

УДК 37.015.31:7

THE AESTHETIC DIMENSION: A WEAK LINK IN THE DISCOURSE OF APPLIED DRAMA/THEATRE IN EDUCATION

Shifra Schonmann

This paper is aimed at encouraging the reader to look at the aesthetic dimension, a weak link in the discourse of applied drama/theatre in education. Its aim is to urge the professionals not to be content with the predominance that is given to the social, the political and the therapeutic dimensions. The main argument is that although drama/theatre education is now being viewed as a multi-leveled discourse, the true appeal and the beauty of drama/ theatre in education lies in its power to embody magic of theatre and drama as artistic and aesthetic ways of expressing the human mind and spirit. Expanding the utilitarian function of theatre at the expense of the aesthetic dimension is to risk losing the whole enterprise.

Key words: *Aesthetic, Applied Drama/Theatre, Education, Aesthetic distance, Catharsis, Conventions.*

Opening.

As a tool to gain self-confidence, develop self-exploration and self transformation, build understanding of others, and to enhance the capability of expressing ideas clearly without fear, drama/theatre education is almost instinctively offered by us drama educators and researchers who are working in any educational setting. It has also been offered as a good tool to deal with moral education: cultural pluralism, affairs of war and peace as well as many other diseases of society. When examining the large variety of articles in the book edited by O'Toole & Donelan in 1996 [23] and ten years later the book edited by McCammon & McLauchlan (2006) [20], and almost ten years later books edited by Schonmann, (2011; 2015) [32; 33], one can easily learn that drama/theatre education is being viewed as a multi-leveled discourse. The intriguing rainbow of thoughts exposes clear inclination towards expanding the utilitarian function of drama and theatre in education.

Drama as education, a phrase that Bolton coined thirty years ago [4] surprisingly, includes many of the forms of applied drama/theatre that have been developed since then. Applied drama/theatre is typically proposed for young children at kindergarten as well as for school-age students. However,

it embraces the range of young adults and old people, the healthy and the sick, free persons and prisoners. The large target population and the wide range of aims expected to be achieved by using drama and theatre as education demonstrate the depth and the breadth of the field. To the outsider, a stranger to the field, this may sound simplistic, sometimes even naïve, and perhaps rightly so. How could applied drama/theatre be a cure for almost all the social and the personal disabilities that flesh is heir to? However, to the insiders, to those who are familiar with the field there is no such question. Rather there is a controversial discussion about the language in use.

In this work I set up in Part One to explore the language used by professionals. My questions are: How do professionals, researchers and practitioners speak about the work they are doing? What language do they use to describe their projects? Why is it that most of the time there are apologetic nuances in the written work as if the language were unable to express well the idea behind the practice? What they are stressing? What is lacking from their discourse? Does it matter?

After identifying the aesthetic dimension as the weak link in the discourse of applied drama/theatre, I will (in Part Two) offer how to enrich the discourse with aesthetic terms and concepts. I will discuss their relevance and importance in developing the field, arguing that language sometimes conducts actions. Standing on the shoulders of giants in the aesthetic field, I will advocate the reclaiming of the artistic-aesthetic dimension, placing it at the core of the applied drama/theatre discourse.

Part One. The Language Used by Professionals: Does it Matter?

This part examines how the field of applied drama/theatre is perceived by its professionals - the researchers and the practitioners. It is based on a meta-analysis of contemporary research and written documents that were displayed in various professional written corpuses, reflecting the research and the practice in the field.

In 2005 I began to analyze programs of the major conferences in drama/theatre education: AATE (American Alliance for Theatre and Education), IDEA (International Drama Education Association) and IDIERI (International Drama in Education Research Institute) and INRAE (the International Network for Research in Arts Education). These are considered to be main international professional gatherings in the field (most of which I have attended). I have been looking into the headings that express the topics that were discussed. My data show that the majority of the topics were concerned with the **by products** that drama and theatre can produce, but **not**

with **the artistic and/ or the aesthetic** dimensions of the field. Sometimes I wonder if we fail to see the wood for the trees (Schonmann) [30].

In the «*Drama Way Project*», a comprehensive work by Jouni Piekkari and others (2004; and see also Piekkari J. (Ed) 2005) [24; 25], I found a good attempt to compile a «mini» dictionary. The *Drama Way Project* gathered some of the main genres of participatory and applied drama. There are altogether seventeen different forms of theatrical ways of how to use drama in various educational and therapeutic systems: *Drama-in-Education (DIE)*, *Theatre-in-Education (TIE)*, *Forum Theatre*, *Legislative Theatre*, *Theatre-for-Awareness / Theatre-for-Development*, *Devised Theatre / From Fact to Fiction*, *Play Back Theatre*, *Sociodrama*; *Celebratory Drama*, *Hospital Clownery*, *Site-specific Theatre*, *Drama Myths and Ritual Forms of Performance*, *Live-Action Role Play (LARP)*, *Street Theatre*, *Community Theatre or Theatre in the Community*, *Text-based Amateur Theatre*, *Improvisation & Drama*.

All of them are celebrations of human interaction and creating and sharing meanings together. Many of the genres overlap, and the lines between them are therefore often blurred. However, the common understanding is that each of them emphasizes different aspects of theatre-making.

So, where is the problem that I want to approach?

Based on the assumption that the language one uses conveys his/her thoughts and affects his/her actions (Lakoff & Johnson) [18] it is obvious that, looking at the words used to describe, explain and research the above forms, is an important source of evidence of how the field of applied drama/theatre is perceived and operates.

A few representative examples cited from the above mentioned *Drama Way Project*, are as follow:

– *Drama in education refers to the use of drama as a **tool** for education.*

– *TIE refers to the use of pre-written and rehearsed theatre performance as a **tool** for learning.*

– *Forum theatre has been used widely to tackle issues such as racism, substance abuse, sexual prejudice or bullying/school violence. Its **target** is the empowerment of individuals and groups.*

– *Legislative theatre is used as a **tool** for local or national democracy and public decision making, to help the people to participate in politics.*

– *Theatre-for-Awareness / Theatre-for-Development- theatre -as a **tool** for participatory development aiming at social change.*

– *Devising theatre techniques have often been used to create plays with young people on the **themes** chosen by them.*

The image is clear: applied drama/theatre is perceived as a **tool** for or a **target** of learning and empowerment, personal development, discussing themes, social change and decision making. The terminology used amongst drama workers, leaders, and researchers is very instrumental. What is definitely missing in the discourse or let us say, rarely used, is the aesthetic dimension.

Here is my claim: participatory and applied drama/theatre employ their main ideas and, accordingly their terminology, to the instrumental and the practical achievements that have been borrowed from the social, psychological, and communication fields. Their «card index» as shown above, contains not even one word on aesthetic or artistic achievements. In the language used to describe their essence there is usually very little or nothing at all about the art we are teaching or creating, or the theatre we want them to be able to enjoy and not to be theatre-illiterate (Schonmann) [30].

In the edited book by MaCammon and McLauchlan [20] *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues*, a book that contains 34 articles covering a wide scope of research and practice in the field, we can see the same tendency. Looking at the headings of the papers, examining their contents, we are assured that the objectives as set out by Saxton & Miller [28] have been fully achieved. But that is exactly my point: analyzing the objectives [28, p. 9] one cannot find the word **art** or the word **aesthetic**; they are notably missing from the discourse. In Bresler [5], the significant and the inspiring *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education* they are notably missing from the table of contents, 13 sections, 1627 pages. Along with this line, when we examine the contemporary research conducted by me (Schonmann) [32], *Key concepts in theatre drama education*, we can find only a short section titled: *Aesthetics and ethics*. In *The wisdom of the many: Key issues in arts education, international yearbook for research in arts education* (Schonmann) [33], we can find only a short section titled: *Morals, ethics and aesthetics*. Tang, O'Farrell, & Bolden [34] set out to interrogate «Significant Themes in Arts Education» in the data represented by the collaboratively developed contents of the above book, *The Wisdom of the Many*. Their detailed report was guided by the following research question: *What is significant in contemporary international arts education?* Their analytical process produced nine themes each of which appeared to represent an interest that was shared within the field. Themes that were written by 104 scholars

included *Construction of Knowledge, Embodiment, Transformation, Personal Wellbeing, Identity, Social Cohesion, Social Justice, Democracy, and Multiculturalism*. By no means do they claim that discussion in the field is limited to these nine themes. However, we can be surprised to find that a number of issues that we recognized as important, including some that were raised in the book, did not find their way into the identified themes, *aesthetic* is one of them.

I want to be clear. I am not saying that there is no aesthetic dimension in the projects themselves. I did not research that, I do not know. What I am saying is that the aesthetic dimension is **a weak link in the discourse**, it is almost missing from the language used to talk about the projects, and thus we may have a firm basis to suspect that it is not well developed, it has not received enough attention. It is certainly not at the core of the applied dramatist's concerns. Let us take a closer look and examine a few examples of the ways in which many professionals speak about the work they are doing:

Theatre and Drama for Empowerment: The Immigrant Experience. This is a story of the PUENTE theatre told by its founder, Lina de Guevara [12, pp. 321-324], who emigrated from Chile to Canada in 1976. She realized that having worked in the theatre all her life, theatre should be her vehicle of communication. With five other women, also Latin American immigrants, they created a play to tell their stories. In all their plays they included a moment of audience participation, because they felt that it was a good way of building bridges. Their main objective was: «to share the power of the stage and reclaim the tradition of popular celebration in which everybody had a creative role to play» (Guevara). [12, p. 324]

Here is my point, the entire paper deals with the strong notion of the importance of telling personal stories **to empower the self, to enhance the sense of belonging and pride in one's heritage**. Again, I am not suggesting that the work itself is lacking aesthetic dimension, I cannot know. However, I can point out the frequent use of social-psychological language that is used and the absence of the aesthetic dimension from the discourse.

Using Drama to Achieve *Social justice: Anti-bullying project in Elementary Schools*, written by George Belliveau [2, pp. 325-335], is another example of emphasizing social justice with elementary students. With the collaboration of a group of twelve pre-service teachers he created and presented a thirty-minute anti-bullying play. In addition, the same twelve pre-service teachers worked closely with classes, assisting the students in developing their own anti-bullying plays. The research behind this initiative for social justice was to examine what kind of an impact (if any) did the

University of Prince Edward Island drama project have on the elementary student participants? The project is clearly and efficiently elaborated. However, while analyzing the themes and the ideas of the project one can find that the discourse related to beliefs and attitudes. «Snapshots of students' stated beliefs, feelings, and perceptions on bullying offers valuable and informative insights to educators and policy makers» [2, p. 332] and the findings: «This project had a very positive impact on their classes... not only did the use of drama help the students express themselves and learn about bullying, but it also allowed them to look at this kind of learning as fun.» [2, p. 330-331]

These findings are only snapshots of students' stated beliefs, feelings and perceptions, as Belliveau himself honestly declared in his comprehensive work, but it is also typical of others who present their findings, mostly clear-cut claims of achieving the purposes.

The American Red Cross has developed a resource for schools called «Master of Disaster». One unit, as O'Connor reports [22, p. 360] is «Facing Fear», is designed to empower sixth-grade children and their teachers to deal with a new disaster, i.e. terrorism. The role of Osama Bin Laden is also presented in another project to restrain fear (Schonmann) [31], all in the name of being able to help children and adults to cope with fear, to channel their stress and the anger. Only few will see how this kind of drama is potentially dangerous and can feed fear (Ramamoorthi). [26, p. 370]

So where does it lead us? Why is it that almost any project of applied drama/theatre always deals with negative aspects of society such as bullying, smoking, drinking, bad driving, and, even when dealing with topics such as protecting the environment, the negative aspects are at the front? Maybe the answer should be in the light of the instrumental essence of the field. Most types of applied drama/theatre concentrate on **changing attitudes, changing behaviors, transformation of...** A large amount of the professionals argue that drama will evoke profound transformation in students. The literature I have mentioned so far along with Nicholson's book [21] *Applied drama: The gift of theatre*, characterize applied drama/theatre as a promising growing field that **can** make positive difference in the lives of other. However I wonder. Are we really think that a brief project can do it? Is this not against what is known in psychology and social studies?

It is time to ask ourselves: Does cultivating the utilization dimension of applied drama/theatre really help to give value to the work that we are doing? Why do we, educators and researchers, almost not see any cultivating of the

aesthetic? And most important, if we do add an aesthetic aspect to the discourse, will it matter? In what sense?

Part Two. Challenges to Aesthetic Discourse: How Can Aesthetics Give Meaning to Applied Drama/theatre?

If, so far, I have depicted 'a half-empty glass' I'll move now to the 'half-full glass' by first mentioning that there are works that have already tried to deal with the role of the aesthetic in drama theatre education. Among them are Bailin [1, pp. 423-432], Jackson [16, pp. 161-170], Rasmussen & Gurgens [27, pp. 235-244], Haseman [14, pp. 201-211], Greenwood [11, pp.47-53], and Klein & Schonmann [17, 60-74].

Let us take a closer look at Haseman's work. He gives us a clear description of process drama in his chapter *The poetics of process: Process drama online*, in which he puts the process drama in the broad context of applied drama and, within this frame, he counts its advantages. The reader can learn very easily about the merit of this form: «process drama as a potent means of making both *art and meaning*, and who, over the years, have come to use it as an effective form of applied theatre» (Haseman). [14, p. 202] As the chapter unfolds, Haseman specifies the points of intersection between the live interaction of *process drama* and the mediated interactivity of online environments. The most powerful claim is that «Both fields recognize that the **aesthetic of drama** and the way elements of drama are used will shape the success of the work in hand.» [14, p. 203] To turn to the poetics of the process he claims that «it is only by considering the interplay between **dramatic tension, character, story, language, physicality and mood** which secure an effective **dramatic focus** that a compelling online drama will be secured.» [14, p. 210] This is a possible way to articulate a claim in the language that is so often forgotten.

Most important to bring up in this context is the special issue on *aesthetics in drama education*, edited by Martin-Smith [19, p. 4], as a guest editor of the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. The fact that a well-known journal opens its doors to twelve researchers trying to put this issue on the map was an encouraging step in the direction that I find most necessary.

It is assumed that the experience of theatre can be distinguished from real life experience. The big question is therefore how will we be able to ensure that the participants in applied drama/theatre will be able to make this conscious differentiation? Furthermore, how will they learn to be able to relate forms to meaning? Understanding theatre and enjoying theatre are active processes that go through a profound development of the abilities to grasp questions of *application, generalization and symbolism*. These are only

a few of the basic elements of the aesthetic dimension, to start with. Note, that as such they are too often missing from the discourse of applied drama.

I will try to demonstrate my intention of how we might insert an aesthetic lens into our discourse by looking briefly at three concepts: «**aesthetic distance**», «**catharsis**» and «**conventions**».

Aesthetic distance.

Almost one hundred years ago, Edward Bullough [6, pp. 87-118] was the first to define distancing as the lie between our own self and its affections [6, p. 89]; that is, our perceptual, emotional state. For Bullough, the ideal degree of distance, which forms the basis of his general aesthetic principle, is the «least amount of distance without its disappearance.» [3, p. 49] Thus, it is proposed here to look at the aesthetic distance as a balance based on Bullough's understanding: «All art requires a distance-limit beyond which, and a distance-limit within which only aesthetic appreciation becomes possible» (Bullough). [6, p. 89]

It is proposed here to look at the aesthetic distance as a point of departure for a meaningful discourse of applied drama while dealing with questions of perception and participation involved in drama-theatre experiences.

Aesthetic distance relates to the spectator's perception of the theatrical event and to the special involvement between audience and stage. As adults, we may cry when we see an emotional scene, especially when it touches our own personal lives, but we know that we are emotionally involved in a theatrical experience and not in a real life situation. An adult spectator will not run toward the stage to stop an act of murder, but a child might. The aesthetic stance inhibits our motor activity and helps to process our feelings (Holland) [15], therefore when the child loses aesthetic distance he sinks into the *as if* situation as though it were a real life situation.

In the context of this paper, the questions to be asked include: How can an understanding of the nature of aesthetic distance open up a new vision to a large variety of projects planned under the umbrella of applied drama? How to develop dramatic experiences in which the aesthetic distance should be applied not to the actor-spectator but to the participants as persons and the role/s they are playing? How can we work to build an aesthetic distance between them and the situation in which they are involved?

Nicholson [21] worked towards this direction in her exploration how the theatricality of autobiographical play «protected the performance by creating an aesthetic distance between them as people and their own autobiographical stories.» [21, p.96] Cultivation of people's ability to operate

aesthetic distance will enable them to participate in drama-theatre experiences with emotion, without losing themselves in the fiction.

While operating *applied drama*, we might achieve a psychological experience, a sociological experience but there will be no aesthetic experience if the aesthetic distance is not fully understood and put up in the front of the discourse.

Catharsis.

Catharsis has been at the center of theoretical and practical discourse for hundreds of years yet it still needs clarifications and adaptations. Although Aristotle mentioned that catharsis was the purging of only two specific emotions, *pity* and *fear*, it is now believed that catharsis can encompass many more distressing emotions such as shame, embarrassment, anger and grief. Excitement is stirred up within the spectators leading to the release of a number of emotions. This venting of one's feelings is not harmful to the spectators; on the contrary, it serves their emotional balance to control their behavior. It helps to maintain the equilibrium of mind, and to overcome fear. Catharsis in this sense is perceived as supporting one's emotional life, and helping a person to function better outside the walls of the theatre.

Placing the concept of *catharsis* at the center of the participant's experience as an emotional and cognitive phenomenon provides an opportunity to share one's feelings within a protected environment at an artistic event and among peers. One of the major lessons from looking at the arts, as we have learnt from Elliot Eisner [8] is «how to secure the feelingful experience that slowed perception makes possible; the arts help students learn how to savor qualities by taking the time to really look so that they can see.» [8, p. 24] My point is to clarify the idea of cathartic power as power to evoke a feelingful experience.

Despite the voices that were heard in the 1970s, claiming that the idea of *catharsis* is considered passé by most researchers in social science, psychology and psychiatry, I argue along with Scheff [29, p. 21], that the closing of the debate over catharsis has been premature. My point in examining catharsis as playing a central role in any conceptual framework of theatre and drama in education is to say that its emotional and cognitive elements are at the heart of the theatrical experience. We need to enrich our discourse with images and arguments of how to create catharsis, knowing that it has a therapeutic influence that helps to release emotions as well as having powers of clarification. Insights that are acquired through cathartic clarification are equivalent to the acquisition of emotional knowledge (Winston). [35, p. 65] However, the fundamental mystery of catharsis still

remains unsolved. «The strange contradiction of pleasure through pain» in Edith Hamilton's words, «still continues to concern some of the most brilliant minds the world has known... Pity, awe, reconciliation, exaltation - these are the elements that make up tragic pleasure» (Hamilton) [13, p. 166].

Conventions.

While catharsis is associated with emotions and with moral values, conventions do not necessarily have emotional or value connotations, though sometimes they may not be free of them. Conventions are based upon the behaviors and manners dictated in advance that have been absorbed by the audience of a specific culture. Unlike real life, in theatre one can break the rules of nature and turn them into conventions. Thus, one can hang a cardboard picture on a wall and claim it is the sun. However, it is impossible to 'break' the rules that refer to the interaction codes of conduct among people because these are practiced on stage as they are practiced in everyday life. This concept should stand at the basis for understanding conventions.

Theatre cannot do without conventions. In order to render the fictional world in full and vital expression the art of theatre uses methods of iconic representation and sets of changing conventions (Burns). [7, p. 83] In fact, many claim that no iconic sign in a theatrical text is free from convention. A crucial question in this context could be: How can one help a child or any other participant in applied drama/theatre to «read» or to «interpret» conventions properly? What would be considered as «properly» in aesthetic terms?

Since every sign has a meaning and this meaning is never an independent entity, we need to understand the nature of the path that the child or adult is walking along when s/he transforms *sense* into *meaning*. In other words, what are the different ways that the child or the adult participating undergoes in his journey to decode the conventions on stage? S/he should see the object or the sign, s/he has a sense of it and only then is s/he able to accord it meaning and might be able ultimately to express her/his understanding. This complicated process should play a central role in our discourse since this matter is associated with our understanding of how an image is constructed in our minds, how one actually perceives art.

Closing.

Some claim that the notion of creating a theory of aesthetics is logically doomed, since aesthetic essence escapes definition. Defining a set of necessary and sufficient attributes of a work of art is not feasible, since that would reflect a restricted conception of art whereas, in its essence, art is limitless. Others claim that the main question is not «What is art?» but rather

«What concept or idea does it express?» This kind of a claim can be based on Wittgenstein, who stated that playing games is an indefinable activity and yet, collectively, we refer to the common properties of a play activity. In the same vein, I suggest that we need not aim to define aesthetics in our discourse, but we should identify and explain common attributes of a phenomenon (such as «*aesthetic distance*», «*catharsis*» and «*conventions*») that enables us to include our work in the category of art. The task of providing a verbal formula to explain the artistic and aesthetic value of our work lies at the core of this paper. New meaning to the enormous work that is being done will emerge from new exploration of language.

I can lean on Erich Fromm's idea in his seminal book *The Forgotten Language*:

Let us assume you want to tell someone the difference between the taste of white wine and red wine. This may seem quite simple to you. You know the difference very well; why should it not be easy to explain it to someone else? Yet you find the greatest difficulty putting this taste difference into words. And probably you will end up by saying, «Now look here. I can't explain it to you. Just drink red wine and then white wine, and you will know what the difference is» (Fromm) [9, p. 11].

Fromm explains, «You have no difficulty in finding words to explain the most complicated machine, and yet words seem to be futile to describe a simple taste experience» [6, p. 17].

By adopting Fromm's understanding for the purposes of our discussion, I identify the «forgotten language» in the context of applied drama and theatre, as the aesthetic language.

If «WE TALK ABOUT» the work we are doing not only in terms of psychologies, sociologies or therapeutics but **also as arts professionals** we might be able to establish the essential conditions that enable a successful field of knowledge to flourish. If we continue the discourse in the field almost ignoring the aesthetic dimension we risk losing the whole enterprise because the only justification of our field is its being **a hybrid phenomenon**, that is to say: emerging as a cultural, social, psychological, pedagogical and aesthetic entity.

I have tried to claim in this paper that, by **its very nature, applied drama/theatre is utilitarian yet the aesthetic is its poetic justification**. In *Variations on a Blue Guitar*, Maxine Greene [10] expresses some principles that should guide us:

«Our core concern, of course, is with aesthetic education; but we do not regard aesthetic education as in any sense a fringe undertaking, a

species of 'frill'. We see it as integral to the development of persons - to their cognitive, perceptual, emotional, and imaginative development. We see it as part of the human effort (so often forgotten today) to seek a greater coherence in the world.» [10, p. 7]

Art adds significance to our lives and to the world; it helps us organize our world. At the heart of the idea of creating an aesthetic experience is the desire to increase our pleasure. Enlivening the «forgotten language» is the key ingredient to bringing about an aesthetic experience.

References

1. Bailin, S. (1993). Theatre, drama education and the role of the aesthetic. *Curriculum Studies*, 25(1), 423-432.
2. Belliveau, G. (2006). Using drama to archive social justice: Anti-bullying project in elementary schools. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 325-335). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
3. Ben-Chaim, D. (1984). *Distance in the theatre: The aesthetics of audience response*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research.
4. Bolton, G. (1984). *Drama as education*. London: Longman.
5. Bresler, L. (Ed.) (2007). *International handbook on research in arts education*. New York: Springer.
6. Bullough, E. (1912). 'Psychical distance' as a factor in art and an aesthetic principle. *British Journal of Psychology*, 5, 2, 87-118.
7. Burns, E. (1972). *Theatricality: A study in the theatre and social life*. London: Longman.
8. Eisner, E. (2002). *The arts and the creation of mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
9. Fromm, E. (1951). *The forgotten language*. New York: Rinehart.
10. Greene, M. (2001). *Variations on a blue guitar*. New York: Teachers College Press.
11. Greenwood, J. (2011). Aesthetic learning and learning through the aesthetic. In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key concepts in theatre/drama education* (pp.47-53). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense publishers.
12. Guevara, L. de (2006). Theatre and drama for empowerment: The immigrant experience. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 321-324). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
13. Hamilton, E. (1930/1963). *The Greek way to western civilization*. New York: Mentor Books.
14. Haseman, B. (2006). The poetics of process: Process drama online. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 201-211). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.

15. Holland, N. (1968). *The dynamic of literary response*. New York: Oxford University Press.
16. Jackson, A. (1995). Framing the drama: An approach to the aesthetics of educational theatre. In P. Taylor & C. Hoeppe (Eds.), *Selected readings in drama & theatre education* (pp. 161-170). Brisbane: NADIE Publications.
17. Klein, J. & Schonmann, S. (2009). Theorizing aesthetic transactions from children's critical values in theatre for young audiences. *Youth Theatre Journal*, 23, 60-74.
18. Lackoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
19. Martin-Smith, A. (Guest Ed.) (2005). Special issue: Aesthetics in drama and theatre education, *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 39, 4.
20. McCammon, L. A. & McLauchlan, D. (Eds.) (2006). *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues*. Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
21. Nicholson, H. (2005). *Applied drama: The gift of theatre*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
22. O'Connor, P. (2006). Keeping a piece of the rainbow: Empowerment and disempowerment in drama education. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 357-365). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
23. O'Toole, J. & Donelan, K. (Eds.) (1966). *Drama, culture and empowerment: The IDEA dialogues*. Brisbane, Australia: IDEA Publications.
24. Piekari J. (2004). «Drama Way» Web site, <http://www.tkk.utu.fi/dramaway/handbook.php>
25. Piekari J. (Ed) (2005). *Drama - a Way to Social Inclusion: Practical Process Description for Drama Workers*. University of Turku, Centre for Extension Studies.
26. Ramamoorthi, P. (2006). Freedom space: Drama therapy with prisoners in madurai. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 367-373). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
27. Rasmussen, B. & Gurgens, R. (2006). Art as part of everyday life: Understanding applied theatre practices through the aesthetics of John Dewey and Hans Georg Gadamer. *Theatre Research International*, 31, 3, 235-244.
28. Saxton, J. & Miller, C. (2006). Foreword: Seeing in all directions. In L. McCammon & D. McLauchlan (Eds.), *Universal mosaic of drama and theatre: The IDEA 2004 dialogues* (pp. 9-10). Ottawa: IDEA Publications.
29. Scheff, T. J. (1979). *Catharsis in healing, ritual, and drama*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
30. Schonmann, S. (2005). «Master» versus «Slave»: Contradictions in drama and theatre education. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 39, 4, 31-39.
31. Schonmann, S. (2006). *Theatre as a medium for children and young people: Images and observations*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

32. Schonmann, S. (Ed.) (2011). *Key concepts in theatre/drama education*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense publishers.
33. Schonmann, S. (Ed.) (2015). *The wisdom of the many: Key issues in arts education, International yearbook for research in arts education (Vol. 3)*. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.
34. Tang, A., O'Farrell, L., and Bolden, B. (2015). *Significant themes in arts education*. Unpublished document. With the support of the UNESCO Chair in Arts and Learning, Queen's University grants and institutional programs, University Research Services, (in the author's archive).
35. Winston, J. (1998). *Drama, narrative and moral education*. London: Falmer Press.

ЕСТЕТИЧНИЙ ВИМІР: СЛАБКА ЛАНКА У ДИСКУРСІ ЩОДО ПРАКТИЧНОГО ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ ЕЛЕМЕНТІВ ДРАМИ/ТЕАТРУ В О

Шифра Шонманн

У статті підкреслюється необхідність заохочення уваги читача до дослідження естетичного виміру, слабкої ланки у дискурсі щодо практичного застосування елементів драми/театру в освіті. Мета статті полягає у переконанні професіоналів не дотримуватися думки щодо визнання домінуючої ролі соціального, політичного та терапевтичного вимірів. Головним аргументом на користь цього є те, що хоча драматична/театральна освіта сьогодні є предметом багаторівневого дискурсу, істинна привабливість і краса використаних у процесі освіти елементів драми/театру полягає у їх можливості втілити магію театру і драми як художніх та естетичних шляхів вираження людського розуму та духу. Розширюючи практичну функцію театру за рахунок естетичного виміру, ми ризикуємо порушити його цілісність.

Ключові слова: естетичне, практичне застосування елементів драми/театру, освіта, естетична дистанція, катарсис, конвенції.

ЭСТЕТИЧЕСКОЕ ИЗМЕРЕНИЕ: СЛАБОЕ ЗВЕНО В ДИСКУРСЕ ПО ПРАКТИЧЕСКОМУ ПРИМЕНЕНИЮ ЭЛЕМЕНТОВ ДРАМЫ / ТЕАТРА В ОБРАЗОВАНИИ

Шифра Шонманн

В статье подчеркивается необходимость опощрения внимания читателя к исследованию эстетического измерения, слабого звена в дискурсе по поводу практического применения элементов драмы / театра в образовании. Цель статьи состоит в убеждении профессионалов не придерживаться мнения о

доминирующей роли социального, политического и терапевтического измерений. Главным аргументом в пользу этого является то, что хотя драматическое/ театральное образование сегодня является предметом многоуровневого дискурса, истинная привлекательность и красота использованных в процессе образования элементов драмы / театра заключается в их возможности воплотить магию театра и драмы как художественных и эстетических путей выражения человеческого разума и духа. Расширяя практическую функцию театра за счет эстетического измерения, мы рискуем нарушить его целостность.

Ключевые слова: эстетическое, практическое применение элементов драмы / театра, образование, эстетическая дистанция, катарсис, конвенции.

Shifra Schonmann - Professor Emerita, holder of Bar-Netzer Chair of Education, Society and Theatre for Young People at the University of Haifa, Israel; a visiting & research professor at a number of universities such as NYU, Stanford, Simon Fraser (Canada), Reading (England), University of Melbourne, Doshisha University (Kyoto, Japan) and the University of London, Central School of Speech & Drama; an invited speaker in international conferences, a member of Editorial Board of several leading journals; an advisor of UNESCO Arts Education Observatory for Research in Local Cultures and Creativity in Education, Hong Kong; a member of INRAE's steering committee.

E-mail: shifras@edu.haifa.ac.il

Шифра Шонманн - почесний професор, завідувач кафедри педагогіки, суспільства та драматургії для молоді під патронатом Ханни Бар-Нетцер Хайфського університету, Ізраїль; ад'юнкт професор, що займається дослідницькою роботою і читає лекції у ряді університетів: Нью-Йоркський університет, Стенфорд, Університет імені Саймона Фрейзера (Канада), Університет Рідінга (Англія), Мельбурнський університет, Університет Досіся (Кіото, Японія) і Лондонський університет, Школа ораторського мистецтва і драми; запрошений доповідач на міжнародних конференціях, член редколегії кількох провідних журналів; радник Обсерваторії ЮНЕСКО з досліджень у галузі художньої освіти, що займається вивченням місцевих культур і творчості в галузі освіти, Гонконг; член керівного комітету Міжнародної науково-дослідної мережі з дослідження питань у галузі художньої освіти (INRAE).

E-mail: shifras@edu.haifa.ac.il