitations; the effectiveness of various theatre forms as measured in audience psycho-physical response to standardized presentation.

Research in Theatre Engineering

By GEORGE IZENOUR

Research in Theatre Engineering means to this writer a program of development concerning all aspects of the physical plant or building which can, in engineering terms, best be described as the production machine, and which has been described poetically, not by engineers however, as consisting of two planks and passion. The poetic inference can logically be interpreted as: one plank for the actor, one plank for the audience, and what passes between them is passion. It has been true traditionally, and still is, more or less, that the design

of the physical appurtenances of the theatre is the responsibility of someone other than a performer, director, or stage designer for the simple and obvious reason that a theatre building is classified as a public space; this puts it in the public domain where building codes which provide for the public safety are a requirement. To the same degree this is also true where the stage is concerned.

Historically, the production machine (building and equipment) has always accurately reflected the state of engineering science of every age; and it is no accident that the "deus ex machina" is a theatrical creation, be it a simple Archimedean pulley or lever system, a Vitruvian drop curtain, a daVincian counterweight winch system, or an elaborate computerized electronic control system for lighting, rigging or lifting which very quickly lands us in the Twentieth Century.

In theatre, as in other activities involving engineering, people tend to be conservative if a capital investment may be required. There are countless examples of an obsolescent man-machine relationship being maintained long after it has become impractical and uneconomic. Yet it is these very man-machine relationships that are the basic concerns of engineering.

The practicing engineer has always thought of machinery as the logical extension of man, and until only recently this extension has had to concern itself principally with organic sources of energy, i.e., the muscles of other men or animals which severely limited in space and time that which could be accomplished. This is no longer true now that the cosmic source of all energy has been made available in ever-increasing amounts and at an ever-lowering cost. And to say that this will not profoundly affect the theatre production machine is to be guilty of the same non-think of many who like everything about modern city life except its high-rise buildings and its transportation system, and we all understand that a modern metropolis is impossible without either. Granted that the precise man-machine relationships have yet to be correctly established, established they will and must be.

The modern theatre is of this age and, to use the contemporary expression, it had better "get with it."

The present research activity in theatre equipment engineering is, by comparison with that in other specialized fields of engineering, almost nil. This writer knows of only one university laboratory where theatre engineering is presently being pursued. And the picture is little better where the theatre equipment manufacturers with their limited budgets and untrained engineering staffs try as they will to improve matters. The situation is even worse where the building itself is concerned. Theatre buildings are historically the province of the architectural profession, which in North America is almost without experience in the field since no buildings to speak of, except in educational institutions, have been planned or built in the last forty years.

It is essential that theatre engineering research laboratories be a part of every graduate program in theatre arts. The basic disciplines long associated with engineering must become better understood by the theatre in general, and by those individuals who operate at the technical level in particular. Technical research, since it must somehow be subsidized, cannot logically be carried on anywhere else. Such a program would logically produce theatre

engineers who could then provide the design knowledge and who would be licensed to practice in the public domain. And I will go even further and say that theatre engineering does not deserve to be recognized as a profession until its practitioners are willing to assume public responsibility for their professional acts.

Once the personnel, who do not now exist, are trained, the broad areas where work can profitably be done are structural design, mechanical design, control systems design, acoustical design, and cybernation (integration of man and machine). Each of these five broad categories can be subdivided into a myriad of projects sufficient to keep a dozen university laboratories going twelve months of the year. The solution that will allow this work to get started is enough university laboratories supported by modest annual budgets (in thousands of dollars only) to allow their progress to be measured in failure so that buildings which cost millions can be measured in success.

Research in Stage Lighting

By CHARLES ELSON

Research in the area of stage lighting is usually confined to the scientific and technical craft aspects. Private enterprise has pushe advances in light sources, smaller and more efficient housings, elimination of solid circuitry, remote control of direction, focus, and color, and the compacting and humanization of control boards.

I contend that, by and large, stage lighting requires intense research as an *art expression*. Of all the visual elements of the theatre, lighting in this century is able to make the most profound contribution through its realized potential as an expressive interpretive force. Rarely, however, is this potential fully achieved by most lighting practitioners who seem to be satisfied essentially with visibility and the obvious cliché contributions of color, form, and movement. They are basically craftsmen who aspire to the results of artists.

The fault is not theirs. Their training in school or in the field is rarely capable of developing artists. It is easy to master the technical aspects, but it is most difficult to understand and make tangible the subtle *aesthetic* virtues inherent in lighting.

It is in this area that I recommend subsidy for research. What is urgently needed is a series of organized demonstrations done with light to indicate fully the interpretive possibilities of what Professor McCandless long ago designated as the qualities: intensity, color, form, and movement within the context of the functions of visibility, relationship to nature, composition, and mood.

As a distinct example of a needed study, let me cite the lack of understanding of color as it relates to all the functions. Rarely does one encounter a discrimi-

nating approach to the use of color. Most designers, unequipped to realize its full potential, resort to a handful of safe personal clichés, applying them to a variety of types and styles of drama regardless of their specific needs. A lighting designer should understand and handle color with greater creativity than the most practiced painter since each playscript inherently demands its revelation in its own terms. In this instance I am proposing a thorough study resulting in practical demonstrations that makes clear how the hundreds of colors, their intermixing and reflection from colored surfaces, are subject to the specific demands of the script and its other visual components.

Scene Design Problems
By ELDON ELDER

With the rapid expansion and changing trends in the theatre in the United States at this time special new problems for the designers are arising. The areas of investigation in the field of scene design which the Office of Education might recognize and could support in a series of programs seem to embrace several diverse aspects of scene design in America today, but they are all in some way connected to this rapid expansion and change in the theatre of the mid-Twentieth Century.

There is very little pure research in the area of scene design. This implies that any programs relating to scene design should be placed where there are proper laboratory facilities, specifically a theatre or theatres with collaborating staff available to carry the studies to completion through practice and experimentation. However, there are certain areas of scholarship relative to scene design which need exploration, amplification, and analysis.

Essentially all the programs divide into two parts: finding information through research, experimentation, and/or scholarship, and, making that information available to theatres, to designers, or to schools and universities that are interested and wish to make use of, and benefit from, this information.

Designing for Repertory

With the rapid growth of repertory and professional regional theatre there are special problems in design for both designers and producers to solve. As yet no one has examined in an organized fashion the problems peculiar to repertory theatre design or proposed methods to train personnel to solve them.

A program to study and analyze the problems of design for repertory theatre in America with recommendations on training methods and procedures to prepare the designer who wishes to address himself to this important new aspect

of our cultural life could have wide reaching values and long term significance.

To implement this program it would be necessary to support a related research program to collect and organize material and information on all the important, long-established repertory theatres of Europe. Once completed this research should be made available through the establishment of a central archival research center equipped and staffed for easy and practical dissemination of information to scholars, university drama departments training personnel for repertory, and to the repertory theatres. This should probably include travel abroad for scholars to research and record the necessary information as well as staff facilities to put it into organized useful form in the repertory archive. The theatre in America has a very short heritage. Modern scene design in America is no more than 50 years old. It is necessary to extend our brief heritage with knowledge of the experience of the theatres and information on the design art of Europe.

Preparation of the designer for his new role as consultant

Today's theatre requires the designer to take an active part, to be pivotally involved, in all aspects of the visual theatre. The rapid growth in theatre is responsible for this. The designer often becomes part of a team to develop and organize a new theatre—under best conditions this implies developing a theatre concept and form as well as designing the stage and scenery. More specifically this is the designer's preparation for the role of consultant as well as scene designer and stage decorator. It is rapidly taking on great importance. A plan for training in this area merits study.

Studies of new materials and new methods

Studies of new materials and new methods that might be made available to the designer should be carried forward under real conditions of real value. The experimenter must have theatre facilities in which to try his materials and methods.

Clarification of the standards of certification for the professional designer

The artistic genius of the designer is largely intangible. It cannot be measured by formulae or a predetermined set of rules; but the technical and mechanical skills and training necessary for the professional designer can be measured, and standards can be recognized. This work could be carried out in conjunction with the United Scenic Artists of America or with them as a cooperating agency. Parenthetically, I have specified professional, not to separate it from non-professional design standards, but simply because I believe good designers are professional designers, whether their work is in the "commercial" theater, the university, or the repertory theatre. All other designers who are not "professional" are amateur. Therefore, to standardize *professional* certification is to set the guide lines for all good designers.

The problems of quality scene painting in American theatre

The art and craft of scene painting throughout the United States is in jeopardy. Scenic artists are not being trained in sufficient numbers to service the commercial theatre in New York City, not to mention the regional and

repertory theatres across the nation. The scene designer has become divided and separated from the art of scene painting. Yet these skills and this artistry are necessary parts of his equipment. Furthermore, the designer and the scenic artist have become separated, and often almost alienated, one from the other. They should be reunited as a team. Two areas of training seem to be indicated: a study to develop methods of training the scene designer in the art of scene painting; one to develop methods of training the scenic artist both to lift the level of work and return the art of painting to the theatre. The objective would be to satisfy the indicated nation-wide demand for excellent scenic artists.

Research in Theatrical Costume

By PATTON CAMPBELL

After the preliminary readings of a script have been completed the research process in theatrical costume design begins. This is the first and essential step before the making of sketches, and supervision of the execution of the costumes themselves. Costume research is accomplished in three areas: verbal, visual, and actual. In literature and in history we frequently find quite specific descriptions of clothes and accessories. These can offer beginning clues to form, color, and detail, but ultimately will require verification from paintings, prints or photographs of the period in history concerned. Pursuit of visual material leads to museums and libraries where pictures of any given locale and period in dress are often available and carefully classified.

The diversification of visual research is one of the fascinations of the costume profession. For *Man of La Mancha*, for instance, the paintings of Velasquez were an obvious and invaluable inspiration for Quixote's family, whereas material for Aldonza and the muleteers posed more of a problem. The amount of source material available for low-life characters in a period production often seems to be in inverse proportion to the distance in time. Except for Rembrandt most of history's great painters preferred to portray kings and queens rather than beggars and whores. My search led to the sketchbook of the German, Christoph Weiditz, who visited Spain in 1529. In his primitive drawings of Moorish peasants I found plentiful ideas for the rough characters who drink and carouse at the Inn of La Mancha.

Other productions had led to *The Queen*—bound copies of the English fashion chronicle—for Douglas Moore's operatic adaptation of *Wings of the Dove*, to Kabuki prints for the New York City Opera's *Mikado*, or to movie magazines of the 1940's for small town girls in a musical about World War II.

Ideally, however, one wants to look if possible at actual sources, clothes and accessories which were actually worn in a given period and place. At the

Brooklyn Museum's Design Lab and at the Metropolitan Museum's Costume Institute it is possible to see at close hand articles of clothing dating from the Sixteenth Century. One can examine the clothes, put them on figures, sketch them and ultimately make specific cutting patterns with details of trim to be used in the workroom.

How could these methods of research be improved? A vast amount of visual material has already been assembled by such brilliant costume historians as Laver, Cunnington, and Davenport. Such studies must be encouraged and fostered in future generations, of course. But a great deal remains to be done to preserve visual documents which are fragile and in danger of disintegration. In searching for Western women of the 1890's it is heartbreaking to leaf through a Sears Roebuck catalogue and feel the pages pulverize in one's fingers. In the great libraries much is already being done with microfilm, but it is difficult to draw accurately from a mechanical viewer. Much could be done to organize and supplement visual materials for theatrical libraries in the manner of the New York Public Library's Picture Collection.

What about the actual clothes? A sample of 16th Century Spanish lace can be touched only with the utmost care. In time it will disintegrate altogether. So, too, will all the dresses and frocksuits now hanging in the Brooklyn or Metropolitan museums. A means should be found to photograph each garment in color on a figure, and then to make cutting patterns in metal or plastic which will record permanently these valuable but perishable sources. The maintenance of the present collections is costly and actual use of them limited only to those who can afford expensive memberships. And these are not within the range of a talented young designer in a school or community theatre. Further subvention to widen their usefulness is imperative.

In the area of the costume sketch the designer's work becomes most intro- spective. Research at that point must be within himself. It is then that he de- cides how to use the facts he has accumulated to best express the intent of the play for which he is designing. He may want to utilize what he has learned literally, in a realistic manner, or to adapt and stylize it according to the de- mands of the production as a whole. In any case this is the area of choice, and the most personal part of a designer's efforts.

In the final stage, the execution of the costume itself, research could be done in the development of new techniques. The costume business is tradi- tionally a backward one, often cleaving to out-moded methods of production. Any designer learns from experience to catalogue his own sources of supply and personnel for a given job. My own address book has headings like "Athletic Emblems," "Crown Jewels," "Thrift Shops." Would it not be useful if ANTA could supply school and community theaters throughout the country with source lists covering the principal metropolitan centers?

Lastly, new fabrics and materials can be useful for costume execution. A dancer's costume, delicate and fragile from the front, must have the durability of a football uniform. It is subjected to hard wear, sweat, and frequent clean- ing for eight performances a week. The costume business is one of subterfuge: lurex cording is crocheted to simulate chain mail, patterned fabrics are often re-embroidered to give them proper scale for the stage. For the armour in *Man of La Mancha* I developed a method of casting an actual suit and helmet of the

period so that it could be duplicated in durable light-weight plastic for an army of a thousand if necessary.

Almost all the costumes in that production have been exposed to the "breaking-down" process—one which never fails to dismay the craftsmen who have labored to make a new costume of strength and beauty. They wince when they see their work frayed with scissors, roughed up with a wire brush, dumped into tubs of "dirty" water, then sprayed and splotched with dye solutions and hung over nails never to be pressed again. Dyes and paints for costumes need to be developed to withstand wear and cleaning. The costumer's concern is that such coloring processes be permanent so that the production will look the same after a year's run as it did on opening night. Ultimately, of course, it is for the audience—the first one or the last—that we have done our work, and for them that we want to perfect our techniques as artists.

Theatre Teaching in the Elementary School

By JUANITA D. FLETCHER

Two forms of educational theatre are used in the elementary school: creative drama and play production.

Definition:

Creative drama is an educational device which is centered on an experience or a story and skillfully guided into a learning experience. It differs from play production in that it exists for the participant rather than for the audience. Further, structured dialogue, formal scenery, lighting, and costumes are not used. The children produce their situations, create their own dialogue, and use very little or no scenery or costumes.

Aims:

This form of theatre is especially valuable to the elementary school teacher because it is closely related to the aims and objectives of the elementary curriculum. In addition, the concerns and interests of the child are used and so there is no conflict between teacher-evaluation of need and pupil motivation.

The aims of creative drama are specific for each experience. Some objectives may be related to the formation of a sense of values, the development of insight into self, the formation of attitudes toward parents, school personnel, school, study, and the development of poise in the practice of social amenities. Since children frequently express their own problems in a creative dramatic experience, the objective may be to effect a catharsis, or to help the teacher reach a better understanding of the child.

Subject-matter centered objectives may include: the development of insights

59

into the lives of people of a different age or civilization; comprehension of certain difficult concepts in either science or literature; the development of appreciation of the arts.

Values:

Creative dramatic experiences promote a better understanding of self and a consequent improvement of self-concept. Because it affords opportunities for free use of oral expression, creative drama makes a valuable contribution to language arts programs. Fluency in speech provides a basis for the acquisition of skills in reading and writing. Perhaps the greatest asset is that it utilizes the natural inclination of children to "pretend" or "play act" and turns it into a learning experience.

Creative drama is of value in teaching such atypical children as the slow learner, the gifted child, the deprived child, the handicapped, as well as the average student.

Sources:

The sources of creative drama are many. They include stories excerpted from subject-matter content, fairy stories, poems, rhymes, and myths. Children's own experiences very often provide an opportunity for enactment. Holidays and seasons and environmental occurrences are easily adapted to creative plays.

Such motivational materials as the stories and poems are selected carefully. They ideally contain some element of conflict or a problem in the plot. The objectives and interest level of the class really determine the choice of material. Pictures may be used for further motivation.

Variations of Creative Drama:

The same story or situation may be enacted several times using different actors. A variety of interpretations usually results, and the plot takes sharp turns according to the cast. The dénouement for each production is quite unique, and the teacher must be very discerning, perceptive, and alert so that he may guide the children in relating the outcome of the play to the purpose of the lesson without forcing it.

Puppetry is another form of creative drama which is in popular use in the elementary school classroom. The objectives are the same as for creative play. However, children frequently find greater freedom of expression through the use of puppets than in personal enactment. It seems that the individual child is relieved of the responsibility of what is said and how to say it since the puppet is doing the "speaking." Often the child who is afraid to speak becomes quite loquacious as a puppet-master. Self-consciousness about the expression of emotions is lost when the puppet speaks. There seems to be a naturalness of expression in a puppet show which is sometimes lacking in a creative play.

The children make their own puppets out of readily available materials such as cardboard, papier maché, sticks, strings, etc. The stage and setting may be entirely imaginary, or may be real.

Since puppets' faces are rigid, communication depends to a great extent on vocal expression. Therefore, the motivational material must contain opportunities for strong characterization. Such strong characters are essential because

they must serve to inspire the young artist in the creation of an interesting puppet.

As in creative play, the sources for suitable plot material may grow out of the subject-matter content of a lesson, or it may be found in fairy tales, etc. The number of characters appearing on the stage should be limited, and movement should be an integral part of the plot.

Play Production:

There are occasions when the elementary school child participates in the presentation of one act and three act plays and musicals for an audience. This form of theatre is not as universally used by the average classroom teacher as is creative drama. However, an elementary school may present plays once or twice a year.

When a play is being presented for an audience an entire class or drama club or student body may be involved in the actual production, but the gifted children are usually the ones selected for speaking parts.

Objectives:

The objective of such a presentation is primarily for the entertainment of the audience. Emphasis is placed on smoothness of production. Secondary aims are related to the growth and development of the production staff and the actors.

Procedure:

A teacher with some training in drama, or a drama coach is assigned to direct the production. The presentation is regarded as co-curricular or extra-curricular activity, although the play may grow out of the curriculum and return to enrich it.

Casting, the building of scenery, rehearsals, etc., follow in a general way the usual procedures for the presentation of a play.

Other Activities in Drama:

Groups of elementary school children frequently attend seasonal performances of ballet, puppet shows, plays, etc., produced by community groups and by professionals. Such performances are discussed and evaluated in the classroom.

Theatre Teaching on the High School Level
By WALLACE SMITH

The first problem in discussing high school theatre is one of definition. There are so many ideas about the art and content of theatre that it is impossible to indicate that any one is true of the whole nation. For purposes of this paper I would define theatre as the art that is:

1. A synthesis of the experiences that each participant has had.
2. The art that uses Man as the medium by which the final result is achieved and as the final result itself.
3. A social art, having existence as a whole only during performance.

It is important to define the art of theatre so that some understanding of its place in education can be made, and so that it may be taught with the best effect by the most qualified teachers.

Too many statements of the alleged contributions of theatre to secondary education have been in the form of subjective evaluations of activities and attitudes, often without other substantiation than a kind of faith that all this is true. Therefore, the place of theatre art in education is hazy, distorted, and likely to be bound up with objectives and values attributed to all fields or to other fields, like English, supposedly allied to theatre.

As a result, a teacher of theatre is seldom sought by high school administrators and the actual educational values seldom realized. The true values of the art cannot come in education unless the art is taught by qualified people.

Theatre is essentially a non-literary, non-verbal art. Its inclusion as parts of other subject matter of which these statements are not true confuses the issue and distorts the view of the art by the students, keeping them from reaching full possibilities in the field. Especially in dealing with numbers of culturally disadvantaged, where reading and verbal use is at a low level, theatre may provide a chance for students and may find persons of ability whom verbal and other intellectual tests and measures miss. More work needs to be done in this area.

It is the hope that those who teach theatre in secondary schools will see:

1. Theatre instituted as a creative, non-imitative art wherein students are freed from the necessity of following an older person's standard as determined by the adult's view of Broadway.
2. Artist-teachers who accept their responsibilities as *teachers* at the high school level, and who find the opportunities for artistic expression that exist there: teachers who will train for this particular level of the profession.
3. The achievement of a *real* theatre in secondary schools, living because it is part of the lives of high school people NOW, not as a shade of what may be in the future or has been in the past.
4. A theatre based on the young people who work in it, and taught by teachers who know the psychology and capabilities of adolescents.
5. A theatre based upon its actual values to education and recognized as part of a curriculum, avoiding the generalized illusions that have plagued it so long.
6. An education opportunity that will enable the artist-teacher to develop in his field as any artist must. Too many teachers now continue what they were taught in graduate school or college without opportunity to adapt it to the high school, or to learn what artistic values there are in a true theatre.
7. A theatre that is based upon serious study and worthwhile performance, and not a therapeutic course to solve student behavior problems, nor an interesting "activity" or hobby for those who have time after real work is done. Very little theatre teaching can take place during production or preparation for it. In production one learns what to avoid and what tricks can be used to get by in a hurry.
8. A theatre in curricular study that is best for the so-called "amateur" who profits himself and his community by learning the values of theatre in properly controlled situations, and does not gain illusory concepts in a performance before adults with further illusory concepts.
9. A theatre that does what a real subject must do to fit into education:
    a. Teach something fundamental to the lives of the people.
    b. Teach something that cannot be taught by some other subject.

Theatre Teaching on the College and University Undergraduate Level

By HENRY WILLIAMS

It is an irony of education in America that teachers in the arts, who are most concerned with imaginative expression and revelation of the human condition, have themselves been among the least articulate educators. We have, for example, no acknowledged pedagogical theory in theatre education to use for references or departures when we discuss the problems of our field. That is to say, we have no structured propositions that deal with the learning process of the theatre student and that influence our practice accordingly.

Basis for a theory clearly exists. One may infer from the declarations, considered proposals, and practices of theatre educators that *they believe the theatre to be an important and complex art of intrinsic interest which deserves thorough study.* The currency of such an article of faith furnishes promising ground for building a teaching theory, if we confess at the start that our field has followed and conformed to the dispensations of sponsoring institutions, instead of asserting its identity and insisting on its prerogatives.

The most significant feature of the basic belief of theatre educators is its valuation of the theatre as an art. This allies our field with music and the fine arts in education, even if most of our programs originated in relation to those fields termed the language arts or communication arts. The reality of our alliance in education with music and the fine arts appears in our notions about desirable students and what should happen to them, for we have common ground here with our colleagues in the other arts fields. At bottom we are more concerned to find those elusive qualities of talent, imaginative faculty, and aesthetic apprehension than we are to recognize intellectual agility, shrewdness in perceiving logical relationships, and the gift for manipulating propositions.

I would suggest that we know the educational process in a student of theatre involves more than the appreciation and mastery of appropriate bodies of knowledge. It entails a vital development of the spiritual self as sense perceptions sharpen and the ability to express inner realizations becomes more viable. Without denying the usefulness of conventional knowledge to the theatre student, it is important to assert that the learning process in art can be effective only when meaningful self-development takes place.

Proceeding from this generalization and drawing upon experience, I think we can describe the outline of successful development in a theatre student and therefrom determine the function of the teacher and the learning situation. This development seems to fall into four stages.

I would call the first of these stages *initiatory*. At this point in his experience the student is a neophyte making his first significant encounters with the art. These encounters provoke in him an intense self-awareness and a desire for fulfillment through participation. Lacking objectivity, his trial flights are unwittingly imitative; indeed, he thinks, conceives, and executes imitatively.

Second is the *formative* stage, in which our student is motivated to investigate the field and its possibilities for him. His viewpoint is still fundamentally subjective, but he is very receptive to outside influences and aware that he is absorbing them.

Now comes the *productive* stage; the student is committed to the theatre and will seek a career in it. An important thing happens: objectivity becomes an attribute of his efforts and he is more truly interested in the work of others than he has ever been.

Finally, the *creative* stage. He can stand alone. The student is disciplined, which is to say he knows his limitations, and is involved in working out his style of expression.

The objective of theatre education, I take it, is to help the student achieve the creative stage. It follows that the teacher's work is not simply to nurture and guide the pupil in the earlier stages but to assist him in passing from one stage to the next when ready. If so, we face the prospect of abandoning or ameliorating the single standard of student evaluation which now obtains in a higher education. This means, for example, accepting a college sophomore in the initiatory stage despite his being among peers in the formative stage; he will know less and have fewer skills, but if he has promise for one in the first stage then his progress should be evaluated accordingly instead of his being expected to match the achievements of his fellows in a higher stage of development. The outcome is a *pluralistic standard* of evaluation.

How justifiable is it to confer baccalaureate or graduate degrees in an arts field merely because the student has satisfactorily completed a requisite number of courses? If pluralistic evaluation becomes a necessary fact, the logical consequence would be to have the faculty confer the degree only when the student is ready to enter the next stage of development, e.g., the baccalaureate degree conferred only when the student is ready for the productive stage.

Another worrisome issue has to do with the dissimilarity of the campus experience to the professional world of the theatre. Is there not a disparity between the donnés of the student's campus theatre and the donnés of his professional situation? As things stand, we may advise him of the differences, but we thrust him forth without specific preparation. Internship or something like it might go far to bridge the gap, which can be a chasm, between the features of the learning and the professional situation.

University theatre can be faulted for policies of play production that slight educational objectives, for neglect of research possibilities into the theatre as a performing art, and for curriculum content and structure which is imitative of pedagogy in other fields of study. But several avenues lie open to greater effectiveness in theatre education. Among them are those which call for a kind of practical research which circumstances have not heretofore favored, but which might be possible through governmental assistance.

In the area of play production standards for college and university theatres, for example, an impediment to improvement is the comparative isolation of campus theatres from each other. Performances seldom undergo evaluation by competent outside judges; self-tolerating criteria are justified in this vacuum and campus productions thus serve more of a public relations function than an

educational one. Regional field secretaries and program observers, qualified to lend professional counsel to limited producing situations and objective evaluations to well-established programs, would go far to raise the quality of theatre production in colleges and universities.

A limited concept of theatre research also inhibits the likelihood of theatre education's making significant contributions to the American theatre as a whole. The most respected programs of graduate study tend to equate "research" with historical studies of drama and theatre. Meanwhile venerable hypotheses in acting and staging await rigorous testing; virtually all areas of theatre technology and design need critical examination; innumerable generalizations concerning the aesthetics of the theatre and drama should have intensive study if we are not to continue as careless, prolific theorizers in a field notable for inspired rather than disciplined thought.

The ferment of the past few years teaches us as well that attitudes, methods, and previously unquestioned dispensations are now being challenged in theatre education. A spirit of reform is in the air. In order to proceed sensibly in this fast-moving period—during which we can believe the patterns for the future are being moulded—it would be most helpful to know what has brought about the many revisions of policy that we note in institution after institution. It cannot be coincidence that so many programs have been enlarged, eliminated, or distinctly altered; but no good explanation exists for these developments.

Theatre education has a firm claim to recognition in its fostering of a productive non-professional theatre in this country. Its next mission can be to participate more directly in the creation of a national theatre worthy of comparison with the great epochs of the past. To accomplish as much, theatre educators must doff the policies of expediency which have marked this field in its initial stage of growth and move boldly but rationally in new directions.

Theatre Teaching on the Graduate Level in Colleges and Universities

By MONROE LIPPMAN

Theatre as an academic discipline is dichotomous. On the one hand are involved its humanistic aspects: its history, its literature, its theory, its criticism; on the other are included its artistic or creative aspects: the art, craft, and techniques of playwriting, acting, directing, design, technical production—all those facets which, in their totality, constitute the essence and reality of the living theatre. Adequate and proper theatre education should include both segments of this duality, for neither can be really meaningful without an understanding and appreciation of the other. This is not to say that at the graduate

65

level (which is the concern of this paper) the program for the potential scholar or scholar-teacher and that for the potential artist or artist-teacher should be the same; but since the scholar must understand the art and craft with whose historical, literary, and theoretical aspects he is primarily concerned, and since the artist should have an understanding of the historical, literary, and theoretical aspects of the art which he practices, the differences should be essentially a matter of emphasis rather than kind.

The primarily scholarly nature of the Ph.D. degree should be preserved; that is, the doctoral program should be based on research in history, dramatic literature, criticism, and/or theory. But none of these areas can be really meaningful without an understanding of the theatre's artistic aspects. A theatre historian is not likely to be effective as a teacher or scholar without a knowledge and appreciation of the living theatre and its practical components; dramatic literature cannot be genuinely understood or effectively taught without a solid knowledge and understanding of the art which takes the literature off the printed page and puts it on the stage for which it was written; criticism cannot be valid without an understanding of the practice with which the criticism is concerned; and no significant body of theatre theory can evolve from minds that are theatrically ignorant. It therefore follows that doctoral study in the theatre cannot be effectual without either the prerequisite or the provision of a solid understanding of the living theatre, its practices, and its problems. The *ideal* preparation for the theatre scholar-teacher would include an M.F.A. or professional program before undertaking the Ph.D. program. It is true that many brilliant scholars would not perform outstandingly in such a program, but exposure to one would nevertheless prove beneficial. Short of meaningful professional experience, such training as a basis for a sound scholarly education would provide the best kind of preparation for effective and authoritative teaching in the field of theatre.

Before considering the nature of the professional program (by which is meant training for a career as a professional theatre practitioner) let us recognize that many of the requisites for sound scholarship and many of those for theatrical artistry are simply not the same. Let us explode once and forever the myth that earning (or worse, merely receiving) a Ph.D. degree makes one a theatre artist. Although there doubtless are some scholar-artists, they are much more the exception than the rule. There are many fine scholars who are not, cannot be, and do not want to be artists, just as there are many fine artists who are not, cannot be, and do not want to be scholars. It is high time that university administrations be educated to this fact, and to the recognition that the artist-teacher may perform a valuable educational service for the university without being a scholar and without possessing a Ph.D. degree (two conditions which unfortunately do not always coincide). Until the administrator is convinced of this fact, theatre education will continue to suffer from the present too frequent practice of assigning scholars to what should be professional courses, and artists to what should be scholarly courses.

If universities are to offer professional education in theatre (and such education is certainly as valid as that in the law, medicine, architecture, business administration, and other professional fields in which universities now offer

training) it seems best that such education be offered at the graduate level, for these reasons: (1) a liberal education is important to the theatre professional (as to others) in today's and tomorrow's increasingly complex world; (2) rigorous professional training for the theatre requires emotional stability, a degree of maturity, personal security, and genuine (rather than merely romantic) dedication. These qualities are much more likely to be found in the student of graduate school age than in the undergraduate.

Professional training should vary in content with the purpose of the specific area of training. For the actor, it should include thorough training in voice, speech, movement, acting techniques (both inner and outer), textual analysis, and character analysis. For the director (who, with the designer, should certainly have a liberal education first) it should assume or demand a meaningful knowledge of theatre history, dramatic literature, and theatre theory, and should embrace the study of acting techniques, directing techniques, and enough knowledge of design, costuming, and lighting to enable him to plan intelligently and communicate effectively with designers in those areas. For the designer, it should include the study of design techniques, lighting, costuming, and enough basic directing to lend an understanding of the actors' and directors' problems and a sense of the physical stage.

Finally, but importantly, the professional theatre program should be articulated with the profession by means of a good professional company (ideally but not necessarily within the university) through which the talented product of the program might find the opportunity to serve an internship under professional conditions, comparable to that served by young medical doctors after completing their professional education and before embarking fully on the practice of their profession.

The Changing Aspects of Instructional Technology
By ROBERT HEINICH

Fundamental changes are occurring in the nature and use of audio-visual materials that will profoundly affect the audio-visual field in particular and school organizational patterns in general for many years to come. Patterns of teaching methods, classroom and school organization, school design, and administrative structures all will be affected by movements now well under way. The changes are not just a matter of developments within the traditional audio-visual field but also in the creation of new means of communicating ideas and presenting instructional content.

From the time when audio-visual materials were first produced for school use up to a few years ago, production and use of films, filmstrips, etc., could be characterized by the adjectives, *random* and *supplementary*. Films for the most

part were produced in isolation with little attempt to build integrated and comprehensive libraries. Production planning by film companies usually centered on individual titles that could find a reasonable market. This helped lead to overproduction in some areas and scarcity in others. Every now and then someone ventured forth with an integrated series of four or five films but this was unusual.

Perhaps the first indications of the changes ahead were the pioneering groups of films correlated with textbooks by McGraw-Hill. This was about 15 years ago. The idea remained at that level until a few years back when larger and larger integrated groups of films started to appear, climaxed by a set of 162 films containing the content of a complete high school course in physics.

The success of the physics series led quickly to similar groups in chemistry and in the Humanities. The Ford Foundation sponsored the first twelve films in the Humanities series which now boasts 34 releases already on the market. At this time a total of 75 films, designed as the heart of a high school course in the Humanities, is planned but Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, the producer, is leaving the final number open. This series has successfully brought the instructional efforts of some of the best teachers in the country and the talents of some of the best actors on the continent into direct contact with high school students.

As a result of his experience in the Humanities series, Clifton Fadiman, long a foe of educational media, told the National Council of Teachers of English in *The Role of the Humanities in the Secondary Schools*:

It grew out of the recognition that, as far as method is concerned, Western education is marked by three decisive breakthroughs. The first was the invention of the school itself, pioneered by the Platonic Academy. Here instruction was largely oral, therefore limited in effect. The second breakthrough came toward the middle of the fifteenth century, with the invention of movable type. The mass-produced book, a technological extension of the Academy, became central to education. And now comes the third breakthrough, a technological extension of both the book and the academy. This is, of course, the whole complex of technical devices—television, films, records, tapes, and why not Telstar?—whereby for the first time in history the teacher and the universal audience can in theory be brought together at a single point in time.

The Rocky Mountain Area Project, with headquarters in the Colorado State Department of Education, has had outstanding success in bringing the Humanities to small high schools by way of these films. In remote and isolated towns of Colorado, the films would be followed by amplified telephone dialogue between students and the principal lecturer in the particular film in a dramatic demonstration of how technology can help humanize the curriculum.

Concomitant with these changes is a change in attitude regarding the status of films in the curriculum. The word *supplementary* used to be almost inseparable from film. Now, however, film is assuming a more basic role in the classroom. The relationship between teacher and film began to change until now, with the EBF Humanities series, for example, the teacher actually shares his classroom with the film instructor.

In addition to the changes in traditional materials, new concepts in audio-visual instruction have concentrated on techniques geared to give direct instruction rather than act as supplementary aids. Learning laboratories, first

used to teach foreign languages, are designed to present to the student pre-pared units of instruction in a manner not possible in normal classroom situations. Teacher and electronic device work as partners.

While the console presents the instruction to the students, the teacher con-centrates on checking individual progress. The more the teacher can be relieved of drill work, the more time he can devote to developing individual student skills. But note the concept of shared responsibility during the lesson.

The introduction of television into the classroom has had an even greater effect in certain cases. In some colleges and universities, complete courses are taught via television. In most applications of television, however, shared re-sponsibility between the classroom teacher and the TV teacher is the rule.

Programed instruction, via teaching machines or other techniques, is designed to present instructional content to the individual student in a manner that permits the student to proceed without necessity of presentation by the teacher. The teacher may be present, but his role in relation to the student has changed.

Technological development may never reach the point at which we can de-fine education as the student at one end of a log and a computer at the other, but we will move further in that direction. It is not too far fetched to speculate that in 20 years perhaps one-third of our professional personnel may never come into regular contact with students. They will be engaged in preparing in-structional content to be presented to the student by a variety of devices.

The changing nature of the traditional audio-visual materials and the newer media are all aimed toward the ultimate goal of developing systems of in-structional materials that, when introduced into the classroom, can assume, to a greater or lesser degree, some of the functions of the teacher.

With the development of a technology of instruction capable of producing consistent results, larger and larger units of instruction are being incorporated in a mediated form. Rather than conceived as "aids," mediated instruction may be conceived as self-contained instruction if necessary. This does not mean that the classroom teacher is eliminated, but it does mean that his relationship to media and students has changed.

The acceptance of mediated teaching, as a full professional partner with classroom teaching, has tremendous implications for subject-matter specialists. It means that students in public schools are able to benefit from the instruc-tional efforts of the best scholarship and teaching in the country. It allows a much more direct relationship between subject-matter specialist, school teacher, and student.

When Jerrold Zacharias started the Physical Science Study Committee, whose charge was to revolutionize high school physics, he placed prime reliance on media. Paul E. March, who documented the history of PSSC, put it this way:

Materials are more malleable than people: they could be changed and changed and changed again at a small loss; once perfected, they could be reproduced and distributed anywhere and anytime in whatever quantities were needed. The products of technology, they could be designed to illuminate scientific phenomena, and would keep this integrity in any school in the country. The scientists' concern was not what teachers might do with these materials, but what the use of such materials might do to students studying modern physical science.[1]

[1] Cf. Paul F. Marsh and Ross A. Gartner, *Federal Aid to Science Education*, Syracuse, 1963.

Jerome Bruner, in his recent book, *Toward a Theory of Instruction,* would place prime responsibility for subject-matter content in the hands of specialists whose efforts would be incorporated in mediated instruction. Instruction in mediated form would then be used in conjunction with a classroom teacher within the structure of shared responsibility outlined earlier.

The Function of Educational Media in the Teaching of Theatre Arts

By HAROLD S. MARIENTHAL

Nowhere is the breach between modern technology and the arts more readily observable than in the neglect to use the former to give impact to the latter. The tools of science and engineering have been placed at the service of nearly every investigation into human affairs, except the pursuit to better understand and appreciate the arts, which are, in the final analysis, man's most profound expression of his yearnings and achievements.

No teaching tool will ever take the place of the competent classroom teacher who considers the individual need, capacities, and performance ability of each student. No machine, whether projecting moving or still pictures, is expected to be a cure-all. But, intelligently and imaginatively applied, the audio-visual supplement to the teacher's knowledge and experience can help education take a giant step toward relieving its acute teacher shortage, upgrading the quality of its teaching, and keeping an exploding student population abreast of the kaleidoscopic world in which it lives. It can do much to take the theatre arts beyond the periphery of linguistics and bring alive the colorful and dynamic world of the living theatre.

With this assumption at its base, the following report explores existing educational media, their possible extension to all levels of the educational spectrum, and a proposal for a pilot project to encompass the collection and distribution of existing theatre arts materials, the production and distribution of significant new materials, and the creation of a "Theatre Arts Pilot Center" to provide centralized access to the most up-to-date equipment and assist teachers toward acquiring proficiency in its use.

The following eight production techniques suggest themselves as basic to an effective and complete program structure: (1) Motion pictures, (2) Cartoon animation, (3) Stop motion animation, (4) Overhead projection, (5) Videotape, (6) Filmstrips, (7) Slides, and (8) Audio recordings. Today's student, at home in a burgeoning maze of communications systems, is familiar with most, or all of these. It is their judicious aim at specific teaching targets and their more comprehensive availability in the field of the theatre arts that should result in a much greater instructional dimension.

Motion Pictures:

No existing medium more demonstrably explores dramatic performance on the living stage than the motion picture. Because of its range of editing techniques, no medium is more selectively flexible. What *are* performances like at the theatre of Epidaurus as performed by the Greek National Company? Is the Comédie Française as technically brilliant as we suggest to our students? How glorious for all students of the theatre if a living motion picture record were available for the study of such companies. The application of the motion picture in the teaching of the theatre arts is relevant to all educational levels.

Cartoon Animation:

The cartoon is one of the more engaging teaching tools available for the study of the theatre, and is particularly effective on the lower grade levels. Theatre historians and aestheticians have concerned themselves with acting technique and have written volumes with respect to its theories and practices. No amount of theorizing is as effective as a visual demonstration. How singularly effective and enthralling (especially for the young child) to create an amusing and imaginative character who serves to interpret visually the aggregate theories of scholars. Thus, Thespis becomes Thespucius, Prince Thespian, Sir Fopling Thespis, Monsieur Thespis, Arlecchino Thespis, and Mr. Jim Thespis—in his inimitable way teaching the changing modes of an ancient art.

Stop Motion Animation:

This technique is particularly useful for step-by-step demonstrations, such as the reconstruction of theatres, ancient and modern, treatments of architectural details in context with the whole, and analyses of theatrical designs.

Overhead Projection:

This simple projection device provides maximum flexibility at minimum cost. Its chief advantage lies in its capacity to project a picture, in color, from nearly any available source, to a large assembly.

Videotape:

This brilliant new production technique is only now coming into its own. It offers the greater flexibility of the motion picture without its expense. Its most applicable areas are those where immediacy is desirable. Outdoor, nighttime, indoor, and one-time-only performances may easily be captured on videotape. Interviews with actors, directors, designers, outstanding scholars, renowned theatre architects, together with their visual demonstrations, offer an instructional scope unprecedented in educational history.

Videotape installations exist nearly everywhere in the civilized world. In the United States, particularly, the facilities of the Educational Television Network create a chain of production centers that require only meticulous planning and the creative touch of the producer to open entirely new vistas of instruction in the living theatre. In this connection, it must be noted that for mass distribution of videotaped materials, technology has made possible tape-to-film transfers of highly satisfactory quality.

The great effectiveness of the electronic picture lies in its transmission from a central source to multiple outlets. Its most efficient use, therefore, on all levels of instruction, should be through planned curricula studies telecast simultaneously to more than one classroom situation. This is the function of ETV in the schools today. At the same time, the cost of basic equipment has declined sharply. This has made it possible, in isolated situations, to use videotape for specialized instruction. On the university level, it is a matchless device to teach acting techniques, making it possible for the actor to see himself instantly after completing a rehearsal scene. The subtleties of production, such as lighting, costuming, make-up, and stage movement may be monitored from a central source for closer teacher-student relationship through the use of videotape playback equipment, with such recent improvements as the stop-frame, advance, frame and slow motion. Videotape makes it possible to isolate production strengths until all weaknesses are remedied. It is an objective, impersonal device rather than a subjective and personal view of production. Thus it provides the drama school room with a highly improved form of evaluation.

Filmstrips:

Filmstrips are particularly suitable for gathering such information as is collected in rare books and periodicals. One of their chief virtues is their relative inexpensiveness and the flexibility

they provide to the lecturer in a description of a projected illustration. Considerable research has been conducted by manufacturers of such equipment to insure adaptability to a large variety of projection demands. The latest modification of the "Execugraf" model permits the transmission of sound, prerecorded on tape, synchronized to the filmstrip by ultra high frequency sound blips. This model also features a self-contained screen for projection to a small audience which, in the reverse position, becomes a projector to a large one.

Slides:

Slides offer the least expensive, and in many ways, the most flexible visual embellishment in the teaching of certain aspects of the theatre. Nearly all pictorial material may be converted into slides. With respect to the effective use of slides, the chief requirement for the contemporary scholar and teacher is the basic organization of such materials.

Audio Recordings:

The theatre is seeing *and* hearing. If a picture is worth a thousand words, then a thousand words, if spoken in the right way by the right source, may also create a memorable picture. Audio recording, on film, tape, or records, may capture for students on all educational levels the voices of the world's great actors reading the fine lines of playwrights. For the very young, this is a fine method to hear the child's version of the classics as performed by professionals. Perhaps a slide of the author, or simple slides of the characters accompany the reading for that total audio-visual impact that is so meaningful for students in the elementary school. For secondary school students, or for the undergraduate, an Eric Bentley, singing the atonal songs of a Kurt Weill, goes a long way to capture the flavor of Brecht. The Elizabethan lovesong, injected into the lecture at the right moment, adds welcome color and atmosphere. Tape-recorded interviews with famous personalities, music and sound-effect suggestions for theatrical embellishment, instructional materials by international experts with respect to lighting, scenery, costuming, dialects, directing, publicty and promoton schemes may all be captured on audio devices inexpensively and effectively. Finally, this technique permits group hearings of complete plays by renowned acting companies, a means of introducing the best of theatre that is becoming increasingly popular.

Theatre Literature and Criticism

By GERALD WEALES

There is something vaguely disquieting about an attempt to see the critic in a context such as the one in which we now find ourselves—a survey of research conditions in which grand plans and great projects hover just off-stage in every report. It is the confrontation between one man's mind and the work he wishes to experience (understand? explain?) that leads to criticism. Yet, hopefully, neither the mind nor the work exists in a vacuum. The critical environment is our concern here. To sketch that environment (in the hope that it may be changed for the better), I propose to consider, first, the methods and matter of criticism; second, the tools of the critic and their availability; third, the educational implications.

Let me begin by admitting that there are a variety of approaches to dramatic literature, each with its own validity, but that not all of them are essays in dramatic criticism. Implicit in this stricture is the assumption that it is the function of criticism to illuminate the play, not the playwright, nor his society, nor the history of his genre. Not that there is a firm line between the historian

and the critic. O. B. Hardison Jr., in his *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages,* a study that shakes the foundations of the Chambers-Young version of the development of drama, uses critical analysis to write what he calls "essays . . . in history."

A play is a cultural artifact as well as an aesthetic object. Emphasis on the first of these can lead to research in cultural history. If a play—particularly a popular one—is in some way representative of the society and the time in which it is first produced, an understanding of the explicit and implicit meanings of the play can tell us something about that society and that time. A cluster of plays, making use of similar themes and devices, may reveal the society even more clearly. One of the dangers of this approach is pointless theme-picking—for instance, a descriptive list of American plays in which materialism or homosexuality or loneliness is in evidence. Research in this area is only of value if the material is related significantly to society. At this point, the drama critic joins forces (or borrows the disciplines) of the sociologist, the historian, the political scientist and the psychologist.

The play not only stands in a particular time and place, but at a point on a line that can be called the history of drama. More research might well be done in clocking the points of specific plays and in clarifying the line itself. There is a need not only for detailed studies of periods (the 1930's in this country, for instance) and institutions (the Barker-Vedrenne Court Theatre seasons, for example), but for good general histories that are more than lists and thumbnail descriptions, for works which make clear the relationship between the audience of each period and the inherited or innovational dramatic devices available to the playwright. At this point cultural history and the history of the genre overlap.

Such studies may be the work of the historian, but the critic will hopefully make use of them. Much may be gained by understanding how a play relates in technique and idea to those that come before and after and to its contemporaries, domestic and foreign. It might be well to start thinking about *Candida,* for instance, by recalling that Shaw wrote Richard Mansfield that he could cast Burgess and Prossy if he knew "any pair who could play Eccles and Polly Eccles [in *Caste*] thoroughly well." There are pitfalls to this approach. Rigidity is the main one, the tendency to fasten labels (those of genre or movement) as though a play could be classified as accurately as a butterfly can. Not long ago, in a class studying *Golden Boy,* a student, impatient with 1930's political concerns, wrote a convincing analysis of the play as an expression of existential pessimism. That student may be an argument for further research on the play's place in the history of American drama, but her quite accurate recognition of the personal pessimism that underlay Odets' avowal of leftist opitimism is a warning against the easy label.

There is as great a need for good biographies as there is for good cultural histories. With a few happy exceptions, biographies of playwrights and other theatre people tend to collapse into show-business anecdotage. The ordinary theatrical biographer piles one presumably amusing story on top another, each one less illuminating than the one before, and passes off the mad mosaic as a portrait of a man and an artist. Real information about a playwright, particularly about his artistic intentions, may be of use to the critic in dealing with

the man's work. It is a mistake, however—perhaps it is a crime—to confuse biography and dramatic criticism. The popular press's preoccupation with whether or not Maggie in *After the Fall* is Marilyn Monroe and what secrets of the Miller-Monroe marriage bed the play reveals is only a vulgar instance of a practice, too prevalent among academic critics, which might be called the biographical fallacy. Much time and energy goes into identifying the presumed originals of characters in drama, as though playing the *roman-à-clef* game were an act of criticism in itself. The fact that Shaw made use of Jenny Patterson's anger when he came to write *The Philanderer* may be of use to the Shaw biographer, but the critic can only be concerned with how the anger is used in the play; the biographical information is only valuable if it somehow clarifies the "how."

In emphasizing the value of knowing a play's place in the history of drama or in the biography of the playwright, I am suggesting that a play can best be understood in relation to the society and the time in which it was written and first produced. This is the contention of the contextualist critic. His materials consist not only of the play's text but of all available knowledge on the original production of the play; of the conventions of the theatre at that time; the reception of the play as evidenced in reviews, private documents and theatre receipts; the contemporary relation of the theatre to the other arts and to the social and political currents. I find it difficult to conceive of a critic who is not in part a contextualist, although I can understand disavowing the label in the face of scholars who let the accumulation of performance information finally smother the play itself. The limitation of the contextualist approach is that the best plays escape their period and the critic, dealing with them, will cripple himself if he imagines that his work is done when he recreates the contemporary understanding of and response to a play. That is only a step to a fuller understanding. Shakespeare specialists may have felt justifiable outrage at some of Jan Kott's readings in *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*, but there is a metaphorical message in that title.

The great need of dramatic criticism today—contextualist or not—is to escape the old-fashioned assumption that a critic has done something vital when he has reduced the play to paraphrase, when he has simply stated plot and theme. There may be a need for theoretical statements on the nature of drama and criticism (such as Eric Bentley attempted in *The Life of the Drama*), but aesthetic generalizations have a way of becoming orthodoxies. We have had too much of that in both literary and dramatic criticism. I am less concerned with terminology than I am with whether or not the critic comes to grips with the play as a complete work—text and texture—and tries to understand how everything in it works in relation to that completion. Whether he calls what he is reaching for "the action" or "the whole metaphor" or "the emotional fabric" is less important than the reaching itself. In the attempt, it is necessary that the drama critic separate himself from the literary critic. It is not that they do not have a great deal in common, but too much academic criticism of plays has treated drama as though it were simply another literary form. A play is unique simply because it is written on the assumption that it will be acted and that its meaning and effects will not be carried simply by words, but by aural and visual effects that complement and contradict the words.

What is needed are more studies of dramatic literature that tell *how* rather than *what* a play means. If we are to understand how a particular element con-tributes to the totality of a play, however, we are going to need to know a great deal more than we do now about the element itself. For this reason, serious re-search needs to be done on the following subjects:

(1) Language. We really know very little about stage language—its relation to the actor, to the character, to the audience. How many of its effects come from conventions outside the play, how many are dictated by the play's action? How does the speaking of a line alter its meaning? To what extent are the implications of a line—clear enough on the page—lost in the theatre where there is no time to ponder it? Are repetitions pedagogical or aesthetic? Are echo effects supposed to be recognized or simply responded to? In fact, how much of the lan-guage is calculated for emotional rather than intellectual response?

(2) Gesture. The same kinds of questions need to be asked about the silent language.

(3) Spatial relationships. Where are the people on stage? How does the action dictate their positions and how do their positions modify the action? In a television production of *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray*, which played recently on the educational channel in my neighborhood, the scene in which Mrs. Cortelyon comes to take Ellean away was played with a great many close-ups. The total effect of the scene was lost. Paula's realization that Mrs. Cortelyon's kindness is an insult and her reaction make dramatic sense only in a total social context; it was in seeing the scene fragmented by the jumping camera that I realized how much Pinero depended for the effectiveness of his scene on the audience's seeing all the characters at once.

(4) Temporal relationships. Why do the scenes in a play fall into a particular sequence? Can the play retain its central action if the order of scenes is changed? if the sequence of lines within a scene is altered? How much is the audience expected to remember? At what point can an insignificant detail be introduced, at what distance from the moment in which it be-comes significant?

(5) Character. Although much has been written about theatrical stereotypes (stock char-acters) and social stereotypes, there is still work to be done on the playwright's dependence on them. Research into off-stage role-playing and the player's consciousness of his role should contribute to our understanding of stage characters from the standpoint of the playwright, the audience and the character himself. There is work to be done on mannerism as a reflection of character and as a creator of it. Laurence Olivier's recent statements about building a char-acter from the outside in, about beginning with voice and gesture, should interest the drama critic as more than an indication of how one actor works. To what extent does the playwright and the audience act as though the interior man is defined by (even made by) his exterior be-havior.

(6) Sets, costumes, lights. These are, of course, related to the problems of spatial relation-ships. A knowledge of the available mechanical techniques at any period is necessary to our understanding of how a playwright used or avoided them in achieving his total effect. Research into the production or the proposed production of a play, however idiosyncratic its conception, may contribute to our reading of the play. When Shaw told Ellen Terry that if he were direct-ing *Hamlet* at the Lyceum, he would have her play Ophelia's mad scene in an English garden, was he making a serious critical point or only conversation?

The danger in a list like this is that it may become an invitation to further fragmentation and trivialization in dramatic criticism. The tendency, not only in dramatic criticism, but in literary criticism in general and in history and in most academic disciplines (read the late C. Wright Mills on sociology) is that studies are being turned out which examine a minute portion of a large pat-tern. The well-documented or closely observed pieces multiply, but no synthesis is ever made. In part, this is a reaction to the windy generalizations which once passed for criticism. For my own part, I would prefer to read a short article on a single effect in a play rather than another platitudinous restatement of plot

and theme. What is more if I had a choice between two shard analyses, I would choose, say, "Marion's Third-Act Entrance in *Biography*," over "Death Imagery in *High Tor*" on the assumption that the first comes closer to what dramatic criticism needs to be concerned with. The impatience of the editors of our theatrical journals with this kind of article is understandable. Many of them are written by graduate students and young instructors who have stumbled on a peg (as magazine editors call it) on which to hand a short article, and they are motivated by an understandable something other than critical afflatus. Such abuses aside, dramatic criticism in the immediate future will hopefully consist of studies of plays and playwrights which make intense use of careful examination of the elements out of which the whole is built.

If critical methods are in the process of a change which should be encouraged, critical subject matter is in something of a rut. There are fashions in criticism as in most things, and the same plays and playwrights are examined and re-examined and re-reexamined as though dramatic criticism were interned on a small patch of ground, bounded by Shakespeare on the north and Samuel Beckett on the south. Walter Meserve estimates that 80 per cent of the essays on American theatre submitted to *Modern Drama* are on four playwrights—Albee, Miller, Williams and O'Neill. Even if we assume that these are our leading playwrights and hence deserve much critical attention, it is obvious that the bulk of American drama is being neglected while we worry over the presumed big four. This is not to suggest that one should knock out a Twayne volume on Sherwood or Rice because none exists (this has been done), but that the minor playwrights or the unfashionable ones (Odets, say, or Behrman) should be examined seriously to see what they really did in their plays and how close that reality is to the labels with which we pin and dismiss them. In the same way, research needs to be done on generic forms: American farce, musical comedy, the Broadway sex comedy, the psychological tear-jerker, the social play. Study of the conventional theatre and of the practicing playwrights in it will not only be of value in itself, but it will increase our ability to deal with those plays and playwrights that transcend the conventional. As Gilbert White said in *The Natural History of Selborne*, "The bane of our science is the comparing one animal to the other by memory."

We treat the drama of other countries much as we do our own. We concentrate on Shaw and Eliot and more recently Osborne and Pinter at the expense of other English playwrights; we prefer Brecht among the Germans; Ionesco and Genet among the French. The only Italians we concern ourselves with are Pirandello and Betti; to us, Spain means Lorca; Norway, Ibsen; Sweden, Strindberg. I take my examples from modern drama because that is the period in which I do most of my work, but if we moved back into history we would still find a few explored playwrights rising like islands out of an unexamined sea. This is only a paradigm of the truth, of course. One can point to books on Cocteau and Giraudoux, on German Expressionism and supranational absurdity to indicate the lively interest of American scholarship in European theatre. There is, however, a great deal of theatrical activity in all of the European countries where research needs to be done. More important, there are geographical areas in which we know practically nothing about the playwrights—who they

are, what they write, how they write. This is primarily because no playwright has arisen from those areas to find a place in the Tinkers-to-Evers-to-Chance (that is, Ibsen-to-Strindberg-to-Chekhov) history of modern drama, and thus to attract our attention to his theatrical milieu. What has been going on in the Balkans since Menander? What of the theatre of the Near East? of the Far East? of South America. It is true that we have had a number of books on Asian (primarily Japanese) theatre and a handful of published African plays, but they are only a scratch on the surface. Willis Knapp Jones's recent *Behind Spanish American Footlights,* the result of forty years of preoccupation with Latin American drama, should be only a beginning of research, a foundation for criticism.

The discussion of subject matter brings us directly to the critic's tools. If, as I suggested at the beginning of this report, criticism is the clash between a man and a work, the major tool is the play itself. One of the things that must be done is to ascertain the availability of texts that need examination, or to provide them. The following projects, all of which would need financial backing, would be of value:

(1) The preparation of extensive bibliographies of published plays. So far as American theatre is concerned, a bibliographical supplement to the Burns Mantle volumes might be a starter. So far as foreign plays are concerned, a bibliography should probably go beyond the simply listing of plays both in the original language and in translation and make an attempt to evaluate the available translations as to accuracy and—still touchier—theatrical usability.

(2) The preparation of extensive bibliographies indicating where the manuscripts of unpublished plays may be found. A beginning would be made if the detailed cataloguing of theatre collections, so desired by theatre historians, were undertaken, preferably by means of retrieval systems which would make the information easily available.

(3) The publication of heretofore unpublished plays that are of historic or aesthetic interest— perhaps beginning with the more important texts in the Library of Congress and the Lord Chamberlain's office.

(4) The re-printing of published plays that have been allowed to go out of print. Since publishers are more likely to follow fashionable trends than to create them, subsidy publication is a necessity here. I know from my own experience in this case, having failed to convince publishers that the plays of Granville Barker and James Bridie should be published in this country, and, more recently, that a collection of Group Theatre plays and of 1930's farces would be of value to anyone.

Nor is it too early to think of collected works. A number of important American playwrights of the 1920's and 1930's have died in the last few years. Well-edited complete editions would be useful, perhaps through the playwrights' original publishers or through university presses.

(5) Translation of foreign plays unavailable in English or available in versions too archaic, idiosyncratic or inaccurate to be of use today.

One of the most important of the secondary tools of the critic is the work of other critics. Although there is a great need for good historical studies of domestic criticism, the major problem here, as with texts, is bibliographical. Detailed bibliographies need to be prepared on what has been written about particular playwrights and, even more important, about those elements which I discussed earlier as so in need of critical study. Special attention needs to be given here to theatrical reviewers, for the hurried impressions of a man who saw a play in production may be of great value to the critic whose unhurried impressions have to come from an examination of the play in print.

On the assumption that the theatre-history section of this survey will deal a:

length with what needs to be done with theatre literature other than plays I plan to pass quickly over other research possibilities. I should point out, however, that if criticism is to deal with the play as something that is to be acted, it is important to have available as much information as possible about acting techniques, physical and vocal; lighting; costumes; theatre buildings; the constitution and expectation of audiences; the spiritual, political and aesthetic motivation of playwrights; theatrical conventions of all kinds. After all, playwrights unless they write in and for closets, are aware of all these things, or use them without quite being aware. Studies of what actually went on in sub-dramatic theatrical forms—music hall, vaudeville, burlesque, circus—would be of particular use here. Imagine trying to discuss Cocteau's *Orphée* without being aware of the conventions of magic acts.

Finally, a note on education. Dramatic criticism is in a slightly strange position in the American university system. The men who will write it or will use its techniques in the classroom are not being trained in special departments. Nor should they be; enough fragmentation has gone on in the university. As things stand, however, some of these students who are involved in drama critically are in English departments, some in language departments and some—an increasing number—in theatre departments. Inevitably, their special demands must accommodate themselves to the program of the department in which they work. To avoid the limitations of that situation—too much emphasis on the literary in English and language departments, too much emphasis on the mechanics of production in theatre departments—active cross-departmental programs should be established, ones in which the teachers have both the opportunity and the inclination to be colleagues in more than name.

Beyond that, students (and, for that matter, teachers and critics) should be given the opportunity to see as much theatre as possible. What I am suggesting is play-going fellowships which would let the drama specialist spend an extended period of time (from a month to six months) in theatrical centers in this country or abroad. It might also be worth considering the feasibility of placing students as observers and participants with any of the growing number of regional and festival theatres in this country. Such a program would work, of course, only if the theatre were willing to welcome the student with something more than indifferent sufferance, an attitude that seriously hurt the foundation-supported resident playwright program a few years ago. The regional theatre might also consider adding a drama specialist to its staff, to serve as adviser and critic not as publicist (as Kenneth Tynan does with the National Theatre in England), for it would be a healthy thing for drama criticism if more of it were written outside the university.

The suggestion in the preceding paragraphs is that the drama critic, the specialist in dramatic literature, be seen and educated as a professional in his own right and not as an adjunct to something else—literary scholarship or play production. To strengthen this attitude a series of Drama Institutes (comparable to the N.D.E.A. Linguistics Institutes) might well be created. They would provide a community of interest which the critic's own department cannot, an environment in which the crucial need for a directional change in criticism, described at the opening of this report, might be aired, argued and overcome.

APPENDIX B

Members of the Conference

ALLEN, RALPH, Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, University of Pittsburgh; Editor, *Theatre Survey* (II, III)

BARRON, FRANK X., Research Psychologist, University of California, Berkeley (II, III)

BLOCK, HASKELL M., Comparative Literature, Brooklyn College; Ed., *Masters of Modern Drama* (II, III)

BOWMAN, NED A., Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, University of Pittsburgh; Editor, *Theatre Design and Technology* (III)

BOGUSLAW, ROBERT, Department of Sociology, The American University (II)

BROCKETT, O. G., Department of Speech and Theatre, Indiana University; Ed., *Educational Theatre Journal*, 1960-1963 (I, II, III)

BROWN, IRVING, Consultant in Theatre Education, Arts and Humanities Program, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (III)

BURNIM, KALMAN, Department of Drama, Tufts University; author, *David Garrick, Director* (II, III)

BURRIS-MEYER, HAROLD, Director of Theatre, Florida Atlantic University; co-author, *Scenery for Theater, Theaters and Auditoriums* (II, III)

BUTLER, JAMES H., Department of Drama, University of Southern California; President, National Collegiate Players (I, II, III)

CAMPBELL, PATTON, Scenic and Costume Designer, New York City (II)

COLE, EDWARD C., School of the Drama, Yale University; co-author, *Scenery for the Theatre, Theaters and Auditoriums* (I, II, III)

CURVIN, JONATHAN W., Department of Speech and Theatre, University of Wisconsin (III)

DOWNER, ALAN S., Department of English, Princeton University, former chairman American Society for Theatre Research (I, II, III)

EDMONDS, J. RANDOLPH, Department of Drama and Speech, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College (III)

ELDER, ELDON, Department of Theatre, Brooklyn College; stage designer, New York City (II)

ELSON, CHARLES, Department of Drama, Hunter College; American editor, *Stage Design Throughout the World 1935-1950*, and *1950-1960*, (II)

FALLON, RICHARD, Department of Drama, Florida State University (III)

FLETCHER, JUANITA D., Division of English and Speech, District of Columbia Teachers College (II, III)

FREDERIKSEN, NORMAN, Director of Research, Educational Testing Service, Princeton (II, III)

GAISER, GARY, Department of Speech, Indiana University; chairman, Experimental Research Project AETA (II, III)

GILLETTE, ARNOLD, Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Iowa; author, *Stage Scenery: Its Construction and Rigging.* (III)

GRAHAM, KENNETH, Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, University of Minnesota; President, American Educational Theatre Association, 1964 (III)

GUNKLE, GEORGE, Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Iowa (II, III)

HEINICH, ROBERT, School of Education, University of Southern California (II, III)

HEWES, HENRY, Dramatic critic, *The Saturday Review* (III)

HEWITT, BARNARD, Department of Theatre, University of Illinois; author, *Theater U.S.A.* (II, III)

HOBGOOD, BURNET M., Division of Dramatic Art, Southern Methodist University; ed., *Directory of American College Theatre* (II, III)

HURRELL, JOHN D., Department of English, University of Minnesota; ed., *Drama Survey* (II, III)

IZENOUR, GEORGE C., School of the Drama, Yale University; director of Electromechanical Research (II)

JACKSON, ESTHER M., Visiting Professor of Dramatic Literature, Shaw University; formerly Specialist in Theatre and Dance Education, Arts and Humanities Branch, U. S. Office of Education (III)

KENNEDY, JOHN L., Department of Psychology, Princeton University; Vice President, Institute for Educational Development (I, II, III)

LIPPMAN, MONROE, Department of Theatre and Speech, Tulane University (II, III)

MACGREGOR, ROBERT M., Editor and publisher, *Theatre Arts Books* (II, III)

MARIENTHAL, HAROLD, Department of Theatre Arts, University of California, Los Angeles (II, III)

MAYLEAS, RUTH, Program Director for Theatre and Dance, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities (III)

MCANENY, MARGUERITE, formerly Curator, William Seymour Collection, Princeton University Library; chairman, Theatre Library Association (II, III)

MCDOWELL, JOHN, Director, Ohio State University Theatre Collection (III)

MCINTYRE, BARBARA, Department of Theatre Arts, Northwestern University (III)

MENAGH, H. BERESFORD, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, American Educational Theatre Association (III)

MEISEL, MARTIN, Department of English, University of Wisconsin; author, *Shaw and the Nineteenth Century Theater* (II, III)

MESERVE, WALTER J., Department of English, University of Kansas; Associate Editor, *Modern Drama* (II, III)

MORRISON, JACK, Dean of Fine Arts, Ohio University; formerly Specialist in Theatre Education, Arts and Humanities Branch, U. S. Office of Education (I, III)

MYERS, PAUL, Associate Director, Library of the Performing Arts, New York City (III)

PAGE, CHARLES H., Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Cruz (II)

PEDICORD, HARRY W., Department of English, Thiel College; Chairman, American Society for Theatre Research (III)

PETTET, EDWIN B., Department of Theatre Arts, Brandeis University; former editor, *Theatre Survey* (III)

ROSENBERG, MARVIN, Department of Dramatic Art, University of California, Berkeley (II, III)

SCHAAL, DAVID, Department of Speech and Dramatic Art, University of Iowa; Associate Editor, *Educational Theatre Journal* (III)

SEIGER, MARVIN, Department of Speech and Drama, Hunter College (III)

SHATTUCK, CHARLES H., Department of English, University of Illinois (II, III)

SMITH, WALLACE, Evanston, Illinois, High School; Director of the Secondary School Theatre Conference (II, III)

WALKER, JOHN H., School of Drama, Art, and Speech, Ohio University; President, American Educational Theatre Association (III)

WEALES, GERALD C., Department of English, University of Pennsylvania; dramatic critic, *The Reporter* (I, II, III)

WILLARD, HELEN D., Curator, Harvard Theatre Collection (III)

WILLIAMS, HENRY B., Department of English, Dartmouth College; Director of Experimental Theatre (III)

YOUNG, STANLEY P., playwright and editor; former Executive Director, American National Theatre and Academy (III)