

DRAMA IN EDUCATION:
EXPERIENCING FOR SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

by

Todd Kristian Sessoms

A Project Submitted to the Faculty of
The Evergreen State College
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the degree
Master in Teaching
February 2007

The Project for the Master in Teaching Degree

by

Todd Kristian Sessoms

Has been approved for

The Evergreen State College

by

Dr. Sonja Wiedenhaupt, Ph.D, Member of the Faculty

February 23, 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project, or rather its author, stand in the debt of many who have sacrificed and supported in an effort to see its completion. Foremost among those who are thanked most sincerely is Professor Sonja Wiedenhaupt. Without her example, mentorship and guidance, this inquiry truly would never have been written. Warmest thanks and deepest regards are also extended to Professors Sherry Walton, Anita Lenges, Terry Ford, and Scott Coleman, the remaining MIT faculty. Most sincere admiration, blessings, and thanks also to the MIT class of 2007, who never ceased to inspire, surprise, and impress. Gratitude, love, and deepest appreciation to my family and dedicated friends; it is because of you that I take this path. Lastly, and of particular importance, is this dedicated to all those students with whom I will have the greatest privilege to learn.

ABSTRACT

This paper, including both an historical context and critical review of the research literature, examines the effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development. The conclusions largely suggest that perspective taking- the ability to consciously view conflict or condition from the perspective of another- is a normal cognitive developmental process with a linear growth pattern from childhood to adult maturity; it is the pro-social development necessary for community inclusion, taking an individual out of the egoism of his or her earliest years and into a shared social relationship. Empathy, a complex emotional and cognitive ability resulting in feeling with another, is shown to have a significant and positive relationship with perspective taking, requiring an additional affective quality. Development theory posits that normal cognitive development ubiquitously results in the capacity for perspective taking and empathy; however, one's mastery of such skills is further dependent upon his or her experiences and engagement beyond the achievement of such capacity. Drama in education, drama participation across curriculum, offers participants the opportunity to further engage with these developmental processes, possibly leading to an increased instance in empathic responding. This is entirely dependent, however, on the type and quality of the dramatic experience, which has been shown to also result in sympathy- feeling for as opposed to feeling with- or the assimilation of experience into one's existing schematic framework. The available research is limited and not wholly conclusive; however, several strong implications exist for the positive inclusion of drama in education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
APPROVAL.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	1
Master’s Paper Question.....	2
Rational.....	2
Conflicts and Limitations.....	10
Definitions.....	13
CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.....	16
Schooling from the Substructure.....	17
Progressing to the Progressives.....	23
Educating for Equity.....	27
CHAPTER 3: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Where We Start.....	35
All Participation is Not Equal.....	60
General Effects of Drama Participation.....	70
Role Play.....	93

Drama Participation, Empathy and Perspective taking.....	100
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION.....	121
Introduction.....	121
Summary of Findings.....	122
Suffice to Say.....	128
Implications for the Classroom and Further Research.....	131
REFERENCES.....	136

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

When we see more and hear more, it is not only that we lurch, if only for a moment, out of the familiar and the taken-for-granted but that new avenues for choosing and for action may open in our experience; we may gain a sudden sense of new beginnings, that is, we may take an initiative in the light of possibility (Greene, 1995, p. 123).

Statement Of Purpose

This is a paper about social justice. Though it is viewed through lens of education, theatre arts, and cognitive development, this is ultimately an investigation driven by a profound sense of hope and obligation, striving to explore avenues that lead to positive social transformation and the creation of a more equitable society. By examining the relationships between theatre arts and pro-social development, the aim of this work is to analyze and articulate the theoretical base as well as the current research surrounding the use of drama in education, and its impact on those who participate. This section will examine the multiple purposes for such use and investigation. In addition, it will make explicit the terms and ideas to be used throughout this work. Though a base assumption of this author is that theatre does in fact have a positive, productive influence on one's personal and pro-social development, all appropriate and necessary efforts have been made to seek out research that subverts as well as supports that supposition. May it be judged fair by the reader.

Master's Paper Question

What is the effect of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development?

Rationale

This topic has particular personal importance to the author. As so many adolescents who are considered outsiders found, the theatre was one of the few places I felt welcome during my transition into adulthood. Less a place of refuge than one of experimentation, the stage offered an opportunity to step out of “the familiar and the taken-for-granted,” as Green (1995, p.123) articulated, and learn to see the world through different, albeit imagined eyes. Later in my professional career, I came to understand and appreciate the subjective nature of existence as I was continuously asked to personify individuals with whom I shared few if any historic, social, economic, rational, or emotional qualities. I cannot suppose to place a value on such an experience, nor can I generalize it to the population of performers at large; however, such activities profoundly impacted my own emotional development and helped me to begin to understand my true role as a part of the larger community.

Only another could comment on whatever emotional intelligence I do or do not have. That which I am aware of, however, my own use of empathy, sympathy, and perspective taking for the purposes of judgment and action, has much of its nativity in the theatre. Those experiences provided part of the impetus for this project- to see if what I believed true about my own education could be validated by both research and the experiences of others. As a teacher motivated by issues of social justice and equity, the second driving motivation behind this particular inquiry was to determine the validity of drama as a

pedagogical practice, specifically in regard to students' development of perspective and altruistic engagement.

Rogoff (1990) described children as learning while steeped in a cultural milieu, tacitly internalizing the lessons surrounding them with the aid of a more capable peer. As Rogoff articulated, children learn a "cultural curriculum: from their earliest days, they build on the skills and perspectives of their society...[and] progress toward local ideals of mature thinking and action, rather than progress toward a universal goal" (Rogoff, 1990, p. 190). An operative word in this sentiment is build, for just as the individual is shaped by the culture in which he or she exists, so too does he or she help to reconstruct the culture in turn. Cultural tools are passed on to children through social interchanges and intersubjectivity, and these tools serve to connect them to their physical and social environment as well as shape their cognitive growth through experience. As they then use the acquired tools to engage with other individuals or the culture at large, both parties are changed by the interaction. Vygotsky, as articulated by Miller (2002), saw this as an internalization process by which the intermental becomes the intramental. Communication between individuals, or an individual and his or her culture, moves from without to within, and both are changed in the process. In this manner, boundaries of both individuals and cultures are porous, and can only be defined in their interconnectedness.

Bolton (1979) applied Vygotsky's, and in an indirect and predictive sense Rogoff's (1990), theoretical framework to the discipline of theatre. Through dramatic play, the individual engages actively with the tools of his or her culture, constructing meaning through his or her external actions on an imagined context. That which initiates within

the abstract of the internal is tested against the concrete of the external, providing the player with vital feedback that can then be used to inform future actions. In this way is meaning constructed; intersubjectivity is established between the participants and the context, leading to the internalization of the intermental and creating common ground between the disparate pieces.

As one takes on the givens of a character, he or she uses his her own imagination to fill the gaps where the playwright or guide has left off. Through this activity does he or she bring his or her own context and understanding into the imagined world. That world then reacts to her actions, providing an antithesis, if you will, which necessarily leads to an adaptation and new action. Likened to Miller's (2002) description of Vygotsky's theory, so too is this process congruent with Dewey's (1944) definition of experience: acting and having the world react with consequence such that an adaptation is necessary for further action. This process stands both in support of and in opposition to the notion that theatrical participation may lead to an increase in one's ability to perspective take. The experience of interacting with and within multiple contexts suggests a growing proclivity for and comfort with identification alongside multiple viewpoints. However, one's learning and growth from imagined circumstances has limits, and the dominant context of the participant's daily life and culture will continue to bear far greater significance on cognitive and psychic development. All interpretation of the chosen world will be based upon that which exists in the given, the prejudices and stereotypes of which are easily affirmed and strengthened (Gesser-Edelsburg, 2005; Riviere, 2005).

Perspective taking and empathy are chief concerns of the educator for reasons ranging from the practical to the esoteric. On the side of the former, a great deal of

contemporary conversation surrounds the preparation of students for mature and professional engagement in an ever-shrinking, global marketplace. Without placing value on such economic and technological progress, it is a reality that our domestic and international cultures are becoming more intertwined, and while this action has a homogenizing effect on economic ideologies, those participating in the dominant system are ever growing in number and difference. Today's students, more than any previous generation, will be asked to work across those differences in order to gain success, regardless of how it is defined. The culture, like the individuals who are a part of it, is in a constant state of flux as the population grows and interacts. Empathy for and towards one another, and an ability to perspective take is necessary to minimize conflict and move forward together.

Pederson (1997), in her study on intercultural sensitivity (ICS) in adolescents, identified a strong, positive and highly significant relationship between empathy and ICS. Her study, as discussed in Chapter III, has significant implications for students who will be living and working in an ever diversifying, heterogeneous society. ICS, as described by Pederson, is the ability of the individual to adapt to, accept, and integrate cultural differences into their own vision of reality. Contrary to the monoculturalist who sees his or her cultural worldview as the center-point of reality, one who has a high degree of ICS sees difference not as a threat but as being stimulating or desirous. Pederson makes a strong case for the positive correlation of empathy and ICS, and as such, we can conclude that empathy is an important, if not necessary skill for success in heterogeneous, multicultural society.

The chief concern of any society is the protection and maintenance of its people and the distribution of scarce resources. There are other aims, of course, but it is these two that are most fundamental to social stability. Humans live in a complex web of interdependence. Our nature makes us dependent upon one another for our very survival; few if any are able to provide for their sole subsistence without the aid of another, let alone a community. Yet modern American society has obfuscated the true nature of human interconnectedness and left us with what Wilken (2006) described as neutral interdependence. Neutral interdependence is the pervasive mentality that results from societal participation in the free market system. No longer are we asked participate in the conscious engineering and distribution of scarce resources, but rather, simply purchase that which we want or need in the market at our own discretion.

The critique of such a system is that it imbues the participants with a false sense of independence, as if they are able to survive simply on their own efforts without regard to the efforts of others. Such a society of perfect liberty, in which each individual has not only the right but the obligation to act out of his or her own desires, has helped to promulgate the false comfort of individual autonomy. Individualism as an ideology has succeeded in establishing a strong sense of individual responsibility and accountability. Its roots, as Hunt (2003) described, go back to the protestant reformation and the rise of classical economic theory.

Heilbroner (1997) articulated Smith's notion of the invisible hand, the idea that a perfect society would be attained in the action of each individual working for his or her own benefit, resulting in a fair a profitable distribution of goods and resources in a free market system. A focus on individual benefit, however, removes one from the concerns

of his or her neighbor. Actions, purchases, even policy decisions are made with little to no regard for another's wellbeing, and justified in purpose by the belief that all others are protecting their own self interests and doing so with an equal amount of power and vigor.

Smith, as Heilbroner (1997) articulated, believed that this form of social organization would indeed provide for the greatest amount of social good. His contention was that the invisible hand would guide resources and goods to where they could be used most productively in the creation of things most needed by the consumers. So too would the distribution of labor and mass participation eventually lead to more enjoyment and less work for all. Our society, however, has not quite lived up to the image put forward by Smith. Without doubt, technological advances have led to the considerable raise in subsistence level standards since Smith's 18th century perspective; however, the neutral interdependence it promotes, the false sense of autonomy and self-sufficiency it creates has done more to return us to a Hobbesian state of nature, in which each is at war with all for their piece of an ever-shrinking pie.

Smith, Heilbroner (1997) wrote, believed that that there was something else involved that would mitigate the destructive potential of a society in which all participants work solely for their own self interests. In Smith's own words from *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*,

When we are always so much more deeply affected by whatever concerns ourselves, than by whatever concerns other men; what is it which prompts the generous, upon all occasions, and the mean upon many, to sacrifice their own interests to the greater interests of others? It is not the soft power of humanity, it is not that feeble spark of benevolence which Nature

has lighted up in the human heart, that is thus capable of counteracting the strongest impulses of self-love. It is a stronger power, a more forcible motive, which exerts itself upon such occasions. It is reason, principle, conscience, the inhabitant of the breast, the man within... who, whenever we are about to act so as to affect the happiness of others, calls to us with a voice capable of astonishing the most presumptuous of our passions, that we are but one of the multitude, in no respect better than any other in it; and that when we prefer ourselves so shamefully and so blindly to others, we become the proper objects of resentment, abhorrence, and execration (cited in Heilbroner, 1997, p. 68-69)

Smith believed that our conscience, our ability to empathize and sympathize with others would mitigate the destructive side of self-interest. This is the necessary component for the maintenance of the societal good and the assurance that all benefit in equal measure. And so it is that empathy becomes of primary importance to society. In order for society to progress and benefit all of its members, individuals contained within must have an understanding of the situations and needs of all participants. Policies will never be equitable so long as those voting are doing so simply out of their own self-interest. An intuitive understanding of the interests of the whole must be fostered if individual actions are to benefit anyone but the individual. For this reason is such an inquiry of importance to society at large. Greater social empathy has an increased chance of providing for the greater social good.

Western society is predicated upon the belief that human beings are inherently self-interested, whether Smith meant for such an interpretation or not. In such a society,

however, altruism and other oriented behavior have no place. Even the most selfless act is seen as fulfilling some selfish need, be it for gratitude, tangible reward, or simple friendship. As Batson (1991) articulated, the universal egoism of western society relegates all things to the domain of objects for consumer's pleasure, reducing even the dearest relationships to one of value exchange and profit. Within that model of society lies very little room for social justice and absolutely no place for altruism, defined as "a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another's welfare" (Batson, 1991, p. 6). An assumption latent to the question driving this master's paper is that human beings are indeed capable of altruistic behavior, and that empathy is positively linked to its occurrence. As much of a societies consciousness is created by its economic mode of production, the instance of and belief in altruism will be minimized in western society. The question then becomes, how does one become educated in its use and what experiences lead to its growth. Though a strong suspicion exists, as stated above, that there is a relationship between perspective taking, empathy and altruism, this particular investigation lays its focus on the two former in relation to drama in education.

An additional importance of empathy and perspective taking exists in the social studies. It is the purvey of the social sciences to ask what it means to be human. Such a question is meaningless without an understanding of the subjective and an ability to see beyond one's own cultural context. This is above described as necessary for active civic engagement, another aim of the social sciences, and is an entry-point into understanding history. Foster and Yeager (1998) described historical empathy as a process by which the student comes to see a historical decision, event, crisis or condition in terms of its time and place. Such an act requires a suspension of disbelief and an ability to cognitively

place oneself in the circumstances of the investigated. This is not unlike the process of engagement in the theatre. It too foremost relies on the suspension of disbelief and an ability to construct a narrative through which character's choices are made sensible. Historical and social understanding simply relies upon the interpreter's ability to empathize and perspective take. Though seeing through another's eyes is never completely possible and all experiences are necessarily subjective interpretations in their retelling, a strong sense of historical empathy enables the student to closely approximate and understand that which is being studied with as little bias as possible.

Conflicts And Limitations

The greatest conflict surrounding the issue of drama in education is simply where to place it, if it is included at all. In our current atmosphere of high-stakes testing and skills based instruction, theatre is largely viewed as an extracurricular activity or elective at best. In this situation, only a select population of students are ever exposed to what benefits it may offer; statistically speaking, it is often those students from middle- to upper-middle economic classes who have such opportunities, which raises concerns about equity, advantage, and cultural hegemony. Nearly all of the research to come focuses on drama that is used across curriculum. The kind of theatre that has the greatest impact on student learning in regard to perspective taking and empathy is not that which takes place in an acting class or on the high school stage, but the unscripted, guided role-playing that takes place in content area classrooms. This notion is controversial in that it subverts the classic arguments for additional arts funding. If the research is to be believed, it is far more important for teachers of every content area to have training and

proficiency in forum theatre (Boal, 1979, 1992) and improvisational role-play than it is for a school to have a theatre department or put on a spring musical. This statement is somewhat fallacious in that it discounts the meaningful learning experiences gained from having both; however, the point is there to be made. Theatre budgets, like those of its art compatriots, are being cut to make room for a greater academic focus. Yet academics would benefit in many ways from the inclusion of theatre in the classroom. So too would such an inclusion be more equitable, in that a much larger population of students would have the opportunity to participate- even in a non-performative role.

A great debate exists in the theatre community regarding that of theatre for development. At its most basic, theatre for development (TFD) is a process in which professionals guide the creation of a public community play, written and performed by non-theatre-professional community members, typically dealing with the social issues and needs of developing areas. TFD has its supporters and naysayers. Those who support the process see it as a tool of social justice and a means to bring community issues to light; as Nicholson (2005) described, it can aide in a community uniting behind a single and powerful message. So too does it offer the opportunity for catharsis in the Aristotelian sense, that essential human experience resting at the very origins of theatre, religion, and sporting events. In a post-colonial world, however, TFD, for many, has come to symbolize the west's efforts at maintaining cultural hegemony or practicing ideological imperialism. In place of community issues and values, western values and desires are imposed upon the participants, and subsequently, the viewers. In this way can the process become a form of neo-colonialism, destroying traditional culture in the name of development, western-style.

This phenomenon of practice can be seen to occur in the classroom as well.

Schooling is, as to be later discussed, an exercise in assimilation and cultural maintenance. Drama in education can thusly work two ways, in favor of the systems of oppression that exist in our schools and culture, or in opposition to them. In order to not simply reproduce the existent stereotypes, prejudices, and beliefs of the dominant culture, the teacher/leader/trickster/player/director/guide must be adept at facilitating the process. A less attentive or aware facilitator is likely to aid in the creation of such an atmosphere that rejects any interpretation other than the dominant expression of the host culture. So too could he or she easily impose a particular view or ideology upon the participants, as in the critical interpretations of TFD.

The research on drama in education is fairly limited. Despite the existence of a great deal of theory and conviction, there is not as much empirical evidence regarding the effects of drama in education as there is for some of the other art-forms. The majority of the research available is currently coming out of Great Britain where there is a rich history of community theatre. Studies continue to be done in the United States and the topic does indeed hold interest for many researchers; however, the current educational climate does not view such research as a priority and funds it accordingly. A good deal of the research presented in chapter three focuses on young children and early adolescents. While this information is tremendously useful and important, it indicates a lack of study into the effects of drama in education on later adolescent development. The developmental foundations for empathy and perspective are expected to occur prior to one's entry into puberty; however, the mastery of such skills occurs over a lifetime. Additional research into post-puberty to late-adolescence is necessary to draw any

substantive conclusions. Lastly, the qualitative nature of the empirical evidence minimizes a good deal of the research's generalizability. Thought trends seem consistent and strongly suggest patterns with near ubiquity, nothing can be applied with certainty. But then again, what can?

Definitions

- **Drama in Education:** A non-performative, improvised theatre that is used in an educational context outside the drama department. Drama in education is either teacher-led or student-led, and used across curriculum to aid students in the construction of meaning and understanding (Bolton, 1979, 1984). Drama in education has its strongest supporters and research in Britain. In the United States it is still largely viewed as an elective class to be taken by students- often in affluent communities.
- **Social Justice:** Working towards equity in opportunity, resource distribution, civic engagement and access to the means of production. Social justice is an active process that can manifest in myriad modalities, ultimately working to help those oppressed peoples find self-empowerment and change the material conditions of life. Social justice is not to be seen as simple idealism, for idealism is in reaction to a reality predicated on the material conditions of life. Social justice aims at social transformation through the transformation of consciousness and condition upon which people rely.
- **Empathy:** Unless otherwise defined in the research in the research to come, empathy is defined in accordance with the definition developed by Keefe (1979), which has five traits or skills. They are (1) the ability to perceive another's verbal

or nonverbal messages, (2) accurately identify and understand the meaning of another's messages, (3) experience the physical and psychological response to another's messages while forestalling conscious cognitive engagement or evaluation, (4) a clear delineation between shared emotions and individual emotional response, (5) and the accurate communication of feelings in reaction to the initial message, as communicated through verbal and nonverbal means.

Sharing vicariously another's emotions and thoughts is a more concise, though less distinct definition. How one acts upon their empathic response is of particular interest.

- Sympathy: Unless otherwise defined in the research to come, sympathy can be taken to mean feeling for another as opposed to feeling with another. Sympathy is a projective response to another's subjective experience and is more associated with an individual's perceiving of another through their own experience; that is, an assumption that another will react in the same manner and with the same amount of vigor. See Klein (1995) for a comparison of empathy and sympathy.
- Perspective Taking: Is taken in the perspective of another in place of one's own. The working definition for this thesis largely comes from the work of Selman (1975, 1980), who viewed perspective taking as having a natural linear growth pattern for age in normal cognitive development. Moving through a series of qualitative advances, perspective taking abilities grow as a part of prosocial behavioral characteristics. Human beings are social creatures in that we depend upon each other for our daily survival. Prosocial behavior, such as perspective taking and empathy, are necessary for community inclusion. Perspective taking is

the ability to view conflict and condition from the perspective of another. It is that which takes the individual out of egoism and into a community of people, and is strongly correlated with empathy. Perspective taking is the cognitive, conscious effort that is then colored by the emotional provided by empathy.

CHAPTER 2: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Chapter two explores the historical background of the question and aims guiding this master's paper. Though the project's chief investigation is into the effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development, its larger context is rooted in social justice. An assumption exists linking perspective taking, empathy and altruistic tendencies, thus inquiring as to the legitimacy of using drama in education as a means of social transformation. For that reason, the history of drama in education itself has been left out in order to examine social transformation and reform movements as they have previously existed in education.

Beginning with broad examination of education as it began in the United States as well as the purpose of organized education in any large society, this chapter will identify the specific times and ways in which issues surrounding social justice, critical thought, other oriented behavior, an ethic of care, and an awareness of the community outside the individual have been integrated into the educational system. Three general periods are examined. The first, under the section entitled, "Schooling from the Substructure," describes the common school movement and creation of the comprehensive high school. The second, located in "Progressing to the Progressives," focuses on the progressive education movement. The last, located in "Educating for equity," looks at the efforts undertaken by the equity reform movement. In each, an attempt is made to bring light to the political, social, cultural and economic contexts thereof.

Schooling from the Substructure

Marx (1970) believed that a society's mode of production, its economic base or substructure, has an insurmountable influence on its political, social, legal, intellectual, and religious environment. In his own words, "[it] is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness" (Marx, 1970, p. 20-21). To fit this in with the sociocultural, radical constructivist view, a society's mode of production, the way in which it makes its food, makes its money, and makes its babies, largely determines the experiences of the individuals contained within it. If individuals construct what they know based on their subjective experiences, and the mode of production plays a major role in determining the type and organization of those experiences, then one's conception of the world will necessarily be influenced by his or her society's economic base.

There is significant congruence between Marx's (1970) notion of the substructure and Walton's (S. Walton, workshop facilitation, January, 2006) description of the Principle of Correspondence. The Principle of Correspondence is in fact a substructure principal, which relates specifically to schooling. In essence, it holds that schools always reflect the social structures, norms, and values of the societies in which they exist. Spring (2005) provided several examples of the Principle of Correspondence in action within the American school system. Colonial schools, for example, were erected to facilitate cultural transmission, promoting and perpetuating the values and cultural norms of their particular society. The first law regarding education in this country was the Massachusetts Law of 1642, which officially established schools in the colony with the expressed purpose of educating students "to read and understand the principles of religion

and the capital laws of the country” (Spring, 2005, p. 14). The protestant reformation and subsequent shift in Christian dogmatic understanding gave way to the new belief that individuals were themselves responsible to read and adhere to the scriptures; one’s salvation depended upon such biblical engagement. It was this value that laid the pragmatic foundation for ubiquitous public education.

Schooling in the United States, just as in any other civilization throughout history, has been a purposeful contrivance for the transmission of certain cultural tools, and the domination of one ideology over all others. As Spring (2005) demonstrated, schools in pre- and post-revolutionary America were used to Anglicize the nation. Germans in colonial Pennsylvania were taught English customs and the English language in an effort to “purify” the countryside, and Native American children, both before and after the Revolutionary War, were forced into boarding schools in an effort to compel their cultural conversion and take their land without fighting costly battles. During the 1830s and 1840s, the Common School movement was an admitted attempt at ensuring the dominance of Protestant, Anglo culture. Being run by state and local governments, the Common School was seen as a tool by which social, political, and economic troubles could be mended. Social and political stability, the chief aims of the common school, would be achieved by replacing the disparate cultures and value systems existent in our heterogeneous society, with a singular monoculture that shared a worldview. Education then became the chief tool of cultural creation and replication.

The common school movement must be viewed with a sense of historical empathy. As Spring (2005) articulated, Horace Mann, the father of the common school, had similarly observed and been disquieted by the same social trends being described by

Marx in Europe. Industrial capitalism had led to an increased disparity between social and economic classes, which magnified the potential and instance of class conflict and raised the specter of all out revolution. Whereas Marx and Engels (1998) saw a proletariat revolution as the necessary answer to working class exploitation, Mann viewed common schooling as the bloodless solution to increasing class consciousness and the disparity in wealth distribution.

Universal education, or the common school, could bring the many peoples of a heterogeneous society under one ideological umbrella. In a sense, it was seen as the sole instrument in the assurance of democratic survival; universal education would provide citizens with a shared history and sense of common destiny, thus mitigating the cultural and class strife threatening to tear apart society. It would help to establish a common class consciousness, which all citizens would hold and benefit from, and lead to greater civic engagement as opposed to violent uprising. As a significant portion of a young person's political socialization, the common school would help individuals see the vote as a more effective means of utilizing individual agency than the destructive means of revolution, therefore increasing democratic engagement and ensuring the continuous domestic reproduction of the republic's political model.

Lastly, as discussed by Spring (2005), publicly supported, universal education would benefit the whole of society in that it offered significant opportunities for social mobility and wealth creation. The common school would end the tradition of guarding education as the sole province of the wealthy and aristocratic, and offer meaningful opportunities to those of poorer classes to better their economic situation, increasing the general wealth of society. In this sense, education was coming to be seen as a panacea,

the great social equalizer that afforded all an opportunity so long as they were willing to work for it. Such a system would pacify the calls for redistribution of wealth and property by creating a meritocracy, in which individual merit and work ethic were seen as the only hindrance to social and economic success. The very notion of class itself would be wiped aside as the common child became the common man, and all labored for the common good. The irony, of course, is that such collectivist rhetoric actually helped to further the individualistic ideology that would be necessary to sustain a growing consumerist society.

The common school was one of the most significant educational movements in the United States, still holding tremendous on our collective consciousness. The notion of a meritocracy still prevails as equality trumps equity, leading to the pervasive societal belief that each person has the same educational opportunity and therefore the same chances for economic success; one only fails to achieve because of his or her own shortcomings. Blind does this make society to the fact that being given the same opportunity to attend public school is not synonymous with having the same opportunities. In its day, however, universal education was believed to be a form of capital investment rather than indoctrination, a means by which to solve social ills rather than a tool for the reproduction of inequities. As the Principle of Correspondence suggests, it was an effort to bring the social life of the nation's citizens into congruence with its economic life. Fault is to be found in the latter, of which the former is a responsive reflection.

With the rise of industrial capitalism in the United States, public education shifted to meet the needs of the changing social and economic conditions. As discussed by

Spring (2005), doctrines of social efficiency rose as a means of preparing American youth for adult roles in the workforce. The development of large corporations and industry increased the demand for human capital, laborers with certain social and vocational skills, and it was decided that the comprehensive high school would be responsible for the preparation of such a work force. The common school movement had led to a tremendous increase in the number of schools and students during the latter half of the nineteenth century. As Collins (n.d.) reported, 300 high schools had been built by the time of the Civil War. An 1874 ruling by the Michigan Supreme Court, which held that school districts must be maintained and supported with public taxes, led to a tremendous boom in the building and attendance of secondary education institutions. By the last decade of the century, 2,500 high schools were in operation in the United States.

The changing economic and social conditions necessitated that some form of mandated curricular guidelines be issued for secondary education. Scherer (n.d.) described the seven categories that made up the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, the design of which began in 1915 by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. These seven principles dictated that all students be taught the following: Good health and personal hygiene habits; the fundamentals of reading, writing, oral and written expression, and mathematics; the skills necessary to be a positively contributing member of the household, which included learning through literature, the social studies, the arts, and being instructed in good relationships between males and females; information regarding a variety of vocations as well as the relationship between one's chosen vocation and the community; civic morality and democratic engagement; the appropriate use of leisure time; ethical character including

personal responsibility and initiative. The capitalist system relied on workers who could simultaneously work cooperatively and specialize in a particular task. The comprehensive high school, with its differentiated curriculum and opportunity for specialization, reflected the classical liberal ideal of comparative advantage. The student was to have the ability to specialize and develop a personal skill that would best benefit the economic system, and therefore society.

The notion of education as a panacea continued from this idea. Schools were to prepare young people for positive economic and social engagement in their adult lives, and, if instructed properly, all of society would benefit in the accomplishment. Absent from this belief, however, and largely in congruence with the stated objectives of the common school movement, was a critical awareness of the exploitative and inequitable nature of the economic system itself. As a means of social reproduction, schools prepared students to enter an authoritative and inequitable economic system, and as such, education itself became authoritative and inequitable. In specific regard to the questions and assumptions driving this master's paper, education in this time period sought to homogenize differing perspectives in an effort to establish a single social reality. Social perspective taking was not strictly valued, and education, in line with the Principle of Correspondence, was used to reinforce a single perspective over all others.

Progressing to the Progressives

American public education began to experience a shift in the first quarter of the twentieth century. The shift was away from the traditional educational system of didacticism and the three r's, and towards a system that utilized children's interests by encouraged learning by doing. Bolton (1984) described this as being a later wave of the new movement, which, in 1870's Britain, began when educators embraced Rousseauian notions of the child, and encouraged play and active engagement with the surrounding environs. In the United States, progressive education had its nativity around the birth of the twentieth century, growing out of a rising concern that schooling had become antithetical to the values of a democratic tradition.

As described by Miller (2002), the movement was committed to the belief that all people have the right to actively participate in the decisions that affect their lives, extending this engaged citizenship beyond the mere political to both the social and economic domains as well. Rooted in an understanding that diversity is to be respected and embraced- valuing each for who he or she is, believes, and contributes- and that a critically engaged intelligence is necessary for effective, civic participation, the progressive education movement sought to completely reform schooling as it was in the United States.

The progressive education movement was built upon the then relatively new science of psychology. As articulated by Berube (1994), it embraced the notion of the whole child and critiqued the American system of education as being one in which the child him or herself is forgotten. Berube described the contribution made to the movement by the philosopher/psychologist William James. James, the father of

pragmatism as a philosophy, wrote strongly of the need for teachers to be trained in the ways and workings of the mind. He argued that a child's intellect is not fixed but develops over time, and that for teachers to be effective, they themselves must be educated in the ways these changes take place. Key to the pragmatist philosophy was the notion of learning by doing- the notion upon which the progressive education movement was predicated.

Dewey, one of the pioneers of this particular progressive movement, saw the purpose of education as developing the whole person. Influenced heavily by Rousseau, as Berube (1994) described, the founders of progressive education believed in the natural growth of the child; children and young people were seen to construct their understanding of the world through actual experiences with their environment. The role of the educator was to craft the environment and design experiences for his or her pupils that would require their intelligent and intentional investigations. Young people would act upon their environment and their environment would consequently react, such that an adaptation was necessary for further progress (Dewey, 1944).

In this sense, education was seen as moving in a continuous pattern from one adaptation to another. Unlike the traditional education model, where the chief aim was to assimilate into the authoritative structure as a dutiful citizen and produce answers that were seen as objectively correct, the progressive model turned to the emotional and creative aspects of human development. Its aim was the organic production of critically engaged human beings who cared more about ways of thinking than memorizing and repeating information in an artificially prescribed manner. As it was written in *Democracy and Education*, “[were] all the instructors to realize that the quality of mental

process, not the production of correct answers, is the measure of educative growth something hardly less than a revolution in teaching would be worked” (Dewey, 1944, p. 176).

Dewey (1938) wrote prolifically on the need for experiential education. It was his belief that the traditional form of schooling, where knowledge lies static in the heads of teachers and on the pages of books, was antithetical to the espoused democratic ideals of the United States. Based on authoritative control rather than shared values, the traditional teaching method did not teach children to love learning and intrinsically seek out understanding, but forced them into a state of false docility where information and behavior was externally imposed upon them. The Principle of Correspondence dictates that schools reflect the values and social norms of their host society. The progressive education movement saw the traditional school system as mirroring authoritarianism rather than democracy, and questioned the nation’s values in kind. Like others before and after them, progressive educators believed that the school could be used as an instrument of social change. By making the classroom a more democratic community in which all voices, beliefs, ideas, needs and abilities were welcomed, teachers could help young people grow into the critical citizens needed in order to affect larger social transformations.

An education based upon experience was seen as allowing students to construct meaning from within rather than accept it from without. So too would it help them to develop a sense of learning in the moment. As Dewey (1938) articulated, whether in the past or in the future, one can only live in the moment he or she is in. By engaging in an experience and attempting to construct meaning from its purpose in the moment, one

better prepares him or herself for similar activities in the future. Focusing on the future at the expense of the moment, however, does little more than damage one's ability to be successful if and when that future arrives.

Progressive education, argued Berube (1994), gave education in the United States its essential character. It was the first and largest school reform movement to take place since the institutionalization of public, universal education, and brought humanity back to a system that had become as industrialized as the factory floor. Despite the praise, however, the movement was not without its shortcomings. Progressive education was difficult to define. As a movement, it struggled to clearly articulate its philosophy and agenda, and as Berube noted, failed terribly in the education of the immigrant poor. Largely conceived in elite educational institutions, the progressive movement was geared to the needs and cultural norms of the wealthy classes of the dominant culture. Its noble aim was greater self-actualization; however, its methodologies were rooted in the ideologies of the affluent and badly served the particular needs of non-native English speakers and the immigrant poor.

As described by Miller (2002), the movement largely broke apart in the 1950's, though it had been faltering for years. The cultural conservatism spurred on by the Cold War, coupled with strong critiques about its abandonment of rigor in the core subjects seen as necessary in the battle against communism, ensured its exit from center stage. Berube (1994) articulated a more fluid explanation for progressive education's eventual dismissal; it was simply no longer relevant. The equity reform movements of the 1960's asked questions that the progressive movement could not address. By the last two decades of the twentieth century, increased economic competition and poor school

performance led to an excellence reform movement that focused solely on rigor in the basic academic subjects. One might simply say, “progressive education was no longer progressive” (Berube, 1994, p. 27). Much like the ideology of the common school, however, progressive education had a tremendous impact on both the institution and the nation’s collective consciousness. In many senses, its philosophy and methods can still be seen in one incarnation or another in schools across the country.

Progressive education, in regard to perspective taking and empathy, marked a departure from the singular viewpoint in favor of growing heterogeneity. It viewed the stated values of democratic and civic engagement as being absent from traditional education, and sought to embrace the multiple viewpoints and experiences of its student citizenry. Through such an experience was social transformation seen as being possible; students educated in critical engagement and the valuing of difference would enter society as agents of democratic participation as opposed to willing subjects of authoritative control. As previously critiqued, the effort to include all voices and bring to light all perspectives was not universally successful as it ironically favored a particular social class. This lack of equity would be addressed by a later generation as social values were more explicitly questioned and confronted.

Educating for Equity

The Civil Rights Movement and struggle for racial equality spurred on a powerful educational reform movement late in the middle part of the twentieth century. Heavily influenced by prominent thinkers, educators and activists within the African American community including W.E.B. DuBois, Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Michael

Harrington and Malcolm X, the movement for equity focused on the American poor and disenfranchised, primarily aimed at increasing social mobility through education. As Berube (1994) described, the crafters of the equity reform movement shared many ideals and aspirations with those of the progressive education movement; however, theirs was an effort specifically aimed at bringing about change by educating the poor out of poverty.

The equity movement gained allies that the progressive movement did not. Though the progressive education movement had many prominent and influential individuals working towards its success, it never gained the federal support that the equity movement garnered. The Civil Rights Movement opened many eyes to the inequities of American society and the plight of generational poverty, which disproportionately impacted the African American community. In doing so, it created a tremendous will and momentum to make structural changes at the legal and social level. First among these, as Berube (1994) described, was the desegregation of schools under the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of 1954. Though the long-term benefits of educational desegregation to the African American community continue to be debated, the Supreme Court decision was seen as a major political and moral victory that energized the Civil Rights Movement. So too did it publicly set the precedent for taking extra-legal issues under consideration when crafting law and policy. This opened the door for lawmakers to go “beyond legal equity” (Berube, 1994, p. 64) in an effort to bring social and economic equality into existence.

The Johnson administration, inheriting much of its agenda from the previous Kennedy administration, used such an argument in the crafting of its war on poverty and

Great Society initiatives. A significant part of the equity reform movement, Johnson's Great Society initiatives aimed at using education as means to eradicate poverty in the United States. Chief among its accomplishments, described Berube (1994), were the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which established and provided funding for programs to aid poor students in elementary schools, and the Head Start program, which was created as a pre-school program for the benefit of poor children.

The Johnson administration went further still in its efforts to curb inequity with the creation of Affirmative Action. Offering preferential treatment for educational admission and general employment to African Americans and other minorities who have suffered from long years of institutional racism, Affirmative Action was viewed by those in the equity movement as key in the effort to bring greater social mobility to communities of color. Divisive from its inception, the policy has been critiqued as institutionalizing reverse racism and unfairly punishing those of the dominant culture—particularly European American males. As one of the most aggressive actions of the equity reform movement, the critique is expected. As Berube (1994) noted, however, the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld Affirmative Action in principle on more than one occasion. Yet at the time of this writing the legal foundation of this tool for equity continues to be challenged in the judiciary and tried in the public court.

The Equity movement, as Berube (1994) depicted, faded with that of the Civil Rights Movement. Momentum waned in the early 1970's due, in part, to the social backlash and rise of conservatism aided by an economic downturn. Though the Civil Rights Movement had significant gains in terms of confronting institutional racism and winning access to areas of American life that had previously been completely shut,

economic equity remained unrealized. The equity reform movement did have a significant impact on education, going further than the progressives in their efforts and successes in educating the poor. Educational research, particularly on communities with the least economic means, was generated and continued, and a greater sense of moral purpose was ascribed to education in general. Like the progressive movement, however, a coherent philosophy of education did not arise out of equity reform, and the movement for excellence and rigor in the basic academic subjects easily took its place. It is here that the national educational system currently resides- with its emphasis on objectivity and uniform standards- firm in its belief that equality of opportunity will yield equality of results, once again institutionalizing meritocracy. Though small shifts have occurred since its implementation in the 1980's, no significant reform movement has yet supplanted the ideology of excellence. Artistic pursuits, intellectualism, morality, social responsibility and the subjective- those qualities that make us human- are left as the sole province of the wealthy or relegated to electives and extracurricular activities, if included at all.

This chapter has examined a piece of the history of educational reform in the United States of America. The Principle of Correspondence dictates that schools reflect the norms and values of the societies in which they exist. As such, educational structure and curriculum is expected to reflect and reproduce the existing social order. In the United States, that process has been most heavily influenced by the evolution of industrial capitalism and its subsequent labor needs. This structure is identifiable in the authoritative, didactic and pedantic nature of education, as it exists both in its historic and contemporary incarnations.

Since the implementation of universal education, two reform movements have defied social reproduction theory and attempted to move education in a new, more human direction- both having lasting impacts on the nation's consciousness as well as schooling as it is still known today. The progressive education movement sought to implement a whole child approach in which education embraced diversity and crafted critically engaged community members. The equity reform movement attempted to increase social mobility for the poor and institute a new age of equitable opportunity. These two movements in history have important relevance to the question driving this master's paper in that they address times during which the educational institution intentionally expanded to include issues of social justice, critical thought, other oriented behavior, an ethic of care, and an awareness of the community outside the individual. In regard to perspective taking, empathy and altruistic engagement, if they have previously existed in an educational context, they have existed here.

As described by Wiedenhaupt (S. Wiedenhaupt, personal communication, February 2007), perspective taking can be seen in this historical context as moving from the exclusive to the inclusive and back again. The common school movement sought to legitimize one perspective over all others, seeking social stability through the intentional creation of a singular, national mythology to which all would subscribe. The progressive movement arose in seeming opposition to this effort, intentionally opening itself to alternate perspectives by centering the education in the students themselves. Social transformation as opposed to social stabilization was the ultimate goal, and the means utilized individual experience in an effort to achieve self-actualization. The progressive movement, however, left many voices out as it primarily found purchase in elite and

wealthy communities. The equity movement was born out of the civil rights movement, and strove to bring forward those voices and perspectives that had been ignored and stifled. It challenged both the culture and the educational institution to witness the perspectives of the historically disenfranchised, and act towards them out of empathy in an effort to bring forth greater social equity. In short, this history starts with the endorsement of a single perspective, continues with the inclusion of more perspectives- albeit those of the dominant culture- and expands further to bring in the many perspectives of those who had suffered greatest from institutional racism and violence.

Despite these movements towards inclusion with their endorsements of a pluralistic, democratic, more equitable society, such efforts were largely overcome by the movement for excellence and objectivity that arose in the 1980's. This movement, as it is previously described, placed the value in education on objective standards, academic curriculum, and the utilization of the traditional authoritative teaching methods critiqued by the progressives. An emphasis on objectivity and the single standard returns the focus in education to that of one perspective. In a sense, it returns the institution to the creation of a shared mythology at the exclusion of all other narratives.

One hypothesis as to why the progressive and equity movements did not have more lasting successes in reforming the institution of education is rooted in the Principle of Correspondence. These movements for democratic engagement and social equity were incongruent with the actual social structures, norms, and values of the United States. For schools to change, the values of their host society must change. Thus the return to objective excellence, inequity, and authoritative control strongly suggests it is these

qualities that are truly valued in the United States, regardless of political or social rhetoric to the contrary. Social organization as it exists in a capitalist society is reflected back in the education system, helping to reproduce itself time and again. The reform movements, from this perspective, sought social transformation by providing young people with experiences that would enable them to organize their adult communities differently. The strength of the existing structure, however, proved stronger in the end as the education system reverted to its reflective position. Of course, this hypothesis assumes that influence is unidirectional and would suggest that society is strictly created from the bottom up. Yet the educational reform movements did have an effect on the lasting consciousness of society. Schools today, though very much in the world of meritocracy, are not the same as they were before these movements took place. This suggests that social transformation, however small, is achievable through educational efforts outside of the substructure.

Chapter Three: Critical Review Of The Literature

Introduction

This chapter critically examines the literature surrounding the development of empathy and perspective taking in adolescence, as well as the impact that drama in education may or may not have on such development. The organization is laid out such that there are five sections, each offering an individualized view of a particular aspect of the driving research question, building upon one another in a relatively linear fashion. This project's question, as it has been previously articulated, is "what is the effect of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development?"

Pursuant to answering that question, this chapter begins with a section, entitled "Where We Start," which aims at establishing a base understanding of adolescent empathy and perspective taking prior to any specific treatment. The second section, entitled "All Participation Is Not Equal," is composed of three studies that specifically address the effects of watching theatre on a particular form of adolescents' emotional development and meaning making. Section three, entitled "General Effects of Drama Participation," examines just that, the general effects participatory theatre has on adolescents. Such participation influences individuals in myriad ways, which in turn impacts their emotional and empathic development; section three looks at some of those developments. The fourth section, entitled "Role-Play," considers a specific subset of participatory theatre- role-playing in the cognitive sense; that is, mentally active and physically passive. The fifth and final section, "Drama Participation, Empathy and Perspective Taking," concludes this chapter with eight studies of particular relevance to

this project's question. A sort of pulling together of the disparate parts, this final section most explicitly address the question at hand.

In critiquing the literature, attention was placed on the variables empathy, sympathy, and perspective taking. As each researcher came to his or her understanding through a particular context and methodology, the definitions used for these variables change accordingly. Difficult to control for and elusive in their ability to be measured, it is not uncommon for a researcher to measure one in place of another, particularly in regard to empathy and perspective taking. This leaves one with many questions as to what change is taking place and how it is being influenced. In those studies where such an issue exists and remains relevant, which is not true of them all, the dependent variable will be identified and critiqued in terms of its effective measurement. Natural development, the subject that begins this chapter, is one of the consistent lenses through which most studies are viewed. In each, the question of whether or not the findings could be the result of a natural process is necessarily asked.

Where We Start

This section's aim is to establish a baseline, a modicum of understanding regarding the natural development of empathy and perspective taking as it occurs in adolescent development. As Eisenberg (2005) articulated, there is no dearth of research suggesting that perspective taking occurs as part of a normal developmental process from childhood to adult maturity (Selman, 1975, 1980), and that its linear growth correlates with an increase in prosocial development during the same period (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, & Lieberman, 1983; Eisenberg, 1986; Kohlberg, 1981). Adult maturity is

relatively equated with Piagetian notions of cognitive development (Miller, 2002), largely seen as being achieved in the mid- to late-teens. Such developmental advances in perspective taking are believed to lead a greater access to and increase in sympathy and empathy as well as a higher level of moral reasoning (Batson, 1991; Hoffman, 2000). So to, as Eisenberg (2005) suggested, have they been theoretically linked to the development of altruism (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg, Zhou, & Koller, 2001; Underwood & Moore, 1982).

Eisenberg (2005) begins this section with a study supportive of a developmental view of perspective taking. Krebs (1982) then correlates perspective taking, what is therein called role taking, with altruistic tendencies. The rest of the studies, save the last, examine various components of perspective taking and empathy, as they exist in the sample population without any intentional exposure to drama in education- that which this paper is most interested in. The section's charge, in sum, is to provide a sense of the natural changes that occur within normal cognitive development; if one is to identify the changes that drama affect, one must first know what conditions normally exist so as not to give them undue value.

Eisenberg's (2005) longitudinal study of changes in prosocial responding and moral reasoning followed a group of individuals (n=32) throughout their maturation, from preschool to early adulthood. Interviewing the sample twelve times, hereby referred to as T1 –T12, part of Eisenberg's examination included a study of the change that occurred in participants Sympathy Response, defined as the "tendency to experience feelings of warmth and concern for others," and Perspective Taking, defined as the "tendency to adopt the point of view of others" (Eisenberg, 2005, p. 244). Change in

these two criteria has particular relevance to the guiding question of this thesis.

Applying no treatment to the participants, the effort was to identify and document the natural progression of prosocial development and moral reasoning as it changes with age. Her findings, supported by the literature at large, indicate a positive increase in sympathy, empathy, and perspective taking, which continues throughout adolescence and early adulthood. It is important to note here that the dependent variables empathy and perspective taking are distinguished from one another in that the former is both cognitive and emotional and the latter is simply cognitive. Empathy and perspective taking are not synonymous.

Eisenberg (2005) used and described three, 7-item subscales of Davis' Interpersonal Reactivity Index to measure change in participants' empathy-related responding. Participants' mean scores in perspective taking saw a general increase from T7 to T12, approximately fifteen to twenty-six years of age (means= .73, .79, .82, .80, and .87 respectively: T9 was left out due to the use of a differing point scale). Using MANOVA for the five assessments of perspective taking, a significant linear growth pattern for time presented itself ($p < .01$), illustrating a general increase taking place from late adolescence to early adulthood. Women tended to score higher in perspective taking measures, though the difference fell just short of statistical significance ($p < .06$). Participants' moral reasoning preferences, as recorded by independent raters with an inter-rater reliability of .72 or above for all preferences except pragmatic reasoning, and a .80 or above at T12, demonstrated a significant linear growth pattern with age at Level Four ($p < .01$), considered the self-reflective, empathic orientation level. An increase in

participants' sympathy-response did not occur in kind with that of their perspective taking (means for T7, T8, T10, T11, and T12 were .83, .71, .81, .83, and .82).

The results of Eisenberg's (2005) study should not be considered to have wide generalizability. Though there is no explicit description of how the sample was chosen, it can reasonably be assumed that a simple random sample was not employed. Of the thirty-two participants (n= 16 females, 16 males), all were of Euro-American heritage but two. In addition, at the time of T12, all but three participants had some college experience: Two had earned advanced or professional degrees, one was in law school, sixteen had graduated with their Bachelors degree, eight were in the process of finishing their undergraduate education, and two had either completed their Associates degree or left college unfinished. These figures are not reflective of the American population at large, and indicate a socioeconomic status well above that of the average citizen. It is conceivable that socioeconomic status acted as a confounding variable in this study, in that what was observed as a "natural" development may actually be indicative of a social conditioning particular to this population. Not having a more diverse sample renders one only able to speculate as to the ubiquity of the observed phenomenon.

Measures were taken through the use of several self-report questionnaires at each level, and phone or in-lab interviews at T10 and above. This brings into question the accuracy of the measurement of the dependent variables. Distinguishing sympathy from empathy in such a situation is difficult at best, as the individual reporter may not be aware of the degree to which he or she is engaged in either effort.

The fact that perspective taking witnessed a demonstrable increase while sympathy-response did not, suggests that participants had a growing awareness of and

ability to imagine how circumstances may look from another's perspective, without the seemingly logical corresponding growth in an ability to experience warmth and concern for that person. Though there are many possible explanations for this phenomenon, one related to the social realm may be a lack of awareness regarding privilege. The demographic breakdown of the sample does indeed suggest high socioeconomic status, with some ninety-one percent of the sample attending post-secondary education and ninety-six percent being of the dominant culture in American society.

As Johnson (2006) articulated, those with societal privilege are often unaware of the advantages conferred upon them, not having to directly face the prejudices or generational poverty that many others do. Being unaware of one's social and economic advantages leads to the belief that personal or familial success is a measure, strictly of one's own merit. The logical conclusion to this thought is that a lack of awareness regarding one's own privilege correlates with an ignorance of the additional difficulties and burdens others face in their journey. Such blindness reinforces the mentality that one's economic or academic success is entirely determined by the efforts of the individual, and those who achieve less materially have done so because of laziness or chosen ignorance rather than lack of gifted opportunity. This is meant in no way to demean the efforts or individuals of any socioeconomic class, but merely to illustrate a logical thought experiment in why perspective taking may grow while sympathy remains stagnant. Those of the dominant culture and higher socioeconomic status who have not been exposed to the realities of their privilege may well be unsympathetic to those in lesser material conditions; their own socialization would support the idea that one gets what one deserves through individual effort and hard work. Such a belief structure would

make strides in explaining why participants of this particular study were able to imagine what others must feel in differing circumstances than their own with greater awareness as they aged, but did not have a measurable increase in the tendency to sympathize with such individuals.

Eisenberg's (2005) study, though of limited generalizability, lends additional voice to a larger theoretical base. Selman (1980) theorized and articulated the existence of a linear growth pattern in social perspective taking from childhood to adulthood, which this study has validated empirically. It is worth stating again that adulthood is loosely and rather subjectively defined, seen as being achieved in the mid- to late-teen years when one reaches the apex of his or her natural development. From that point on the individual is understood to have the capacity for adult cognition, which includes perspective taking and empathic engagement. Having the capacity to do something, however, does not automatically suggest being skilled at it.

As Eisenberg (2005) articulated, Davis and Franzoi found that the tendency to take on others' perspectives increases during adolescence, as this study confirms, and that advances in perspective taking abilities are conceptually linked to the later development of altruistic reasoning (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg, Zhou, & Koller, 2001; Underwood & Moore, 1982). It is reasonable to conclude, therefore, that a natural, linear growth in perspective taking occurs from childhood to adulthood. The promise of development, however, does not automatically translate to actualization, just as an increase in perspective taking ability does not automatically lead to a greater tendency to sympathize. Simply having the tools does not necessarily guarantee one mastering their use.

Krebs (1982) offers additional support to the positive link between perspective taking, what he refers to as Role Taking, and altruistic tendencies. Krebs starts with the assumption that role taking is a natural part of cognitive development as one moves from egocentric to sociocentric orientation. Whereas Eisenberg (2005) sought to demonstrate this progression empirically, Krebs (1982) uses the assumption as his starting place, seeking to correlate it with altruistic behavior. This study has particular relevance to the guiding question of the thesis in that it too provides a base understanding of the existent relationship between perspective taking (role taking in this study) and altruistic behavior. As this thesis is ultimately examining the effects of drama in education on adolescents' perspective taking abilities, pursuant to answering whether such activities can be considered a valid part of a larger educational effort towards social justice, Krebs lends weight to the notion that an increase in perspective taking abilities correlates with an increase in altruistic behavior.

Twenty-four participants, elementary school children in a second- and third-grade combination class, were used in the study, chosen at this age for their particular developmental placement, theoretically transitioning from egocentrism to sociocentrism. Of the second-grade students, eight were male and six were female. Of the third-grade students five were male and five were female, with a combined-class age range of seven to nine. The sample was stratified insofar as children were chosen to represent differing socioeconomic strata.

As described by Krebs (1982), participants were given two tests of role taking ability, both designed by Flavell, and observed for behavior disposition by two independent raters. The inter-rater reliability of the role taking tests scorers was .95 ($p <$

.0001). The inter-rater reliability for behavior observations was statistically significant but weak at .54 ($p < .001$). Correlations between role taking ability and altruistic behavior proved both strong and significant for the second- and third-grader participants ($r = .47$ and $.52$, at $p < .01$, and $p < .005$ respectively). Children's scores on the two role taking tests were also correlated with their teacher's rated observations to produce results that were both strong and significant ($r = .42$ and $.57$, at $p < .05$ and $p < .005$ respectively). Both correlations suggest that an increase in role taking ability is marked, in kind, with an increase in altruistic tendencies. A third correlation, both strongly negative and highly significant, supports this hypothesis that role taking and altruism can be positively associated; behavioral observations correlated the relationship between offering help and seeking dominance ($r = -.72$ at $p < .001$).

This positive correlation between role taking and its dependent variable of altruistic behavior is significant though not necessarily strong. The relatively small sample size leaves a desire for either a larger correlation or a larger amount of participants in order to take certainty from the "r" factor. The relationship expressed, however, has significance to this master's paper in that it suggests an increase in perspective taking will correlate in an increase in altruistic, other oriented behavior. This inquiry is attempting to discern the effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development. If it is indeed shown that participation in drama has a demonstrative and positive effect on one's ability to engage in perspective taking, this study would suggest that an additional increase would take place in participants' altruistic tendencies as well. If it were shown that drama in education has no demonstrative effect on one's perspective taking development or mastery, this study

would then suggest that no increase in altruistic tendencies should be expected from such participation.

Like Eisenberg (2005), the large-scale generalizability of this study is in question. Though students came from families of diverse socioeconomic strata, all lived in a single community and attended a single school. These findings will necessarily be colored by the experiences of the particular community, and not having data from individuals being raised in different settings renders it inappropriate to presume that such findings are ubiquitous. So too is there an absence of information regarding the curriculum and activities the school-aged participants engaged with. It is possible that teachers, having such a longitudinal research study taking place in their midst, worked role taking and prosocial behavior into their curriculum. These are necessary qualities for successful groupwork and students may have received such training repeatedly. That said, the empirical results do confirm that which is speculated about in the theoretical literature and suggests a particular trend. Though the inter-rater reliability was not particularly strong for the observational portion of this study, the composite scores of altruistic and egoistic behavior amongst the raters had near perfect correspondence at .96.

Two of the three raters, including the participants' teacher, were women and none were privy to the results of the children's role taking ability tests. This helps to mitigate gender bias and or preference, and neutralizes any possible desire to confirm students' test results with their classroom behavior. So too does the opportunity to observe participants in natural settings, i.e. the classroom, help to ensure natural responses; however, it is likely that the participants' teacher witnessed the most natural behavior of the students due to their prior knowledge of and comfort with her. The other two

observers, a male college student and a female college student, may have influenced the students' behavior simply by being in the room; having strangers observing their classroom behavior may have inspired a performative quality in the students or added to already existing shyness. The question then becomes, did students increase their altruistic tendencies because of an intrinsic belief or because they simply knew it was what they were supposed to do?

Though some very valid questions remain, Krebs (1982) does add empirical evidence to the speculated relationship between role taking ability and altruistic behavior. The positive correlations discussed suggest that as one increases in her or his ability or tendency to abstractly take on the perspective of another, she or he experiences a like increase in altruistic behavior. So too must the opposite be true; the less an individual is able or willing to abstractly view from another's perspective, the less she or he is likely to engage in altruistic behavior. In terms of Krebs, of course, this can only be said to be true in the case of a particular set of second- and third-graders in Brookline, Massachusetts, in 1982. It does, however, suggest a pattern that should not go unnoticed.

Quintana et al. (1999) rooted their study in similar literature and assumptions as the previously described. Beginning with Selman's (1980) developmental model of social perspective taking, which, views social perspective taking as having a linear growth pattern from childhood to adulthood, Quintana et al. (1999) sought to examine whether social perspective taking ability (SPTA) was an accurate predictor of ethnic perspective taking ability (EPTA). EPTA, like Selman's (1980) description of SPTA, is described on a hierarchical scale ranging from Level Naught to Level Four, with each level applying the described social criteria specifically to the ethnic realm. For example,

Level Two of SPTA (developmentally seven to twelve years of age) corresponds to an individual's employment of role taking skills in order to understand how others' will perceive his or her actions. Level Two of EPTA (developmentally seven to twelve years of age) corresponds to an individual's employment of role taking skills in order to understand the implications of racial categorization and social status as it relates to racism and prejudice. This is rather moderate in skill as compared to Level Four (approximately twelve years of age to adulthood) in which individuals are able to achieve a multicultural identity and an understanding of both intergroup and intrapsychic diversity.

This study takes social perspective taking as its independent variable; that is, its base assumption is that Selman's (1980) linear developmental model of cognitive perspective taking is accurate and without dispute. The dependent variable is then Ethnic Perspective Taking Ability, and this is measured in relation to both age and the SPTA scale. This study's importance to this master's project lies in that it adds further weight to the notion that such development, SPTA and EPTA, is to a large degree normal development. So too does it help to deepen or broaden one's conceptualization and definition of perspective taking- that one's abilities to perspective take may cross lines of culture or ethnicity. This last notion, however, does not take into account cultural cues or funds of knowledge (A. Lenges, workshop facilitation, January, 2007). In terms of this project, if EPTA has a positive relationship with SPTA and we take SPTA to be a natural development, than any effect dramatic participation has on SPTA will likely have a congruent effect on EPTA.

Quintana et al. (1999), using a sample of Mexican American adolescents (n=43), positively and significantly correlated SPTA with EPTA ($r = .43$ at $p < .01$), confirming their initial hypothesis that SPTA would act as a positive indicator of EPTA. This supports the key theoretical assumption that developmental advances in the cognitive realm are translatable to the ethnic realm. Data for both SPTA and EPTA were gathered through semi-structured interviews, which were audio taped and later scored by independent raters. The two raters had demonstrated inter-rater reliability in a previous study ($.89$ at $p < .05$), and were presumed to continue in like manner. The students' teachers provided an additional measure, observing the participants' classroom behaviors in a natural environment and rating them in terms of their social behavior. Teacher ratings correlated positively and significantly with those of the independent raters (ranging from $r = .46$ at $p < .03$, to $r = .74$ at $p < .001$), suggesting a high degree of accuracy in recording through this use of triangulation.

The student sample was itself heterogeneous in makeup. Though all were of the same ethnic demographic, Mexican American, some lived in predominantly Anglo neighborhoods (n=21), some lived in predominantly Mexican American neighborhoods (n=12), and some lived in ethnically mixed neighborhoods (n=10). Likewise, domestic language usage was mixed with some speaking Spanish in the home (n=10), some speaking English in the home (n=10), and some speaking a mix of the two (n=23). The socioeconomic status of the participants' families varied considerably. Fourteen participants had at least one parent with less than a high school education, fourteen had parents who both completed high school, and fifteen had at least one parent with some post-secondary education. One participant was first-generation American, born in

Mexico and immigrating with to the United States with his or her parents, sixteen were second-generation, eleven were third-generation, and fifteen were forth- or later generation.

This demographic information is important in terms of the participants' ethnic identity, the achievement of which was found to have a positive correlation with EPTA ($r = .33$), and weak negative correlation with SPTA ($r = -.05$). That is to say, SPTA and EPTA appear to develop in a parallel progression; however, ethnic identity achievement correlates only with EPTA, a logical assertion, which indicates a qualitative difference between the two abilities despite their strong relationship. If such a qualitative difference exists, the previous notion that drama in education would affect SPTA and EPTA in kind may be fallacious. Further and specific research would be needed to support or deny any such assertion.

Much like the previously critiques, broad generalizability cannot be taken from the findings of this study. Though the raters did demonstrate strong inter-rater reliability under previous circumstances, no comparison was attempted in this context. It is not inconceivable that scoring may be influenced or affected by cultural incongruities between the subjects and the raters; that is, a rater may misinterpret the reactions of a sample participant due to a lack of familiarity with his or her particular cultural encapsulation. Quintana et al. (1999) did, however, employ the observations of participants' teachers in an effort to achieve triangulation, as mentioned previously. This certainly offers more confidence in the observations at large. The sample size was relatively small, intentional in design, and studied over a fairly short time frame. The intention was not to conduct a longitudinal survey but to identify corresponding traits in

developmental stages. In this sense, it is successful. Beyond a positive relationship between SPTA and EPTA, however, it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions.

Pederson's (1997) study, using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods, aimed at identifying the salient characteristics associated with adolescents' range of intercultural sensitivity (ICS), specifically a sample of seventh graders (n =145). The definition of ICS is likened with this paper's conception of perspective taking. Six seventh grade social studies classes from three schools, located in three districts were chosen for the study. Though the schools and students were chosen via simple random sampling, purposive sampling was used to choose the districts in an effort to include rural, urban, and suburban communities.

Pederson utilized standardized measures as well as personal interviews to collect data on possible correlates and predictors of ICS. They included: The Early Adolescent Intercultural Development Inventory, Bem's Sex Role Inventory, Bryant's Empathy Index, Altemeyer's Adapted Authoritarian Scale, researcher generated questions, an open-ended interviews. The qualitative measures were used to inform the quantitative. These measures can inform the master's paper question in that uncovered relationships may help inform future interpretation of the effects of drama in education on such variables. For example, a relationship between sex role identity and authoritarian behavior may go unnoticed by the drama researcher, leading him or her to conclude that dramatic participation leads to an increase or decrease in participants' authoritarian tendencies while being blind to the much more significant relationship with sex role. That is to say, identifying such relationships reduces the potential for future confounding variables.

Pederson (1997) identified several statistically significant relationships in her study, the strongest of which existed between one's measure of empathy and her intercultural development. The respondents' (n = 125) scores on the empathy index had a range of 58 and a mean of 75. The Pearson correlation coefficient revealed a positive, and highly significant relationship between empathy and ICS ($r = 0.40$, $p < 0.0001$). As an adolescent's empathy score increased, so too did her intercultural sensitivity. A statistically significant negative correlation was identified between authoritarianism and ICS (n = 116, $r = -.24$, $p < 0.008$), indicating that those with more inflexible attitudes about the self and others are demonstratively less sensitive to differences around them. There was a predictable, statistically significant, negative relationship between one's empathy score and authoritarianism score (n = 116, $r = -0.30$, $p < 0.001$). A final positive and statistically significant relationship was identified between androgyny, those students of male and female sex who identified strongly with both male and female traits, and intercultural sensitivity (n = 22, $B = 0.21$, $p < 0.01$). One's sex itself was only of borderline significance ($p < 0.06$). Additionally, Pederson found that neither minority status ($p < 0.71$), nor second language acquisition ($p < 0.52$) were statistically significant predictors of intercultural sensitivity.

The qualitative measures, interviews conducted with nineteen students at each school, revealed several interesting qualifiers to the quantitative data. The standardized tests indicated that students living in suburban communities had the greatest amount of intercultural sensitivity. When interviewed, however, this proved to be misleading. Students' perception of what ICS was varied greatly depending on their community. For example, students in rural communities, who had the highest likelihood of living in

homogeneity, viewed intercultural experiences as being novel and far from their daily lives. Urban students, who were most likely to live in heterogeneous communities and have intercultural friendships, held contradicting notions of intercultural experiences. On the interpersonal level they reveled in their intercultural relationships, yet on an impersonal level, the urban students reflected fear and suspicion of the “other.” Suburban students tended to view the world as ever diversifying, and accepted the growing multiculturalism.

These interviews identify locale as an additional predictor of ICS, a measure not identified by the standardized methods. So too did they begin to illuminate the limited reliability of such measures in determining correlates and predictors of ICS. Each student necessarily views the questions and queries through the particular lens of their community. As such, a standardized inquiry proves to have greater inaccuracies in that it makes judgments about answers without taking cultural considerations or personal definitions into account.

Pederson (1997) did utilize methodological triangulation in an effort to more thoroughly examine the sample. This study, though unique in its examination of predictors of ICS among early adolescents, has very little generalizability. Despite the quantitative, standardized measures, and the random sampling of students, the districts themselves were chosen intentionally, reducing the general applicability of the findings to the population at large. So too does it fall short of being able to identify any causal relationship between the disparate factors studied and ICS.

Several solid correlative relationships were illuminated, and this allows us to identify traits like empathy as a strong predictor of ICS; however, it is unwise to assume

a perfect link between the two. Much of the literature as well as theoretical assumptions have held that perspective taking is necessary for empathy where as empathy is not necessary for perspective taking. This study's conclusion that empathy is in fact a strong predictor of ICS, which was likened to perspective taking, goes somewhat against the aforementioned belief. A more likely hypothesis would be that ICS and empathy are actually more alike than ICS and perspective taking. This being the case, experiences that positively impact the development of empathic abilities/responses would be likely to impact ICS in kind. In relation to this master's paper question, any relationship between drama in education and empathy is like to impact participants ICS in a congruent manner.

Tirri (2000) worked to identify the development of empathy and role taking skills in sixth grade students (n = 100) and ninth grade students (n =94), growing up in Finland. Students were asked to write a story about a moral conflict they experienced at school, involving either themselves or their friends. The stories were then analyzed using qualitative measures, with a focus on the interpersonal relationships expressed within. The theme most central to the moral conflict was identified, and the students' approach to moral reasoning was discerned through their descriptions of interpersonal interactions and conflict resolution; justice oriented moral reasoning and care oriented moral reasoning were the predominant approaches. Empathy and the students' ability to engage in role taking was determined alongside their moral reasoning preference by two independent raters. The inter-rater reliability was 0.90, as determined by the independent rating of a sample of stories (n =20), calculated using the formula of "number of rater agreement/number of stories" (Tirri, 2000, p. 4).

The empirical findings identified five major themes in the students' stories. They were: Harassment, peer relations, teacher behavior, adult behavior, and common rules. Four different social relationships were also expressed in the students' stories. They were: Teacher-pupil, pupil-pupil, pupil-adult (non teacher), and pupil-somebody else. The solutions to the conflicts described by the students reflected either a justice-oriented model of reasoning, a care-oriented model of reasoning, or some combination thereof. Sixth grade boys showed a strong proclivity for justice-oriented moral reasoning, with 64% demonstrating justice-oriented engagement only. 14% of sixth grade boys expressed care-oriented behavior, and 12% indicated an ability to use both. Sixth grade girls had a different distribution in their moral reasoning approaches, with 48% demonstrating care-oriented solutions only to the conflicts described. In addition, 38% of sixth grade girls were justice-oriented only, and 14% indicated an ability to use both. The difference between the two genders was statistically significant ($p < .007$). There was no significant change, statistically or otherwise, for either gender from sixth to ninth grade.

Empathy and role taking ability was measured by analyzing the students' stories for the different perspectives contained within them. Raters searched not only for care-oriented solutions to the conflict presented, but also examined the students' interpretations of situations as a whole. 20 % of sixth graders were able to view the conflict from another perspective and reflect on possibilities to change it. Approximately 13% of ninth graders demonstrated the same ability, all of which were girls.

The female subjects of this study showed a greater ability to empathize and role take than the males in general. So too were they more able to view conflicts in the larger

context of life. This is somewhat in contrast to the findings of Pederson (1997), who found a significant relationship between androgyny and intercultural sensitivity, but no such relationship between female identification and ICS. Of course, there are two assumptions within this statement. One, there is no way of knowing where these individuals would score on Bem's Sex Role Inventory, and it is possible that many would fall into the androgynous category. Secondly, empathy has been shown to be a strong predictor of ICS and this study links it to care-oriented moral reasoning. There is not, however, definitive evidence linking care-oriented moral reasoning directly with intercultural sensitivity. Inferring from the evidence provided by Tirri (2000), one may be able to hypothesize such a relationship; however, there is nothing to confirm or disconfirm such an assumption.

The data collected for this study was done in a natural setting. In asking students to write stories in their normal classroom settings, the possibility of their being affected by an unknown interviewer was somewhat mitigated. The findings seem consistent with other similar studies, and as such the information has a degree of dependability. Its generalizability, however, is left in question. There is not enough data on the process that was undertaken to determine these results. We do not know who the raters were and how they were chosen. We do not know how explicit the instructions were that the students were given; that is, if what was being measured was actually included in the instructions provided. The findings do seem consistent with those of previous studies conducted in the United States and Canada (Tirri, 2003), yet we do not know what cultural factors may be in play. In addition, we do not know how the sample was chosen. The students came

from four different schools but there is no information provided that tells how those schools or particular students were chosen.

One clear concern is what exactly was being measured. Though both empathy and role taking were looked for and measured, it is unclear as to exactly how they were distinguished. There is a possibility that what was actually measured was perspective taking as it has been described throughout this chapter. That being the case, the lack of significant growth from sixth to ninth grade seemingly stands in opposition to the notion of a linear development in perspective taking abilities, at least at first glance. Selman (1980), however, hypothesized that one comes fully into his or her potential somewhere near the twelfth year. That is, the students participating in this study may have already crossed the apex of their cognitive development. Adding a group of younger students to the study, second graders perhaps, would allow for a deeper critique. This study's relevance to the master's paper question lies in its description of the development over time. Furthering the conversation about the possible natural development perspective taking and empathy, Tirri (2000) adds to the researcher's ability to identify possible confounding variables.

Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al. (2003) conclude this section with a study suggesting that self-regulatory activities, including empathy and concern for others, can be increased in individuals through educational activities. Utilizing a quasi-experimental design with a pre- and post-test, Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al., split their sample (n=40) randomly into two groups of equal size. One group functioned as the control group (CG, n=20) while the other functioned as the experimental group (EG, n=20). The EG was given, in addition to the regular set of instruction offered at this government funded,

private school, an additional set of curricular activities referred to simply as portfolio.

Portfolio consisted of weekly, one-hour lessons throughout the academic year, totaling thirty hours by the conclusion of this study. Activities in portfolio varied considerably depending on the topic being explored, described as ranging from planning a task to altruism.

According to Appendix A. (Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al., 2003, p.435), topics specific to the portfolio study of empathy included human emotions, friendship among schoolmates, gestures and postures in communication, social skills in the classroom, putting oneself in the other's place, the meaning of feeling empathy, collaboration and altruism. Teaching methods utilized were largely didactic in nature, though additional methods included cooperative learning, modeling by the teacher, role-playing, practical cases, feedback, and thinking-aloud. It should be noted that Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al. provide a specific definition for empathy, their dependent variable, containing two parts. The first is affective in nature- a reaction to another's emotional experience- and the second is cognitive- seeing from another's perspective in a non-judgmental way. It appears that the portfolio, experimental group received direct training in the definition and appearance of the dependent variables- empathy and altruism- accompanied by practice time and limited actual engagement. This brings into question what was actually being learned. It is possible that the instruction itself acted as a confound; explicit training in the technical aspects of empathy and altruism may have led to a change in behavior without a correlative change in intrinsic, emotional life- a much more difficult thing to measure.

Significant gains were measured in the experimental group, according to the pre- and post-test that was utilized, with regard to the correlations in empathy and concern for others. The pre-test identified a weak correlation between Empathy and Self-Control ($r = .131$), where the post-test identified both a strong and significant correlative relationship ($r = .625$ at $p < .01$). So too were there tremendous gains in the correlation between Consideration to Others and Empathy, moving from a weak relationship ($r = .174$) to a strong and significant one ($r = .549$ at $p < .01$). An examination of the change in mean scores for CG and EG reveal an increase in all categories for both groups; however, the change in mean scores experienced by EG were significantly higher than those of CG, in both a statistical and informal sense ($p < .001$). The pre- to post-test increase in mean score for Empathy and Consideration to Others for EG was 77.54 and 56.56 respectively, as compared to the pre- to post-test increase in the same categories for CG, which were 31.01 and 14.28 respectively. This strongly suggests that such prosocial behavior can be and is influenced by educational activities. Those that specifically targeted these social characteristics, i.e. the portfolio experiment, seem to have been validated in their hypotheses. And yet some growth was experienced in the CG, lending weight to the theoretical assumption that prosocial behavior is, to some degree, a product of cognitive development.

The findings of this study have only limited generalizability, as the sample was neither random nor diverse. Set in a government-subsidized, Spanish private-school, participants were judged to be of normal educational level for their age (mean = 13), and being raised in families whose socioeconomic status was appraised as medium; this variable, however, was neither measured nor factored into the final evaluation of the

investigators. Legitimate questions surface about the sample population itself; it is possible that some of the results were influenced by the socio-political context in which the population existed- indeed likely. Whether or not these findings could be generalized to another sample in another sociocultural context can only be answered with another study. The quasi-experimental design, however, with its experimental and control groups taking the same pre- and post-tests and receiving the same basic instruction- EG having the additional portfolio component- does lend great weight to the legitimacy of Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al.'s findings, that self-regulation can be increased through educational practice.

There is a behaviorist component to this examination. A good deal of the rating system to which the participants were subjected focused exclusively on observed behavior. Though it did span the academic year and took several different measures of learning, there seems to be an underlying assumption that a change in behavior over time perfectly correlates with learning. A re-test, done a year or two down the road or under differing circumstances, would offer a meaningful picture of the long term impacts portfolio had, or the inclusion of some sort of significant measure of metacognition would go great lengths to providing assurance to a skeptical reader.

This section has added empirical evidence to the theoretical base that surrounds normal cognitive development and the growth of perspective taking and empathy. It appears reasonable to conclude that social perspective taking has a normal linear growth pattern with age from childhood to adult maturity (Eisenberg, 2005; Selman, 1980), achieving its greatest momentum in late adolescence. Empathy is strongly correlated with intercultural sensitivity (Pederson, 1997), an advanced form of perspective taking,

and social perspective taking is a predictor of ethnic perspective taking (Quintana et al., 1999). These are normal developments and social/cognitive achievements for these particular samples, which are each rooted in their particular culture and time. And while one cannot claim a true ubiquity to all that has been reported, strong trends are certainly suggested.

Perhaps most important to this thesis, in the initial section that is, is Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al.'s (2003) findings that empathy- accurately reacting to another's emotional experience and seeing from his or her perspective in a non judgmental way- and other self regulatory and prosocial abilities can be increased through educational activities. Though the findings of their study are suspect in that they primarily measure behavior, the literature and theoretical base support the hypothesis they sought to document (Eisenberg, 2005; Selman, 1980). This is a necessary starting place for the resultant investigation. Perspective taking abilities and empathy seem to be natural developmental achievements in normal cognitive and socially developing individuals; however, development alone can only go so far. This raises the specter of a nature versus nurture debate, yet it is the argument of this thesis, as it is also argued by Miller (2002), that it is more appropriate to see nature and nurture as working together instead of being mutually exclusive.

It would appear that normal development equips individuals with the tools necessary for perspective taking and empathy. If one is to accept development theory as it is, our species moves from the egoism of early childhood- Level One- to a complex, multi-dynamic understanding of identity and social behavior- Level Four (Quintana et al., 1999; Selman, 1980). The tools are there, and development theory suggests that a level

of proficiency is achievable by all. To what degree one develops a mastery of their tools, however, is largely determined by his or her experiences after the appropriate developmental stage has been achieved. That is, all have a natural capacity for perspective taking and empathy, yet further development beyond that natural capacity is entirely dependent upon experience and use. Having the capacity to develop a skill does not necessarily mean that one will develop that skill. Natural development theory suggests a ubiquity to the process of human cognitive and emotional change through maturation- that normal development provides all with a solid foundation regardless of circumstance. What one builds upon that foundation, however, is neither prescribed nor predicted, but very much dependent on context and contact. Increased skill or mastery with perspective taking and empathy can come only out of increased opportunities to work with such skills and develop such mastery.

Moving forward with this understanding, the coming sections will examine the effects of drama on further development, asking if it may legitimately be considered one type of experience that leads to such mastery. As has been seen, it is necessary to have an understanding of the assumed developmental framework so that it does not act as a confounding variable. As researchers attempt to measure the effect of drama in education on its participants, it will be necessary to take development into consideration. If this variable is not controlled for, there is little way to ensure that any change being measured is actually attributable to dramatic participation.

All Participation Is Not Equal

This section begins the investigation of the effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development. Used to establish the difference between drama in education- a student-centered, experiential form of education- and youth theatre- performative and scripted drama enacted by and/or for youth- these three studies examine the degree to which watching theatre influences learning and emotional development. As described by Henry (2000), many prominent theorists in the discipline of theatre have held the belief that the art form's greatest teaching abilities lie not in its viewing, such as a passively absorbent audience member, but in its use for individual and social development (e.g. Bolton, 1984; Slade, 1954). Non-performative, child-centered explorations of the known, unknown, and imagined worlds have tremendous power in the process of meaning making. In the pursuit of identifying those experiences that may best aid in the process of emotional development, and as an empirical test of the above-described theory, this section asks, 'What about watching?'

Klein (1995) identified several factors that led to the distancing of children from the emotional worlds of the performers they watched. Interviews were given to a sample of children (n=88: 33 first-graders, 28 third-graders, 27 fifth-graders- the mean ages at which were 7, 9, and 11, respectively) after they had watched a youth theatre performance appropriate for their age group. The resultant data revealed a pervasive tendency for the children to sympathize as opposed to empathize with the characters. Klein here defines sympathizing as having emotions with objective reasons that differed from the characters observed, and empathizing as having subjective emotional reactions

matching those of the characters observed. In all, approximately half (53%) of the children empathized and demonstrated care oriented moral reasoning preferences, correctly identifying the protagonists subjective emotional experience and thinking those thoughts expressed in the dialogue. A majority of the children (88%) experienced distancing from the objective and justice orientations of the characters. Distancing, as described by Klein, is either equated with sympathizing or marked by absolute distraction; that is, distancing results in having a subjective emotional experience that is incongruent with that of the characters observed.

In support of the literature, and the findings of the previous section, empathy increased with age as well as gender. Older children had a higher tendency to continue thinking from the character's perspective for a longer duration, compare characters' emotional and moral behaviors to their own, and apply the perceived message of the performance to themselves and their society. Younger children, in particular the first-graders, found themselves dissimilar from the protagonist, often focusing on physical appearance, and thus distanced themselves from her/his emotional experience. So too did first-graders largely focus on their own likes and dislikes rather than those of the characters ($p < .05$). This is congruent with the previous sections conclusions, that younger children would naturally be less developed in their perspective taking abilities, and no amount of theatrical exposure could cause a change that they were not already cognitively prepared for.

Klein (1995) found that several specific factors inhibited the children from feeling empathy while it triggered sympathy and distancing in its place. Foremost among these factors was the inability of the children to assist the protagonist in her/his efforts directly

on stage. Second, and related to the previous, characters broke the fourth wall by addressing the audience directly. As Kline noted, this may have heightened the young audiences' self-awareness, inadvertently increasing the existent tendency to focus on their own desires or hypothesized reactions to the set conditions of the play. So too may have caused a degree of confusion in that it suggested or encouraged more participation when it was not actually permitted. The third main factor that inhibited empathic engagement and triggered sympathy or distancing was simply spectacle. Costumes, props, unusual characters, and special effects all proved distracting, mostly for the younger audience members, eliciting individual personal desires and equating the performed experience with dissimilar personal experiences or expectations. Boys in particular distanced themselves more often in that they judged the use of props and dramatic action from personal experiences and desires, which were either played out or unsatisfied by the actual theatrical action.

These findings are relevant in that they bring into question this particular form of dramatic participation- namely passive participation. Viewed from a developmental perspective, the findings thus far make perfect sense- younger children would not be expected to make the same cognitive or other-oriented perspective leaps that their older companions would. The variables being studied are empathy and sympathy, as defined above, and they cannot be understood outside of this developmental perspective. Dependent as they are, the question becomes how responsible is the act of viewing in effecting one's response. The answer seems to be that until some basic cognitive abilities are present, viewing does little more than reinforce that which is already present; it reveals an egoistic response that is necessarily self-referential. The implications for this

master's paper are such that the effects of viewing may not be fully understood when experimented on such a young audience. If they, according to developmental theory, have no theoretical chance of anything but the most limited amount of perspective taking, few if any conclusions can be drawn as to its ultimate effects. A study focusing on older students with more theoretical capability of engagement is necessary for the drawing of truly solid conclusions.

Both the pre-play questionnaire on empathic predispositions and the post-play, fifteen minute personal interviews were coded, rated, and triangulated by three independent raters with a reliability ranging from .89 to 1.0. This suggests a high degree of accuracy in measuring the participants' subjective experiences and qualitative data. Children were from varied socioeconomic backgrounds, though it does not appear that this was a variable controlled for. The generalizability of these results is low, as the study was largely qualitative and fixed in a single population, though it does support current theoretical models for cognitive development (Miller, 2002; Selman, 1980). The results, however, might look quite different in an area of high poverty or differing social ideologies. A sample of older youths, adolescents or young adults, would also likely produce very different results. As younger children may not yet have reached a level of cognitive development at which one expects to see higher levels of perspective taking and empathy, Selman's (1980) Levels Three or Four, it is reasonable to expect their observed absence here amongst the seven-year olds. That which has greatest relevance to the current thesis is the notion that, as observers rather than participants, the sample largely found the play to be entertaining. Entertained, however, does not necessarily

equate with learning or change. Klein (1995) noted that children laughed and enjoyed themselves thoroughly, but were not *educated* by the play.

Gesser-Edelsburg (2005) found that, in the case of a specific non-fiction piece with specific educational and social aims, the presentation of the performance actually resulted in student beliefs that were diametrically opposed to those conclusions that were desired; that is, the play was counterproductive to its own goals. Telling the story of a brutal gang rape, which took place at Kibbutz Shomrat, Israel, the play was written to counter prevalent sexual stereotypes and gender violence existent in society and popular media. Empirical evidence gathered from the responses of high school students who attended the Haifa Theatre production of *Backyard Games* (n= 617) found that these stereotypes were not only reinforced but also increased in the watching of the performance.

Students answered questionnaires before and after the performances about their perceptions of innocence and guilt in rape cases, individual agency in sexual aggression and the like. Students also participated in teacher-led discussions prior to the performance and small group discussions after the performance, the latter of which was used for qualitative data purposes (n= 21; three groups of seven: One all male, one all female, and one mixed). During these discussions students would identify the stereotypes that they saw in popular media as well as articulate their own beliefs. The main quantitative findings show that the degree of guilt or responsibility students felt the girl had for her own rape increased significantly after watching the performance (31.5% increase in victim guilt, “High” or “Very High” categories; $p < .000$). There was also a significant increase in the degree to which students felt she could have avoided being

raped through alternative behavior (31.1% increase in the “High” or “Very High” categories; $p < .000$). A last significant increase was in the students’ tendency to believe that boys can get into situations in which they end up committing rape (17.5% increase in those who felt “most, a big majority or all boys” can reach such a situation; $p < .000$).

Gesser-Edelsburg (2005) laid a majority of the blame for such student conclusions at the teacher led discussions, whose purpose was to familiarize the students with the facts of the brutal crime, prepare them for the theatrical reenactment, and discuss the themes and beliefs surrounding the issue. This had the effect, however, according to Gesser-Edelsburg, of preparing the students to watch what they believed was the reality of the event rather than an artistic interpretation of it. Telling the story in a different context or from a different point of view, the victim’s, for example, may well have produced differing results in post-performance student beliefs. This was, no doubt, a powerful and memorable performance for all those involved. It did not, however, result in the kind of thinking or belief matrices that the artists and researchers had hoped.

Initially intended to counter the notion that women are somehow responsible for the sexual violence they may experience because of their behavior or dress, students were instead left with a strengthening of such opinions. Initially intended to counter the notion that men are somehow slaves to their own sexual desires, easily acting out with little provocation, students tended to leave instead strengthened in such a belief. Such conclusions speak to the strength of belief perseverance and prior knowledge. Despite the intentions of those who artistically interpreted this account, the students came to the performance steeped in the values, stereotypes, and prejudices of their particular culture in time. Only able to *participate* in the production as silent observers, the students were

left to make meaning based on the perceptions they already had. That is to say, any new understanding would have to grow out of what they already knew, thus reinforcing and strengthening the original stereotypic, though ill conceived, conceptualizations. This result is in line with Zull's (2002) description of the growth of neuronal networks, as well as Piaget's theory, as articulated by Miller (2002), of schematic adaptation. Having been prepped for the play with an activation of prior knowledge and assumption without a critical critique of that which was known, students tended to assimilate what they saw into that which they already knew/believed.

If the participants were able to workshop the themes, that is, participate in a physical and emotional way, it is possible that they would have left with different, more empathic notions. In such a situation, they would be asked not only to process what they see through their prior knowledge and understanding but to use it in the negotiation of a real, albeit imagined, landscape with heightened circumstances. Such a scenario would emphasize a student-centered construction of meaning rather than a performer centered interpretation intended for absorption. There are lingering questions, however, as to how much the change in student understanding and responding was directly influenced by the act of watching. Though this study does indeed carry the suggestion that watching theatre is effective only in confirming viewers' preconceived ideas, to completely draw such a conclusion is not advised. It is possible that the pre-play workshops may have unduly influenced the results, or that the play itself was directed in such a manner as to lead to these findings. Had the characters been more explicit in confronting such stereotypes, the act of watching may have produced different results. The form of the presentation itself may impact the measured results. The study's relevance to this

master's paper question lies in its suggestion that watching theatre reinforces one's perspective rather than changes it; this is, though, a mere speculation.

Whiteman and Nielsen (1986) chose to evaluate the effectiveness of using presentational drama as a means to teach information to graduate students in a social work program. The starting hypotheses were that a play-presentation would be both more enjoyable than a lecture, creating an operant conditioning function for learning (Moursund, 1976), and more successful in teaching the desired information. The graduate class was split into four groups randomly, and equally divided between the two professors, each of who lectured once and presented the drama once. Students were given two questionnaires at the end of class, one measuring knowledge retention (KR) and one measuring attitude toward presentation (AT). One week later students were given the questionnaires again to measure attitude and retention over time. Whiteman and Nielsen offer us a look at the effects that watching an educational production have on attitude and learning.

At the time the first AT was given there was no significant difference in student enjoyment of the class regardless of presentational format or professor. At the time of the second AT, students who were presented with the play reported enjoying the educational experience significantly more than those who were presented with a lecture. On a scale with ten being the highest score and fifty being the lowest, enjoyment rates for students who were presented with the play were closer to ten than those of their lecture-presented classmates (means= 21.0 and 28.8 respectively, at $p < .02$). The first KR scale indicated a slight but significant difference score for knowledge retention that favored those presented with a play (means= 12.7 and 14.4 respectively, $p < .02$). The second KR scale,

however, indicated no significant difference in score based on either professor or presentation format. There was a possible dropout effect in this second study. One student was not present for the second KR and a reevaluation of the first KR minus his/her score rendered the difference no longer significant.

Whiteman and Nielsen (1986) seem to have confirmed their first hypothesis, at least among this population, that the presentation of information in the format of a play does indeed make for a more enjoyable and memorable learning experience than that of the traditional didactic approach. Its overall effects on learning or knowledge retention, however, are less certain; no significant or demonstrable difference was accounted for amongst the groups a week later.

There are several areas where the findings may have been influenced by outside, not controlled for variables. Knowledge retention over time may have been impacted by, as Whiteman and Nielsen concede, the sharing of information outside of class. So too may the increased enjoyment level experienced by those presented with the play have somehow been influenced by the specific demographics of the sample population. No description other than their chosen profession is offered and one is left without an idea of the participants' feelings towards drama or alternate learning preferences. The results must therefore be taken as suggestive, illustrative of a noticeable trend though not widely generalizable. To take the suggested trend as universally applicable would at least require that this study be replicated in several other populations where variables such as learning preference and dramatic experience can be controlled for. If perspective taking has a natural development with age, it is assumed that graduate students would be well into the highest level of such development, perfect for a study in change. In relation to

this master's paper question, this study adds to the conversation regarding if and how watching theatre leads to a demonstrable change in the viewer. Whiteman and Nielsen (1986) seem to suggest not.

This section has shed light on the effects produced by being observers of theatre. Klein (1995) demonstrated that, at least for younger children, the most significant factor that inhibited the use of empathy as an audience member was the inability to participate in the action or problem solving alongside the protagonist. Observation alone did not trigger sustained empathic responses in most children, and the spectacle of the performance had the tendency to trigger distancing in that children retreated to their own experience or desires in relation to the action or object. These findings are congruent with the theory of cognitive development explored in the first section. It may be quite possible that the younger children simply did not yet have the tools developed for such empathic engagement.

Gesser-Edelsburg (2005) demonstrated the tendency of theatre for youth- theatre that is performed for youth rather than theatre that asks for the active participation of youth- to reaffirm or increase the social stereotypes they already have, despite having the opposite goal. Whiteman and Nielsen (1986) demonstrated that presentational drama makes for a more meaningful and enjoyable classroom experience- when measured over time- than the typical didactic instructional practice of lecturing; however, it neither increases nor decreases one's ability to retain that which was learned. In regard to perspective taking and empathic development, such findings suggest that watching theatre may lead to the reinforcement of one's own perspective rather than encourage the exploration of another's; however, some of the findings suggested influence from sources

not measured- natural development (Klein, 1995) and play structure (Gesser-Edelsburg, 2005), for example- and call into question the soundness of any direct application.

Taken together, it is reasonable to conclude that observing drama or theatrical performances in an educational setting can be a powerful and memorable experience, perhaps leading to greater enjoyment of the class, depending on the individual; however, it does not necessarily correlate with the construction of new knowledge. Being centered in the performer rather than the student, most of what is gained on the part of the observer is a belief in what is already know. In the language of this master's paper question, the viewers tend to sympathize rather than empathize. In Piagetian terms (Miller, 2002), they are asked to assimilate rather than challenged to accommodate.

General Effects of Drama Participation

This section examines the general effects experienced through drama participation. Moving from the audience to the stage, the participants in the following studies took drama in education at its meaning. Some of the research focuses on actual drama classes; however, much of what is to follow looks at drama as it is used across curriculum, fitting more with the definition of drama in education. Though empathy and perspective taking remain the focus of this project, these next several studies offer a broad view of the perceived benefits of dramatic inclusion; the literature was rich enough to necessitate such a mention.

The section contains ten studies in total, beginning with an examination of theatre participation on the participants' perceptions, likening the experience to an altered state of consciousness (Scheiffle, 2001). Innes et al. (2001) examine the effects and trends

discovered in two qualitative studies aimed at bringing forward student voice. Hughes and Wilson (2004) describe the effects of youth theatre on young people's personal and social development. Holloway and LeCompte (2001) qualitatively examine the impact that participation in the theatre has on adolescent girls. Huntsman (1982) specifically focuses on improvisational activities, utilizing a quasi-experimental method to measure the impact such activities have on various personality traits of the participants. Horitz (2001) looks at the opposite population as Holloway and LeCompte (2001), examining the impact of community theatre on adolescent boys in the English countryside. Bayliss and Dodwell (2002) qualitatively examine the impact that theatrical participation has on relationships between students, specifically attending to a mixed population of young people who are both mainstreamed and in special education environments. Fleming et al. (2004) describe the impact of drama on students' language, mathematics proficiency and attitude. Crumpler and Schneider (2002) conduct a cross-study analysis examining the effects of process drama on literacy acquisition. Riviere (2005) concludes the section with an ethnographic study with similar findings to Gesser-Edelsburg (2005), that drama can perpetuate cultural and individual stereotypes.

Scheiffle (2001) begins this section with a comparison and examination of acting and altered states of consciousness (ASC). Empirical evidence is provided to support the theoretical suggestion that, in acting, the individual engages in an altering process of most of the fourteen criteria that make up ASC. Using a sample from his own class (n=12), Scheiffle surveyed the students using a questionnaire format with a rating scale of one to five, one being the lowest, to rate the change they experienced in the fourteen dimensions of their subjective experience following thirty minutes of improvisational

work. Nine out of the fourteen categories received a score of two or above, suggesting meaningful change. The categories with relevance to this master's paper question that received the greatest amount of change were that of "level of arousal (mean= 3.08)," followed by "emotional feeling and expression (mean=2.75); "sense of personal identity" was the least changed dimension of ASC (mean=1.50) (Scheiffle, 2001, p. 188). This study is relevant in that it establishes a qualitative difference between that which an individual experiences while watching a theatrical performance and that which he or she experiences while participating in one. So too do the categories relate to qualities necessary for the higher levels of perspective taking or empathic engagement. The participants would have been expected to be at the height of their normal cognitive development, meaning that any change would be the result of some external variable- measured for or not- and not the simple result of natural developmental processes.

The size of this sample, the time spent in process, and the scaling system are all too small for any reader to generalize the findings. The rater, researcher, and professor were one in the same, suggesting a degree of unavoidable bias. The lack of a control group also leaves the reader unable to draw certain conclusions as to the noted change being attributable to the thirty-minute improvisational session. That said, the qualitative aspects of the study have strengths that are not easily negated. The fact that the experiment was done with a group of individuals already having significant time and emotional investments in each other suggests that their experiences were as natural, or free from influence, as possible.

Of course, the professor has a set of beliefs that will no doubt manifest in the classroom. As a powerful influence on the classroom's norms and atmosphere, the

professor himself may have influenced the students' experiences unwittingly. This presents an interesting problem of interpretation. Students would not have been influenced by the presence of a stranger and likely performed more naturally in this setting. Being tested, however, before and after the experience, and knowing that a change was indeed expected from the professor/researcher, may have influenced the reporting of the sample. The sample, however, reported anonymously thus reducing social or authoritative influence to answer one way or another. In the end, participants mean scores suggest that participation in dramatic activities results in a meaningful change in the subjective experiences of: Attention, imagery and fantasy, inner speech, meaning or significance of experiences, time experience, emotional feeling and expression, level of arousal, self-control, and suggestibility- nine of the fourteen criteria of ASC; a curious suggestion that is not equated in the experience of watching theatre. The previous section made no such claim, suggesting instead that watching theatre resulted in assimilation and confirmation rather than accommodated growth.

Innes et al. (2001) examined two qualitative studies aimed at bringing the student participants' voices to the forefront of analysis. Rooting themselves in the theoretical framework of Boal (1992, 1995, 1996, 1998) and others, the researchers aimed at understanding the perceived learning outcomes as experienced by the students in their particular context. The first study looked at secondary students attending two different schools (n= 50, 28 at school A and 22 at school B), in their implementation of a series of three workshops based on the teachings and theories of Boal. Workshops included exercises in power dynamics, emotional sculpting, and Forum Theatre. The second study focused on four primary school teachers who were asked to develop drama lessons for

their class, which required students to take on a role. In each classroom, the individual teachers' training, pedagogical beliefs, expectations, goals, and the like were the greatest determinants of the process and outcomes of the sessions.

After each workshop in the first experiment, students were asked to reflect upon their learning, noting what they learned, what they would like to have learned, what remained unclear for them, and how these workshops differed from their normal drama class. The answers largely separated out into five dominant categories, emergent themes that became the base of the grounded theory. As Innes et al. (2001) articulated, they were: *Learning about drama*, including learning techniques and theories of the art form as well as new ways to communicate through drama; *learning about personal growth and capacity*, which translates to both cognitive and persona awareness; *learning about others and the self in relation to others*, which included an increase in group awareness, trust, and reliance; *learning about the world*, which manifested in an awareness of the connectedness of all action, as well as how to act upon the newfound knowledge surrounding social issues of concern; *implicit understandings made explicit*, which one might refer to as a form of metacognition, students became more aware of their own beliefs and understandings.

Students spoke of their learning in specific ways, referring to individual realizations about both the process and outcomes. The measure of learning or change was qualitative and individually assessed. In this sense there is no objective demonstration of learning; students talking about what they learned is not the same as demonstrating it. In relation to this master's paper question, however, that which the students articulated has significance to both perspective taking and empathy- most

significantly in the theme of *learning about others and the self in relation to others*, and *learning about the world*. In these thematic descriptions students revealed an ability to see themselves, others, and problems in new and more complex ways. The fact that the sample participants were senior high school students, presumably at the Level Four developmental stage (Selman, 1980), indicates that the change described is not likely to be the sole result of natural development but in fact due to activities engaged in. Of course, students may have been engaged in activities outside of the study that were not controlled for. That participants perceived qualitative changes, and development theory suggests that such changes were likely beyond that of natural development, does not automatically lead one to conclude that dramatic participation was the only possible source of such change. A relationship may exist but it cannot be said to be causal.

The second study utilized an interview process to illuminate students' perceptions of their own learning. As in the first, certain themes emerged in the interview process. They were: *Learning supports literacy*, as a great many students articulated feeling more confident in their language skills and writing abilities; *learning critical thinking skills*, as students were able to engage in questioning, debate, and discussion, and make meaningful connections between the "real world" and the imagined metaphoric one; *learning cooperative group skills*, which included teamwork and friendships maintained across differences; *understanding theatre skills and forms*, as students were able to discern the elements of theatre; *developing knowledge of the world*, which included learning about adult roles and that different people think differently.

These two studies speak to both the profound ability of students to identify their own leaning and share insights into how it can and does take place. So too do they lend

voice to the strength of student centered pedagogy, including drama in education.

Though generalizability is at a minimum- being qualitative in nature the findings are necessarily rooted to the specific population studied- strong trends and themes are added to the literature and conversation surrounding these topics. Some additional confidence can be drawn about the authenticity of the described experiences because of the teacher-as-researcher design. Students were engaging in authentic situations and environments with adults they already knew, and, presumably trusted. Such a design helps to mitigate outside influence and researcher impact. This differs a bit from Scheiffele (2001) in students were given no test to measure learning but rather encouraged to share their reactions without categorization. Such an invitation would come without the influence of a perceived hypothesis and therefore expected response.

The studies were conducted in Australia, where support for the arts are generally funded in greater measure than the United States. This and other cultural beliefs and practices that lead to a comparatively heightened familiarity with dramatic or ritual activities no doubt influenced both the process and outcomes. The trends suggested in this study do speak positively of the impact of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development. The growth described by the participants suggests that this work can lead to positive change in such cognitive and emotional qualities above and beyond natural development. This conclusion, however, is tentative and rooted in the specific population.

Hughes and Wilson (2004) described the findings of study conducted by the National Association of Youth Theatres (NAYT, England), funded by the Arts Council England (ACE). The study examined the impact of youth theatre, loosely defined as

organized theatre-activities that engage youth outside of a formal educational environment, on young peoples' personal and social development. Hughes and Wilson define personal and social development as referring to "the skills, qualities, capacities and resources that help young people make successful transitions to adulthood, that is, lead healthy, confident and independent live wherein they can fulfill their potential " (Hughes & Wilson, 2004, p. 58). The study utilized both quantitative and qualitative measures, and recruited and train twelve young people involved in the youth theatre community to act as peer researchers. A large sample of youth (n=300) participated in the study, and a larger sample of youth theatres were reviewed (n=700).

Research workshops were held with 250 youth theatre participants (12-30 years of age) from twenty-one different organizations. Questionnaires were given to workshop participants as well as others not in attendance but active in the youth theatre community, resulting in the receipt of 359 completed forms. Qualitative interviews were conducted with a number of youth (n= 23), which were transcribed, analyzed, and thematically organized using grounded theory and narrative analysis. Interviews revealed a strong tendency for youth participants to feel more accomplished in their peer and collaborative interactions, and develop skills that easily translate to other parts of their lives. The analyzers worked collaboratively in the end with peer researchers and youth theatre practitioners to settle on the themes and develop a theory of youth theatre. Qualitative interviews were held with youth theatre practitioners (n=26) and analyzed in the same manner as the youth. Questionnaires were also given to the professional practitioners, resulting in the receipt of seventy-three completed forms form fifty-one organizations.

Hughes and Wilson (2004) outlined several of the emergent themes discovered in the qualitative interviews; there are some striking similarities to those described by Innes et al. (2001). The first theme is that “youth theatre helps young people develop a range of personal skills and resources (Hughes & Wilson, 2004, p. 63),” including, self-discipline and initiative, discipline and commitment to process, risk taking abilities, and the opportunity to wrestle openly with thought and emotions. The second theme identified was that “youth theatre provides an informal and supportive context for personal and social development (Hughes & Wilson, 2004, p. 64),” which indicates a strong sense of community and feeling of being “known.” The third theme was that “taking part in youth theatre encourages young people to participate more fully in their communities...playing a part in the wider world (Hughes & Wilson, 2004, p. 65),” which is strongly reminiscent of Innes et al. (2001) in that students learn more about themselves in relation to the larger community, and learn how to act upon their newfound knowledge. The last theme identified was “the importance of performance and creative process (Hughes & Wilson, 2004, p. 66),” which relates not only to content area knowledge but also to a venue in which youth can focus their energies and act in a manner that has greater congruence with who they feel they are. Some of the salient benefits identified in the questionnaires handed out included: Improved confidence, becoming better at making friends, more able to be oneself, increased open mindedness, better ability to work collaboratively with others, and increased happiness.

The study is a litany of benefits ascribed to youth theatre participation. It is a self-described effort at theory building rather than theory testing, and as such cannot be taken to be more. In terms of this master’s paper question, that theory suggests that

drama in education does positively impact one's perspective taking and empathic development beyond that which is expected to result from natural developmental processes. The findings are essentially those of the individuals reporting them, and though a diverse group of youth and professionals were engaged from the diverse regional communities across England, they are specific to those individuals. So too does a similar problem exist here as it did for Innes et al (2001), that self-reporting one's own subjective experience is not the same as objectively demonstrating change. The great amount of similarity to the qualitative findings of Innes et al., however, which looked at similar age groups halfway around the world- though admittedly Anglo in dominant culture- suggests that the theories being developed are not to be dismissed lightly. Longitudinal research is need yet in this field to both test and add to the theory.

Holloway and LeCompte (2001) conducted a two-year, qualitative study in a Theatre Arts (TA) class, which was part of a larger arts enrichment program at an American public middle school. The effort was to see how participation in theatre arts impacted students' perceptions of themselves. During the two-year period, the researchers observed regular classes, attended field trips and guest artist programs, conducted informal conversations, took detailed field notes and kept journals. At the end of the first year they conducted interviews with fifteen girls in the TA class; at the end of the second year they interviewed twenty-four. This study focuses on the participant observations and experience of five girls who were part of the program both their seventh and eighth grade years.

The participants described how the development of an "artist's tool kit enabled them to transform how they thought about themselves and their futures" (Holloway and

LeCompte, 2001, p. 401). Three primary practices make up the tool kit to which the students referred: Centering, open-mindedness, and self-expression. Utilizing these three practices enabled the five girls to construct images of their possible selves outside the cultural norms or dictated stereotypes. In this way, the tools and practices used to create a character became internalized processes. Just as one might experiment with a role, trying on different characteristics and regulating its different behaviors, these students believed that they gained an awareness and ability to guide their own activities and imagined selves.

The centering practice learned as part of the theatre tool kit translated into greater academic confidence for all but one of the students. Learning how to focus and center helped these particular girls see themselves as better students and want to try harder in other academic areas, or so they self reported. Having time and space to reflect as well as the ability to critique and work collaboratively aided in the development of the participants' perceived open-mindedness. The students all reported having a greater understanding of others' perspectives, and attributed this to their work in TA. Self-expression gave the students a sense of pride. By the end of the second year, all five girls described themselves as being artists, and having more confidence than before the program began. Engaging in the symbolic action naturally present in TA and necessary for the construction of the artist's tool kit, broke down the authoritarian walls of both traditional education and traditional gender roles.

Though absent of quantifiable data, the findings of this study are consistent with others of similar nature. It is grounded in the sociocultural theoretical base and adds to it accordingly; symbolic action and the engagement in cultural tools are used as a means to

develop the self (Bolton, 1978; Miller, 2002; Rogoff, 1990). The study's external validity may be in question, however, as there are possible influences that are not fully taken into account. In terms of the development of confidence and self-individuation experienced by the five participants, it is possible that socioeconomic status played a significant role in such an accomplishment. The school itself is set in an affluent university setting, and though there is a significant amount of diversity and disparate cultural practices present, it is assumed that both artistic expression and participation are valued. Were this is a community in which the theatre arts are not as financially and culturally supported, or where identity foreclosure is often necessitated due to socioeconomic conditions, the results may look quite different.

Though the participants' experiences are subjective in nature and self reported as opposed to objectively demonstrated, they do positively contribute to a pattern that suggests that active participation in a dramatic practice positively impacts one's perspective taking abilities. Just as in previous studies (Holloway and LeCompte, 2001; Innes et al., 2001; Scheiffle 2001), the participants should have achieved the height of their normal cognitive development, meaning that any measure of change or growth would be the result of external engagement. In regard to empathy, no conclusions as to the effect of dramatic participation can be gleaned from this study. The growth that was described lies purely in the cognitive realm and therefore outside the reach of empathy.

Huntsman (1982) utilized a quasi-experimental design in her study on the effect improvisational activities have on student self esteem, spontaneity, and ability to identify with others. Volunteers from five introductory psychology classes (n=30), were initially placed into gender segregated groupings and then randomly placed into experimental and

control groups. The experimental group, in addition to their regular class load, participated in an eleven-week workshop, two-hour sessions twice weekly, which consisted of improvisational activities that were student-centered and role-taking in nature. The control group was given no treatment. Both groups were pre-tested and post-tested with the same three tools intended to measure self-actualization: The California Psychological Inventory, the Personal Orientation Inventory, and the Self-Report Inventory. A null hypothesis statistical design was used to test for gains in self-confidence, gains in self-worth, and gains in spontaneity, and gains in ability to relate well with others.

Huntsman (1982) found that at the time of the post-test, the experimental group had made significant increases in self-confidence ($p < .05$) and spontaneity ($p < .005$) over the control group (means= 20.02 for EG and -5.87 for CG- self-confidence -, and 10.17 for EG and 1.92 for CG- spontaneity- respectively). There was an increase in overall self-worth; however, it was not statistically significant ($p < .10$). There was not a significant difference in gains between the two groups regarding ability to relate to others.

Several factors may have contributed to this particular set of findings. Huntsman (1982) articulated the possibility that improvisational activities simply do not influence one's self-worth or ability to relate well with others. Alternatively, it is possible that certain personality traits cannot be affected in such a short period of time, and that a longitudinal study would reveal greater differences. It is possible that the three tests administered were not sufficient in their duty, or that the particular cultural environment somehow acted as a confounding variable; this study was conducted at a Mormon college

in North America, and it is possible that the internal beliefs that this study sought to measure did not change because of their importance in the religious and social life of the participants. The social community that the participants were a part of greatly valued cohesiveness and involvement, and was relatively homogenous. The tests were designed to measure growth and it is possible that in regard to the ability to relate to others, participants had already achieved as much master as they needed for their particular context. The researcher also noted that the testing situations were not consistent in their stress level, with some students allowed to complete the tests at home and others taking it in the testing center. It is possible that this could have had an impact on one's perception of his or her confidence level.

This study does have findings consistent with others and is supportive of some of the emerging themes of the qualitative studies. In that sense it supports the theoretical base and stands with good precedent. Its small sample size, testing incongruity, and short run, however, leave it with relatively low generalizability. So too does the all-volunteer and relatively homogeneous sample restrict its larger application. In reference to the master's paper question, few conclusions can be drawn. Though the findings are consistent with the pattern established in the previous studies regarding confidence, the findings are too specific to the population to allow for certainty. The growth in ability to relate to others, the topic most relevant to perspective taking, was not significant, suggesting that for this population improvisational activities have little demonstrable impact on such skills. This is contradictory to the previous studies (Holloway and LeCompte, 2001; Innes et al., 2001; Scheiffle 2001).

Horitz (2001) conducted a qualitative case study with an interest in how participation in a community play might affect late-adolescent males. Following a sample of year-ten drama students (N=40) through the creative process of writing, staging, and performing two scenes in a larger community play, Horitz identified three emergent themes in the boys' experience: Ownership of content, having the opportunity to develop scenes and characters from their own lives and feeling great value in their being consulted throughout the process; subject-specific learning, including the ability to be self-critical without lessening their experiences or successes; personal and social development, which was largely inspired by the moral debates surrounding the differing levels of commitment of each boy. The last theme has the most relevance to this master's paper question. Participants would theoretically have reached the completion of their normal developmental abilities- having reached the point at which they had the full capacity for perspective taking and empathic engagement- suggesting that whatever growth experienced in such cognitive and emotional measures would have been the result of some external experience as opposed to natural development. Whether or not that experience was accurately measured in the study, being the play participation, is not certain.

Though these findings are congruent with those of the previously described, qualitative studies (Holloway, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001), adding to the general strength of the theory, the results are of limited reliability and little generalizability. The sample participants were drama students already involved in such a production, and therefore had a predisposition towards the positive and engaging aspects of drama participation- they wanted to be there. In addition, the qualitative, semi-

structured interviews were conducted with students the drama teacher had suggested, all four of whom had a degree of motivation greater than that of the group as a whole. Horitz (2001) intentionally asked a fifth student with demonstrably lower motivation to join in on the qualitative interviews in an effort to have a sample more representative group as a whole. Other means of gathering information, including videotaping rehearsals, collecting essays from the participants, and having questionnaires filled out, all contributed to the emergent findings. Horitz did, however, start with a set of very specific questions, all of which were answered or informed by the emergent findings. This leads one to ask if the findings were in fact emergent, or if they were found simply because they were looked for.

Bayliss and Dodwell (2002) qualitatively found that participation in a play had the effect of forming positive relationships among students, increasing friendships, and successfully engaged students in complex problem-solving and highly focused work for much longer durations than they were used to. The study blended two groups of students, one group from a comprehensive mainstreamed school (n=23) and the other from a special school for students having severe learning difficulties (n=9, 2 non-communicating- 1 with autism and 1 with significant behavior challenges), in the discipline of theatre. The findings are consistent with those of other qualitative studies (Holloway, 2001; Horitz, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001) in that they demonstrate an increase in positive relations between the participants, the establishment of a sense of community, and an increase in awareness of the self in relation to others. The main difference between this study and others is the diversity of the participants. Combining both mainstreamed students and students with significant learning difficulties,

does not necessarily make the results more reliable, but it does speak to the power of intersubjectivity (Miller, 2002; Rogoff, 1990) as it is experienced in theatre participation.

Quantitative, standardized tests were developed for the study but, according to the researchers, proved unreliable. Bayliss and Dodwell (2002) attribute this largely to the tremendous variety of ability within the group. The sample is small and the study lasted just one week. That being the case, these findings are best used as part of grounded theory research methods. The long-term effects of this participation can only be speculated at, though the tutor for the mainstreamed students later described them as having significantly “gelled,” leading to a smooth transition to the next academic year. Through the frame of this study, it is reasonable to conclude that participation in drama has a trend towards community building and meaningful relationships. This does not, however, help one to conclude anything significant in relation to the master’s paper question. Furthermore, the conclusions drawn may have resulted from something Bayliss and Dodwell neither measured nor controlled for; that is, time on task. Intersubjectivity (Miller, 2002; Rogoff, 1990) is not unique to theatre, and while it is likely in part responsible for the outcomes, drama should not necessarily get the credit. It seems far more likely that the increase in positive relations and sense of community were a result of the time spent engaged in mutual effort. One cannot say that any other type of activity with similar engagement requirements would not reveal similar results.

Fleming et al. (2004) described the impact of drama on students’ language, mathematics, and attitudes. Four primary schools in geographically similar locations in the east side of London were used as the sites of the experiment. Two schools served as control groups while the other two served as experimental groups- what Fleming et al.

call Transformation groups. The theatre treatment, known as the Transformation project facilitated by the national theatre, integrated drama workshops and performances into curriculum for two years. The control schools maintained a standard curriculum, and all schools took the same standardized tests as measures of relative learning.

At the end of Year Four, after the two-year theatre treatment, the experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group in reading residual ($p < .05$). So too was the mean mathematics residual of the experimental group significantly higher than that of the control group ($p < .000$). Attitude towards subject matter experienced mean gains in each group and was significantly higher for the experimental group only in mathematics ($p < .05$). In terms of self-concept, the mean scores of the experimental group were significantly higher than those of the control group ($p < .001$). This has relevance to the master's paper question in that it suggests that drama in education does have positive measurable impacts on participants, and can be used as a tool for deeper student learning. Whether or not this translates specifically to perspective taking and empathy cannot, however, be answered by this study.

The strength of this study lies in its use of two experimental groups and two control groups. Such use allows for a more thorough comparison and inspires more confidence in the overall findings. Congruence in data between the two control groups and two experimental groups suggest some accuracy in measurement; that is, the parallel groups experienced similar results indicating consistent implementation. So too does having the control group help one conclude that the differences in the results are in fact due to the treatment experienced in the experimental group. Using schools in the same general geographic region as was done here reduces the likelihood of the occurrence of

gross cultural or ideological differences influencing the data. These students were, according to Fleming et al. (2004), of similar socioeconomic backgrounds. The other side of that argument, of course, is that generalizability is lessened by the use of such a homogeneous group.

A good amount of the students were learning English as a second language, and the additional practice with language usage experienced in the drama workshops likely explains the significant increase in mean score experienced by the experimental group. Despite the strength of these findings they must be approached with caution. There are several variables for which there was no measure. Time on task, for example, may prove to be a significant variable not studied, such as in the language example just mentioned. It is conceivable that a non-drama-based curricular treatment of equal time engagement and emphasis would produce the same results, or even greater gains. The experimental groups may have also been greatly influenced by teacher enthusiasm that developed with a new curriculum. A teacher who is refreshed by a new curriculum may bring a greater amount of excitement and enthusiasm to the classroom. This alone might lead to greater student involvement and therefore greater student learning. These possible confounds do not entirely discount the findings of this study; however, they do raise serious doubts as to their strength and application, regardless of the soundness of the experimental design. One can conclude with some confidence, however, that drama in education has not shown to be detrimental to student learning or personal development.

Crumpler and Schneider (2002) conducted a cross-study analysis that examined the effects of using process drama- the use of drama in education with teacher-in-role and structured activities designed to encourage students to imaginatively interact in the

classroom- in teaching literacy. Similar to Innes et al. (2001) and Fleming (2004), Crumpler and Schneider (2002) found that drama had a meaningful positive impact on literacy acquisition and development. The cross-study analysis revealed a prominent theme shared by all five studies. Using a pooled case comparison, the area of analysis that revealed itself was “composing in role and complexity of stance (Crumpler & Schneider, 2002, p. 67).” In one study, primary school children were asked to write and draw after participating in a dramatic interpretation of *Where The Wild Things Are*. In the recording process, boundaries were blurred for one student as she represented herself in writing as the reader, writer, and character she portrayed. A complex grasp and commingling of imaginary worlds revealed itself in her writing.

This has some significant implications for the master’s paper question. Through the process drama activities, this student revealed a complex engagement with perspective taking abilities, moving with fluidity from one identity to another in a meaning-making exercise. Development theory (Selman, 1980) would suggest that such a demonstrated use of perspective taking is congruent with normal developmental processes and not a result of theatrical engagement; however, the process drama activities gave did successfully engage the student in the use of and practice with such skills. Though it does not comment on the ability of drama in education to positively or negatively influence one’s development of perspective taking abilities, it does indicate that it is a useful tool for actively engaging those abilities. That alone is significant for research indicates that continued engagement with or use of cognitive skills leads to their being strengthened (Zull, 2002).

Several other participants integrated actions from the drama into their writings and reflections. The writing became a place in which students could reflect upon their own actions in the context of the story, the drama, or their lives. As articulated by Crumpler and Schneider (2002), process drama offers students a way to explore the texts they read without the boundaries of the literature itself. Students engage with the themes in imagined context that allows for engagement in the world of the text as well as the everyday and the imaginary. “[Drama] becomes a conduit that facilitates a flow of imagination between process and product (p. 77), and allows for the construction of meaning in individually unique ways.

This study does, of course, fall victim to the same general critique and praise of all qualitative studies. The teacher as researcher design allows for a higher degree of authenticity in student experience and expression due to assumed familiarity. The findings work to contribute to theory as opposed to proving a rule, necessitating in the conclusion of identifiable trends with nominal generalizability.

Riviere (2005) offered an ethnographic study of a drama classroom that illustrates an important aspect of drama participation absent, at least in the overt sense, from most other studies in this section. Working with adolescent women in a secondary drama classroom, Riviere identifies a tendency to perpetuate cultural stereotypes deeply rooted in the patriarchal and often racist unconscious of the particular socio-cultural context. Female students, when asked about what it is like being a girl in the drama classroom, spoke of the emotional roles they get to play as well as the respect they get from the young men. As conversations progressed, it was revealed that the young women implicitly believed and acted out deeply held, stereotypic and often sexist notions of

womanhood. According to Riviere, during exercises in which students were given the freedom to improvise characters, the young women tended to portray their sex as compulsive shoppers, caring mothers, intensely emotional, or part of the good girl/bad girl binary.

As individuals rooted in a particular socio-cultural context, students come to the classroom, drama or otherwise, with deeply ingrained beliefs, values, stereotypes and prejudices. All of these are brought into the classroom via the individuals present, teacher included, and are as such reproduced in the action. Riviere (2005) documented the process and outcome of this phenomenon, as to some extent it was also documented by Gesser-Edelsburg (2005) in the students' reactions to *Backyard Games*. The question for continued study is how effective is drama at breaking down those innate beliefs, that internalized sexism, and creating a new more metacognitive understanding. Several of the previously mentioned qualitative studies (Holloway, 2001; Horitz, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001) as well as the theoretical literature support the notion that participants come to know themselves and make implicit knowledge explicit through certain types of dramatic participation.

Riviere (2005) is an appropriate close to this section and highly relevant to the driving question of this master's paper. If drama in education is indeed a tool to be utilized in the further development or mastery of perspective taking and empathic abilities, which has not yet been conclusively concluded, Riviere reminds the researcher that such development and practice is done within a sociocultural context and ideological milieu. One may develop in his or her ability to perspective take and empathize;

however, the conclusions of which are bound to the perceived social territory in which he or she dwells.

This section leaves one with several conclusions regarding the general effects of drama participation. The many qualitative studies (Bayliss & Dowdwell, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002; Holloway, 2001; Horitz, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001) share qualities that suggest a relative strength to the grounded theory. These include the establishment of community and meaningful relationships, tendency towards open-mindedness, self-expression and self-awareness, knowledge of the art of drama, knowledge of the world or one's place in it, and a possible increased proficiency in literacy.

In regard to the specific effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development, this section only hints at conclusions. Crumpler and Schneider (2002) allude to the potential of drama in education to be used as a tool for engagement in these cognitive skills, as do Holloway and LeCompte (2001). Hughes and Wilson's (2004) findings suggest that drama in education does in fact have a positive impact on growth in perspective taking and empathic abilities beyond that of normal development, as does Innes et al. (2001). These findings, however, are largely based on qualitative research dependent self-reported measures, resulting in a suggested trend as opposed to an objective conclusion.

An important addition to this section, made by Riviere (2005) and somewhat likened to Gesser-Edelsburg (2005), is the inescapable importance of prior knowledge. Riviere (2005) reminds the reader that social inequities and stereotypes are played out in the drama classroom or drama activity just as they are in society at large. This can

provide for an excellent learning opportunity, the fulfillment of the qualitative observation of theatre participation leading to self-awareness- making implicit knowledge explicit. If participants in the theatre exercise are not aware of such notions, however, and a More Capable Peer does not scaffold towards the construction of such an understanding, those inequities and hegemonic, internalized oppression, will continue to be reinforced and reenacted unconsciously and overtly.

Role-Play

This section, in brief, attends to some of the effects of role-playing on its participants. An essential part of drama in education and an easy theatre exercise to implement across curriculum, role-play means many things to many people. The first of these two studies takes role-playing largely to mean a cognitive exercise. Like perspective-taking itself, Taylor (1997) views such activities as the province of the cerebrum. Clayton (1985), the second study, attempts to correlate one's behavior in a role-play activity with his or her behavior outside of the imagined context. Neither overtly views role-playing as a means by which one engages with content to construct new meaning, but as a tool with other purposes.

Taylor (1997) conducted two experiments aimed at measuring the effects of positive and negative framing, and computer-based role-playing on one's decision-making process. The first of the two experiments dealt solely with whether or not the framing of a question impacted the decision of those individuals confronted with it. Sample participants came from three different populations: A high school in western New York (n= 141), undergraduate classes from western New York universities (n= 97), and

the professional Earth Science community attending the 1995 Northeast Regional Meeting of the Geological Society of America (n= 40). No information is provided as to how the students were chosen for participation; the Earth Science professionals were approached by an experimenter at the conference they were attending and asked to participate.

Participants were given questionnaires that posed problems dealing with the storage of radioactive waste and other environmental dangers. Questions were given a positive or negative frame; for example, a positively framed question may indicate that there is a 90% likelihood that all waste could be transported safely, while a negatively framed question may indicate that there is a 10% likelihood of an accident occurring in transit. Those being questioned were to choose appropriate planning and funding measures based on the provided information. Results indicated statistically significant framing effects for all three of the problems posed: Hazardous Waste ($p < .005$), Flood Protection ($p < .05$), and Volcano Monitoring ($p < .05$). No significant difference existed in the ways in which participants from the three groups answered the questions. The experiment demonstrated that a question's frame has a significant influence upon the way in which it is answered; in this instance, the frame had a demonstrable influence upon the treatment choice made by the test-taker.

In regard to the question guiding this master's paper, Taylor's (1997) relevance becomes most clear with the second experiment, in which a computer-simulated role-play was found to mitigate the framing effect demonstrated by the previous. Ninth-graders (n= 277) from a western New York high school participated in the six-week study as part of their class work; none of the students had been part of the first experiment. Half the

students engaged with a computer-based role-play in which they took on the role of a volcanologist receiving updated data daily. These students were asked to make decisions regarding the wellbeing of a village situated near an active volcanic region. Information was provided to them in either a positive or negative frame, consistent throughout. The other half of the students engaged with a paper-and-pencil role-play similar in structure but for the real-time engagement. Updates were provided for these students every 10 days, also framed as positive or negative.

The entire sample was given the same questionnaire used in experiment one as a means to determine the significance of framing on this population, which was found to be statistically significant (computer group at $p < .05$, and the paper-and-pencil group at $p < .01$ for Flood Protection). That is, participants of both the paper-and-pencil and computer role-play demonstrated a significant ability to be influenced by the framing of a question in an independent test, outside the simulation itself. This provides the reader with an understanding that the sample population of each role-play entered the experiment with a demonstrated ability to be influenced by the framing of a question. The results demonstrated that one group was significantly influenced by frame while the other was not. In light of the findings from the questionnaire, one can conclude that the difference did not exist in the populations themselves but in the activities they participated in.

At the conclusion of the experiment, framing effect was found to only be significant for those students who engaged with the paper-and-pencil role-play ($p < .001$). Those who engaged with the computer-based, real-time role-play had no demonstrably significant framing effect ($p = .58$). Four weeks after the exercise all participants were given a quiz to assess their retention of knowledge. Those who engaged with the

computer-based role-play proved to remember more about the content of the exercise as well as the measuring tools ($p < .05$).

One of Taylor's (1997) base assumptions was that role-playing encourages the participant to take on a different perspective than his or her own. That assumption was not explicitly tested in the experiment and therefore cannot be validated by the findings. The findings suggest that this type of role-play may have some impact on one's ability to minimize cognitive errors, specifically shielding one from framing effect. Why that may have been the case for those who engaged with the computer-based as opposed to the paper-and-pencil exercise is up for speculation. It may be that the continuous input of information and immediate feedback helped students think around the positive and/or negative framing, or that simple novelty was a significant variable not measured for.

The most interesting finding of this study, and that which is perhaps most applicable to the question behind this master's paper, is that those students who participated in the computer-based role-play only seemed to elude the framing effect for that problem with which the role-play directly engaged. That is, this seeming skill did not transfer to problems posed in another domain; i.e., the questionnaire from experiment one. This gives the implication that skills developed in or required by a role-play activity may only show themselves in that specific activity, not transferring to activities that lie in other domains. In other words, role-playing may help one to develop certain perspective-taking skills or hone other cognitive abilities, as Taylor (1997) presumed, but those abilities may not stay with the user as they engage in other activities. Such a conclusion would not lend weight to any argument for the inclusion of role-playing in a curriculum

aimed at the development of perspective-taking abilities. This study, however, is not nearly exhaustive enough to lead one to wholly accept such a conclusion.

Not having any information regarding the sample size or treatment administrators does not lead one to feel confidence in this study's generalizability or wide application. Certainly it raises interesting findings worth a more detailed examination; however, universality is far from proven. The first experiment dealing simply with frame effect has strength in its use of three different communities; however, the use of random sampling and a control group are absent from the process. So too does the second experiment lack such measures that would increase the finding's general application. The two role-playing activities were difficult to compare due to the difference in their nature, and no control group was utilized. Ultimately what can be taken with confidence is minimal. The role-playing activity was purely cognitive in nature and so it makes sense that its influence would be the same. A more fully physically engaging role-play activity may yield different results in terms of skills being transferable.

Clayton (1985) examined the effect of role-playing on participants' decision-making process, post participation. A sample of fourth-grade students (n= 91, 46 male and 45 female) participated in the experiment, which evaluated a nutritional education program. The participating students were spread across three different classes, two of which received a treatment including a role-play activity, the third, acting as a control group, received the standard nutrition curriculum. The two treatment classes, in addition to the role-play activity, received modeling procedures, and one was given an extra segment on self-control instruction.

In the role-play activity, students were asked to choose three snacks from an offering of 18 (nine deemed nutritious, nine deemed non-nutritious), which were represented by photographs of the foods. Students would then socialize with one another and pretend to eat their snacks during the rest of the allocated time-period. An actual snack-choosing exercise was then conducted in which students were given the same food choices to make and consume. Just as in the role-play, students would socialize with one another and eat their snacks during the rest of the allocated period. This activity was done pre- and post-treatment in an effort to control for treatment effect, and ultimately aimed at illuminating the relationship between student snack choice in a simulation and student snack choice in actuality.

Clayton (1985) identified a moderately positive correlation, pre-training, for all three classes ($r = .342, .48, .37$), only one of which was statistically significant (class two, $r = .48, p < .05$). Post-training, classes one and three increased in their correlation and achieved statistical significance ($r = .41$ at $p < .05$, and $r = .45$ at $p < .05$, respectively); however, class two did not. Clayton concludes from the data that role-playing is not a valid measure of student choice; that is, the way one engages in a role-play activity does not strongly correlate with how he or she will choose to engage with similar situations outside the role-play. In the experiments, students tended to make healthier decisions during the role-play, only to choose the high-flavor, low-nutrition, high-name-recognition snack food when actually offered.

This study provides some challenge to the reader in that it is unclear as to what exactly is being studied. The hypothesis being tested seems to be that a student's choice in a role-playing activity will be congruent with his or her "real life" actions. This being

the case, Clayton (1985) concludes that the hypothesis was false; role-playing then becomes suspect as an educational tool. This is not entirely dissimilar to the conclusions drawn by Taylor (1997), that the skills used in a role-play are domain specific and not necessarily transferable to another context. This conclusion, however articulated, is not strongly supported by Clayton's (1985) findings, and has relatively low generalizability. So too is it important to remember development theory in regard to this critique, and more importantly, its relevance to the master's paper question.

Though Clayton's (1985) findings suggest that role-playing has no significant lasting effect on participants' choices- such choices are equated with perspective taking in the study, though the term's usage is not congruent with the understanding built in this paper- development theory would suggest that the age of the participants was a serious confound. That is, the students used in the study would have normally been early in their natural perspective taking development, falling in or near Selman's (1980) Level Two, indicating only basic skills with individual and social perspective taking; they would not yet have a framework complex enough to demonstrate significant change regardless of treatment. In regard to the effect of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development, Clayton's (1985) findings are largely inconclusive.

Both of the studies in this section suggest that the skills developed or utilized in a role-play activity are specific to the domain of that activity. Taylor (1997) found that students were able to avoid the framing effect presented in a particular role-play but remained able to be influenced when posed with a second round of questioning. Clayton (1985) suggested through empirical evidence that students were able to make intentional, educated choices in a role-play activity that were quickly abandoned in their daily

behavior; the lesson presumed learned did not transfer long-term. Both of these studies are weak in their research and assumptive laden. Clayton, in particular, seems to view learning simply as a change in behavior over time, a classically behaviorist position, that simply does not go far enough in explaining the learning cycle. So too are there developmental concerns, as discussed above, that are not taken into account. Though the findings of these two inquiries should not be dismissed, they cannot be taken as absolutes either. One possible conclusion to draw is that simple cognitive role-playing, that is, intellectual engagement without a corresponding physical participation, is not a strong indicator of growth in perspective taking or demonstrably significant learning. Of course, if such activities were given a higher degree of repetition or focus, the outcome may have been quite different.

Drama Participation, Empathy and Perspective Taking

This section brings together eight studies that have a particular focus on the effect of theatre or dramatic participation on empathy and/or perspective taking. Ranging from literary role-questioning to explicit instruction in role-play and perspective taking, the collection examines the effects of drama in education on perspective taking and empathy above and beyond the normal developmental advances.

Trzebinski (2005) begins this section with an examination on the power of narrative on empathic engagement. Kehoe (1979) then provides a study in which the effect of role-exchange questioning- likened with an activity in perspective taking- was measured in regard to change in resultant empathic perceptiveness. Chalmers and Townsend (1990) follow with an examination of a social perspective-training program,

which included role-play among other activities aimed at developing participants' perspective taking and empathic abilities. Day (2002) used forum theatre workshops as a venue to qualitatively engage and study students' attitudes towards those different from themselves. Self-reported measures were examined to determine change in attitude, leading to conclusions about the use of drama as a perspective taking activity. O'Toole and Burton (2005) also looked at the use of forum theatre as a means for the development of conflict literacy and deterrence. McNaughton (2004, 2006) follows with two studies that examined the effects of drama in education on students' developing attitudes and world concept. Krogh (1985) utilized a quasi-experimental method to examine the specific effects of role-playing on young people's perspective taking abilities. It fits into this section better than the previous in that it is specific in its focus. Finishing out the section is Medina's (2004) ethnographic case study on how drama was used to construct meaning from a specific text.

Trzebinski (2005) demonstrated the power of narrative in the process of personal empathic engagement. Conducting a naturalistic experiment, Trzebinski examined the role played by narrative, in students choosing to engage in helping behavior. Narrative is discussed in this study as the context through which an individual divines his or her self, group, and other identity. Life, in its narrative form, is seen as being a series of interacting characters and plots, with all their necessary intentions and conflicts that result in a pattern of action. To be exposed to another's narrative is to see him or her in relief, to contextualize and subjectively understand him or her in a way that is distinct or more real.

Trzebinski (2005) found that narrative priming has a significant impact on one's choice to engage in helping behavior ($p < .05$). This was done through the combination of several separate experiments, which examined both narrative competency- one's ability to accurately understand another's subjective experience- and narrative as a teaching tool. Narrative priming consists of providing students with an account of an individual's personal story in an effort to give both human context and emotion to the problem posed. After either narrative priming, categorical priming or no priming, participating secondary students in Poland were asked to help an ill person by giving their time, donate bone marrow, or work with *Big Brothers Big Sisters*- three separate experiments. In each experiment, a clear pattern for narrative priming positively correlating with helping behavior exposed itself. The third experiment, which ended with a request that participants help the *Big Brothers Big Sisters* organization, found that of those participants who received narrative priming, 74% agreed to help, as compared to 39% and 35% of those who had categorical or no priming, respectively. So too was a significant relationship ($p < .005$) found between participants' narrative competence and their likelihood to choose to help the individual to whom they had been exposed- the greater their competence the more likely they were to choose to help.

These results are reminiscent to those described by Taylor (1997). Narrative priming could be seen as providing a frame for the question. As Taylor found, a question's frame has a significant impact on the way one answers it. That narrative priming and an individual's ability to accurately understand the narrative given has a significant impact on their resulting choice is not surprising.

The empirical findings of Trzebinski's (2005) study lend weight to the notion that understanding another's narrative, their context, allows for greater empathic engagement and ultimately the choice to respond in a prosocial manner. This pattern is strongly suggested by the three experiments performed in the study, indicating that narrative exposure allows for the construction of a distinct and coherent picture of a person despite mitigating inputs. There is, however, much left unknown about the experiment, leaving one unable to generalize Trzebinski's findings beyond a suggestive pattern. The sample is unknown in terms of its size and demographic. There is no information regarding the cultural backgrounds of the participants that might expose confounding variables, such as a religious upbringing with a rich narrative tradition, or a proclivity to help only those within a specific community. No information about the stories' protagonists is given as well. Narratives' protagonists may have closely matched the readers, which could go far in explaining the high percentage that chose to engage in helping behavior. So too are the specifics of helping behavior necessarily to be influenced by the culture in which it exists.

The relevance of these patterns, subjective as they may be, lies in drama's utilization of the narrative in its process. Drama itself is not utilized in this study and therefore conclusions in specific regard to the effect of drama in education cannot be drawn. What is applicable, however, is the suggested strength of narrative in resulting in the instance of empathic engagement. If narrative and narrative competence does increase one's ability to empathize with and subjectively understand a person, as Trzebinski (2005) suggested, drama could be used as a powerful tool in such an achievement. Drama in education can provide students with a means of engaging with

the narratives of others as well as practice with their individual narrative competence. Conversely, and of additional importance to the driving question of this master's paper, drama may be credited with an increase in participants' instance of empathic engagement unduly. If one is to take Trzebinski's findings with certainty, it may not be drama that has a direct impact but the work with narrative that drama provides. That being the case, other narrative activities may be equal or better in producing results than drama itself.

Kehoe (1979) defined empathy in the context of a shared relationship. Guira's (1967) definition is expanded to include that of Hoffman (1975), essentially arguing that empathy involves the gaining of understanding through a shared experience, which is not necessarily voluntary, but does result in the "experiencing of another's emotional state" (Kehoe, 1979, p. 49). Kehoe's study examined the effects of role-exchange questioning on students' empathic perceptiveness. A sample of secondary school students (n=199) were randomly assigned to an experimental or control group (EG or CG respectively), and were taught lessons by the same two teachers alternately; the teachers could then teach both the experimental and control group in an effort to control for teaching differences.

Students in EG read a book about a Hungarian immigrant couple growing up in Winnipeg, Manitoba, with detailed descriptions of personal discrimination that was suffered. Students were asked role exchange questions, which predominantly asked them to put themselves in the protagonist's shoes and describe how they would respond. The control group read *Who Has Seen The Wind*, and was asked irrelevant role exchange questions about the main characters relationship with god. Each group was given an empathy scale test at the conclusion of the class. Measures demonstrate that there was no

significant difference between the information provided by either group. Kehoe (1979) expressed surprise in the complete lack of treatment effect, and replicated it with an older group of students- twelve-graders. This second effort was presumable to mitigate the possible confound of normal cognitive development, assuming that the older students would have reached the height of their natural development, though the results were the same in their lack of significance.

There are many reasons why such an experiment might have no positive results. In the first place, there was no pre-test given, and while the ultimate measure was between the two groups, not having an initial reading of placement on an empathy index leaves the researcher unable to accurately discern how much growth has taken place. Secondly, both classes were essentially asked to do the same thing. Though the books differed in subject matter and title, both classes were asked role exchange questions about them. No doubt, one student's feelings for *Who Has Seen The Wind*, was just as powerful as another's for *Under the Ribs of Death*. EG was asked protagonist specific questions while CG was asked seemingly irrelevant questions. Kehoe (1979) concluded that role exchange questioning did not have an effect on empathic development. It might be better to say that this study suggests such a conclusion; however, the findings have little generalizability due to the sample size, homogeneity of population, and absence of pre-test. In regard to the master's paper question, Kehoe seems to suggest that perspective taking activities, imagining a situation from another's perspective such as may be done in dramatic activity, does not demonstrably effect one's empathic engagement. This conclusion, however, is far from strong and additional research into dramatic questioning is need for further application.

Chalmers and Townsend (1990) worked with a population of young women in a minimum-security detention and rehabilitation center in Auckland ($n=6$, mean age=13.66), in an effort to determine if explicit work or training could lead to an increase in perspective taking and empathic engagement. The girls came from unstable and low socioeconomic conditions, and included eleven individuals of Maori heritage, three of Pacific Polynesian heritage, and two of European heritage. The social perspective-training program (SPT) the sample participated in was administered in fifteen, one-hour sessions. It involved, among other things, a pupil-centered role-playing method aimed at developing participants' perspective taking and empathic abilities. The study was quasi-experimental in that it utilized both a control and experimental group (CG and SPT respectively), and applied a pre- and post-test to measure that which was learned. The study's relevance to the effect of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development is clear. Drama was used as a tool with which to engage in skills that, according to theory, should be at the height of their normal development. This means that any change from pre- to post-treatment would not be confounded by development and result from some external engagement.

Chalmers and Townsend (1990) found that mean scores on the empathy index significantly increased for SPT between the pre- and post-tests ($p < .05$). The control group experienced a gain, but not a significant one ($p < 1.0$). In addition, there was a significantly improved view of and ability to accept individual differences ($p < .05$). No other change was significant in nature, though a decrease in negative behavior came quite close. The measures were taken as part of a series of standardized tests, one of which was the Bryant Empathy Index as referred to by Pederson (1997). Scoring and measures

of learning were not tied in to participants behavior so much as their thinking, which indicates a somewhat less behaviorist theoretical framework- atypical for a prison of any level of security. There is certainly the possibility that the changes occurred because of the compulsory nature of the institution; wishing to win favor with an authority or have an experience seemingly outside the walls of the institution, imagined as they might be, could have had an effect on the testing results. However, one cannot say.

It would seem reasonable from this study to conclude that empathy and acceptance for others can be increased in individuals who are at the appropriate developmental level through dramatic participation and experience. This takes no accounting for learning preference or personal proclivity, and cannot be taken as universally applicable. The researcher must also be aware of what she or he is looking at so as not to misidentify a change in behavior as necessarily equal to actual learning or intrinsic motivation. The study does, however add to the theoretical framework and suggest the possibility.

Day (2002) conducted a qualitative study in which a group of secondary students (n= 60) participated in a forum theatre workshop as described by Boal (1994). Focused on the experience of homeless and/or refugee students, the workshop aimed at giving mainstream students an opportunity to witness another's experience as well as try out moral behavior that could later be applied to real-life situations. Students claimed that the experience changed the way in which they perceived homeless and/or refugee individuals. This is consistent with Trzebinski's (2005) findings on the impact of narrative priming and competency.

A recurring metaphor articulated by the participants was “putting yourself in other people’s shoes” (Day, 2002, p. 27). Students who initially sympathized with the characters began to empathize as they experienced, on an admittedly imagined level, the oppression and discrimination experienced by those individuals. These feelings were further attributed to the human experience of being the ‘other.’ Not every part of the workshop was as influential as every other part; many of the activities were viewed as simply being entertaining. The participatory feature, however, allowed for the construction of new emotional responses and working knowledge.

Though the participants largely described this forum theatre workshop as engaging, meaningful, and transformative in the way they consciously perceive those who are different from themselves, it is not possible to conclude that such an event has a universally positive impact on participants ability to empathize or perspective take. Findings were based on students’ self-reports, and while an individual’s subjective experience is helpful in suggesting results and crafting theory, it is not the same as objectively demonstrating change or learning. One can therefore conclude that the findings are suggestive but not conclusive. Generalizability is also minimized in that this was a qualitative analysis, which dealt with a specific population in a specific location. Trends and patterns that make themselves known in the population can be viewed only as part of a larger picture. The literature reviewed, however, does suggest that such trends are experienced in other populations under similar circumstances.

The qualitative data was collected through one on one interviews with the participating drama teachers (n= 3), and tape-recorded group interviews with a sample of student participants chosen (n= 20). The students were chosen for interviews by their

drama teachers, who were asked to make such decisions as would achieve a gender, ethnicity, and ability balance; an additional five volunteered. In all, one third of the workshop participants responded; this large number gives the reader a higher degree of confidence that their responses are reflective of the population being studied. Though the general findings suggest that forum theatre workshops, with their participatory component, do lead to an increased empathic understanding amongst the participants, the population sampled mitigates the broad application of its conclusions. All the participants were either drama students or drama teachers who, presumably, were comfortable taking an active role in the workshop. That is to say, drama, being an elective course, tends to draw a particular personality type, which is stereotypically comfortable with public expression. Such expression and participation was identified as the salient feature for those interviewed, leading one to conclude that non-drama or publicly expressive participants may not respond in the same way. This study adds further voice to the growing pattern suggestive of the power of participation, though participation itself has many definitions.

O'Toole and Burton (2005) describe the use of forum theatre, as well as other participatory theatrical forms, as part of a nine-year, ongoing study, which aims at examining the use of drama in conflict deterrence and resolution. Being conducted in three countries (Sweden, Malaysia, and Australia) with a focus on differing ethnic and socioeconomic conditions, The Brisbane Project is an effort to use drama in the education of participants towards a cognizant understanding of the nature and dynamics of conflict and bullying. Utilizing an action research model, the project described by O'Toole and Burton sought to promote conflict literacy amongst its participants. Conflict literacy is

not so much an understanding of how to resolve conflicts as they happen but rather an understanding of the dynamics of such conflicts.

The researchers developed several hypotheses which the study sought to test, included: Drama could in fact increase one's conflict literacy, including issues surrounding cultural difference; content literacy would lead to an ability to manage one's own conflicts as well as aid in the management of community conflicts; drama is more appropriate for conflict management than conflict resolution, for it requires a degree of empathy and intellectual distance not easily achieved in the heat of conflict; students have the ability to take some measure of control for the management of both their individual conflicts and those that arise in their school community.

Data was collected through mostly qualitative forms, with a strong reliance on personal interviews with the stakeholders, or participants of studied encounters. Fifteen high schools took part in the project, as did sixteen primary schools. Peer teaching is utilized as students write, direct, perform, and watch the dramatic action. Though Boal's (1992) forum theatre was the initial foundation for the Brisbane Project, its simplicity was found to be ineffectual in generating techniques for conflict resolution, resulting in the development of "enhanced forum theatre" (O'Toole and Burton, 2005, p. 276), which includes several different forms of process drama. Enhanced forum theatre becomes an integral part of the academic curriculum in each participating school, with the greatest opportunities for workshops on conflict resolution taking place in English, Social Studies, Health, or Physical Education classes; the preference is not to have such a curriculum existent only in schools' drama departments. Peer teachers educate students as to the form and function of process drama and lead the classes through the program. Older

students act as the teachers for younger students; for example, Year Eleven students are initially trained to be the key educators and teach Year Eight or Nine students in turn. Year Eight or Nine students then teach Year Five or Six, and so on.

The findings of this longitudinal and continuing study are many. Some of the most pertinent findings, however, deal with an increased empathic understanding of all those in a conflict or bullying situation; these findings were both observed by the researchers and self-reported by the participants. The Brisbane Project has resulted in an understanding amongst participants that anyone can be a bully, bullied, or a bystander in a particular conflict depending on the context and givens of the situation. Instead of stigmatizing the bully and attempting to rescue the victim, thus rendering him or her stigmatized, this project helps participants to understand that all play a role in the escalation and de-escalation of such situations. Researchers observed that this project allowed for the creation of a value-less, non-judgmental context in which these issues could be explored freely. Such an exploration can lead to an increased degree of empathy for all parties by all parties. In addition, it provides an opportunity for self-empowerment and a step away from arbitrary hierarchical authority. So too does the use of drama allow for a free exploration of real bullying situations, allowing all to learn from the subjective experiences of others.

O'Toole and Burton (2005) provided the reader with some strong trends and suggestions that should not be dismissed. The generalizability of these findings is strengthened in that they rise out of several different populations from several communities in several different cultural and regional contexts. The longitudinal aspect also lends strength to the findings' general applicability. The study does not incorporate

quantitative research methods, at least in this particular reporting, and the lack of a control group leaves one with questions as to possible variables not controlled for, such as natural development. Ultimately, this study lends weight to the theory that participatory drama can lead to the development of greater perspective taking ability. By practicing such skills in an imagined, value-free context, participants are given the opportunity to develop and construct tools for later use in both their personal and community life. It does not, however, prove such a notion conclusively.

McNaughton (2004) used drama in education to teach for sustainability. Using a variety of non-performative, participatory dramatic activities, McNaughton sought to use drama to help primary school students develop concepts and attitudes that would result in environmentally responsible decision-making later in life. Drama was thought to provide students with an imagined context in which they could practice active citizenship, and facilitate a contextual learning experience more effective in producing cognitive change.

The small qualitative study produced several findings, foremost among which, for the purposes of this thesis, was the increased use of sympathy and empathy by the young students. McNaughton (2004) observed that participation in drama forces the participant to see the world from another's eyes, and ultimately reflect on the ways and reasons behind the actions of another. In role, students attempted to act like another person and make decisions from that person's perspective. Out of role the students examined the truthfulness of their decisions in the drama's context. This provided an opportunity to practice empathy and perspective taking skills. That an increase was observed, however, may have more to do with the time spent on task, explicitly working with the process,

rather than an effect of dramatic participation. Time on task was not a variable controlled for.

McNaughton's (2004) study falls into the category of action research. It utilized qualitative procedures and a multi-case study approach to amass a collection of data that could be used to divine trends and patterns in the use of drama in education. The findings are supported by the literature at-large, and as such they strengthen the general conversation regarding the benefits of and purpose for drama's inclusion across curriculum. These findings are, however, specific to the small population used for the study and not to be taken as universally applicable. That said, efforts at triangulation were made as McNaughton enlisted a second teacher to teach the lessons she developed, and code the observations accordingly. This action reduces teacher affect as a possible confound or un-controlled for variable. The emergent themes found in each group were congruent despite the separate instruction, leading one to believe that, in terms of this group, the findings are strong. There is, however, no discussion as to the specifics of this population, cultural practices or mores, which may have had significant bearing on the resultant findings.

McNaughton (2006) followed up this study with a third phase, which took place some time after the previous two. Children were asked in recorded interviews about their most memorable moments, presuming that those most memorable would equate to those with the largest impact on learning. This assumption is articulated by the author and quite important. Most of the responses talked about how much fun it was to participate in, or referred to the acting components of the process as being most memorable. This does not, however, necessarily indicate a learning experience as it was intended to occur

by the researcher. A fun and memorable learning experience does not guarantee that what was learned was in congruence with what the teacher hoped his or her students would learn. Though the experiences were fun and memorable, students may have simply learned that acting is enjoyable.

This second round found emergent themes congruent with those of the last study. In terms of sympathy and empathy, students effectively played the made-up characters with whom they identified. Students worked to portray the conflicts and choices their characters encountered with honesty; they reacted to situations as best they could and demonstrated concern and compassion for those who played members of their community. Post-dramatization, students engaged in intellectual thought experiments, asking questions about what they would do in similar situations. So too did they care to know of the wellbeing of the characters even after the show was done. What was measured, qualitatively, was the participants' proficiency in perspective taking and empathic engagement. McNaughton (2006) did find these qualities to increase with participation; however, there are questions as to the possible confound of natural development. Working with primary school students who are in the process of advancing in their natural cognitive abilities renders the observed change from being conclusively and wholly attributed to drama in education.

Similar critiques exist for this particular version of the study, which was described in some detail in the previous entry. Being qualitative, there is little generalizability that exists in regard to the population at large. The small sample size and lack of simple random sampling work to exacerbate one's doubt in regard to generalizability. All that

differed in this later round was the time period and amount of students willing to share their interest or feelings

Krogh (1985) studied the effects of drama, specifically role-playing, on children's perspective taking abilities. The sample (n= 90) had an even gender balance and was selected randomly from an intentionally chosen school. The school itself was predominantly of middle to upper-middle economic class, mostly Anglo-American families. There was a legal integration policy as well, which resulted in roughly twenty percent of the school's population being bussed in from communities of lower to lower-middle economic class, mostly African-American families. The demographic breakdown mimicked that of the school at large.

A quasi-experimental method was chosen with a pre- and post-test, an experimental and control group. Not all the participants were interviewed and tested; five boys and five girls from each class were chosen at random to participate in the interview process. The pre-test measured perspective taking abilities as described by Selman (1980), which was immediately followed by the intervention or control activities. The role-play activity experienced by the experimental group gave the students the opportunity to write and act out a decision made by the protagonist in a story they had read who reached a moment of conflict. The actors, at the conclusion of their performance, were asked how the outcome of their decision- as the protagonist- made them feel. So too was the class asked to reflect on the various choices made by the various actors. Each decision was looked at by the participants in terms of its consequences and benefits as well as the characters' comments. At the end of the discussion, students were asked to make an individual choice as to the best alternative,

which was not made public. Within one week of the class activities, treatment and control groups were post-tested in the same manner as the pre-tested.

Results revealed a significant positive increase in perspective taking in the role-play treatment group (mean change= 33.6 on the low end, to 60.2 on the high end, at $p < .0003$). This suggests that dramatic role-play has a positive impact on young people's conscious perspective taking ability. Issues of natural development are possible influences as participants may have still been advancing in their normal cognitive abilities; however, the short duration of the experiment may help to minimize such a confound. Despite the significant results connected with role-playing, it was found that structured discussion actually proved to be slightly more effective in eliciting positive change in mean scores on the perspective-taking test, though it did not approach significance.

The study utilized a teacher as researcher methodology, which may have resulted in two forms of contrasting influence. In one sense, the students may have acted more naturally in the research setting, it being naturalistic with familiar and known facilitators. In another sense, students may have felt even more pressure to perform a certain way so to not disappoint or fail in front of an adult role model. Krogh (1985) also acknowledges that a sort of "teaching to the test" effect may have been present. The stories and activities used in the actual role-play were similar in form and structure to the pre- and post-test designed by Selman (1980). This provided an opportunity to work with the tools and skills being tested in the manner in which they were being tested. A confounding variable may be seen in this, for the mean changes in score may be a simple result of time-on-task as opposed to any benefit specific to dramatic participation.

Students in the role-play group were offered additional experiences working with perspective taking skills through dramatic play. A possibility exists that another form of practice or inquiry may demonstrate similar or even more significant results. Still, drama does appear to be an effective tool for positive change.

Medina (2004) used an ethnographic, case study approach in which one boy, George, was followed in his use of drama to construct meaning from a given text. The school in which George studies is located in a Midwest region of the United States, which is slowly transforming from one of Euro-American dominance to a more diverse population. George was a fifth-grade student of African-American ethnic identity, chosen to participate in the ethnography specifically because of his high level of engagement in and comfort with the drama process. Data was collected in the form of classroom observations, video and audio recording. Observations were coded and triangulated for greater accuracy. It is assumed that such triangulation was checked with an inter-rater reliability measure; however, no such mention was made by the study's author.

Group drama activities intending to provide students with a medium through which to explore and create meaning included tableau construction, writing in role, and the creation of news stories to be presented to the class. Though George was the student whose experience was analyzed, the whole class participated in the dramatic exercises. It was concluded that the improvisational role-play and dramatic interpretation allowed for the construction of meaning that went beyond that contained in either the text or the students' lives alone. A sort of hybridized understanding was developed that borrowed parts from the students' previous knowledge and experience, the characters and situations

of the story studied, and the physical interaction with each other and the classroom itself. Intersubjectivity came to exist between the individuals and the text, and the individuals themselves, all leading to the construction of new meaning through the inter-to intramental process described by Vygotsky (Miller, 2002). In the end, the drama helped the participants negotiate the complex border between the author's and their own ideologies, resulting the construction of a wholly new understanding built on that which came before.

This study speaks to the emergent themes and theoretical framework of drama in education. It concludes this section because of its broad brush-strokes, suggesting that dramatic participation as a tool across curriculum can aid in the construction of knowledge and understanding in ways that traditional didactic or pedantic education cannot. This is, of course, a qualitative study of minute proportions, examining the experience of one student in a particular context at a particular moment in his culturally encapsulated history. As such, one cannot say that there is a great amount of generalizability to be found in George's particular experience. However, the findings are further support for the theoretical base of this discipline and additional, empirical evidence that implores educators to embrace drama in education as a viable and important educational activity.

Trzebinski (2005) found that narrative priming coupled with narrative competence does indeed positively impact one's empathic engagement. Though drama itself was not explicitly used in the study, and it is certainly not the only activity able to engage one with narrative process and competence, it is reasonable to see drama as a tool for such engagement. Chalmers and Townsend (1990) concluded that drama could be

utilized in the positive development of perspective taking skills and possible empathic engagement, though there are lingering questions as to the study's measuring of behavioral changes in a compulsory system.

Both Day (2002) and O'Toole and Burton (2005) also suggested that drama in education does in fact have a positive impact on participants' perspective taking and empathic abilities. Utilizing variations of forum theatre workshops, both studies qualitatively measured increases in students' abilities to see from perspectives that were not explicitly their own. These were self-reported measures as opposed to observed or objectively quantified changes; however, they do suggest patterns that cannot be ignored; O'Toole and Burton (2005), in particular, make such a suggestion with their longitudinal, international study. McNaughton (2004, 2006) and Medina (2004) add their findings to this suggestive pattern as well, though issues of development cloud the certainty of their conclusions. This is also the case with Krogh (1985), who found that role-playing does have a positive and demonstrated impact on participants' ability to engage in cognitive perspective taking. Only one study, Kehoe (1979), found no change in empathic engagement despite work with perspective taking activities. This study did not explicitly look at drama in education and, despite its quasi-experimental methodology, utilize a pre-test, thus mitigating its conclusive measure.

It has largely been concluded by researcher and theorist alike, that participatory drama for non-performative purposes positively impacts the development of perspective taking abilities. Though a good deal of the research focuses on theory construction and support, working with specific, non-generalizable populations, it seems reasonable to conclude that the theory has both strength and positive implications for the driving

question of this master's paper. It needs mention, however, that concerns do still exist as to how much drama in education can be credited with the positive changes described. Perhaps it is best said in that there is significant evidence that strongly correlates drama in education and positive growth in perspective taking and empathic development; however, a direct causal relationship has yet to be conclusively illustrated.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSION

Introduction

This chapter offers the conclusions reached in regard to the question driving this master's paper. This is an ever-evolving topic and can thusly conclude only in part. No doubt the debate over the legitimacy of drama in education, and art education in general, will continue for years to come, as public school funding shrinks in the face of fiscal reallocation. What can be concluded- from both the literature critiqued here within as well as the historical context of the master's paper question- will be. So too will the reader find a discussion on the unanswered aspects of the question as well as suggestions for further research. This is the most personal chapter of the whole, and as such I will not refrain from straying into the first person. May the style and story of this chapter be not offensive among its more academic counterparts.

My interest in theatre goes back many years. I will not recount the specifics of my adolescence, but suffice it to say that it was on the boards that I first found myself. Not naturally gregarious or extroverted as is the stereotypical thespian, I was drawn to the process of creating a soul; taking the givens of a character, the dramaturgy of the cultural place in time, the gifts of information supplied by the others players and the pieces of my own imagination. It was through this process that I came to hear my own voice as it was distinguished from others. That awareness brought with it not only a sense of self but a sense of difference as well- difference in me and difference in others. From that day I have been a devote student of the human experience, ever seeking to understand the countless ways in which we make sense of our subjective realities.

For several years I worked as an Actor / Educator with an educational theatre company, performing a one-man-show about the Great Depression for secondary education students. This experience was that which provided the impetus for my move to teaching. Up to that point my work in the educational theatre program was by far the most important and fulfilling of my life, helping students' to open their eyes to a watershed moment in American History and make social studies meaningful and relevant. I realized that as an educator I would make a much greater difference for social justice than I ever could as an actor. By breaking down the teacher-student relationship, engaging in comprehensive, anti-racist, anti-bias, multicultural curricular instruction, and by asking the big questions in a student-centered classroom, such as "what does it mean to be human?" I will help young people find their own voices of self-empowerment so that together, we will transform the world. Such is my modest aim, and thusly begins this conclusion.

Summary of Findings

The first section, "Where We Start," added empirical evidence to the theoretical base that surrounds normal cognitive development and the growth of perspective taking and empathy. It appears reasonable to conclude that social perspective taking has a normal linear growth pattern with age from childhood to adult maturity (Eisenberg, 2005; Selman, 1980), achieving its greatest momentum in late adolescence. Empathy is strongly correlated with intercultural sensitivity (Pederson, 1997), an advanced form of perspective taking, and social perspective taking is a predictor of ethnic perspective taking (Quintana et al., 1999). These are normal developments and

social/cognitive achievements for these particular samples, which are each rooted in their particular culture and time. And while one cannot claim a true ubiquity to all that has been reported, strong trends are certainly suggested.

Perhaps most important to this thesis, in the initial section that is, is Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga et al.'s (2003) findings that empathy- accurately reacting to another's emotional experience and seeing from his or her perspective in a non judgmental way- and other self regulatory and prosocial abilities can be increased through educational activities. Though the findings of their study are suspect in that they primarily measure behavior, the literature and theoretical base support the hypothesis they sought to document (Eisenberg, 2005; Selman, 1980). This is a necessary starting place for the resultant investigation. Perspective taking abilities and empathy seem to be natural developmental achievements in normal cognitive and socially developing individuals; however, development alone can only go so far. This raises the specter of a nature versus nurture debate, yet it is the argument of this thesis, as it is also argued by Miller (2002), that it is more appropriate to see nature and nurture as working together instead of being mutually exclusive.

It would appear that normal development equips individuals with the tools necessary for perspective taking and empathy. If one is to accept development theory as it is, our species moves from the egotism of early childhood- Level One- to a complex, multi-dynamic understanding of identity and social behavior- Level Four (Quintana et al., 1999; Selman, 1980). The tools are there, and development theory suggests that a level of proficiency is achievable by all. To what degree one develops a mastery of their tools, however, is largely determined by her or his experiences after the appropriate

developmental stage has been achieved. Moving forward with this understanding, the coming sections will examine the effects of drama on further development, asking if it may legitimately be considered one type of experience that leads to such mastery. As has been seen, it is necessary to have an understanding of the assumed developmental framework so that it does not act as a confounding variable. As researchers attempt to measure the effect of drama in education on its participants, it will be necessary to take development into consideration. If this variable is not controlled for, there is little way to ensure that any being measured is actually attributable to dramatic participation.

The second section, entitled “Not All Participation is Equal,” shed light on the effects produced by being observers of theatre. Klein (1995) demonstrated that, at least for younger children, the most significant factor that inhibited the use of empathy as an audience member was the inability to participate in the action or problem solving alongside the protagonist. Observation alone did not trigger sustained empathic responses in most children, and the spectacle of the performance had the tendency to trigger distancing in that children retreated to their own experience or desires in relation to the action or object. These findings are congruent with the theory of cognitive development explored in the first section. It may be quite possible that the younger children simply did not yet have the tools developed for such empathic engagement.

Gesser-Edelsburg (2005) demonstrated the tendency of theatre for youth- theatre that is performed for youth rather than theatre that asks for the active participation of youth- to reaffirm or increase the social stereotypes they already have, despite having the opposite goal. Whiteman and Nielsen (1986) demonstrated that presentational drama makes for a more meaningful and enjoyable classroom experience- when measured over

time- than the typical didactic instructional practice of lecturing; however, it neither increases nor decreases one's ability to retain that which was learned. In regard to perspective taking and empathic development, such findings suggest that watching theatre may lead to the reinforcement of one's own perspective rather than encourage the exploration of another's; however, some of the findings suggested influence from sources not measured- natural development (Klein, 1995) and play structure (Gesser-Edelsburg, 2005), for example- and call into question the soundness of any direct application.

Taken together, it is reasonable to conclude that observing drama or theatrical performances in an educational setting can be a powerful and memorable experience, perhaps leading to greater enjoyment of the class, depending on the individual; however, it does not necessarily correlate with the construction of new knowledge. Being centered in the performer rather than the student, most of what is gained on the part of the observer is a belief in what is already know. In the language of this master's paper question, the viewers tend to sympathize rather than empathize. In Piagetian terms (Miller, 2002), they are asked to assimilate rather than challenged to accommodate.

The third section leaves one with several conclusions regarding the general effects of drama participation. The many qualitative studies (Bayliss & Dowdwell, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002; Holloway, 2001; Horitz, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001) share qualities that suggest a relative strength to the grounded theory. These include the establishment of community and meaningful relationships, tendency towards open-mindedness, self-expression and self-awareness, knowledge of the art of drama, knowledge of the world or one's place in it, and a possible increased proficiency in literacy.

In regard to the specific effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development, this section only hints at conclusions. Crumpler and Schneider (2002) allude to the potential of drama in education to be used as a tool for engagement in these cognitive skills, as do Holloway and LeCompte (2001). Hughes and Wilson's (2004) findings suggest that drama in education does in fact have a positive impact on growth in perspective taking and empathic abilities beyond that of normal development, as does Innes et al. (2001). These findings, however, are largely based on qualitative research dependent self-reported measures, resulting in a suggested trend as opposed to an objective conclusion.

An important addition to this section, made by Riviere (2005) and somewhat likened to Gesser-Edelsburg (2005), is the inescapable importance of prior knowledge. Riviere (2005) reminds the reader that social inequities and stereotypes are played out in the drama classroom or drama activity just as they are in society at large. This can provide for an excellent learning opportunity, the fulfillment of the qualitative observation of theatre participation leading to self-awareness- making implicit knowledge explicit. If participants in the theatre exercise are not aware of such notions, however, and a More Capable Peer does not scaffold towards the construction of such an understanding, those inequities and hegemonic, internalized oppression, will continue to be reinforced and reenacted unconsciously and overtly.

Both of the studies in the fourth section suggest that the skills developed or utilized in a role-play activity are specific to the domain of that activity. Taylor (1997) found that students were able to avoid the framing effect presented in a particular role-play but remained able to be influenced when posed with a second round of questioning.

Clayton (1985) suggested through empirical evidence that students were able to make intentional, educated choices in a role-play activity that were quickly abandoned in their daily behavior; the lesson presumed learned did not transfer long-term. Both of these studies are weak in their research and assumptive laden. Clayton, in particular, seems to view learning simply as a change in behavior over time, a classically behaviorist position that simply does not go far enough in explaining the learning cycle. So too are there developmental concerns, as discussed above, that are not taken into account. Though the findings of these two inquiries should not be dismissed, they cannot be taken as absolutes either. One possible conclusion to draw is that simple cognitive role-playing, that is, intellectual engagement without a corresponding physical participation, is not a strong indicator of growth in perspective taking or demonstrably significant learning. Of course, if such activities were given a higher degree of repetition or focus, the outcome may have been quite different.

Trzebinski (2005) found in the final section that narrative priming coupled with narrative competence does indeed positively impact one's empathic engagement. Though drama itself was not explicitly used in the study, and it is certainly not the only activity able to engage one with narrative process and competence, it is reasonable to see drama as a tool for such engagement. Chalmers and Townsend (1990) concluded that drama could be utilized in the positive development of perspective taking skills, and possible empathic engagement, though there are lingering questions as to the study's measuring of behavioral changes in a compulsory system.

Both Day (2002) and O'Toole and Burton (2005) also suggested that drama in education does in fact have a positive impact on participants' perspective taking and

empathic abilities. Utilizing variations of forum theatre workshops, both studies qualitatively measured increases in students' abilities to see from perspectives that were not explicitly their own. These were self-reported measures as opposed to observed or objectively quantified changes; however, they do suggest patterns that cannot be ignored. O'Toole and Burton (2005), in particular, make such a suggestion with their longitudinal, international study. McNaughton (2004, 2006) and Medina (2004) add their findings to this suggestive pattern as well, though issues of development cloud the certainty of their conclusions. This is also the case with Krogh (1985), who found that role-playing does have a positive and demonstrable impact on participants' ability to engage in cognitive perspective taking. Only one study, Kehoe (1979), found no change in empathic engagement despite work with perspective taking activities. This study did not explicitly look at drama in education and, despite its quasi-experimental methodology, failed to utilize a pre-test, thus mitigating its conclusive measure.

Suffice to Say

It has largely been concluded by researcher and theorist alike, that participatory drama for non-performative purposes positively impacts the development of perspective taking abilities. Though a good deal of the research focuses on theory construction and support, working with specific, non-generalizable populations, it seems reasonable to conclude that the theory has both strength and positive implications for the driving question of this master's paper. It needs mention, however, that concerns do still exist as to how much drama in education can be credited with the positive changes described. Perhaps it is best said in that there is significant evidence that strongly correlates drama

in education and positive growth in perspective taking and empathic development; however, a direct causal relationship has yet to be conclusively illustrated.

The positive impacts on student learning and empathic development that have thus far been discussed may have resulted from other variables not controlled for, such as focused time on task and the explicit use of such skills in an educational context. That is to say, the literature contained in the fifth section does not conclusively demonstrate that participatory drama is either unique or salient among those activities that would provide for the explicit training and use of perspective taking and empathic qualities. It does strongly suggest, however, that drama in education is an effective way to educate for such skills, stronger even than many other traditional education activities. Yet, it may still prove to simply be a venue through which such development can occur. Drama in education is therefore seen as an activity with strong trends for many, which indicate an increased familiarity with and competence in perspective taking and empathic abilities. A further question exists, however, as to other educational activities that would indicate the same.

In summation, Eisenberg (2005) started out the literature review with a study analyzing the age changes in prosocial responding. Grounding her work in the theories of cognitive development as they are described by Selman (1980), Colby et al. (1983), Kohlberg (1981) and Eisenberg (2005), found a significant increase in perspective taking corresponding with age, a near linear progression from adolescence to early adulthood. This finding is theoretically supported (Miller, 2002; Selman, 1980) and empirically backed up (Krebs, 1982; Tirri, 2003). Furthermore, it suggests that the skills of perspective taking and empathy are normal advances in human, cognitive development.

Ours is a species that depends on one another for our very survival. Interdependent in every way, despite the rigid individualism and absolutism existent in American society, prosocial behavior is necessary for the cultivation of community in our adult lives- though the communities may look very different.

One can conclude with some confidence that this has near ubiquity in the *normal*, human population. There are, without doubt, exceptions, and those whose brains are constructed a little differently or have experienced some early physical trauma may not develop along the lines being expressed. For the majority of us, however, the trend suggests that we do indeed experience a linear growth in perspective taking with age. The question then becomes, once that developmental level is reached and the capacity for such cognitive engagement is present, what experiences lead to an even greater mastery or intuition of these skills? Each of us is rooted in our own sociocultural context, and the world we know and interact with is known only through our experiences. Do some experiences engage the prosocial more than others? Are there some experiences that foster even greater access to empathy and perspective taking than we develop in adolescence, and if so, how do we as educators design them in our classroom?

Significant research exists supporting the notion that participation in creative dramatics, be it improvised role-playing, forum theatre, or scripted drama, leads to the development of significant relationships, increased confidence, other-oriented awareness, and self individuation among its participants (Bayliss & Dowdwell, 2002; Crumpler & Schneider, 2002; Holloway, 2001; Horitz, 2001; Hughs & Wilson, 2004; Innes et al., 2001). So too is there considerable empirical evidence positively correlating participation in theatre arts and an increase in perspective taking abilities (Chalmers &

Townsend, 1990; Day, 2002; O'Toole & Burton, 2005). That said, not all participation is equal. Watching theatre and performing theatre have demonstrably different effects upon the individual in regard to their capacity to empathize (Klein, 1995; Gesser-Edelsburg, 2005). Prior knowledge and cultural context are ever a part of an individual's composition; they are the developing tools with which she constructs meaning, personal identity, and worldview.

To put it simply, participating in theatre, and specifically non-scripted, guided theatre, can provide the individual with an experience that requires him or her to adapt what he or she knows or believes in order to succeed. In Piagetian terms, as described by Miller (2002), certain types of theatrical participation are more likely to lead to accommodation and schematic change than others. Viewing theatre is more akin to assimilation, or the reinforcing of that which already exists, somatically and philosophically. This does not mean that the latter activity is devoid of value or that the former is automatically preferable; however, an educator will be served differently by the employment of each. In the end, when examining the effects of drama in education on adolescent perspective taking and empathic development, the necessary conclusion is, well, it depends.

Implications for the Classroom and Further Research

Cognitive development theory, if it is to be taken as it is, dictates that a linear growth pattern exists with age, increasing from childhood to adult maturity. That being the case, drama in education may be less effective in helping younger people develop their perspective taking and empathic abilities; if they are not yet developmentally ready with the capacity to engage in such cognitive skills, no amount of practice will expedite

the process. Yet drama in education may be a means through which young people can work with and gain a sense of mastery over the skills they do already have. This is necessary for teachers who plan to integrate drama into their curriculum to understand. Just like in any other content area, it is necessary for the educator to craft experiences of developmental appropriateness in regard to drama. Too high or too low in the zone of proximal development will render the activity as mere entertainment at best, and miseducative at worst.

So too is it necessary for the educator to identify students' prior knowledge when engaging in drama as an educative means. Though forum theatre and active dramatic participation seems to have great potential as an educational tool, particularly in providing for disequilibrium and the active testing of perception, it also appears to have a strong potential for leading to assimilation, or the reinforcement of that which is already believed at the expense of new, contradicting perspectives. This can be particularly dangerous when it comes to the internalization, dissemination, and perpetuation of pervasive stereotypes, dominant culture ideologies, and systems of oppression. Just as drama can be used as an agent of change, so too can it be an agent of social reproduction. Systems of oppression have the potential to be reinforced and reproduced without an explicit and conscious effort otherwise. As hooks (2003) articulated, this can lead to the further development of unconscious understandings that work to control the individual, resulting in actions and agency that actually function in opposition to one's beliefs and value system.

Significantly more research is needed to definitively answer the question driving this master's project. So too are the implications necessarily vague for lack of objective

answers. The research seemed strongest in terms of development theory, and as such, individuals not yet into their early adulthood would not be expected to have reached their mature perspective taking capacity. Further research is needed on older populations before one can begin to honestly conclude as to the specific effects of drama in education on perspective taking and empathic development. One can, however, discern a positive relationship between dramatic participation and perspective taking, as reported in much of the qualitative data.

The title of this master's project includes the notion of experiencing for social transformation. If one is to return to some of the assumptions and questions asked in the first chapter of this project, it is evident that the purposes behind such an investigation is to determine if drama is a legitimate and positive tool in the movement for social justice as it takes place in the classroom. Can drama, as a pedagogical instrument, be effectively used in educating individuals for critical engagement in a pluralistic society, and result in greater instance of other-oriented behavior? The assumption beneath these ideas is, of course, that an increased ability in and proclivity for perspective taking and empathic engagement would strongly and positively correlate with altruistic tendencies, or at the very least, a broadening sense of self interest that includes the welfare of society at large. Research does support this assumption (Batson, 1991; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987; Eisenberg, Zhou, & Koller, 2001; Underwood & Moore, 1982); however, no perfect correlation exists.

A further assumption beneath this is that education itself is a legitimate tool for social change. Social reproduction theory, the Principle of Correspondence, and Marx's (1970) notion of the substructure would all suggest otherwise, arguing instead that

society's mode of production and economic values have a disproportionate impact on education, and therefore the consciousness of students. As was seen in the second chapter of this master's project, these theories are supported by the history of schooling and its routine return to conservative, economic, and authoritative organization.

Yet society and identity are not simply conferred upon the individual without his or her active engagement. Social reproduction theory and the like tend to see influence as unidirectional rather than multidirectional. However, schools, societies, even the substructure are made up of people working and acting with and for one another. As such, humans exist in a sociocultural, intersubjective milieu that is in a constant state of creation and recreation; despite the vigorous individualism and neutral interdependence of the United States, this is a social reality ubiquitous to the human experience (Miller, 2002; Rogoff, 1990). As also seen in the second chapter of this project, the reform movements of progressive education and institutionalized equity did not simply falter before a larger economic and cultural system. Both had significant and lasting impacts on the collective consciousness of society and aided in larger social changes. This suggests a multidirectional understanding of influence in which all parts of society have an impact on all others; like ripples on the water, a change in one affects the rest in kind.

The strength of the substructure lies in that it organizes the activities and experiences of the citizenry. As such, its impact on institutional and social consciousness is tremendous- but not absolute. One's understanding of the world comes through his or her experiences with it, and experiences are crafted in many ways. Traditional didactic and authoritative education utilizes such experiences to prepare one for life in a like society; it is this that leads to social reproduction and the maintenance of the status quo,

inequitable as it may be. Social justice and social transformation, it stands to reason, would then be best served in the creation of experiences that reflect their values. Such an action would have a correlative impact upon the consciousness of its participants, spreading forth as they interact with the larger society; again, the metaphor of ripples on the water rises to the surface.

Radical constructivism suggests that all knowledge is in the mind of the knower (von Glasenfeld, 1992). As one's consciousness is necessarily constructed through his or her subjective experiences with the world, knowledge itself is formless- anything but objective. Drama in education can provide individuals with meaningful experiences that become the somatic structures of their subjective reality. As such, it is not wholly irrational to conclude that dramatic work in which one is routinely asked to take the perspective of another would lead to a strengthening of such skill; the greater the frequency and quality of opportunity, the greater the strength of the skill. As one's proficiency and use of perspective taking grow, so to does his or her empathic responding and other-oriented, if not altruistic behavior (Batson, 1991; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987; Eisenberg, Zhou, & Koller, 2001; Underwood & Moore, 1982). In this way can drama in education become an experience for social transformation. Of course, this is a subjective opinion. Then again, aren't they all?

References

- Aubusson, P (1997). What happens when students do simulation-role-play in science?. *Research in Science Education*, 27(4), 565-579.
- Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bayliss, P., & Dodwell, C. (2002). Building relationships through drama: The action project [1]. *Research in Drama Education*, 7(1), 43-60.
- Berube, M. R. (1994). *American school reform: Progressive, equity, and excellence movements, 1883-1993*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. London: Pluto Press.
- Boal, A. (1992). *Games for actors and non-actors* (London and New York, NY, Routledge).
- Boal, A. (1995). *The rainbow of desire*. London: Routledge.
- Boal, A. (1998). *Legislative theatre*. London: Routledge.
- Bolton, G. (1979). *Towards a theory of drama in education*. London: Longman.
- Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as education – an argument for placing drama at the centre of the curriculum* (London, Longman).
- Bolton, G. (1993). Drama in education and TIE: A comparison. In T. Jackson, *learning through theatre*, 39-47.
- Chalmers, J. B., & Townsend, M. A. R. (1990). The effects of training in social perspective taking on socially maladjusted girls. *Child Development*, 6(1), 178-190.
- Clyton, B. (1985). The validity of a role-played measure of students' snack selections. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 8(3), 229-238.
- Colby, A., Kohlberg, L., Gibbs, J., & Lieberman, M. (1983). A longitudinal study of moral judgment. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 48(Serial No. 200), 1-124.
- Collins, B. D. (n.d.). *The rise of the high school*. Retrieved January 2007, from <http://www.nd.edu/~rbarger/www7/riseofhs.html>

- Crumpler, T., & Schneider, J. J. (2002). Writing with their whole being: A cross study analysis of children's writing from five classrooms using process drama. *Research in Drama Education*, 7(1), 61-79.
- Day, L (2002). Putting yourself in other people's shoes': The use of forum theatre to explore refugee and homeless issues in schools. *Journal of Moral Education*, 31(1), 21-34.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York: Perigee Books.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dewey, J. (1944). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Eisenberg, N. (1986). *Altruistic emotion, cognition and behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eisenberg, N. (2005). Age changes in prosocial responding and moral reasoning in adolescence and early adulthood. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 15(3), 235-260.
- Eisenberg, N., & Strayer, J. (Eds.). (1987). *Empathy and its development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Zhou, Q., & Killer, S. (2001). Brazilian adolescents' prosocial moral judgment and behavior: Relations to sympathy, perspective taking, gender-role orientation, and demographic characteristics. *Child Development*, 72, 518-534.
- Fleming, M., Merrell, C., & Tymms, P. (2004). The impact of drama on pupils' language, mathematics, and attitude in two primary schools. *Research in Drama Education*, 9(2), 177-197.
- Gesser-Edelsburg, A. (2005). Paradoxical outcomes in an educational drama about gang rape: Ethical responsibilities of practitioners and educators. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(2), 139-158.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essay on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Heilbrunner, R. (1996). *Teachings from the worldly philosophy*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Hoffman, M. L. (2000). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Holloway, D. L., & LeCompte, M. D. (2001). Becoming somebody! How arts programs support positive identity development in adolescent girls. *Education and Urban Society* 33(4), 388-408.
- Horitz, T. (2001). 'B-o-u-r-n-e-m-o-u-t-h! Our town!' Effects on male teenagers of participation in a community play. *Research in Drama Education*, 6(1), 69-84.
- Hughes, J., & Wilson, K. (2004). Playing a part: The impact of youth theatre on young people's personal and social development. *Research in Drama Education*, 9(1), 57-72.
- Huntsman, K. H. (1982). Improvisationa dramatic activities: Key to self-actualization?. *Children's Theatre Review*, 31(2), 3-9.
- Innes, M., Moss, T., & Smigiel, H. (2001). What do the children say? The importance of student voice. *Research in Drama Education*, 6(2), 207-221.
- Johnson, A. G. (2006) *Privilege, power, and difference*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Kehoe, J. W. (1979). The effects of role exchange questioning on empathetic perceptiveness. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 25(1), 48-52.
- Klein, J. (1995). Performance factors that inhibit empathy and trigger distancing; Crying to laugh. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 9, 53-67.
- Krebs, D. (1982). Role-taking ability and altruistic behaviour in elementary school children. *Journal of Moral Education*, 11(2), 94-100.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Krogh, S. L. (1985). Engaging positive justice reasoning and perspective-taking skills; Two educational interventions. *Journal of Moral Education*, 14(2), 102-110.
- Marx, K. (1970). *Critique of political economy*. New York: New World Paperbacks.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998). *The communist manifesto*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- McNaughton, M. J. (2004). Educational drama in the teaching of education for sustainability. *Environmental Education Research*, 10(2), 139-155.
- McNaughton, M. J. (2006). Learning from participants' responses in educational drama in the teaching of educational for sustainable development. *Research in Drama Education*, 11(1), 19-41.

- Medina, C. L. (2004). The construction of drama worlds as literary interpretation of Latina feminist literature. *Research in Drama Education*, 9(2), 145-160.
- Miller, P. H. (2002). *Theories of developmental psychology*. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Miller, R. (2002). *A brief overview of progressive education*. Retrieved January 2007, from the John Dewey Project on Progressive Education web site: <http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/articles/proged.html>
- Nicholson, H. (2005). *Applied drama*. New York: Palgrave.
- O'Toole, J, & Burton, B (2005). Acting against conflict and bullying. The Brisbane dragon project 1996-2004 – emergent findings and outcomes. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(3), 269-283.
- Pederson, P. V. (1997, November). *Intercultural sensitivity and the early adolescent*. Paper presented to the College and University Faculty Assembly at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Quintana, S. M., Castaneda-English, P., & Ybarra, V. C. (1999). *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 9(2), 161-182.
- Riviere, D. (2005). Identities and intersectionalities: Performance, power and the possibilities for multicultural education. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(3), 341-354.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sanz de Acedo Lizarraga, M. L., Ugarte, M. D., Cardelle-Elawar, M., Iriarte, M. D., & Sanz de Acedo Baquedano, M. T. (2003). Enhancement of self-regulation, assertiveness, and empathy. *Learning and Instruction*, 13, 423-439.
- Scheiffele, E. (2001). Acting: An altered state of consciousness. *Research in Drama Education*, 6(2), 179-191.
- Scherer, M. (n.d.). *The cardinal principles of secondary education*. Retrieved January 2007, from <http://www.nd.edu/~rbarger/www7/cardprin.html>
- Selman, R. L. (1975). Level of social perspective taking and the development of empathy in children: Speculations from a social-cognitive viewpoint. *Journal of Moral education*, 5, 35-43.
- Selman, R. L. (1980). *The growth of interpersonal understanding: Developmental and clinical analysis*. New York: Academic Press.

- Siks, G. B. (1985). Drama in education – A changing scene. In N. McCaslin (Ed.), *Children and drama*, 1-14.
- Spring, J. (2004). *The American school (sixth edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, H. A. (1997). Effects of computer based role-playing on decision making skills. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 17(2), 147-64.
- Tirri, K. (2003). The moral concerns and orientations of sixth- and ninth-grade students. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 9(1), 93-108.
- Trzebiski, J (2005). Narratives and understanding other people. *Research in Drama Education*, 10(1), 15-25.
- Underwood, B., & Moore, B. (1982). Perspective-taking and altruism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 143-173.
- von Glasenfeld, E. (1992). *Aspects of radical constructivism and its educational recommends*. Retrieved February, 2006, from <http://srri.nsm.umass.edu/vonGlaserffeld/onlinePapers/html/195>
- West, C. (2004). *Democracy matters: Winning the fight against imperialism*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Whiteman, V. (1986). An experiment to evaluate drama as a method for teaching social work research. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 22(3), 31-42.
- Zull, J. (2002). *The art of changing the brain*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

