Drama as a teaching tool: An argument for the integration of drama into the everyday curriculum

Katherine E. Speed

MA Applied Theatre

(Drama in the Community and Drama Education)

September 2013

Abstract

In this paper, I propose an argument in favour of using drama techniques in the classroom to teach non-drama subjects as a solution to the growing cuts to arts education as a result of the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001 (NCLB). This piece of legislation has had a huge impact on the way students' progress and achievements are observed in the form of state-mandated accountability measures. These measures have numerous flaws in themselves that make them unreliable benchmarks of students' success, and because schools' funding are tied to students' test results, schools are focusing all their efforts on the test-mandated subjects and in turn leaving non-tested subjects, specifically drama, far behind. A process of integrating drama into the non-drama curriculum will achieve the dual goal of helping students reach the benchmarks mandated by NCLB while exposing them to drama, a subject that they might otherwise have no access to at all. This concept does not aim to replace drama programmes in schools which already set drama as an independent subject but rather to supplement schools and districts that would otherwise have no opportunities for students to experience drama at all.

Within this paper, I will dissect NCLB, specifically the parts that relate to my argument. I will then present a short case study of a suburban town in Massachusetts and how the legislation has affected arts education for them over the last thirteen years. In the next chapter, I will discuss the intrinsic value of drama as a teaching tool, demonstrating the aspects of drama which lend themselves to an educational setting as well as how integration will promote drama as an art form. Finally, I will examine how the role of the Drama Teacher will and must change if integration becomes common practice in American schools.

Plagiarism

‘I understand the School definition of plagiarism and declare that all sources drawn on have been formally acknowledged.’

Signature:

Date: 10.09.13

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my tutor, Nicola Abraham, for her unceasing dedication to help me through this process. As an American with an undergraduate degree based in performance, I have never written a dissertation or anything quite so daunting before. Nicky has answered every question I've thrown at her and been there as a constant source of support and knowledge. I couldn't have done it without you – thank you.

I would also like to thank Olivia Jakeman-Kahn and her family, for housing me in the last week of this process when I was forced to move out of my student housing, as well as for treating me like family in my entire time in England. I'm lucky to have found you.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents and my two sisters Meggie and Susie. It has been a difficult year at times being so far apart from one another, but I am blessed to know that I can always follow my dreams with you as a support system. I love you all.

Contents

Introduction

Throughout the history of the United States, the nation has gone through multiple waves of educational reform. Many a time reform measures have drawn upon innovative ways of looking at education, broader teaching methods, and a more individualised view of each student. The *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001, however, did the exact opposite. This controversial piece of legislation has caused myriad political debates regarding its effectiveness and drawn criticism from educationalists across the spectrum of teaching ideologies. It has limited the creativity and individualism of today's students by reducing their achievements to scores on arbitrary, state-designed tests that vary across the country in their reliability and ability to compare to one another. And it has inadvertently restricted the subjects that are taught, eliminating access for many students to many essential disciplines, including the arts. Attempts at reforming the *No Child Left Behind* Act have been weak at best, and there's no end in sight to this restrictive piece of legislation. The arts, drama in particular, are being left behind, and the children are ultimately the ones being affected.

With limited efforts at reform and no serious mention from politicians of scrapping this law and redrafting a new educational policy, the situation for proponents of arts education is bleak. I propose a temporary solution to the problem of access to arts education while this flawed piece of legislation is still in place – that the integration of drama into the non-drama curriculum will both give students the opportunities to experience drama as an art form and still meet educational goals and attain specific knowledge.

Current practice in the United States for many arts educators is having other subjects thrust into their subject matter in order to 'legitimise' it. Music teachers are expected to take time out of their music classes to do a math problem on how many times per second the strings of a violin vibrates in order to produce a B flat. Drama teachers are forced to teach their kids plays that might be on the state-mandated test instead of letting them learn how to analyse, rehearse, and perform a monologue. Rather than taking time away from arts programmes that already exist, this proposal seeks to demonstrate the value of adding drama teaching into curricula without having to change the

schedule of the school - by integrating drama into the curriculum. For schools whose funding has been cut so significantly due to a poor economic climate and funding restrictions as a result of *No Child Left Behind*, integrating drama into the curriculum in appropriate areas will supplement pupils' education by not only giving them access to drama when they might not have had it before but also by enhancing the material they are learning as mandated by *No Child Left Behind*.

In Chapter One, I will dissect the pieces of the *No Child Left Behind* Act that are relevant to my argument. Chapter Two will contain a short case study of a town in Massachusetts, describing how the passing of this legislation has affected fine arts education in a specific community. Chapter Three will outline the status of drama in the current educational climate and present arguments for the uses of drama in the classroom and its intrinsic value as both a teaching tool and an art form, supported by dramatists such as Heathcote, Bolton, and Robinson. Chapter Four will focus on the changing role of the drama teacher as a result of this proposed method of integrated, cross-discipline teaching, influenced by the writings of Day, O'Neill, and Bolton. Finally, I will conclude my argument, tying together everything discussed so far in the paper.

I will once again emphasise that this proposal is not an effort to replace all current drama programmes already in existence in the United States. Rather, the purpose of integrating drama into a non-drama curriculum is to supplement in schools and districts that do not give students access to drama education in specified drama classes. This proposal is, in essence, a temporary measure; should educational reform be enacted that places drama at the centre of the curriculum, it will no longer be needed. But with no end to *No Child Left Behind* in sight, it is important to not just think about future generations of students but to consider current ones as well. In the fight to get drama legitimised in the eyes of all educators and politicians as an essential piece of a well-rounded education, we must recognise the students who are receiving little to no drama education right now, and this proposal is in consideration of them.

Chapter One
Unpacking NCLB in the Context of This Paper

The *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001 (NCLB) is one of the most controversial pieces of educational legislation in the history of the United States. Hailed as a piece of bipartisan legislation, it was signed into law by President George W. Bush on 8th January 2002. The act itself was a reauthorisation of a much older piece of legislation called the *Elementary and Secondary Education* Act of 1965 (ESEA), which was designed to focus on raising the standards of low-achieving schools in areas of poverty (Jorgensen & Hoffman 2003:4). The goal of the law was to raise American students' achievement standards to a predetermined level of proficiency and close gaps due to race, ethnicity, socioeconomic background, and gender in these standards. One of the main changes in the legislation was to directly tie funding to accountability standards, meaning that when schools failed to meet expected achievement levels, their funding would be cut. Upon first being introduced, NCLB was well received, as the appearance of making education a priority appeased the American people. However, as the changes dictated by the law began to be implemented, educators, politicians, parents, and students began to see the serious flaws within the new system and called for reform - a call that has been largely unmet. Because the law was drafted and signed into law by President Bush, it lasted throughout his entire administration. When President Obama was elected, his administration proposed changes to the law, but the changes failed to fully address many of the major problems NCLB perpetuates.

The law itself is nearly 700 pages long and lists many specific provisions that are unnecessary to the discussion in this paper. For the purposes of this chapter and understanding the arguments in the chapters that follow, I will be focusing on only a few aspects of the law, namely the sections describing the State Plans for accountability and provisions for arts education in order to better understand the effect that the law has had on arts education in America. I will dissect these sections, outline the changes proposed and enacted by the Obama Administration, and present concerns demonstrated by scholars, politicians, and educators alike. The full version of the law may be viewed in Appendix A.

Title I, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 1111 - State Plans

This section of NCLB focuses mainly on dictating the procedure for the creation of state plans for accountability in education. Paragraph 1 begins by stating that all states must individually produce a plan that proves it has high standards of learning for students. This plan must be based on some form of assessment that will be used state-wide and applied to all students, regardless of race, gender, English language ability, or socioeconomic status. Although the plan must be submitted to the Secretary of Education, it is not subject to his approval (Appendix A, pages 20-21).

In some ways, this seems counter intuitive to the purpose of creating the state standards in the first place. After all, if the plans are not subject to any sort of federal approval, how can it be certain that they are adequate? But this tiny provision in this section is part of the eternal debate of the American Democratic system of government - states' rights versus the federal government. Proponents of states' rights, namely the current Republican Party, believe that small government is the best way to run the country, the theory being that allowing the federal government to grow too powerful may lead to trampling on the rights of individuals in the form of a dictatorship or tyrannical government. The current Democratic party, on the other end of the spectrum, generally believe that a strong federal government is better equipped to support the needs of the American people than individual states and that state leadership leads to a divided nation. The clause allowing states to create their own state plans that are not subject to the approval of the federal government falls completely on the side of states' rights. By allowing states to create individual plans that are only accountable to them, there is no national standard for proficiency. As a result, a student who is considered proficient in one state if tested in another state might be in the tenth percentile. The result is a nation with scattered levels of achievement, wherein a student who has the unfortunate luck of living in one state will not receive the same level of education as another simply to mollify politicians crying out for small government. It seems as though the submitting of the state plans is merely a

formality, and the only power the federal government has is to make sure the plan is being carried out, even if the plan does not set appropriate proficiency standards.

Within the state plan, the state must have provisions for assessing students in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science (the latter beginning in the 2005-2006 school year). States are allowed to set proficiency standards for other subjects not required by NCLB, and the state plan must include a further system for how these subjects, known colloquially as "non-tested subjects," will be taught equally across the state to all students (Appendix A, page 21-25). The selection of these three subjects as tested subjects has been a large point of contention for many opponents of NCLB. To solely identify math, reading, and science as the subjects necessary to receive what is considered to be a high-quality education reduces learning to a basic skill with finite outcomes rather than a lifelong process to be applied to a range of situations. As pointed out by Tina Beveridge, educating children solely in reading and math will prepare them for nothing more than the lowest-level tasks and jobs in the future (Beveridge 2010:6).

Additionally, the selection of reading, math, and science as the mandated tested subjects under NCLB has lead to a distinct narrowing of the curriculum in many areas of the country. Because a school's funding is based on its success or failure to achieve adequate yearly progress (also known as AYP, a concept I will address shortly), and AYP is measured by students' scores on the state assessments in math and reading, regardless of whether a state has assessments in other subjects, schools tend to focus their teaching and resources on the subjects that will yield the highest test scores. Putting more time into teaching math and reading means taking time away from other subjects. In some cases, students have been assigned grades for classes they didn't take to disguise the fact that the school was only teaching classes that would ultimately improve test scores (Guisbond, Neill & Schaeffer 2012:5). Ultimately, rather than creating well-rounded students, NCLB's test mandates create an educational system that at times completely cuts out essential subjects such as social studies, never mind arts programmes, in favour of reaching arbitrary proficiency levels.

The concept of adequate yearly progress, or AYP, is another provision that has received much criticism. According to the law, each state must define AYP in order to form its own system of accountability. This self-defined benchmark must be equally applied to all students in the state, be "statistically valid and reliable," result in continuous and substantial academic improvement for all students, be based on the academic assessments created by the state for this purpose, and include plans for growth for particular groups of students, such as minority/ethnic students, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students (Appendix A, page 25). AYP is what determines whether a school is labelled as "needing improvement." Under NCLB, if a school fails to meet AYP for two consecutive years, it will be labelled as needing improvement, and a series of strict measures will be taken to try to bring the school up to meet AYP. This includes restrictions on, and in some cases the cutting of, a school's funding (Appendix A, page 62). This leads to further narrowing of the curriculum in order to improve scores, as school officials and local educational agencies (LEAs) feel they cannot afford to put already restricted money or time into programmes that do not improve test scores in the test-mandated subjects.

The American Federation of Teachers identifies many misconceptions with the AYP provisions that cause the data they produce to be skewed and inaccurate. Firstly, AYP does not measure the performance of a whole school, but rather the performance of students in only a few grades. Furthermore, since a cohort of students in one grade might differ greatly in ability from a cohort of students in another grade, this data fails to acknowledge that the grades tested may not be a reflection of a school as a whole (American Federation of Teachers 2004:1). AYP also does not track the same group of students over time, which means that progress is measured between cohorts rather than how the same group of students progresses throughout the school or district (American Federation of Teachers 2004:1). If the goal is to track whether students are learning at the proper rate, it would make more sense to compare data of the same group of students from year to year rather than three different fourth grade cohorts, for example, from year to year.

Another issue is that AYP does not take into account the starting point of the school in terms of reaching AYP targets (American Federation of Teachers 2004:2). This is because AYP targets are based on a number rather than a percentage. For example, if a school begins the year far below these targets but jumps halfway towards the target in a single year, it still fails to make AYP; another school could begin the year far above the targets and have its students test scores turn out far lower than the previous year, but since the scores are still above the mandated targets, the school has technically still made AYP. If AYP targets were based upon a percentage of improvement rather than reaching a number, schools would be rewarded for consistent improvement and punished for failure to improve rather than being punished for outside circumstances that prevent them from being able to make a near-impossible improvement in the time allotted.

Despite the fact that closing achievement gaps is one of the main goals of NCLB, the AYP provision fails to demonstrate that this is happening. Again, because AYP is a fixed target rather than a percentage of improvement, if every student in the school makes AYP, there could still be large gaps between different groups of students in the school, such as minority/ethnic students and white students, or English Language Learners and native English speakers (American Federation of Teachers 2004:2).

Finally, because states are allowed to set their own levels of proficiency, even if every school in the country met AYP, it would not mean that the students were proficient in reading and math compared to a widely accepted standard. States cannot adequately compare proficiency because their levels are different (American Federation of Teachers 2004:2).

When a school fails to meet its AYP benchmarks, it is put on a probationary period, wherein steps must be taken to bring students up to the state determined proficiency levels. Beveridge notes:

> In that probationary time, the school, the district, or both are required to formulate strategies, using their own funds, to bring failing students up to benchmark level … using existing resources to provide students

> with extra tutoring either during or outside the school day (Beveridge 2010:1).

With funds already being restricted as a punishment of sorts for failing to meet targets, and if the only way to meet targets is to use the school's own funds to improve students' scores in math and reading, funding is naturally pulled away from programmes that do not aid in this goal - very frequently, this means the arts.

Title V, Part D, Subpart 15, Section 5551 - Assistance for Arts Education

Proponents of arts education, upon perusing the *No Child Left Behind* Act, have a moment of joy upon realising that the act does have a section with provisions for arts education. That moment is short lived, however, when looking at how short the section is compared to other sections in the law, and hopes are further dashed upon reading what provisions are allotted to this noble cause. This is the only time the arts are mentioned as part of this piece of educational legislation, excluding references to the arts as non-tested subjects, and the section details how federal funding can be used to enhance Fine Arts programmes in schools.

NCLB lists the purpose of this section as to support education reform that makes arts education an "integral part" of the school curriculum, to determine and help students meet state-set high achievement standards in the arts, and "to support the national effort to enable all students to demonstrate competence in the arts" (Appendix A, page 431). These purposes are problematic in themselves for a few reasons. Firstly, the ambiguous wording of making arts education an "integral part" of the school curriculum puts no political importance on the arts. The wording essentially says that while the arts are important to a well-rounded education, they're not important enough to put any specific legislation behind them. Additionally, the concept of state-set standards means, once again, that states will have differing standards for arts education. In practice, this means little to no standards in many states. This is chiefly due, as we have already seen, to the narrowing of the curriculum towards tested subjects and the channelling of funds in that direction. Finally, the law insists only on students demonstrating "competency" in the arts. It makes no mention

of students excelling or meeting proficiency standards. As in other parts of the law, this section demonstrates the general attitude that getting by is enough for a student to be considered well educated, and that excellence is no longer the goal.

According to this section, the Secretary of Education can make grants or enter into contracts with state and local agencies (school districts, LEAs, etc.), institutions of higher education, museums or other cultural institutions, or "any other public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations" (Appendix A, page 431). Essentially, there are no guidelines regarding to which the Secretary of Education can make grants. While this might seem like a win for arts educators in desperate need of funding, I believe that no restrictions will negatively impact the arts cause. In the same way that making social studies a non-tested subject demonstrates to educators that less effort and funds should be put into the teaching of social studies, the failure to put any definition or boundaries on arts education indicates that it is low-priority for legislators and thus should be low priority to educators. The lack of restriction shows, in effect, a lack of interest in the arts and further moves them into an unimportant position for states' funding.

Funds granted by the Secretary of Education may be used to research arts education, develop model assessments for States to use as their achievement standards for the arts, develop and implement frameworks for arts education, improve professional development programmes for arts staff, or support model projects with a few specific organisations (Appendix A, page 432). It is important to note in this section that "If the amount made available to the Secretary to carry out this subpart for any fiscal year is $15m or less, then such an amount shall only be available to carry out the activities described in paragraphs (7) and (8) of subsection (d)," which are the paragraphs specifying the model projects with specific organizations (Appendix A, page 432). Essentially, this prioritises certain schools over others, as only specific schools would be able to benefit from programmes with these organisations, whereas many schools could theoretically benefit from developing frameworks for arts education or arts education research.

Finally, conditions of receiving funds include using the money "only to supplement, and not to supplant, any other assistance or funds made available or funds made available through non-Federal sources" (Appendix A, page 432). In other words, if a school already has some funding for arts programmes, it cannot apply for more funds through this law and re-channel the funds into other programmes. As a result, many schools may not bother to apply for the funds, because the amount the government is able to give away won't be enough to cover their desired programme anyway. Once again, the funds get channelled into test-mandated subjects, furthering the issues of narrowing the curriculum.

Ultimately, this incredibly short section fails to fight on behalf of arts education in its lack of specificity. It places no importance on arts education and does not define the arts as a necessary or even beneficial part of a well-rounded education. The funding delegated to the arts is so minimal as a whole that it might as well not exist at all. The *No Child Left Behind* Act is certainly no advocate for arts education, and in its failure to advocate, it significantly hurts the arts programmes that have helped so many students in the past become great artists, thinkers, and human beings.

Plans for the Improvement of NCLB

The Bush Administration stood by NCLB for the entire stretch of President Bush's two terms in office, continuing to implement its changes and gather the skewed data that it produced. When President Obama was elected into office, he heard the American people's cry for educational reform. The Obama Administration subsequently released "A Blueprint for Reform," listing suggested improvements of NCLB. However, the system Obama proposed, and later implemented, is highly flawed.

The Obama Administration created a waiver plan, under which states must continue annual testing in reading and math in the same way as NCLB. This means testing students at grades 3-8 and again in high school (generally 10th grade). This time, however, the tests must be re-written to reflect what they're calling "college- and career-ready standards." The plan states that

studies have shown that many students, upon entering a four-year university, are required to take remedial classes in math and reading in order to prepare them for university standards, and as a result students are spending money to go to university in order to learn what they should have learned in free, public secondary schools (Department of Education 2009:8-9). While the idea of college- and career-ready standards might seem like an appropriate goal, Guisbond, Neill, and Schaeffer predict that these tests will be similar to current tests, but because the standards will be set towards being ready to enter four-year universities rather than simply meeting a proficiency standard, they will be more difficult to pass (Guisbond, Neill, & Schaeffer 2012:10).

The plan also states that for non-tested subjects, states must have measures that are comparable within a district, so that there is some form of assessment for all core curriculum subjects. I will go into detail about how this affects the arts specifically in the next chapter. However, Guisbond, Neill, and Schaeffer note that this will cause money to be spent on the development of new tests that will further perpetuate all of the existing problems with standardised testing (Guisbond, Neill, & Schaeffer 2012:11).

This is only the first administration to have the ability to reform NCLB. The problem, however, seems to be that NCLB is based upon a series of standardised tests to set accountability standards that fail to accurately measure students' abilities and proficiency. According to Colwell, "Policy is based on belief - faith in programmes supportive of democracy and of education's role in that democracy" (Colwell 2005:22). If this statement is accurate, based on the *No Child Left Behind* Act's educational reforms, one can conclude two things: that the current belief system is in data and numbers rather than the individualism of learners, and that a basic understanding of math and reading are the only things necessary to receive a quality, well-rounded education that prepares today's students for tomorrow's economic climate. The answer, then, is twofold. The ultimate goal would be to change the public's belief to reflect the type of education we dream of for our children rather than the type of education we can squeeze by with, but until that goal can be achieved, to work with and through the current belief system until it has been changed.

Chapter Two

Fine Arts Education in Westborough, MA: A Short Case Study

Looking at the law itself as well as scholarly and political criticism is enough to demonstrate that the *No Child Left Behind* Act is a seriously flawed piece of legislation. Its singular focus on mathematics, reading, and science isolates those subjects as the only disciplines of any import to American students, and its system of accountability based on testing that is measured differently in every state creates a scheme wherein students' unique personalities and learning styles is reduced to a number and there's no way to compare students across the country. The numbers speak for themselves: American students are suffering at the hands of this piece of legislation. And to hear a specific case serves only to strengthen this line of thinking.

For this purpose, I interviewed the Coordinator of Fine Arts in Westborough, Massachusetts, David Jost. In this position Jost oversees all of the Fine Arts programmes in the entire town, ranging from the strings programmes beginning in the third grade to visual arts classes undertaken by high school students, from the middle school play to the high school Festival of Student-Directed One Acts, from auditions for the Central District Orchestra to collaborations with neighbouring towns. No one can speak of the effect that NCLB has had on the Westborough Public Schools' arts programmes than Jost.

Westborough, Massachusetts is a relatively small town about 29 miles west of Boston (Town of Westborough 2013). The population of approximately 18,000 residents enjoy a school system consisting of three elementary schools for students in kindergarten through grade three, one intermediate school for grades four through six, a middle school for grades seven and eight, and a high school for grades nine through twelve. The town prides itself on its arts programmes, and in 2013 it was named by the NAMM Foundation one of the top 300 Best Communities for Music Education in the country for the fourth consecutive year and the seventh time in 14 years (Westborough Patch 2013).

Despite this, Jost describes some troubles that he has faced in recent years:

> Our biggest problem that we have in the state right now is that we're competing for the same resources that the tested core is. When you go to measure the success of a school district, the general public, superintendents, school committees understand the data that's generated by MCAS [the Massachusetts state accountability system]. It sits very nicely in black and white; you can compare School District A to School District B to School District C and break it down as much as to which teacher is more effective than another teacher … The subjects that are not tested by that don't have that benefit. So when it comes to making decisions about where do we spend our tax dollars and our resources, the tendency is to take the funding and channel it towards programmes that are designed to improve the scores on the tests (see Appendix B, page 2).

Jost's description of events is an example of the narrowing of the curriculum posed as a concern by many scholars, as addressed in chapter one. According to Jost, the arts are listed as core curriculum in the state of Massachusetts, but they are not listed as "tested core" - meaning, subjects that districts are mandated by the state to test in order to determine funding. Because the arts are not tested, funding is channelled away from these subjects and towards the tested subjects in order to improve scores on those tests.

There was a point in time when the arts were not even given this much importance in the eyes of the state. Jost is the Co-Chair of a group called the Administrators in Music Education in the state of Massachusetts, which has worked for a few years to get the arts listed as core curriculum. The current challenge that Jost and the committee face is coming up with an accountability system for the arts that would comply with the state's requirements. This academic year, the state has mandated that every subject must have its own measure, determined by the district, for measuring student progress, whether that subject is part of the tested core or not (see Appendix B, page 2). Jost adds that the group does not want the arts to become a part of the tested core, because he, like most arts educators and indeed the group as a whole, does not think that testing is the most effective benchmark by which the arts could be measured (see Appendix B, page 2). Nonetheless, some system of accountability must be created in order to fulfil state requirements for core

curriculum, and this is the issue that Jost and the committee are currently working to resolve.

The work Jost does with the Administrators in Music Education is largely to benefit the arts programmes in multiple cities and towns in Massachusetts, but he also discussed troubles as a result of NCLB specific to Westborough. The main problem that Jost has encountered is, not surprisingly, related to funds. After NCLB was implemented, all federal funding that the school would receive was tied to NCLB, and as a result the funds would be channelled towards the tested subjects so as to improve scores on the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (also known as MCAS, the state-mandated test for NCLB accountability), or to populations of students with the greatest achievement gaps. As a result, the budgets for math, reading, and special education have grown significantly over the last few years, whereas the arts budget has remained the same.

In fact, the budget for the school district as a whole has grown for the last few years (see Appendix D). In 2009, the budget for the School Department was 52% of the town budget, at $37,755,528, and by 2013, it had risen to 54% of the town budget, at $41,282,909. The only year that the School Department saw a budget decrease was in the 2012 fiscal year. Comparatively, the Fine Arts Department of the School Department has not been so lucky. The budget has decreased $6,338 between the 2011 and 2013 fiscal years, with the actual decrease happening between the 2012 and 2013 fiscal years (see Appendix E). This is a budget reduction of 6.08%, despite the School Department's budget increasing by 3.25% that year. Jost notes that while Westborough has been lucky to have avoided many cuts over the last thirteen years since NCLB was enacted, it has failed to see any growth. Despite increased enrolment in its programmes, the Fine Arts Department has been unable to increase its staffing because of a lack of funds. The Special Education Department, on the other hand, has been able to increase its staffing, as the local authorities have increased their budget in order to close achievement gaps for special needs students, which is one of the goals of NCLB (see Appendix B, pages 2-3).

No Child Left Behind has made an impact upon the Westborough Public Schools system in visible ways. Specifically, the arts are being negatively impacted in that federal funds, tied to NCLB, are delegated to tested subjects rather than the arts, such that even when the School Department's budget increases as a whole, the arts budget either remains the same or, in some cases, is cut. It's a bleak future for arts education, even in a town like Westborough that works so hard to prioritise it. Arts educators can help to make up for these funding cuts by integrating arts education into appropriate curricula. Jost sums it up well by saying:

> Through the Arts, we share the creative spirit of mankind being for the benefit of our peers, and future audiences. Drama being isolated by itself and not included as an integral part of an English curriculum does not make sense. It is a key element of that subject matter, and should be included. As drama is not to be just read, but needs to be interpreted as seen through a performance and delivered by the performers, it needs to experienced first hand and in the moment. It is critical to any well-written English curriculum (see Appendix C).

The integration of drama into the English curriculum is a mutually beneficial practice. Drama enhances the English curriculum in that it brings to life the plays that are already studied by pupils in preparation for their state-mandated tests at the same time that it educates them on an art form that is losing ground in the fight for funding. Integration gives students the opportunity to experience drama when they otherwise would not. Furthermore, because English is mandatory for all students in the country, it exposes all students to drama rather than the few students who have the opportunity or make the choice to enrol in drama classes. The following chapters will propose and expand upon an argument for integrating drama into the English curricula in the United States.

Chapter 3
The Intrinsic Value of Drama in Education

The education of the current generation of young people is arguably one of the most important feats of any generation of adults. Young people are the people who will make the greatest impact upon the work force; they often have the most innovative thinking and are the future of the working world. Thus it is no surprise that economic failure is often seen as a failure of the education system. Robinson (1983) notes:

> A key theme in these changes [in educational legislation] has been a tendency to associate educational policies with poor industrial and commercial importance and high levels of unemployment, especially among young people (Robinson 1983:10).

His observation of the relationship between the economy and education is an astute and particularly relevant one. When a nation faces an economic crisis, such as the one that the United States faces today, educational policies are often tightened, calling for greater accountability and data that proves that students are improving. Unfortunately, data does not always reflect the quality of learning that students are receiving, and the accountability systems mandated by *No Child Left Behind* are no different. Robinson acknowledges this when he compares examinations to paper currency for the labour market, arguing that 'they are prone to inflation when too much currency chases too few commodities' (Robinson 1983:12). Indeed, this is exactly what the NCLB-mandated tests have become: a means by which to measure the value of a student that ultimately has nothing solid behind it to back it up. Specifically, as described in earlier chapters, the accountability measures required under NCLB have placed certain essential subjects on the proverbial back burner, giving a higher status to mathematics, reading, and science. As a result, drama programmes have suffered significantly.

Currently, the status of drama in an American education system is incredibly low. Robinson cites the factors for determining the status of a discipline in an educational programme as the amount of time allotted to the subject and whether or how long students are required to study it (Robinson

1983:8). Based on this assessment, drama is virtually useless in the eyes of the drafters of American educational legislation. Drama is not mandated on a national level, and as explained in chapter one, states may choose to make certain subjects tested subjects, but they are not given any weight in terms of determining the state's academic proficiency overall. Individual states have the option to make fine arts classes compulsory, but few do as a result of limited funds and a misplaced importance upon tested subjects. Even when students do have fine arts classes, much of the time they are being cut down in the amount of time students spend in those classes. Beveridge points out that certain schools will take away students' elective classes (which is usually the position drama classes are afforded) and replace them with remedial math or reading when they fail to meet NCLB benchmarks. Other schools have changed their schedules to allow for longer but fewer class periods, meaning that while the length of time spent per class increases, the frequency of classes decreases, overall decreasing the amount of time spent in fine arts classes such as drama (Beveridge 2005:5). The cycle is self-perpetuating. Although many arguments can be made for the positive impact of arts classes upon the growth of the child, school administrators and LEAs have a difficult time justifying spending money on arts classes when the failure to meet NCLB proficiency standards will result in the further restriction of a school's funding. This may seem greedy and capitalistic, but the intentions are ultimately based in the same place - if there's less funding for the school as a result of time being spent on classes that don't contribute to the specific goal of meeting AYP for tested subjects, that's less resources for the students, and the less prepared they are for college or the working world when (or if) they graduate from high school.

Furthermore, in schools and districts where drama classes are still an option for students, a culture of segregation of the "smart" kids and the "dumb" kids continues to place drama in an unimportant position in the curriculum. Robinson (1983) cites a practice of academism versus vocationalism, where the students who exhibit high levels of skill in the traditionally academic subjects such as mathematics and reading are advised to take other similarly academic classes, moving them up into and towards a university-bound path. The kids who do not excel in these subjects, on the other hand, are thrown into the non-

academic classes, such as drama, and are given the impression that the fact that they are challenged by traditionally academic subjects means that their skills are of less value. By associating drama with vocationalism rather than academism, schools and districts that continue this practice are placing drama in a category of less value than other subjects (Robinson 1983: 13). It also further serves to drive the “dumb kids” towards failure in a self-perpetuating cycle where all they see is their own inability to compete with the “smart kids,” as recognized by school administrators who place them into drama in the first place. Additionally, the practice of separating the arbitrarily determined academics from the vocationalists prevents students who might have enjoyed or excelled in drama from having the opportunity to try it.

The seemingly obvious answer to this quandary would be to work towards making drama a test-mandated subject for all states. Most arts educators, however, are against this practice. Jost (2013) notes that despite fighting for the arts to gain core curriculum status in Massachusetts, the Administrators in Music Education will not be working to make the arts part of the tested core because ‘testing is not the benchmark by which the arts are measured’ (see Appendix B, page 2). Robinson agrees, arguing that testing is ultimately detrimental to arts study. He notes that exams constrain the arts by using predetermined objectives to define success, emphasizing product over process, and putting importance on “academic” values, and he further describes exams as being contradictory to many arts practices because they are competitive in nature and have a high level of failure (Robinson 1983: 16). None of these are ideals that arts educators want to perpetuate in their classrooms.

The issue we have here is a system that is highly flawed and mandates testing in order for a subject to have any value in the eyes of society. The nature of drama, however, does not fit into the testing box. Schools are constantly having their funding cut and reducing the amount of money that can be put towards classes solely dedicated to the arts, in many cases getting rid of the programmes altogether. In a society that is so focused on the utilitarian value of something, how can we fit in an art form that is seen as mostly having an aesthetic value? The challenge, then, is to change the current mode of

thinking to reflect drama's intrinsic value in a classroom setting, both as a teaching tool and as an art form.

The concept of integration is not a new one. Numerous artists and educators have advocated for the practice, all the way back to 1949 when Marjorie Hourd argued the merits of the teaching of drama within literature (Bolton 1998:91). Robinson, however, fundamentally sees an issue with this line of thinking:

> Drama teachers and many others began by challenging two related assumptions: first, that education is mainly a process of vocational preparation; second, that academic education is the most important priority in schools. It is now more important than ever that we maintain that opposition. (Robinson 1983:12)

Although Robinson suggests that it is important that drama be seen as having its own value outside of a utilitarian one, I believe that including drama into the non-drama classroom challenges the aforementioned assumptions set by more traditional educational theorists. Giving students different ways to learn that are not necessarily focused on vocational preparation but more focused on creating well-rounded human beings will have the added benefit of preparing them to think in alternative ways, which will give them the skills they need to pass these tests. It will also address multiple learning styles of students in ways that other forms of teaching will not, thus possibly reaching students who were isolated by those forms of teaching. Finally, bringing drama into the non-drama classroom can serve as an introduction to the world of drama for a student who otherwise might not have elected to take a class solely devoted to drama.

The uses of drama in the classroom are countless and strong. Bolton identifies three main purposes of using drama in schools, under which all drama work can be categorized: towards exercise, meaning the practicing of performance skills such as mime; towards performance, meaning the practicing of the process of public performance; and towards experiencing, meaning the practice of empathy and spontaneity, achieved through such activities as role play or improvisation (Bolton in Day 1983:81). All three of these have strong uses in the classroom, but the latter of the three in particular moves students towards the ultimate goal of meeting test benchmarks because qualities of

empathy and spontaneity help students gain a much deeper understanding of the material they are studying. Particularly in the English classroom, wherein students are trained towards achieving proficiency for the reading tests mandated by NCLB, students can gain a much stronger foundational knowledge of a text by participating in drama activities based around the text. If, for example, the class is studying the novel *Lord of the Flies*, the students might greatly benefit from a process drama wherein they are stranded on an island and must achieve certain tasks in order to survive. Mirroring the *experience* of the characters would give the students a greater insight as to their motivations and some of the deeper politics at work within the text, enhancing their understanding of the book as a whole.

Bolton also lists three levels of meaning that students engage in when working on a piece of drama: a contextual level, a converse/universal/thematic level, and a personal/idiosyncratic level (Bolton in Jackson 1993: 46-47). Teaching students how to work on each of these levels and recognise that work will move them towards a more coherent understanding of their work rather than the basic, superficial level reached by testing. Using the example of *Lord of the Flies* again, students working in a process drama based on that text would have the contextual level of the difficulties of being trapped on a deserted island and the basic instincts of survival. Then students would recognise the thematic level of the human struggle between following society's rules and indulging in man's animalistic instincts. Finally, students would bring their own personal thoughts and feelings to the work that would enhance their learning in an individual way. Working on each of these three levels achieves the dual goal of educating students to meet specific benchmarks as well as educating them on how to handle conflicts within their own lives by helping them to better understand themselves.

Using drama in education plays into Day's theory of the difference between learning by discovery versus learning to discover (Day 1993:83). Most teachers use a learning by discovery method, wherein the teacher has objectives for the lesson and guides students towards the knowledge he hopes they will have by the end. This usually works well with fact-based learning, when questions have a simple, right or wrong answer rather than being open for

debate. Drama in education encourages learning to discover, also known as inquiry-based learning, wherein the teacher wants to help students learn procedures for how to learn better. Day argues that the learning by discovery methods typically 'involve suppression of the pupils' freedom to disagree with the teacher,' whereas learning to discover methods allow students to question established knowledge (Day: 83). While I agree that learning by discovery does tend to be more closed than learning to discover, I disagree that it constantly keeps the student from being able to express his own opinions. Drama in education affords teachers the opportunity to use both of these methods in a way that doesn't quash a student's curiosity or difference of opinion.

For example, a teacher might set out with the objective of teaching a student that by the end of *Hamlet*, the title character has effectively achieved the goal of avenging his father's death but at a terrible price, and to teach towards that aim would be employing a learning by discovery method. The teacher could simultaneously employ a learning to discover method by allowing the student to question why Hamlet was so single-minded in his desire to murder Claudius, whether or not he was sane throughout the majority of the play, and whether or not his actions ultimately benefitted the kingdom of Denmark. Other teaching approaches simply ask students to respond to those questions; dramatic exploration allows students to discover the answer through experience rather than simply through mentally theorising a response. Ultimately, in a society that is so narrowly focused on getting the right answer, learning by discovery will be a necessary method of teaching. But by integrating a learning to discover method into everyday teaching, students will be offered the opportunity to both get the right answer and find creative ways of arriving there, thus creating more well-rounded individuals.

One other aspect of drama as a teaching tool is that it forces students to become responsible for their own learning. With a system that is essentially teaching students how to pass a test, which is the climate that has been created as a result of NCLB, students have no real sense of responsibility to do anything but pass the test. Because NCLB does not reward success but only punishes failure, once they reach the arbitrary state-set benchmark, their job is essentially done. Employing drama techniques in the classroom sets a standard

whereby students will get out of the activities what they put into them. Heathcote and Bolton (1995) discuss the importance of responsibility in terms of a Mantle of the Expert approach. This method requires creating 'a place where action occurs; where tasks are carried out with a high degree of responsibility' (Heathcote & Bolton 1995:17). Creating that atmosphere will result in students who feel that they are deserving of trust, that they are worthy of high-level tasks, and thus that they are capable of high-order thinking. Giving students responsibility makes them feel responsible, and in turn they are then able to handle more and more challenging tasks and material. Furthermore, Mantle of the Expert enables small group autonomy and different role for the teacher wherein the teacher is operating within the learning process as opposed to outside or above it. The change in the teacher's role as well as the opportunity to work in small groups as opposed to either in large groups or individually allows for difference of opinion between students and encourages critical thinking and creative problem solving (Heathcote & Bolton 1995:17).

Bolton theorises that three things must happen in order to successfully operate a Mantle of the Expert approach:

> One: The specific thing you are setting out to teach *emerges* from the curriculum tasks. Two: The students must be conscious of what they are learning, as they continually record and assess newly acquired knowledge and skills. And three: they must become *responsible* for what they learn, that is, *they* must make it happen. (Heathcote & Bolton 1995:18)

This same order of thinking can be applied to any instance of teaching and learning, and ultimately the first two feed into the third. By letting the students discover the objectives and be constantly aware of the fact that they're learning something, they will find importance in it on their own, which is far more valuable to them than what someone has told them the importance is. Drama as a tool for discovery enables that kind of learning to take place. A piece of drama, including educational drama, is laid out in a specific narrative structure that reveals bits of information at strategically chosen moments in the process. These moments are chosen for their dramatic impact, and linking emotion to

learning through narrative helps to strengthen the influence of the learning moment.

In conjunction with the sense of responsibility that drama presents to students, a dramatic structure to a curriculum changes the way that teachers and students interact socially to allow for greater retention. Kelman lists three processes of social interaction - compliance, identification, and internalisation. Compliance occurs when a person accepts informational or behavioural changes from another in order to gain favour with that person. Identification occurs when a person accepts these changes as a result of a positive association with that person. Internalisation occurs when a person accepts these changes because it makes sense to him, or because it already fits in with his system of thoughts and values (Kelman in Day 1983:85). Many traditional teaching methods employ forms of compliance or identification. In a sense, the post-NCLB educational system employs both: For students, accepting the taught information gains them favour with their teachers and parents and positively associates them with the “smart” kids. While this may work for some, it ultimately fails to increase retention of knowledge in an educational setting because these two processes are the least organic to individual learning styles. Internalisation, on the other hand, results in increased retention because it incorporates knowledge into the students’ individual systems in a way that already works for them. Drama employs the internalisation process most frequently. Because the pedagogy of drama in education is that ‘there is no correct answer,’ allowing students to come to conclusions on their own, explore their own solutions to problems, and come up with their own ways of presenting their findings, they are able to do so in a way that makes sense to them, is organic to their system, and thus strengthens information retention. Again, when students are given responsibility, they respond with more responsibility.

Robinson discussed the idea of curriculum as process, which he described as the ‘reciprocal relationship of elements - that each part is in some respects in every other’ (Robinson 1983:18). Rather than separating learning by subjects, Robinson argues that curricula should have shared elements that lead to connections that students themselves can make. Because of the social nature of drama, that special piece of drama that allows for and encourages

connection of all parts of the human experience, it is a natural catalyst for learning across many spectrums. Furthermore, Eisner describes the idea of a subject being contextualist or essentialist (Eisner in O'Neill 1983: 26-29). Many times, theorists place drama in education in the contextualist category, because it turns drama into something utilitarian in order to get a job done. However, I have argued in this chapter that drama in education is actually a more essentialist measure. The exploratory and empathetic nature of drama encourages a deeper understanding of texts that contributes towards the educational goals created by NCLB but also moves beyond them. It aids students in reaching test-mandated benchmarks while simultaneously developing their self-awareness, social skills, and higher order thinking. No other art form can connect to every part of the human experience in the way that drama can, and in that sense, no other art form is better suited to aid in student learning.

Chapter 4
The New Role of the Drama Teacher

In the first few chapters of this paper, I have unpicked the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001, focusing on the specific parts of the paper that have impacted arts teaching. I have presented an example of a school system affected by the changes enacted under NCLB. And finally, I have addressed the uses that drama has in a classroom setting and the particular qualities of drama that lend themselves to teaching in a unique way.

The proposed process of integrating drama into a non-drama curriculum is not one that can be implemented without any sort of change to the current system, as the everyday teacher is not trained in the dramatic arts. Colwell notes, 'Teachers are smothered by the richness of the arts, including in some cases an added responsibility for a humanities-related approach, and decisions about what to include are difficult and frustrating' (Colwell 2005:24). This line of thinking represents the opposite scenario, wherein arts teachers are forced to integrate non-arts subjects into their teaching in order to legitimise it, and the result is that they find choices of what to include in the curriculum quite difficult. Again, the solution to the many problems created for arts education by NCLB is not to try to legitimise already existing arts programmes by including other subjects into the spectrum of topics to cover but rather to use drama techniques in schools and districts that do not already have independent arts programmes to supplement learning.

The problem that arises here is that the average teacher is not trained in using drama for education. Thus I believe that it is the role of the current and future generations of drama teachers to facilitate this change by adjusting their roles to allow cross-curricular integration to occur. The new role of the Drama Teacher will change the way that teachers interact with each other as well as the way teachers interact with students, and in so doing, a smooth transition may be made from a system that focuses solely on test scores and traditional teaching methods to one which values the uniqueness of each student and uses drama as an essential tool for learning.

Under this new method of teaching, the Drama Teacher will have essentially two responsibilities: to help teachers not trained in the dramatic arts recognise opportunities for drama in everyday classroom activities and use them properly, and to have a solid foundational knowledge of and passion for drama and use that background to inform teaching of other subjects. In this way, the new Drama Teacher

will put more emphasis on the 'teacher' aspect of the title 'teaching artist.' For the purposes of this chapter, the title of 'Drama Teacher' will refer to a person trained in drama who uses drama techniques to teach, as opposed to a person who teaches drama as his or her sole discipline.

Changing teacher interactions

While it would be ideal that all teachers in a school have the knowledge and skills to use drama when it is organic to the immediate learning environment, to allow that to happen would mean a complete restructuring of the way teachers are trained. This would take valuable time, which in some ways defeats the purpose of the entire argument for integration - by the time society re-trains teachers to use drama in education techniques at all times, integration might not be necessary, as educational reform might be implemented that mandates arts classes be given their own time slot and become necessary for all students. The responsibility then falls on the drama teacher to help non-drama teachers recognise these opportunities on their own. This comes with its own set of challenges, but it is not an impossible task. These challenges include changing the way teachers would identify themselves and rearranging the hierarchical structure of subject matter that has traditionally put drama in lower priority but will now place it at the top.

The status and identity of a teacher in a secondary school setting is often determined by the subject that he or she teaches. Teachers of mathematics often see their work as being fundamentally different from that of English teachers, despite the fact that they are all working towards the same end of educating young people. Robinson (1983) argues that this is because of a strong focus on specific disciplines: 'Secondary [teachers'] … professional identities are strongly rooted in the institutional and strongly classified forms of educational knowledge. Attempts to change or mix subject categories may be seen as a threat to these identities' (Robinson 1983:14). Particularly at the secondary school level, teachers in the United States are trained how to teach their specific discipline rather than how to teach in general. For example, History teachers have trained specifically to teach History, and to suddenly ask them to use drama – a discipline that is considered a subject all its own – could be seen as asking them to completely change the way they teach as well as what they're teaching. While teachers are taught to think of their discipline as independent and separate from other disciplines, any good teacher should be prepared to answer the inevitable question from frustrated students, 'When will I ever use this in real life?' Almost any response that a teacher will give to that question will involve some sort of other

discipline in its answer. In that way, teachers should be prepared to recognise connections between their subjects and other subjects and as such be ready to relinquish the identity of being a *math* teacher or a *history* teacher in favour of simply being a teacher.

Furthermore, the value in teaching is very often placed upon knowledge over skills. As Hoveid and Hoveid point out, 'there is a universalism rooted in epistemology that gives teachers the idea that knowledge endures, that knowledge is stable, that knowledge is universal' (Hoveid & Hoveid 2008:131). Teachers whose identity is based upon the possession of a certain amount of knowledge and the subsequent dissemination of that knowledge may feel that the introduction of a technique that is focused on the dual goal of knowledge dissemination and the practicing of skills is completely changing the way that the subject is taught. They may even feel that the introduction of a drama technique into a non-drama classroom will be an impediment to the students gaining knowledge. Once again, the Drama Teacher will need to be an advocate for his own craft, explaining and demonstrating the value of drama as a teaching tool, in this case focusing on its utilitarian value over its artistic value.

The negotiation of this change in role will not be easy. Some schools might face resistance from teachers who feel that their identities have been threatened, as Robinson points out above. But who better to negotiate and facilitate these changes than a drama teacher? Because of the communal nature of drama and the knowledge of social dynamics that drama teachers possess as a result of their training, they are able to recognise conflicts in situations and dissolve them in much less confrontational ways (Hogan 1983:75). All competent teachers are already trained to note the dynamics of a classroom, and the aid of drama teachers will only further this ability. The new Drama Teacher must take on a role as a facilitator of social change and advocate for his craft within a school, educating the other teachers on the value of drama in the classroom and when it is possible to utilise it.

Robinson argues, following on from his statement on teachers' identities:

> Opportunities for drama activities emerge organically from the work of many teachers of other subjects. Are they to bide their time till the drama specialist is free? Or do they refuse to exploit these opportunities altogether for fear of creating a demarcation dispute? (Robinson 1983:15)

Although he was arguing against the use of drama techniques in non-drama classes, I believe that his statement actually argues for the integration of drama into traditionally academic subjects. Because, as he states, dramatic moments emerge from non-drama

subjects constantly, teachers should be trained to recognise those moments and be able to use them themselves. As previously mentioned, this will require the aid of the drama teacher in providing opportunities for teachers of other subjects to learn how to recognise those moments. The new Drama Teacher must not just be a teacher of students but a teacher of teachers as well.

The greatest challenge that the new Drama Teacher will face in this is convincing his or her colleagues that integration is not simply a good idea but an essential one. Drama exists naturally in the learning process, but teachers trained outside of a dramatic pedagogy do not perceive that and cannot perceive it until it is pointed out to them:

> Until teachers of the arts in general, and drama teachers in particular, are able and willing to share their thinking with their colleagues and superiors, the impression that their subjects exist at the fringe of school activities, rather than the centre, will continue to be reinforced (O'Neill 1983:26).

Drama teachers must *make* themselves essentialist by demonstrating to other teachers the necessary role that drama plays in student learning. Upon doing that, they must help others to implement those tools in order to permeate that idea throughout the entire school, district, state, or country. As Hogan points out, 'A school cannot just radically change one part of its curriculum and remain wholly the same; change must be universally applied' (Hogan 1983:75). It would be unrealistic as well as useless to expect the Drama Teacher to be the only one teaching a certain subject using drama techniques – the impact of the change would not be felt. It is necessary then that the Drama Teacher be the catalyst for these changes, because it is the Drama Teacher who is in the greatest position to initiate them.

Changing the way we teach

This is not to say that the sole role of the new Drama Teacher is to teach other educators how to use drama. The new Drama Teacher also has the responsibility of using his or her skills to teach students using drama in a classroom setting. Practitioners such as Bolton and Heathcote emphasise that the most important aspect of using drama in teaching is changing the position of the teacher in relation to the students (Heathcote & Bolton 1998:4). Rather than operating under the traditional hierarchy of teacher over student, the teacher should involve himself in the learning process so that all parties are able to learn from each other and creative thinking and problem solving can be achieved on the part of the student. For example, Bolton sees the role of drama in education as having three main points: (1) drama is 'about making

significant meaning', (2) drama activities operate best when the entire class shares that meaning, and (3) teachers should empower their students, and the best way to do so is by taking on a facilitating role and operating within the dramatic art as opposed to outside it (Heathcote & Bolton 1995:4). Teachers should not put themselves to a higher status than their students; experience the learning with them rather than above or before them. Day agrees - because of the participatory nature of drama, a teacher cannot simply instruct. It must be an active process for all involved (Day 1983:82).

Similarly, Day (1983) identifies four types of teachers: subject-matter-oriented teachers, instructor-centred teachers, student-as-mind teachers, and student-as-person teachers. Subject-matter-oriented teachers focus on the student being able to master concepts, understand specific information, and be able to perform certain skills, with an emphasis on cognitive knowledge rather than personal development as a whole. Instructor-centred teachers believe that the teacher is kind and focus on teaching students to learn in the way he would learn things. Student-as-mind teachers refers to teachers who focus on the personal development of the student, but only in an intellectual capacity. Finally, student-as-person teachers focus on the personal development of the student *as a whole*, from his intellectual capacities to his emotional understanding to his social abilities (Day 1983:88-89). The drama teacher must become a student-as-person teacher, focusing on giving students the skills and knowledge he must acquire in order to fulfil certain requirements, such as those created under NCLB, but also develop the other aspects of the students' personalities that will serve them later in life.

O'Neill, on the other hand, notes three types of learning that can occur from using drama in education: learning arising from the social and interactive nature of drama, the learning and practicing of cognitive or imaginative skills, and learning that is unique to drama (O'Neill 1983:32). She stresses that all three are useful tools, but drama teachers should strive towards using the third as frequently is possible in order to put drama in an essential place in the curriculum. The Drama Teacher should focus on finding the aspects of drama that are special and utilise them as frequently as possible. In so doing, they cement the position of drama in education as being squarely in the centre rather than on the fringe as an unnecessary discipline. Furthermore, exposing students to the unique qualities of drama might encourage them to explore drama in other settings outside the classroom.

Drama Teachers must also recognise, however, that their methods are not without flaw. As Day points out, 'Effective confrontation of problems requires the

maximizing of valid information about teaching' (Day 1983:78). Teachers must be able to analyse the differences between their intentions and their outcomes when it comes to teaching students. If a particular method that has worked with one class of students is not working with another, the Drama Teacher should look at his plan as well as the specific traits of the class he is teaching and analyse why it has failed. Then this failure might be used to improve upon one's teaching and thus better serve the students the teacher is trying to educate.

Bolton accurately summed up the role of drama in the classroom when he said, '...classroom drama is to do with creating an art form in a way that is significant for its participants; from the art-making experience, something new is understood or something is newly understood' (Bolton 1993:39). The new Drama Teacher must look at drama as having this ability and apply it in every possible situation. When used in educational settings, drama allows students to simultaneously make art and change and deepen their understanding of a topic, idea, concept, or skill. The Drama Teacher is the facilitator of that change in understanding and thus must take on a role that both allows that type of learning to happen in his own classroom but also share his knowledge with other teachers so as to allow it to take place whenever possible. Unless these changes are implemented and drama teachers recognise and accept their new role as leaders in devising curriculum and helping fellow teachers, the entire concept of integration cannot be adequately applied so as to achieve its goal of meeting curriculum objectives while exposing students to the arts.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued in favour of the concept of integrating drama into classes that are not based in the practice of drama in order to expose students to the art form who might not have otherwise had the opportunity as a result of the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001. In Chapter One, I dissected the controversial piece of legislation and traced some of its history. The main issues with NCLB that affect arts education in the United States are the state-mandated accountability measures and the overall lack of definition or advocacy for the arts within the law itself. Under NCLB, all states are required to submit a plan that measures the proficiency of its students in the three required subjects of math, reading, and science. However, since the benchmark that determines 'proficiency' is determined by each state independently, there's no way to compare students from state to state. Additionally, the emphasis on meeting benchmarks and the funding cuts that accompany a failure to do so have driven schools to channel much of their funding, especially federal funds, towards the test-mandated subjects and thus away from subjects such as drama. The result is an education system that teaches to a test rather than creating well-rounded individuals who are prepared for the real world, and the arts suffer the most because many schools are losing or have already lost programmes for the arts, limiting students' opportunities to experience the arts, including drama.

I then presented a short case study of Westborough, Massachusetts, a suburban New England town facing difficulties as a result of NCLB. I discussed the impact NCLB has had on the Fine Arts Department in Westborough, which has mainly been a financial one. Because all of the federal funding that Westborough receives is tied to NCLB, the School Department channels those funds towards the areas it needs improvement in on the state-mandated MCAS test, particularly the Special Education department, which requires assistance to close achievement gaps according to NCLB's methods. I also presented evidence demonstrating that while the budget for the School Department has grown almost consistently over the last few years, the Fine Arts budget has decreased significantly. I concluded that while David Jost and his team have worked hard to keep most of the same facilities and opportunities available to students over the last thirteen years since NCLB was enacted, he has

constantly had to struggle against its tight grip and has failed to see the growth that is required by increased enrolment in arts programmes in Westborough's public schools.

In Chapter 3, I began my argument for integrating drama into the curriculum. Drama is an indispensable tool for the teacher in its ability to deepen students' understanding through empathy and shared experience. In dramatising the events of a learning moment, such as a text in an English class, students not only gain the knowledge that is required for them to pass state-mandated tests, but also strengthen their conception of contextual and universal themes, practise social skills, and develop problem-solving strategies and learning styles of their own, all while still creating art. Bolton in particular argues for this, citing the ability of drama to cause a change in understanding (Bolton 1993:39). Although theorists such as Robinson (1983) argue that integration is a detriment to drama as an art form, I disagree because there is an inherent value in the art created by the students as they learn, and by emphasising this alongside the intellectual knowledge they gain, drama as an art form is experienced simultaneously. To say that the value of children's art is less than that of 'legitimate' artists, is to reduce the beauty of art in itself as an accessible form of expression and demonstration of the human condition. Furthermore, as a result of practising drama in an educational setting, students may seek out dramatic activity outside the classroom, whereas without using drama in education, they might not have been given the opportunity.

Chapter 4 addressed the changing role of the teacher upon implementing these integration techniques. Changes would and must occur both in the classroom and in the teachers' lounge. The Drama Teacher has the responsibility to share his knowledge with non-drama teachers of how to recognise moments for dramatic activity as opportunities to deepen students' understanding. Hogan acknowledges that the Drama Teacher is in a very strong position for achieving this goal because of the social nature of drama, which allows practitioners to understand and thus navigate the dynamics between people (Hogan 1983:75). The Drama Teacher also must negotiate the changing roles of other teachers, acknowledging that this might come with difficult confrontations of identity, as proposed by Robinson (1983:14). Finally, the way

that teachers teach will change as well, mainly in that the teacher must no longer see himself as the leader of the classroom but rather as the facilitator of learning. Heathcote and Bolton advocate for this approach, stating that the Drama Teacher must operate within the drama work rather than outside it, and in so doing will create an environment with more freedom for students to express themselves and think differently (Heathcote & Bolton 1998:4).

Overall, I believe the research I've conducted indicates many benefits to integrating drama into the non-drama curriculum under *No Child Left Behind's* current mandates. The nature of drama encourages change in understanding and depth of thinking that current educational practices, specifically those in place as a result of the testing mandates of NCLB, do not. In this way, drama as an educational tool achieves a dual goal – students meet, or even exceed, proficiency standards necessitated by this piece of legislation and also have an opportunity to participate in drama activities when they might otherwise have not been exposed to that opportunity.

There are some artists who argue against integrating drama into the everyday curriculum. Robinson, for example, states, 'This strategy of bending drama to current priorities may be expedient in the short term. It has no basis for developments in the long term' (Robinson 1983:11). While this is an accurate assessment, it does not mean that integration of drama into existing curricula would not be beneficial. Current students are suffering in the United States as a result of a lack of cohesiveness in their education. Educational policy keeps schools from being able to receive the funding to keep arts education running in the same way it does now. I do not propose to replace already existing arts programmes with curriculum-integrated ones, but rather to supplement curricula that do not have an arts program as a result of the culture of testing and tightening funds implemented by NCLB in order to maintain some form of arts education in these less fortunate schools.

As Bolton points out, '... the richness of classroom drama lies in its potential to achieve change of understanding (a pedagogical objective) along with improvement of drama skills and knowledge (an artistic objective)' (Bolton 1993:39). This trait almost exclusive to drama is one we should not ignore

simply for fear of classroom drama eradicating the need or desire for independent drama classes. To do so would be to deny students a greater, richer understanding of the material they are learning and the opportunity to engage in and enjoy classroom activities. There will, and should, always be someone fighting for independent drama classes in schools. Robinson notes, 'In our concerns with status, we should not mistake the means for the end' (Robinson 1983:21). Regardless of NCLB, I believe that the practice of integrating the arts across a curriculum is one that will ultimately benefit the arts community as a whole. Although those in the arts community see the value of drama as a form all its own, those outside of it at times need more convincing. Pointing out the utilitarian value of the arts as well as the traditionally aesthetic inherent value will strengthen its essentialist status in society. Hogan states that 'the self-diagnosis of need … is the driving force behind change' (Hogan 1983:75). Integrating drama into the classroom will begin this process of self-diagnosis, and once society sees the positive results of this method, it will cry out for true educational reform that will finally create well-rounded, world-ready individuals with opportunities for and appreciation of the arts.