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Abstract.

This study seeks to clarify and to provide an understanding of dance artists in education practice, an area which is not yet fully understood. The climate of educational change and increased accountability in which the research takes place highlights the urgent need to inform future debate. Towards this end, the study draws upon an historical overview of the field, tracing the parallel developments in dance education and dance in the theatre.

An ACGB residency project acts as the case study, providing instances for first-hand field-work study of dance artists working in education. Video recordings, observations of practical activities, and interviews with dance artists, dance educators and students provide the basic research material. The results of the fieldwork are analysed in the light of pertinent literature, with the residency project providing a test-bed against which problems discussed in the literature are set. Here, disparate concerns emanating from national dance artists in education practice are identified and examined.

Subsequently, a coherent rationale for "Partnerships" between dance artists and dance educators is developed, based on dance as art in education and the requirements of dance within Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992). New models are then proposed for projects which focus on choreography, performance, appreciation, or a combination of these. Since these proposals have implications for the training of dance artists and dance educators, an outline programme for a training system is also explored.

Finally, recommendations for policy are presented, tempered with consideration for what is both appropriate and possible in future practice, to enable "Partnerships" to be planned and implemented with maximum effect for dance artists, dance educators and participants.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACGB</td>
<td>Arts Council of Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADiM</td>
<td>The National Organisation of South Asian Dancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMS</td>
<td>Arts Education for a Multicultural Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/S</td>
<td>Artists in Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A level</td>
<td>GCSE Advanced level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/S</td>
<td>GCSE Advanced Supplementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCPE</td>
<td>British Council for Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>British Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRB</td>
<td>Birmingham Royal Ballet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATE</td>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCPE</td>
<td>Chelsea College of Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDET</td>
<td>Council for Dance Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG</td>
<td>Contemporary Dance Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE</td>
<td>Certificate of Extended Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGA</td>
<td>Core Group A (student group, CSHM residency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGB</td>
<td>Core Group B (student group, CSHM residency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAA</td>
<td>Council for National Academic Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRE</td>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHM</td>
<td>Chelsea School of Human Movement (Brighton Polytechnic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daCi</td>
<td>dance and the Child international</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>Department of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFE</td>
<td>Department for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDC</td>
<td>Extemporary Dance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDT</td>
<td>Educational Dance Drama Theatre Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDT</td>
<td>Extemporary Dance Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>General Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE</td>
<td>General Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLAA</td>
<td>Greater London Arts Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMI</td>
<td>Her Majesty's Inspectorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILEA</td>
<td>Inner London Education Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Key Stage (in the National Curriculum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMC</td>
<td>Laban Art of Movement Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAMG  Laban Art of Movement Guild
LCDE  London Contemporary Dance Experience
LCDT  London Contemporary Dance Theatre
LCMG  Local Consultative Management Group
LEA   Local Education Authority
LEAG  London and East Anglian Group
LFB   London Festival Ballet
LMS   Local Management of Schools
LSCD  London School of Contemporary Dance
MED   Modern Educational Dance
MEG   Midlands Examination Group
MOE   Ministry of Education
NATFHE National Association for Teachers in Further and Higher Education
NCC   National Curriculum Council
NCDAE National Council for Dance Artists in Education
NDTA  National Dance Teachers Association
NEA   National Endowment for the Arts
NEG   Northern Examining Group
NFAE  National Foundation for Arts Education
NFER  National Foundation for Educational Research
NVQ   National Vocational Qualifications
O level GCSE Ordinary level
PE    Physical Education
PEA   Physical Education Association
PGCE  Post Graduate Certificate of Education
QTS   Qualified Teacher Status
RAA   Regional Arts Association
RAB   Regional Arts Board
RAD   Royal Academy of Dance
SCODHE Standing Conference on Dance in Higher Education;
SDTA  Southern Dance Teachers' Association
SEA   South East Arts
SEG   Southern Examinations Group
SWRB  Sadlers Wells Royal Ballet
TiE   Theatre in Education
PART 1
The dance artists in education movement has been a significant innovation which has developed from the initial work of a few pioneering companies to the point where the Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) maintained that "every dance company in receipt of revenue funding has an education programme and specialist staff" (ACGB, 1993, p1). However, in spite of this considerable expansion it is an area which in its complexity has been under-researched and not yet fully understood. The main authors in the field (Briginshaw et al, 1980; Hamby, 1980, 1981; Briginshaw, 1983; Hockey, 1987; and Sharp and Dust, 1990) all showed how certain issues reappeared over the years in a variety of contexts. Overall, a gap in the relationship between dance artists and dance educators has resulted in very few projects being viewed as unqualified successes. Hence, this research set out to investigate why the notion of partnerships has not been totally effective. It will do this through exploring instances of dance artists in education practice, and providing a test-bed against which the problems which emerged might be set. Identification, analysis and discussion of the issues raised will then lead to consideration of how future policy might be shaped, and finally to recommendations which might guide future practice.

Interest in the area arose through monitoring one of the initial ACGB pilot projects in 1980. The insight gained into the contribution of a particular company, and to the response of pupils and dance teachers, was deepened by in-depth knowledge of the dance tradition within the school. Further interest in the area developed through the initiation, organisation, planning and evaluation of residencies at the
then Brighton Polytechnic (see Chapter 3). It was this ongoing contact with dance artists, the ACGB and the Regional Arts Association (RAA) which led the ACGB to invite Chelsea School of Human Movement (CSHM), Brighton Polytechnic, to take part in the ACGB scheme. While it could be argued that the researcher's interest might lead to bias, the time span between the field work and submission of this thesis has distanced any personal involvement. Therefore, the research process, the collation of findings and interpretation of data will be treated objectively.

The study will draw upon historical research into related areas and in-depth research into a case study conducted in 1985. The overview of the field traces the parallel developments of dance in education and dance in the theatre: i.e. the two worlds within the dance artists in education partnership. The development of dance artists in education practice and the underlying beliefs of dance artists and dance educators. In particular, the attitudes of dance artists and dance educators will be crucial to the study as these were largely responsible for what took place.

The current education context, in which dance artists in education work occurred, has been influenced by developments over the last fifty years. The infiltration and upsurge of modern educational dance (MED) based on Laban's ideology provided the base on which dance in education was founded. This form of functioned under the physical education (PE) umbrella from the late 1940s through to the late 1960s and early 1970s. A critical phase followed when educators sought for well-founded principles upon which to base dance education. Paralleled by the arrival in Britain of the American modern dance genre educators found a new focus for dance education which reflected the professional training of contemporary dancers. However, a realisation that this shift of emphasis was too great led to a search for a conceptual framework for the study of dance, and to the emergence of the
dance as art model, thus dance education came to cohere around the central aspects of choreography, performance and appreciation. Complementary moves resulted in the relocation of dance away from PE and towards an arts orientation in both higher education and schools.

Such shifts underpinned the developing relationship between dance education and professional dance. However, in spite of the growing support for the dance as art model throughout the 1980s, the issue has become complicated further. While dance in the National Curriculum has been relocated under the PE umbrella, this has not precluded it from being taught within the school context as a subject in its own right or as part of an arts programme (Department for Education and Science [DES], 1992). Moreover, retention of the dance as art model as the predominate focus at secondary level has maintained the relationship between dance education and dance in the theatre. Furthermore, the inclusion of dance as a feature of the "Partnerships" (DES, 1992, p H1) initiative has moved dance artists in education practice onto another level.

The topic of the thesis also demands a parallel understanding of the artistic background to the dance artists in education movement. While the early foundations of the relationship between dance artists and dance educators were first nurtured between the wars, the spasmodic talks, lecture demonstrations and small performances given by dancers or dance students from the professional ballet world bore no relationship to dance in education. This position continued even though Ballet for All developed the lecture demonstration format in the early 1960s. Hence, at this time there was no overt attempt to influence any of the dance work that existed in schools\(^2\) (Brinson, 1982b).

It was only when a number of dance artists initiated early collaborative work in a new form of dance, called variously Central European Dance or Modern Dance, that the professional dance world started to bear a relationship to dance in education\(^3\). The work of Mimic Dance
Theatre [renamed British Dance Drama and then Educational Dance Drama Theatre Company (EDDT)], was particularly significant. As the first educational dance company to work almost entirely in schools its main contribution came from its educational focus and the external model it provided for teachers of MED\textsuperscript{4} (Bagley 1979). The initiative by Stuart Hopps to set up educational work within the framework of a professional theatre company was also crucial. Hopp's experiences were instrumental in his later involvement in the development of the initial ACGB Dance Artists in Education projects\textsuperscript{5} (Briginshaw, 1983).

However, questions only started to be raised about the void between the educational and the professional dance worlds when American Dance companies performed in London in the late 1950s and 1960s\textsuperscript{6}. The absence of a modern dance company in the British theatre prompted comparisons with the USA where professional dance was thriving and had an apparently close relationship with dance in education (Forster, 1957; Winearls, 1958; Briginshaw, 1983). Hence, the introduction of the modern dance genre into Britain in the late 1960s under the name of contemporary dance was crucial to future developments (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980). The impact of the American model and the impetus this provided led to the expansion of dance artists in education practice from the 1970s (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980; Briginshaw, 1983). An increasing interest in school-based work and the inclusion of participatory elements as a regular feature then paved the way for the growth of the dance artists in education movement (see Chapter 2).

The field work, based on a professional dance company's extended period of residency in CSHM, Brighton Polytechnic, is important to the case study. As this was a comprehensive and lengthy residency it included most of the features typical of other dance artists in education practice at both the macro- and micro- levels. Thus, the residency provided the opportunity to test the problems identified by Briginshaw
et al (1980) in the ACGB Dance Artists in Education Projects. Subsequently, these were compared with issues classified by Hockey (1987) and Sharp and Dust (1990).

Overall, the complex nature of the topic requires an integrated and multi-faceted approach to enable probing at various levels. To facilitate access to data four research methodologies will be used: namely the use of video recordings, observation techniques, interviews and questionnaires. However, as will become clear, these methodologies were reappraised while the study was in progress and tools constructed which allow for the identification, interpretation and comparison of data. Overall, the comparison of material between video recordings, observed recordings, interviews and to a lesser extent questionnaires will be seen to facilitate qualitative insights into the data and create an overall and trustworthy picture of the phenomenon.

Outline of the thesis.

In Part 1 a selective historical overview of the literature from the field provides insight into the dance artists in education movement. This clarifies the foundations, shifts and prevailing attitudes which influenced the contexts in which projects took place (Chapter 1). Consideration of the evolving relationship between dance in education and dance in the theatre traces and clarifies the changing nature of the association (Chapter 2).

Part 2 provides an understanding of the positions from which the case study partners each approached the project (Chapters 3). An overview of the residency highlights the principles on which it was based and the processes and activities that took place (Chapter 4). Reflection upon the research process enables the epistemological and technical concerns which arose from the four main research tools to be addressed (Chapter 5). Consideration of data from the case study, based
largely on the findings from the video recordings and the observed sessions, reveals topics which require further attention (Chapter 6).

In Part 3 themes drawn together from Part 1 inform discussion of those that emanated from the case study. Discussion of the central issue of aims, objectives and evaluation reveals the confusions which arose, the inequality of the partners and the effects this has had on planning (Chapter 7). Examination of the many and diverse project activities under the fundamental organising concepts of performance, choreography and appreciation exposes diverse practices (Chapter 8). Consideration of the multi-faceted roles faced in project situations revealed the expectations and confusions which arose (Chapter 9). Overall, the debate in Part 3 underpinned the discussion that was to follow on future policy.

Since many of the previous disparate elements had been fully referenced in the preceding Chapters it was felt redundant to cross-reference in Part 4 of the thesis. At this point issues which arose from Parts 1, 2 and 3 were pulled together into a coherent argument on which future policy might be based. Hence, discussion focused on principles which could underpin the establishment of good practice and future work (Chapter 10). Consideration of new parameters for the design of projects preceded exploration of alternative approaches for planning curriculum content (Chapter 11). This led to discussion of the controversial issue of training for dance artists and dance educators (Chapter 12). Finally, the previous debate provided the base for recommendations which could guide future policy and practice (Chapter 13). Reflections on the study in general and proposals for future research conclude the thesis.

Reference to the many institutions, organising bodies etc. throughout the study has necessitated the use of abbreviations. Each title is given in full in the first instance and thereafter (in general) the abbreviation has been used (exceptions occur when the term has been used in the
title of a book or as a heading or sub heading for the thesis). A complete list has been presented in the Glossary. It should also be noted that some dance companies, institutions and organising bodies were renamed during the course of the study. In order to facilitate access for future researchers, these are referred to in the text by the name for the appropriate period of time. For example, reference is made to Ballet Rambert until 1985 when it changed its name to Rambert Dance Company. Referral to the RAA and to the more recently named RAB is chronological in Part 1 and Part 2. In Part 3 both terms are used when the issues raised emerged from both RAAs and RABs. In contrast, the current term RAB has been used throughout Part 4.

Similarly, as the thesis moves from an historical background to present day and future considerations, Part 4 is written in the present tense to confront the tensions which currently exist.

Throughout, end-notes are used when necessary to illuminate the text.

Notes.

1 The author was co-ordinator of the Expressive Arts department and head of dance at Wakeford School, Havant. She returned to the school as a monitor for the ACGB pilot project held there in 1980.

2 This group was an extension of the lectures and lecture demonstrations provided by the Royal Ballet School during the early 1960s. On receipt of Gulbenkian Foundation funding in 1964 Ballet for All established itself on a permanent basis and toured small theatres, schools and colleges throughout the country (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980). The group ceased to function in 1979 because of the numerous groups which started to work in education (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980).
For example, Kurt Jooss, who had trained with Laban from 1922-1923 and then in classical ballet in Paris and had his own dance company, undertook some work in higher education (Dove, 1975). Other exponents of modern dance taught in education contexts on a more regular basis, as for example Harmel and Loman (Harrold, 1966).

This company worked on a part-time (1954–1957) and then on a full-time basis (1957–1980). The Movement Teaching Unit started as a pilot scheme in 1970 and became formalised in 1974 on receipt of a Gulbenkian Foundation grant. This group took demonstration classes with pupils and in-service courses for teachers. Apart from this there had been little work involving substantial practical audience participation (Bagley, 1980). The group disbanded in April 1980 when the ACGB withdrew funding on the grounds that it no longer met the necessary technical standards (Briginshaw, 1983).

Stuart Hopps pioneered the formation of Scottish Ballet's first education group, Moveable Workshop, 1973-1975 (later to become the Scottish Ballet (Cope, 1976)).

Ruth Forster (1957), in a conference address, maintained that the experience of students in dance was limited as they were unable to see the work of choreographers or dancers working within the same form of dance as they practised. Jane Winearls (1958), in the introduction to her book on the Jooss-Leeder dance technique, noted the gap between what took place in education and the professional theatre dance world.
Chapter 1

Dance in Education.

1.1 Introduction.

An appreciation of the changing concept of dance education over the past fifty years is crucial to an understanding of the development of the dance artists in education movement. The past and present relationships between dance artists and dance educators are largely reliant upon the attitudes and knowledge of the partners involved and the context in which projects take place. These affect the principles, the design and the interpretation of dance artists in education programmes. The purpose of this chapter is to trace the changes which have taken place in dance education from MED to the dance as art model. Current initial teacher training and Inservice provision are also considered to clarify the present stance adopted by the education profession in any partnership with the professional dance world. Hence, this chapter catalogues the background to the projects.

1.2 Shifts in the conceptual basis of dance education.

Smith explained that over the past four decades there have been discernible shifts in the conceptual basis, aims, contents, methodologies and in the procedures for assessment of dance in education.

Smith, 1987, p 101
As will become apparent, the changes Smith identified encompassed a move from an emphasis on various child-centred ideas to three models of dance: dance as a means of aesthetic education within a PE context; dance as art within artistic contexts such as Expressive or Performance Arts, and dance as a multi-faceted activity within a Humanities context.

MED, based on Rudolph Laban's analysis of movement, provided the foundation for the development of dance education for girls under the PE umbrella from the late 1940s. Webb (1967) outlined how acceptance of Laban's ideas by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in the early 1950s underpinned the advancement of MED. From that time it became a central part of specialist Physical Training/PE studies for women training to teach within secondary schools, and an area of study in non-specialist colleges. As Adshead (1980) explained, this paved the way for the almost total and unreserved adoption of MED within the broader sphere of women's PE by many educators for almost two decades.

Although a detailed definitive account of the introduction and development of MED into the United Kingdom has yet to be written, Webb (1967) and Adshead (1981) both correctly identified the widespread influence that Laban and Lisa Ullmann had on furthering its growth. The nature of Laban's theories put forward in Modern Educational Dance (Laban, 1948) and Mastery Of Movement On The Stage (Laban 1950) was reflected in publications from MOE: Physical Education in the Primary Years (MOE, 1953), Part 1 Moving and Growing (MOE, 1952) and Part 2 Planning the Programme (MOE, 1953). These placed an emphasis on either 'movement as an art', or on 'dance', or on 'Movement to Music' (MOE, 1952, pp 67-71; 1953...

The essential characteristic of the MED model of dance advocated by Laban and his disciples from the 1940s to the 1960s was the emphasis on a child-centred process of dancing and its experiential contribution to the development of the moving/feeling qualities of individuals. Hence, movement concepts derived from, for example, contrasting effort actions were considered to be important contributions in the all round development of the physical, emotional and social dimensions of the person. To facilitate this process, educators provided dance environments which encouraged spontaneous, self-expression and individual creativity complemented by group work focused on a shared experience. But as McFee (1994, p 112) explained, its main contribution came through "methods of teaching based on child-centredness and a particular analysis of what was crucial in
understanding dance movements".

While there was justice in the idea that some of Laban's ideas were of pedagogic importance, educators such as Preston (1966) and Layson (1966) started to voice publicly their worries about the critical state and future of MED. In particular, Layson (1966) urged for an objective examination of Laban's work, identified the need for the aims and purpose of MED to be rethought, pushed for dance to be recognised at General Certificate of Education (GCE) "O" and "A" levels, and supported dance as part of the emerging B.Ed. degree. These arguments paved the way for further investigation into the principles on which MED was based by Curl (1966, 1967a, 1967b, 1968a, 1968b, 1969) and Redfern (1973a).

Such questioning led dance in education to a crucial period in the late 1960s and 1970s as lecturers in higher education started to reappraise the prevailing dance philosophy and practice. However, while this reflected growing concern about MED, it also mirrored the rigorous examination of educational objectives and the changes taking place in teacher education at that time. The initiation of three year training courses as the norm for potential teachers enabled in-depth (frequently termed "main" level) dance studies to be offered in general colleges of education as well as specialist PE colleges. Subsequently, Adshead (1983, p3) identified that by "1973 more than 100 colleges of education and specialist PE colleges offered dance within the teacher education programme".

As the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980) revealed, throughout this surge of development the majority of teachers of dance for the secondary age range still came from specialist colleges of PE. Subsequently, these teachers had themselves participated in dance
courses which placed a focus on acquiring practical experience of Laban's movement theories together with suitable teaching content and method for use in schools. But, as Adshead (1980) and the Gulbenkian (1980) report identified, discrepancies occurred between the length, breadth, depth and focus of dance study in both subject and professional curriculum courses. Such an inconsistent approach to the study of dance within higher education had repercussions on what took place in schools for, as the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980) stated,

> initial teacher training followed by adequate In-service training as the future of maintained dance education in Britain.

Gulbenkian, 1980 p 76.

1.3 The search for a new model of dance education.

Wilson (1969) claimed the critical scrutiny of Laban's theories identified in 1.2 led to a crucial period as educators recognised the urgent need for well founded principles on which to base dance education, the classification of objectives and a suitable methodology for dance study. While Reid's (1969a, 1969b, 1970a, 1970b, 1971, 1973, 1974) aesthetic debate indicated a way forward, other theorists such as Curl (1973a, 1973b, 1973c), Brooke, Whiting and Bruce (1973), Best (1974), Redfern (1975a, 1976a, 1976b) and Renshaw (1973) widened the discourse to include dance as aesthetic education within a PE context. As Renshaw (1973, 1978) explained, any practical activity which involved the body moving could fulfil these criteria since the aesthetic was considered to be a wider concept than that of art. Hence, dance forms now took on a movement orientation which placed them amongst a number of activities such as
gymnastics, games, swimming, and athletics.

Adshead helped to clarify the distinctiveness between "art" and the "aesthetic" when she explained that

while all forms of dance might be said to be aesthetic they do not all fulfil the requirements of art and indeed do not exist for that purpose.

Adshead, 1981a, p 78

This position was respected by McFee (1994). He showed how in this approach young people were expected to appreciate qualities of movement without resource to its intention. But he too claimed that movement had to be transformed from aestheticised movement into dance as art before it could become a form of artistic expression. Hence, when interpreted in practice, the aestheticised movement approach neither emphasised the distinctiveness of dance nor presented young people with guidance about what they were to create or to feel. Even so, Tribe (1978, 1981) maintained that a growing number of educators showed an increasing interest in dance as a means of aesthetic education.

Throughout the mid and late 1970s dance, as aestheticised movement, became further developed for the Human Movement Studies discipline approach. This resulted in dance becoming subsumed under psychological or social/anthropological or historical or philosophical headings and to it being studied from the perspectives of one or other of these established disciplines. As Adshead argued, dance under this umbrella term

lays emphasis on other disciplines and does not necessarily inform the student about the structure of dance itself in any depth.

Adshead, 1981a p 68
But at this time the conceptual structures which surrounded dance were not given any credence, and dance was not yet accorded a separate discipline status.

The search by higher education for a new conceptual base for the study of dance was partially influenced by forces outside the education system. A very different picture of the aims, content and methodologies of dance in education emerged with the shift of focus to the technique based contemporary dance American model. The emerging image of dance as a theatre art, exemplified in the development of American modern dance in Britain, placed an emphasis on technique and dance products which displayed technical skills within a given idiom rather than the process of dancing. This fuelled debate about the nature of dance taught within the education system and the relevance of dance to society in general. Significantly this gave dance educators in Britain the first public theatre art model of a modern dance genre to which they could relate.

Smith's (1987) claim that the move away from MED was gradual reinforced Russell's (1974) perception of the crystallised position of those who resisted the new thinking and continued to follow the expressive model. But as Howlett and Howlett (1983) revealed, other teachers who struggled with the theory, practice and teaching of MED turned to the American model. Smith (1987) also reaffirmed how educators took the opportunities provided at the many courses and conferences organised during this period to learn a range of contemporary techniques and procedures of teaching choreography. Subsequently, those educators who acquired new knowledge and executant expertise started to emanate demonstrations of modern dance technique such as Graham. Thus as educators moved away
from "process" as in the "orthodox" MED model to dance "products" the professional world increasingly dominated developments. However, critics such as Ross (1975) and Williams (1976) voiced their concern when they questioned the educational value of young people being indoctrinated in the prescribed training model of professional dancers. As Williams (1976) revealed, the key issue was both what and how technique was taught, and the problems which arose because of the varied uses and meaning given to the term. These anxieties were reiterated by Smith (1987, p 101) a decade later. She revealed how examination work for degrees and Certificate of Secondary Education (CSE) assessments in the mid 1970s exemplified the use of defined exercises, movement phrases from classwork, and the use of "somewhat watered down contemporary techniques" in dances produced and performed by candidates. Such practice was fuelled partially by the infiltration of the American model and the early work of dance artists in education (see 2.2).

However, in the early to mid 1970s writers such as Redfern (1973a, b, c) reappraised just how far the pendulum had swung from MED to what was now termed "modern dance" 4.

Redfern (1975a) strove to maintain the balance when she warned educators about the total swing to the theatre art model. In doing so she urged for the importance of process as well as product, the ability to make structured wholes which had meaning for both spectator and performer, and the capability to appreciate created forms. Such arguments prompted a move away from the training emphasis of the American model and a search for a new focus. This, together with the changes taking place in higher education, resulted in a drastic rethinking of the aims, content and methodologies for dance in education. Adshead's (1981a) radical proposal for a
conceptual framework placed dance study within a specific contextual framework, and placed an equality of emphasis on the three stands of choreography, performance and appreciation. This satisfied both artistic and educational criteria, placed a focus on the process of creating and the product, and enabled dance to contribute towards the aesthetic development of individuals. As Adshead argued,

If a form of dance similar to that in the theatre, e.g. ballet or modern dance, is taught, then it is argued that the justification might be within the realm of art education since dance in the theatre is accepted as art.

Adshead, 1981a p 26

A decade later, Smith (1987), Jobbins and Smith-Autard (1993) reaffirmed this tripartite approach with its focus on technique, choreography and appreciation had become the common core of most dance study in higher education and in schools.

A further shift occurred which retained the centrality of the art model while widening the vision of dance education. Adshead's (1981a) argument for dance to be placed under a Humanities umbrella embraced the study of dance in many contexts such as community, educational, recreational, religious, social, theatrical, therapeutic, traditional etc. However, since the changing context altered the nature of the dance and what it was most about a different emphasis came to be placed on choreography, performance and appreciation. As this approach permeated degree courses and then work in schools a growing emphasis has been placed on young people acquiring an understanding of the comprehensive nature of dance through reference to a wide range of dance styles. Hence, at General Certificate of Education (GCSE) Ordinary (O), Advanced (A) and Advanced Supplementary (A/S) level, a growing focus has been placed on the
cultural context of dance through the inclusion of such dance styles as traditional, social, African or South Asian. Moreover, the broad social/historical context, together with artistic and cultural manifestations, have been written into the dance programmes of PE in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) and the recent guidelines for dance issued by the ACGB (1993).

1.4 Expansion and consolidation: the dance as art model.

As Adshead (1980, 1981b, 1981c, 1981d) identified the B.Ed., B.A. and B.Hums. degree courses engaged students in the total art form of theatre dance as a publicly derived phenomenon. While initially embraced mainstream forms of modern dance (i.e. Graham and Cunningham) they widened to include the post modern genre of the late 1970s and 1980s. In general, practical and theoretical studies focused on dance making, dancing and dance appreciation. As Adshead (1981a) and the Council for National Academic Awards (CNNA) (1992) document revealed, dance making, frequently termed either choreography or composition, provided students with the experience, understanding and ability to create dances. Performance aspects enabled young people to develop interpretative and executant skills. Hence, when performing or choreographing, students were expected to be immersed in, and to utilise, techniques and a set of principles taken from the professional dance world. This was complemented with appreciation aspects to enable students to come to an understanding of appropriate stylistic conventions and meanings fundamental to knowing about dance. Thus, as the study of established and esteemed works became an essential part of dance
study students were expected to identify the salient features of a specific work, or to make clear and objective evaluations of a dance or the specific aspects studied. However, while performance, choreography and appreciation were at times separated as independent activities the interrelationship between the three remained vital. For example, both appraisal and performance played a central role in the choreographic process. Adshead (1981b, 1981c) also explained that some courses were further supplemented with a concentration on other forms of dance and/or consideration of historical and social contexts. But overall, as study of Western theatre dance remained predominant, the education climate in Higher Education was appropriate for the initiation, and development of the dance artists in education movement.

A parallel shift of focus to dance as art at secondary level also enabled dance knowledge to be related to the “external” world. White (1977) revealed that this was reflected in examination syllabi for the GCSE “O” level. These focused on the theoretical and practical elements emanating from ballet and modern dance as exemplified in the western theatre. The proliferation of the GCSE examinations that followed in the late 1980s further reflected the influence of higher education. For example, in 1990 the Southern Examining Board syllabi included study of the repertoire of particular choreographers and companies together with critical appraisal of modern theatre dance. Two years later Briginshaw and Paine (1992) showed how the then newly rationalised GCSE dance syllabus administered by the Northern Examining Board continued this trend through retention of an emphasis on choreography, performance and appreciation. Hence, while the board no longer named a dance style or period or set work to study a focus remained on the professional dance world. This came
through the wide range of practical and theoretical content, the set tasks and sample examination questions. Hence, there remained an assumption that educators could acquaint young people with specific insight into the repertoire of individual choreographers and companies. This has repercussions for this thesis (see 8.4).

Similarly, A/S level examinations in dance by the University of London Examinations Board from 1986 and June 1990, respectively also focused on dance as a theatre art. Again both syllabi remained firmly rooted in either the classical or modern theatre art forms and were based on the central concepts of performance, choreography, and appreciation. However, a further dimension was added to the A/S level through candidates being given the opportunity to go beyond theatre genres and to study dance in a wider cultural context.

Bull (1989) and Stevens (1990) reflected that a growing number of pupils have taken GCSE “A” and “A/S” examinations in dance and that dance has also extended into Performance/Expressive Arts syllabi. This, together with the dance as art approach, has made four contributions to education. First, it enabled young people to acquire a sound base of dance knowledge and thus raised standards of making, performing and appreciating dance work. Second, it resulted in an emphasis being placed on dance in the theatre. Third, the conceptual approach has influenced curriculum development throughout both the lower and upper secondary school. Fourth, this new way of thinking made dance educators increasing aware of the need for a resourced-based teaching approach.

The main premise which underpinned the resourced-based teaching approach was that reference to exemplars of the public world of theatre dance could be made pertinent to pupils, and that dance
knowledge could be acquired through visual experience and discursive interchange as well as by physical participation. As Smith (1991) argued, the use of masterworks which demonstrated particular features, qualities or styles both complemented and extended the knowing acquired in practical work. This enabled pupils to become aware of shared public reference as their knowledge of dance as art extended beyond the classroom. In turn, this gave young people a framework of reference within which individual perceptions of dance works could be organised. For example, knowledge of a variety of styles and conventions which characterise theatre dance extended the boundaries of young people to the concept of dance as art.

Overall, support from dance educators has led to masterworks being used as a central feature in the teaching of dance as an art form, and particularly in the development of choreography, performance and appreciation. Equally important, this model has fostered a methodology which encompassed a coming together of both the process and product model. While process enabled movement to be personally created, products (i.e. dances) were now formed in relation to publicly referenced criteria. Hence, communication of ongoing and final choreographic work only had relevance when it met accepted artistic criteria. Overall, the growth of the resourced-based teaching approach has significance for this thesis as it has provided a fertile area for the interchange with the professional dance world. This is explored in Chapter 8 and Chapter 11.

1.5 The relationship of dance with PE and the arts.

Criticism of MED and a parallel growing disenchantment of its placement within the PE context was a primary focus of debate when
education departments in polytechnics and colleges diversified into non-teaching qualifications. Reid's (1970a) argument that dance as art could not logically be conceived as part of PE supported moves in higher education to study dance as an autonomous subject or to incorporate it into an arts area for degree work at a variety of levels (see 1.4). Adshead (1983) revealed how the Robbins Report (1963), the phasing out of the Certificate of Education and its replacement by an all-graduate profession together with the emergence of a new validation body, the CNAA, forced dance courses from predominantly teacher training to alternative models. But significantly, diversification raised possibilities of dance as art as an area not related to schooling. This separated the study of dance for use in schools from dance as a study in its own right which had no direct relevance to what took place in primary or secondary education. Hence, the shift from the study of MED to a focus on dance as art (see 1.3, 1.4) was paralleled in some institutions with dance becoming a minor or major area of study in a Creative/Expressive/Performance Arts B.A. (Hons.) degree.

Cole (1978) disclosed that parallel moves also took place in secondary education from the late 1960s. However, while Ross (1975) and Hamby (1978a, 1978b, 1878c, 1979) urged for placement of dance in the arts area arguments of the practical disadvantages of such a move continued to retain dance within PE. As Adshead (1981b, 1981c) explained this view was reinforced as most B.Ed. (Hons.) courses remained under the umbrella of PE. However, recognition that the artistic demands of the subject had increased caused educators such as Glaister (1987) to argue for a more arts-oriented placement in the belief that dance was no longer the exclusive concern of PE departments. Glaister (1987, p 106) summed up the dilemma when, in tracing the development of dance education, she ultimately asked.
"will PE always encompass both sport and dance, or will dance move to the performing arts or stand on its own?".

While Smith (1991) maintained that this concern remained an ongoing contentious issue this must be viewed in the light of recent developments. Jobbins and Smith-Auturd (1993) claimed that the consensus view of dance teachers over the last two decades emphasised the artistic nature of dance and the conceptual approach to dance education. Moreover, as Stevens (1990) maintained this resulted in a growing move to place dance alongside other arts subjects which use a similar conceptual basis. This view was strongly supported by The Arts in Schools Project, directed by Dr Ken Robinson, now Professor of Arts Education at the University of Warwick. Indeed, the formalisation of a coherent arts policy by this project, which included dance, took this argument further. However, while this proposition has gained considerable ground, dance has been written into the National Curriculum as one of the generic activities of PE (DES, 1992). Hence, Brinson's (1991) anxieties that the historical tradition prevented dance from removing itself from PE were reaffirmed. But while there may be some truth in this position, McFee (1994) suggested that this was two demands not one. He maintained that when dance appeared in schools it was quite compatible with it being part of PE, even though it would be the only art within this discipline.

The main differences between dance taught within a PE or arts area have repercussions for this thesis. The different beliefs, attitudes, and practice of educators who considered dance to be part of PE stemmed from their own immersion in MED philosophy and practice in initial teacher training courses within PE contexts. This has affected to a
greater or lesser degree the relationships between dance educators and dance artists. To reiterate a point made earlier, under the PE umbrella dance has moved through a series of shifts from MED to dance as art. But while the experiential nature of MED has diminished, many of its practices have continued to surround what might be regarded as a dance as art approach. Indeed, a good deal of dance practice in schools (which stemmed from MED) emphasised the importance of the pupil's own creative activity. This was often to the exclusion of developing this understanding, or the appreciation of existing works, or deepening knowledge of cultural practices and conventions in the arts. The argument which continued to underpin this approach was that the concern of dance education was the development of pupils' unique individuality through encouraging them to express their own ideas and feelings. Hence, as Smith (1991) explained, through this approach young people were expected to experience a greater awareness of movement, to extend their range of bodily facility, and to improve their confidence. This approach emphasised the primacy of the process over product, of what was happening to the child in the course of his/her dance activities rather than emphasising the product itself. This was overlaid with the expectation that involvement in dance (as in the process of MED) was useful for the attainment of larger, more general goals shared with other aspects of education. Hence, through dance young people were expected to acquire personal and social skills such as interrelating with others; be involved in learning processes such as problem-solving, decision-making etc.; and develop creativity and the education of feeling.

In contrast, while the dance as art model amalgamated some of the above "educational" elements, the "professional" model it also
introduced new elements. Smith (1990, p3) argued that "its distinctiveness lies in the concept of dance as art education contributing towards aesthetic feeling". As the three stranded approach of choreographing, performing and appreciating now provided the conceptual basis for dance study a balance was striven for between creating, performing and viewing dances. This has placed a greater concern on the product, since the quality of what is produced has become a major source for appraising what pupils have learned. This has also led to an overall concern for young people to appreciate dances as art works, i.e. both their own and those produced by professional dance artists for performance settings. Furthermore, the scope of dance study, also widened to include a focus on cultural learning. Overall this had led to a view that dance education has a unique contribution to the education of young people.

Many who favoured the dance as art approach have also argued for the placement of dance within an arts area. Under this context the uniqueness of dance has been emphasised and pupils have been offered the possibility of dance understanding and of making informed artistic judgements. Moreover, as McFee (1994) explained, the justification of the distinctive rationale for dance as an artistic, rather than an aesthetic or cultural activity, also gave an indication of the style of dance to be included. As Burke (1991) argued, dance educators have to get the selection right as only some kinds of dance experience offer opportunities for choreographing, performance and appreciation. But each of these has to be satisfied if the dance experience is to be worthwhile.

While Jobbins and Smith-Autard (1993) revealed that many teachers have adopted the dance as art approach others have had difficulty in
accepting this model for a number of reasons. Brinson's (1991) argument that the distinctive nature of dance has been determined by its placement in the curriculum and influenced by the training and ideologies of initial teacher training courses followed by educators helped to clarify the position. There continued to be a number of reasons which might explain the reluctance of PE teachers to involve themselves in the dance as art practice. First, those who were immersed in MED as students retained MED, or quasi-MED, practice in the belief that the content and methodologies of the dance as art approach were inappropriate for use in schools. Second, they did not have a sound enough dance knowledge base on which to found their teaching. Third, as suggested by McFee (1994, p 71), PE teachers in general "do not see dance as centrally their business, they perceive its distinctiveness, and do not wish to accommodate it". Fourth, dance education has a distinctive identity and provides unique possibilities which are different from other PE activities. These last two points were significant since, as McFee (1994) claimed, they continued to underpin the negative attitudes of some PE teachers towards dance. These points also reaffirmed why some teachers have found it difficult to support dance artists in education practice. For example, they questioned the focus of work, the content, and the methodologies associated with a contemporary dance training model.

1.6 Dance in the National Curriculum.

Stevens (1990) recorded the steps taken to safeguard the place of dance within the National Curriculum by the Interim Working Group to the British Council of PE (BCPE, 1990), and a consortium of four
associations specifically concerned with dance in education. Simultaneous consultations by the consortium with the Art and Music Working groups, plus a combined arts lobby for an interim working party to formulate a coherent arts policy, which included dance, did not lead to way forward. Subsequently, the National Curriculum forced dance back to its original PE context in spite of the development from the 1970s of dance as art and as a subject study within Expressive/ Creative/ Performing arts areas.

The final Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) document addressed the range and content of a modern PE course from 5-16. As such it covered a wide grouping of related generic subject areas which complemented and contrasted one another. Crucially for dance education the contribution of dance to the broadly based programme was clearly identified. In spite of an apparent change of focus to a more movement orientated and process based approach the notion of PE (which included dance) has been flexible enough to encompass artistic, aesthetic and cultural factors. Hence, placement of dance within a broad social and historical context has allowed it to be studied as an artistic and cultural manifestation. Programmes of study have addressed the very significant and important role of dance as an art form and as a more broadly based cultural phenomenon. Even so, as Curl (1991a, 1992b) explained, the requirements of the National Curriculum did not alleviate the concerns of the consortium, and more specialised dance educators have been less than satisfied with the place and content of dance within PE. In particular, the wide ranging nature of the PE attainment targets failed to address the particular needs of dance. Moreover, the decision that dance would not be compulsory for all pupils in Key Stage (KS) 3, i.e. for pupils from twelve to fourteen years
of age, had far reaching consequences. It removed any guarantee that boys would have equal access to dance in the secondary school despite the increasing emphasis placed on this aspect from the mid 1980s.

However, the added emphasis on accountability of teachers, the retention of the dance as art model at secondary level, the Statutory Order allowing dance to be targeted as a subject in its own right or as part of an arts programme, and the inclusion of "Partnerships" (DES 1992, p H1) with outside agencies has been significant. This has maintained the relationship between dance education and dance in the theatre. Hence, the National Curriculum could provide a fertile ground for the development of dance in education, and the maturation of partnerships. The importance of these proposals for this thesis are returned to in Chapters 10 and 11.

1.7. **Current position in teacher education: Dance.**

The conclusion of the CNAA report, *Dance in Degree Courses in Polytechnics and Colleges: a review of present practice and future development* (CNAA, 1992) noted the decline in initial teacher education in dance. It revealed that by 1992 only four education courses from former specialist PE colleges remained within the then polytechnic structure. While each course continued to follow subject study based on PE, preparation for teaching dance varied in relation to the time allocated and to the depth of specialism that students selected to follow. Courses generally followed a dance as art approach although tinged at times with a MED bias. While participants have
been both men and women, the former rarely studied dance in more in-depth programmes. Hence, as Stevens (1990) claimed, as most teachers of dance continued to come through the PE·route, dance educators in secondary schools remained predominantly female, the degree of specialism varied, and little has been done to rectify the gender bias in education.

In contrast, the alternative route into teacher education which emerged for the dance teachers has become significant. Although Adshead (1981c) identified that the Post Graduate Certificate of Education (PGCE) was widened to include dance the needs of the secondary age range were largely ignored until the mid 1980s. Three courses then developed which offered dance as a main method of subject study for this specific age range. From 1983 Liverpool Polytechnic offered a PE course which also catered for the special needs of dance teachers. From 1984 and 1985 Bedford College of Higher Education and CSHM/Brighton Polytechnic, respectively, offered courses designed with the prime intent to furnish the teaching profession with specialist dance teachers. These were a direct response to the growing body of graduates who emerged from degree courses in dance, and to the demand from schools for secondary trained teachers who could teach examination work. Together these two courses have provided a steady, albeit small, number of teachers to the field who, because of their particular expertise, have been appointed mainly to posts within Expressive/Creative/Performance arts departments. Since they were originally trained in dance study such teachers embodied in themselves something of the interface between the dance artist and educator. This is important for the future development of dance artists in education and as such is returned to in Chapter 10.
In-service work for qualified teachers has also played an important part in the development of dance education. A wide range of additional courses have focused to a greater or lesser degree on knowledge of dance and its application to various age groups. Those which have led to certificate or diploma awards validated by a higher education establishment have tended to be career orientated. Others of a much shorter duration have been essentially concerned with the updating of theoretical and practical knowledge in relation to current professional practice. These have been mainly organised by PE advisers, or higher education institutions, or particular dance organisations such as the NDTA. While in-service training has been threatened by changes in government policy and funding procedures, the National Curriculum has made such provision even more important. More specifically it has repercussions for working with dance artists in education and thus for the findings of this thesis.

1.8 Summary.

The conclusion to be reached from this chapter is that the historical development of dance in education over the last four decades has largely informed what takes place today. The attitudes, beliefs and practice of dance educators reflect the shifts in balance that have occurred from MED through the various changes outlined to the current consensus view of dance as art in education. In particular, the change to the current emphasis on the conceptual basis of the dance as art phenomenon is identified together with the parallel shift of dance moving away from physical education. While these innovations almost always started in higher education they gradually filtered down to schools. Here they became reflected in the different focus of
examination work and in resourced-based teaching approach. Such moves were also reflected in the development of the dance artists in education movement discussed in Chapter 2. However, despite the advances made in terms of conceptualisation and placement, the PE in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) document returns dance back to its original context. As indicated current developments in teacher education are significant as the products of teacher training are the key people in the education side of the dance educator/dance artist interface. Significantly, the new PGCE courses with dance as a first subject study widen the concept of the specialist dance teacher and their potential for relationships with dance artists. Similarly, the need for in-service provision is highlighted with specific reference to the demands of the National Curriculum. Overall, the scene is set for the discussion of the development of dance artists in education in Chapter 2.

Notes


2 Together with Outdoor Pursuits these activities are considered to be the core subjects of PE.


3 This could be viewed as a rearguard protection of Laban’s ideas and was reaffirmed further in other books published in the MED vein (see 1.2).

4 Dance in education has come full circle and returned to its original title Modern Dance. While MED became synonymous
with dance in education based on the Laban model, the term "educational" was removed in the 1970s to distinguish trends towards the emerging model of dance influenced by the professional American modern dance idiom. Hence, modern dance from the mid 1970s became synonymous with dance as art.

The Consortium was made up of delegates from the Council for Dance Education and Training (CDET), the National Association for Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE) Dance Section, the National Dance Teachers' Association (NDTA) and the Standing Conference on Dance in Higher Education (SCODHE). This joint body voiced its concern to the DES and the National Curriculum Council (NCC) that dance was redescribed as part of PE. The Interim Working Group of the British Council of PE was chaired by Elizabeth Murdoch, Head of Chelsea School of Human Movement, Brighton Polytechnic.
Chapter 2.

The Relationship between Dance in Education and Dance in the Theatre: the mid-1960s to early 1990s.

2.1 Introduction.

An understanding of the history of the dance artists in education movement is important for this thesis as it reveals the relationship between dance in education and dance in the theatre. While this was first nurtured between the 1920s and 1930s, education work with dance artists only started to take place on a more consistent basis from the early 1960s (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980). Prior to this period neither the matinees nor the infrequent lecture tours of the major ballet companies were intentionally focused towards an audience primarily from education, and performances in schools by smaller companies were mainly for financial reasons (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980; Briginshaw, 1983). Until this time there was no specific educational direction and no attempt to present ballet as a resource for, or as a form of, dance in education (Briginshaw, 1983). Even when dance artists from a Laban-based background started to provide an external model for dance in education there was no large scale professional company to which educators and/or pupils could relate. It was only after the introduction of "contemporary dance"\(^1\) into Britain in the mid-1960s that the work of dance artists in education started to expand
and to build on the use of the lecture demonstration format pioneered by Ballet for All (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980).

From the mid-1960s the tentative relationship between dance artists and dance educators manifest in the early dance artists in education movement started to consolidate and expand. Even so at the start of the 1990s Brinson (Davies, 1990) maintained that the education work of many companies continued to be symptomatic of the inward-looking focus of the theatre dance world. In particular, he stressed the need for companies to upgrade their priorities for education work, urged the ACGB to encourage companies to revamp both their policies and methodologies, and made a plea for dance artists to improve contact with dance education.

This chapter aims to trace what led to statement through plotting the significant developments from the mid-1960s to the present day. It also traces the response initiated by the ACGB for the artistic world, plots the reaction of educators at crucial conferences, and reveals the initiatives which sprang from education schemes.

2.2 Setting the scene: the growth of dance artists in education, 1960s-1970s.

Clarke (1966) explained how the modern dance genre imported from America, based on the principles of technique and choreographic training developed by Martha Graham, led to the emergence of contemporary dance in Great Britain. This new form of dance influenced the formation, by Robin Howard, of the Contemporary Dance Trust (CDT) in London, the growth of Contemporary Dance Group (CDG), the London Contemporary
Dance Theatre (LCDT), and the London School of Contemporary Dance (LSCD) (Clarke, 1966). While contemporary dance also became manifest in the theatre in the work of Ballet Rambert this company continued for a while to be influenced by its past.

The combined influence of LCDT and Ballet Rambert and their specific contribution should not be underestimated. Their significant effect on other companies can be classified into five main groupings. First, the use of the lecture demonstration format, initially pioneered by Ballet for All, became extended by both LCDT and Ballet Rambert prior to being used by other companies (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980; Brigmanshaw, 1983). Cohan used it as the means through which he introduced, explained and demonstrated contemporary dance to the wider audience met by CDG as it toured schools and colleges throughout the country. This lecture demonstration group, together with the growth of the company, provided the first opportunity for dance tutors and students to see an example of the modern dance genre in the British theatre. Likewise, Ballet Rambert's focus on appreciation aspects in lecture demonstrations exemplified its reorientation from a classical to a contemporary company (Gulbenkian Foundation report, 1980). Specifically designed matinee programmes in regional theatres initially emphasised technique and rehearsals. When these expanded to include a focus on repertoire the unpredictably wide range of the audience posed problems in planning, format and delivery (Mann, 1982).

Second, the ACGB upheld LCDT and Ballet Rambert as models for others to follow. The early work of both companies was cited as examples of what could be achieved in creating and establishing
audiences for contemporary dance (ACGB, 1978/9). Encouragement to undertake educational work as a successful form of marketing resulted in other groups adapting the LCDT/Ballet Rambert models for their own use (Cope, 1976; Briginshaw, 1983). Such companies then made their own particular contribution. For example, both Scottish Ballet's Moveable Workshop and Scottish Ballet's Workshop built participatory elements into workshops and provided detailed notes for teachers. This marked the first attempt by dance artists to influence directly what was taught in schools (Cope, 1976; Briginshaw, 1983).

Third, an increase in activity and diversity of practice was exemplified by Ballet Rambert when it set up two special groups to produce and to perform specially designed children's programmes. One, Bertram Batell's Sideshow, offered lecture demonstrations and taught workshops in schools and colleges. The other, the smaller Ballet Rambert Dance Unit worked almost entirely within the education context. Such initiatives paved the way for groups which offered a performance orientated programme within education contexts (ACGB, 1981a; Briginshaw, 1983). In particular, the work of Ludus, a "dance in education" group was important on several levels. This was one of the few dance groups with anything in common with the alternative, small fringe theatre, community arts and Theatre in Education (T:E) projects which emerged in the late 1960s and flourished in the 1970s. All its work was intentionally orientated towards an audience in an educational setting and the social and political content or message was as important as the dance performed and its execution. Equally significant was its potential impact on curriculum development through the substantial and detailed written material provided for
both teachers and pupils (Briginshaw, 1983). Small-scale companies specialising in education work also emerged (ACGB, 1981a). Non-revenue-funded companies, dance and mime artists and choreographers applied for project grants and bursaries to develop educational programmes. A special allocation from the ACGB aided such developments as full-length productions for a children's audience and lecture demonstrations (ACGB, 1981a). New dance artists such as Maedee Dupres, Sue Maclennan and Belinda Neave also responded and became increasingly involved in education (Briginshaw, 1983; Nash, 1987).

Fourth, throughout the 1970s a few dance artists influenced by LCDT also had a significant effect on students and lecturers in higher education. For example, Janet Smith, who entered higher education in the mid-1970s, was a clear example of how a dance artist took a predominant dancer and choreographer role in an exchange of space for expertise basis. Others were appointed as part time teachers (e.g. Irene Dilks). More significant roles in terms of status did not appear until the 1980s. Private institutions who trained professional dancers also engaged dance artists on a more regular basis either on a sessional arrangement for specific projects or for an academic year or longer.

Fifth, several new patterns of collaboration emerged which proved to be a turning point for dance artists in education. The principle was pioneered at Roehampton Institute that dancers could use the facilities of an institution over a long term period without any obligation to teach or to perform in return with Ian Spink and Dancers (Briginshaw 1983). Other residencies followed which were arranged on a more formal footing (Briginshaw, 1983). However, it
was the initiation and development of residencies based on the Artists in Schools (AIS) Dance Component, operated in American Schools by the National Endowment of the Arts, which expanded the work of dance artists and had a significant impact on education (Briginshaw, 1983).

In particular, LCDT's week-long residencies in 1976 in five colleges in Yorkshire provided the impetus for future work (Gow, 1976a). Six aspects of this residency were particularly important:

1) company members taught Graham-based technique classes to students and pupils in schools and Cohan presented a lecture demonstration to show what the company was attempting to achieve;

2) at open rehearsals Cohan gave a commentary to the audience and answered questions on the work;

3) the company performed;

4) in the final week Cohan completed the choreography of a new work, Khamsin (1976). This was premiered at the Playhouse, Leeds, on 22nd March (Webb, 1976);

5) the residency enabled Cohan to present the company to a wider audience than was normally encountered on tour;

6) it allowed Cohan to develop and to show the teaching side of the company's work (Gow, 1976).

Cohan then further adapted the residency format to enable the company to stay in an institution for a week and to offer a programme in local colleges and schools. This included choreographic lecture demonstrations, open technique, open rehearsals and open choreographic sessions. Performances in local theatres extended to include open forums in which the audience
could question the director and dancers about their work (Briginshaw, 1983). Overall, each of these features was an important precursor for the future practice of other companies.

### 2.3 The Arts Council of Great Britain Scheme: 1980—1985/86.

The ACGB pilot projects in 1980 proved to be a turning point for dance artists in education as they were the first sign of the closer co-operation that Macdonald sought with educational bodies. In particular, the involvement of the DES, albeit in an observer capacity, enabled residencies to be placed within secondary school contexts and encouraged LEAs to jointly fund projects (Briginshaw et al., 1980). Modification of the format based on the AIS scheme met the particular requirements of each context as well as the needs of the companies and individual dance artists involved. All three projects were divided into three main parts over a five week time span. The preparatory period, in which a dance artist taught in a school for two or three weeks, was followed by a company residency of one week, and finally by a choreographic focus of a further two or three weeks (Briginshaw et al., 1980; Hockey, 1987).

New ground was broken in the ACGB projects between 1981-1986. When the first mime residency took place in Peterborough in 1982 the scheme became known as Dance and Mime Artists in Education (Hockey, 1987). Throughout there was an extension of the types of venues used, the formats followed, the geographical areas reached and the companies involved (Hockey, 1987). Projects were placed in primary/middle schools, a range of secondary schools including a boys school, a Dance Centre and a Dance Drama Centre.
Residency lengths and structures varied between two to five weeks, or over an extended period such as an evening a week for a term plus an intensive week. While three projects returned to the Havant, Leeds and Manchester areas, two dance artists and one company from the initial residencies worked in a new collaborative mix. By now work with teachers' groups was also a common feature of all ACGB projects.

Two "en route" monitoring decisions made by the ACGB were particularly crucial. The first, in 1982, was when the ACGB decided to retain the scheme at a pilot stage for at least a further two years (Hockey 1987). The second, was when the ACGB widened the scheme to include individual artists and companies from the classical ballet, Indian and African traditions. Thus, in 1984 an Afro-Caribbean company (Ekome) participated for the first time in project work and a second mime residency took place.

The scheme concluded in 1985 with all three projects breaking new ground (Hockey, 1987). The first took place with a ballet company in a London comprehensive school. The second widened the approach, format and concept of projects as it was based on a hospital and a social club in Yorkshire for children and adults with learning disabilities. The third moved the scheme into the field of higher education with the residency at Brighton Polytechnic, CSHM. This last project provides the foundation on which Part 2, Part 3 and much of Part 4 of this thesis is based.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) identified that support from both the ACGB and the DES for the pilot projects gave dance artists in education an added impetus and respectability. This encouraged other companies to extend their
work in education and facilitated the development of significant new contacts within the education context between young people, individual dancers and companies. The emphasis on participatory elements for young people established new ways of working which became modified by other dance artists for their individual needs. In particular, the focus placed on technique and the inclusion of choreographic work for selected pupils became commonplace (see 8.3). Significantly, patterns of collaborative work influenced two dance artists who each formed and directed a small group primarily concerned with education. Both companies then participated in other ACGB residencies.

In-depth monitoring of the three projects in 1980 preceded the publication of Dance Artists in Education. Report of the Pilot Projects (Briginshaw et al, 1980). This described the residency, discussed the results, identified the issues, and made recommendations for future action. While monitoring was less extensive, in later years written reports continued to create a composite picture of events rather than identify successes or shortcomings. It was, however, only at the conclusion of the scheme that the ACGB commissioned Hockey to summarise and evaluate its overall achievements (Hockey, 1987).

The final report outlined the origins and development of the project between 1979/1980—1985/86; overviewed the residencies; presented case studies from some of the twenty three individual projects that had taken place; and highlighted the successes and issues. While Hockey (1987) attributed many of the concerns encountered to the development of dance in education and its relationship with dance in the theatre she claimed that the
scheme had far reaching effects on both education and artists. For example, a year preceding the report, she argued that related trends in dance education can be attributed to the Scheme and similar initiatives. Most fundamental is the consideration of dance as an art form and all that this concept implies... the place of technique and composition, the value of performance, and the role of appreciation have all been given greater emphasis in recent years.

Hockey, 1986, p 186

Overall, Hockey (1987) maintained that artists in education had contributed to the revitalisation of dance education and the reconsideration of its rationale and content. Equally significant, patterns of collaborative work had influenced dance artists to form and to direct small groups primarily concerned with education work; and to some companies formulating and implementing education policies through an education officer or a team. Even though the report was supportive in nature Hockey (1987) urged that the lessons learnt should be incorporated into future developments. While Hockey (1987) made a plea that the initiatives, collaboration and potential should be recognised, nurtured and valued, the report neither provided an underlying rationale for the dance artist in education movement nor a theoretical framework on which future work could be based.

2.4 Continuation and expansion: the mid-1980s to the early 1990s.

Although new dance, as part of the modern tradition, ballet and black dance were introduced into the ACGB scheme after the 1983 residencies, no such provision was made for Asian dance. Even then
the educational involvement of artists from these traditions only increased after completion of the scheme.

While the education work of large and small scale companies in the modern tradition continued, a change occurred in the intent and structure of projects (Thomson, 1992). In particular, the large scale residencies that took place with LCDT under Cohan and Mansfield were replaced by smaller ventures. Overall, Thomson (1992), as the education officer for LCDT, revealed that the company's education work was now delegated to free-lance dance artists who worked in areas in which the company performed. Changes in management, funding problems, and the belief that the needs of the artistic world remained predominant may have contributed to this new direction.

Since the mid-1980s Ballet Rambert has also exemplified a changing approach to dance artists in education. A more positive stance emerged once Richard Alston took over as Artistic Director. Throughout this period the education officer of the renamed Rambert Company set up and presented workshops, pre-performance talks, projects and residencies. For example, the 1992 Kent project with able young people demonstrated how dance artists, including Alston, and the education officer could work as a team (Howard, 1992). But other companies such as Phoenix placed less importance on education work when it moved into middle scale touring. The company's new approach was exemplified in its approach to a project in a Kent school in 1992 (Hughes, 1992). Classes and workshops were now delegated to either an outreach worker or selected dance artists.
While many small dance companies continued to follow established formats for education work into the early 1990s, the constraints of combining the role of education officer with administrative and performance responsibilities led at times to initiatives not being explored fully (Carlisle, 1993). Problems posed by injury or other unforeseen circumstances resulted in difficulties which could not be resolved to the mutual benefit of the parties concerned. Thus, as Carlisle (1993) argued, the experience of dance artists and/or the Artistic Director of a company withdrawing from planned work while a project was in progress was not unusual.

Individual dance artists also continued to offer their work to education either as individuals or as part of a company. One in particular, Gregory Nash (1988) challenged what generally took place within one-off workshops taught in advance of performance and in residency situations. Prior experience as a dancer with a number of small companies such as Cycles, Mantis¹⁸ and Michael Clarke, and his short period as an animateur for Mantis in 1983/4¹⁹ led Nash (1988) to question the type of educational work undertaken by dance artists. His search to strike a better balance between performance of his own work and education contributed new elements to education work²⁰. It showed how choreography could become the focus for all project activities.

From the mid-1980s some of the most significant contributions to education work came from the realms of ballet, Black and Indian traditions. Recognition that the major ballet companies were undertaking a growing amount of educational work led the ACGB to include ballet as part of the Dance and Mime Artists in Education projects in 1985. Such developments as the appointment of an
education officer and the setting up of an education unit spearheaded by London Festival Ballet (LFB) (see 2.51) (Hoyle, 1980) then influenced similar initiatives in other companies such as Royal Ballet (RB) and Sadlers Wells Royal Ballet (SWRB) (Morris, 1985a). Activities such as the school matinee format to prepare an audience for performances; the preparation of resource packs which described particular ballets and/or gave a brief history of the production; and the design of workshops and lecture demonstrations to fulfil educational requirements became commonplace. Similarly, the use of members of the company and/or the education officer as a resource became a general feature of education work. Its scope was then widened by the RB when it included backstage visits, school matinees and parents' evenings (Morris, 1985b). Overall, the premise behind all education work was to make ballet more accessible, to be informative and to act as a stimulus for academic work (Davies, 1990).

Collaboration with LEAs took the work of ballet companies onto a more formal footing. The first large scale scheme, a one week project in primary and secondary schools, organised as a joint venture between SWRB and the City of Manchester LEA set a precedent for those to come (ACGB, 1986b)\(^{21}\). Numerous other special projects followed including ones which allowed a principal dancer from the RB to work alongside Indian and Afro-Caribbean dancers on a multi-cultural cross curricular theme (Katrak, 1987; Rogers, 1985)\(^{22}\).

Significantly, a crucial change appeared in the range and breadth of SWRB's (now Birmingham Royal Ballet (BRB)) education programme after the appointment of Gill Henderson as education officer.
Although company members continued to be used as a resource the education department now took on more and more of the ensuing work. Two projects at the opposite ends of the spectrum exemplified new approaches in which projects as shared enterprises were concerned with curriculum design (Henderson, 1990). In the first, a dance artist reconstructed Act 11, Giselle, (Coralli and Perrot, 1841) and the education team choreographed in the modern genre with "A" level students in response to a task from the "A" level examination syllabus. In the second, new ground was broken in a primary school project which was designed to comply, in part, with the requirements of the National Curriculum (Henderson and Gradle, 1990). The experimental concept of this particular project enabled the education department to be used as an extension to the teaching staff and to act as advisory teachers in developing dance within the school. In this way, the project served as Inservice development for members of staff using dance in a cross-curricular approach (Henderson and Bradie, 1990).

The formation of groups mainly of Afro-Caribbean origin, such as Aklowa and Ekome, set a new trend in the 1970s. In general, education work followed the already established format of performances accompanied by lecture demonstrations with practical classes extended to include drumming and drama. Support for the extension of the work of ethnic artists in education came from the Dance Artists in Education conference of 1979 (Bourne, 1979) and led to several dance artists, particularly of Asian origin, being funded in the early 1980s. However, the growth of Asian and African People's dance only extended when dance artists
from these traditions received financial support on an more consistent basis from the ACGB.

The promotion of Asian dance forms coincided with the ACGB paying more attention to regional dance developments. An Asian Music Project, which included dance in Leicestershire schools and colleges, preceded the setting up of an Asian Dance Animateur scheme in 1985\textsuperscript{25} which extended the vision of professional dance work in education\textsuperscript{26}. However, it was not until the ACGB South Asian Dance in Education project at Bedford in 1989 that official recognition was given to the contribution that Asian animateurs and teachers were making to education. The project, hosted at Bedford College of Higher Education, was the result of four years of research, planning and co-ordination at the ACGB (Constanti, 1989). Overall, it placed the art form in the context of dance in Britain and aimed to develop an understanding and appreciation of this style of Indian dance among schools and community groups in the area. Throughout the project, five British based Indian teacher/performers gave practical tuition in a variety of venues to a range of young people from primary school children to undergraduates\textsuperscript{27}. The above project partially filled the gap identified at the conclusion of the ACGB Dance Artists in Education scheme and was an attempt to raise awareness of South Asian as well as African People's dance. Acceptance that the needs of such groups might require different approaches was also in response to the separate category of funding created within the Dance Projects budgets in 1987/8 for Dance of Ethnic Minorities. The work of Asian dance artists was then placed onto a more formal basis through the public launch of The National Organisation of South Asian Dancers (ADITi) in Bradford, in June 1990 (McGough, 1989). Since then RAAs/RABs
have been encouraged to provide equality of opportunity and to engage actively in the development of educational work with South Asian dance artists. Subsequently, the possibilities of the work of ethnic dance artists has been taken into a new direction by such groups as Race Apart (New Asian Dance Theatre) (Elliott, 1991). Although this company's work has remained specifically Indian it has been presented so that it could be related to by young people from diverse backgrounds.

Unlike the development of contemporary, ballet or South Asian traditions, the growth of African People's dance in education has been more haphazard. Although early companies were pioneers on the self-made touring circuit there were few Black dance companies working in Britain in the early 1990s. The most significant impact has come through the work of Adzido Pan African Dance Ensemble. Although the company's main aim has been to perform dances from African countries, workshops have become a central feature of its work in schools (Semple, 1992).

In spite of Black dancers having no form of organisation similar to that of ADiTi, alternative avenues for the development of Black Dance in education have emerged. The opportunities offered by the National Foundation for Arts Education (NFAE) and Arts Education for a Multicultural Society (AEMS) have led to an expansion of education projects in this tradition (see 2.8).

2.5 The Arts Council of Great Britain: Education Policy.

The ACGB has shown an increasing interest in education from 1975. The added impetus given by the publication of the Radcliffe-Maude reports in 1976 enabled collaboration between arts and...
education organisations, including policy and funding considerations, to become a reality.

The appointment of Irene Macdonald as ACGB Education Officer in 1978 led for the first time to the initiation and formulation of education policies for artists in schools; to collaboration with national education organisations; and to the encouragement of a closer contact and co-operation between arts and education agencies at all levels. When the ACGB Education Unit took on responsibility for educational involvement in all the arts, Macdonald was charged with two main tasks. The first, was "organising meetings and conferences to bring arts and education providers into closer touch with each other" (ACGB, 1978/79, p 31). The second, was initiating "pilot projects in different subjects... throughout the country" (ACGB, 1978/79, p 32). At the same time, a new post for a dance officer was created whose brief included special responsibility for developing educational work in dance.

The ACGB's increasing involvement in educational work was also evident in The Arts Council and Education. A Consultative Document (1981a). This clarified the ACGB's relationship with the education system, its own educational responsibilities, the shaping and development of ACGB policy and how this was expected to affect those receiving grant aid from LEAs and RAAs. Shaw, the Secretary-General of the ACGB, anticipated a special role for RAAs acting with LEAs which would allow national, regional and local tiers to interact and plan effectively together (ACGB, 1981a). The establishment of an Education and Outreach panel reflected further the ACGB's commitment to education at a time when dance
companies were being exhorted to produce an education policy and
evidence of commitment to education (Mansfield, 1987).

In the 1983, The Arts Council and Education: A Policy Statement
(Acgb. 1983a) anticipated a closer co-operation between itself and
client organisations at all levels (Acgb. 1983a). The status of dance
artists in education was raised by seeding money for development
in this area, the inclusion of education members on to the dance
panel, and the use of educational criteria to judge work (Croall,
1984). It also led RAAs to review their work and staffing policies,
and in time to innovative education programmes (Robertson, 1986).
Thus, by 1984 each company was expected to have an active policy
for education which was closely related to its artistic policy. Prime
importance was placed on the central role of dance artists, the
links forged with the education sector, the appointment of
education officers, and the need for professional arts organisations
to establish criteria for assessing professional work (Robertson,
1984). While funding was now determined in part by a company's
education provision the right of individuals to opt out of this area of
work was respected, and the ACGB encouraged RAAs and LEAs to
develop policies for professional arts input into education.

The fresh interest in education pursued by most of the RAAs in
1985 came from the ACGB's own 1983 policy statement which was
later reaffirmed in The Glory of the Garden (Rogers, 1985). This
ACGB document outlined policy for the next ten years and, in
relation to dance, aimed to strengthen existing companies and
their links with regions (Fawkes, 1984). Although five areas were
identified for development three were particularly significant for
this study: to strengthen the support given to Black and Asian
dance; to develop the educational outreach work of all revenue funded companies; and to pursue effective development through RAAs setting up joint funding arrangements for arts projects with LEAs, arts bodies and sponsors.

Deliberations by the ACGB's Education Unit identified training and research as one possible means of collaboration with the formal sector (Rogers, 1985). Hence, from Spring 1986 limited ACGB funds allowed those working professionally in the arts to gain experience in working with the education sector (ACGB, 1986a). Although advice was available from the Education Training Section (ACGB, 1986a), individuals were expected to devise short intensive training programmes, or short-term secondments, or short-term courses or workshops. As this has repercussions for dance artists in education it is returned to for further discussion in Chapters 9 and 12.

During 1987 the ACGB education structure underwent a period of dynamic change. The new temporary education working party set up to implement the revised policies, under the chairmanship of Dr. Ken Robinson (then director of the Arts in Schools Project), consulted specialist groups for advice on specific areas. Particularly significant for this study was the focus placed on the training of artists and teachers, the importance of companies as a resource in education and the preparation of artists for an active role in education. The funding of a major research project with the National Foundation Education Research (NFER) aimed to evaluate the work of visiting artists in schools and to help artists to make a substantial contribution in education.
Linking personnel,

The diversity and extent of dance artists in education was partially responsible for the creation of various posts with a particular responsibility for work in education. The appointment of education officers by the major dance companies became common practice in the second half of the 1970s. The trend initiated in 1975 by LCDT was followed by Ballet Rambert and LFB in 1979. By 1981 major companies were engaged in education work although some showed preference for working with students, teachers and adults rather than with children (ACGB, 1981a).

These officers, sometimes also dancers or ex-dancers and/or qualified teachers, were responsible for liaising with LEAs and schools, discovering their needs, designing educational programmes and providing aids from company resources. However, the expertise of an advisory team or unit as used by LFB marked a significant new development. Such units functioned generally in two ways. Either a small group of dancers visited educational institutions to present lecture demonstrations, classes and workshops; or individual dance artists/teachers taught technique classes and/or workshops.

It was, however, not until the review of the education work of the major companies in 1984 that a closer collaboration started to take place between the ACGB, companies and the RAAs\(^{30}\) (Maldoon, 1984). This was exemplified in, for example, the establishment of a structure which allowed education officers to meet on a regular basis. Out of this grew the joint introduction to the Dance Pack, Dance Companies. How to use them. Dance Companies. What they
offer (ACGB, 1988), which gave information on dance companies offering education work and ways in which to use them.

The assignment of dance fellows, animateurs or co-ordinators to work within a specific community setting and/or education institution, which came into being in 1978 initially to fulfil needs identified during touring, paralleled the developing dance artists in education movement. The limitations of "one night" stands were acknowledged as was the need for a dance artist to be resident in the community if a long-term programme was to be developed. Since the inception of the fellowship scheme under Greater London Arts Association (GLAA) in 1978 a growing number of animateurs have been appointed to other RAA areas (Glick, 1986).

Overall, the responsibilities of an animateur were to stimulate and foster the interest and participation of a community in dance activity (Cole, 1982) by teaching, performing and choreographing, as well as organising dance events and attracting other dance artists to the region (Glick, 1986). The work of Kate Castle and Rosamund Shreeves, the first dance fellows to be appointed by GLAA, indicated the impact that could be achieved by professional dancers31 (Early, 1979a; Claid, 1979). Similarly, the work of Lewis and McLusky exemplified the major long term impact that an animateur could make on the local community.

The concept of the dance fellow then became extended in 1981 when the ACGB, together with Cheshire Education Committee and two RAAs, jointly funded the appointment of Lewis as an animateur/dancer in residence to an LEA centre used by local schools (ACGB, 1982a). Significantly for this thesis, one of the major responsibilities was to introduce school pupils to the
repertoire of visiting dance companies, and to work on dance projects, including productions, with pupils and teachers. Throughout the 1980s Lewis's work exemplified how contact could be established, maintained and fostered with schools, teachers, LEAs and arts bodies.

The ACGB dance panel included in its policy substantial support for dance fellows and animateurs and facilitated the growing part they played in educational work. While this was exemplified in The ACGB's Dance and Mime Animateurs: a national evaluation (Glick, 1986) the report also revealed how the education service provided by animateurs bridged the gap between the professional performing world and the education and community sectors. Hence, the growth of the animateur movement enabled opportunities for the exchange of ideas and expertise with education bodies and has facilitated an increase in specific projects for education such as those discussed in 2.8.

2.7 Responses from conferences

A series of conferences staged in the second half of the 1970s provided opportunities for dance artists and dance educators to meet together for the first time and to share with each other their aims and concerns (Holbrook, 1975; Webb, 1976). The initial concern of two, held in 1975 and 1976, was on the possibilities of interaction rather than on collaboration. The tentative relationships established at the Warwick University conference in 1975 and the I.M. Marsh residency in 1976 eased some of the distrust felt by both parties (Holbrook, 1975; Gow, 1976; Webb, 1976). Brinson (1982a) maintained that the second conference, which coincided
with the completion of the first series of LCDT residencies, was crucial in the developing relationship between the two professions. It provided one of the earliest opportunities in which artists and educators could meet together to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of joint work and to see practical examples of education work (Gow, 1976; Webb, 1976). Even though the concentration on presentation of work in the largely LCDT initiated residency caused concern the atmosphere of the conference was generally optimistic (Webb, 1976).

By contrast, the provocative nature of the 1979 Dance Umbrella Conference on Dance Education "exposed many of the rifts between dance artists and dance educationalists" (Macdonald, 1980 p 40). The aims and standards exemplified in the performances and demonstration classes presented by the professional dance world raised disturbing elements. Fawkes suggested at the time that this was

not just the basic differences between professional artists and educationalists which still have to be resolved but the apparent mutual distrust which has to be removed.

Fawkes, 1980, p 17

Such apprehension became exacerbated further when dance tutors in higher education supported Bourne's statement that dance artists currently working in the field are not of a high enough calibre...neither the vocational schools nor the established companies rate educational work highly; it is neither a first option for a dancer...it is usually only those who have failed to win a place in one of the major companies who drift into the work.

Bourne, 1979, p 1
A further four conferences in 1981\textsuperscript{33} provided an important bridge which helped to dissolve the animosity between dance artists and dance educators apparent at the above Dance Umbrella Conference. Although the gulf between the two professions only marginally improved the emphasis placed on the nature of collaboration and the need for educational aims to be prioritised enabled delegates to rethink their position. Another, organised by the DES in North Wales in September 1982, also touched on dance artists in education as part of its main thrust on "Dance in Secondary Education" (Briginshaw, 1983).

The new stance that dance educators started to take in the early 1980s to the promotion of work did not occur in isolation. It was an integral part of concurrent shifts in higher education (see 1.5). However, a gap continued to exist between teachers and artists in the later half of the 1980s. Unlike the major conferences focused on dance artists in education, varied reference was made to the area in only a limited number of conferences from the mid-1980s.

The symposium organised by the Royal Opera House in 1987 concentrated on the relationship between schools, opera and ballet companies through making specific reference to the dilemmas faced by education officers. In particular, discussion focused on the recurring question of involvement, quality of product or quantity of pupil participation. In conclusion, the conference identified that true collaboration could not take place until educators extended their perceptions about what dance artists offered, and anticipated that the 1987 Gulbenkian Foundation new grant aid category for
projects could help schools to develop links with outside agencies, including major performing companies.

The Dance and the Child International (daCI) Conference hosted at Roehampton Institute in July 1988 made two specific contributions to the debate. Presentation of research findings enabled the author to monitor the response of a range of educators and an ACGB dance officer. More importantly, funding acquired from the ACGB enabled daCI to mount a separate course which provided the opportunity for dance artists and two dance tutors to explore together current policy and practice. Although in terms of numbers the response from the artistic world was disappointing those present identified several areas of concern. In particular, the lack of support systems for education work exacerbated the problems encountered by the new generation of dance artists.

Although the work of dance artists was not central to the ACGB report on *Young People Dancing* (Rae, 1990), its findings revealed the impact of professional companies working within the field of youth dance. Five issues were raised:

1) companies wanted an education liaison network as their work was hampered when they had to formulate their own policies in specific regions;

2) companies preferred to establish an ongoing relationship with specific groups of people rather than constantly having to undertake pioneering work;

3) most work continued to take place with contemporary companies in spite of a shift in attitude in recent years from the large classical companies;
4) young dancers within small and middle scale touring companies were placed frequently under considerable pressure;

5) individual dancers and companies identified a need for specific training in areas in which they lacked expertise.

The conference "Towards the Future — Dance Education in the 1990s", at Bedford College of Higher Education in July/August 1990, brought dance artists and dance educators together at a crucial time for dance education. Anticipation that the National Curriculum would result in changes to dance education led to a growing interest from the professional dance world. The presence of a number of company education officers indicated an interest in the policy and practice of current, albeit changing, dance education. While the programme included dance artists teaching workshops and a seminar on dance artists in education practice, education officers expressed disquiet that these did not adequately cover the range, provision and the support currently offered. In particular, they considered that the potential of working with a company was not sufficiently appreciated and understood (Le Grand, 1990a). However, while dance educators were positive about encouraging its future growth, John Auty (Dance Adviser in Lewisham) voiced concern about such issues as planning, the activities offered, content and teaching. But a decade on from the initial ACGB pilot projects education officers were unable to accept that the principles on which project work was based led to the problems which emerged.

Since this conference, several moves have taken place to increase an awareness in dance teachers of the assistance offered by company education departments. The NDTA's Annual General
Meeting in 1990 opened up discussion on the ways in which links might be strengthened; articles were published about the work of companies in NDTA's termly Bulletin; and a representative from NDTA attended meetings of the education officers. However, as education departments of professional companies were relatively new there was still no formal training for those who pursued this career route (Le Grand, 1990c). Individuals have varied training and work experience, generally either in education and/or performance. Yet education officers have advised and designed much of what has taken place in dance artists in education programmes. Hence, this topic is returned to for further discussion in 9.3 and 12.4.

Two further conferences staged by NDTA in November 1990 and December 1992 focused on the relationship between professional dance artists and education, working together, and the nature of collaboration. Although these conferences enabled both parties to meet in practical and theoretical discussion no new ground was broken as the underpinning principles and rationale for dance artists in education were largely ignored. This was also reflected in the NATFHE Dance section conference, Towards a National Dance Culture, Dance Education and Training in the 2000s, December 1992.

One other conference has been worth noting. In August 1991 the author tested interim findings of this thesis at the daCi international conference, held in Salt Lake City. At a seminar on dance artists in education, delegates from different countries supported the issues raised about principles, structures, activities and training.
Other Education initiatives.

In contrast to the early dance artists in education projects dance educators started to take a much more pro-active role towards the end of the 1980s. Such initiatives resulted in dance being considered within the wider sphere of arts and multicultural education.

The contribution of individual dance artists and companies to the development of dance in the curriculum recurred as a theme under the guidance of the NFAE. In general, an attempt was made under this umbrella heading to promote inservice training for teachers and to promote learning in the arts and across the whole curriculum. In dance, projects with individual dance artists have ranged from a one week inter-schools programme focused on thematic work (Lewis, 1989) to liaison between a dance animateur and an LEA in an enterprise spanning a group of primary and secondary schools (Humphreys, 1989). Other projects have embraced wider issues such as dance and gender (Brook, 1989; Allen and Creighton, 1989) or multi-cultural education (Sarker, 1989).

Quite different approaches have been taken by two other companies. Ludus continued to follow the principles on which its work was based when it used performance as the central point for all residency work with pupils with moderate learning difficulties (Usborne, 1989). Participation in a variety of practical activities introduced dance to ten/eleven year olds and stimulated learning across the curriculum.
Alternatively, SWRB participated in an education and community programme in Scarborough which included a range of activities such as open-days; residencies in primary, secondary and special needs schools; and workshops for teachers and ballet students (Walker and Hill, 1989). Significantly, practical work was adapted so that projects in specific education contexts had a particular focus. These ranged from an emphasis on the theme of a ballet at a special school, to a focus on movement based material with a group of children with profound and multiple learning difficulties.

Another NFAE project included a Dance and Music collaboration with Southern Arts and five local education authorities. This involved dancers from the Indian and ballet traditions and musicians working in upper primary and middle schools over a period of six weeks. Dance artists and musicians explored the classical and South Asian traditions and looked at gender roles within those styles (Maree, 1990a). The collaboration and preparation for this project between advisers, teachers, dancers and musicians was particularly crucial.

A second project, designed primarily as an Inservice course rather than as a classroom initiative, provided Dorset teachers with the opportunity to acquire new ideas and techniques across a wide range of styles such as Indian, Afro-Caribbean, ballet, contemporary dance and contact improvisation (Maree, 1990b). In addition to professional artists working with pupils, teachers were given information about how to use dance artists in the formal education context. Two features which occurred at the conclusion of the project were significant. An information handbook was prepared based on suggestions made and questions raised; and an evaluation
of the course built in as part of the project design was undertaken for the NFAE by the Advisory Teacher for Dance.

Another important development which combined further the work of professional artists and education became manifest in the Arts Education for a Multicultural Society (AEMS) scheme. Set up in 1987 by the ACGB, the CGF and the Commission for Racial Equality, this aimed to find a way to develop arts education so as to put multicultural/anti-racist policies into practice; and to reflect the diversity of the world in which we live (Brandt, 1987). The underlying premise of much of the work was that the best way of demonstrating different arts and ways of looking at them, was for arts practitioners to work with teachers and pupils. This became exemplified through the establishment of partnerships between LEAs and RAJ’s, the co-ordination and funding of projects, and the designation of a number of institutions as AEMS schools (Young, 1989).

Overall the AEMS project strengthened the support advocated to Black and Asian Dance and the development of education and outreach work in the Glory of the Garden (ACGB, 1985a). From the start the stress placed on the importance of preparatory work was manifest in the provision of both initial training courses for artists and Inservice for teachers. The organisation of joint planning meetings aimed to integrate work approaches with new curriculum development. Projects varied in length from one-off performances and workshops to one day per week over a ten week period. While these initially took place in schools the AEMS scheme mirrored the ACGB Dance and Mime Artists projects when it extended into higher education (see 2.3). However, in this case a parallel initiative

Research into the work of professional artists in schools, and particularly the work of dance artists, was initiated by the ACGB (see 2.3). Since then the NFER has explored the concept and role of professional artists in schools to identify their potential contributions (Sharp and Dust, 1988). Investigations focused on a number of artists-in-schools schemes, and the education work of a number of companies. Selected projects were followed through from inception to evaluation and consideration given to their placement and the backgrounds of those involved. A particular focus was placed on the interaction between teachers, artists and pupils, and the roles they assumed when working together (Sharp and Dust, 1988).

To help artists and teachers combine the strengths of their two professions, findings were published in Artists in Schools (Sharp and Dust, 1990). This publication aimed to give practical guidance for teachers and artists, and to help artists and educators clarify aims so that they might co-operate more effectively. Overall, the over-riding intention was for those involved to be able to build an educational experience which was of artistic, educational and social value for young people.

In contrast, Residencies in Education: setting them up and making them work (Dahl, 1990) explored the setting up and running of six successful artists-in-education projects in the Yorkshire Arts region. Whereas Artists in Schools (Sharp and Dust, 1990) placed an equal focus and sought to advise both artists and educators,
Residencies in Education (Dahl, 1990) was aimed more directly at the artist in education. While there was a specific emphasis on self-help many of the practical considerations for organising a placement echo, to some extent, aspects covered in Dance Pack, Companies and How to Use Them, Dance Companies, What They Offer (ACGB, 1988). In spite of the pack's focus on visual artists many of the aspects covered are equally applicable to those from other disciplines. However, Worsdale (1990) argued that this publication gave little sense of the contribution that placements had made to the learning of young people.
2.9 Summary.

This chapter shows how the early practice of major companies influenced a diverse range of small scale initiatives by the early 1980s. These provided the foundation for the more formalised dance artists in education scheme developed by the ACGB with modern dance companies which then widened to include a contribution from ballet, South Asian Dance and African People's Dance artists. Significantly, as the role and support of the ACGB made much of this work possible the artistic world, including linking personnel, dominated the dance artists in education movement. Hence, early response from educators hints at the differences between the professional dance world and that of education. However, from the mid-1980s both parties showed a growing willingness to collaborate which moved dance artists in education practice forward. In particular, a more pro-active stance by the education world led to the inclusion of dance into NDAE and AEMS initiatives. This is echoed in more recent conferences and publications aimed at both the dance artist and the educator.

Finally, while much headway has been made since the mid-1960s Brinson's (Davies, 1990) plea for companies to improve contact with dance education suggests that there is much in the dance artists in education movement which requires reappraisal. These concerns, and those which emanate from the education world, are examined in Chapter 7.
Notes.

1 In Britain the term "modern dance" has been sometimes employed to describe styles established before modern dance began to develop separately in the USA and Europe. In this sense "modern dance" often described the later European styles particularly associated with artists like Jooss, Leader and Wigman. "Contemporary dance" described Graham, Humphrey and later American styles. In this interpretation there was no significant contemporary dance in Britain before 1965-1966 (Gulbenkian Foundation, 1980).

2 The Moveable Teaching Unit of EDDT, which was started as a pilot scheme in 1970 and formalised with a Gulbenkian grant in 1974, took demonstration classes with pupils and inservice courses for teachers. Apart from this there had been little work involving substantial audience participation.

3 East Anglian Dance Theatre was an example of an early group that presented a programme which appealed to the younger audience (ACGB, 1981a; Briginshaw, 1983).

4 New dance was a generic term for a variety of movement forms and choreographic principles particular to individual artists. There has been an ongoing experimental New Dance movement in this country for nearly fifteen years as a breakaway from Contemporary Dance conventions. While styles have derived from techniques such as Ballet, Cunningham, or Limon others have their origins in other forms like Tai Chi, the Alexander Technique and Release work (Nash, 1988).

5 Dance artists in residence first became a reality at Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds (Williams, 1978). This was a private venture initiated by Jean Williams (a college lecturer) with Janet Smith (a Dartington College trained choreographer and dancer who was also a qualified teacher). Arranged on an exchange of "needs", i.e. a space for expertise basis, Williams provided Smith with a base for her work over a three year period in return for a contribution to college based dance courses. Significantly, this residency was initiated by a dance educator and a dance artist for their mutual benefit with initially no involvement of any outside mediatory or funding body and was also one of the biggest residencies that has taken place in this country (Briginshaw, 1983).

6 Irene Dilks, a principal dancer from LCDT, previously trained as a teacher at I. M. Marsh College of PE, Liverpool. She mainly
taught contemporary technique in colleges and schools in the North of England and made two major contributions to the ACGB dance artists in education projects during the early 1980s (Briginshaw, 1983).

7 For example, one with Strider at Dartington Hall College in the early 1970s preceded Scottish Ballet's Moveable Workshop at Aberdeen College of Education in 1974 (Briginshaw, 1983).

8 In the AIS scheme the six week residency began with two weeks of introductory work introduced by a movement specialist. This prepared students for the company residency that followed and a final two weeks was led by a movement specialist.

9 According to Robin Howard, Director General of LCDT the aims of the Yorkshire residency were two-fold; first, to show how a professional company worked in classes, rehearsals and performances; and secondly, to do some teaching, to learn how schools and colleges taught dance, and to find out what role dance played in the larger community (Gow, 1976).

10 For example, Dunfermline College of Education hosted the first residency with Ballet Rambert in 1978; smaller companies such as Cycles and Emma (which then became Midlands Dance Company) worked in schools and colleges; CSHM (Brighton Polytechnic) hosted three residencies with Mantis Dance Company, two with Phoenix, one with London Contemporary Dance Experience and another with Contemporary Dance Experience between 1980-1984 (see Chapter 3).

11 The policy of joint funding initiated by the ACGB extended and became a common feature of dance artists in education projects supported by RAAs.

12 Dance and Mime Artist in Education (ACGB, 1987). While Hockey dated the Author's preface and Acknowledgements as December 1986, Jane Nicholas, as Dance and Mime Director, dated the Foreword as June 1987.

13 In addition, a second residency also took place with LCDT and Hampshire even though the LEA received no further funding from the ACGB (Woolley, 1981).

14 Irene Dilks, Timothy Lamford and Spiral collaborated at the residency held at Manchester Dance Centre (Hockey, 1987).
No individual dance artists or companies who participated in this project were named in the Hockey (1987) report.


Valerie Briginshaw, Jack Brook and Patricia Sanderson monitored the 1980 pilot projects for the ACGB and published a report of their findings: Dance Artists in Education, Report of the Pilot Projects (ACGB, 1980). Anne Cole also monitored the Havant project.

Nash took part in two residencies at CSHM with Mantis: he performed with the company and in 1981 and in 1982 he also took an animateur role.

The Artist in Education. A New Dance Approach was published in Collected Conference Papers in Dance Volume 4 (Ed. Curl, G.) 1989 NATFHE. This article was first presented as a paper to the NATFHE Dance Section conference, "The Professional Dancer in Education — a Reappraisal" at Wakefield District College, October 10th 1987. It was then revised and rewritten in February 1988 prior to publication in 1989.

In Oxford the inclusion of a choreographic project for dancers, and young people, workshops and open rehearsals led to the formation of a youth and an adult dance group, platform opportunities for young dancers to show their own choreography, and a Performance Arts course based at the college (Nash, 1988).

This featured performances by dancers, dance artists choreographing work with participants, performance by pupils and in-service training for teachers (ACGB, 1986b).

For example, one was co-ordinated in local Birmingham schools over a two year period (1985-1987): another dancer in residence project in West Midland schools signalled the secondment of a principal dancer, Nicki Katrak, from the SWRB to work alongside Indian and Afro-Caribbean dancers on a ten week multi-cultural project (Katrak, 1987).

This took place in a Performing Arts Department at Barnsley College of Art and Design.
The overall project was focused on five Birmingham and Sandwell primary schools and one special school (Henderson and Bradie, 1990).

This was jointly funded by Leicestershire City Council and Leicestershire County Council.

The services of two Asian animateurs to educational institutions and community organisations resulted in showcase performances of Indian dance arranged in local theatres, community centres and schools. These included specially-created productions of Indian Dance Drama which involved school children and young dancers.

Undergraduates were given an intensive introduction into the rudiments of Indian dance forms in the hope that it would give them a basic vocabulary which they could then use in future work in schools. In addition, weekly dance performances of Indian dance brought the art form to a wider audience.

Since then a succession of dance officers including Peter Kyle, Ruth Glick, Sue Hoyle, and currently Jeanette Siddall have developed and guided this area of work.

Despite this recommendation it was not until 1981 that the first Black dance company, Phoenix, was formed which included in its brief, touring to schools. Interestingly, this paralleled the work of Mantis. Although both companies were formed initially to undertake education work in schools their emphasis shifted towards performance as they moved into middle scale touring.

By 1984 the following companies had also appointed Education Officers and offered programmes for educational work: Mantis, Janet Smith and Dancers, EDT, Moving Picture Mime Show and Northern ballet.

While these two dance artists came from different backgrounds they had also trained as teachers within the maintained sector (Early, 1979a; Claid, 1979).

Participating companies included EDDT, Emma, Ludus and the newly organised Ballet for All.

These were organised by the ACGB (January, 1981); the Laban Art of Movement Guild (LAMG) (March, 1981); the Association
of Dance and Mime Artists (July, 1981); and the University of Leeds (September, 1981)

34 The two lecturers, Anne Cole and Mary Wilkinson, had both organised work with dance artists over a number of years. See Chapter 3 for the work undertaken by Cole at Brighton Polytechnic (CSHM). Wilkinson had been responsible for the organisation of the Roehampton Dance Week which grew out of the Spink residency.

35 The latter involved a South Asian dance artist and a visual artist collaborating in a combined arts project which covered work with infant, junior and secondary school pupils including some disabled young people.

36 Six days were spread over a period of six months.
PART 2
Chapter 3.

The Case Study Partners:
Chelsea School of Human Movement,
Brighton Polytechnic, and Extemporary Dance Theatre.

3.1 Introduction.

In Chapter 1 the changing nature of dance in higher education and its current focus on dance as an art form is identified and reference made to the training of dance teachers within a variety of contexts. Chapter 2 considers the history of the dance artists in education movement with particular reference to the relationship between dance in education and dance in the theatre. This chapter provides the background for the residency.

Discussion of CSHM examines two separate but inter-related aspects. First, the dance programmes followed by participants in the residency, who trained to teach dance within the PE context, are overviewed. These were the first cohorts to complete an all-graduate programme of study. Second, encounters with dance artists at CSHM between 1979-1985 are discussed as these laid the foundation for the ACGB Dance Artists in Education residency with EDT. These two foci provide an understanding of the dance knowledge base of the students who worked with EDT.

Discussion of EDT's dance artists in education practice establishes that the company (renamed EDT in 1984/85) played a central role in the early initiatives of the ACGB and in later developments. An overview of the changing nature of the company's artistic policy provides the framework for the initiation, development, consolidation,
expansion and decline of the company’s education work. Finally, the company’s approach to education work and its focus on the use of repertoire as the focal point for projects is discussed. This sets the scene for the residency as the education policy of EDT, significantly coloured the negotiations and planning that took place, the practical work that occurred, and the approach of the company and individual dance artists.

3.2 Chelsea School of Human Movement.

Webb’s (1977) documentation of The History of Chelsea College of Physical Education with special reference to curriculum development 1898-1973 traced its growth through the foundation era (1898-1929), the transition period (1929-1958) and the expansion stage (1958-1973). The thesis placed its growth within the location of Chelsea (London), Borth (Wales) and Eastbourne (East Sussex). It also charted the college’s institutional location as part of the South Western Polytechnic, then a Local Education Authority maintained college, and its place as the School of Human Movement within East Sussex College of Higher Education. Since then CCPE, renamed CSHM, has further grown and expanded as part of Brighton Polytechnic. As a school it functioned in the Faculty of Social and Cultural Studies from 1979 and then as a department within the Health Faculty. In 1991, when it joined with Education to make a new Faculty of Education, Sport and Leisure, it became known as the Chelsea School of Physical Education, Sports Science, Dance and Leisure (CSPESSDL). Since 1992 its institution base has been renamed the University of Brighton.

CSHM in its many guises has made a distinguished contribution to education through the professional development of specialist women
(and then men) PE teachers. Throughout its history the awards offered have changed in line with current developments in education. Courses have broadened to include the PGCE in PE, a Sports Science degree, higher degrees, and more recently a PGCE course in Dance. However, only those courses leading to an initial teaching qualification are of interest to this study.

While it is beyond the realms of this thesis to trace the development of dance at CSHM, it is important to note that the forms of dance studied reflected the changing focus of dance education outlined in Chapter 1. However, while the range of theoretical and practical courses offered mirrored the shift from MED to dance as art, CSHM continued to embrace a Laban approach (CSHM, 1979). Overall, courses ranged from those followed by all students to others selected for further in-depth study. For a period of time an advanced course was run for Chelsea students in conjunction with the LAMS (September, 1964) (see 1.24), and a one and two year course was also offered for students from both the Guildford School of Acting and Drama Dance Education (Webb, 1977) and London College of Dance and Drama.

In order to identify the dance background of residency participants the following discussion focuses on aspects of dance study that had relevance for the case study. Between 1979-1985 all students followed a general dance course in both the Certificate of Education and B.Ed. PE degree which laid the foundation for further in-depth study (CSHM, 1979, 1980). The main distinction between the different levels lay in the emphasis placed on Laban derived principles and the responsibility individual students took for choreographic work. However, contact hours in a new B. Ed. (Hons.) Degree for Specialist Teachers of PE and Dance, 1980–1985 (CSHM, 1980), were reduced to
meet CNNA requirements and because of national patterns in higher education (see 1.4). Subsequently, programmes of study, including dance, had less time than ever before, and dance was no longer pursued to the same depth as in previous courses. However, dance courses showed a reorientation from Laban based work to dance as an art form. This became the focus for all students, and particularly for those who followed the option and specialist dance programmes. These courses were significant for this study as they provided the foundation of dance knowledge for all students who participated in the EDT residency (see Chapter 4). Some studied dance further because of their interest in teaching. Others followed a specialist dance route to increase their own knowledge of choreography, performance and appreciation.

At the start of the residency students in the first year cohort had been at CSHM for little more than a term and were only just beginning to develop a minimal skill and sensitivity in dance-like movement. They had been introduced to dance as one of a range of practical activities and to the various disciplines which informed the study of PE. In particular, the dance course focused to a greater or lesser degree on three main components: technical study, composition and dance in education. However, as these areas were designed to interlink over a two year period the time allocated to technical studies and to dance composition was divided according to the needs of particular groups.

In contrast second year students had acquired a basic vocabulary and control of a range of more complicated movement patterns and experienced basic choreographic processes and principles (CSHM, 1980). However, the approach to, and involvement of, first and second year students in the residency must be viewed in the light of the very limited dance experience they had prior to entry to CSHM and the
limited time devoted to dance (i.e. approximately 80 hours over the two year period) as one of a range of practical and theoretical areas of study.

The dance knowledge and experience of third and fourth year students varied enormously. While all fourth year students had undertaken a professionally orientated course some had not been involved in any dance activity at their own level during the academic year 1984-1985. Others had reinforced and extended their knowledge of dance through either a dance option or specialist dance course.

Three aspects of the third year Modern Dance option and Performance route courses have specific relevance for this study. Students from both courses had been introduced to a greater in-depth study of contemporary technique as a "performance discipline than most students at CSHM. Hence, by the start of the residency these students were competent and confident in performance through participation in technical work which had become increasingly more complex in design. Disciplined performance in dance was supported through participation in classes taken by professional exponents of such particular codified systems as Graham and Cunningham.

Students in the third year option course and Performance route had also extended their understanding of choreographic principles and processes in relation to abstract, lyrical and dramatic dance modes. Further study in year four enhanced powers of discrimination in the treatment of material, a more complex understanding of choreographic devices, and the use of critical faculties in the appraisal of dance as an art form. While choreography, technical study, and dance analysis were interrelated ongoing elements of study, a particular emphasis was placed, at times, on certain aspects. Visits to
performances of professional dance companies, the presence of dance artists at CSHM (see 3.31 and 3.32) and the use of other resources widened and enriched the students' understanding and appreciation of dance as a theatre art form beyond the horizons of CSHM (CHSM, 1980).

The practical and theoretical knowledge that students had acquired in dance was paralleled with a focus on the professional implications of the teaching of dance in secondary education. First year students had been introduced to the educational value of dance as an art form and to the place of dance within the curriculum. Second year students had been prepared for imminent teaching commitments. While students in the third and fourth years had taught dance to the lower secondary age range those in the option and dance specialist courses had generally also worked with older pupils. Hence, students from CSHM brought to the residency varied depths of knowledge of dance as an art form and a wide range of teaching experience together with associated skills.

A module of particular interest and relevance to this thesis was "The dancer in the community" (CSHM, 1980) component that some dance specialists had completed in the third year. This course had introduced students to the extent to which dance artists could contribute to educational processes; to the potential relationships between artist, educator and the learner; and to the role of dance in the school curriculum and in the community. Examination of the role of the artist enabled students to identify potential relationships and to examine issues relevant to both the professional dancer and the school child (CSHM, 1980). An appraisal of current national provision for dance was complemented by professional viewpoints from the managing director of EDT, a dance animateur from Gillingham and the Dance and Drama Officer for South East Arts (SEA).
A variety of dance artists visited Brighton Polytechnic from 1980 to 1985 to perform for, and to work with, students in CSHM and the Combined Arts Department, to teach on weekend dance courses, and to take weekly technique classes. In addition, ongoing contact with dance artists, attendance by dance tutors at conferences, and monitoring of residency work contributed to a growth of experience in this particular area. Exploration of project work within the Polytechnic led to the author initiating a series of residencies with support from CSHM. These provided students with first hand experience of, and insights into, the public world of theatre art and alerted students to possibilities that might arise in their future teaching careers.

This section outlines the most important elements of the seven residencies that took place at Brighton Polytechnic as they were all, to some degree, important in building a bridge between dance artists and dance educators. For the purpose of this study, these are classified into two groups dependent upon the length and depth of contact with individual companies:

a) projects which evolved over a period of three years;

b) shorter residency experiences.

In addition, the protracted residency negotiations between CSHM and the company initially proposed for the ACGB project are referred to. These preceded the planning stages of the residency discussed in Chapter 4.
Three residencies took place with Mantis Dance Company between 1980–1982:

4th–9th November 1980;

16th–19th November 1981;

29th November–11th December 1982.

Mantis, with Micha Bergese as Artistic Director, was selected for the first venture into residency work by Brighton Polytechnic for three reasons. First, the co-ordinator had established contact with Bergese at national conferences, during the ACGB pilot scheme\(^7\), and at dance courses organised by CSHM. Second, Bergese’s involvement in two of the initial ACGB Dance Artists in Education projects in 1980 (see 2.3) had sensitised him to the emerging issues. Third, Bergese’s interest in education was partially responsible for Mantis, an all-male company, receiving an ACGB grant when the company formed in 1981\(^8\) to promote dance in schools and art centres. Initially its main aims were to present a wide range of dance activities for teenagers in schools; to stimulate and encourage boys as well as girls to respond to the art of dance; and to take dance to a wider audience (Harbord, 1980). The company hoped that the presence of an all-male company in a school as teachers would increase the acceptability of the male dancer, and do much to overcome the reticence of boys to dance (Harbord, 1980).

To enable dance artists to reach as many young people as possible the company offered a range of classes, creative workshops, choreographic sessions and lecture demonstrations as well as special workshops for teachers. At the end of the first year a change from an all-male company was paralleled with a gradual shift from a focus from education to a performance orientation. This increased and by
the time the company ceased to function it offered very little education work (Cole, 1982a, 1983a).

The three Mantis projects were important precursors for the residency with EDT. Organised on a largely self-funding basis, they were largely financed through "selling" dance activities to other Polytechnic departments, local schools and the wider community. This affected the time that dance artists spent in the Polytechnic.

Overall, a radical change occurred from the first to the third residency partially because of funding received from SEA. In the second, a growing focus on work with students led to a widening of practical activities within CSHM to include lecture demonstrations, master classes and intensive choreographic work for selected students. A parallel decline in schools from one-off technique and workshop sessions was complemented with an emphasis on lecture demonstrations.

Prior to the third residency Cole (1982a, 1982b, 1983a) identified how lecture demonstrations could become the focal point for the new residency programme and the vehicle through which young people might be led into workshop activities. The positive response from educators, their belief that lecture demonstrations could introduce young people to dance as art, and thus to the realms of artistry, reaffirmed Hamby's (1980) and Briginshaw's (1981) position. Hence, one-off sessions ceased to dominate work with young people, a greater focus was placed on the appreciation of repertoire, and lecture demonstrations replaced practical activities. Within CSHM this was complemented with a move to place a focus on intensive work with selected groups of students (Cole, 1982a). This resulted in young
people having either a deeper and more sustained relationship with dance artists or a minimal and almost tokenistic experience.

The evolving nature of the residences with Mantis was due to the growing relationship established between Bergese, the company administrator\(^{10}\) and the CSHM representative. The monitoring and evaluation of dance activities was important to the ongoing development of work as the majority of artists and educators involved had not, prior to the first Mantis residency, previously worked with dance artists. Written and verbal feedback from Bergese, Polytechnic staff and local teachers identified that each residency had been a stimulating venture which reinforced and strengthened the work in dance already taking place within the Polytechnic, local schools and the community (Cole, 1982a, 1983a). However, in spite of the excitement and interest generated, concerns emerged such as technique, content, preparation and organisation. As these were built on in the second and third project, the company's repertoire became the central focus (Cole, 1982a). Practical workshops were also organised for teachers to enable a close relationship to be fostered with schools and the company. This allowed educators to work with dance artists, to gain some insight into the company's repertoire, and to discuss the possible focus of dance activities for specific educational contexts. Thus selected dances became the focal point of lecture demonstrations, short sections of particular dances exemplified certain characteristics, creative workshops focused on ideas behind viewed dances and, whenever possible, teaching arose out of, and fed directly back into, the theatrical presentation.

Nine issues arose from the three Mantis residencies which have a bearing on this thesis. These are the importance of:
1) planning as an ongoing process between the artistic director, the administrator and the residency co-ordinator;

2) dance artists accepting the premise, during the planning stages of a project, that groups of students have different needs and then matching these in practice;

3) artistic and educational concerns having equal priority instead of artistic commitments, at times, being given preference;

4) exploring the most valuable way of using dance artists in schools so that they no longer only took on the role of surrogate teacher;

5) examining how lecture demonstrations, rehearsals and open choreographic sessions could be used to help young people gain in-depth insight into, and thus a greater understanding of, dances selected from the company repertoire;

6) allowing curriculum groups to engage in an intensive experience and to present dance work in a "performance situation";

7) a positive role model for boys;

8) preparatory visits to schools by the company;

9) the commitment of a company to the success of a project.


Other residencies at Brighton Polytechnic during this period were also organised on a largely self-funding basis with some financial help from SEA. As before these involved students from different Polytechnic faculties, pupils in schools and teachers. While lessons learnt from the ongoing involvement with Mantis were built on, the design and interpretation of projects led to comparable concerns.
Brighton Polytechnic, CSHM, hosted two residencies with Phoenix:

17-19th + 23rd October 1983:

11-17th October 1984.

A particular strength of both projects was the immediacy, vitality, and appeal that the performance had for adolescents and students (Cole, 1983e, 1983i). Overall the presence of the company at CSHM gave a boost to dance and encouraged the involvement of young men (and boys in schools). This was partially achieved through either a lecture demonstration or performance preceding technique classes and workshops.

A residency took place with London Contemporary Dance Experience (LCDE) on 25th-26th January, 1983. While this company came under the artistic supervision of Robert Cohan (Artistic Director of LCDT and Contemporary Dance Trust) and the management of Richard Mansfield (Education and Community Services Officer, LCDT), it was directed on tour by Maggie White. A late funding decision by SEA led to limited planning between the company and CSHM, and to the majority of work taking place at CSHM. Secondary school involvement was limited to attendance at a “specially designed” performance, and local primary schools were invited to a special lecture demonstration/performance.

Despite the apparent success of the residencies with Phoenix Dance Company and LCDE, issues again arose which paralleled other residency experiences. These fell under three broad headings: organisation, content and the education environment (Cole, 1983e, 1983i). Briefly:
late funding decisions from SEA resulted in superficial negotiations between the company, CSHM and interested parties;

concerns arose when the practical activities, lecture demonstrations and/or performances presented were different from those negotiated;

some sessions had to be adapted because dance artists were not punctual;

technique emerged as an issue as dance artists did not adapt material to the age and experience of participants;

questions were raised about the relationship of workshop sessions to performances and lecture demonstrations;

dance artists encountered particular problems when trying to articulate clearly requirements to trainee teachers in a higher education context;

dance artists incorrectly claimed that they could give students a resource for teaching practice;

pressures were faced by dance artists in the teaching situation despite the claims that some were experienced teachers;

the claim that each company offered two different programmes was misleading.

---

3.33 Proposed Dance Artists in Education project with Ballet Rambert.

Brighton Polytechnic's experience of planning and hosting two residencies with Mantis, with a third planned for November 1982, led the ACGB to approach CSHM about possible involvement in the "Dance Artists in Education" scheme. This proposal was aired at an exploratory meeting in June 1982 at CSHM between Peter Kyle (Dance Officer, ACGB), Gill Burke (Head of CSHM) and Anne Cole (CSHM). Kyle's proposition that "the time was now propitious for the ACGB
projects to move into the field of higher education" (Cole, 1982c, p 1) encouraged CSHM to consider the venture\textsuperscript{12}.

At a series of protracted meetings over an eleven month period between Kyle (ACGB), Mann (Ballet Rambert) and Cole it became apparent that the particular priorities of these groups could not coexist (Cole, 1983b, 1983c). For example, the dance artists were unwilling to proceed educationally. However, once another company was identified by the ACGB as a potential project partner negotiations were resumed with the Polytechnic. Hence, the project with EDT which is discussed in Chapter 4.

\textbf{3.4 The artistic policy of Extemporary Dance Company/Extemporary Dance Theatre, 1975–1990.}

Throughout the early years of EDC the company toured extensively to small towns and larger cities, which rarely saw dance performances, under the artistic directorship of Geoff Powell (1975–September, 1977) and Ingegard Lonnroth (September, 1977–March, 1978)\textsuperscript{13} (Stoll, 1978a). Expansion under Paul Taras\textsuperscript{14} (1978-1981) (Stoll, 1980) led to the company achieving national prominence. The blend of ballet and a form of contemporary dance influenced by a Graham-derived technique was complemented by the repertoire being widened as company members and outside choreographers worked with the group. A move into "seasonal work"\textsuperscript{15} enabled concentrated touring to take place, more time to be spent on the creation of new works, and a focus on long term planning (EDC, 1981a). Overall, this resulted in EDC moving successfully from small to middle scale touring (EDC, 1981g; Rubridge, 1984).
The innovatory image, brought to the company on the appointment of Emilyn Claid in the summer of 1981, became crystallised in the creation and presentation of a new kind of dance theatre. The change of artistic policy obvious in the repertoire of the 1982-83 season was manifest in a new emphasis on elements of theatre in order to widen both the scope of dance and its audience.

This change of direction brought together inspiration from the area of new dance and the professionalism of a major touring company. The new ideas taken into the programme on an annual basis reflected current trends in the dance art world (EDC, 1982b). These were used to create a different and exciting form of dance theatre and to establish EDC's unique identity in the modern dance field. Throughout, Claid's aim was to take performances of the highest possible standard all over the country, to make dance more accessible and enjoyable for audiences, to dispel the belief that dance had to be understood to be enjoyed, to show that dance could entertain and stimulate both audiences and participants and to provide alternative ways of looking at attitudes and ideas that governed people's lives. This was achieved by Claid commissioning programmes of contrasting work from New Dance choreographers and designers who reflected her belief that "art must in some ways be ahead of its time and questioning its environment" (EDC, 1982c). The emphasis placed on the accessibility of the movement and the music further helped to achieve this aim.

The move away from dance as an abstract art form to one with theatrical overtones, was mirrored in the new company name: Extemporary Dance Theatre (EDT). This was manifest in the company's repertoire, and in the easier and more relaxed movement style evident in the performance of the two new dancers appointed to
the company \[19\]. This new approach was exemplified throughout the residency. A further radical change in EDT's artistic policy came in 1985 through the move to a more project based approach. The abandonment of the repertory structure in favour of working on different projects which reflected individual styles was complemented with an emphasis on making two entirely new productions a year (EDC, 1982c). This policy enabled EDT to explore a mixture of styles over a period of time rather than in the space of one evening. Longer dance theatre pieces were toured for about three months prior to being dropped as a new project began. This new way of working enabled dancers to get to know the choreographer, to explore ideas in depth and to acquire a more thorough understanding of each dance piece. As every project was totally different from the last a programme consisted of one or two pieces in a complementary style. This allowed for a mixture of experiment and accessibility, enabled the company's programme to cover an enormous and, therefore, unpredictable range of work, and allowed dancers and musicians to be chosen according to the choreographer's work (EDT, 1982c) \[20\]. This trend continued until 1989 when the company reverted to repertory based work.

3.41 The education policy of the company, 1979–1981.

Although performance was always the central thrust of the company's work a shift occurred from an almost superficial concern with education work to one in which it was fully integrated into company policy. This grew from the early ventures under the artistic direction of Powell and Lonnroth to a more regularised approach after the appointment of Paul Taras. This was then turned into a more formalised education policy under the direction of Emelyn Claid.
The early educational forays into schools in areas adjacent to the company's touring schedule between 1975–1978 were built on by Taras (EDC, 1978, 1979a). Under his directorship the seeds of five main types of education work developed in schools in areas in which the company toured. First, from October 1979 contemporary/modem dance classes with dance artists became increasingly popular for pupils aged eleven upwards (EDC, 1979b, 1979c, 1979d). Workshops were offered from March 1981 when the term was adopted to describe a mixture of technique and creative dance work (Oxford Playhouse, 1981).

Second, Taras became involved in the creation of two specific dance programmes for pupils (EDC, 1978). One arose as a direct result of EDC and the ACGB responding to a request from McLaren, Inspector of PE and Dance for ILEA (Lewis, 1978). Taras's growing interest in education work became consolidated when the ACGB confirmed its suggestion that future funding might be available for educational programmes (EDC, 1978; 1979a). Experimentation with matinee formats sought to find new approaches and more suitable ways than hitherto of presenting dance to school audiences. For example, a programme called "Extemporizing" was specifically designed to give children an insight into a dancer's daily work and the choreographic process (EDC, 1979d; 1981b; 1981c). This was then adapted into the specially choreographed dance demonstration of the company's technique offered to schools (EDC, 1981f).

Third, support from the ACGB enabled EDC to establish a teaching unit in the 1979–1980 season. This augmented the company's performance role and offered a more comprehensive and consistent teaching service than before (Taras, 1979a). In general, the unit
worked in local schools in all touring areas in conjunction with the company's performances\(^{26}\) (Taras, 1979b).

Fourth, the company mailed schools with information about its history, its desire to promote original talent, and the opportunities it gave to established choreographers to "extemporise" creatively (EDC, 1980a).

Fifth, Taras involved the company in a variety of activities at Nonington (EDC, 1979b), in a further project at Banbury School (EDC, 1979c), and in the Dance Artists in Education scheme in 1980 (Briginshaw et al., 1980)\(^{27}\) (see 2.3). These revealed a significant change in education work from a largely performance role to one which involved the company in master classes, choreographic workshops and performance (EDC, 1981b). Further pioneering work also took place during the Banbury residency. The inclusion of two new dances, one choreographed with pupils by dancers and the other choreographed by the school's dance teacher (Sue Orchard) with company members\(^ {28}\), paved the way for future developments. This was the first time that young people or a teacher had worked in this manner with a professional dance company (EDC, 1981b; 1981c; 1981d).

The bridge built gradually between dance in education and the professional dance world\(^ {29}\), outlined in Chapter 2, facilitated the dialogue between the ACGB, HMI and project-aided companies. This exchange was of particular importance to the growth of EDC's education work as it opened up discussion, explored possibilities for development and identified common concerns (Nicholas, 1979; Macdonald, 1979). In spite of the financial, artistic and management implications of education activity an action group was formed to support the
promotion of professional dance within the context of education. This seems to have laid the foundations on which the ACGB dance artists in education scheme was built (see 2.3).

The initial invitation to Taras from the ACGB for EDC to participate in the ACGB pilot projects was greeted with interest tempered with caution (ACGB, 1978). Taras foresaw that EDC could neither devote six weeks to such a project without receiving "heavy" funding nor risk the adverse affect that the time scale could have on the company repertoire (Taras, 1979b). Hence, two conditions set by Taras became embedded into the ACGB Dance Artists in Education project in Manchester, 11-16 February 1980 (EDC, 1979d) (see 2.3). An additional dance artist was used as a teaching unit in advance of the company; and a choreographer was commissioned to liaise with the company for the follow up work (Taras, 1979b).

3.42 Radical changes to the education programme.

A new look emerged under the direction of Claid which radically changed the company's education programme. From March 1982 schools were offered a mixture of technique and creative dance classes; matinees introduced company class on stage with an accompanying explanation of the effect that exercises had on a dancer's body. Significantly for this study, the unique "question and answer" sessions initiated on selected sections from the repertoire opened up dialogue between artists and educators (EDC, 1981d).

These first steps by Claid preceded a more formal and structured education policy. For example, the company released a video which sought to give insight into the life of a dance company on tour. Use of the video for preparatory and follow up work in schools prior to a theatre visit were paralleled with meetings between EDC
representatives and PE advisers (EDC, 1981b, 1982a, 1982d). These generated local interest in classes, special workshops, and longer term links.

Such moves were primarily influenced by Claid's need to inform teachers about the new focus on dance theatre for the 1982–83 season and its wide range of appeal. Anxiety that lack of time and money prevented work on suitable education programmes was compounded by failure to find someone with the talents required for education work. As this was crucial to EDC's new education programme Claid approached the ACGB with the proposal to employ Maggie White as an education liaison officer for a six month period (EDT, 1982d). This appointment was instrumental in EDC pioneering its new approach in 1982 and its response to increasing requests for classes (EDC, 1982d, 1982e, 1982f).

Claid and White aimed to set up a system which would avoid problems previously created in one off classes in schools. For preference, planned introductory and follow-up work related workshops and classes to the repertoire performed in theatres (EDC, 1982b). Overall, the company's education programme aimed to create a new relationship between young people and the repertoire performed in matinees. It was anticipated that this might enable pupils to understand the conception of the work and the creative process that went into a performance (EDC, 1982/83). Preparatory work was set up by White making personal visits to county PE advisers in touring areas. Notes issued by the company then enabled interested schools to prepare pupils for the visiting "teacher".

The integration of EDC's new education programme into the company policy resulted in dancers becoming more in touch with education
work. This may have pre-empted the ACGB, in November 1982, to invite EDC to participate in the Dance Artists in Education Scheme for a second time. In line with ACGB policy the residency at Walton School, Peterborough, from 24th January–18th February 1983 was partially funded by the ACGB, other agencies and the school (EDC, 1982l). The project gave the educational establishment the opportunity to play "host" to a professional company, and the opportunity to engage in workshops, public performances and discussions with dance artists about their professional lives. Throughout the residency two other dancers were appointed to undertake some of the education work (EDC 1982b, 1982l).

The appointment of Sue Hoyle as the new administrator of EDC/T was paralleled with the company's move into business sponsorship. Financial backing from British Petroleum (BP) allowed Celia Macfarlane (dancer, choreographer and teacher) to be appointed as dancer in education for one year. The phenomenal growth in EDT's education work became manifest in practice through the 12XU (Michael Clark, 1983) repertoire-based "workshops" that Macfarlane taught throughout the 1983/84 season (EDT, 1984c). Additional finance from BP worth £10,000 for three major projects extended the education programme into the 1984/85 season (BP, 1984). This enabled the company to develop its artistic policy and to respond to the growing demand for education work. This led to two more teachers joining Macfarlane on the education programme for the 1984/85 season (EDT, 1984c). All three "dance artists" worked with pupils ranging from nine upwards to students training as professional dancers. Specific workshops and choreographic ideas sessions were also offered for teachers (EDT, 1984b).
The use of repertoire as the focal point for education work.

Claid and White initiated the use of the company repertoire as the stimuli for workshops in 1981. However, a structured focus only came to be placed on dance works after Macfarlane, as dancer in education, used *Counter Revolution* (David Gordon, 1981) as a starting point for work in schools. This link was further strengthened when it became common practice to have "research time" during the choreographic period. Sponsorship from BP in September 1983 allowed Macfarlane to spend time participating in and observing rehearsals prior to the company tour. Subsequently, workshops were intentionally focused on the repertoire in order to illuminate to young people the processes by which dances were created (Davies, 1987). This structure, and the principle of using repertoire as the resource for education work, was then adopted in 1984 for the enlarged education team of three dancers.

The growth of EDT's education work cannot be separated out from Claid's company policy which incorporated notions of personal creativity for both the dancer and workshop participant (Davies, 1987). This interlinked the performing life of the company with education activity as it offered pupils opportunities to experience dance as a creative participatory activity, and to express themselves in an open way. The importance placed on the education team acquiring an understanding of dances from observed rehearsals was crucial to the exploration of the movement potential of workshop ideas in planning meetings. However, although dances were used as the focal point for all workshops the process of creating was considered to be more important than any finished product. Hence, a workshop in EDT terms neither involved the reconstruction of a section from any dance nor set ideas being closely followed. Throughout, individual team
members had the right to establish the content in relation to a particular group's abilities and needs.

Davies (1987) claimed that a more sophisticated model of education work was developed for the 1984/85 season and then further refined (Davies, 1987). This was significant for this thesis as it provided Macfarlane and dance artists with the foundations on which the company based much of the education work described in Chapter 4. Sponsorship from BP allowed all three teachers to spend time with the company, and to acquaint themselves with the dances choreographed during the rehearsal period. This ensured that workshops were designed to give pupils an understanding of the choreographer's intent, the ideas behind the pieces and some of the processes involved in making a dance. Hence, pupils were given the chance to express themselves physically, to gain confidence in their bodies and their ideas, to acquire a greater understanding and enjoyment of the company's theatre performance, and to increase their knowledge about contemporary dance.

Sponsorship from BP also funded the production of poster leaflets to promote workshops and factsheets which gave teachers knowledge about the company's work. These focused on its history, specific dances such as **Spiked Sonata** (Dan Wagoner, 1981), the use of music and design for dance, and movement ideas (EDT, 1984d)\(^40\). Further financial support from BP extended EDT's work in the area of special needs, developed in-depth work in some schools and enabled the company to commission a dance which would introduce movement theatre to young people (Tong, 1984). Hence, **Office Suite** (David Gaines, 1984) was premiered at a special school's matinee at Torrington Theatre, Basildon, and performed during the EDT residency at CSHM (see 4.6).
The comprehensive and wide-ranging sponsorship provided by BP in 1984/85 facilitated new opportunities for young performers through the first ever dance apprentice scheme (BP, 1984). This enabled Claid's proposal to attach a young dancer to the company as a working dancer taking classes, rehearsing and performing with company members to become a reality (EDT, 1984c). The launch of the dance apprentice scheme gave the first BP dance apprentice, Jon Smart, an unrivalled opportunity to develop his skills with experienced dancers, internationally known teachers and choreographers and time to mature as a performer. This has bearings on this thesis as Smart performed and taught throughout the CSHM residency (see Chapter 4).

In 1985 a further increase in the education programme of the company was complemented with "teachers" in the education unit maintaining a close involvement with the company, choreographers and the artistic director (Davies, 1987). EDT's abandonment of the repertory structure between 1985 and 1989 in favour of the creation of two entirely new productions each year had a significant effect on the education work. But even though the dance in education team had very little time to explore and to consolidate workshop ideas for teaching situations repertoire remained the starting point for all practical work. In addition, some sessions were designed for GCSE students, choreographic projects were undertaken with Youth Groups, young people performed alongside the company in residencies, and specific "teacher training" courses were offered. However, in line with national practice education became subsumed under the "outreach work" umbrella heading.

In 1986 the education team tested a new way of teaching dance theatre that challenged traditional gender roles and positions within
society. This pilot project, the final education venture under Claid, aimed to devise an anti-sexist way of teaching the arts through work with a mixed group of "students" and educators in London and Kent. Observations and assessments were made throughout the year by Sue Davies (the current EDT Education Officer) and the project director Maggie Semple (now Director of Education, ACGB). Although the project continued after Claid suddenly left the company in 1986 education work was no longer a priority. It declined after the resignation of Sue Davies, and was weakened further by the time the ACGB withdrew funding from EDT.

3.5 Summary.

This chapter identified the dance context within which the residency took place. However, while it is clear that students at CSHM were involved in dance as part of B.Ed. (Hons.) degree course work it is questionable whether the dance experience encountered prepared them adequately for the residency. For example, although courses had a performance perspective this was not their prime importance.

There is little doubt that the residency work that took place at CSHM, Brighton Polytechnic, during 1980-1985 provided a valuable experience on which to base the ongoing negotiations with EDT. However, while these ventures could be viewed as successful, a pattern of issues arose which mirrored what was taking place in other dance artists in education schemes nationally. In particular, reference to the lengthy negotiations between the ACGB, Ballet Rambert and CSHM highlight the tensions between the artistic and educational worlds.
The overview of EDC/EDT’s education programme identified a change from a performance orientation to one which included young people in a variety of participatory activities. Claid’s new approach manifest in a more formalised education policy and programme is significant for this thesis. Use of the repertoire as the focal point for education work became refined once the policy of research time with the company and choreographers became common practice. This, together with the expansion of the education programme, enabled the teaching team to prepare themselves for work in schools. As this policy underpinned the work of EDT throughout the ACGB residency at CSHM dance works were used as starting points for participatory activities. However, dance artists had to take on major teaching roles as Macfarlane was the only "outreach worker" involved in the residency.

The experiences of dance artists in education programmes brought to the residency by CSHM and EDT influenced many of the decisions taken during the different phases of the residency discussed in Chapter 4. While these were project specific they must be viewed in relation to the national scene outlined in Chapter 2.

Notes

1 The time for “modern dance” was reduced from 180 to 110 hours. The new course was followed by all students in years one and two (see note 15). It was designed to give students a sound knowledge of the inherent characteristics of dance in order to lay the foundation for teaching dance to young people. Practical activity enriched and highlighted areas of knowledge and understanding acquired in other courses such as Elements of Music, Folk Dance, Aesthetic and Cultural Forms and Movement Concepts (CSHM, 1980).

2 Students were expected to acquire a basic knowledge of the craft of composing short dances for two or more performers and an
understanding of aesthetic criteria for the evaluation of dance work (CSHM, 1981).

3 A focus on principles underlying technique systems such as Graham and Humphrey as well as Laban elements provided the foundation for much of the technical work.

4 A Graham class was taught by Namron (former LCDT dancer) in the Graham style when Phoenix Dance Company was in residence at CSHM in October 1984; and Stephanie Jordan, then a member of the dance staff at Crewe and Alsager College, taught a Cunningham class when visiting CSHM in the role of a dance artist.

5 The choreographic aspect of the course also included, for example, clarity in spatial and dynamic form in the development of motifs, complex variation of motifs and identification of main transitory passages; group dynamics; awareness of interacting forces and their dramatic inference; introduction to the concept of illusion in dance performance; use of a wide variety of stimuli for dance ideas including structured and unstructured environments; use of music and other forms of accompaniment supportive to the dance (CSHM, 1980, 1981).

6 Although the B.A. (Hons.) Expressive Arts degree was cited within the Faculty of Combined Arts, all full time dance tutors had initially taught dance at CSHM: Olga Napper, Julie Korth, Liz Aggiss and Kay Lynne.

7 The author co-monitored the 1980 ACGB Dance Artists in Education project at Wakeford School, Havant, with Jack Brooke from Portsmouth Polytechnic.

8 Bergese had gained a width of residency experiences from teaching technique and presenting lecture demonstrations at Wakeford School, Havant, and choreographing with selected pupils in the Manchester project.

9 The lecture demonstration at one school in Brighton resulted in a teacher taking a party of 90 pupils to a performance.

10 Whilst Bergese was the initial administrator, Fiona Dick from Dance Umbrella soon took on this role.

11 Teachers noted that limited advance notice and lack of publicity material had resulted in only two schools attending the lecture demonstration/performance.

12 A second meeting took place between Kyle (ACGB) and Cole (Brighton Polytechnic) on 7th September 1982.
EDC began at Edinburgh Festival in 1975 when a group of graduates from London School of Contemporary Dance performed to critical acclaim (Stoll 1980). The many offers of bookings that followed led to the realisation that there was a need for a small scale touring modern dance company to bridge the gap between small "ad hoc" dance groups and the larger companies, such as London Contemporary Dance Theatre and Ballet Rambert. Therefore, Geoff Powell established EDC professionally in 1976 with the intention of bringing to audiences a small but highly professional group showing works of a high standard. It aimed to provide a home for new choreographic talent, both from inside and outside the company, and to allow the more established to experiment with new ideas. Initial grants were received from the Gulbenkian Foundation for basic equipment, and new works commissioned from members of LCDT and Ballet Rambert as well as from young talented choreographers (Stoll, 1980). Acknowledgement of the work of the company came through the major grants first awarded to the company in 1978 and 1979; the award of the first and only annual grant to a new contemporary dance touring company in 1980; and in the company being one of the few to be chosen for an increased grant in 1981 (Stoll, 1981).

Prior to this appointment Taras had been a principal dancer with Ballet Rambert, administrator of New London Ballet, and a free lance co-ordinator of what was to become Dance Umbrella (Stoll 1980).

This move, initiated by Taras as a result of his investigations in the United States in Autumn 1980, led to the company working for a ten month period rather than on a yearly contract. (EDC 1981a).

Claid came to EDC with a diverse background which ranged from performing with the National Ballet of Canada, to co-founding the experimental X6 Dance Space in London (EDC, 1981a). As this was the home of British New Dance Claid was partly responsible for the development of alternative dance forms in Britain. The changes which took place in EDT can only be understood in relation to these developments.

This resulted in new works, by different choreographers made during a nine week rehearsal period at the beginning of each season, being toured with others from the repertoire of the past in two simultaneous programmes.

These often remained in the repertoire for two to three years, as for example *Three Dances* (Ian Spink, 1979), recreated for EDC in 1981, and *Coca Loco* (Ian Spink, 1984); *Naples* (Fergus...
Early, 1982); *It Happened at Club Bombay Cinema.* (Karole Armitage, 1982); and *12XU,* (Michael Clark, 1983) (EDT, 1985).

19 Annelies Stoffel (trained at the Laban Art of Movement Centre) and Edgar Newman (trained at LCDS) joined the company for the 1983-1984 season and were still with the company during the CSHM residency (see Chapter 4).

20 In a communication entitled "Successful Shapes of Change" Claid emphasised her desire for the company "to influence a change in the world through theatre dance by presenting another view of life, of dancers and dance, of women and men, and of running the world" (EDT, 1982c).

21 Taras inserted a teaching clause into the contracts of all dance artists who worked with EDC (EDC, 1978). The reference to teaching duties had been used previously by "Emma with Equity's agreement for our kind of touring" (EDC, 1978).

22 EDC started to use workshops after the company completed a five day education project in Clwyd Mold (EDC, 1980a).

23 One enabled an audience to see a taped slide presentation of the company at work prior to a performance designed for different age groups (Stoll, 1978b). Despite there being no direct financial reward or support from the project, other than that available from educational experts, EDC took a specially devised programme into schools from April 1978.

24 For example, one programme was designed by the photographer, Alice Fursdon, and showed the company in class, rehearsal and performance (EDC, 1981b; 1981c).

25 In this, a demonstration of modern dance technique (to a percussive score by Tom Keliefor) was followed by a performance of selected works from the repertoire.

26 The appointment of two "excellent" teaching specialists allowed the company to give prime consideration to education requests and to meet the increasing demand for classes and workshops. In particular, the company aimed to maintain satisfactory teaching levels in order to avoid the teaching criticism frequently levied at young dancers when they tried to emulate the specific approach of educationalists (EDC, 1979a).

27 The project at Banbury school took place in March (23-27th) 1981, i.e. a year after the ACGB residency in Manchester (1981c).

28 The opportunity to choreograph a dance with company members was reported to be a "once in a life time" venture (EDC, 1981b).
Although it had been initially intended that dancers would work with pupils Taras took the unprecedented step of allowing the teacher to work with the dancers. This was the first time that such a thing had happened not only with EDC but with any other professional dance company in a residency (EDC, 1981e).

29 This claim was made by Butterworth to Dance Umbrella in 1978 (Macdonald, 1979).

30 The residency, sponsored by Manchester Education Authority, took place at Cardinal Newman School and the Dance Centre (EDC, 1979g). Irene Dilks taught for the company in the early stages of the residency and Micha Bergese was responsible for the intensive choreographic work.

31 A dance and design collaboration was presented at the Jeannetta Cochrane Theatre. Devised by Philip Smith, from Bournemouth College of Art, and Joanna Allsop this gave insight into the life of a dance company on tour, backstage and in choreographic rehearsal. It was then transferred from Betamax into a fifteen minute VHS video with music and sound accompaniment for schools to show how a middle scale dance touring company worked. This video was shown continuously at a presentation for teachers in March 1982 prior to being sent out to schools (EDC, 1982b).

32 White was considered to be an ideal candidate who, besides being a trained dancer and choreographer, had directed her own company, gained a reputation as a "talented" teacher at the Place and the Laban Art of Movement Centre (EDC, 1982d).

33 For example, over 50 classes had been arranged between October 1980 and May 1981 with carefully selected modern dance teachers all over the country (EDT, 1982f).

34 White devoted seven weeks of the six month period to the preparation of work. She watched rehearsals and performances, talked to choreographers, drew up publicity material for schools, worked on teachers' notes, made contact with, and personally visited, PE advisers and explored the matinee format (EDC 1982/83). Material in the form of quizzes and programme notes were also made available to schools for pupils. Teachers were provided with notes as a form of backup material to enable continuation of work in normal class time. Specific courses were also arranged for teachers by PE advisers and feedback was sought from schools through the use of questionnaires. Throughout administrative support was given to the education programme by the company press and publicity officer, Liz Stoll (EDC, 1982/1983).
These could be used as preparation for a theatre visit or to initiate follow up work. There was a booking fee of £5.50 (EDC, 1982b).

Peterborough Arts Council acted as a central agency for further sponsorship from the City Council, Development Corporation and Cambridgeshire County Council (EDC, 1982i).

Mary Prestidge and Kirstie Simson (EDC, 1982b, 1982i).

Sue Hoyle, administrator from 13th July 1983 and manager from March 1984 until 1986, led a new administration team for Extemporary which was to have an impact on the work of the company. She brought to her new roles the experience she had gained at London Festival Ballet (LFB) where she was first Publicity Assistant and then Education Officer. Prior to LFB she had read Drama and French at Bristol and then lectured in Paris.

Caroline Frizall (then lecturer London College of Dance and Drama) and Maggie Semple (then chair ILDTA) worked alongside Cecilia Macfarlane. Two teachers worked for the company on the same two days each week and the third undertook weekend and school holiday commitments (EDT, 1984c).

Whilst the first two were ready at the start of the 1983/84 season the remainder were available from December 1984 (EDT, 1984d).

Claid and Hilary Ball, director London Youth Dance Theatre, identified that talented young dancers who had completed their training needed further experience to equip them for a career as professional dancers. BP made £5000 available for this purpose. (EDT 1984c).

Jon Smart trained with London Youth Dance Theatre and at the Laban Centre for Movement and Dance from October 1981–June 1984 (EDT, 1984c).

Macfarlane was joined by Rachel Harrison and Christy Adair (Davies, 1987).
Chapter 4

The Extemporary Dance Theatre / Chelsea School of Human Movement (Brighton Polytechnic) Residency.

4.1 Introduction.

The invitation by the ACGB to host a residency in one of the few remaining training centres where students specialise to teach dance within a PE context extended the boundaries of the initial Dance Artists in Education scheme into the field of higher education. In particular, CSHM was selected as an appropriate setting because of the considerable experience gained in planning, organising and funding the three Mantis projects outlined in 3.31. Direct interaction between dance artists and dance educators reaffirmed dance tutors' commitment to residency work. Hence, the one month residency at Brighton Polytechnic with CSHM and EDT, January/February, 1985, built on previous familiarisation with dance artists in education in this particular department (see 3.3). Similarly, EDT's prior experience in other ACGB projects (see 3.41, 3.42) provided the foundations for the negotiations and planning that took place. Likewise, how this was then interpreted in practice was largely determined by the company's current education policy.

This chapter aims to outline what took place during the planning, implementation, and follow up stages of the project. It identifies that the general and specific aims provided the base line from which planning and follow up work stemmed. A general overview of the structure precedes detailed discussion of the timetable and the
Residency activities are considered here under the headings of choreography, performance and appreciation to comply with the Adshead (1981a) model outlined in 1.3, 1.4. This clarifies the involvement of dance artists, participants and dance tutors. Table 1 shows the range, balance, and time allocated to practical activities under these three headings.

4.2 Planning and post project phases.

Throughout the preparatory and follow-up phase, constant liaison took place between ACGB, EDT personnel and the residency co-ordinator as the CSHM, Brighton Polytechnic, representative. While the focus and aims of the project were resolved during the initial period, the mid-planning stage explored the most beneficial type of contact that students could have with dance artists. Discussion of the dance activities offered by the company established student needs in relation to residency aims. Project partners accepted the importance of a company orientation period at CSHM prior to the start of the project, and the principle of the EDT "Movement Research" initiative for the middle two weeks of the residency.

Parallel discussions within the Polytechnic with the Head of CSHM, the project co-ordinator, dance tutors in the Polytechnic, Expressive Arts and Primary Education departments, and CSHM staff explored the principle of the residency, its aims and objectives and possible structure. The anticipated "heavy" expectations placed on students in the first and last weeks of the residency were examined in relation to ongoing degree commitments. Support in theory from the B.Ed.
Table 1: Residency activities engaged in by students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Choreography</th>
<th>Workshop based on principles of choreography</th>
<th>Repertoire-based workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: V = ID No. of video recording
M = ID No. of monitored session
G = Student groups
Programme Committee and the CSHM School Board preceded detailed discussion at a series of meetings. When the programme was finalised colleagues were alerted to timetable implications, including contact time with students (December 1984). However, further in-house negotiations took place as EDT granted one company member leave of absence for the mid-residency period. This resulted in major modifications to the timetable which were only resolved a week before the residency started.

Although all projects initiated under the ACGB Dance Artists in Education scheme were negotiated and planned over a period of time, preparation for this particular residency took place during eighteen months. It also followed the general principles associated with other ACGB projects (see 2.3). Hence, it aimed:

1) to stimulate dance activity in the CSHM and Polytechnic setting and to increase interest in dance beyond the institution's immediate context;

2) to widen the horizons of students to dance as an art form;

3) to give young people the opportunity to participate in work with dance artists;

4) to follow the format already associated with project work.

These were then particularised for the specific nature of the EDT/Brighton Polytechnic residency. Therefore, it was predicted that students would:

1) be acquainted with the company repertoire;

2) be given insight into particular characteristics of selected dances from the repertoire in lecture demonstrations;
3) engage in compositional work based on EDT's repertoire;

4) gain an understanding of certain aspects of selected dances through practical involvement in workshop activities;

5) participate in technical and workshop activities within each session;

6) be committed to the creation and performance of a new dance if in one or other of the two intensive groups.

In line with other ACGB dance artists in education residencies of the early 1980s (see 2.3) the project was jointly funded by the ACGB and Brighton Polytechnic, with the latter acquiring a substantial contribution from the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Additional funding from SEA extended the residency to a period of four weeks and led to additional company specific and CSHM aims being written into the project. Thus it was anticipated that:

1) the company would develop its own long-term artistic policy;

2) students would be given the opportunity to see a variety of dancers at work as choreographers;

3) the longer time scale would enable relationships to mature between dance artists, educators and students;

4) students would be alerted to current dance artists in education practice;

5) engagement in a collaborative process would help to clarify relationships between practising dance artists, dance educators, and students;

6) the residency might help to illuminate aims, objectives and expectations for future work.
4.3 Structuring the residency: student contact.

Activities were essentially focused within CSHM and orientated towards those students committed to the B.Ed. (Hons.) teacher training course in PE and dance. As a result of negotiations, and bearing in mind the maximisation of student involvement, the most appropriate timing for the residency, company commitments, and the Polytechnic structure and cyclic pattern the residency was structured over a four-week period. However, acceptance of a late touring booking by EDT delayed the residency by one week. This set in motion a sequence of negotiations within the Polytechnic which resulted in student contact with dance artists being minimised since it was not possible to alter such CSHM commitments as second year teaching practice and reading days.

Arguments in favour of working with one or two dance artists were countered with others which favoured engaging with several. In practice a compromise was reached which enabled curriculum groups to have a varied input in week one and some consistency of contact in the remaining weeks. Several principles were also adopted: where possible students who studied dance within different contexts worked alongside each other; CSHM students participated at times in cross curriculum groupings; the CSHM Performance Group worked mainly with one dance artist; and fourth year students had little contact with the residency because of the heavy course commitments at this particular point in the final year of the degree.

In-depth work extended to include two groups of students from the third and fourth years who were known throughout the residency as
Core Group A (CGA) and Core Group B (CGB). While dance specialist students met daily with one dance artist, others in CGB had a midweek break from dance activities. Both groups focused on the development of a choreographed dance with a view towards presentation and performance. Hence, contact time with dance artists varied between some having almost daily contact and others having very limited time. For example, while the intensive contact experienced by the two core groups was a direct result of agreed project decisions, the lack of involvement experienced by second year groups directly arose out of EDT's decision to move the residency. (The residency timetable is shown in Appendix I.)

In the first week, all CSHM students attended one of the two lecture demonstrations. The audience at the two performances consisted mainly of CSHM students and staff, and invited guests from organising agencies, the local borough and other Polytechnic courses.

Students on the B.Ed. (Hons.) PE and Dance degree at CSHM experienced their greatest and most varied contact with dance artists and intensive choreographic work started with CGA and CGB. Company members were also involved with students from the B.A. (Hons.) Expressive Arts (Dance minor), and B.Ed. (Hons.) First and Middle school courses. Dance artists also worked with teachers from East Sussex and the Southern Dance Teachers Association (SDTA); and Cipher, the Brighton based Youth Group.

Students had less contact with dance artists in weeks two, three and four. The second and third weeks took on a different format from the first, with a number of different variables. First, during the mid-residency period the company focused their attention and energies for several hours a day mainly on their own class followed by "movement
research". This resulted in a limited amount of practical work with students. Second, as students maintained normal degree commitments most activities lasted for an hour. Third, the two "choreographers" each extended their work with CGA and CGB outside normal timetable hours. Fourth, the In-Service course for teachers continued as did work with B.Ed (Hons.) Middle school students and Cipher. Fifth, additional open technique classes were taught by three dance artists. Sixth, no Expressive Arts students took part in residency proceedings. Seventh, no dance artist had any contact with second year students.

The structure of the fourth week was influenced by the need to prepare and to present workshop performances and a final sharing. Hence, minimal practical work took place with general curriculum groups. In particular, second year students had little contact with dance artists because of imminent teaching practice commitments, and many fourth year students (apart from dance specialists) were not on campus for the last week of the residency. Proceedings concluded with two workshop performances and a sharing. The latter provided a platform for the dance work arising from the residency period. A final forum allowed an interchange of ideas between CSHM students, dance tutors and company members.

Despite the ongoing negotiations internal problems arose when the perceptions of the residency organisers and those of Expressive Arts or CSHM staff did not in the event coincide. For example, the confusion and over-large classes experienced in the first week was a direct result of an Expressive Arts tutor allowing students to change their groups. Coursework concerns of a more ongoing nature also emerged when students became torn between residency expectations.
degree assignments and normal extra curricula commitments.

Two late decisions by EDT affected the timetable. For example, the absence of one dance artist during the mid residency period led to fewer company members being available to teach curriculum groups. Last minute changes by the Artistic Director altered the teaching programme. Some sessions were delayed because of commuting problems.

4.4 **Follow-up phase.**

The follow-up phase of the residency involved a general meeting, reports from CSHM and EDT, and post residency work. The meeting, held on 2nd May, 1985, was attended by an ACGB Dance Officer, the Artistic Director of EDT, the Head of CSHM, dance tutors from the B.Ed. (Hons.) PE and B.A. (Hons.) Expressive Arts courses and student representatives from CSHM. The ACGB dance officer (Ruth Glick) placed the meeting in the overall context of the Dance Artists in Education scheme and in the specific framework of the EDT/CSHM residency. In order to facilitate dance artists in education projects in general the ACGB aimed to discover what could be learnt from this particular project so that findings might be incorporated into future planning.

Project partners identified the need for preparation to be "educational" for both dance artists and dance tutors; the desirability of widening the dialogue to include all participating dance artists and dance tutors; the crucial aspect of residency timing; the relevance of appreciation elements; and the possibility of any future work being built into the degree structure on a more regular basis than hitherto. Questions were raised about the in-house planning structure, the
degree of tension apparent between CSHM staff expectations, excessive workloads and residency commitments.

Although the meeting concluded that an overall enrichment of dance had taken place, students queried the principle of selecting some young people for involvement in intensive work while excluding others from a similar experience. Representatives identified the assured attitudes of core groups and contrasted this with the mixed reaction of the majority of curriculum groups. They suggested that students in general would have had a more positive attitude to the residency if they had been involved in a similar in-depth activity. Feedback from the company was positive in nature and highlighted the integration of dance artists within the CSHM and the company contexts. However, while the Artistic Director disclosed that dance artists had coped well in the new role of teacher, students identified exceptions. The meeting concluded with a stress placed on the need to complete residency reports.

Discussion established priorities for follow up work at CSHM. These included dance artists guest teaching at CSHM over a period of time; or working with one or both core groups; or building dance artists into the long term plans for curriculum development; or the company making a video. In reality, one dance artist, Lloyd Newson, returned to CSHM to work as a choreographer with third and fourth year dance specialist students in January and April 1986. He then returned to work with a similar group of students over a series of weekends for a two year period. While the first two weekends were funded via the ACGB project the remainder were financed by alternative "in-house" methods.

Only significant issues are noted here from the EDT (1985) and CSHM
(1985) residency reports submitted to the ACGB. Significantly, while they each revealed that the residency was challenging, productive and successful, the EDT (1985) report stated for the first time the company's aims. These were:

1) to encourage students to take pride in their own physical ability and ways of dancing;

2) to widen students' knowledge of different dance ideas and ways of moving;

3) to encourage discussion;

4) to make the point that dancers were approachable;

5) to challenge company members in their roles as teachers.

In general, from EDT's point of view, the residency provided an excellent chance to integrate the company's education and performance programmes, allowed dancers to work closely together, and enabled dance artists to discover more about their dancing and teaching methods. More specifically, while the company considered that the preparation period was positive Claid maintained that the company had not devoted sufficient time to detailed preparation. In noting any shortcomings Claid identified the difficulties of involving the Expressive Arts students, expressed disappointment that few students attended the "movement research" sessions, and stated the need to monitor the progress of the two core groups on a weekly basis. Finally, Claid considered that CSHM's positive and open response had helped to build the confidence of dance artists, and to build a greater understanding between dance educators and dance artists.
The CSHM (1985) report set the project within the specific context of the department, the Polytechnic and current dance artists in education schemes. A description of the residency outlined the range of activities offered and related this to the overall aims of the project. Overall the evaluation acclaimed EDT's contribution and the central concern of dance artists to communicate dance at a level within which students could cope, comprehend and become meaningfully involved. At a more subtle level, those qualities which characterise professional attitudes were clearly manifested by dance artists in day to day activities. This contributed to the positive level of student engagement and thus to its success. Critical appraisal of the two core groups' choreographies were countered with praise for the exceptional performance qualities demonstrated by students in the workshop performance. Overall, the value of the enterprise was identified by the positive response of the student body and company, and the insight and deeper appreciation that students had gained into the world of theatre dance. Questions were raised about the central contribution that dance artists could make to education in general: the planning of content; the teaching skills of dance artists; and the need for an orientation period.

4.5 Choreography.

In compliance with one of the aims of the residency, EDT used the four dances performed from its current repertoire (see 4.6) as the focal point for workshop activities. In general, approaches ranged from students developing work with guidance from dance artists, to creating their own dances. Alternatively, workshops were based on movements or choreographic devices used in a particular dance or the essence of the dance. While workshops at times encompassed aspects
of reconstruction, only students in the Performance Group were involved in the exact recreation of a section from a dance. At times other starting points such as everyday gestures, or games based on chance, or improvisation were used as the basis for compositional work.

The two dance artists who each worked with CGA and CGB took overall responsibility for the development of a particular dance while engaging students in active choreographic decision making processes. Work with CGA focused on the use of "chance" operations to determine movement material in relation to set tasks. Content was introduced and developed in a variety of ways to take the work from a simplistic to a more complex nature. Different formats allowed for the collection and layering of material, the gradual formation of patterns of movement and sequences, the ordering of content in groups, the organisation of sections of the dance and to the final choreographed form. Similarly, work with CGB focused on the collection and development of material to set tasks related to specific ideas. Content was introduced and developed in a variety of ways in order to take the work from a simplistic to a more complex nature. Material was collected, layered and gradually formed into individual and group sequences prior to being organised into sections of the dance relevant to the overall choreographed form.

Technique was also used on rare occasions as the basis for workshop activity. When this happened the emphasis of the session remained technique focused although content was manipulated in relation to given tasks, as for example reordering movements in a sequence. The decision by EDT to undertake "movement research" as part of residency proceedings resulted in the company spending time on its
own work for several hours a day. Confusion about how "open" some sessions were to observers plus CSHM timetable commitments prevented dance tutors and interested students from viewing much of this work.

4.6 Performance.

The company performances stimulated interest in the residency, and provided a unique opportunity for students to widen their horizons of dance as art. Four dances were performed from EDT's 1984–1985 repertoire:

- **Field Study** (David Gordon, 1984)
  - music — by John Field.

- **Ombres Electriques** (Daniel Larrieu, 1984):
  - music — Sound Collage by Roger Sourd.

- **Office Suite** (David Gaines, 1984)
  - music — excerpts from Jazz Standards and Popular Tunes.

- **Spiked Sonata** (Dan Wagoner 1981);
  - music — American themes of the 1930s.

The main thrust of activity in the final week was on preparation for performance in the "Sharing/Workshops" by EDT, the two core groups and the performance group. While the planned involvement of Expressive Arts students in the workshop performances did not take place, the outreach worker performed her one-woman show to members of the two core groups. The final presentations were not conventional dance performances. Instead, the main emphasis was on the sharing of the dance pieces which had grown out of the core and performance group workshops and the company movement research period. The programme opened with three student pieces: a "collage"
in several sections choreographed with CGB: an excerpt from Spiked Sonata (Dan Wagoner, 1981) performed by the CSHM Performance Group; and a "Chance" dance choreographed with CGA.

EDT presented six items: a reconstruction of 12XU (Michael Clark, 1983); four new pieces from the "Movement Research" sessions; and a final improvisation based on the company's recent work with Katie Duck.

The main performance thrust of the residency with the majority of the students came through the focus on technique. A range of activity took place under this general heading which could be subdivided into two categories. First, there was a concern with a general body warm up through the use of exercises, and/or simple body and leg combinations in place, and/or footwork patterns and/or travelling sequences. Second, the body was used in a more relaxed manner as, for example, in the use of running, stretches and swings. Third, a focus was placed on Cunningham and Graham codified styles. Cunningham was used more frequently than Graham technique, and was approached in two different ways. In one, Cunningham derived work was used to build simple exercises and combinations in place and across the floor. In the other, Cunningham based principles more clearly underpinned the use of rolls, arches, stretches, twists, isolations and bounces combined with weight changes and balances.

Although Graham-type work was only used minimally it generally followed the format of a typical class: i.e. floorwork, standing in place and combinations across the floor. However, its underlying principles were not always made explicit, and the content of sessions varied.

The technique work taught to the two core groups was modified in
relation to ongoing choreographic work. Throughout, technique became incorporated into the ongoing developing choreographic work and rehearsals. Both groups practised sequences to correct the technical demands of movements and rehearsed sections with an eye to performance skills. Hence, the perception of students to the technical demands of movements and sections of the dance were heightened as they met an increasing concern with basic technique principles through the rehearsal process.

4.7 Appreciation.

Appreciation aspects took place in the more formal lecture demonstration and less formal contexts such as the practical activities and the final sharing. The lecture demonstrations preceded the company performances so that participants, as audience, could be given an insight into particular aspects of the company's repertoire. The Artistic Director was responsible for what was focused on and how this was presented.

Both lecture demonstrations followed a similar format and focused on dances choreographed by Gordon from the past and current EDT repertoire, i.e. Counter Revolution (1983) and Field Study (1984). Throughout the Artistic Director made reference to the choreographic structures, meanings and performance requirements of the sections shown in the video extracts and live performance. In particular, practical demonstrations drew attention to the similarities and differences between the two dances and performance demands. Specific characteristics inherent within Field Study (David Gordon, 1984) were focused on such as the use of chairs and the apparent gentleness and sensitivity in the dance. Gordon's "constructionalist"
approach was outlined to students and a question and answer session enabled dance artists, students, and dance tutors to share ideas. The discussion groups timetabled to take place after the second lecture demonstration were cancelled, for no apparent reason, by the artistic director.

The final sharing gave dance artists and some student groups equal responsibility to review the dances seen in the workshop performance and to ask questions about how these had been developed. This, together with the familiarity built up with dance artists, enabled an easy exchange of views between all those involved either as presenters, or dancers or audience. Small "buzz" groups of students, dance artists and dance tutors then gathered together to discuss views and impressions of the residency.

4.8 Summary.

This chapter provides a descriptive overview of the different stages of the residency, i.e. the planning, implementation, and follow up phases. It identifies that the aims and objectives set in the initial planning stage affected decisions about the structure of the residency, including the company "movement research", and student contact with dance artists. Consideration of the follow-up phase clarifies that a number of separate yet interlinked activities took place under this title. Discussion of residency activities under the umbrella headings of choreography, performance and appreciation reveals what the company actually did and the activities in which participants were involved. Hence, the chapter as a whole sets the scene from which discussion of the results of the case study and the research methodologies considered in Chapter 5 stems.
Notes.

1 Ten dance artists and two professional musicians were involved in fifty-seven practical sessions with Polytechnic students and with middle and secondary school teachers from East Sussex and the SDTA. The two core groups each worked intensively with one dance artist for a total of nine sessions. A minimum programme of dance activity was also undertaken on the Falmer (Brighton) site of the Polytechnic with B.Ed. (Hons.) First and Middle school students.

2 Throughout week two, eight dance artists worked with twenty-five groups. Four dance artists taught fourteen curriculum groups: of these five were taken by the EDT outreach worker, five by the rehearsal director, and four by two company members. The two dance artists who worked with CGA and CGB again took a total of nine practical sessions.

3 Eight dance artists taught twenty-five groups. Five worked with eleven curriculum groups: the outreach worker and the rehearsal director each taught five groups and two company members both took one each. Two dance artists again worked with the two core groups for a total of nine practical sessions. Requests from students and staff at CSHM resulted in three additional dance artists teaching two open technique classes, a ballet class and two practical sessions with fourth year students.

4 Five dance artists worked with eight student groups, the outreach worker taking five of these. The two core groups met four times for technical and dress rehearsals.
Chapter 5

Research Methodology: the Fieldwork.

5.1 Introduction.

This chapter aims to reflect upon and report the research process of this study. The wide remit of the early stages of the research was to examine how a particular dance artists in education project, i.e. between CSHM, Brighton Polytechnic, and EDT, was approached and interpreted. However, the acceptance of the research proposal and the timing of the residency left only two and half months in which to design, modify and finalise those methodologies used. Although some empirical research had taken place in the area there was a scarcity of evidence, and thus a difficulty of knowing about what was happening in projects. Within the literature in general there was little reliable information to go on (see Chapter 2) and, overall, the conclusions reached suggested that definition, justification and implementation were all complex and problematic. For example what do dance artists actually do in education contexts?

This chapter aims to address the issue relating to the epistemological level described variously as logic of justification (Smith and Heshusius, 1986); or the philosophical basis underpinning the research process (Finch, 1986); and the procedures and techniques employed (Burgess, 1985, Smith and Heshusius, 1986). In the writing
of this chapter, as in the research process, epistemology and method are regarded as 'inevitably intertwined' (Finch, 1986, p 9).

5.2 Theoretical Considerations.

The researcher's role in the research process must also be acknowledged as an integral part of the reporting of what Rose (1982, p 115) called the 'natural history' of the study. The research which was largely of an exploratory nature (Phillips and Pugh, 1987 p 45) became gradually more focused as time passed. The instinctive and the more soundly theoretical or empirically based shifting of ideas, concerns, problems and plans were part of the natural progression of the study. The research did not set out be a 'methodological pluralist'; there was no knowledge of which issues and which concepts might emerge it was not possible to foresee the direction that the research would take. As Rose (1982, p 115) noted, the course of a project cannot be predicted in advance, it could only be 'seen in retrospect' once the research was finished.

Changing parameters were a condition of the research process. While it was clear that a 'scientific' approach was not relevant for this study any anxieties encountered about the influence of life experiences and intuitive hunches were dispelled somewhat by encountering the views of Mills (1959) and Bacon (1981). The concern for 'systematic reflection' advocated by Mills (1959) together with attention to both the process of research and its final outcome was crucial. Equally significant, was Bacon's recommendation that research has suffered:
from a failure to recognise the need for a disciplined subjectivity within which conventional scientific data is complemented by that concerned with intuition and feeling, and in which the research endeavour is seen as a continual, ongoing investigatory, and questioning process.


The nature of the research was considerably complex. The residency provided the opportunity to test the problems identified in relation to dance artists in education as exemplified in the ACGB pilot projects of 1980 (Briginshaw et al. 1980) and in other residency work hosted at CSHM (see 3.3). This necessitated choice of methods and techniques within methods which allowed research of a very particular kind. Hence, the nature of the problem determined the methods (Stubbs, 1976 p195) and particularly the pioneering techniques used.

Epistemologically there has been a shift during the research process from the quantitative research style. While this would have produced a statistical enumeration and standardisation it would not have given the detailed description and depth of data offered by qualitative research. Furthermore, having used four distinct methods, the appraisal can be viewed as being based on 'methodological pluralism' (Bell and Newby, 1977; Bilton et al, 1981). This was a valid approach in an exploratory study where the foci emerged during the research process. In this particular instance, the quantitative data from the dance artists', dance tutors' and students' surveys in the form of the questionnaire was expected to reveal breadth of data and general patterns by obtaining an overall picture. Importantly, the use of video recordings, monitored observations and interview techniques gave a direction to future work. They facilitated an interpretive, qualitative case-study method which allowed depth of first hand knowledge. The techniques employed enabled the researcher to find out what actually
took place as well as to get at meanings and understandings within the residency context.

The researcher identified a number of inherent advantages of the multi-method approach and the way different methods could be used to complement each other in the overall understanding of the particular focus. The most directly applicable to this study was that their respective strengths might be reaped (Bryman, 1988, p127). Overall this enabled breadth and depth; structure and flexibility; a more complete picture and hence a greater understanding of what went on.

The rest of this chapter, with the main research phases providing the framework, has been devoted to giving 'a complete picture' of the research process. Although mainly devoted to 'what was done', that is the methods adopted, researcher reflections on the process contribute to an explanation and understanding of the process involved.

Four methods were used to facilitate a wide and detailed investigation:

1. video recordings of dance artists working with groups;
2. independent observers recording the work that dance artists undertook with students;
3. taped interviews with dance artists, students and dance tutors;
4. questionnaires to dance artists, students and dance tutors.

5.3 Questionnaires.

Initially, the aim of phase one of the study was three-fold. With no comprehensive existing data bank, it was important to build up a picture of the students', dance artists' and dance educators'
conceptions of a particular residency situation, to identify issues, and, from the data, to generate hypotheses for further investigation. The survey method, specifically the questionnaire, was seen as the best means of achieving such aims. The broad nature of the task and the desire to leave options for further work open, resulted in the inclusion of a wide variety of variables. The surveys capacity for generating quantifiable data on large numbers of people (Bryman, 1988) suggested that a self-completed questionnaire “mailed” to P.E. students, dance artists and dance educators would allow enumeration of data from a group of trainee P.E. teachers, dance artists and tutors in Higher Education. The questionnaire allowed information to be acquired in a succinct manner and could be distributed and collected with relative ease. However, to be effective, it had to be designed in relation to the main issues which were expected to emanate from involvement in project work (Oppenheim, 1966).

Bryman (1988) has claimed that one of the major characteristics of quantitative research is that inferences can be made about the population as a whole. To do this elements of the ‘analytic, relational type of survey’ (Oppenheim, 1966, p 8) were built into the survey to explore the relationships between particular pre-defined variables, and to find associations and relationships. The flexibility of question format possible within survey design also led to the use of different groups of questions that each required specific types of answers. Factual information could provide an essential background to the study. The measurement of opinions required the use of sets of closed questions and attitude statements. Answers had to be selected from a given range of statements on a five point scale, and in some instances additional opportunity was given to the receiver for a short statement. Rank order questions and ‘qualitative’ open ended
questions were also used. This enabled the researcher to 'understand and capture the points of view of the respondents' without predetermining points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories (Patton, 1980, p28). Patton suggested that even at this elementary level of measurement, open ended responses could reveal depth and details of feelings. More emotive questions were interspersed with others and any personal data included came at the end.

Clarke and Clarke (1984) stressed the value of planning, and careful preparation followed by pilot work in which the adequacy of the questionnaire could be tested on the kind of respondents to be used in the main survey. In this instance, piloting one questionnaire with students from a CSHM curriculum group enabled a check to be made on ambiguity, 'loading' and bias and the language used. This was particularly important as the self-administered questionnaire depended on the questions and written instructions to elicit accurate responses and to motivate the respondent (Sudman and Bradburn, 1983). While much was learnt from the actual response to each question, of equal value was the feedback on other issues, for example, clarity of questions and layout; understanding the questions; and time taken.

Although in total five questionnaires were designed for students only questionnaires one and two were scrutinised, clarified and piloted with two groups. When modified in relation to student responses the finalised versions provided the format on which questionnaires three and four became based. However, difficulties were experienced in the design of questionnaire five as it was targeted for students, dance artists and dance educators. The inadvisability of utilising one
questionnaire for dance artists and dance educators resulted in two corresponding versions. While the structure, the nature of the questions, and the format remained constant, issues of a more sensitive nature led to slight variations in each questionnaire and to some questions being refocused and rephrased.

In spite of warnings from Moser and Kalton (1971) that the length and number of questionnaires could affect the response rate the inclusion of open ended questions kept options open for future work. This allowed respondents to give fuller accounts. Initial groundwork with students to persuade them to co-operate in the pilot project was followed by personal contact and introducing respondents in all three groups to the aims and nature of the research. Guide-lines given by Oppenheim (1966), Moser and Kalton (1971) and Clarke and Clarke (1984) were followed, as were recommendations about the importance of closely matching randomly selected groups with a control group, and the importance of keeping the interest of respondents in longitudinal design. Overall, the questionnaire was used as a research tool because it allowed information to be acquired in a succinct manner, and in this instance, could be distributed and collected with relative ease.

During the design process consideration was given to the type of statistical analysis which might be utilised. Similarly, preliminary decisions about coding for open-ended questions were noted. Questionnaires were designed and mailed to three target groups throughout the residency; B.Ed. (Hons.) PE students, dance tutors at CSHM, and dance artists. These were distributed to students immediately prior to and during the project. While all students were asked to respond to questionnaires one, two and five, a control and
randomly selected group were also given questionnaires three and four (See Appendix II). Questionnaire one, the pre-test, was given to all B.Ed. (Hons.) students in order to establish what participants knew about the company prior to the start of the residency. Questionnaire two aimed to establish the activities in which students were involved. En route tests, numbers three and four, were designed to monitor trends and any attitude changes of the core and control groups. Questionnaire 5, the post test, was given to all students to find out factual evidence about the residency activities and to identify whether there had been any shift in student attitudes which mirrored the questionnaire given to dance artists and dance tutors towards the end of the third week.

A blank copy of three of the questionnaires is included in Appendix 2.

5.4 Interviews

The advantage of interviewing within the case study was immeasurable. To ease the process, and to ensure that interviews were carried out in line with research procedures, the principle monitor was briefed about the duties involved. This enabled the monitor to enter the research process with the knowledge that she had to remain neutral, refrain from giving advice, refrain from asking leading questions and avoid entering into an argument with the respondent. The interviews were tape recorded to facilitate ease of discussion and to avoid the distraction of note taking. This, according to Lofland and Lofland (1984, p 601) was 'imperative' when the interviewer had to be fully alert to what was being said, when there was no fixed order of questions and probing was such an important point of the process. It was stressed that the taping was to help the
researcher's analysis. All interviews took place in an office and, on average the total interview time spent with one respondent was approximately one hour. However, the number that took place was dependent on the distribution of the free time of students, dance artists and dance educators. Throughout, the interviewees were allowed to give information when s/he thought fit. While the interview format devised was similar for all three groups, it allowed questions to be slanted to either dance artists, or students, or dance tutors as the need arose.

The use of interviews as a more formal research tool required cooperation from students, dance artists and dance tutors. It involved a highly flexible face-to-face situation in which structured conversation had to be skilfully handled so that an exchange of ideas could take place. In the case study these were subject based, designed for all three parties and provided the opportunity for an in-depth focus on selected areas. These were intended initially to extend findings from the questionnaires, and aimed to explore the response of the company, dance artists and dance tutors to identified issues and to EDT's current practice. In particular, the interview aimed to understand and to capture the respondent's perspective (Howe, 1988).

Oppenheim (1966), Moser and Kalton (1971) and Clarke and Clarke (1984) identified that interview design should include a definite purpose or aim. To be effective, there was a need for a structured interview schedule, the design of objective questions consistent with valid external criteria, and a limit placed on the number of questions to enable respondents to develop a theme (Oppenheim, 1966; Moser and Kalton, 1971). Attention was paid to the language used including the use of emotive words and phrases and the length of questions
When briefing, the interviewer's attention was drawn to interview techniques and Clarke and Clarke's (1984) warning that difficulties might arise from assuming that respondents have a certain knowledge base. A stress was also placed on the importance of asking questions so that respondents could answer them openly and in their own way. Equally crucial was the need to pursue a question only as far as it served a useful purpose, and to make maximum use of the time available.

As use of interviews in this study was characteristic of a qualitative research method they adhered to the need for flexibility and adaptability so that a personal and in-depth response could be elicited from the interview (Cohen and Manion, 1989). The use of a semi-structured interview within an overall framework of core structured questions allowed the interviewer to encourage interviewees to talk openly and freely in response to the questions asked. This ensured that no issues were omitted through failure to remember them. Therefore, the interviewer was able to deviate and to explore emergent areas in greater depth, to gain clarification of points made and to elaborate on possibilities. Measor (1985b) argued that such rambling might lead to data central to the interviewee.

Moser and Kalton (1971) warned that much of the success or failure of an interview was dependent on the opening few minutes. Hence, to establish a good rapport with the interviewee and to elicit unbiased feedback in the remainder of the interview the initial question was intentionally structured to obtain factual background information (Oppenheim, 1966). The interviewer was then required to build up and to maintain a relationship throughout the interview so that the respondent was interested and responsive. While the interviewer had
to be able to respond sensitively to issues which arose spontaneously these had to be focused in such a way that bias in answers was avoided (Clarke and Clarke, 1984). Although the interviewer had to clarify precisely what the respondent meant on points of uncertainty, at no time was she expected to interpret the respondent's remarks in a detrimental way (Oppenheim, 1966). Measor (1985b) argued that any rambling this might lead to could lead to data central to the interviewee. The core of questions was based on the questionnaire from phase one with a number of additional items. With no fixed schedule, flexibility allowed the interviewer to pursue any issues raised by the interviewees which were of particular concern to them and influenced their dance artists in education practice. Also, having being guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity, most respondents were willing to talk honestly particularly when convinced about the genuine interest of the interviewer.

On completion of all interviews the tapes were fully transcribed. While this was time consuming, it required the researcher to study each interview and stimulated analysis (Lofland and Lofland, 1984). It also enabled analysis to be conducted over and over again and thus for interpretations to be checked. Equally important, as Dean and Whyte (1979) suggested, the cross-checking of questionnaires, interview transcripts and video recordings of actual practice. This enabled the researcher to feel confident in the replies of respondents.

Interviews took place with a random selection of students from different year groups, all dance artists and three dance tutors en route and post the residency. (The fourth dance tutor was not included because of her role as researcher). In addition, the Artistic Director of EDT and the head of dance were each interviewed because
of their influential roles. Residency pressures, the availability of the interviewer and interviewees influenced the number and selection of students and dance artists interviewed. In total, 14 interviews took place with students from years one to four, and with 10 dance artists and 3 dance tutors. While dance artists, dance tutors and some students were interviewed individually, other students were seen in groups of two or three. Time constraints and company commitments prevented the Artistic Director being interviewed until June 1985.

5.5 Observations.

The other major technique used to gain an overall impression of the residency was observation. Literature emanating from the ACGB projects discussed in 2.3 rarely identified exactly what took place. Therefore, in an attempt to overcome such vagueness, a thorough investigation of EDT's work occurred through the objective observation of practical activities by outside monitors. Bernard, Peterson and Brown (1981) maintain that certain content areas, such as the arts were not conducive to quantification, and therefore should be evaluated through less prescriptive models. Observations methodologies and other qualitative evidence have been suggested as alternative or supplements to objective data. However, the appropriateness of any methodology has to be dependent upon the situation. While the field notes method recommended by Lofland and Lofland (1984) was useful, this became adapted to fit the particular context of the study. Although notes were made during practical sessions these focused on the given content, the approaches taken and the attitudes that generally prevailed.

It was recognised at the outset that the use of observers to record
practical sessions might cause some disquiet among dance artists. One drawback of the relatively short time span of the residency was that dance artists had little time to grow accustomed to the observer's presence in the practical classroom and elsewhere. In accordance with Bryman (1988, p 112) and warnings about 'reactivity' or 'reactive affects' the researcher anticipated the possibility of the observer effect on dance artists in their formal and informal dealings with students, and on the behaviour of students. However, Blease's (1983, p 214) findings that this factor was lessened in the less formal setting of practical work where teachers had greater freedom of movement was encouraging.

To facilitate an ease between company members and the monitors an informal dialogue was set up which allowed an exchange of ideas to take place on the first day. Monitors were requested to be as unobtrusive as possible and 'the need to obtain a degree of credibility in the eyes of those being observed' (Blease, 1983, p 214) was given careful consideration. To counter Threadgold's (1985) observation of the gulf between theorists and practitioners, stress was laid on the interests of the observers in dance, and that they were in fact studying the reality of the situation. The observers tried to be non-threatening and stressed the study was not an evaluation of what particular dance artists were doing. The intention was to be able to identify what they did in practice, to be able to place their views in the context of the other ACGB projects, and for the observer to get a feel of the residency. In practical work, interest was, at this stage, on what happened with students and not on the personal performance of dance artists. The researcher hoped that the observers would be seen by the dance artists as sympathetic, dance-interested teachers observing to get an idea of their views, the working situation, and
what they did. Hence, the observers “remained a non-participant observer(s) throughout, and carefully established the role of friendly, curious and non judgmental visitor” (Locke, 1989, p 7). However, in the guise of a non-participant observer, interesting possibilities for participation arose when monitors took part in practical sessions.

To make the process as objective as possible two monitors, who had knowledge of dance as an art form and teaching expertise, undertook the observation process. One was an experienced dance teacher engaged in M.A. study at the University of Sussex. The other had recently completed a B.Ed. (Hons.) in Dance with a distinction in teaching. Both had previous experience in, and were sympathetic to, dance artists in education practice. To facilitate a systematic procedure, briefing took place with the two monitors prior to the start of the residency. Points covered included their role, the processes to be followed with dance artists and students, what to look for and how to record data. To check procedures and objectivity, they both observed, monitored and recorded the same two sessions independently and the residency co-ordinator covered two other practical activities. Discussion between all three parties identified similarities, differences and any shortcomings in the recording system. This was then adapted. However, variation might have occurred as monitors probably became less observant or, conversely, more attentive as the tasks became better learned, or when they participated in sessions. Other problems such as fatigue and bias may also have influenced outcomes. Even so the arguments, put forward by Cohan and Manion (1989) that mediated observation has a place in research methodology have been affirmed in this study.
In the rare event when the monitors participated in sessions mental notes were made during the activity and jotted down immediately it was finished. Hence, Lofland and Lofland’s (1984, p 65) inscription of field notes as a “running description of events, people, things heard and overheard, conversations with people” was adapted. In this study elements in the observation sheet directed the focus and any descriptive feedback.

Although the limited availability of monitors prevented a record being made of the work of every group, observation was carried out with some curriculum groups across all years and particularly with CGA. These all took place in the ‘practical classroom’ situation during timetabled sessions. Notes were made either during the session or as soon as possible afterwards. While Table 2 shows that 28 sessions were observed and recorded, the number of dance artists observed in a week and in total varied and was largely dependent on the residency timetable. While most dance artists were observed working with different groups, some were viewed teaching the same groups on more than one occasion.

The designed observation format provided the vehicle through which monitors recorded the work of dance artists with specific groups. In particular, they noted their perceptions of what took place and how students responded under the umbrella headings of technique and workshops. To facilitate the process, the observation sheet was divided into technique and creative work, and then into such further sub-sections as content, artistry and methodology. The focus placed on such factors then differed depending on whether they fell under the ‘technique’ or ‘creative’ heading. For example, attention was drawn
**Table No. 2  OBSERVED AND RECORDED SESSIONS**

* = session was observed and recorded  
| Student Groups | Week 1 | Week 2 | Week 3 | Week 4 | Week 5 | Week 6 | Week 7 | Week 8 | Week 9 | Week 10 | Week 11 | Week 12 | Week 13 | Week 14 | Week 15 | Week 16 | Week 17 | Week 18 | Week 19 | Week 20 |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| PG            | 3      | 9      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| CGB           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| CGA           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 4SP           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 4             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| D             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| C             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| B             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3A            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3C/D          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3A/B          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3A2           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 3A1           |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| D             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| C             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| B             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 2A            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| D             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| C             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| B             |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| 1A            |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

**Dance Artist**  
G: (2)  
I: (8)  
E: (2)  
B: (2)  
C: (2)  
D: (1)  
H: (2)  
F: (1)  
J: (6)

No. of Monitored Sessions
to how technique was adapted for a particular group; or a focus was placed on the interrelationship between technical work and the repertoire. A record was also made of the dance artist's, monitor's and selected students' perceptions of how the aims of a session are fulfilled.

Time limitations prevented the observations sheet being piloted prior to the start of the residency. Despite the objectivity and practicality of the format being discussed with monitors, amendments had to be made to its design once the research was in progress. In retrospect, the observers were expected to do too much and subdivisions of the main headings made the vast task they faced even more complicated. While this resulted in the recording of generalised information which may have been biased even less precise, comments were made when monitors participated in sessions. This might well reflect how events affected the observer rather than the group. Terminology also created other problems as that used by the monitors and dance artists appeared sometimes not to match. Thus, despite observers knowing what to look for they did not always use the same language as the dance artists to describe the activities seen. The unavailability of the main monitor during the second week resulted in fewer activities being observed than anticipated.

In total, 10 dance artists were observed in 29 sessions.

A blank copy of the observation sheet is included in Appendix II.

5.6 Video Recordings.

While the observation and recording of sessions by outside monitors
was considered to be a central means for obtaining data, it was recognised that one person could neither record all the practical work undertaken in a session nor fully monitor teaching aspects. While time, funding and personnel restraints prevented the project from being filmed in totality the use of video to record activities was expected initially to provide a general overview and record of the residency at CSHM. However, this not only gave an impression of a variety of activities but was particularly useful as it allowed the event to be captured as it happened in an unbiased manner. Furthermore, it enabled the researcher to return to data continually over a period of time without losing the context or the content of what took place. Bernard, Peterson and Brown (1981) confirmed the use of video taping as a useful tool in mediated observations because of its permanency. Hence, in this study it has allowed access to the images portrayed and thus to the data.

A structured programme of video recordings took place even though it was initially only to provide an overall impression of the residency rather than as a major element in the research design. Although it was anticipated that dance artists might be anxious about their work being recorded it was assumed that this would be less impersonal and immediately threatening than monitors observing and documenting sessions. Therefore in order to record a variety of activities across all year groups filming started immediately. A focus was placed on both the work undertaken with the majority of B.Ed. (Hons.) PE students and on the activities of the two core groups.

Table 3 shows the number of times dance artists were video recorded working with groups. The majority of these took place in week one because of the changing format and purpose of the residency. While
some practical sessions were also recorded in weeks two and three
those filmed in week four showed dance artists and students in other
contexts such as a rehearsal, a work-shop performance and the final
sharing. The number of times that dance artists were recorded varied
widely. In general, the work of each curriculum group was recorded
less consistently than the practical activities of the two core groups.

When the value of the collected material was recognised, a major
challenge was that research tools had to be designed which allowed
for the identification, analysis and interpretation of data. This task
took place over two phases. In the first, the material inherent within
each video session was identified and interpreted in verbal form. In
the second, tools in the form of analytical tables had to be designed
which allowed for the analysis of data. Adaption of an analytical model
pioneered by Adshead et al (1988) enabled content to be identified in
relation to dance as an art form, sub-divided under the umbrella
headings of technique, a range of workshops and choreographic work.
In addition, as content and presentation had a particular relationship
which required further exploration, use was made of the Mosston
(Mosston and Ashworth, 1986) spectrum to identify a distinct range of
teaching styles and to separate these from the material presented. It
also allowed such essential practices as demonstration and correction
to be pinpointed. This model has been used extensively as a means of
appraising teaching objectivity in initial teacher training for PE and
Dance students since the mid 1980s, and has been focused on in HMI
directed courses. Hence, analysis of the practical activities (video
recorded) on an adaptation of the Mosston spectrum enabled
identification of the teaching approaches adopted, and clarified the
Table No. 3  VIDEO-RECORDED SESSIONS

* = session was video-recorded
number = indentification number of record

| WEEK | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| PG   | 3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| CGB  | 2 | 21| 24| 25| 22|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| CGA  | 14|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4SP  | 4 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| C    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3C/D |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A/B |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A2  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A1  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| C    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2A   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| D    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| C    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| B    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| IA   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Dance Artist
No. of Video  G (2)  I (10)  E (2)  B (6)  C (3)  D (3)  H (1)  F (1)  J (6)
similarities and differences evident in technique and workshop activities. Together these two formats provided the means to verify or to question data obtained from other sources and also allowed new issues to be identified.

5.7 **Limitations of the fieldwork**

Yin (1989) regards the opportunity of using many different sources of evidence as a major strength of case study data. The range of techniques of data collection within this particular case study method rather than a reliance on one technique importantly offered the researcher a strategy for validating data akin to Denzin’s (1970) ‘within method’ triangulation.

Unfortunately the timing of the case study prevented the feasibility of the methods being piloted in an exercise incorporating all the techniques. This might have proved that the method was feasible and given forewarning of unforeseen problems. In particular, it might have alerted the researcher to the massive amount of data which would be accumulated from transcribing interview tapes and writing up observations of the video recorded work. Similarly, although the willingness of subjects had been recognised as a key factor it had not been tried in practice. Overall, the time span between the acceptance of the residency proposal and the fieldwork (2.5 months) prevented clarification of set goals, refinement of the methods used and the piloting of research instruments. This has to be borne in mind when considering the limitations of specific research methods.

The residency co-ordinator and EDT management assumed that dance artists would find the presence and use of a video camera less
inhibiting than the initial attendance of observers. The familiarity of
dance artists with video recording company rehearsals allowed them
to accept its use in the residency context more easily than they might
have done. Even so some individuals found its presence an added
pressure. Practical considerations, such as the pre-planning required
to book technicians in weeks two, three and four and in the evenings,
prevented work being video recorded spontaneously.

Yet despite dance artists being familiar with, and accepting the
principle of their work being recorded it did, in practice, result in
added pressure. In particular, the two dance artists who taught most
of the practical work in weeks two, three and four were the most
affected. This was exacerbated for one individual who was also
responsible for the work of one of the two core groups. In addition
both dance artists who took on the role of the choreographer may
have experienced further tension because of working towards a final
performance.

The interpretation and analysis of video recorded work posed a series
of challenges. The initial analysis of what actually took place was
extremely time consuming. With hindsight, too much detail was
transcribed about the content and teaching approaches found in each
session. Although these were written up in detail a more general
analysis had to take place to enable the researcher to make sense of
the mass of data. If this had taken place during the interpretation
stage it could have eased time pressures and more importantly, might
have affected the design of the analytical tables. Similarly while the
researcher was aware of the need to pilot the tables used this was
impractical because of time constraints.

Although the interviewing strategy employed could be regarded as
successful with hindsight the intention to phase and schedule interviews en route and post the residency required more thought. The assumption that they could all take place during the four week period did not take into account the time pressures experienced by all three groups. Limitations were imposed as the random selection and interviewees did not follow procedures outlined by Oppenheim (1966), Moser and Kalton (1971) and Clarke and Clarke (1984). Subsequently, despite a large percentage of these taking place during the first week, the work loads of dance artists and students prevented individuals from being easily accessible. Hence some selection became dependent upon availability.

The design of the interview was also subject to alteration. Modifications were made to some questions to make them even more pertinent for specific interviewees or to allow them to comply with the phasing of the interviews throughout the residency period. Longer questions were broken down into a series of short and more direct questions, and language became adjusted to refocus the respondents' answers. But as Oppenheim (1966) claimed this, and emotionally loaded words and/or phrases, might have coloured answers. Equally important, the assumptions made by the researcher that all respondents would have the required knowledge to answer the interview questions proved inaccurate.

Oppenheim (1966) and Clarke and Clarke (1984) identified that the interrelationship of the three variables — the respondent, the interviewer and the interview schedule — could affect results. In particular, they refer to the problems of rapport and interviewer bias as being of major importance in data collection. As the standardisation of interview questions and procedures were not
always followed through, results may have been coloured. The timing of interviews and subjects targeted may have resulted also in the rephrasing of questions to redress balance. However, the most important aim was to set up some rapport with dance artists rather than immediately probing for information. Measor's (1985b, p 57) reflection about getting access to the interviewees' "life and view of the world" through shared interests and assured anonymity can be applied to the interviews as a whole.

Oppenheim (1966), Moser and Kalton (1971) and Clarke and Clarke (1984) claimed that surveys generally produce reliable but less detailed information than interviews, and that their strengths are twofold. First they enabled the efficient collection of data on a large number of individuals; second they allowed for a precise comparison to be made between the answers of respondents. However, despite the advantages of the survey method, problems were experienced with the questionnaires designed for this particular project. These fell into the categories of piloting, implementation/time, design and analysis. Time pressures resulted in only questionnaires one and two being piloted with student groups and these were selected for ease of access rather than in the random manner recommended by Moser and Kalton (1971). Other questionnaires were checked by colleagues to see if they were logical, easy to follow, misleading or biased. A further limitation may have been imposed as students in the random group were not selected totally from those with comparable experience in course length.

Although the distribution of questionnaires was easy, they became increasingly difficult to collect. In particular neither second nor fourth year students viewed the completion of the last questionnaire as a
priority and prompting for returns was difficult because of limited contact with particular cohorts. Similarly the workloads of dance artists affected the number of returns. They may have regarded them as an unnecessary chore and/or been suspicious of their use. In contrast, the small sample of dance tutors made for easy collection of questionnaires.

Although Oppenheim (1966) and Moser and Kalton (1971) stressed the importance of maintaining interest in questionnaires, this was not followed through totally in practice. The format and length of questionnaires three and four required modification and questionnaires two and five needed simplifying. Limitations were also imposed on the study by the variety of responses given to open questions and by the subsequent decoding. Similarly some questions were too open, or too much space was left for 'any other comments'. In such instances the variety of statements was difficult to interpret.

Despite warnings by Oppenheim (1966) about the importance of the language, problems arose even though an attempt had been made to avoid ambiguities. Therefore, terminology used by dance artists, dance educators and students did not always coincide. As an educator, the researcher probably used definitions less familiar with the professional dance world. This, together with the academic turn of the questionnaire, may have further disadvantaged dance artists.

The importance of confidentiality and anonymity has been stressed by Oppenheim (1966), Moser and Kalton (1971) and Clarke and Clarke (1984). Despite the emphasis placed on this with all respondents, some individuals may have been apprehensive about the confidentiality of the information. In particular dance tutors could have been apprehensive as a small sample might have made
Overall, the use of extensive video recordings produced an unexpected mass of material for research purposes. This material focused on technique, repertoire, reconstruction and choreography. The richness of the video data provides a special opportunity to investigate the focus, intent and approach as taken by dance artists in practice. Significantly, the wealth and diversity of the data influenced the direction of the research, and the survey questionnaire data became supportive to the findings from the other research tools rather than a primary element of the study. (Questionnaire survey material remains with the author).

One of the main problems of the research was that the mass of material that was acquired had to be interpreted. Rose (1982, p 124) offers the useful explanation of the process involved when dealing with deciphering qualitative data and the data analysis process. He considered that whatever the strategy employed, the researcher is always involved in 'a cyclable process of data analysis' which is 'one of progressive refinement or revision of results (e.g. concept, description) until they are consistent with the data'. Thus, the aim where there is more than one case is to build a general explanation that fits each of the cases even though they will vary in detail. Rose (1982, p 124) suggested that tentative results which may be no more than hunches at the start are progressively revised and repeatedly checked through combing through field notes and other data. McDonald and Walker (1975, p 9) believed that in case study research 'proof is rarely obtainable', and proposed that the main means of validation was cross-checking where the researcher is guided by the pursuit of discrepancy. Hence, any inconsistencies or negative cases played a
crucial role in the analysis process. To this end models for the analysis of data had to be devised to handle evidence, to develop a model and to reach conclusions (Yin, 1989).

The culmination of all the methods and techniques used during the research process could be regarded as exploratory because of the lack of previous research. This led to the identification of ongoing pressing concerns and emerging foci. The research process began with the researcher's acquaintance with the general literature relating to dance artists within education, progressed through the various stages of the questionnaire, interview, and observation design, and how these, and video recordings were implemented. Finally, the more interpretive case study phase is presented in Chapter 6. Overall, the use of more than one method was seen as particularly appropriate and an important strategy in exploratory research of this nature. In particular, the major case study phase allowed the foci to emerge and be investigated, as well as providing an overall picture which allowed an understanding of the topic.

It could be argued that the focus on one company with their specific education contexts limits the results of the findings. However, while each company will have its own philosophy which determines current practice, it was anticipated that the results would reflect the practice of others involved in dance artists in education programmes. Finally, the time gap between the event of the residency and the presentation of this study might seem to limit the relevance of the findings to the recommendations. However, discussion in Part 3 suggests that many of the issues identified in the findings continue to recur in current projects.
The analysis of data from the four research methods employed has led to a reappraisal of the methodologies. The assumption at the outset that the observed sessions would yield the core of the research material was not justified. Likewise, while the observed records gave an overall impression, the detail obtained was, on its own, insufficient to provide in-depth insight into the activities undertaken. In contrast, expectations that video material would provide an overall record of the residency and substantiate observed evidence was surpassed. The main value of the video recording centred on the availability and constant access it allowed for analysis of material. In practice the key to the majority of the residency came from the video recordings as they provided confirmation, when cross-referencing, of what took place in observed sessions. The undisputed value of the interviews was the in-depth information which they yielded in spite of procedures not always being followed through. A chance was taken on the possibility of bias for the sake of richness and spontaneity of information that only the interview can give. This added a further dimension.

The inherent weakness of the questionnaire survey should not be seen as detracting from the status of the findings. The primary analyses of data are comparative, and the level and significance of findings from one group in relation to another are not adversely affected. What is more, the analyses in detail of material from video recordings are particularly significant for this study. The findings that have been reported are those that, in combination with other evidence, are highly trustworthy.

Bell and Newby (1977) comment on the tendency of multi-method
research to trust one sort of data rather than the other. In this case, the qualitative findings have been believed, and when there were apparent contradictions or anomalies, these have been explained through qualitative insights gained from a comparison of data from all three sources: i.e. video recordings, documentation from observed sessions, and interviews. Acknowledging such weaknesses as there are, and making reasoned judgements about the status of the data, are methodological strengths.

It is believed that the integrated use of such research tools as video recordings, observed sessions and interviews in this study has pioneered a new approach to dance research. The multi-pluralist approach adopted, together with the analytical stance taken to the data, have enabled the concerns of dance artists in education practice to be recorded, analysed and interpreted more fully than hitherto. It is believed that the limitations experienced and addressed here could be built on for future work.

Finally, the researcher acknowledges that her values, beliefs and behaviour might have coloured impressions, interpretations and evaluation of the results. Although this influence cannot be eliminated, recognising it and the aforementioned limitations has helped to ensure that the investigation has been conducted as objectively as the situation allowed. Throughout, the researcher's interest and commitment has been in the pursuit of truth.

Having described and accounted for the way the research has developed, Chapter 6 is primarily concerned with presentation, analysis and discussion of the data generated in the field work. The significant contribution made by this data to the understanding of dance artists in education is then discussed in Chapter 7.
PART 3
Chapter 6

Discussion of Results: Analysis and Appraisal.

6.1 Introduction.

Discussion in Chapters 1 and 2 provides the foundation for the growth of the dance artists in education movement. Chapter 3 identifies the central interest of CSHM and EDT in projects and sets the context in which the residency took place. A description of the preparation, implementation and follow up phases of the case study in Chapter 4 draws together crucial material for this study. Consideration of the various research methods employed and their implementation in Chapter 5 also makes reference to the tools designed to facilitate data collection and its interpretation. Significantly this Chapter draws together analyses, interprets and appraises the material which stemmed from the case study.

Table 2 (Chapter 5) displays the range of practical activities observed. Discussion under the umbrella headings of choreography, performance and appreciation shows the importance given to each aspect throughout the residency. Table 3 (Chapter 5) shows that a number of activities were video recorded, or observed, or, in some cases, video recorded and observed. Hence, ways had to be devised to analyse and to record data. While interim tables and detailed tabulations remain with the author, various samples are included in Appendix 3. These records, together with interview material and the CSHM report (1985), provide the foundations on which the following
discussion is based. Significantly, the results would have not been sufficient without the opportunity allowed to constantly cross check data. But even then the researcher was looking beyond the immediate data. She was aiming to see if there were any underlying issues congruent with those from general dance artists in education practice as well as others which opened new areas for discussion (see Chapter 7).

6.2 Aims and objectives of the residency.

The relative success or failure of the EDT/CSHM/ACGB project was dependent to a great extent on the detailed planning and timetabling that took place between all three parties. Early negotiations with ACGB, EDT and CSHM explored the possibilities of the residency, the compatibility of the proposed partners and anticipated aims. However, as representatives from the ACGB, or the company, or Polytechnic tutors, or the LEA were at times absent from crucial meetings aims remained at the superficial and all-embracing level. In addition, the prime importance given to artistic goals and the experiential nature of the project culminated in the minimisation of education aims, some bewilderment about expected outcomes, and confusion about the real purpose of the project. This reflected other practice of the time (see 2.3).

Despite the ACGB's move to place projects in higher education no statement was forthcoming which outlined the special circumstances encountered. The shift may have been in response to CSHM's earlier involvement in project work or, alternatively, an attempt to widen the scope of dance within a particular teacher training institution in which students studied dance within the PE context. If so Claid's
desire to influence the future development of dance in higher education may have been in response to a hidden ACGB agenda (Interview A). Whether such aims underpinned the emergence of the dance artists in education scheme in general are returned to in 7.3.

In an attempt to clarify how the overall aims of the EDT/CSHM project were to be interpreted in practice, dance tutors discussed residency objectives with dance artists. Yet, despite this move, interview material (5.4) revealed that company members were still uncertain about project expectations and what needed to take place under the umbrella headings of technique, workshops and choreography. Similarly, CSHM’s wider aims which related to the more global ACGB scheme also required further clarification. Overall the CSHM/EDT residency exemplified the crucial need for project partners to articulate clearly main aims and objectives prior to any form of specific planning taking place. This has repercussions for other dance artists in education projects and is returned to for further discussion in 7.3.

6.21 Planning and post-project phases.

In line with ACGB practice of the time, planning initially took place between the ACGB, EDT and CSHM. This enabled a productive liaison between all three parties which, in many respects, facilitated what was considered to be at the time thorough preparation and planning. Even so the mechanics for the making and implementation of decisions were not always beneficial to the overall programme. With hindsight, the general outcome could have benefited from a meeting structure which allowed relevant Heads of Departments, B.Ed. course leaders, and the co-ordinator to meet together to discuss cross-faculty curriculum implications, course assignments and student workloads.
A common decision on such matters could have eased some of the difficulties encountered.

Overall, pre-residency expectations affected the initial approach of dance artists and dance tutors to planning. The width of aims resulted in the variety and number of activities offered and thus in the project falling into the trap of trying to do too much. Both the CSHM (1985) and EDT (1985) reports exposed that preparatory discussions concentrated on activities rather than on a collaborative in-depth consideration about residency outcomes.

The timing of the residency was crucial to both parties. The two sets of work patterns peculiar to Brighton Polytechnic and the company created tensions which had implications for the project as a whole. The change of dates discussed in 4.2 had severe outcomes. These set into motion a sequence of in-house negotiations across departments and faculties to ensure that residency commitments could be honoured. However, as the issue was not fully resolved students already disadvantaged because of teaching practice obligations were further penalised. The impact of the final week was also diminished for general third and fourth year students. Therefore, questions were raised about how far either party should be expected to compromise their plans and at what point this becomes unrealistic. While such circumstances were project-specific they also mirrored other dance artists in education practice (see 2.3 and 3.32). Hence, the principles on which understandings were made and on what grounds these might be modified are returned to for further discussion in 7.4.

The anticipated orientation period for the company at CSHM did not take place. Both the CSHM (1985) and EDT (1985) reports revealed the tension between agreement in principle, what was realistic for
dance artists stretched by a heavy touring schedule (Interview A), and the nature of what took place. While all three parties identified that preparation was crucial neither the company nor individual dance artists were as thoroughly prepared as they might have been (CSHM, 1985: Interviews A-D, T1-3).

Equally, the CSHM report (1985) exposed that the perceptions of students and those of dance tutors about preparation did not coincide. Despite the measures taken to inform students of what was going to take place dance tutors could only resort to generalities as EDT had not been explicit about its intentions. Even so the Artistic Director maintained that dance tutors could have done more than they did to prepare themselves and students (Interview A). While the main problem stemmed from the company’s ideas and planning remaining vague (Interview A, T2/3) these issues go beyond this particular residency. These are returned to in 7.3 and 7.4.

6.22 **Follow-up meeting and evaluation.**

Throughout preparatory discussions the ACGB stressed with EDT and CSHM the implicit nature of follow-up work and used the term to cover four interrelated facets: the follow up meeting, monitoring, evaluation and further work with dance artists (CSHM 1985). However, as no aims for this stage of the residency were discussed with project partners, neither the similarities, nor differences, nor specific conditions for each feature were ever defined.

Although the ACGB provided guidelines for evaluation at the follow up meeting neither dance artists, nor dance tutors, nor student representatives were clear of exactly what was expected of them. Therefore, as dance artists and dance tutors were unsure about how
to proceed, neither the dialogue that took place nor its resulting action was as effective as it might have been. This was symptomatic of two far more fundamental concerns. First, the absence of clear aims and specific objectives led to confusion about the nature and intent of each activity. Second, failure to separate ongoing appraisal, evaluation procedures, and future work with dance artists resulted in neither party knowing exactly what was expected.

On completion of the residency, partners each wrote a report for the ACGB which outlined its structure together with successes and shortcomings (CSHM, 1985; EDT, 1985). In general, these were highly supportive and lacked objective critical appraisal. While they raised only one issue of concern, the lack of detailed preparation, more specific comment on the effect of the residency on student learning was presented in an appendix to the CSHM report. However, to reiterate a point made earlier, in general lack of clear residency aims and objectives and guidelines for the reports prevented any realistic evaluation. Moreover, the value placed on either document was suspect as no joint discussion about the findings took place between the ACGB, EDT and CSHM.

Of the proposals for further work with dance artists referred to in 4.4 funding implications prevented CSHM from hosting a one week residency with EDT (CSHM, 1985; EDT, 1985). Similarly, financial constraints and the realities of long term planning precluded CSHM from integrating project work on a regular basis into the B.Ed programme. In practice the most realistic option for the academic year 1985-1986 was for one or two dance artists to return to CSHM to work with similar groups of students to those in the two core groups. But even this was restricted further by such restraints as funding.
and/or timing, and/or the company's schedule and/or degree commitments. In the event touring pressures and other company demands resulted in EDT losing its impetus for further contact with CSHM. Trying to match the availability of dance artists with degree commitments was equally problematic for CSHM. Hence, only one dance artist returned to CSHM to undertake further work with students.

Three main issues arose from the follow-up work of the CSHM/EDT residency which had repercussions for other project work. First, the ACGB needed to define and to clarify more explicitly the objectives for its seemingly different phases (see 7.3). Second, the fundamental relationship between aims, objectives and follow-up work required further thought (see 7.3 and 7.7). Third, the principles on which further contact with dance artists was based needed to be examined in relation to funding implications.

6.3 Residency structure: issues of relevance.

Despite the focus placed on timetable design during the preparatory period, concerns arose which required modification or clarification. The length of practical sessions caused difficulties for both the company and students. The priorities that each dance artist placed on certain aspects of work undoubtedly influenced their attitude, and ultimately that of students, to the length of sessions (Interview B, C, I, J). Nevertheless, the time element cannot be considered in isolation from either the material taught or the teaching ability of individual dance artists. These underpinned the problems encountered in both one and two hour sessions.
The idealistic proposal of the ACGB to bring together two student groups studying dance (albeit in different contexts) to share residency activities proved to be problematic. The assumption made by the ACGB, dance tutors and dance artists that this would be advantageous to students did not take account of the implications. Dance tutors failed to foresee the degree of risk that individuals would feel when working with others from different degree backgrounds or the adverse repercussions that this would have throughout week one upon the CSHM student body (CSHM, 1985). Difficulties became manifest in over-large classes when Expressive Arts students randomly selected the sessions they attended. Other problems emerged such as participants feeling inhibited, unconfident or inadequate when students worked in mixed and cross-year groupings. These were then further exacerbated when students were taught by dance artists they did not know. Furthermore, the issue of how to involve the fourth year as a whole did not satisfy this particular cohort. Overall, the EDT/CSHM residency revealed that the ways in which students were grouped into working units needed further consideration so as not to dilute the outcomes.

One of the most difficult things for students and dance tutors to handle was that there was no let up of their other work. Tensions were experienced between fulfilling residency commitments, degree assignments and ongoing course work expectations (CSHM, 1985). These were exacerbated further when some staff openly questioned the value of the residency. Such problems prevented students from giving even more time, and reinforced stereotype judgements at CSHM about the role of dance for "dancers", "non-dancers" and male students.
Equally, dance tutors faced a similar problem as they were expected to fulfil normal teaching commitments. The pull and the intense feeling of guilt about not being around either residency or CSHM commitments prevented dance tutors from totally benefiting from the project (Interview T2). Thus, the workloads of staff also required some degree of modification. These issues have implications for the wider debate and are returned to in 7.5.

The question of how much time students should have with company members recurred constantly in the breadth-versus-depth debate throughout planning discussions. In practice the perceived need to involve students in as many dance activities as possible resulted in the varied and ongoing contact with dance artists shown in Table 4. However, both the CSHM (1985) report and interview material (S1-4) revealed the apprehension and dissatisfaction felt by students when working with a variety of company members. In particular, disappointment was expressed about relationships not being maintained and work not being followed through. Limited time, together with lack of continuity with one specific dance artist, caused anxiety and prevented students from gaining as much from the residency as they ought to have done.

The breadth-versus-depth debate was equally problematic for some dance artists. Interview material (C, I, J) revealed that the stance taken by individuals was dependent upon whether or not dance artists had prior experience of working with a range of groups other than their peers. Dance artists more accustomed to the teaching role were not satisfied with the varied contact with student groups. Other company members were less concerned about the number of times they taught groups (Interviews H, E).
In general, residency experiences were somewhat governed by the dance artists with whom students had contact, and by whether they were in curriculum or intensive groups. The lack of coherence experienced by those in the former contrasted with the deep involvement of core group students with dance artists committed to the task of choreography. The significant and developmental dance experience for these groups allowed individuals the good experience of doing something well (CSHM, 1985). As both occurrences reflect what has happened in projects of any length they are returned to for further discussion in 7.4 and 8.3.

6.4 **Nature of the content: Choreography.**

Table 1 (Chapter 4) displayed the variety of activities which focused on choreography to some degree. These are discussed here under the sub-headings of repertoire, or the principles of choreography, or choreography. The interim tables which show the full working out of data remain with the author. However, in Appendix III various samples of detailed tabulation show exactly what took place under each of these headings. While each aspect was analysed separately under general and core group headings they were then combined into one table.

Participation in repertoire-based workshops as a central feature of the residency provided students with a particular experience of, and practical engagement in, exemplars of the public world of dance as an art form. Although dance artists and dance tutors agreed jointly that one dance, *Field Study* (David Gordon, 1984), was to be used as the basis for much of the practical work, discussion did not go beyond a
### Table No 4

**STUDENT GROUPS — CONTACT WITH DANCE ARTISTS**

(No. of sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student Groups*
superficial level. Similarly, limited negotiations took place on the simplistic or more in-depth approaches that might be appropriate for particular cohorts.

The absence of an explicit company policy for repertoire-based workshops resulted in no agreed objectives or criteria for the selection of dances or particular sections focused on throughout the project. This, together with the lack of detailed planning (Interview A) resulted in dance artists not knowing what content to present or how to approach sessions. In spite of support from the CSHM (1985) report for the use of repertoire-based workshops interview material (S1-4, T1-3) revealed disappointment that the possibilities for such work had not been addressed fully. This was partially due to there being no discussion about who should select the focus of sessions.

Table 5 shows the varied emphases placed on the four dances used as the main content for practical work.

The analyses of workshop content, under the headings of repertoire-based workshops and reconstruction (as exemplified in Table A and Table B in Appendix III) disclosed the diversity of material presented to particular cohorts and across year groups. Overall, approaches, practical interpretations, and procedures varied with groups and across cohorts. While choreographic principles were focused on at times, more frequently specific movements and/or phrases were either taught or used as the base for creative work. Although dance artists sometimes emphasised one of the aforementioned aspects at others they amalgamated a number of approaches. In general, interview material (A 3; D 1–4; S 1–14) suggested that the wide and inconsistent
Table 5  Workshops based on repertoire — identification and number of video-recorded and observer-monitored sessions

The table shows the dances focused on in repertoire-based workshops, the number of times they were used, the identification numbers of the video recordings and monitored observations, and the student groups taught.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dance</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Identification Number</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(David Gordon, 1984)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombres Electriques</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Daniel Larrieu, 1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiked Sonata</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dan Wagoner, 1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12XU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Michael Clarke, 1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two other related contrasting practices also emerged. First, although some dance artists explicitly focused on choreographic devices and concepts others assumed that these were implicit within the movements and phrases taught. Second, dance artists either used critical appraisal as the means to evaluate the developing choreographic structure or placed little, if any, importance on evaluative comments.

Overall, the notion of focusing workshop activities on EDT's repertoire, agreed in principle during the planning stages of the residency, was only partially realised. This resulted in:

1) different forms of experience related to the samples of the repertoire taught;

2) a varied focus placed on the dances and content introduced to student groups;

3) inconsistency of experience for students in year groups;

4) some duplication of work;

5) inappropriate selection by dance tutors of movement content for particular groups.

Three central issues arose from the use of repertoire as the central focus for workshops. First, concern was expressed about the lack of criteria for the selection of the dances and particular sections chosen for practical work. Second, dance artists were unclear and confused about the intent of a session, its outcome, and the different approaches taken. Third, dance artists were inconsistent in how they translated and passed on information to students. While the use of
repertoire as a basis for workshop activity could not be totally
divorced from teaching issues, the latter have been considered
separately in 6.7.

The sub-heading "principles of choreography" arose from Adshead’s
(1981) claim, discussed in 1.3 and 1.4, that a body of knowledge
structures both the notions of choreography and the practices which
arise from these. An adaptation of Adshead et al’s (1988) analytical
model in Table 6 shows the common elements which underpin this
notion. While such elements provided the content for workshops
based on the principles of choreography, changes necessarily took
place depending upon the genre of the dance studied.

Even though preparatory meetings explored the possibilities of this
type of work, project partners did not come to any joint agreement
about the approach to be taken or the content that should be
introduced to cohorts or particular groups. Fundamental to the
concerns which emerged were the absence of a company policy, in-
depth discussion, and the assumption that company members could
automatically provide participants with insight into their unique
experience of dance as art.

Analysis of the content of workshops based on the principles of
choreography (see Table C as an example in Appendix III) showed an
inconsistent approach to the development of choreographic work.
These findings were reaffirmed by dance tutors (Interview 1-3) and
students (Interview 1-4) who noted their concern about the lack of
emphasis placed on choreographic principles and their development.

While subject matter was essentially abstract in nature, treated in a
Table 6  PRINCIPLES OF CHOREOGRAPHY—IDENTIFIABLE COMPONENTS (adapted from Adshead et al, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identifiable Components:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Matter / Content</strong></td>
<td>pure movement / story / theme / topic / idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment</strong></td>
<td>representational / narrative / literal / abstract / lyrical / impressionistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style</strong></td>
<td>distinctive ranges of style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement</strong></td>
<td>gestures / bends / extensions / twists / turns / stepping / running / jumping / falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial elements</strong></td>
<td>shape / pattern / line / direction / level / location in performance space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dynamic elements</strong></td>
<td>tension—force / strength—lightness / speed—tempo / duration / rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clusters of movement elements</strong></td>
<td>simultaneous occurrence of movement with spatial + dynamic elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dancers</strong></td>
<td>shaping dances, individual or groups of bodies in stage space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual setting / environment</strong></td>
<td>performance area, costumes and props</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music / Accompaniment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notions of choreography</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contemporary mode, and had its roots in either Graham or Cunningham or new dance work, approaches varied. Table C also exposed the different emphasis placed on such aspects as spatial and dynamic elements, how these were clustered and used in shaping the dance, and the introduction of varied choreographic concepts. Likewise, differences were also apparent in how dance artists focused on the use of relationships.

Despite the selection of dance artists who took on the role of a choreographer being critical to the success of intensive work little discussion took place between EDT and CSHM about this issue (see 4.2). Similarly, little consideration was given to the appropriateness of the choreographic ideas for the expertise of each group even though dance artists had to deal with very different types of students in terms of motivation and involvement. In practice, the focus with dance specialist students in CGA was on dance knowledge and performance. In contrast, the emphasis with CGB students was on selected ideas to which the group could relate. This was important as this dance artist had to deal with such student inhibitions as lack of confidence and their perception that they were not dancers (CSHM, 1985, Interview T2).

The CSHM (1985) report and interview material (S1-4, T1-3) maintained that first hand engagement in decision enabled the two core groups to come to a greater understanding of choreographic principles and the processes involved in the creation of a dance. Involvement in such necessary prerequisites for performance as rehearsals also moved students into the realm of theatrical presentation. Hence, as students in both groups took upon themselves the role of the professional they gained an immense satisfaction from doing
something well. Yet in spite of the success of performance elements (see 4.6) dance tutors (Interview 1-3) and the Artistic Director (Interview A) expressed disappointment that CGA students had not realised their full choreographic potential. The mismatch between stretching students physically and the choreographic focus was due in part to the difficulties experienced by the dance artist when in the choreographic role (Interview A). The added anxiety of completing a dance which was to be viewed by funding agencies may have compounded the issue (CSHM, 1985).

Despite the agreement that curriculum groups would focus on key works from the repertoire, no planned company policy was followed. There was, therefore, no framework within which individual dance artists could make decisions about the content or approach to workshop sessions. This led to:

1) individual dance artists selecting the intention and content of sessions;

2) no set criteria which underpinned the selection of the dances, or the sections focused on, or the approaches used;

3) no criteria for the selection of choreographic principles;

4) workshops which focused on either key works from the repertoire, or on principles of choreography, or on a mixture of both, or on reordered technique exercises;

5) little consideration for the appropriateness of material or approach taken to practical work with each cohort or across year groups.

Subsequently, students experienced:

1) little, if any, progression or development of work either in one-off sessions or when taught a number of times by the
same dance artist;

2) different approaches to workshops based on key works from the repertoire;

3) no explicit focus on choreographic principles in workshops based on repertoire;

4) no stress on the choreographic process and/or its devices in workshops supposedly based on the principles of choreography.

6.5 Nature of the content: Performance.

Performance included a variety of situations in which the company and/or students presented dance to an audience within formal and informal contexts. Students were also engaged in performance elements to varying degrees in practical activities. These aspects are considered separately.

The performance aspect of EDT's work provided a professional dance model to which students could aspire, placed the lecture demonstration within the theatrical context and became the inspiration element onto which the majority of practical activities were built. Overall the varied programme broadened the students' concepts of dance as an art form and reaffirmed the role of the dance artist as performer. In general, students understood, were more interested in, and associated more easily with, dances which they had acquired some prior experience in either the lecture demonstration and/or practical sessions. However, the individual judgements of students were influenced by a growing knowledge of dance particularly when a work was of a more abstract nature.
Despite the success of the company performance, tutors and students raised three questions (CSHM, 1985; Interview T1, 2). First, should there be agreed criteria for the selection of those dances performed within an education context? Second, how could participants have been given more insight into the dances presented prior to the company's performance? Third, how could performance be used to motivate further the work of participants? These issues are returned to in 5.5.

Even though the lecture demonstration provided a common reference point, the perceptions about what it achieved differed. While the Artistic Director viewed it as a successful learning experience both students and dance tutors raised questions about its organisation, format and mode of presentation. Concerns were raised about its design and presentation; the appropriate size and make-up of the audience for active viewing, interaction and discussion with dance artists; and the minimal insight that students were given into viewed work. In reality, how effective the lecture demonstration was as a vehicle for introducing dance work depended mainly on the clarity of communication between dance artists and students.

The degree of success attributed to the company's "Movement Research" period depended on the perspectives of dance artists, students and dance tutors (CSHM, 1985; EDT, 1985; S1-4, T1-3). In spite of its inclusion being a positive and highly profitable experience for the company it prevented students from having contact with most dance artists in the mid-residency period. However, the EDT (1985) and CSHM (1985) reports disclosed a disappointment and frustration that this unique opportunity was not utilised fully by dance artists and dance educators. Both parties pin-pointed confusions could
have been avoided if the company had clarified when sessions were open to observers.

The workshop performance provided a platform for dances to be shared with an audience which arose from the company "movement research" period, the EDT repertoire and selected student groups (CSHM, 1985). While the success of the company improvisation as a shared activity with the audience was noted in the CSHM (1985) report no mention was made of the physical expertise of the dancers in any of the performed dances.

Appraisal of the student choreography was minimal. While students were surprised at the ideas and formation of the dances created they found the CGB dance more accessible than the abstract "Chance" work choreographed with CGA (CSHM, 1985; Interview S1-4). Whether students were able to appreciate work that neither had a "story line" nor included a wide range of content reflected individual degrees of dance knowledge. Interestingly, the Artistic Director equated the successful outcome of the CGB piece with the ability of the dance artist who worked with the group (Interview A).

The professional attitudes, the performance standards achieved and the reception that the two core group dances received was commented on favourably by all dance artists, students and dance tutors (CSHM, 1985; Interviews A, I-J; S1-4; T1-3). Students were impressed particularly by the success and "excellent" level of performance achieved by individuals termed "non dancers" and "games players" (CSHM, 1985; Interviews S1-4). Similarly, dance artists were surprised at the ability of individuals in CGA and Performance Group who strove to meet quasi-professional standards (Interviews A, L, J). The fact that the
dance artists failed to perceive initially the ability of these particular students reaffirmed the need for an orientation period.

In common with other ACGB practice of the time (see 2.3) the Artistic Director used the closing stages of the residency, i.e. the workshop performances, as a guide to evaluate what students had achieved (Interview A). But the emphasis placed on performance levels disregarded the pressures faced by those involved as they strove to complete the task (CSHM, 1985). There was, therefore, an imbalance throughout the residency between the importance placed on, and appraisal of, performance and the lack of attention given to choreographic and appreciation elements.

The residency concluded with dance artists and the two core groups sharing with the student body the processes they had engaged in when choreographing specific dances. The overall impression of the success of the sharing was reflected in the CSHM (1985) and EDT (1985) reports and interview material from all three groups. The immediate response from students was that the residency had been a great success. Generally, they considered that they had been involved in a valuable learning experience which had extended their knowledge of dance in a number of ways. Interest, involvement and commitment had increased to such an extent that the consensus of opinion expressed was an acute disappointment that the residency could not continue or be repeated in the near future. This positive response might have been even greater if all students had worked towards a presentation goal and contributed to the work presented in the final sharing.
6.6 **Technique: the diversity of experience, contrasting outcomes.**

One of the most significant issues which emerged in the study was the diversity of experience that took place in practical sessions between curriculum and core groups. **Table 1** (Chapter 4) identified the varying amount of time given over to technique and showed some sessions that were totally technique-focused, others in which technique preceded workshop input, and some in which no technique took place.

**Table 4** showed the number of occasions that dance artists worked with specific groups, together with the one-off and ongoing contact that took place with students.

Analysis and interpretation of the content taught (as for example in **Appendix III, Tables D, E and F**) showed that the technique experience of curriculum classes and performance group fell into five categories.

1) A focus was placed on either Graham and/or Cunningham-codified technique, as in a professional dance class. The prime emphasis in Graham-based work came through the use of contractions and spirals in a variety of exercises, combinations in place and travelling sequences. A focus was placed on the principles of Cunningham-based work such as the clear, clean lines (often broken) of the body; the constant shift of weight and focus; rapid rhythmical and directional changes; flexed and pointed feet, curved upper back/tilted torso; pedestrian movement combined with highly technical action; the use of small intricate footwork; and precision in phrases which had an "oddity" about them.

2) Exercises and combinations which derived from the principles of Cunningham and/or Graham technique were modified in relation to the use of a curved or straight back. This, together with some of the above principles, was used frequently with
different student groups.

3) Actions and principles of movement which derived from a range of styles including Graham and/or Cunningham and new dance were moulded together into a more idiosyncratic and personalised form of technique work. Two dance artists in particular worked in this manner.

4) A series of running and dodging activities preceded either a form of general warm up and/or a variety of body conditioning exercises and/or the use of massage-like actions.

5) When no technique was introduced the focus was placed solely on workshop material.

The varied approaches taken to technique and the different content introduced resulted in little consistency of experience in either the approach taken or the content taught within a specific cohort or across all four years. Similarly, there was no apparent overall structure for the presentation of material in sessions which either focused on technique or in those in which it was used as a precursor to workshop input. Differences were apparent in the practices followed by company members and in the work of individuals both within and across year groups. Instances of dance artists collectively or individually following a common approach, or a similar format or presenting comparable input to a whole year group were rare. Interview material from dance artists (C, E, J), dance tutors (1-3) and students (1-4) disclosed how participants could have benefited from a more consistent and progressive approach to technique (CSHM, 1985).

Lack of detailed planning underpinned the diverse practices that emerged. Discussion rarely went beyond the superficial level and dance artists and dance tutors did not come to any shared definitive understanding of what was going to take place. No clear decisions
were made about the function of technique, the need to accommodate the different experiences of students or the request that more importance should be placed on workshop activities. Furthermore, there was no definitive company policy for the focus placed on technique, the time devoted to it, or how it was presented. Subsequently, despite the length of individual sessions, the technique element varied from a minimum of thirty minutes to a maximum of two hours (see Table 1, Chapter 4).

Detailed tabulation and interpretation of the technique experience of CGA and CGB showed that this differed from those outlined with curriculum groups (see Appendix III, Table E). Commonalities of intention and practice were obvious in the work of the two core groups even though students were exposed to different content. Both dance artists focused to a greater or lesser extent on an accepted stylistic approach based on a loose interpretation of Cunningham principles. A systematic, planned approach enabled the principles of Cunningham-based work to develop from modified exercises to those of a more stylised professional dance class. In particular, the avoidance of a pure codified style gained the confidence of students in CGB who were largely anxious about technique and performance skills.

Analyses of video and monitored records (Tables 2 and 3, Chapter 5) revealed that more demands were made on the physical dexterity of students as combinations of movement became increasingly more complex through the addition of new material. Both dance artists focused on the importance of technique as a means of making students more confident in performance skills, the interrelationship between technique and choreographic work, and an appropriate selection of movements and sections from the evolving dance. Throughout,
technique was used as the tool to improve specific aspects of performance for the final presentation of work (CSHM, 1985).

The above discussion based on analyses of video and monitored records (shown in Tables 2 and 3, Chapter 5) and the CSHM (1985) report revealed two sharply contrasting practices, identified here as a "good enough" and "not good enough" practice (see Table 7). In general, under the 'not good enough heading' curriculum groups had little understanding of the nature or purpose of technique. It was taught frequently in isolation and had very little relevance to the workshop material presented. Subsequently, many students questioned the emphasis placed on technique, found the repetition of exercises frustrating, and viewed the experience negatively (CSHM 1985). Overall, the relative importance and/or value that students placed on technique was determined by the experiences encountered, the dance artists they worked with and whether there was an interrelationship between technique and workshop activities. These experiences contrasted sharply with the 'good enough' experience of core group students who were introduced to technique as an integral part of the choreographic and performance process.

Several factors contributed to the emphasis dance artists placed on technique with curriculum and/or core groups. These included the overall contact that individuals had with each group as well as the length and frequency of sessions. This was exacerbated further by the lack of a collective policy and/or decision making process about the technique work offered (Interview C, J, I). Resolutions about time, structure, content and approach were influenced by the personal
Table 7  
TEACHING TECHNIQUE: 
CONTRASTING PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Good enough”</th>
<th>“Not good enough”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detailed analyses of material</td>
<td>Little analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stating, emphasising, reinforcing specific points to work for</td>
<td>Vague feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent use of demonstrations</td>
<td>Infrequent use of demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied use of demonstrations</td>
<td>Limited range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent use of repetition to refine</td>
<td>Little/no repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with precision</td>
<td>Little/no concern with precision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice: isolated movements combinations</td>
<td>Little/no practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New material added in stages to known movement</td>
<td>All added together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>No questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>No discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to group</td>
<td>Little awareness of group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of communication</td>
<td>Confused instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate estimates of: assessment vocabulary material pacing</td>
<td>Inaccurate estimates of: assessment vocabulary material pacing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modification of actions</th>
<th>Little modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Striving for standard</td>
<td>No concern for standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative practice</td>
<td>Superficial practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preference of dance artists. In turn these were affected by each individual’s professional training, career and teaching experience. Furthermore, the collective view of residency work held by dance artists also affected to some degree what was presented and how this was taught. But, students, as trainee teachers, were quick to identify instances when dance artists experienced problems. Any shared decision making was viewed as a sign of lack of preparation. Hence, as technique remained a recurring concern of the project these factors are returned to for further discussion in 8.52.

6.7 Teaching.

Throughout the residency the role of the dance artist as a surrogate teacher occurred to a greater or lesser degree. This was in line with other dance artists in education projects of the time (see 2.3). Hence, even though both partners had prior experience of residency work (see 3.3 and 3.4) concerns about teaching still emerged. These stemmed from the processes used by dance artists when they taught practical work to young people.

In general, dance artists compounded content and presentation as they mistakenly believed them to be indistinguishable. In order to clarify what actually took place this study has pioneered the analysis of data under two separate headings: content and presentation. Discussion of content took place in section 6.4 and 6.5. Tabulation and independent analysis of data from technique, workshop and choreographic activities facilitated the following discussion (see examples in Appendix III, Tables G and H). These tools gave an overall impression of the methods employed by dance artists, led to the identification of
specific features in one or more types of work, and enabled appraisal of significant elements.

Analysis of observed and video recorded sessions (see Tables 2 and 3, Chapter 5) and the material shown in Table 7 disclosed that dance artists used a variety of ways to present technique, workshop and choreographic content to students in curriculum groups, performance groups and/or the two core groups. The following discussion considers general features relevant to the teaching of technique and workshops (including choreography) prior to consideration of such specific aspects as the use of correction and demonstration in these activities.

Identification of specific features related to the teaching of technique in video recordings of the work of particular dance artists led to the assumption that they were present also when the same individuals taught groups which were only observed. Overall, examination of material in relation to the Mosston spectrum (Mosston and Ashworth, 1966) discussed in 5.6 revealed that students were involved in two very different types of experience. These provided significant examples and have been classified in Table 7 as “good enough” and “not good enough” practice. In the first, dance artists who used the majority of the classified elements provided “good” exemplars of the teaching of technique. In such instances students were given specific points to work towards, modified actions, strove for a good standard of performance, and were involved in what could be termed qualitative practice. In the second, the “not good enough” category, company members failed to assess accurately the professional dance language used, to give clear instructions, or to use a range of elements. Lack of an overall concern for quality by dance artists resulted in students rarely altering movements, or showing a concern for performance
standards. Subsequently, students were confused by the different expectations placed on them.

Collated material from video recordings and monitored sessions (see Tables 1, 2 and 3) of workshops exposed that dance artists used diverse methods to teach material. In general, dance artists used similar approaches when they reconstructed a section of a dance or taught combinations of movement to those used when they taught technique. In each case students were expected to reproduce and to repeat material as accurately as possible. Evidence from both observed and recorded sessions revealed that dance artists used a variety of ways to present the content of reconstruction (and technique) sessions to groups. The main modes were:

1) demonstrating, with or without verbal commentary;
2) marking movements through with students, with or without accompanying explanation;
3) stating, emphasising and reinforcing points to work for;
4) dancing movements through, with or without students copying the dance artist;
5) correcting;
6) repeating;
7) calling movements and/or giving counts as practical work takes place;
8) isolating, clarifying and practising selected movements;
9) introducing new material, which may or may not be added to previous material;
10) practising movements individually or in combinations;
11) using cues;
12) questioning.
Constant assessment of performance against known criteria resulted in modification of actions. Throughout, whether content was reinforced and refined with a concern for performance standards was determined by the feedback given by individual dance artists.

In contrast, differences were apparent in the processes used when dance artists taught creative workshops based on repertoire or on the principles of choreography, or when they were engaged in the creation of a new dance. The main differences came from the amount of guidance and type of feedback given to students as they formed material. This resulted in two very different types of outcomes, characterised in Table 8 as “good enough” and “not good enough”.

Overall, the precision and detail given by dance artists about the intent and expectations of sessions varied. Feedback ranged from consistent, task-specific comments about selected movements, how they were performed and the compositional structure, to minimal and vague statements which exemplified an indifferent approach. Similarly, the attention that individual dance artists gave to the expected role of students, the use of observation and the teaching manner adopted also varied.

The divergent approaches used by dance artists were partially determined by the type of workshops taught. In particular, dance artists experienced difficulty when they moved from a reconstruction focus in which known content was taught to one of a more creative nature. This problem was exacerbated when they had to interpret how to facilitate the development of new material. Hence, two contrasting practices were evident. In the first, students developed content within
## Table 8
**TEACHING COMPOSITIONAL WORK: CONTRASTING PRACTICE**

### “Good enough”
- Appropriate selection of material
- Precise explanation of subject matter
- Clear limited tasks: exploration of material, careful guidance, shaping material
- Constant use of choreographic concepts
- Development of choreographic concepts

### “Not good enough”
- Inappropriate selection of material
- Vague explanations
- Wide tasks: too much exploration, little guidance, little shaping of material
- Limited use of choreographic concepts
- Limited development

### Ongoing observation of student work
- Limited observation
- Little analysis of material
- Vague use of material
- Implicit appraisal

### Interpretation of student derived material
- Lack of interpretation
- No layering of material
- Little development/concern for quality

### Detailed analysis of material
- Gradual layering of material
- Development with concern for form and quality
clear constraints with a concern for quality. In the second, students were left to answer wide tasks with very little, if any, guidance from the dance artist. Overall, the main distinction arose from the gradual layering of material and how this enabled students to develop work with a sense of quality.

Further examination of collated material identified that correction and demonstration were used frequently by dance artists in all taught practical activities. Analysis and tabulation of each facet under the headings of technique, repertoire-based workshops, reconstruction and the principles of choreography exposed similarities and differences in their use. Therefore, the use of demonstration in technique sessions, and in workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction, and the principles of choreography were analysed separately and then merged to provide an overview of what actually took place.

The use of correction when teaching technique (Table 9) has also been classified into “good enough” and “not good enough” practice. When used consistently by some dance artists students strove to improve their physical skill and to achieve a good standard relative to the experience of particular groups. In technique and reconstruction sessions the use of frequent verbal correction to the whole group was complemented with either manual and/or verbal adjustments to individuals. Throughout, dance artists showed a sharp perception to group and individual difficulties and encouraged students to identify and physically discern the differences between exercises. Appropriate specific feedback on how movements were performed, what needed to be modified and the appropriate actions to be taken, together with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Good enough”</th>
<th>“Not good enough”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear communication</td>
<td>Confused/vague instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent/specific analyses of movement</td>
<td>Little/no analysis of movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal correction to group: specific feedback how to perform movement what needs to be modified appropriate action</td>
<td>Verbal correction to group: vague feedback how — confused what — not identified inappropriate/no action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive feedback</td>
<td>Negative feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual correction to individuals</td>
<td>Little manual correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance artists as visual model</td>
<td>Little/no model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students provide visual model</td>
<td>Little/no use of student model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluation/self check</td>
<td>Little/unsuccesful use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit focus on correction</td>
<td>Implicit assumption correction will happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit aim—repetition exercises</td>
<td>No explicit aim/repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students strive to improve physical skill</td>
<td>Students fail to modify actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative outcomes relative to group</td>
<td>Few qualitative outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
repetition of the task, enabled students to alter and correct actions. Demonstrations from dance artists were accompanied with an explanation of the difficulties encountered and directions about what to look for and where to look.

In contrast, dance artists who found it difficult to give corrections to non-professional dancers achieved very different results. As students were given very little understanding of what was expected of them they found it difficult to modify actions in response to the given input. This was exacerbated by an assumption that correction was implicit to the task in hand. Failure to pinpoint exactly what had to be corrected and precisely how to adapt movements resulted in little modification of actions. Students had to evaluate and to correct their own performance in relation to the feel, clarity and/or understanding of movements. Most verbal correction was made from the front. However, at times dance artists moved around the group, and gave manual and/or verbal correction to individuals, and/or used a member of the peer group as a visual model, and/or worked alongside an individual or a group. The effect of correction to individuals was limited when it was given from the front, or if they were singled out for correction for too long, or if negative feedback was given. This brought into sharp relief the difference between the professional and the education worlds. Table 10 showed the variety of ways used and Table 11 identified the most common elements utilised by dance artists when teaching either technique or reconstructing a section from a dance.

In addition to a similar use of correction in workshops verbal feedback was also given to small groups. However, as much of the feedback was
Evidence from both observed and recorded sessions reveals that dance artists use a variety of ways to present the content of technique and reconstruction sessions to groups. The main modes are:

- demonstrating, with or without verbal commentary;
- marking movements through with students, with or without accompanying explanation;
- stating, emphasising and reinforcing points to work for;
- dancing movements through, with or without students copying the dance artist;
- correcting;
- repeating;
- calling movements and/or giving counts as practical work takes place;
- isolating, clarifying and practising selected movements;
- introducing new material, which may or may not be added to previous material;
- practising movements individually or in combinations;
- using cues;
- questioning.
Table 11: Teaching of technique — common elements

The most common elements used by dance artists when teaching technique:

- demonstrating with or without verbal commentary;
- stating, emphasising and reinforcing points to work for;
- dancing movements through, with or without students copying the dance artist;
- correcting;
- introducing new material which may or may not be added to previous material.
again not task specific it neither identified errors nor focused on choreographic devices. In general, comment was only made on known or taught movements and not on developing compositional work.

While adjustments were at times made "by example" the use of physical correction was more limited than in technique or reconstruction work.

Overall, three concerns emerged about the use of correction:

1) the positioning of dance artists when they gave corrections either to the whole class, to small groups or to individuals;

2) while dance artists generally gave corrections in a positive and encouraging manner they rarely seemed aware of the acute embarrassment experienced by some students;

3) the frequency, length and intimacy of contact when physically correcting both male and female students into required positions was uncomfortable for some participants.

The contrasting procedures which emerged from the analysis of material in **Table 9** were a direct result of dance artists modelling their teaching on professional practice. This raised several concerns:

1) the range of approaches used seemed to be dependent upon how experienced a dance artist was as a teacher;

2) the importance placed on the use of the corrective process varied;

3) in general dance artists did not clarify that correction was used to increase the overall physical competence of students;

4) dance artists were unaware that the appropriateness, or otherwise, of the given feedback affected the outcomes of sessions;
5) dance artists failed to recognise that some professional practices caused acute embarrassment;

6) the diversity of the teaching expertise of dance artists lessened the project experience for students;

7) dance artists were less confident about the use of correction in workshop and choreographic work.

Analysis of material as exemplified in Tables K and L in Appendix III exposed that while demonstration featured centrally when dance artists taught technique and reconstruction work it was used rarely in workshops based on repertoire and choreographic work. Demonstrations were used in five main ways in technique and reconstruction work and a further two in sessions of a more compositional and/or choreographic nature. In general, dance artists used demonstrations mainly:

1) as a practical visual model to initiate exercises;

2) to provide students with a model to copy to which they could aspire;

3) as a moving visual aid, accompanied by verbal commentary for students to copy as they execute movement;

4) to show the right and wrong way of executing movements;

5) to introduce sequences and combinations of movement both in place and travelling across the floor;

6) to reinforce new movement patterns;

7) to go over and to reinforce material already worked on;

8) to focus attention on isolated movements as part of the corrective process.

In addition, dance artists used demonstration when working in a more
creative manner in workshops, or when engaged in choreography. However, their intention differed as they were used to prompt students to find new movement. At these times, demonstration was used:

1) to show possibilities of the divergent nature that answers to a task might have;

2) to give confidence to students to create their own new material.

Hence, dance artists either guided participants through planned stages to what was, for students, "unknown" material or showed a range of divergent responses to the set task.

Table 12 classified the use of demonstration into either "good practice" or "not good enough practice". Throughout the former, demonstrations were clear, precise, and dynamically executed with an emphasis placed on what students had to look for and where to look. This was enhanced by verbal commentary to aid student understanding of the movement principles worked on. The simplicity and/or complexity of given movements and combinations then determined if they were broken down for further demonstration. At times, important modifiers occurred as, for example, with talking and/or marking demonstrations through at a slower speed. An overall concern for artistry provided students with a qualitative model to which they could aspire.

While all dance artists generally used demonstration to provide students with a visual model to copy, the emphasis placed on demonstration and their effectiveness varied, and sometimes they were not used at all. In general, lengthy, unclear explanations, in which movements
Table 12
USE OF DEMONSTRATION:
CONTRASTING PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Good enough”</th>
<th>“Not good enough”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movements, sequences, combinations shown as a unit</td>
<td>Complicated presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken down for further attention</td>
<td>Not broken down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifications: talked through tempo slowed moving visual model</td>
<td>No modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of communication: clear, precise explanations</td>
<td>Unclear communication: vague, lengthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention drawn to: what to look for where to look sensation/feel of movement</td>
<td>No guided looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of imagery</td>
<td>No use of imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement principles</td>
<td>No reference to principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performed well</td>
<td>Casually performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused intention Clear, dynamically executed demonstration Precise explanation Use of modifiers to aid students Concern for artistry and quality</td>
<td>Lack of focus Unclear, poorly executed demonstrations Vague explanations No use of modifiers No concern for quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate from corrective process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used throughout as integral part of the corrective process and/or to initiate new work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were neither simplified sufficiently nor demonstrated with a concern for artistry, resulted in students failing to understand what was physically expected of them.

While individual dance artists used demonstrations to a greater or lesser degree, their effectiveness was determined by whether or not dance artists:

1) placed a focus on where to look and what to look for as any demonstration took place;

2) restricted the number of points students were given to observe and to implement practically;

3) broke movements down so that they were within the capabilities of the students;

4) placed an importance on demonstration as part of the teaching process;

5) performed the demonstration with a concern for quality and a sense of artistry.

6.8 Roles of dance artists, dance tutors and students.

The roles that dance artists, dance tutors and students took on during the residency period were partially due to the activities in which they were involved, and, in part, to the responsibilities they faced. In general, while the performance role of dance artists remained the most prominent feature of a professional career it was not the prime function of company members during the residency. Although the emphasis placed on the company performance reaffirmed the role of individuals as performers this became modified in other situations such as the lecture demonstration and workshop performance.
In sharp contrast, the centrality of the performance role became replaced throughout the residency by those of presenter and/or teacher. The first occurred to varying degrees in more formal situations such as the lecture demonstration, workshop performance and final sharing. Although the Artistic Director was mainly responsible for what took place company members shared some of the input in the first and third contexts. However, discussion in 6.5 exposed the particular disquiet of dance tutors and students about the design of the formats used and the preparation of dance artists. As the role of teacher, interlinked with that of presenter, created particular difficulties for dance artists these are returned to in 9.3.

In the main, students were expected to fulfil a performance role throughout the residency at the expense of either a quasi-choreographic or appreciator role. Hence, difficulties were encountered when what students were least good at was valued above all else (CSHM, 1985: Interviews T1-3, S1-10). A disparity was also obvious between the insight into the choreographic process (and thus role) gained by students in the two core groups and the majority of participants. Similarly, although some emphasis was placed on appreciation in the lecture demonstration minimal attention was given to it in practical activities. In sharp contrast to the emphasis on roles emanating from the professional dance world little, if any attention, was given to the teaching skills of students.

While dance tutors took on an organising role to a greater or lesser degree during the preparatory period they found it difficult to know their function during the implementation of the residency. Although they participated at times in practical work in general they pursued an observer role. Both their teaching skills and dance knowledge were
ignored by dance artists, as was their ability to present work to large groups. Hence, questions about the roles of dance educators and dance artists are returned to in Chapter 9.

### 6.9 Summary.

The issues which arose throughout the residency pin-point concerns which require further reflection. Discussion highlighted the crucial need for the preparation period to clarify aims and objectives, to find meeting structures which facilitated project planning and the need for orientation time. Similarly, consideration of follow-up work identified that the aims and intention of activities required clarification. Appraisal of the relevance of residency structures revealed the ongoing breadth-versus-depth debate, timetabling concerns, and the effect that excessive workloads could have on dance artists, participants and dance educators. The content debate identified questions that required resolution about the nature of the company performance, lecture demonstrations, the company movement research period, the shared workshop performance and final forum. Overall, questions have been raised about how activities could be used to more effect with students. Analysis and interpretation of the dance content pin-pointed the diversity of technique experienced by students, the range of content covered under the workshop umbrella, and the ongoing choreographic work. A focus on teaching identified the difficulties encountered. Finally, the complexity of the roles undertaken by dance artists and the effect that these had on those assumed by participants and dance tutors were noted. As these issues comply with many of those which emerged from Chapter 2 they are discussed in relation to the overall dance artists in education movement in Part 3.
Chapter 7.

Exploring the Interface: Dance Artists in Education — Structures and Issues.

7.1 Introduction.

Briginshaw (1983) maintained that there was a relationship in dance artist in education work between the activities offered by dance artists, the roles generally undertaken and the issues which continued to reappear in a variety of project contexts. Hockey (1987), when overviewing the ACGB scheme, examined activities, roles, achievements and ongoing issues under the headings of educational, artistic, and administrative elements. The limitations and frustrations recorded in research into more general artist in education work by Sharp and Dust (1990) led them to claim that very few of the projects studied were seen as an unqualified success.

The discussion in the following three chapters falls into three sections. The first is based on an adaptation of Hockey’s (1987) and Sharp and Dust’s (1990) categories. The second draws on the conceptual base for dance study proposed by Adshead (1981a), i.e. choreography, performance and appreciation, as it provided a structure under which dance in the theatre and dance in education could be examined. In this respect, aspects such as the lecture demonstration and open
preparation are considered under performance as this has been their main focus throughout the 1980s. The third, discussion of the roles of dance artists, is influenced in part by Briginshaw's (1983) classification as this provides a starting point for the consideration of the many functions of the roles of dance artists.

Table 13 shows where the topics examined are located in literature.

This chapter explores organisational concerns which Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) maintained recurred throughout the ACGB schemes and Sharp and Dust (1990) reaffirmed were also present in more recent work. Discussion initially explores the fundamental relationship between dance artists and dance educators. A focus is then placed on aims and objectives, the area of planning, follow-up work and funding, together with their related concerns, as they are common to all projects. Finally, although most of the concerns discussed were identified by the early authors referred to, this thesis takes the work further. The following discussion is at a more analytical level than earlier debate as the researcher collated hitherto disparate points in the literature, made them into a coherent whole and subjected them to further analysis.
Table 13  Identification of Issues in the Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE:</th>
<th>ANS</th>
<th>CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>PREPARATION</th>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>ORGANISATION TIME</th>
<th>LEA ADVISERS</th>
<th>WEB EDUC. CONTEXTS</th>
<th>FOLLOW UP</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PROJECT STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PROJECT STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PROJECT STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PROJECT STRUCTURES</th>
<th>PROJECT STRUCTURES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
<th>ROLES—ARTISTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEBB</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS et al</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS</td>
<td>1980b</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMBY</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GULBENKIAN</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD</td>
<td>1981a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMBY</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRINSON</td>
<td>1982a</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNN</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIGGS</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITZGERALD</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORRIS</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRISON</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOCKEY</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACDONALD</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIES</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles - Artists</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Project Structures</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshop Dance Educator</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methodology</td>
<td>Workshops Dance Artists</td>
<td>Workshop Dance Artists</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Ability</td>
<td>School Personnel</td>
<td>School Workshops</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience With Children</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>Project Team</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter</td>
<td>Open Prep. Techniques</td>
<td>Open Prep. Techniques</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Open Prep. Rubrics</td>
<td>Open Prep. Rubrics</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Lecture Demonstration</td>
<td>Lecture Demonstration</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Role</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13 (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp &amp; Dust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldous &amp; Creighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Educ. Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:**
- Sharp & Dust
- Walker
7.2 The relationship: dance artists and dance educators.

Briginshaw (1983) revealed that the ACGB, under the Secretary Generalship of Sir Roy Shaw, formulated a coherent policy for education to complement the arts education carried out in schools. This led to those resources from the professional arts as a whole, which were relevant to education both in schools and in a wider context, being utilised primarily to develop a partnership of cooperation and collaboration between artists and educators. Thus the 1980 Dance Artists in Education pilot projects were an extension of the ACGB's administered scheme which embraced art, drama, mime, music, writing and photography. These placed professional artists in direct contact with young people through residencies in schools. The scheme in general and the dance projects in particular need to be placed in the context of the great deal of activity that had already taken place by dance artists in education from the mid 1960s (see 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.8). As Briginshaw et al (1980, p 15) claimed, the overall aim of the initial pilot projects reaffirmed the ACGB's commitment "to improve knowledge, understanding and practice of dance and to make dance more widely available". Use of the dance profession as a resource for educational purposes was then reinforced by the ACGB's investment of public money in the initiation and establishment of related schemes such as the dance animateur movement (see 2.6).

In an attempt to bridge the gap between dance in education and dance in the theatre the ACGB's Dance Artists in Education Pilot Projects Report (Briginshaw et al 1980) and the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980) both invited:
a new relationship between the dance profession and the education profession, each drawing upon the other as a resource.

Gulbenkian, 1980, p 7

Hamby (1981), Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) all maintained that the void between dance artists and dance educators derived from the association between dance as art as exemplified within the professional dance world and dance as a subject in the school curriculum. The historical development of both professions, together with the different training routes which emerged, underpinned the opposing perspectives apparent in the interests, beliefs, values, purposes and language used by each group and thus the strengths and weaknesses that predominated. Communication has been at the source of many of the problems encountered.

Further diversity arose from the three models of dance widespread in education from the 1970s (see 1.3). First, many teachers had come to dance as an activity within a PE context which emphasised MED until the late 1960s and the 1970s. Teachers, traditionally trained as physical educators, faced a dilemma as their experiences were far removed from the professional dance as art training followed by dance artists. Fundamentally, the problem stemmed from the differences between the nature of dance taught in schools and the professional theatre model (Hamby, 1980). Alarm about the activities presented resulted in caution about any moves towards further collaboration and resistance to criticisms made by dance artists about dance in schools.

Second, and in contrast to the first, the significance of the dance as art model in education, together with the development of the pilot projects, enabled dance educators to take account of dance as a
theatre art phenomenon. Hockey (1987) argued that three contributing factors came from the worlds of education, dance education and the theatre. Reappraisal of the tenets of child-centred education led dance educators and aestheticians such as Curl (1966, 1967a, 1967b, 1968a, 1968b, 1969) and Redfern (1973a, 1973b) to use philosophical enquiry to examine the concepts of MED. In the theatre, British forms of imported modern dance techniques developed and in schools the emphasis changed from MED to modern dance. Thus, as identified in 1.3, 1.4, for the first time in British dance history, the curriculum began to embrace theatre dance forms and, like the other performance art forms of drama and music, dance became more relevant to the outside world. To reiterate a point made in 1.4, this model influenced the growth of dance in schools from the mid 1970s, provided the theoretical and practical foundations for examination work, and from the mid 1980s became the consensus view of dance education.

Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) both maintained that although the dance as art model paved the way for a new kind of collaboration between the two professions fundamental concerns still required resolution. Primarily, while educators and artists now dealt with similar concepts and material embracing theatre dance forms their roles and approaches remained essentially different. But Sharp and Dust (1990) reaffirmed that this diversity was still apparent at the end of the 1990s. Moreover, they also queried whether dance artists and dance educators knew enough about each other’s working processes and worlds to collaborate effectively. Overall, coherent partnerships have been blocked by the two parties not finding an effective way to mesh their different methods of operation. This is returned to in 10.2.
Third, dance as a subject in its own right existed within contexts such as liberal arts or humanities (Adshead 1981a). This last model embraced all aspects of dance and included theatre dance. However, as all three models offered different experiences in dance they raised a fundamental question about whether artists were only a relevant resource when dance in schools followed the conceptual dance as art model. They also highlighted that dance artists and dance educators needed a greater understanding of each others weaknesses and strengths before they might collaborate more effectively than hitherto.

7.3 Aims for projects.

Webb (1976) revealed that the concept of defined aims by artists and educators has been relatively new to residency work. Artists, as the initiators of projects in the 1970s, devised the aims and educators accepted these as an inclusive part of a project package particularly when LEAs organised school involvement. White (1977, p 17) contrasted the clearly stated aims of LCDT with those of educators which "lacked definition and thought". But Briginshaw (1983) identified that throughout this period aims were either a collaborative statement agreed by various participants or arose from one or more of those, as for example the artists, the educators or the mediators/administrators/funding bodies. Macdonald, ACGB Education Officer at the time, reflected the confusion surrounding other artists in education programmes prior to the onset of the 1980 pilot projects (see 2.5). While aware that artists and educators had different aims she believed that these:

could co-exist as long as they are clearly stated at the outset and provided respect is maintained for the differing positions.

Macdonald, 1979, p 2
But this open-ended and flexible approach proposed by Macdonald (1979) led to the emergence of two contrasting practices. In one, in-depth discussion of aims at preliminary meetings led to agreement on the main objectives and the methods by which these could be achieved. In the other, absence of a focused dialogue between artists and educators led to misunderstanding, a conflict of views and disagreement concerning methods. While it was recognised that there was a need

... to improve knowledge, understanding and practice of dance and to make dance more widely available

Briginshaw et al., 1980, p 15

confusion and misunderstandings arose between the two parties. Conflicts about aims and methods of achieving them were a common occurrence. Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), and Hockey (1987) each identified that while dance artists were primarily concerned to promote their particular view of performing, educators continued to see the artist principally as a surrogate teacher (see 2.7, 6.7, 6.8). But Briginshaw et al (1980) argued that the ACGB could have prevented a major source of confusion if it had stated that the prime reason for placing any artist in an educational establishment was to show his/her distinctive way of working.

Although Briginshaw (1983) identified that the way was paved for a new type of collaboration between the two professions the ACGB, and thus the world of the artist, dominated dance artists in education practice and little consideration was given to whose priority should be maintained (see 2.5). The minimal involvement from the DES manifest in the early projects caused Hamby (1981, 1982), Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) to argue that there were four fundamental principles to which dance artists should adhere.
First, projects in schools needed to be seen within an education context and priority given to educational engagement. Thus the aims and concerns of dance curriculum were seen as logical starting points. Second, artists ought to become aware of educational goals and to make their work more consistent with general educational objectives or philosophy. Third, dance artists were only a relevant resource when dance in schools was art based. Fourth, the particular expertise of professional choreographers and dancers enabled them to make a unique contribution which was quite different from that of the teacher. However, a shift of position occurred when Macdonald (1981a) articulated more particular aims for the scheme than previously and maintained that a decision on common aims and how these might be met was crucial to the success of projects. But despite the new initiatives taken by dance educators Hockey (1987) claimed that a lack of understanding of how professional work related to the educational setting was manifest in confusion about terms of reference, roles and planning.

Hockey (1987) attempted to clarify the position when she argued that during the preparatory stage thought had to be given to such fundamental concerns as the aim of the residency, the objectives, content and methods by which aims were to be achieved, and the expected outcomes. But what it meant to be an educator or an artist remained at the root of the issue. Even though some companies demonstrated a growing concern for educational needs and the concept of partnerships, incompatibilities were still present. Travis (1987), then education officer of LFB, claimed that these were symptomatic of dance artists in education practice. Hence, the different approaches of educators and artists, aims, and the problems to which these gave rise often recurred as one of the foremost causes
for concern in independent dance projects, in those which took place under the NFAE and AEMS umbrella headings (Brook 1989, Humphreys 1989, Johnson 1989, Sarker 1989), in more traditional projects (Henderson, 1990; Henderson and Bradie, 1990), and in research into general artists in education schemes (Sharp and Dust, 1990) (see 2.8). But if the rewards were to be greater than the problematic outcomes the two-way relationship between artists and educators in which both worked from their strengths had to be emphasised.

Three crucial interrelated concerns remained predominant. First, the DES (although sanctioning and collaborating with the ACGB on the initiation, implementation and monitoring of the 1980 ACGB pilot projects) failed to take an active and positive lead about dance artists in education. Even when the ACGB became increasingly more articulate the artistic world continued to dominate both policy and practice (see 2.5). What was right for dance artists continued to be given preference over educational goals. Yet the DES, through HMI, neither issued an official statement nor any guidelines for development. The "hands off" approach may have been due to HMI maintaining the attitudes to dance education developed from the Laban era and to the perpetuation of dance as part of the PE model. Overall, however, the absence of a clear statement of intent from the DES resulted in a basic flaw. In general, teachers failed to give serious consideration to dance artists in education practice and could not articulate coherent educational aims with the ACGB, RAAs (or with the recently reorganised Regional Arts Boards [RABs]), or co-residency partners.
Second, the emphasis placed on technique and performance in projects mirrored the skills and high level of expertise expected of dance artists, support of dance as art, and hence, "the taking of an artistic interest in dance" (McFee, 1994, p 78). This approach differed from the focus in degree programmes followed by most dance teachers until the early 1980s. This gave preference to MED and to education aspects rather than to high personal expertise. Even when dance courses in PE contexts changed to the dance as art model, and thus to the integration of an artistic and educational approach, the latter remained paramount. Hence, the contrasting practice and opinions brought to projects was a direct result of the different training routes followed.

McFee (1994) clarified the fundamental difference when he stated that:

...the dance artist is concerned to make art (to some degree or other) and sees this as developmentally advantageous for pupils.

(McFee, 1994, p 82)

This, he argued, differed from the educator's view of the artistic approach for dance education which integrally combined concern for learning with engagement in the art form. However, the emergence of a new breed of dance teacher from the PGCE route referred to in 1.7 has alleviated the problem to some degree. It enabled new teachers to combine the professional expertise of the performer with knowledge of dance education.

Third, failure to reach an agreement upon residency aims in preliminary discussion together with the imbalance of power in favour of the artistic world continued to result in misunderstandings. But
Hockey (1987) suggested that even when dance artists and dance educators believed they defined joint aims clearly the absence of a formalised dialogue led to confusion. Similar difficulties experienced in the case study, 4.2, such as establishing the real purpose of a project and how this was to be achieved have been echoed in more recent projects (see 2.8). Overall, the importance placed on the experiential nature of a project has taken precedence over concern for whether any learning could or should take place. However, the added accountability and responsibility expected of teachers when delivering the National Curriculum has now made it imperative to incorporate learning possibilities into the design of projects. This could facilitate a process of integration, allow for the marriage of content with the education context, and enable any final product to become the starting point for further physical and intellectual attainment within the dance curriculum.

Fourth, lack of clear aims and objectives confused expectations. Bewilderment arose when the objectives set embraced the whole range of activities offered. This prevented joint partners from being clear about the outcomes of any project for the learners involved. In general, the multitude of activities and the absence of defined parameters prevented the identification of clear objectives which were realistic, logical and which indicated the plan to be followed. While this may sound over-simplistic, defining aims and objectives for projects has been difficult. In general, aims emphasised the experiential nature of activities. But as White (1973) argued, while engagement in an activity might enable young people to appreciate what there is to value or admire in it, this does not necessarily lead to an understanding of the activity. Moreover, when objectives were written in the form of what it was hoped the participants could
experience, they did not describe adequately what young people might learn. While Eisner (1971) supported the view that aims should be reasonably wide in scope, and flexible enough so that arts education should be concerned with the development of perceptual and productive skills as well as the medium, when followed through in practice this had implications for curriculum development. Subsequently, Dallas argued that attention should be given to:

... what it is hoped participants will come to know, do or believe as a result of... learning anything.

Dallas et al. 1978, p 7

When applied in dance projects, Eisner's (1971), White's (1973) and Dallas's (1978) arguments could lead to the expectation that some change might occur which would enable the learner to be able to do something new, or to do something better and thus expand his/her knowledge of dance. In Eisner's (1971) terms, defining the focus of a project more clearly need neither restrict what dance artists actually do nor take away from the artistic experience. For example, discussion in 2.2, 2.4 identified two significant examples which interpreted educational needs into specific project parameters and honoured the uniqueness of the professional theatre world. Both revealed a clear understanding of aims and objectives, the content taught, the processes followed, and the anticipated final outcomes. Hence, joint partners had articulated what each residency was actually about, set appropriate boundaries and distinguished between what could and could not take place in relation to the needs of each educational institution and what the company offered. But this role of the company had an advantage over most others; in the education officer the interface between the artistic and education worlds met both in philosophy and practice.
7.4 Planning and preparation.

The Gulbenkian Foundation report's (1980) warning that detailed preparation was essential when artists work in schools was reiterated by Briginshaw (1983) who identified insufficient attention to planning and preparation as the underlying cause of the misunderstanding and problems that recurred. In making the distinction between projects which had been successful as a result of careful preparation and those which were profitable in spite of being hastily arranged, Macdonald (1981a), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) raised questions about the inadequate timing, the pattern of planning, and the personnel involved. Hockey (1987) further identified the perennial administration problem of insufficient time for all parties to prepare adequately. These were exacerbated further in short-term or one-off situations. But even when projects had a longer preparatory period, as in the case study (see 4.2), similar issues still arose and became further exacerbated once the ACGB's role was largely taken over by RA8s/RA8s. But although Sharp and Dust (1990) stressed that planning recurred as an issue for all artists in education programmes, the situation in dance has been particularly difficult. Allen and Creighton (1989), Brook (1989) and Johnson (1989) suggested that detailed information about the planning of projects generally remained with dance artists or companies and their host institutions.

The issue was exacerbated further by how the planning period was used. Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) showed that the meeting patterns initiated by the ACGB for the Dance Artists in Education scheme provided the model for all major projects, including the case study (see 2.3). While the format followed enabled the ACGB, the company and host institution to agree a project in principle,
further meetings were negotiated as and when issues arose. But as the case study, 4.2, exemplified, this prevented the ACGB from developing a strategy for in-depth planning. As every residency was considered to be different from all those that had gone before, prior experience was not built on in a constructive and worthwhile manner. Yet in reality each one was a variation of a format that was by now fairly well established.

The case study, 4.2, revealed how the absence of coherent principles on which all planning decisions could be founded remained the main drawback. Rather than agreement of aims leading to collaborative planning and in-depth discussion, crucial factors were addressed superficially or totally ignored. But discussion could have focused on, for example, how the company's concept of technique might be integrated with that of the institution and established the relevance of the kind selected (if it was to be taught) for particular classes, and agreed the policy to be followed with different groups. Similarly, an exploration of the relationship between technique and choreographic work could have led to a policy which enabled young people to have a deeper understanding of what they were doing. But for this to occur educators require the skills to make sense of what dance artists do so that they could translate this into the education situation. In addition, the case study (4.2) also disclosed that a sporadic meeting pattern resulted in information being withheld from dance educators and dance artists. Yet failure to explore these issues fully was crucial not only to the EDT/CSHM project but also to the wider planning debate.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) suggested that the early ACGB projects were influenced greatly by dance artists and dance educators who had little, if any, prior
experience to draw on. They also noted that while some LEA advisers and teachers failed to see the relevance of projects to the school situation, others took an active part in the development of the new dance artists in education movement (see 2.3). Significantly, the case study clarified that the roles of the personnel involved in the planning process determined in general the nature of the collaboration that took place. This affected both the company and the education institution and ultimately the design of the final programme.

The importance of the contribution that the head teacher and a dance teacher could make to the planning and preparation period of any project has been overlooked and undervalued. While Hockey (1987) argued that the roles of both were crucial, she maintained that attitudes of headteachers compounded the issue. In general it was not clear whether they were committed to this area of work or viewed it merely as a useful political career move. Overall, they had little understanding of what a residency could offer and were unable to state their expectations.

Other misunderstandings derived from dance educators not being involved totally in the planning process and because little attempt was made to distinguish the different levels at which language was important. Additional concerns occurred when aims were defined in the technical language of the artistic world. For example, while dance artists defined contemporary technique in terms of codified styles such as Graham and Cunningham or as an amalgam of styles, dance educators tended to use it in a more generalised way. Similarly, misconceptions and dissatisfactions emerged unless definitions were explored precisely — for example, about what could take place in workshops. Thus questions such as "What does such language
describe and/or stand for?", and "Whose language should prevail?", remained unanswered. As Davies (1987) stressed, there was an urgent need to develop a common language by which dance artists and dance educators could express their work together during the planning stages of any project. But this issue was further complicated by the different interpretations placed on terminology by dance companies (see ACGB, 1988). However, the new breed of dance teachers referred to in 1.7 integrally combined knowledge of the artistic world with the demands of the education profession. As they themselves were arts-orientated they were more likely to be sympathetic to the presence of artists and more likely to communicate with them in a common language. In general, the welcome extended to dance artists and the ensuing encounters that took place were coloured by how knowledgeable dance educators were about the dance world.

The role of the adviser in the planning and development of residency work, and in particular in the ACGB scheme, has not been clear. While Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), Hockey (1987) and Sharp and Dust (1990) all named the LEA adviser as a key figure who should be involved in planning and decision making processes the contribution made by such individuals has varied. In spite of some PE advisers showing a commendable enthusiasm and active interest in dance the limited involvement of others has minimised much of the current work. In general, neither the collaborative nature of the planning exercise was stressed firmly enough nor was there sufficient time for artists, advisers and teachers to go much beyond administration and organisational points. Hockey (1987) argued that in too many cases advisers failed to give planning sufficient attention as they saw projects as peripheral to their concerns. But Carlisle (1993) suggested that similar problems also arose when advisers
endeavoured to make a major contribution without a sound knowledge base. Yet despite these shortcomings notable exceptions have come from authorities with a structure which allowed an adviser or teacher to have prime responsibility for dance (Brook, 1989). In general, whether or not advisers took the opportunities presented to broaden their knowledge of dance, to sharpen their perceptions, and to foster their enthusiasm has not been researched. Yet this was particularly crucial for those advisers who, as they were not specialists in dance, lacked background knowledge and training.

Hockey (1987) noted the difficulties encountered when an LEA adviser opened up a project to other educational contexts. In particular some of the NFAE activities (see 2.8) exemplified the dilemmas which arose when a project covered a number of schools since this spread the work too thinly. In addition, Carlisle (1993) argued that limited contact with dance artists led to the pressures experienced in the 1992 East Sussex Frontiers project and in the 1993 Vitol residency. She also claimed that any possibilities of sharing work were hindered further when an LEA adviser or animateur took on the role of coordinator without being fully conversant with the needs of the participating parties. But recent government policy and the disbandment of the advisory service as it has been known has made the debate about the specialist dance adviser even more crucial.

Yet in spite of the advances identified above questions were still raised in the early 1990s about how well-informed LEA advisers, teachers and headteachers were about dance artists in education projects. To reiterate a point suggested earlier, a situation arose whereby some teachers learnt to negotiate and implement projects through collaborating with dance artists over a number of years. Conversely,
the last projects discussed in 2.8 exemplified how some teachers placed in an advisory role functioned from a minimal knowledge base of this area of work, failed to acquaint themselves with current practice, and ignored advice of those brought in on a consultative basis. However, gaining experience through "trial and error" situations has not been an adequate model on which to base future practice. Moreover, the confusion dance educators found themselves in was inextricably bound up with the non-interference stance taken by HMI (see 2.3). Subsequently, advisers have been given neither any incentive from the DES to encourage their involvement nor provided with examples of good practice. A marked difference also existed in the artistic world between those who were involved in, and gained practical experience of, dance artists in education projects and those who did not avail themselves of their opportunities. Hence, absence of any formalised system prevented the first generation of British dance artists in both the modern and ballet genres from passing on their acquired knowledge to a new generation.

Parallel problems also faced new entrants to both professions. How much trainee artists and educators knew about this area of work was largely dependent on the dance programmes followed by individuals within higher education contexts. More often than not those who came from either B.A. (Hons.) degree or professional dance training programmes had acquired practical expertise through working with dance artists at selected points in their course (see 1.7). This contrasted with the necessarily limited experience gained by the vast majority of those training to teach dance who entered the profession via a B.Ed. (Hons.) PE route. Hence, established practitioners as well as new entrants to the two professions were unlikely to have focused on either the principles underlying the dance artists in education
phenomenon or on models of current practice. Equally, they had not considered how dance artists and dance educators could best inform each other about their area of work.

7.5 The consultative process.

Discussion in 7.3 and 7.4 revealed that the main objective behind the consultative process was to initiate, to plan and to implement a project. Examination disclosed that there were three main levels of interaction which took place from the inception of a project idea to its conclusion. These have been categorised as follows:

LEVEL 1: Main funders and participants — National/Regional.

LEVEL 2: Local concerns/consultants — Local education context.

LEVEL 3: Project participants — Teacher/Dance artist.

Any discussion formalised into decisions at either national or regional meetings affected local concerns and thus influenced how dance artists and dance educators interacted within specific project contexts.

Level 1 involved the main funders and participants in discussion at national and regional level. In an attempt to initiate joint ownership of projects, the ACGB established small consultative groups to oversee the planning and implementation of specific projects as, for example, in the case study (see 4.2). This involved personnel from the ACGB, the dance company, the host institution and, at times, from local RA’s/RAs. Any issues and/or decisions emanating from this level were then debated within the local education context (i.e. at level 2) prior to further negotiations at level 3. However, despite
representatives from the education world being involved in initial consultations at national level, the power base of project work remained invested in the artistic world. The resulting imbalance of power at local level between the company and the host institution was further exaggerated when a representative from either the ACGB or the RA8 was present.

Although the co-ordinator has been mainly responsible for the success of any project in an education context the role has been underestimated. But this is the person who normally liaises with the ACGB, the RAA/RAB and the company as well as being responsible for negotiations in the education context. However, when these stages are not followed through thoroughly, and/or when decision making takes place from the top down, company members and/or dance artists have rarely been involved in policy making discussions.

The third level of consultation took place between dance artists and educators in specific project contexts. At this level the co-ordinator was mainly responsible for overseeing the organisation and day to day running of a project in consultation with the artistic director. Hence, the co-ordinator was the person whom company members, education staff and participants turned to in the expectation that s/he could resolve any difficulties encountered. Yet the case study (see 4.2) uncovered that in general no formal ongoing consultative process took place in long term projects. But a regular meeting format could have enabled dance artists and dance educators to monitor what took place and to resolve the issues which arose.

The need for "in house" organisational structures and supportive frameworks within school contexts identified by Hockey (1987) was reiterated in the case study, 4.2, in relation to a specific higher
education context. Yet the issues which arose were fundamentally of the same order as those normally found in secondary and other tertiary levels of education. The avenue whereby a co-ordinator could reach those hierarchical bodies which had the power to access projects to young people has been crucial. Absence of such a structure led the non-existence of positive and defined administration at a local agency level which became manifest in a lack of direction and management within the hierarchy of an education context, and inadequate overall co-ordination and/or liaison.

Other local concerns also emerged as dance artists had to assimilate a company policy into each targeted group of primary, or secondary, or tertiary education contexts. But whether dance artists have been familiar with the philosophies, organisational structures and working patterns of different education contexts could be questioned. Equally problematic has been their knowledge of institutions since each of these could have been unique in their structure and working patterns.

7.6 **Orientation time.**

Briginshaw et al (1980) stated that in principle a company needed an orientation period within an education context and Hockey (1987) showed that progress had occurred in this topic by the completion of the ACGB scheme. Even though the ACGB, artists and educators argued that acquaintance with the dance tradition of a school could enable dance artists to prepare more thoroughly than hitherto and Hockey (1987) urged for an extended planning period such warnings were largely ignored. Hence, insufficient time, unrealistic planning, misguided assumptions about standards and inappropriate selection of material remained an abiding problem. Even when an orientation
period was planned, as in the case study (6.21), funding and timing issues prevented the company from familiarising itself with the dance programme of the host institution and its environment. But this company's specific example merely mirrored the problems and emergent issues faced by all touring companies involved in project work.

Two other fundamental concerns emerged from the different positions held on the value of an orientation period. The first derived from a company not giving dance educators access to its repertoire. Both the case study (see 6.2) and the 1992 East Sussex project revealed that dance educators could not inform themselves as thoroughly as they might about either a company's repertoire or its previous education experience without the close collaboration of dance artists. But the complicated issue of a company opening up its repertoire to the world of education has been fraught with difficulties which stemmed from the different positions held by artists and educators. However, even on the rare occasions that dance educators have been given a unique opportunity to gain first hand knowledge of the repertoire of a company they have not exploited this fully. As the case study, 6.21, revealed, this had repercussions on the insights given to the young people involved. Yet participants also required thorough preparation so that they could come to the situation from an informed base and be reassured that any apprehensions they had about working with dance artists were unfounded.

The second concern stemmed from the anxieties felt by both dance educators and dance artists. Dance educators who came to dance through a PE route could have been in awe of dance artists. Similarly, dance artists equally may have felt threatened if questioned about the
educational content of projects and the teaching methods employed. However, if an orientation period became a standard expectation of all long term projects, both parties would have to question how their attitudes influenced their own and their partner's practice. In particular, the accepted notion that the expertise of dance artists is of a higher order than the teaching skills of dance educators would need to be reconsidered. These issues are returned to in Chapters 9 and 10.

7.7 Follow-up work.

Both Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) maintained that follow-up work covered separate activities such as evaluation of projects, including post-residency meetings, and further contact with dance artists. Subsequently, confusions arose as these headings described two very distinct activities.

The topic of evaluation has been divided in the present study into what took place at national and local level. First, the literature review revealed that documentation and dissemination of assessment reports on projects have remained largely with dance artists and host institutions, RAA/RABs officers and local advisers. Although Brinson (1982a, 1982b) asked for regular research into the process of collaboration the ACGB only undertook two large-scale public evaluations. Subsequently, the reports published by Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) described projects and gave general recommendations. But so far these have remained the only findings disseminated to a wider public. Similarly, the evaluation of other dance projects organised under the aegis of RAAs/RABs has been equally sparse. But in sharp contrast Brook (1989), Humphreys (1989), Lewis (1989),
Sarkar (1989), and Sharp and Dust (1990) identified programmes initiated under the Arts in Schools and the NFAE umbrella headings which attempted to identify long term effects, future needs and approaches; to make recommendations for action; and to disseminate findings. Yet in spite of this move a fundamental question remained unanswered. How could dance artists in education practice be more regularly monitored, researched, and the results disseminated to a wider public? Further discussion on this topic takes place in 10.2.

Second, the case study clarified how the evaluation process at local level was further divided into two sets of activities. The follow-up meeting involved representatives from the ACGB and/or RAA, the company, the host institution and, at times, participants. Here the intention was to clarify what had taken place, to consider the effects of the project on the parties concerned, and to inform future developments at national level. While project partners were also expected to write independent reports the case study (see 6.22) revealed that these may have been neither discussed with the parties concerned nor shared in a wider public arena. Thus, to reinforce a previous point, the wealth of information gathered from a particular project was not used to further public debate. Hence, dance artists and dance educators have neither been able to build on the successes nor avoid shortcomings of previous projects.

Another crucial question has also remained unanswered: why has evaluation been so ineffective? It could have well been a direct result of aims which were all embracing, failure to identify and to follow through appropriate planning processes, and a lack of clarity about what was to be targeted and to what purpose. Such affected the material gathered and thus the findings presented in any report.
Literature and the case study also failed to address the topic of the ongoing monitoring of projects. Throughout there appeared to be a hidden assumption that both parties could overview what took place and communicate concerns on an individual basis as and when they arose. Absence of a formalised structure did not encourage active dialogue between the two parties in the resolution of organisational, teaching or policy issues. The notion of planning formalised monitoring meeting structures into a project on either a daily or weekly basis to allow dance artists and dance educators to explore the interface they both share, is returned to for discussion in 10.4.

Although the ACGB stressed the importance of follow-up work the term, which derived from the ACGB, was itself confusing (see 2.3). Despite the ACGB encouraging partners to discuss and to engage in further work with specified dance artists this feature was rarely realised to the satisfaction of dance artists, or dance educators or participants. Post project contact has tended to take place with a host institution in one of two ways, selected dance artists or a company worked with as many participants as possible; or a dance artist undertook choreographic work with a selected group. The success of such a venture was dependent upon the expertise of the particular individuals involved. However, all too often the planned follow-up period did not take place for a variety of reasons which were either company or institution based. The case study, 6.22, showed how once a project was completed, pressure of touring demands and financial restrictions distracted dance artists. Subsequently, as follow-up work was no longer a high priority dance artists placed their energies elsewhere. Equally, parallel pressures resulted in dance educators losing their enthusiasm for follow-on work particularly when discussions with a company proved to be problematic. The selection of
those involved in post-project contact raised a further issue. Negotiations between partners rarely took into account the needs of the educational context. Hence, company commitments resulted in attached outreach workers or other dance artists who had no connection with a company being engaged for this particular work.

7.8 Funding.

The ACGB followed the principle of joint funding adapted from arts development in general and entered into matched funding arrangements with LEAs or other bodies so that a significant proportion of overall costs of projects could be met from this source (Briginshaw et al 1980, Briginshaw 1983, Hockey 1987). Rogers (1985) suggested that a similar principle was followed by RABs when allocating ACGB funds under the headings of regional development money and education work.

Davies (1987) pointed out that the limited money available from the ACGB for residency work resulted in companies seeking out business sponsorship to avoid financial crises. The claim by Mansfield (1987, p 80) that “in contemporary dance it is far easier to secure business sponsorship for residencies than for a new work” may have resulted in the increasing focus that some companies placed on education, including the formation of education units. Yet Nash (1988) ascertained that even with sponsorship, economic pressures made it increasingly difficult for larger companies to use performing dance artists in residency work. This situation was further exacerbated through the reorganisation of RAAs and the new structure and funding directives of the newly named RABs.
Similarly, educational institutions faced different yet equally problematic financial pressures. Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) both identified the additional pressures faced by schools and dance teachers when LEAs did not match ACGB or RAA funding. Although the latter has been a valuable negotiating tool with LEAs the financial implications of Local Management of Schools (LMS) has escalated the situation. Hence, whether funding could now be secured from strained educational budgets for dance artists in education programmes has become even more uncertain. This topic is returned to in 10.6.

Despite the attempts by educators to redress the balance of power from the mid 1980s, artistic priorities continued to dominate. Hence, neither the nature and force of the original agreement nor the ensuing processes which resulted when either party was allowed to withdraw or to modify agreements received due consideration. Yet, as the case study (6.21) exposed, this altered the circumstances of a project since moral and practical issues emerged which generally devalued the parties concerned.

The substitution, or recalling, or withdrawal of dancers identified in 2.4 highlighted the dominance of the artistic world. Inherent within such practice was both an automatic "valuing" of the dance artist profession together with its parallel "devaluing" of the education world. Hence, questions must be raised about the relative worth of the education component if dance artists could, and do, change their plans at any point in the project. It is argued in 10.6 that the introduction of binding contracts could place a value on the situation which ought to lead to mutual professional respect.
Summary.

A number of issues have been explored throughout this chapter. Identification of the gap between dance artists and dance educators raised questions about how a bridge could be built between the two professions. Exploration of the current emphasis on wide aims and the recurring issues which emerged from the continuing dominance of the artistic world highlighted the need for this topic to be addressed. Discussion of the planning and meeting strategies, the personnel involved and the responsibilities faced uncovered topics which required resolution. The need for appropriate structures for informed decision making was pinpointed and the impact of current "in house" frameworks on both the planning for, and the implementation of projects, queried. Clarification was also required of the unique contribution that dance artists can make to projects and the role of the co-ordinator. Concerns about the role of the D.ES and the need for educators and artists to become more informed than hitherto about the principles and practice of dance artists in education programmes were recognised. Equally important, the knowledge base of dance artists about the range of educational contexts into which they take work was also challenged.

Consideration of equality, or otherwise, of joint partners raised questions about the nature of agreements, the processes followed and specific planning. While the importance of an orientation period and the preparation of all those involved was highlighted the fundamental mistrust of project partners remained at the core of the issue. Significantly, discussion of monitoring, evaluation and post-project contact, as separate aspects, highlights the need for a more formalised structure than hitherto.
Finally, throughout the chapter the researcher sought to reveal conclusions about some of the deep, underlying causes (e.g. the different training of artists and educators, the predominance of the ACGB and the relative non-engagement of the DEJ, etc.) which have prevented the dance artists in education movement developing and maturing as effectively as it might.

When these topics are returned to in Chapter 11, arguments are put forward for projects to be designed as a coherent whole.
PART 4
Chapter 8.
The Project: A Working Framework.

8.1 Introduction.

Briginshaw (1983) identified five project structures which differed in length and intensity. First, "one-off" meetings of the two parties took place in a half day or day visit to the theatre or an organised meeting. Although this involved dance artists and participants in one or more activities what took place was necessarily transitory. Second, dance artists had contact with young people in a full-time residency situation over a period of time which varied from a few days to some weeks, months or even years. Third, an artist or a company visited a school repeatedly over a period of time, such as once a week throughout a term. Some projects of a long term nature (e.g. residencies) combined aspects of the one-off situation and the in-depth experience. Fourth, the artist or company or education institution either initiated the idea of special packages which included a variety of activities or had this negotiated with them. Fifth, many projects of a long term nature (e.g. residencies) combined aspects of the one-off situation and an in-depth experience. However, some of the concerns which arose were inherent within, and stemmed from, the particular type of structure followed. Indeed, as Sharp and Dust (1990) clarified, each type of structure influenced the kind of interaction that took place.
The investigation of current dance artists in education practice in Chapter 2 identified a number of activities common to all projects. Although these were initially performance orientated, Hockey (1987) noted that participatory elements introduced in the late 1970s developed throughout the ACGB scheme. This led to a position whereby educators were often pressurised to maximise both the activities offered and the number of young people involved. As Briginshaw (1983) claimed, the activities undertaken by dance artists and their relation with past and current roles were partially responsible for certain issues which reappeared in a variety of contexts. One included those activities which derived from the professional world such as performance, preparation for performance and choreography. The other involved functions which emerged alongside the development of the dance artists in education movement such as lecture demonstrations and teaching. Sharp and Dust's (1990) parallel classifications of maker, presenter and instructor/facilitator in artists in schools practice in general were not sufficiently explicit to be used for this study. Hence, Briginshaw's (1983) dance-specific categories have been adapted to aid the discussion.

In this Chapter discussion of the school context and personnel precedes debate about contact with dance artists. Adshead's (1981a) three stranded conceptual model for dance study provides a structured framework for debate. Since the early 1980s, acceptance of this model as the consensus view of dance education, together with its common usage by dance artists, has provided a common terminology. Significantly, the interrelationship between what dance artists do as they engage in choreography, or performance or appreciation affects how this is perceived by young people and dance educators. Hence,
the issues raised necessarily embrace all three parties. Furthermore, the inclusion of the dance as art model in Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992), albeit under the slightly different headings of plan, perform and describe, further justifies their use here.

8.2 The school context.

Hockey (1987) revealed that the residency structure adopted in the ACGB projects continued to affect the success of a project to a greater or lesser extent. Several difficulties deriving from the unfamiliarity of the educational context identified by Briginshaw et al (1980) and Briginshaw (1983) persisted in more recent work. These ranged from constraints experienced in working in a perceived bureaucratic institution to such practical matters as the number and length of practical sessions, to the make up and size of groups, to issues related to timetabling commitments and to teaching demands. In addition, Hockey (1987) explained how the insecurity and isolation felt by dance artists was further aggravated when combined with the constraints of administration, organisation of a performance, and extra rehearsals. Overall, the most important single factor which recurred was the confusion experienced about the many different types of roles that artists could fulfil. This is considered as a separate topic in Chapter 9.

Hockey (1987) and Sharp and Dust (1990) identified the low priority given in some institutions to the arts in general and to dance as a particular concern. Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) also stressed the importance of the headteacher and the dance educator in those schools committed to substantial arts education, dance as a
performing art and achievement of excellence in the arts. These authors argued that such contexts provided the base for a mutual understanding which allowed dance artists to be welcomed into a school and enabled the dance teacher to take advantage of the residency. Hockey (1987) further maintained that attitudes of headteachers at times compounded the issue as it was not clear whether they were committed to this area of work or viewed it merely as a useful political career move. However, Sharp and Dust (1990) decided that the role of the headteacher and his/her continuing involvement was crucial to the success and status of a project as was the support of such other key personnel as the head of department.

Although Hockey (1987) argued that the role of dance tutors was significant she claimed that many had not gained fully from a residency as headteachers rarely released them from normal timetable commitments. Subsequently, the heavy burden carried while a project was in progress prevented teachers from being aware of new approaches, acquiring different perceptions of the capabilities of pupils, and/or becoming self stimulated and motivated. Subsequently, many teachers were unable to build on what dance artists offered, as for example, the nature and style of a dance or a particular approach. This contrasted the considerable benefits Hockey (1987) claimed were gained when the overall administration was given to a school co-ordinator other than the teacher involved. This topic has not yet been resolved.

While discussion in 7.4 identified the diverse welcome given to dance artists within host institutions, and hinted at internal problems, lack of reports from both ACGB and other independent projects prevented in-depth exploration of the issue. However, 6.2 demonstrated those
problems which could arise at secondary and tertiary levels of education when staff as a whole failed to anticipate realistically the demands of the project. Difficulties were encountered when normal timetable commitments of both staff and young people were affected. It also disclosed how the views of participants could be adversely affected when staff in general questioned the overall value of a project and failed to give it positive support. The confusion and disillusionment which resulted as participants became embroiled in a conflict between normal commitments and residency demands could be mirrored in other secondary and tertiary education contexts.

In general, literature failed to recognise that dance educators have skills which could benefit all residency participants, including dance artists. Hence, the notion of joint ownership of projects has rarely been followed through in practice. But this is hardly likely to become reality unless the professionalism of the dance educator is recognised as being equal to, although different from, that of the artist. However, dance educators might be able to make a valid contribution to projects if dance artists acknowledge that teachers have something unique to bring to the situation. This topic is returned to in 10.4 as the contexts in which projects are based effect, to varying degrees, the success of projects.

Two further problems emerged. The first stemmed from residencies taking place within the middle or towards the end of a busy touring schedule. Carlisle (1993) revealed how small-scale companies faced particular difficulties if they had no replacements when dancers were injured. She maintained that in such instances commitments were neither honoured nor modified in consultation with the dance educator. The second, which derived from visitors watching dance
artists working with young people, has been ignored in recent literature. Briginshaw et al (1980) linked the vulnerability experienced by dance artists in the pilot projects with the assessment of teaching and choreographic abilities by personnel from the artistic and education worlds. Both these topics remain unresolved.

8.3 **Contact with dance artists.**

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) each identified the different positions held about the amount of time that participants had with dance artists. The view which favoured one-off contact with one or more dance artists in both short and long term projects and adhered to the notion of projects as experiential was influenced by the initial aims of the ACGB scheme. This led to the questionable practice of dance educators endeavouring to get their "money's worth" and thus the inclusion of as many practical elements as possible for the greatest number of participants. But 6.21 demonstrated clearly that it was this very expectation which led to the width of activities offered, and thus to the disjointed, vague and tokenistic dance experience in which the majority of young people were involved. The other view enabled selected groups to have more consistent contact with dance artists and provided the opportunity for in-depth work. While this practice became common to long term projects it led to concerns about the selection of participants. In general, project aims determined the emphasis placed on one or other of these distinct types of engagement.

Hockey (1987) argued that while both approaches were present within projects of any length the gap between the experience of participants widened in those of a longer duration. In particular she maintained
that in-depth work allowed participants to be engaged in a more beneficial and longer lasting learning experience than "one-off" sessions. She further claimed that it was only education contexts with established dance traditions which could provide the required support as a residency was in progress and also sustain the work after the conclusion of the event. Hence, Hockey (1987) questioned the value of projects which only allowed limited contact with dance artists, particularly when they were placed in institutions with little, if any, prior dance background. Yet despite Hockey's (1987) assessment many NFAE projects and the 1992/1993 East Sussex Frontiers and Vitol initiatives covered a number of schools. Such patterns enabled LEAs to spread funding in an attempt to stimulate dance activity. But as 2.8 indicated this caused comment on the superficial contact experienced and the pressures faced as dance artists moved from school to school (e.g. Humphreys, 1989; Lewis, 1989). Questions must therefore be asked about the artistic and educational value of the activities that took place and their long term effects.

Six other related issues arose. First, while Briginshaw et al (1980) claimed that the ACGB believed that it was beneficial for some young people to be involved in an intensive experience, dance educators expressed their concern about the problems encountered. Even so, little attention has been given to the rationale which underpinned the practice.

Second, questions were raised in 6.3 about the differences between the nature of the in-cohesive experience in which the majority of the young people were involved and the in-depth work experienced by a few. Hockey (1987) maintained that in-depth work allowed participants to be engaged in a more beneficial and longer lasting
learning experience than "one-off" sessions. In general, Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) both identified that in general dance educators focused on negative aspects rather than on examples which showed, for example, an improvement in the development of control, a high level of concentration and self-discipline, and a mature, positive and responsible attitude to performance even in work shown several months after the conclusion of a residency. Yet, while the experience leading to a new dance and its performance has come to be regarded as generally beneficial to participants, the advantages gained from focusing the resources of a project during the final weeks on the very small numbers involved has been questioned.

Third, how young people were singled out for intensive work was a cause of concern. As Nash (1988), and Sharp and Dust (1990) noted, the processes followed varied depending on the beliefs of particular institutions and the requirements of individual dance artists. While these could be classified as either self, or teacher, or choreographer selected, choice appeared to be dependent upon whether groups were considered to be knowledgeable enough to gain from an intensive experience. This stance was evident throughout the initial pilot projects, those of the mid 1980s and in more recent work. However, Brook (1989) and Henderson (1990) revealed that a selection process based on ability and interest in more recent work resulted in GCSE, A/S and A level examination groupings becoming the focal point for intensive work (see 1.4). Thus, as Hockey (1987) identified and 6.3 affirmed, the concept of labelling a section of a school (or other) population as a "dance elite" remained a complex issue. Furthermore, even though in-depth work became a common occurrence of long term projects, organisational and funding issues prevented most dance artists from conferring with the dance educator over the selection of
individuals, or observing young people in dance activity, or working with them prior to selection. Clarification of the selection processes would appear to be vital if such opportunities are to be made available to a range of young people as well as to those following examination routes. Such a rationale is proposed and discussed in 11.7.

Fourth, little reference was made by Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), and Hockey (1987) to the equally problematic topic of the selection of dance artists even though the latter ultimately influenced the nature of the work undertaken. The added stress placed on dance artists and participants when funding bodies such as the ACGB and the RAAs/RABs viewed the finished work was exposed in 6.5. But despite choreographic work remaining a recurring feature of long term projects little serious consideration has been given to the selection of dance artists. In particular, 6.5 highlighted the difficulties encountered when the concept of intensive work was not divorced from the focus of the activity. The difficulties experienced were a direct result of dance artists having to find alternative ways of working to create and structure new material into its final form. As this was quite different from teaching technique and workshop sessions, the question of the nature of intensive work and selection of those responsible for undertaking it is returned to for further discussion in 11.7.

Fifth, the lack of involvement of boys, has been a topic since the initial pilot residencies of 1980. Although Briginshaw et al (1980) noted that boys took part in some projects there was no concentration on this area despite the ACGB's intention to involve them as fully as possible. Even when the ACGB funded two all-male dance groups for a time (see Chapter 3) the situation hardly improved. Thus, in spite of
Hockey (1987) returning to it as an area of concern the literature in general has ignored the issue. However, one notable exception, an NFAE project, focused on the inclusion of boys (Brook 1989). Since then at least one RAA/RAB has funded male orientated projects in a move to draw young males into dance (see 2.8). But as Carlisle (1993) and Childs (1993) suggested, such ventures could do little on their own to improve the situation. In fact it raised another question since in the event those taking part were predominantly female. Hence, as Carlisle (1993) disclosed a conflict of interest arose when dance educators argued for the project to be opened up to more females to make it a viable proposition. Thus, how to encourage boys to participate remains a recurring theme.

Sixth, participants who engaged in intensive work frequently experienced extra workloads throughout a project period. Problems became manifest in 6.3 from the attempt to marry high residency expectations with normal degree requirements. The root of the issue remained the absence of an agreed policy whereby credit could be gained for involvement in intensive work. Young people in examination groupings in secondary and tertiary contexts were equally vulnerable. Yet so far, the notion of the concept of gaining credit through using a project to study aspects of course work has not been explored. Such a notion of equivalence could have alleviated the problems faced by those groups following GCSE, A/S, and A level or dance courses within degree programmes.

8.4 Choreography.

Despite Cohan's lead in the early 1980s, dance artists rarely engaged participants in the body of knowledge that structured and informed
the concept of choreography. However, Hockey (1987) noted a shift from the early disquiet of dance educators to a more positive position about the suitability and value of choreographic work. This change of attitude paralleled acceptance of Adshead's (1981a) claim that the body of knowledge which structures the making of dance could be taught and practised (see 1.3, 1.4). This became manifest in a focus on the craft of composition and the abstract principles, commonalities, patterns and differences to which these give rise.

Discussion of the Adshead (1981a) model in 1.3 and 1.4 revealed a body of knowledge which holds true for all types of dance activity. While it was not aligned specifically to the dance as art notion its structures could be applied to the nature of choreography and the practices which arose from these. Furthermore, acceptance of the tripartite model of dance as art in education resulted in choreographic principles being taught to young people in higher, tertiary and secondary education. Yet despite this focus and creative work featuring as a participatory element, little attention has been given to this aspect in projects.

As Table 14 displays, a range of activities can take place under each heading. These are considered separately here to guide discussion.

To reiterate a point made earlier the topic of dance artists as choreographers working intensively with groups of young people towards some form of choreographic presentation at a final sharing or performance has been debated since the initial ACGB pilot projects. Briginshaw et al (1980), Macdonald (1981a), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) each reflected that the core of the problem stemmed from different beliefs about how young people should be engaged in
Table 14: Curriculum content in relation to typical dance artist's areas of activity with an identification of participants' and dance educator's involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANCE ARTISTS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>EDUCATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHOREOGRAPHY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company repertoire</td>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own composition (i.e. movement research)</td>
<td>Repertoire and Workshops</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choreographer's composition (intensive groups)</td>
<td>Principles of choreography</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Choreography with dance artist (intensive groups)</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERFORMANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company performance</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical considerations</td>
<td>Technical considerations</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop performance</td>
<td>Workshop performance</td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPRECIATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture demonstration</td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Movement analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open preparation — technique/choreography</td>
<td>Movement analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Practical work — technique/workshops)</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the creative process. The concerns of dance educators who continued to uphold the MED tradition arose from the belief that participants should create from their own thematic material. This differed from the practice of dance artists who determined both the ideas and the content covered. Hence, dance educators were worried about the rightness, or otherwise, of pupils engaged in dance activity largely formulated by dance artists. Hence, questions about the validity of participants working towards a final performance stemmed from young people working in ways which imitated the professional world.

Warnings from Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) that dance artists should not be pressurised to create completed dances were largely ignored. Likewise little heed was taken of the dance artists unease at choreographing with students who were "immature and inexperienced dancers" (Briginshaw et al, 1980, p 18). Yet in spite of the misgivings of both professions Davies (1987) and Nash (1988) showed that choreographic ventures expanded. Young people became involved in choreography presented as part of a company performance, and in choreographic and performance work alongside dance artists. In such instances the results of the choreographic period, i.e. new dances, differed depending on the ability and expectations of selected dance artists and their subsequent interactions with young people.

Intensive work took on a significant new direction when the focus widened to include repertoire work based on the requirements of the A-level examination syllabus (see 2.4). Subsequently, the criteria for the selection of students at times was dependent upon their involvement in examination work. Yet, despite this increase in intensive work, little attention has been given to choreographic
development or content. However, analysis of data in 6.4 disclosed that dance artists invariably fused choreographic principles, critical appraisal and content as they developed a particular dance. The choreographic project was extended further when professionals inserted their own performance amongst that of young people in a new work. This allowed the process and the product to become a shared collaboration.

The collation of literature in Table 13 revealed that during the 1970s and 1980s technique became complemented by a variety of activities normally termed "creative" workshops (Briginshaw et al., 1980). These caused considerable disquiet throughout early practice because of the contribution that pupils made, or had the opportunity to make, to the creation of dances. Redfern (1973a, p 71) argued that this issue was complex and confused because of the different perspectives of "creativity" and expression, the pervasive influence of MED which became synonymous with self-expression and the outpouring of emotion, and the changing nature of dance in education. She highlighted further the incompatibility between theatre dance and how dance was taught within education. But fundamentally the confusion arose because artists considered that pupils could only create when they had acquired a repertoire of movements with which to create. But for the educator the starting point and the focus of all creative work was the child producing his own movement from a given stimulus.

Subsequently, two conflicting views emerged which influenced the attitudes of dance educators. First, any suggestion of imposition or specific direction was deplored by dance educators who favoured Laban-based concepts. They believed that practices followed in the
world of the theatre were not appropriate for the education of young people. Similarly, they also regarded any limitation of the freedom required for the child to "create" to be directly opposed to one of the basic principles upon which dance education had been founded (1.2. 1.5). But Smith (1987) argued that reappraisal of MED led to a gradual change of attitude, to a new approach, and, by the mid to late 1980s, to a different consensus view of dance education (see 1.4, 1.5).

Second, consideration was given to what was referred to in literature as the "unique" experience. While this issue was first raised by Redfern (1975a) and developed by Hamby (1979, 1981) it recurred in the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980), the report of the initial pilot projects (Briginshaw et al. 1980), Briginshaw's (1983) research into dance artists in education and in Hockey's (1987) overview of the ACGB scheme.

Although Briginshaw et al (1980) identified that creative approaches featured in the pilot projects of 1980, Hockey (1987, p 57) revealed that the term "creative workshops" only came into common practice after its inclusion in the overview of the ACGB scheme. These started to feature in projects when dance educators began to insist that the high profile given to technique needed to be redressed. But as the collation of literature in Table 13 revealed, this new term embraced a multitude of activities loosely called "creative" or "compositional". Hence, dance educators were confused about what took place under this umbrella heading and the width of activities covered. However, the vague intention and focus of workshops may have in part to them rarely creating or developing new movement phrases.

This issue was complicated further by the varied interpretations which fell under the umbrella heading of "workshops" when this was
widened by the ACGB in the late 1980s to include choreographic and repertoire aspects and, at times, distinct repertoire classes. Even though the ACGB's Dance Pack (1988) listed activities, there was no clear definition of each company's approach. In general, dance artists offered some form of creative/compositional work based on a dance or, more recently, taught sections of dances from a company's repertoire. Alternatively, they placed an emphasis on such choreographic elements as the creation and design of movements for a dance or selected choreographic principles. Workshops based on narrative themes and ideas which might relate to the dance performance also occurred (ACGB, 1988). Distinct repertoire classes were offered as a more common feature of project work from the late 1980s (ACGB, 1988).

Although at times an emphasis was placed on choreographic elements, what took place did not necessarily expose participants to the study of choreography. This may have been due to the assumption that dance artists would automatically pass onto young people their own unique experience of dance as art. However, as 6.4 showed, participants did not learn anything new about choreography when dance artists failed to identify explicitly the concepts used as a dance was formed. But this contrasted with the emphasis placed on choreography as an integral feature of the professional training of dancers, of degree programmes in dance and within the current approach to dance education. Overall, a polarity existed between the explicit emphasis placed on what was to be learned about choreography within the study of dance at secondary, tertiary and higher education levels and within dance artist in education programmes. As there appeared to be a need for a coherent company
policy for choreographic work this topic is returned to for further discussion in 11.4.

As Hockey (1987) identified, dance educators started to criticise what actually took place under the umbrella heading of "creative" workshops. This occurred when they realised that dance artists had a unique contribution to make which derived from their professional expertise. This was paralleled with a growing assurance that dance artists were better utilised teaching workshops which focused on repertoire. Fundamentally, as dance educators recognised the prime importance of repertoire as a resource, they argued that dance artists had the expertise to access master works to participants and that this was quite different from what they themselves offered.

The initial focus on repertoire took place on an ad hoc basis, and no coherent approach was developed in the early 1980s. However, Nash (1988) suggested that since then companies had been pressurised to strike a better balance between their own performance and education work. Yet in spite of attempts by such companies as Mantis and EDC (see 3.31) to explore the use of key works any benefits derived were minimised because of the diversity of practice and teaching offered. Hence, discussion in 11.4 and 11.8 raises questions about how dance artists could use their intimate knowledge to contribute to detailed understanding of the choreographic and technical structures of selected art works. In particular, it considers how repertoire based workshops could be used specifically to enable participants to become more knowledgeable about dance. Although any or all of these activities could be offered to pupils, students and teachers, what was put forward tended to vary in relation to different types of content, the age and interest of participants and the varied reason for involvement.
Even though the common terminology used by the ACGB suggested a cohesive stance from the artistic world, companies failed to make clear definitive statements which adequately described their distinct activities and/or how these were to be interpreted in practice. As Chapter 6 revealed, there remained an essential need for dance artists to clarify the language used so that dance educators could identify precisely what each company offered. This was particularly important as the different traditions in the work of ballet and modern dance companies made the issue complex. Overall, the problem of terminology and the different meanings and connotations assigned to similar terms by dance artists and dance educators in projects has militated against choreographic discourse and mutual understanding. The issue has been even more problematic when the same language has been used with participants in the teaching situation. For example, choreographic terms which derived from the professional world could confuse the uninitiated and when used indiscriminately could lead to behavioural problems (particularly in schools), to boredom and to a low standard of work. Hence, the topic is noted here and integrated into the discussion on choreography, performance and appreciation in 11.4, 11.5 and 11.6.

Significantly, the ACGB's (1988) publication, *Dance Pack: Dance Companies. How to use them. Dance Companies. What they offer* demonstrated an increasing emphasis on repertoire-based workshops and repertoire classes. But as these terms were used in different ways by companies from different genres dance educators became even more confused. Interestingly, although ballet companies were more reluctant than modern companies to undertake this particular type of work they were slightly clearer about the approaches offered. As manifest in 6.4 the emphasis on repertoire based workshops
continued to be a topic. First, dance educators questioned the educational value of single workshops which did little more than encourage the enthusiasm of participants or give them a pleasurable dance experience. Second, dance artists encountered difficulties in the workshop situation. Third, a marked difference was apparent between the performance standards expected in varied activities, showed how dance artists rarely anticipated or encouraged high levels of performance and interpretive aspects in repertoire or choreographic based workshops.

Although dance artists have worked at times with other professionals in projects on choreographic ventures have those been recorded. Therefore, insight into the company choreographic period discussed in 6.4 was important since the outcomes of the exploratory improvisational process and choreographic period were made public in workshop performances. But, it must be remembered, none of the performed dances were intended for the repertoire. Indeed, Nash (1988) claimed that even when choreographers worked with company members a dance was rarely completed by the conclusion of a project. Hence, an alternative approach was sometimes taken in which a choreographer, or a rehearsal director, worked with other professionals and participants on the recreation of material from a particular dance. This could only add to the richness of a residency experience for both participants and any young people allowed to view the work in progress. But as 6.4 clearly showed, a dilemma arose when this minimised contact with students and "closed" sessions prevented others profiting from the unique experience. Hence, questions have to be raised about how a company focus could be utilised more fully for dance educators and participants.
"Performance" within a total theatre setting in which dance artists displayed their technique and interpretative qualities has formed a central role in dance artists in education projects. Yet, confusion has surrounded the use of the term from the late 1970s since the inclusion of participatory elements also described similar features in the practical work in which young people were engaged. Briginshaw's (1983) classification of performance activities into six areas showed how these were affected by the venue. The term then widened further to encompass workshop performances in which presentation aspects featured. In these, dance artists and young people either "performed" separately or together in an audience setting.

As Gow (1977) and Macdonald (1980) revealed, performances in a theatre setting were complemented at times with school matinées. Moreover, Cope (1976), Macdonald (1980), Hamby (1981), Macdonald (1981), Briginshaw (1983), Cole (1983a) and Hockey (1987) all showed how those in alternative theatre venues such as educational institutions expanded to include education programmes targeted towards particular groups. But performance in such venues has not been without its problems as inadequate facilities, at times, led to a loss of certain aspects of visual reproduction and auditory effects. Moreover, the shift of focus of some companies, the disbandment of others, the appointment of education officers and the subsequent development of education units resulted in education work moving into new directions. Hence, Ludus remained the only company with a specific interest in education until the early 1990s (Johnson, 1989; Ludus, 1991, 1993). However, Brooke (1989), Lewis (1989), Humphreys (1989), Sarkar (1989) and Walker and Hills (1989)
described how projects under the heading of Arts in Schools, and/or NFAE and/or AEMS led to an increase in the use of education venues by individual artists and companies from a range of dance genres.

In general, the public showcase for both the choreographic and technical virtuosity of a company has been highly acclaimed and its impact on viewers undoubtedly contributed to the success of any project. Yet, despite company performance being significant it has not been used as a central unifying feature of a project and there have been no criteria which informed the selection of the dances presented including pieces commissioned specifically for the educational context. Moreover, 6.5 showed that the absence of an in-depth dialogue prevented partners from negotiating on the suitability, or otherwise, of the dances performed.

Furthermore, Hockey (1987) explained that as company performances within education were presented in as near a theatrical setting as possible each one was usually preceded by a technical and a dress rehearsal. This ensured that the lighting, accompaniment, stage sets and props, together with the performance of the dance, met the artistic requirements normally expected within the theatre context. But, in general, the only participants who experienced either technical or dress rehearsals were those involved in concluding "performances". Yet 6.4 underlined the importance of such experience in bringing young people in touch with a new dimension of project work. It demonstrated how participants involved in an in-depth experience could become enlightened by the professional expectations surrounding a performance. But, overall, the majority of young people have not been given an equal opportunity to acquaint themselves with such aspects. Yet the growth of dance as an art form, together with
the emergence and consolidation of Performance Arts faculties in secondary and tertiary education, has placed young people in such contexts as part of normal curriculum demands. Hence, questions need to be asked about how this added dimension could be utilised more fully.

8.51 Artists: performance aspects.

Webb (1976) indicated that the lecture demonstration format was initially developed by Cohan to introduce choreographic aspects into the early LCDT residencies. Briginshaw et al (1980) and the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980) then explained how this was adapted for use in one of the ACGB pilot projects and then it infiltrated into the work of other modern dance companies and remained in almost constant use until the mid 1980s. However, Hockey and Mansfield (1990) revealed that it started to disappear from general use and by 1990 was no longer offered by contemporary companies such as LCDT. Yet Castle and Crow (1985), Morris (1985a, 1985b), Katrak (1987), Rogers (1987) and the ACGB (1988) all affirmed that concurrent moves in the ballet world resulted in the lecture demonstration format being used on a more extensive and consistent basis by such companies as SWRB and LFB.

Throughout, dance artists have been expected to exploit their professional expertise in lecture demonstrations even though this has been quite different from the company performance. Depending on the design of the lecture demonstration, dance artists may have performed a complete dance or excerpts of movements to give the audience some insight into its choreographic structure. Briginshaw (1983) indicated that in such situations a dance was generally
performed without lights and costumes in a studio context which, because of the near proximity of an audience, could have taken away some of the "mystique" of the "performance". Furthermore, 6.5 showed how dance artists were generally in a state of flux as they started and stopped performing selected excerpts. But young people gauged the success of what they saw, at least in part, on the performance qualities of individual dance artists.

Overall, Davies (1987) argued that dance artists encountered three difficulties in lecture demonstrations. The first arose from the strain experienced when dance artists presented work to large audiences with varied expectations and knowledge. The second emanated from the need for dance artists to articulate clearly to a vast group. The third derived from the differing opinions held by dance artists and dance educators about the intention and value of the lecture demonstration and how it should be presented. While these concerns may have led to the initial decline of the lecture demonstration a fourth cause might also be proposed. The new generation of dance artists had no current model on which to fashion their own work. As the potential of the lecture demonstration format has not yet been realised this important issue is returned to in 11.6.

Dance artists and young people have also taken part in workshop performances from the mid 1980s. But in general, any reference by Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), and Hockey (1987) to this aspect has been interwoven with the debate about selected groups (see 8.3). However, the contributions from participants expanded from the dances choreographed with intensive groups, to include sections of reconstructed repertoire and dances choreographed with dance artists and selected young people. In addition, dance artists at times
also performed a dance from the company’s repertoire. While similar problems to those previously cited occurred, others also emerged. Even though the performance role of dance artists was not of prime importance during the project period they were still expected to meet public context performance standards. Yet, with inadequate rehearsal time and without a theatre setting this rarely met expected professional standards. Hence, tensions may have arisen for dance artists when representatives from funding bodies were in the audience.

The professional approach of young people to workshop performances has taken dance artists by surprise. As Hockey (1987) explained, participants found the added dimension of performing in a formal public context challenging. As exemplified in 6.5 the integration of technique and the choreographic process enabled more able and less experienced participants to gain from performing something to the best of their abilities. But in this instance raising performance standards was due partially to technique underpinning the developing choreographic work. Even so the valuing of performance skills above all else in projects needs to be considered in the light of the cost it could have on young people. This could be particularly true if the achievements of participants and dance artists were gauged by what took place in any culminating workshop performance.

While sharings, formal or informal, have also become a significant feature of long term projects the processes followed inevitably varied according to the degree of contribution made to choreographed work by artists, students or pupils. But as 6.5 revealed other participants were well aware that they lost something vital from the residency situation when they were not included.
Companies have also offered open preparation in the form of "open choreography", "open rehearsals" and "open company class". Briginshaw (1983) reaffirmed Webb's (1976) claim that the typical model for "open choreography" sessions was initiated by Cohan in the early LCDT residencies. This format was then developed further by him with LCDT in one of the 1980 ACGB's pilot projects to include an accompanying commentary and explanation directly focused on dance artists (Briginshaw et al., 1980). Once it became adapted by other companies dance artists, as choreographers, were expected to talk about their work to an audience. But Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) maintained that, in general, choreographers found it difficult to expose the normally private process of making a dance and to talk about it to those not intimately involved. In particular, they exposed that dance artists became further distracted by an audience or visitors in the sensitive moments when movements were shaped into the dance. However, Sharp and Dust (1990) proved that the questions this raised about the intimacy of the creative act was not just dance specific. They were equally relevant to the wider context of artists working in schools.

Dance artists have also been cautious about offering "open rehearsals" in which an audience could view dances from the current repertoire. Again initiated and developed by Cohan it continued to be used by LCDT until the late 1980s as part of a package offered for young people in the theatre setting (Hockey, 1987). Although its use expanded into the work of other companies such as Mantis (see 3.31) dance artists in general have been cautious about it being included in education programmes. While "open technique" classes were a common feature of a project package until the mid to late 1980s they too declined once dance artists started to offer other activities. Since
aspects of "open" preparation remained relevant for dance artists in education programmes this issue is examined in more depth in 11.6.

8.52 Participants and dance educators: the technique debate.

One of the recurring dilemmas of dance artists in education practice has been the focus on performance, and thus on technique. Webb (1976) suggested that this could be traced to the formation of LCDT, the influence of its early residencies on other companies, and the rapid increase of participatory activity for young people, students and teachers in classes, workshops and courses in the modern dance genre. However, by the early 1970s problems arose and Redfern (1973b) warned dance educators against the dangers of technique becoming an end in itself. However, while educators such as Webb (1976) highlighted the focus placed on both the teaching and demonstration of technique in the early LCDT residencies they also noted positive effects on participants such as the enlargement of movement vocabulary. Subsequently, White (1977) reflected how arguments made by dancers for technique to be part of college courses gained some support. This then expanded so that by the start of the 1980s Adshead (1980) identified that technique had become an area of study in higher education.

The focus on, and frequency of technique classes, as evidenced in the pilot projects of 1980-85/86, manifested the early concerns of dance educators (see 2.3). Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) reflected the centrality of the issue when they cited the opposing views about pupils/students participating in technique. Problems arose as professional training provided the knowledge base from which dance artists functioned. This was exacerbated as dance
artists considered it to be a prerequisite for, and an integral part of, their work; were concerned that they had little else to teach and desired to improve the physical performance of young people. Conversely, dance educators viewed the over-emphasis placed on skills as a restrictive form of exercise which was a potentially damaging practice for young, developing bodies. The emerging gulf between dance educators who continued to advocate MED and those who came to emphasise the developing dance as art model further provoked the situation (see 1.3). Fundamentally, there was a distinction between the beliefs held by dance educators about a general concept of dance movement, which provided ideas for the creation of dances, and technique in the form of a codified style as used by professionals.

Hockey developed the argument about technique when she asserted that the evident void between dance artists and dance educators was partially caused, as

... the artists themselves did not always help to bridge the gap; perhaps through lack of knowing what else to do, they taught too much structured technique in a way too remote from the children's experience and skills. A false dichotomy arose between technique and creativity, with artists representing the former and dance teachers the latter.

Hockey, 1987, p 25

Failure to understand the fundamental aims and objectives of dance education has continued to lead dance artists to value artistic concerns and ways of working, such as technique, in preference to those followed in the education world (see 7.3). While the inclusion of technique as a participatory element provided the bridge between dance artists and dance educators the focus placed on skills which emulated the high expertise of dance artists, persisted. Hence,
Hockey's (1987) shift of emphasis towards an acceptance of technique for older pupils, particularly those in examination classes, and/or dance clubs was important. This was reflected in questions now focused on the most suitable style to teach, to whom it should be presented, and how it might best be taught. But Hockey (1987) still noted the concern of educators that the levels of pupils' performance should not be compared with those training for the dance profession. However, acceptance that technique was appropriate for selected participants in higher education, as identified in 6.6, and for those young people engaged in examination work diluted the issue to a certain extent. However, while codified styles appeared in the National Curriculum at KS 4, the appropriateness of technique for the lower secondary and primary age range remained problematic. In particular, Nash (1988) and Brook (1989) questioned the focus placed on technique when pupils failed to see its relevance to other dance work. Brook's (1989) claim that poor teaching of technique was compounded by inadequate planning and the selection of unsuitable material went some way to identify the fundamental problem.

The lack of in-depth exploration, negotiation and joint decision making about the function of technique, the style selected along with the emphasis to be placed on it led to many of the concerns expressed here. In particular 6.6 showed clearly how the absence of a collective company policy placed responsibility for decision making firmly with dance artists. Hence personal preference influenced the importance placed on technique together with decisions related to time allocation, the selection of content and the presentation of material. As dance artists rarely, either collectively or individually, followed a common approach or presented similar content to parallel groups, participants were confused by the diversity of material, formats and definitions
they met. Furthermore, young people with little or no experience were frequently embarrassed by some professional dance practices particularly when the high standard of technique demanded was not met in practice.

The case study, 6.6, also demonstrated that the issue was made even more complex by the relevance, or otherwise, of the technique experienced by general and intensive groups. Overall, the negative attitudes towards technique were a direct result of the diverse approach and focus that most groups experienced. Any importance placed on improving performance skills was devalued when there was either no direct relationship with workshop activities or no explicit progression and development of material. Inadequate planning, failure to clarify the distinctive nature of technique for particular contexts, the lack of a company policy and the absence of agreed criteria on which any decisions could be based compounded the issue. This was then exacerbated as artists rarely distinguished between skills and how these were taught.

In sharp contrast 6.6 revealed how participants in intensive groups viewed technique as an integral and worthwhile aspect of choreographic work. This suggested that young people more readily accepted challenges which were explicitly central to the choreographic process and to the improvement of their own physical abilities. It revealed, too, that presentation of the dance in a public performance setting gave technique an added value. However, little consideration had been given to how young people could experience a more consistent and progressive approach to technique so that it became a more integral, and therefore vital, part of project work. Even though this issue has been largely ignored since the Hockey (1987) report and
some dance artists have moved away from teaching codified styles this remained an area for resolution. While the nature of technique and its presentation in dance artists in education projects has still to be resolved the situation has become even more complex because of the varied use and meanings given to the term.

Dance artists first voiced their concern about the physical competence of dance educators towards the end of the 1970s. Williams (1976) cited in Briginshaw et al (1980, p 21) found that just as dance educators questioned technique taught by "inexperienced, untrained and unqualified teachers", dance artists queried technique, being imitated by dance educators who had no understanding of its underlying principles. While both parties expressed equal concern about those who were "experienced", they each saw the fault lying firmly with the other. Hence, as Briginshaw (1983) maintained, this recurred as a topic throughout project work of the early 1980s. However, this situation started to change when dance educators, from the mid 1980s, were themselves more competent and experienced in technique. The growing emphasis placed on dance as art (and thus on technique) within dance programmes in PE degrees, single honours degrees in dance, and combinations of two or more subject degrees which included dance, placed an emphasis on performance (see 1.4). Thus, those who came from undergraduate courses where dance was the sole or major area of study may well have had a wide experience (and a proficiency) in various techniques. Dance educators from the new PGCE dance routes brought something special to the profession, and thus to projects, as performers. Examination work also required dance educators to be more proficient in both their own performance and in teaching technique. Subsequently, more dance educators should have been able to negotiate the technique
component in project work from both an understanding of the professional practice of dance artists and the needs of young people.

8.6 The appreciation dilemma.

Performance elements have allowed education audiences contact with finished works of art mainly within the theatre setting. Additionally, the development of dance artists in education practice has led to a growing number of performances taking place within educational contexts (Briginshaw et al., 1980; Hockey, 1987; Nash, 1988). Adaptation of the early lecture demonstration format of Ballet for All by LCDT from the mid 1970s allowed educational audiences to be presented with some insight into the making and performance of dances. For example,

The LCDT residencies in the late 1970s included such specific appreciation aims as to develop a greater understanding of what the performances are about.

and

to break down the idea that dance is something difficult to fathom.

Gow, 1976, p 361

But in spite of this early model little has been done to encourage pupils to apprehend the finished work. In general, few possibilities for dance appreciation were built into either the ACGB projects or the work of other companies.

Macdonald (1981), as ACGB Education Officer at the time, echoed the Gulbenkian Foundation report’s (1980) regret at the lack of appreciation elements when she noted that
in the projects taking place to date, little has been done to encourage pupils to approach the finished work of art.

Macdonald, 1981a, p 3

The conflicting views held by dance artists and dance educators stemmed from who should provide the guidance needed to develop appreciation skills. Brinson's (1982a, p 30) claim that dancers were "not very good" at giving "verbal guidance" further affirmed Macdonald's (1981a) view. She maintained that the dance artists were not necessarily the best people to explain their own work despite the unique insight they acquired into the dances performed. Hence, the central question, who should provide the guidance needed to develop appreciation skills, was not easily answered.

The acceptance of the dance as art model in dance education (see 1.3, 1.4) together with the increase and development of dance artists in education programmes, led to a growing awareness of the importance of appreciation elements by dance teachers. The vital contribution that the teacher could make to this specific area was highlighted by Redfern who claimed that this was

the special role and responsibility of the educator... professionals from the theatre are hardly likely to have reflected upon the implications of conducting an aesthetic debate for educational purposes, and might well have biases and preferences that are out of place in a school or college.

Redfern, 1976b, p 70

But in the early years dance artists and dance educators neither agreed on the nature of appreciation nor on who should be the presenter of such information. Dance artists were reticent about the importance placed on it by dance educators in the belief that over-analysis destroyed the mystique of dance work. Equally, they were reluctant to verbalise about what they had come to know in a
practical sense and to place anything before an audience which they believed might intrude between the dance itself and the audience's enjoyment. But dance educators considered that when dance artists articulated skilfully about the ideas which informed the dance and its making, an audience was provided with some insight into specific dances. Yet as Hockey (1987) explained, dance educators were also guarded about their own ability to comment upon the work of dance artists in projects. She also claimed that the source of the issue stemmed from appreciation aspects being overlooked within MED training.

Even though Hockey (1987) acknowledged the growing focus placed on appreciation in recent years she argued that it still required a greater emphasis. In particular, she highlighted the contribution that artists working in a longer residency might make in this area and indicated that this could well help to narrow the gap between dance in the theatre and dance in education. McFee (1994) supports this position when he claims that young people need guidance to view the specific characteristics inherent within a dance. However, the marginalisation of appreciation as a major feature of project work by dance artists did not help the issue. Paradoxically this underpinned what dance artists actually did when young people and dance educators were either in a predominantly observer or participant role.

The audience could be included to a greater or lesser degree by means of a verbal commentary in open technique class, open rehearsals and open choreographic sessions. However, while all these situations had a common focus on the company their use in projects varied. How much they featured was dependent largely upon how prepared a
company was to place itself in a variety of potentially vulnerable situations.

From the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s, the focus placed on technique complemented what took place within audience situations such as a matinee, a special school performance or a lecture demonstration (2.2). Company class was used initially to introduce viewers to, and to familiarise school audiences with, the new modern dance genre. Any appreciation elements brought in for the audience were secondary as instructions, comments, correction and demonstrations were directed to dance artists. But as highlighted in 2.4, there was an obvious decline in the use of company class when an emphasis was placed on the use of repertoire. Furthermore, its value was now thought by dance educators to be suspect unless there was an intermediary between the dance work and the viewers.

As revealed in 2.2 and 2.4 open rehearsals were offered by companies from the mid 1970s to the early 1980s. But in contrast to the running commentary from the rehearsal director to the company about such elements as the technical and interpretative demands of the dance there was no direct communication with the viewers. The decline in the use of open rehearsals in the latter half of the 1980s may have occurred because of the growing expectation that dance artists ought to communicate more effectively with the audience. Yet even when observers were left to interpret what they saw for themselves and to transfer concepts across activities, the open rehearsal situation could have provided insight into dance works. Viewers could have gained more from the observing with guidance from an intermediary between the dance work and themselves. This situation may be currently more
pertinent for those involved in examination work than for lower school pupils.

Dance artists were even more anxious about open preparation with a choreographic focus. As this reflected the notion of the privacy of the creative act upheld by choreographers, the relevance of open choreographic situations became questioned by dance artists. In spite of some exceptions, as in 4.4 and 6.4, in general the process of creating remained private to the company. Therefore, dance educators and participants saw little, if any, of the creative process and missed out on what could have been a valuable learning experience.

A separate but related issue arose from the expectation that a choreographer could talk about his/her work in open preparation and discussion sessions. Yet choreographers were usually very reticent due to the belief that talking about their work detracted from the viewing process. But dance educators who regarded it as a vital component of a project argued that unwillingness to share work in this way was incompatible with the concept of projects taking place in education contexts. However, whether choreographers were able to articulate the ideas which informed the dance and its making was questionable. This is examined in 11.6 in relation to the inclusion of appreciation elements in the National Curriculum.

Although lecture demonstrations were a common feature of dance artists in education practice their design and presentation prevented them from being as effective as they might have been. The case study, 6.5, showed how a company offered the same format to more than one group regardless of the differing ability and experience of the audience. But the appropriateness of one programme format for a specific audience did not mean that it was necessarily right for other
groups within a project. Young people in audiences which ranged from lower to upper school pupils including GCSE, A/S and A level groupings had a very different experience and knowledge base. Therefore the range of different audiences needed to be considered in the design of the lecture demonstration.

There appeared to be no easy answers to questions raised about who should provide the guidance needed to develop appreciation skills. Just because dance artists gained a unique insight into the dances performed it did not necessarily mean that they were the best people to explore their own work or to give verbal guidance. Furthermore, how reflective dance artists were about the dance together with any biases and preferences held and how skilful they were at presenting influenced the information given to viewers.

The contribution of the teacher to the whole procedure was also questioned. While some dance educators came to accept that they might well be the intercessionary between the art work and the pupil, others were more dubious. Those dance educators who questioned their own limited knowledge feared that their analytical attempts could not do justice to the selected piece. This could explain why many dance educators continued to rely on dance artists to present lecture demonstrations. But dance educators have a wealth of particular skills not assumed by dance artists which could be utilised more fully than hitherto. Chapter 11 explores the possibility of dance educators collaborating with dance artists and taking on more responsibility for both the planning and presentation of lecture demonstrations. However, dance educators can only make appropriate decisions for a specific audience when dance educators are knowledgeable about a company’s repertoire.
The move by dance educators to engage young people actively in art work, both as observers and participants, indicated that there was something specific to be learned through practical involvement in selected works. Even though dance artists did not consider appreciation to be one of their primary functions, they fulfilled this role when teaching and demonstrating. For example, 6.4 and 6.5 revealed a marked difference in the work of dance artists who placed an emphasis on appreciation in technique and workshop activities and others who rarely mentioned such aspects. Again, only in the intensive groups' developing choreographic work was there a consistent concern for critical appraisal. Moreover, failure of dance artists to focus on appreciation elements became manifest in the lack of progression and development of material.

The continuing disregard of appreciation elements by dance artists also ignored both the current emphasis on the tripartite model of dance education and more recently its inclusion within the remit of dance in the National Curriculum. Moreover, as dance educators now recognised appreciation to be the informing element of project work, the implications this has for "Partnerships" must be explored. Questions, therefore, need to be raised about how dance artists could help individuals to come to know and to understand something specific about dance work. Indeed, dance artists may have a particular contribution to make in this area which could help to narrow the gap between dance in the theatre and dance in education.

8.7 Summary.

This chapter sets the foundation on which much of the following discussion is based. It reveals that despite the progress made there is
still a gap in the relationship between dance artists and dance educators which prevents the notion of partnerships being totally effective. An examination of common project structures discloses that the important issue of contact with dance artists requires further consideration. Discussion of the positive or negative effects that context conditions could have on a project raises other issues which need to be addressed. Similarly the workloads experienced by dance artists and dance educators require further debate. Consideration of the range of dance specific activities that dance artists offer uncovers the complexity of the experiences in which participants could engage. Finally, the roles that dance artists take on and the difficulties encountered are noted as an issue which requires clarification. These topics are returned to in Chapters 10 and 11.

While the National Curriculum welcomed the notion of "Partnerships" these may develop and mature in dance only if artists and educators recognise the need for clearly articulated joint aims and objectives. For this kind of work to be arranged at all implies that the organisers are unwilling to leave collaboration to chance. There is, however, obviously a problem in the interpretation of aims. They might be more easily understood if they are considered as ideas which reflect the needs and aspirations of the parties concerned and their particular artistic and educational cultures.

The root of many of the problems addressed is the need for a company to determine a clear, coherent policy of what takes place under the heading of choreography, repertoire based workshops and appreciation. This would allow choreography to be given a much higher profile than ever before. Similarly, the distinct ways that repertoire can be used and the different outcomes that this can lead
to require clarification. Equally important, the central role that performance, in its widest sense, can play in project work needs addressing. This necessitates agreement on a collective company policy which enables technique to become integral to the developing choreographic or repertoire work and which includes, also, the added dimension of theatrical presentation. Likewise, the need for an intercessionary between all dance work and young people requires further consideration so that appreciation aspects can permeate all project activities. Finally, there is a need to consider whether the principle can be established that dance artists ought to use the act of making a dance, or involvement in repertoire based work, or the appreciation of a particular dance as the starting point for project work. All other aspects can then be brought into play around one central idea. The argument for coherent project design is developed in Chapter 11.
Chapter 9

The Roles undertaken by Dance Artists, Participants, and Dance Educators: expectations and outcomes.

9.1 Introduction.

In the mid 1970s Cope (1976) and Webb (1976) both identified the problematic nature of the roles taken on by dance artists in projects. This was then followed by Briginshaw et al (1980), the Gulbenkian Foundation report (1980), Hamby (1980), Macdonald (1980, 1981a) and Briginshaw (1983) all of whom attempted to clarify the confusion which arose from the multiplicity of the functions fulfilled by dance artists. But Hamby (1980) identified the core of the problem when she claimed that the issue stemmed from whether or not the dance artist had anything to offer to the education context and how this was realised.

Briginshaw (1983) was the first to categorise the dance-specific roles of dancer, choreographer, teacher, adviser and animateur. These were then used by Hockey (1987) as she debated the successes and problems encountered throughout the ACGB scheme. While both authors agreed that the roles of dancer and choreographer were most consistent with the training and professional life of dance artists they realised that all other roles were subsumed within the education context. Although Sharp and Dust (1990) also classified roles
undertaken by artists in education these were not sufficiently dance-specific for this study. In the following discussion, based on an adaptation of Brginshaw's (1983) classification, the role of choreographer has been considered, even though all dance artists do not have this experience; another function, that of presenter, is added while the animateur role is subsumed under the adviser heading, and that of administrator, merely noted.

Table 15 shows the roles assumed by dance artists in different activities under the organising concepts of choreography, performance and appreciation and reveals that these in turn have influenced those adopted by participants and dance educators. Examination of the functions of each party under these headings provided a coherent structure which allowed cross referencing to take place more easily between the concerns addressed here and project activities discussed in Chapter 8. The role of teacher has been explored separately.

9.2 The dance artist as choreographer and performer.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), Harrison (1986), and Hockey (1987) all agreed that performance has been the most predominant and consistent role for which dance artists have been most prepared in their professional training. Since the 1970s it has also remained the one regarded by dance artists as being most significant within the education setting. Hence, as no clear guidelines were given by the ACGB (see 7.3) dance artists assumed that their principal role was to show their distinctive way of performing and/or choreographing. However, even when this was reaffirmed by
Table 15: The roles assumed in dance artists in education projects by dance artists, participants and educators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DANCE ARTISTS</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>EDUCATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHOREOGRAPHY</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive groups</td>
<td>Some contribution</td>
<td>Observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own composition</td>
<td>Some participants</td>
<td>Observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination Work</td>
<td>Some contribution</td>
<td>Observers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PERFORMANCE**        |                       |             |
| Company Performance    | Audience              | Audience    |
| Workshop Performance   | Selected participants  | Audience    |

| **APPRICIAITION**      |                       |             |
| Lecture Demonstrations | Audience              | Audience    |
| Open preparation       | Audience              | Audience    |
| Technique sessions     | All/selected participants | Observer   |
| Workshop sessions      | All/selected participants | Observer   |

| **PRESENTING**         |                       |             |
| Lecture Demonstrations | Audience              | Audience    |
| Workshop Performances  | Selected Groups       | Audience    |
| Final Forum            | Selected Groups       | Audience    |

| **TEACHING**           |                       |             |
| Practical Activities   | Learners              | Observers   |
| Technique              | Learners              | Observers   |
| Workshops              | Learners              | Observers   |
Macdonald (1980, 1981b) as a prime reason for placing any artist in an educational establishment, dance artists remained confused about what was expected of them. The roles undertaken by dance artists have been a major source of unrest not only in the early ACGB projects but also in more recent ventures (see 2.4, 2.8). While dance artists were trained for and familiar with some roles, these assumed other and different types of identity within projects.

As previously stated in 2.2 since the inclusion of choreographic elements for the company in the LCDT residences in 1976 (Webb, 1976) some dance artists have taken on the role of choreographer throughout longer term projects (Briginshaw et al, 1980). Hockey (1987) maintained that it then became a consistent element of ACGB residency work and Davies (1987), Nash (1988) and Henderson (1990) named it as a feature offered by other companies and individual dance artists. However, Briginshaw (1983) suggested that many dance artists who did not have choreographic experience questioned this role.

Examination of workshop activities endorsed that this function was also taken on by dance artists when they focused on content based on either key works from the repertoire or on choreographic aspects (see 8.4). While Brook (1989) and Henderson (1990) disclosed that while dance artists at times worked as choreographers with examination groups at GCSE, A and A/S level, they failed in general to recognise the potential of this particular area of the curriculum. Yet such young people had a potential to work in ways similar to the professional dance world as they had already acquired relatively substantial degrees of experience in both technique and choreographic work. Furthermore, 6.7 also made the point that while dance artists at times
undertook this function in workshops they often operated in a somewhat vague and inconsistent manner. The contrasting focus on, and approaches to, key works from the repertoire and the fundamental concepts of choreography illuminated the problem. In general, dance artists either focused explicitly on certain selected choreographic principles as movement was shaped into a coherent artistic form or assumed that these were implicit within the given material.

Davies (1987), Mansfield (1987), and Johnson (1989) also suggested that choreography was central to the work of individual dance artists and in project work undertaken by large, middle and small scale touring companies. Brook (1989) and Henderson (1990) then helped to clarify that some dance artists used choreography as the central organising concept for projects, both with colleagues and project participants. This occurred with other professionals in two main ways. First, as a choreographer engaged with young people and professionals either in independent groups or together, on the creation of a new dance for performance. But such situations were problematic as dance artists tried to maintain artistic integrity while struggling to develop a dance over a short period of time with untrained young people. Hence, they were often in danger of losing the single mindedness of the role which typified the process engaged in within the professional theatre context. Added pressure was also faced when dance artists and young people worked alongside each other because of their diversity of experience and expectations. Other tensions were created by exchanging the privacy of the company rehearsal for one which was often far more public, and anticipation that the finished work was to be appraised. Second, 6.4 and 6.7 also exemplified how dance artists, who did not normally consider
themselves to be choreographers, faced additional stress when improvisational situations became more structured. They struggled to complete and to present dances in a workshop performance.

While choreography has become accepted as the pivotal concept of dance artists in education programmes, well-established choreographers attached to major companies from both the modern and ballet genres have rarely been involved in projects. In general dance artists who have taken on the role of choreography could be categorised into five groups. Those who:

1) were beginning to establish themselves as young professional choreographers;

2) choreographed with other company members in workshops to produce new work for such events as "Spring Loaded";

3) undertook choreographic commissions for youth and/or education groups under the heading of either a company outreach worker or free-lance dance artist;

4) perceived themselves to be primarily performers with a secondary interest in choreography;

5) assumed a choreographic role in education contexts as part of their role as education officer.

Discussion in 8.3 noted that literature made little reference to the selection of dance artists for the choreographic role. The core of the problem stemmed from a general assumption held by artistic directors, education officers and dance educators that the unique experience that dance artists have of dance as art automatically provided them with a high level of expertise in the craft of choreography. Yet the very nature of professional training equipped dance artists to be performers rather than choreographers. But the
instigators of projects assumed that dance artists could automatically transmit knowledge of choreography gained through performance experience to participants. However, as 6.4 proved, it was only those dance artists who choreographed frequently for the professional world who were able to sustain the role without help from the artistic director and/or other dance artists. Others found the task particularly daunting. Overall these findings suggested that there has been a tendency to underestimate both the choreographic problems which arose, and the resulting pressures faced when dance artists did not have prior experience of shaping new material within a framework of artistic and aesthetic criteria.

To reiterate a point, the role of performer was the one consistently undertaken by dance artists in projects and the one that most equated with their professional training. Discussion in 2.3, 2.4 and 2.8 suggested that the normal performance demands placed on dance artists in the theatre domain became expanded when they performed in education venues. As revealed in 4.6 and 6.5 these became when dance artists accommodated the stress of touring demands; adjusted to an environment which did not totally meet normal professional requirements; performed dances which possibly lost something of their mystique; and adapted to the close proximity of the performance situation. This, together with the contact made with dance artists as individuals, placed dancers under closer scrutiny than in the professional theatre context. Consequently, when a performance was not as finished as it might have been the audience critically appraised the ability of individual dance artists as performers rather than the dance itself.
The role of dance artists as performers in workshop performances was a major one. But discussion in 6.5 articulated for the first time tensions which emerged as dance artists strove to retain their performance standards. Despite such challenges, the professionalism of dance artists enabled them to modify their role to the difficulties of the "theatrical" situation. But such issues were not case study specific as workshop performances have become a common feature of long term projects. Therefore, there must be realism about the contrasting demands placed on dance artists and the performance standards which can be maintained.

The different performance roles placed on dance artists in lecture demonstrations has been ignored in the literature (see Table 13). However, analysis of data in 6.7 enabled these to be classified in two main ways. First, dance artists faced the single role of performer when selected pieces were performed from the company repertoire. Second, the dance artists' high professional expertise had to modified in relation to the context. For example, any performance of sections or phrases from dances was interspersed with engagement in dialogue with the audience. Subsequently, although the performance of selected phrases might exemplify certain characteristics for the audience it created substantial demands on the performance of dance artists.

In addition to the more conventional performance roles other specific challenges emerged when performing in sessions open to viewers. While Webb (1976) showed that dance artists took on the role of demonstrator Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) noted the unease dance artists felt when presenting particular aspects of their training in open preparation sessions. But in these dance artists performed at
levels appropriate for specific activities such as open company class, open rehearsals and open choreographic sessions. However, dance artists faced different expectations when the focus was on maintaining technical virtuosity, or perfecting sections from a dance, or when finding and shaping new material. This may not have been appreciated fully by participants who were probably unaware of the privileged nature of watching dance artists as performers in a training situation; or viewing dance artists in an open rehearsal; or the exceptional occurrence of external observers watching the creation of a dance.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) also revealed that the dance artist often employed a modified performance role in teaching. While the use of performance skills in this context has been overlooked generally in literature 6.4 exemplified how dance artists could provide participants with a "good enough" model to copy. This happened when they demonstrated, or modified demonstrations, or when they taught set movements in either a technique class or when reconstructing a dance. But this problem was exacerbated further in workshops when dance artists at times demonstrated movements from the repertoire or gave examples of movement for young people to copy. Furthermore, as suggested in 6.7, even though demonstrations were a vital feature of the teaching and learning process they were not always "performed" with a sense of artistry.

9.3 The dance artist as presenter, appreciator, teacher and adviser.

Dance artists frequently faced new demands in education contexts. Although the role of presenter was not identified by Brinson (1982b),
Briginshaw (1983), Harrison (1986) or Hockey (1987). Sharp and Dust (1990) suggested that it was used by dance artists in three main ways. First, it encompassed those activities in which dance artists engaged in an interface with pupils when primarily in a formal audience situation such as lecture demonstrations and open forums. Discussion in 2.2, 2.4, 3.3, 3.4 and 8.6 highlighted that one of the challenges faced by dance artists was how best to focus and to present the lecture demonstration so that an audience could be guided to view the particular work. But Hockey (1987) proposed that some dance artists regarded any information that they gave to an audience in order to draw them into the dance as interference. They believed that individuals could themselves associate with different aspects of a dance. But this is contrary to McFee's (1994) position that particular characteristics needed to be highlighted to enable young people to more easily understand and appreciate a dance. Hence, as previously stated, the attitudes and expertise of individual dance artists influenced how much insight an audience was given into selected dances.

Second, appreciation was present in open technique classes and open rehearsals if the dance artist or choreographer was mainly giving information to the viewers. Further problems were associated with "presenting" any information to an audience in such "open" contexts as a company class, rehearsal or choreographic session. To reiterate a point made in 8.5 and 8.6 any communication which took place was addressed to dance artists and audiences, as 'outsiders', were left to interpret the coded messages and 'in-house' jargon as best as they could. However, the stress on appreciation in higher education together with the inclusion of "Partnerships" as a feature of Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992, p H1) suggests
that there is a need for dance artists to re-examine the appreciator role. As "open" situations have the potential for a specific appreciation focus this topic is explored at depth in 11.6.

Third, 6.7 highlighted how the role of presenter and appreciator was equally crucial when dance artists taught any form of practical work to young people.

Cope (1976), Hamby (1980, 1981), Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983) and Hockey (1987) all argued that the most significant role that a dance artist ought to take on in a project was that of an artist concerned to show his/her particular way of performing or choreographing. But literature revealed that the additional role of teacher remained paramount since it emerged in the mid 1970s (Cope, 1976; Hockey, 1987). Hence, dance artists fulfilled this role in a variety of activities with participants who ranged from school pupils to university and college students. Subsequently, throughout the 1980s Hamby (1980, 1981) and other educators raised questions about the role that dance artists took on as replacement or "unpaid surrogate teachers" (Briginshaw et al, 1980, p 32) and at the conclusion of the ACGB scheme Hockey (1987) still maintained that duplication of the teachers role was predominant. Even though dance artists continued to question what they perceived to be excessive expectations, dance teachers, by their timetabling, queried the limited teaching sessions expected by companies. Brook (1989) and Humphreys (1989) both noted that when the notion of a school getting "its money's worth" remained uppermost, dance artists undertook timetables which often resulted in sheer exhaustion. Furthermore, Harrison (1986), Brook (1989) and Carlisle (1993) reaffirmed that this situation prevailed in long term projects and in
one-off teaching situations from the mid 1980s until the early 1990s. Indeed, the very nature and format of current project models, together with the vague aims and objectives discussed in 7.3 continued to place more importance on a major teaching role rather than on encouraging dance artists to explore ways in which they might make other, and more unique, contributions to project work. This crucial issue is returned to in Chapter 11.

A related issue arose from claims by larger companies such as LCDT (see 2.2, 2.3) that they possessed a "number of dancers" who were "experienced...dance teachers" (Briginshaw et al., 1980, p 24). Yet Hockey (1987) argued that the one-off teaching situation encountered did not provide a sufficient foundation on which prolonged teaching could be based. Hamby (1981), Brinson (1982b), Harrison (1986), Hockey (1987), Brook (1989), Humphreys (1989), and Sharp and Dust (1990) all referred to the recurring difficulties met by dance artists. As 6.7 showed these tensions became exacerbated when dance artists reverted back to practices with which they were familiar from both their professional training and daily class. As these were inappropriate for young people they affected the success of a session to varying degrees. Hence, discussion in 6.7 supported Hockey's (1987) claim that experience of one-off teaching situations rarely provided a sound enough foundation on which substantial contact with students could be based.

Harrison (1986) took the argument further when she suggested that the situation was aggravated when dance artists taught creative/compositional work as other factors such as shaping pupil derived material had to be considered. The case study (6.4, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7) showed conclusively that some dance artists experienced considerable
difficulties and rarely functioned totally efficiently when teaching a range of practical activities. It also confirmed that those problems which teachers learned to cope with on short and long term bases were further added to through inadequate planning, poor teaching techniques and the use of unsuitable material. As suggested in 5.6, acceptance of the Mosston model (Mosston and Ashworth, 1986) as a means of appraising teaching objectively in education has complemented the current emphasis on accountability.

Analysis of the practical activities in 6.7 on the basis of the Mosston spectrum discussed in 5.6 highlighted the similarities and differences evident in technique and workshop activities. While this exposed that dance artists were generally comfortable when teaching known material, it clearly revealed the difficulties encountered when trying to lead participants to certain kinds of movements, or when attempting to shape choreographic material. In particular, students became confused about the expectations placed on them when dance artists presented tasks which were either too broad, too complex, too vague or a combination of all three. Dance artists then experienced difficulty in developing and shaping movement into a coherent structure. Furthermore, interview material reaffirmed that participants, as student teachers familiar with a range of teaching styles, were able to gauge the appropriateness of the methodologies used for the content delivered. Overall, evidence enabled identification of "good enough" and "not good enough" practice in technique classes (see Table 7) and when teaching compositional work (see Table 8). Examples of exceptional practice were rare and, generally, dance artists failed to realise that content and presentation had a particular relationship that needed further exploration.
Moreover, 6.7 also revealed the diversity of the corrective processes used and the contrasting practices this resulted in are shown in Table 9. For example, correction was frequently associated with the teaching of technique and its use presupposed that any mistakes made needed to be corrected. But the use of correction as exemplified in the professional dance world was neither a common feature of the earlier MED era (see 1.2) nor common practice in current dance education. In the latter, modification of actions came through the use of positive specific feedback.

Several issues arose from the use of correction. First, verbal feedback from the front of the class was not complemented at times with other forms of correction appropriate to individuals. Second, the use of correction as a means of raising levels of expectations and standards at times had the reverse effect on young people. It brought into sharp relief the difference between the theatre and education worlds. Third, while correction needed to come early, the continual use of negative feedback discouraged participants. Fourth, participants were only able to modify movements when given detail about what needed to be altered and how to modify the action. Fifth, repetition of movements only led to improvement when a focus was placed on refining movement behaviour. Sixth, some professional practices acutely embarrassed young people. Seventh, physical correction, together with the tactile sensitivity and intimacy of touch, was disquieting for participants, regardless of gender, if it was not a part of their normal practice.

Similarly, discussion in 6.7 also verified that demonstration was used in diverse ways. Examination of the "good enough" model in Table 12 revealed the variety of ways that dance artists used demonstration
when teaching technique work or when reconstructing set movements from a dance. It also identified important "modifiers" which allowed participants to understand more clearly what was required of them.

Interpretation of data from 6.7 also uncovered the fact that dance artists used demonstration in a variety of workshops to present participants with ideas about how to answer a specific task. Hence young people were led through a series of steps to what was for them "unknown" material. Alternatively, demonstrations were used to show possible answers to a task of a divergent nature, to inspire young people or to give them the confidence to create their own material. Although any or all of the responses had to fit the task, they could be very diverse.

Although there was little doubt that demonstrations provided a visual model, how effective they were was also influenced by a number of factors which required attention. First, dance artists had to guide participants where to look, and to give specific instructions on how to modify the movements. Second, participants generally could only pay attention to a restricted number of features at any one time. Third, movements needed to be broken-down so that they were within the grasp of young people. Fourth, the importance of the use of demonstration as part of the teaching and learning process needed to be recognised. Fifth, how dance artists themselves utilised artistry in their own performance when they taught was vital to the qualitative response of young people. Thus, set within the wider context of dance artists in education the "good enough" and "not good enough" practices identified could be applied to other project work.

The case study (6.4, 6.5, 6.6 and 6.7) also clarified that the recurring difficulties encountered were compounded through inadequate
planning and the use of unsuitable material. It too revealed that, in spite of the "good enough" examples noted, dance artists were in general rarely able to function totally effectively in both technique and workshop sessions. But despite teaching recurring as an issue from the late 1970s, and into the mid 1980s as a central concern of the case study and as a topic which continued into the early 1990s, company administrators continued to offer projects in which dance artists took a predominant teaching role. Thus, the role of the dance artist as teacher is returned to in 10.7, prior to proposals and recommendations in this special area in Chapter 12.

The expansion of dance artists in education projects led to additional roles for dance artists such as that of adviser. This has been largely a development of the animateur function identified by Breginshaw (1983) in which dance educators and young people turned to dance artists for expert knowledge and advice on such matters as training. However, examination of a number of schemes initiated under the arts in Schools, the NFAE and the AEMS projects uncovered that dance artists have frequently been given the responsibility for delivering Inservice courses. Humphreys (1989), Johnson (1989), Lewis (1989), Usborne (1989) and Walker and Hills (1989) all exposed the fact that this virtually placed dance artists in an advisory capacity. Set within the wider context of dance artists in education the "good enough" and "not good enough" practices identified could be applied to other project work. Recent projects showed an even more marked involvement with curriculum matters than hitherto and appeared to fulfil Le Grand's (1990a) plea for company education officers to have a greater involvement in dance education. However, the current
emphasis on engaging dance artists in an advisory capacity ignored the early warnings epitomised in the writings of Briginshaw et al (1980) and other authors that dance artists aimed to influence dance education. It also reversed Mansfield's (1987) disclaimer that he, and others representing dance companies, avoided any action that might be interpreted as advisory. But in fact, the evidence for intervention has become very clear.

First, the formation of a regular meeting forum for company education officers under the auspices of the ACGB (see 2.6) gave them greater status and resulted in a united voice from the artistic world. However, while this led to companies describing activities in very similar ways, something of the unique and distinctive nature of what they offered was lost. Second, company education officers voiced their concern at not being invited to engage with dance educators in the National Curriculum debate. Third, the ACGB attempted to influence the direction of dance education through its dialogue with the National Curriculum Working Group for PE. Fourth, as sessions for dance educators became a common feature of project programmes some LEA advisers assumed that artists could be responsible for, and capable of facilitating, the professional development of teachers. Use of the expertise of dance artists as performers and/or choreographers enabled teachers to increase their dance knowledge and performance standards, and gave educators "instant" ideas for dance work in schools. However, while the professional world has increasingly influenced dance education the "teaching model" provided by dance artists has been suspect. As Hockey (1987) warned, they had very little experience in schools, and certainly none of teaching on a regular basis. It has, therefore, hardly been surprising that the frequent use of dance artists as "advisers" in curriculum courses has
been problematic. But this focus demoted the professionalism of educators' expertise as dance artists, in the adviser role, lacked knowledge of the education field and failed to adapt professional teaching modes to educational needs. However, while the unique knowledge and experience of dance artists has not been complemented by a concern for education, a growing number of dance specialist teachers have a high degree of practical skill, in-depth theoretical understanding of dance and expertise in the theory and practice of education. Overall, questions must be raised about who should take prime responsibility for curriculum development and whether this could benefit from a close collaboration between dance educators and dance artists.

9.4 Participants: choreographic, performance and appreciator roles.

Despite the roles of dance artists and dance educators being discussed in the early literature (see 2.3) those undertaken by participants received scant attention. Yet as Table 15 revealed these were determined by what dance artists did with young people under the organising concepts of choreography, performance and appreciation.

The assumption, found in the literature overview, that dance artists provided the majority of young people with the opportunities to create new material, and thus to take on something of the choreographic role was contradicted in 6.4. Overall this demonstrated how the endeavours of young people were minimised when they received little guidance on how to develop and progress content with concern for choreographic form. This differed from the role of choreographer
undertaken by participants when the dance artist clearly placed an explicit focus on choreographic concepts in set tasks which became increasingly complex. It also demonstrated what actually took place with participants and that they could help to resolve overall problems when dance artists shared with them the processes and principles involved. Overall, it exposed that the disparity of experience was a direct result of there being no agreement about the choreographic principles to be focused on. Hence, the expertise, knowledge and teaching ability of individual dance artists, together with the degree of comfort they experienced in developing creative work, determined what actually occurred. How participants then interpreted this in practice was dependent upon their previous experience.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), Harrison (1986) and Hockey (1987) pointed to the focus placed on technique in project work and revealed that participants were often expected to reach standards that they could not hope to achieve. Discussion of data in 6.6 uncovered three main reasons for this topic which had relevance to the wider scene. First, the majority of young people were not familiar with technique as practised in the theatre dance domain. Second, the choice of material was at times neither appropriate for the age and/or experience of participants nor adapted to the needs of specific groups. Third, the teaching approaches adopted, together with some professional practices, prevented young people from attaining the required performance standards. Fourth, little attention was given to how young people in curriculum groups met the dual and reciprocal demands of technique and interpretation. Hence, as Brook (1989) confirmed, this remained a cause for concern at the end of the
The case study (6.4, 6.5 and 6.6), also exposed an apparent difference between the high expectations placed on participants when engaged in technique and reconstruction sessions, and the demands made on them in workshop activities. In the latter, participants rarely met a concern for physical and interpretative expertise alongside a regard for choreographic development. While 6.5 uncovered the potential that workshops held for performance in its widest sense, models of good practice tended to come from more experienced dance artists who were able to develop choreographic work with a concern for quality. This reaffirmed Hockey's claim that interpretative aspects were rarely considered.

Although Hockey (1987) noted that the formal workshop performance allowed selected young people to present work to an audience, 6.5 disclosed the dissatisfaction that could occur when others were not given the opportunity to participate in a workshop performance or a final forum. The desire to be involved in any form of public presentation revealed a wish to achieve which contradicted warnings from Briginshaw et al (1980) and Briginshaw (1983) that the formal performance situation pressurised young people. Indeed, 6.4 and 6.5 endorsed Hockey's (1987) belief that working in an intensive choreographic manner towards a final performance had a marked effect on participants. Any added pressures were dispelled as participants realised that the performance goal not only gave them something to strive for, but also placed importance and value on what they did. It demonstrated, too, that as young people moved into the realm of theatrical performance they also experienced the necessary prerequisites of rehearsals and took upon themselves the role of a
"semi" professional with all the demands placed on dance artists in these situations.

Briginshaw (1983), Hockey (1987) and McFee (1994) agreed that formal situations, such as watching a performance or lecture demonstration or any form of open preparation sessions, placed young people in contexts in which they were expected to bring into play both their interpretation and appreciation skills to a range of dance work. However, while a young audience could marvel at the virtuosity of individual performers and the company as a whole, the degree to which dances were appreciated was determined largely by how accessible such works were to viewers. As demonstrated in 6.5, the ability to understand a dance was highly dependent on an individual's experience, knowledge and understanding of dance as an art form. It also revealed that young people equated enjoyment with being involved in, and thus appreciating, the dance.

To reiterate a point made in 8.6, lecture demonstrations and open preparation contexts provided different opportunities for an intermediary between the dance work and the audience. As shown in 4.7, the insight young people were offered through verbal commentary in the lecture demonstration extended at times into a two-way dialogue based on the use of a question and answer format. When this occurred viewers were expected to appraise and to be articulate in their views about what they had seen. In contrast, in any or all of the forms of open preparation discussed in 8.6 there was usually no intercessionary between the audience and the work. Hence, as participants had to be able to interpret what was taking place for themselves they were unlikely to recognise fully the main characteristics of the session.
The case study (6.4, 6.5 and 6.6) also exposed that in addition to the audience situation, appreciation aspects were vital to the development of a range of practical work. In particular 6.4 demonstrated a marked difference between those dance artists who looked objectively at developing work with a concern for artistic and aesthetic criteria, and others who ignored or glossed over such aspects. While the general attitude of dance artists to appreciation elements underpinned this practice other factors may have compounded the issue. The reluctance of individual dance artists to take on this role in turn affected how they encouraged participants to see themselves as appreciators. Furthermore, the overall vagueness of aims and objectives for dance artists in education projects at both a national and local level did not help dance artists to accept that participants could be involved in the appreciation process. This concern is further addressed in Chapter 11, together with proposals for the exploration of the use of appreciation as a focus for projects.

Although the role of participants within the teaching situation did not emerge in the literature overview (see Table 13) it appeared as a topic in 6.8 when dance artists worked with trainee teachers. In this instance students had varying degrees of teaching experience which ranged from novice to those deemed qualified and thus competent to enter the teaching profession. Therefore, in general students were well able to appraise the appropriateness or otherwise of the content and intent of sessions to the teaching approaches adopted. But even though students helped dance artists to resolve some of the difficulties encountered in a choreographic situation the particular skills they could offer were devalued in relation to the performance expertise of dance artists. This point merely affirmed the general attitudes of dance artists to the skills of educator.
Although this situation has not been reflected in other project work, young people in secondary and tertiary contexts might well have critically evaluated how they were taught in a general manner. But the emphasis placed on enjoyment in the early ACGB projects (see 2.3) ignored the more crucial teaching/learning dimension. Indeed, debate neglected how the teaching skills of dance artists affected what young people learnt. Hence, the question of teaching is returned to in Chapter 12 and in the recommendations, Chapter 13.

9.5 **Dance educators: the choreographic, performance and teaching dimension.**

The one-sidedness of the current project structure and the administrative and planning functions assumed by dance educators discussed in 6.2 and 6.21 were affirmed in relation projects within the national context in 7.3 and 7.4. This revealed the emphasis placed on the expertise of dance artists and the neglect of the specific skills of dance educators which company members do not have.

In general, the overview of literature made little reference to the involvement of dance educators in the choreographic role. But 6.4 uncovered a number of points which had bearing on other projects. First, dance educators were actively encouraged not to observe the choreographic work of intensive groups. Second, dance educators experienced difficulty in gaining access to both company rehearsals and to more exploratory company focused choreographic sessions. Third, dance educators were given no opportunity to participate in exploratory improvisation and choreographic work either on their own or alongside dance artists.

Two recent projects exemplified contrasting practice. In one, an
innovative step was taken when a specialist dance teacher continued work with young people and aimed to achieve the "professional" expectations appropriate for a public performance (Hughes, 1992). In the second, dance teachers were given little, if any, choreographic guidance (Carlisle, 1993). While ongoing work with teachers maintained the motivation of a project and engaged educators and pupils in compositional work, the outcomes themselves were appraised with little concern for quality. Encouraging teachers, who had little specialist dance expertise to pursue dance-like activity in schools, was frequently problematic when the support from the LEA adviser was not a dance specialist. But while these projects, just as any other dance artists in education programmes, were not primarily for dance educators, they could have fulfilled an In-service function. Observation of an experienced dance artist as choreographer at work could have extended a dance educator's knowledge of choreography, particularly if some form of guided tutelage had been given (see 2.4).

As dance artists have rarely engaged teachers in the choreographic role they failed to appreciate that a full-time experienced dance educator has spent a considerable amount of time in the act of choreographing by virtue of the emphasis placed on pupils' own creative abilities (see 1.4). However, a growing band of dance specialists have also choreographed for youth and performance groups. Hence, some dance educators might have become even more familiar with choreographing for public audiences than inexperienced dance artists. This could be particularly true of those dance artists who had never taken on any responsibility for choreographic work prior to project situations.

Briginshaw et al (1980), Briginshaw (1983), Harrison (1986) and
Hockey (1987) each identified the focus that project work placed on the professional expertise of the dance artist and in particular their performance skill. Hence, the emphasis on technique throughout the work of the 1970s and 1980s resulted in dance artists judging the knowledge and ability of teachers by their expertise in such techniques as Graham and latterly Cunningham styles. Early projects focused on dance educators acquiring a greater facility, knowledge and performance ability within the modern dance genre in codified techniques for two main reasons. First, dance artists considered that dance educators needed greater knowledge and expertise in technique. Second, as dance educators judged their own ability in performance terms they were persuaded to acquire a greater facility and expertise in technique. In contrast, as ballet was rarely taught within the state education sector, companies within this tradition placed less emphasis on participatory elements and had fewer expectations about the practical expertise of teachers.

The emergence of specialist dance routes into education and the change of focus in dance courses within PE contexts outlined in 1.4 dissipated the urgency for projects to focus on the acquisition of codified styles. But even though the proficiency of dance educators now ranged from the competent to that of a para-professional, dance artists still emphasised technique and dance educators at times participated in such activities. By this very focus, dance artists failed to provide dance educators with the opportunity to further performance in workshop activities of a reconstruction and choreographic nature. Even when this occurred aspects of the dance educator as performer in an interpretative sense have been passed over. Yet a growing number of dance educators have performed either alongside young people in youth, school or higher education
performance groups. Some retained their own performing interest in semi-professional small fringe dance groups. But, to date, project work has not taken into account this new breed of dance educator either in terms of the projects on offer or in relation to what expertise the specialist dance teacher could bring to a project. These issues are considered in 10.3 alongside the notion that dance educators, particularly those with specialist knowledge, have skills that they too could bring to project situations.

Discussion in 7.3 and 7.4 revealed that the dance educator frequently relinquished the roles that s/he normally assumed within the education context during both the planning and implementation stages of a project. This one-sided view of professionalism also occurred in Chapter 6. Throughout dance educators, as highly trained professionals who had their own particular accomplishments, relinquished the roles normally undertaken in the education world. As they lost their role and identity they neither knew what function to adopt with groups they normally taught as a project progressed, nor adapted to, or complemented, the role of the dance artist as teacher, or choreographer or performer. Hence, the skills and expertise of dance artists continued to be acclaimed by the ACGB, RAAs/RABs and dance educators. It seems, therefore, that ways need to be explored which might allow dance educators to be able to use something of their own particular skills within projects. This could be purely from a teaching focus, or from the artistic abilities of educators from specialist dance routes who may even consider themselves to be fringe artists. As this topic is unresolved, how joint partners might collaborate together and utilise more effectively both the artistic merits and teaching experience of educators, are considered in Chapter 11.
The interrelationship of the three stranded approach of choreography, performance and appreciation as enshrined within **Physical Education in the National Curriculum** (DES, 1992) has placed an added responsibility on dance educators to make the latter an integral part of the study of dance. Therefore, recognition must be given to its importance in the process of creating, in the appraisal of the work of young people, and as a way of coming to know, and to understand professional dance work. Hence, there is a need for dance educators and dance artists to collaborate in the design and presentation of appreciation elements, and to explore how dance educators could use their own skills more effectively than hitherto. This could be purely through a teaching focus, or through engaging those with specialist dance knowledge in alternative roles which complement those of the dance artist. This is examined further in 11.83.

9.6 **Training for roles.**

Hockey in her overview of the ACGB projects noted that

in residency work, as in other areas involving artists in education, the same "new" practices are being repeated without reference to or learning from the experience of others.

Hockey, 1987, p 34

Although she identified two ways by which artists could be better equipped to cope with educational or community work many of the issues persisted. The first, has funding implications as it called for more opportunity for visits, informal discussion and observation in the educational setting prior to a project. The second, addressed the notion made by Macdonald (1981a), Bourne (1982), Brinson (1982a) and Hamby (1982) that training should be provided for dance artists
and dance educators with both sides working alongside each other. Hockey (1987) developed this concept when she suggested that training in educational work should take place at every level and stage of the artists' profession. While some opportunities existed the gaps were large and no course equipped artists for the roles they pursued in the educational setting. This crucial area is discussed in-depth in Chapter 12 and followed by recommendations in Chapter 13.

9.7 Summary.

Discussion in this chapter focused on the tensions which arose in projects from the multiplicity of roles taken on by dance artists, participants and dance educators. Overall, this identified that the concept of roles could not be totally divorced from the aims and objectives of a particular project, as these in turn influenced the nature of the different activities in which participants were involved. Furthermore, discussion clarified that the roles maintained by dance artists affected those adopted by participants and dance educators. But as the case study clearly exemplified, dance artists were in a constant state of flux as they moved from one activity to another. Subsequently, participants and dance artists were confused about what was expected of them and often failed to act appropriately. Hence, dance artists, participants and educators all required clarification of all roles they faced. In particular, the role of the dance artist as teacher has remained one of the most crucial. Subsequent discussion of roles in Chapter 10 considers how these could change in relation to the new project structures outlined in Chapter 11.
Chapter 10

Shaping Future Policy: establishing good practice.

10.1 Introduction.

Recent years have seen a gradual and convincing change in the way in which many dance artists, companies and funding bodies perceive their role (see Chapter 7). Subsequently, increasing importance is placed on the quality of what actually takes place within project situations as well as on the artistic outcomes and their presentation. There is a concern, also, from dance educators with the way dance is both perceived and received, with how dance artists can best engage with, and demonstrate their relevance to the education context, and a genuine desire to find ways to forge links with particular education communities.

This chapter aims to consider how future policies could be shaped through establishing good practice. In particular, ways in which the ACGB and the DFE might collaborate are discussed. This leads to a consideration of the separate and joint roles of RA/G officers and LEA advisers, and the interpretation of national policy at regional level. Finally, principles are established which provide the foundation for future developments at local project level.

10.2 The changing relationship: the Arts Council of Great Britain and the Department For Education.

The very different contributions made by the ACGB and the DES/DFE to dance artists in education projects since 1980 underpins many of
the tensions discussed in Chapters 7, 8 and 9. In spite of the general practice of the DES/DFE to retain HMI in post their minimal involvement reflects deep rooted artistic and educational incompatibilities. Lack of ongoing dialogue from HMI and no clear lead minimises the debate and has serious implications such as imbalance of power. Yet the ACGB, in spite of the rapid turnover of dance officers, shows a shift towards educational needs. Clearly recommendations need to be made in this area.

Unfortunately, the climate for change is doubtful. First, as long as the ACGB and RABs remain the driving force the dance artist continues to be viewed as the expert. Second, the majority of dance teachers still come through PE courses, and HMI perpetuate the dance as PE model in primary and secondary education. But in general, dance educators are more professionally committed to the discipline if they come from PGCE dance courses rather than from PE BEd./B.A QTS routes unless teachers followed a dance specialism. Third, while initiatives clearly indicate the great potential of co-operation many from both professions fail to utilise fully the opportunities on offer because of their own lack of knowledge, expertise and training. Hence, projects remain isolated ventures and at the one point of contact, the dance artists in education interface, the full potential is not realised. It is argued that this is likely to continue in essence unless dance artists and arts organisations form an integral part of renegotiated dance curriculum.

The dance as art model epitomised within the National Curriculum is a positive move. As the first independent and public sign from the DFE supporting dance artists in education practice it takes the interest of HMI, first apparent in the early conferences, to another
level. However, while present restructuring makes it difficult to predict the power that HMI will hold in the future, it is imperative that they, as a body, engage actively in the debate. Indeed, a positive stance by HMI, and a clear declaration about the purpose and place of the dance artists in education movement, could help to build a constructive bridge between the two professions. In particular, explicit guidelines for dance teachers, within PE or other contexts, might enable dance educators to state coherent educational and artistic objectives relevant to the particular needs of those involved. Such statements could encourage dance educators to be more confident in their own professional expertise and to be more effective than hitherto. A priority might then be given to young people being engaged in active learning experiences appropriate for their different stages of development, and to artists only being a relevant resource in schools when dance is art based.

Equally important, is the need for the ACGB and the DFE to take an active stance on the need for a systematic monitoring and evaluation process. The provision of "Partnerships: Physical Education and Sport" within Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992, p H1) makes this crucial for future practice. This provides a unique opportunity for dance artists and educators to grasp and to resolve the differences between their two worlds. But to resolve the complex question of whose priority should be maintained, the two distinct but interrelated monitoring and evaluation procedures need to be planned and designed alongside the aims and objectives of a project. Equally crucial, these processes are likely to require regular reviewing by the ACGB and the DFE. Their effectiveness is likely to be largely dependent upon dance artists and dance educators knowing precisely what is to be monitored and evaluated, and how to go about
It is, therefore, suggested that the ACGB and the DFE need to stress having an organised structure built in on a regular basis. While what is being monitored will essentially differ depending on the length and intensity of a project, the principle remains the same.

It also appears critical that the ACGB and the DFE consider the crucial need for research into, and the documentation of, dance artists in education projects at national, regional and local levels. Discussion in 7.3 reveals that in spite of the ACGB reports by Briginshaw et al (1980) and Hockey (1987) there is little research in the academic sense and publication of few project proceedings. Currently this prevents the assessment of planning and implementation concerns, long term effects, the dissemination of new approaches, and the identification of future needs. While this is partially due to devolution of dance artists in education projects to RAAs/RABs, it is also in part a result of commissioned evaluations of particular projects neither being planned as part of overall briefs nor academic investigations. Hence, reports are often bland and frequently biased as more often than not "researchers" are attached in some way to RAAs/RABs. Failure by the ACGB and RAAs/RABs to document, to publish and to disseminate material minimises the importance of the research process. Overall, this prevents common patterns being scrutinised in any depth, results in old practices being perpetuated, and prevents innovative good models being disseminated to a wider public. It is, therefore, suggested that the ACGB and the DFE take a more prominent role in the research of dance artists in education practice through the proposals outlined below.

It is argued that if "Partnerships" with dance artists are to mature and to complement dance work in primary, tertiary and higher education,
a form of consultative process is required at national, regional and local level. Indeed, future developments could be enhanced if representatives from HMI and the ACGB, together with those from the Advisory service and RABs, and others from higher education, schools and companies meet together to appraise the strengths and limitations of present practice. Such a highly specialised group, called here the National Council for Dance Artists in Education (NCDAE), could then operate at three levels. Its brief might include:

1) the establishment of a national policy for dance artists in education which makes recommendations for future action to the DFE (and thus HMI) and the ACGB;

2) the design of a systematic and planned approach to monitoring and evaluation at national, regional and local level. As this is crucial to the development of the dance artists in education movement, the role of the NCDAE is likely to be significant to how this is interpreted in practice;

3) the appointment of a researcher/consultant at national level to overview the co-ordination, design, implementation, and documentation of major projects; to compare achievements against objectives; to identify current trends; and to disseminate good practice. Such a person could act as a neutral sounding board for project design, as an agent between education and artistic parties, and as an arbitrator who is able to resolve any differences that may occur. This new initiative aims to widen the debate, to counteract the subjectivity which frequently pervades project decisions, and to alleviate the absence of any positive or defined administration at the local level. Equally important, it could facilitate adequate co-ordination and liaison and improve the planning, implementation and assessment of projects. Overall, it might also provide evidence to justify the allocation of more resources from the ACGB, LEAs and educational institutions;
4) initiating research (and its funding) into the unique contribution (i.e. the knowledge and understanding) that dance artists might make to KS 1-4;

5) the setting up of a monitoring/study group to identify good practice, and to explore alternative approaches. Such a body could be made up of knowledgeable dance educators from higher education, the advisory service and schools. Part of the group's brief might be to report back to the NCDAE;

6) the development of a networking system through a rolling programme of national conferences focused on dance artists in education. Politically these might be organised by the ACGB and the DFE (or, in the event of their demise, by equivalent dance agencies) in conjunction with SCODHE and NDTA. These could provide a forum for discussion of the joint ACGB and DFE policy, alert educators to NCDAE initiatives, disseminate good practice, and initiate further thought and future action. Such conferences might provide the foundation stone for a national network of in-service provision for adaptation at local level. This would be in line with the recommendations made in Chapters 11 and 12 that training must become, in the long term, a pre-requisite for dance artists in education practice;

7) the setting up of a register of dance artists in education consultants. This could be divided into different categories such as the advisory service; higher, tertiary, secondary and primary education; dance artists and company education officers. Possibly the NCDAE could be charged to negotiate with the DFE and the ACGB how such a register might be monitored and reviewed on a five year basis. The main advantage of such a register could come through the consultative framework and support service it provides for educators and artists. While initially teachers and artists would be recommended for approval by the NCDAE, in the long term entry qualifications such as those proposed in Chapter 12 might be required.

As such a system could extend knowledge of dance artists in education practice, recommendations are made in this area.
Discussion in 2.5 reveals that since 1983 the ACGB encouraged its client organisations to co-operate more closely with education. RAAs/RABs reviewed their policies for education, and LEAs became increasingly aware of the benefits of working in partnership on curriculum projects. However, the gap in provision which appeared when the ACGB devolved its central organising role now places more responsibility on RAB officers to oversee the appropriate selection of dance artists and/or host institutions. This situation is further affected by the changing nature of the role of dance officers to one with a wider brief for the performing arts, the demise of specialist dance panels, the absence of input from education experts, and lack of personnel and time.

Currently, officers find themselves in a position whereby they neither get to know individual contexts interested in dance within geographical areas nor totally immerse themselves in the dance world. Hence, alternative strategies need to be found as present practice suffers when RAB officers are not able to support projects as effectively as they might. A way forward might be for RABs to both reinstate and to appoint additional dance specific officers. While this is contrary to current practice it could enable RABs to improve the quality of their contribution to specific project design. Furthermore, if each RAB also appointed a dance education specialist to liaise and to collaborate consistently with the dance officer this could inform future debate at local and regional level.

In contrast to educational organisations initially reacting to projects, some LEA advisers now initiate dance artists in education
programmes. However, dialogue between dance artists and advisers is complicated when the latter have little understanding of the dance as art model, or limited practical engagement in projects as participants or organisers. Indeed, any enthusiasm might be misplaced if poor practice is perpetuated. Yet advisers have to be accountable for what takes place to the authority, to dance educators, and to participants. But in general, advisers who perpetuate the dance as PE model need to become better acquainted with the principles which underpin dance artists in education practice. Attendance at recent conferences hardly constitutes in-depth professional development or training when neither side is challenged to reconsider or to renegotiate its position.

Although the future of the advisory service is questionable PE/Dance advisers, or their alternative replacements, are crucial to future developments. Therefore, to facilitate the growth of "Partnerships" the NCDAE might encourage LEA advisers to take on more responsibility for future developments, and to devote added financial resources to the in-service training of teachers. This could take place through:

1) the LEA adviser, as a consultant, liaising with both RA\$ officers and specialist dance teachers;

2) the provision of courses which give dance educators the necessary basic skills to engage effectively in the design and implementation of projects;

3) utilising the skills of specialist dance teachers to interpret professional dance practice appropriately for different educational contexts;

4) the use of specialist dance educators as facilitators of long term curricula design;

5) collaboration with the RA\$ and other agencies (such as the Sports Council) to use local and regional resources more
effectively than hitherto. This might result in the development of a five year rolling programme of dance education programmes within the region.

Such proposals could result in an LEA networking system which is adapted to cater for the varying needs of KS 1-4, and the very different knowledge base and expertise of teachers. The five levels provide a logical pathway which educators could move through to gain a further understanding of projects. However, the proposals also include a provocative development which uses the specialist dance educator both as an interpreter of professional practice and as the facilitator of curriculum development with a small cluster group of teachers. This allows those with more expertise in dance education to collaborate with dance artists and to provide role models for other educators with less experience. It also redresses the increasing use of the dance artist as a replacement adviser. As in-service development for advisers is crucial for the NCDAE networking system to operate effectively at local level recommendations are made in this area.

10.4 Establishing good practice: project environments

Discussion in 7.4 clarifies how project environments affect to varying degrees their planning, implementation and ultimate success. It also shows how arts organisations and educators accept that projects flourish in contexts committed to arts education, when support is gained from the head teacher or equivalent, and the dance educator understands the nature of dance artists in education programmes. Thus, if "Partnerships" are to flourish those responsible for the overall organisation of a school, or department in higher education, have to become more accountable for what takes place. In particular three issues still require attention. First, each education context engaged in
a project needs to set up a support system and an "in house" management structure empowered to make decisions which affect the whole curriculum. Second, it is crucial that project partners, and other interested personnel, identify the criteria for joint decision-making and avenues for wide ranging discussion. This could facilitate the resolution of a variety of common practices that take away from, and thus minimise, the success of projects. Third, the feasibility of alternatives such as "equivalence of experience" have to be addressed. This might heighten the value of a project within a particular context, redress crucial time demands, reduce the pressures faced by participants and educators, and enable educators to be more accountable for what takes place. Fourth, ways need to be found to integrate dance artists in education programmes into curricula design so that they might contribute effectively to short and long term learning objectives. Use of the host institution as a focal point for in-service work, could allow the headteacher and dance educator to play an active part in the ongoing professional development of teachers including heads of other schools. Alternatively, they could take on a joint consultative role for a school which is just embarking on a project with dance artists. Recommendations are made in these areas.

Discussion in 7.4 and 7.5 makes it evident that the inadequacies of the present meeting pattern and planning schedules need to be resolved. Therefore, it is suggested that joint partners have to explore and to jointly agree the procedures to be followed before artistic and educational requirements can be resolved. Hence, three separate but necessarily interrelated concerns have to be redressed. First, the very different powers invested in representatives from the artistic and education worlds currently makes joint ownerships of projects almost untenable. At present there are no clearly defined roles for those
involved, no guarantee that there is any continuity of personnel, and no assurance that those present are experienced in, or knowledgeable about, dance artists in education practice. Therefore, to aid negotiations the NCDAE could oversee the setting up of local consultative management groups (LCMG) to plan and to overview all major projects. A pairing system could ensure equal representation from the hierarchy of the company and host institution, dance artists and educators (including the dance educator), and outside agencies such as the RAB and local LEA. Equally crucial, clear guidelines from the NCDAE might ensure that a number of delegates from the artistic and educational worlds have prior experience of dance artists in education practice. Each project could then be regarded as a variation of a format that is by now fairly well established rather than as being different from those that have gone before. This might enable the wealth of experience accumulated by dance officers, consultants and educators to be built on and aid the resolution of ongoing issues. Furthermore, negotiations ought to be enhanced as "Partnerships" in Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, p H1, 1992) place an onus on dance educators (including advisers) to inform themselves of the current practice of dance artists. Likewise, a parallel responsibility is now placed on dance artists to familiarise themselves with the philosophies, organisational structures, decision-making processes and working patterns of the different types of educational institutions in which they work. Hence, recommendations for training programmes for dance educators and dance artists are vital.

Second, the sporadic meeting patterns which take place over a number of months prevent issues from being fully explored. Overall, this dissipates the strength of discussion, elongates the decision making process, and detracts from residency planning. While initial
meetings establish a project's feasibility and the rightness of fit for potential partners this is only the start of negotiations. As clarification of a project policy, agreement of joint decision making and management structures and detailed planning requires time, new approaches are needed to facilitate a clearer understanding of issues. It is suggested that a concentrated planning period over, for example three or four days, might be more profitable than the current ad hoc approach. This might enable a carefully negotiated agenda of crucial issues to be addressed in-depth, the agreed meeting pattern schedules to be agreed, and decision-making strategies formalised. In the unlikely event of an ongoing dispute, a consultant could be called in to aid resolution of any unforeseen difficulties. Publication of the minutes from meetings and a joint report for submission to the NCDAE ought to place the work of the LCMG onto a more formal footing.

Third, project co-ordinators need access to those hierarchical "in house" meeting structures which ultimately have the power to access a project to participants. This would enable the co-ordinator to meet with senior and middle management, and to resolve cross-faculty curriculum implications such as workloads. Equally important, if the principle of equivalence is addressed, involvement in choreographing and performing a dance might be accepted in lieu of certain aspects of course work requirements.

Fourth, the planning group could monitor and evaluate the three project phases, including the processes followed and their outcomes. This ought to rectify the present lack of systematic and planned evaluation at local and regional levels (see 7.5). But this has a number of implications for individual projects. What is to be monitored and
evaluated must be identified in a series of questions compatible with the defined aims and objectives. Also, the organising bodies and project partners must recognise the distinct yet complementary nature of monitoring and evaluation procedures. Hence, monitoring meetings would need to be planned into the project programme and decisions made about how evaluation is to be implemented. This might enable project partners to be more objective and analytical in the reporting phase. Finally, to inform ongoing debate findings would be disseminated to the NCDAE and to a wider public through the rolling programme of conferences recommended in 11.2.

As the above proposals could ease the tensions and misunderstandings that arise, recommendations are made in this area.

10.5 Alternative familiarisation schedules.

Despite the recurring discussion in 7.6 about the crucial need for an "orientation" period this rarely takes place. In general, the type of specific planning required by all three parties is not explored fully because of time and funding implications. A new umbrella heading "familiarisation" is used here to cover how dance artists and dance educators might come to know something of each other's work prior to the start of a project. However, even though there is common acceptance of the fundamental premise of "familiarisation" time, what will take place in the future will be affected by how the DFE and the ACGB separate the principle involved from its financial and planning implications.

The inclusion of "Partnerships" in the National Curriculum makes it crucial that dance artists and dance educators are given time to
acquaint themselves with, and to reflect on, each other's work.

Acceptance of familiarisation as a common factor by project partners ought to enable them to refine agreed aims and objectives in the light of realistic conditions. This is particularly vital for the success of any long term venture.

It is argued that new strategies are required which allow dance artists to "familiarise" themselves with what goes on in a host institution. One proposition put forward here focuses on modifying the first two or three days of a long term project through reducing and refocusing the number of practical sessions taught. This could allow dance artists to observe a dance educator teaching young people, or to see participants perform within either a classroom or performance situation, or to engage in discussion with them about the processes used to create dances. Following a series of planning meetings, dance artists and dance educators could then refine, restructure and agree the dance content and how this might best be presented for particular groups. In turn this could also help to establish common ground between dance artists, dance educators and participants and might also ease the initial rapport.

Similarly, a number of alternative strategies are required if dance educators are to be helped to make decisions about the repertoire of a particular company from an informed base. First, dance artists could be persuaded by the ACGB to open up their choreographic rehearsal period, at times, to dance educators. Second, dance educators could observe a company either rehearse or perform finished dances. Alternatively, as rehearsal schedules may not parallel project planning meetings, a video recording of the current repertoire might suffice. Third, an "education" day for teachers hosted towards the end of a
rehearsal period could include a performance or lecture demonstration followed by practical workshops. This proposal might prove to be the most efficient use of time and funding as it could also be used as a means of professional development for both dance artists and dance educators. Fourth, a follow up, in-service weekend within a project area could enable teachers to gain detailed insight into a selected dance. Each of these proposals, in their own way, ought to allow teachers to become familiar with, and to know something about, the particular characteristics of at least one work. Informed decisions could then be made about the appropriateness of dances and their content for particular groups. As the proposed new strategies have implications for how projects are planned and implemented these are outlined in 11.3.

The support of dance artists is crucial if these proposals are to enable dance educators to prepare young people more effectively than before for future experiences with a company. While resource implications could effectively "kill" each of the above suggestions the current financial outlay is hardly used profitably as many of the old issues constantly recur. But if future projects are planned more thoroughly, designed as an integral part of long term curriculum development, and impressively presented, they should be more cost effective than hitherto. Hence, any extra funding that has to be found must be weighed initially against long term effects.

10.6 Funding, contracts and post-project contact.

The joint funding principle initiated by the ACGB for the dance artists in education scheme continues to influence the development of the dance artists in education movement. While ideal in principle it leads
to education institutions approaching other bodies besides the LEA for financial backing. But as highlighted in 7.6, funding has to be secured well in advance to avoid repercussions on planning, orientation time and follow-up work. However, the situation is now exacerbated as the growing financial crises experienced by companies and individual dance artists are mirrored in the strain on education budgets in general. In particular, the introduction of LMS effectively removes the funding that advisers once secured from LEAs to headteachers and governing bodies. This situation is further compounded when schools opt out of local control and manage their own financial affairs. Thus, funding restraints could more than ever influence the nature of projects and whether they take place.

As RABs face similar changes a framework of reference needs to be clarified and criteria identified so that decision making can support appropriate activities. This makes it crucial that LEA advisers, RAB officers and company education personnel are able to make informed decisions based on current practice, including what takes place within given geographical areas.

The changes that occur as projects are planned and implemented reveal that agreements made between dance artists and dance educators are less than binding (see 7.8). The importance given to artistic needs, as reflected in aims and objectives, is further emphasised when alterations made by dance artists have to be accommodated by host institutions. While little is likely to be change unless dance educators shift towards equal ownership of projects, this on its own will not be enough. But discussion in 7.8 concludes that the current ad hoc approach to agreements is no longer viable and that the circumstances and values agreed need to be honoured. It is
suggested that Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES 1992) makes it crucial that the ACGB and the DFE should consider, together with the NCDAE, the introduction of a system of formalised contracts which are binding. Dance artists and dance educators might then be expected to honour a contract in terms of its principles, aims, focus, frameworks and named personnel. But even then this is only likely to be fulfilled if the NCDAE provides guidelines for clauses to be inserted into contracts, establishes the principles to be followed, and suggests how these are to be interpreted and applied to local contexts. The inclusion of a "recompense" clause might also engage artists and educators in keener consultations during the planning stages. However, as exceptional conditions do arise, the grounds on which agreements could be modified and the degree of compromise acceptable by both parties needs to be defined for the LCMG. Such precepts would then inform and guide discussion on any proposed changes. Finally, members of the NCDAE could be called in to arbitrate disputes.

It could be argued that the acceptance of the principle of contracts by the ACGB, the DFE, and the NCDAE as the agency overseeing their implementation, is vital to the success of future projects. But this has serious implications on the way that artists and educators negotiate, the decisions that are made, the way in which these are formalised, and how these are then honoured. However, while some dance artists and educators are likely to view contracts with a degree of mistrust, others might well welcome them. Placing project work within a formal system ought to result in a growth of respect for the circumstances (including personnel) and the values agreed. In the long term, the implementation of contracts could result in dance artists and dance educators being more committed to projects than hitherto.
Although arguments throughout the thesis support the notion of post-project contact, present practice reveals that it continues to be viewed as separate from project proceedings, and circumstances generally prevent it being carried through to the satisfaction of both parties. In general, as artistic priorities take precedence over educational needs commitments are almost never honoured in full. The fundamental problem stems from failure to plan post-project contact and to integrate it into the overall dance curriculum of the specific educational context.

Hence, a case is made here that new approaches to post-project contact are crucial if this is to be viewed as a vital part of project proceedings. But to be effective these need to be planned as part of a coherent project package, and as an integral aspect of curriculum development. If aims and objectives are then reassessed and clarified towards the conclusion of the project, what takes place might be more realistic than hitherto. Furthermore, if post-project contact is written into a formalised contract both parties are more likely to respect and to follow through any agreed proposals.

It is also argued that different types of projects also require alternative methods of post-project contact. What is right for a longer term residency based in one institution may not be relevant for another which focuses on initiating work in an LEA area. Hence, dance artists could work intensively with selected groups or, alternatively, with teachers over a period of time. Other methods may be equally beneficial if they allow dance artists to make use of the expertise that they have. For example, a company could make a video about a specific aspect of work for use in the education context when a project concludes. This could either demonstrate progressions in technique
accompanied by verbal commentary, or examine the compositional devices utilised by a choreographer in a particular dance. Both would be a valuable learning resource for selected groups studying dance in secondary, tertiary and higher education. Moreover, when companies make videos of their repertoire educational institutions in general might be interested in buying them as this would widen the access to professional work. However, any selected model must be appropriate and realistic in terms of time and funding, and designed and implemented with a concern for qualitative outcomes. Finally, if resources are considered to be important then funds need to be found which allow a company to make full use of its expertise.

As there is likely to be an interim period before any of the above suggestions could be implemented, members of the NCDAE could discuss, in the short term, alternative strategies for post-project contact with dance artists and dance educators. However, in the long term, the design, selection and implementation of new models should take into account how the uniqueness of dance artists might be incorporated into learning situations relevant to the needs of young people. This is equally true when working with participants in an intensive manner, or with teachers on an in-service course, or when using a video of dance work within a classroom situation.

10.7 New responsibilities and roles.

In general, categorisation of roles as belonging specifically to dance artists or dance educators prevents each partner from helping the other to fulfil tasks effectively. Perhaps a way forward is to consider new project design as discussed in Chapter 11 which allows the three fundamental roles of choreographer, performer and appreciator to be
shared by dance artists, dance educators and participants, albeit at very different levels of expertise and professionalism. While this anticipates a redefinition of current roles to those of a primary and secondary nature, others also require clarification so that they might be fulfilled more effectively.

New project structures presented in 11.8 show how the performance role could become more predominant, as in a company performance and lecture demonstration, or complement the teaching role in technique or workshop sessions. Indeed, the performance and interpretative expertise of dance artists could well become a primary feature of lecture demonstrations and other activities in which dancers exemplify their own physical skill and expertise, as in a technique class, or in a choreographic or rehearsal situation.

In general, dance artists have found the teaching expectations placed on them difficult. However, an argument is presented here that they are more likely to be more effective in this predominant role when project parameters are clearly defined and content can be separated from how it is taught. Time then needs to be built into project planning to enable dance artists to examine a range of teaching skills appropriate for different situations, as for example, the introduction and development of material in a didactic manner. This might then enable them to work with participants more effectively in a "performance" or "reconstruction" focused project. Alternatively, the guided and divergent approaches required for a range of choreographic work might be examined. Moreover, the proposed project models might help to alleviate the situation. If developed, dance artists could become more proficient than they are when they teach certain types of work as they would no longer be expected to
change constantly from one activity to another. Hence, recommendations in Chapter 12 for the training of dance artists include a focus on the acquisition of teaching skills.

Discussion in 8.6 identified the difficulties that dance artists experience as they undertake the equally important, and at times even more daunting, role of presenter in lecture demonstrations, open technique and open choreographic situations. Most issues arise as dance artists are neither used to taking on an intermediary role between the dance work and the audience nor familiar with how to organise and present dance to large groups. But if dance artists are to continue to offer such activities, they will need to recognise that dance educators have particular skills that they do not have. If they then share skills and explore together how best to plan and present material more effectively dance artists and dance educators could take more responsibility for those areas in which they have the most expertise.

The third main role, that of the planner and organiser, has in the past been divided into areas of responsibility for either the company or the host institution. Effective partnerships, however, are dependent on good organisation and management by dance artists and dance educators both separately within their own contexts and in liaison with each other. But joint ownership is only likely to come about when co-ordinators take on more responsibility for the planning, organisation and evaluation of projects. The logical outcome of arguments about the vital administrative role for the project co-ordinator places a responsibility on head teachers (or their equivalents) to accept the principle that the residency co-ordinator requires support to make a primary commitment to all three stages of
a project. To this end, nomination of a co-ordinator who could devote more time to negotiations might reduce the tensions faced by dance educators as they try to get a project planned and implemented. But whoever takes on this role must be totally committed to project work, realise its potential and have a direct link to the external and internal meeting structures discussed in 10.2.

10.8 Summary.

The interface between dance artists, dance educators and enabling agencies such as the ACGB, RABs and LEAs is considered in relation to the reorganisation of arts agencies, the possible demise of LEAs and the implementation of the National Curriculum. Support for a structured approach to monitoring and evaluation at national, regional and local level also identifies the need to clarify the dual but essential processes of monitoring and evaluation. As this should allow data to be obtained more authentically future debate might well be more informed than hitherto. The essential need for regular and academic research into the area is also identified, and ways forward suggested.

A crucial proposal is put forward for a national policy together with a strategy for its effective implementation. The role of a NCDAE together with the part that neutral consultants might play in the wider scheme, paves the way for the dance artists in education movement to mature. Furthermore, the opportunities that the networking system allows, for an ongoing dialogue between dance artists and dance educators, should further help to bridge the gap between the two parties.
Arguments for educational priorities to have equal parity with artistic needs are made with a concern for both the unique contribution that dance artists can make to education and the learning potential that this holds for young people. Realisation that "Partnerships" are a required aspect of the National Curriculum necessitates project work being written in as part of long term curriculum development in dance. A focus on the significance of the host environment suggests ways to alleviate a range of recurring issues so that projects might be both more effective and successful than hitherto. The identification of principles which underpin good practice and an alternative interpretation of the roles and responsibilities placed on dance artists and dance educators, paves the way for the new models. Discussion of alternative strategies for post-project contact, together with the proposal that this becomes an integral part of an overall project package, widens future possibilities.

Finally, throughout this Chapter the foundations are laid for the following discussion on new parameters and their implications for the new models proposed in Chapter 11. The principles examined also directly influence the recommendations in Chapter 13.
Chapter 11

Shaping Future Policy:
New Parameters and their Implications.

11.1 Introduction.

This Chapter considers the need to abandon the currently fragmented approach to projects in favour of a more integrated mode. The following discourse proposes that if parameters are defined by the theoretical concepts on which dance as art is based, i.e. choreography, performance and appreciation, these should form the foundation for all projects. All activities could then emerge from, and relate to, a particular focus which allows, also, the intensive debate to be addressed in relation to new proposed frameworks. This could engage young people in a more coherent, integrated and progressive learning experience than hitherto. Subsequently, a proposal is put forward that dance artists in education programmes could become an integrated and complementary part of the curriculum design. To do this dance educators would have to address issues which currently prevent projects from being successfully planned, implemented, monitored and evaluated. Equally important, those dance artists involved would need to be able to interpret the stated aims and objectives so that participants do not become confused about those being pursued at any given time.
The chapter concludes with the presentation of alternative, composite models which build on the conceptual tripartite approach to dance education and the interdependent nature of choreography, performance and appreciation. While each model is designed to take a particular focus, the other two elements are built in to provide an integrated and coherent dance experience. Hence, the emphasis changes in order to serve the intended main feature of a particular project.

11.2 Dance artists in education: a complementary role.

Chapters 6 and 7 both exemplify tensions throughout the dance artists in education movement between artistic and educational concerns. Discussion in 7.2 shows that this mirrors the contrasting levels of support generally received from the ACGB and the DFE. The hypothesis is put forward in 7.3 that projects could make an important contribution to education contexts in which a focus is placed on the conceptual basis of dance as art; this is now reinforced in Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992). While the Secretary of State requested single Attainment Targets, as the sum of the end of KS statements 1–4, these continued to embrace "Planning and composing", "Participating and performing", and "Appreciating and evaluating" from the BCPE's Working Group's Interim Report The National Curriculum in Physical Education (DES, 1991a). Furthermore, the expectation that schools in general could fulfil partnerships, raises questions about the relationship of dance artists in education to curriculum development. However, as dance is not named as a compulsory activity at KS 3 or 4 a situation arises whereby projects could take place as one-off ventures. Moreover, the notion of flexibility for schools and varied teacher expertise may cause
those who are mainly PE trained to question if such 'Partnerships' in
dance are essential. But even if they are whether such teachers have
the knowledge to plan projects as part of ongoing curriculum design is
debatable unless they pursued a dance specialism in their initial
training. However, contrary practice is likely to occur as the
programmes of study provide the base for more specialised dance
educators to teach dance as an art form to GCSE level. While this may
take place under the PE umbrella, it is more likely to occur when
dance is in its own department, or when it is part of a combined
arts area. Indeed, these last two contexts are the ones which lay the
foundations for A/S and A level dance studies, and the ones in which
long term 'Partnerships' are most likely to occur.

The proposal that project design could be integrated into curricula
development rests on several assumptions. Namely, that dance
educators and dance artists have both the knowledge and expertise to
select an appropriate focus; to accept that educational aims could
have equal parity with artistic needs; to negotiate criteria for clear
aims and specific objectives; and successfully to plan and implement
projects. But to do this dance educators have to be able to identify
precisely the particular contribution that dance artists might make to
an institution's overall dance programme. This might then enable
projects to be turned into educational experiences which support
different phases of study rather than as isolated events detached from
the normal school curriculum.
11.3 **Application of principles to practice.**

Discussion in Chapter 7.3 reveals that current project parameters result in wide-ranging and all-embracing expectations, and tensions over artistic and educational aims. These prevent participants from developing capacities for, or a deep understanding of, the major aspects involved. As disclosed in 2.4 such a lack of precision contrasts sharply with projects which have a clear focus and the specific goals of intensive work. Therefore, it is argued that dance artists in education projects should focus on the nature of dance, i.e., primarily dance as a performing art, and on the centrality of dance as an object of understanding. This would allow a focus on particular performances, and thus on dance itself, and generate an understanding of dance works and technique. The proposal that the narrowing of project parameters to specific contributions from dance artists which are either choreographic, or performance, or appreciation-focused, or a clear combination of these, could allow a more enlightened approach and generate insight into dance as an art form. This might mark a new way forward for projects and ultimately for dance education in schools (see 11.8).

It is argued that artistic experience in dance involves learning and understanding about the art form of dance. Hence, dance becomes the medium for the development of perceptual skills and concepts about composition, performance and appreciation as well as physical expertise in the medium. The teacher and the curriculum play a crucial role in providing the environment for artistic learning. As this responsibility is shared at times in 'Partnerships' with dance artists, projects too must give young people tools to confront individual dance
works, and to explore these from an informed background. This could be planned in short term objectives for choreography, or performance, or appreciation if a focus is placed on a planned change in the knowledge, or behaviour, or attitudes of young people. But even then some advancement is likely to occur only when joint partners identify and take into account the past and future experiences of participants, the different processes to be used, and varied experiential and learning outcomes. If these become interpreted in project structures designed with a particular focus and young people in mind, common issues might then be eradicated.

To take the argument further, if 'Partnerships' are set up they are an intentional, purposeful enterprise. Therefore, the aims and concerns of dance education and the very different curriculum packages of tertiary and higher education institutions could provide the foundation blocks on which they are built. This makes it crucial that aims are ideological, demonstrate particular artistic and educational cultures, and set out the body of ideas which reflect the needs and aspirations of the parties concerned. But for projects to become an integral aspect of an education context's dance programme clear objectives have to be identified. These provide the base point for all decision making, and facilitate the teasing out, clarification, and articulation of objectives for choreography, or performance, or appreciation. This is vital to the success of a project as it is only when these are particular and pertinent to certain points that clearer boundaries might be set about what is going to be offered, the content to be taught, and the processes to be followed. But to be interpreted in practice, each type of activity then needs to be defined in terms of further objectives for specific groups. While these need to be realistic and logical, indicate the plan to be followed and what is to be worked
towards, they also need to be flexible so that plans might be altered if appropriate. Equally, they should give dance artists and educators joint ownership of, and therefore responsibility for, what later takes place. This should then enable all intentions to be fulfilled, a proper balance to be maintained, and each section to be reviewed critically in relation to the overall whole.

Significantly, if the syllabi of education contexts are to become the logical starting point for projects there is a need to clarify the unique contribution that companies (or individuals) might make to education. If this is based on the conceptual basis of the dance as art model it must derive from the professional expertise that dance artists have that is different from that of dance educators. Thus, as Hirst (1974) suggests, the educational significance must come through introducing young people to a distinct "mode of understanding" or "form of knowledge" termed "artistic" and "aesthetic". To take this further, if the specialness of artists as professional choreographers and dancers stems from their particular experience this must emanate from, and be related to, the repertoire offered by each company. Once this is understood it could help educators to explore new approaches to using a company as a resource, and facilitate a greater understanding of how dance artists might best contribute to the aims and objectives of a particular dance programme. This makes it crucial for the ACGB and companies to reflect more keenly on their own particular expertise and what they offer in terms of education programmes. Equally important, the ACGB and the DFE would need to find ways to enable dance artists to become more conversant with the global needs of dance education. This could then help companies to determine how best to meet the requirements of contexts which range from primary
to higher education and which each have their own particular characteristics.

11.4 Choreographic policy.

Discussion in 8.4 identifies that although choreographic concepts are implicit in what dance artists teach they become lost amongst, and confused with, content. It also uncovers that dance artists frequently experience difficulties when working in a more creative manner and fail to pass on explicitly to young people their first hand knowledge of choreographic principles. In general, dance artists ignore arguments that dealing in the process of choreography in a practical manner could sharpen the perceptions of young people. But if the focus of a project is on the nature of understanding dance as an art form, young people will need to know what this art is. An important way of coming to a kind of knowing is through induction into the craft-knowledge. This could allow young people to grasp how choreography is designed and allow them to see more vividly what happens when they shape abstract movement, or create a new work, or focus on masterworks from the repertoire. But each of these three approaches is valuable as it contributes differently to the sum total of knowledge and understanding of dance. Therefore, it is argued that involvement in the experience of choreography as the central feature of a project could teach about the art of making dances, about performing, and about appreciation, and thus bring all other aspects of the medium into context.

Support given for the art of composition in Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992), as well as its use as the base of dance programmes within higher education, suggests that there is no
reason why projects, too, could not focus on choreographic concepts. The map of knowledge for the area of choreography in Table 6 (see 6.4) (adapted from Adshead et al. 1988) lays out a curriculum model from which aspects could be selected as the basis for choreographic tasks. Hence, if these become the focus for choreographic work young people ought to be able to learn something about the craft of composing. But to be effective, devices would need to be adapted for the purpose of different projects and the needs of particular participants. However, while outcomes will vary depending on the intent of sessions, and the genre and style of the dance studied, a focus on such features does not, on its own, lead to an understanding of choreography. In general, minimal and varied contact with a number of dance artists is likely to affect what is learnt. But this could be countered if a coherent focus is taken to choreography, performance and appreciation concerns. In contrast, the benefit of a more ongoing, consistent and in-depth approach to a number of identified aspects over a longer period could lead to a certain style of choreographed dance.

Questions are raised in 8.3 about why the value of working in an in-depth experience which leads to the creation and presentation of a dance, has been denied most young people. This may be due to projects following structures established a decade ago, or to anxieties about the in-depth experience, or to the selection of appropriate choreographers being ignored. However, discussion in 8.3 establishes that other participants could benefit equally from working for a prolonged period. Indeed, if the creation of a new dance becomes the focal point of a project, young people could engage in the choreographic process from the initiation of ideas to its final presentation. But unfortunately, what dance artists, as
choreographers, impart to participants about the intimate knowledge and skills acquired when making dances is rarely defined. Yet despite this it is anticipated that participants might develop new perspectives on making dance(s) if they work with dance artists who have considerable experience and understanding of the techniques of choreography. But for this to happen what actually takes place would need to be informed by the choreographic principles and ongoing evaluation processes that structure dance. It is, therefore, argued that first hand knowledge of the art of composing could enable participants to extend their knowledge of choreography, to improve their own performance abilities, and to engage in critical appraisal. An added dimension might also be experienced as young people see dance develop through all the processes necessary to take it into the final performance. But if this is to happen, the experience of participants engaged in technical and dress rehearsals, final presentations, and performance in a public setting must be appropriate for the age and ability of those involved. Such an approach would allow dance artists, as choreographers, to make a specific contribution that is different from that offered by dance educators. However, what they do will only be successful if it builds on the understanding and skills already established. Obviously the selection of dance artists as choreographers for this role is vital. They have the opportunity to pass on to young people the detailed tacit knowledge gained from pieces choreographed, learnt, rehearsed, modified, performed and interpreted.

A proposal is therefore put forward that dance artists and dance educators should be encouraged to focus all choreographic work on the principles involved through either creating new dances or by providing exemplars of choreographed form from the repertoire.
Discussion in 8.4 highlights the increasing emphasis placed on repertoire once dance educators started to insist that dance artists have a unique contribution to make to education. Arguments focus on the access and insight that young people could be given to the current dance phenomena in creative workshops and reconstruction sessions. However, in general, dance artists do not highlight the specific contribution that a company (or dance artist) could make. Indeed the case study, 6.4, exemplifies how the ad hoc approach and the diverse standards expected result in dance artists not using repertoire as effectively as they might. In general, dance artists continue to demonstrate an uncertainty about what could take place, and give little emphasis to the intimate knowledge, or detailed understanding, of the workings of particular dances. Yet it is this very specific perception to the analysis of choreographic structures that dance artists have which allows them to bring an artistic direction to their insight which is unique.

Therefore, a number of concerns have to be addressed before repertoire might be used successfully as a focal point for projects. First, it is crucial that dance educators gain knowledge of a company's repertoire prior to in-depth discussions taking place. Second, joint partners have to clarify and to agree on the main aims of repertoire based activities. Once these two points are clarified it ought to be possible to set criteria which inform the selection of dances, and then to select the distinct emphasis to be placed on choreography, or performance or appreciation. Only then might joint partners set specific aims and objectives for particular repertoire workshops, select the section(s) and material to be focused on, and clarify how this might best be presented. If this takes place participants could then be
given practical insight into, and engagement with, exemplars of the public world of theatre art.

However, as revealed in 8.4, a clearer understanding is required of the approaches to workshops based on repertoire as they could each involve young people in a distinct type of experience. But equally important, a key work needs to be selected for a particular reason: it should be typical of a period, obviously good of its kind, and, epitomise a particular choreographic style. Table 18 shows several distinct approaches that could be used to key into a particular dance. For example, it might be used in either a specialised manner (as in engaging in specific elements from the dance) or in a more general sense (as in taking the essence of the dance). While each approach necessarily involves a concern for choreography and performance the emphasis on each of these might vary. Although choreography is the most essential feature there is also, in some, a concern for the performance of sequences which reveal the initial theme and variations. Alternatively, in others the execution of particular skills could be adapted choreographically if used within the context of a developing work. Overall, what is learnt will also differ depending on how these approaches are further refined. However, an appreciation focus is also required if young people are to be helped to evaluate the meaning and significance of particular dances in an informed manner. Only then might participants be given an understanding of the selected work as an artistic statement.
Table 16

**REPERTORY-BASED WORKSHOPS: A TEACHING MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLORING POSSIBILITIES THROUGH A PARTICULAR/EXACT SENSE</th>
<th>EXPLORING POSSIBILITIES OF A MORE GENERAL SENSE TO CREATE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To teach/learn a fragment/excerpt/small section to illustrate the style and principles of choreography used by a particular choreographer.</td>
<td>1. A. In the style of .... B. To use as the starting point the process by which dances are created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To examine the structure of a dance to reveal choreographic devices used in the making of them: i.e. typical processes and methods of structural movement.</td>
<td>2. Understanding structural principles and practices that evolve from or create the dance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To learn individual movements and particular qualities of one dance to give participants the feel of the dance so that they might recognise its distinctiveness of style.</td>
<td>3. Using individual movements from the dance and/or particular qualities in the style of ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To share some of the meanings in a piece through communicating — for example, steps and names given to them; motifs and the choreographer’s intention — to enable participants to become familiar with the range of movement included by this choreographer.</td>
<td>4. From range of sample steps/movements in a work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To teach/learn steps/movements/floor-patterns and rhythms resembling those in sections of the dance in order to reveal to participants the patterns and qualities inherent within it.</td>
<td>5. Within the framework of the dance. To capture something of the sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To teach/learn the initial theme and variations to establish the main movement ideas in the piece and how these are developed and varied.</td>
<td>6. To use movement/ideas/themes from the dance as starting points to be developed: a) through student improvisation; b) to create a short piece for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To develop particular skills as used in a dance: e.g. lifts.</td>
<td>7. To examine a particular movement principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To deal in great detail with specific sections of dances — range across concepts which underpin knowledge in area of choreography in a much more global sense.</td>
<td>8. To take choreographic concepts as starting points for work based on content of dance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is argued that dance artists and dance educators should be encouraged to use repertoire as the focal point for either choreography, or performance, or appreciation based activities. Furthermore, if repertoire-based work is central to a project all other activities such as performance, lecture demonstrations, technique and workshops might stem from this. Thus, professional dance artists, who are themselves totally immersed in current practice, could alert young people to the different approaches taken to choreography, and thus enrich participants as they come to know and to understand the concepts presented. For example, examination of the choreographic features inherent within a dance in a lecture demonstration could be followed by workshops focused on the individual and particular qualities of the dance. Any knowledge acquired as young people see more vividly what is happening might then be assimilated and transferred to other situations in which they take upon themselves the role of choreographer.

11.5. Performance policy.

Discussion in 8.5 uncovers the confusion which surrounds the many diverse activities which fall under the umbrella heading of "performance" both for dance artists and performers. While the company performance provides an instant bridge between dance artists and education it is currently only used as a public showcase for professional expertise. Three main reasons account for this. First, the Artistic Director (or equivalent), retains the decision-making power about what will be performed. Second, there are no stated criteria which inform the selection of the dances used as the focal point for project work. Third, dance artists and dance educators fail to
recognise the possibilities that performance provides for planned learning. Overall, this minimises the effect that the performance element has on participants. However, a contrary argument is presented here in the belief that performance elements could be maximised when used as a tool to focus on specific dance characteristics. For example, the performance of dance artists might be highlighted when viewing selected pieces of repertoire and then transferred into practical work when young people take part in the reconstruction of a dance.

Debate in 8.52 reaffirms that an ongoing focus has been placed on technique as a central feature of projects. This stems from the failure on the part of dance artists to understand the fundamental aims and objectives of dance education. It also reiterates the valuing of artistic concerns in preference to educational needs. However, discussion in 6.5 and 6.6 shows the different expectations placed on young people in technique and workshop sessions. In particular, it highlights how performance in workshops is diminished when little attention is paid to the implicit relationship between technique and interpretive aspects. This is also different from the central concern for the improvement of personal performance levels and expressive qualities experienced alongside developing choreographic work by intensive groups.

The opposing tendencies between fragmented and very different types of experience also require resolution. Hence, there is a need for joint partners to identify clearly for a project the extent, appropriateness, and purpose of technique when it is dependent upon the conventional preparation of a professional dancer. As discussion in 8.52 highlights, misunderstandings are compounded when joint partners are unable
to resolve whether there is a hierarchy of technique relevant for a specific context. But if a more informed debate is to take place a company would need to be more explicit than hitherto about the technique that it practices, the company technique policy, and the terms it uses. This could enable a joint agreement to be made about the approach to technique within a particular project.

Discussion in 8.52 also uncovers the crucial relationship between the distinctive nature of technique and other project activities, such as repertoire-based workshops and choreography. Only when this is clarified are young people likely to realise the reciprocal demands of training the "instrument" and how this is then specifically utilised in the performance of particular dances. But 6.4 and 6.5 show that participants in general come to perform movements more accurately and skilfully, or are more interested in developing interpretive and expressive qualities when working towards some form of final performance. This enables young people to experience the correlation between technical virtuosity, content, form, and expression of the dance idea. But even then specific groups will only benefit from such an experience if joint partners together clarify an overall, cohesive and logical approach to the style focused on, modes of presentation, and the progression and development of material.

It is argued that the design of new project structures, together with a redefinition of parameters and the clarification of aims and objectives, are vital to the resolution of the fundamental differences that dance artists and dance educators hold about technique and performance. While the professional conventions of technique may be appropriate for some groups, such as those involved in either the work of a particular choreographer, or the reconstruction of a section from a
dance, they are not totally suitable for other young people. This is particularly true if technique is taught in isolation from choreographic and appreciation aspects. Hence, a new approach is required to skill-based work to allow young people to realise the reciprocal nature of the demands of physical skill with choreography and performance.

A further "performance" issue requires resolution. A distinction is apparent between those who participate in rehearsals with a theatrical presentation focus and perform in an audience situation and the majority who are involved neither as onlookers nor as performers. Hence, the positive outcomes identified in 8.51 are experienced only by selected groups or pupils following examination syllabi. However, it is suggested that as performance elements feature within the National Curriculum for pupils at KS 3 and 4, dance educators might now give more support to young people working towards a theatrical presentation. Hence, new models outlined in 11.8 provide opportunities for groups to rehearse their work for, and then to perform in, concluding workshop performances. It is argued that if this takes place, technique and interpretive skills and quasi-professional standards could underpin choreographic and workshop activities. But if young people are to meet this new challenge, and to have their horizons opened to the function and process of rehearsals and performance, the focus and intent of sessions must be selected appropriately for the age and experience of those involved. Even so, joint partners must be wary of the disparity between the professional expertise of dance artists and the ability of young people when they dance alongside each other. Although this adds a further dimension, both the work that participants are involved in, and how they are led to meet growing professional expectations, require careful consideration.
As discussed in 8.6, the tension which arises from the different perceptions held about the nature and value of appreciation results in such elements being peripheral to project design. In particular, dance educators believe that watching is a form of participation which must be planned for. If this is so then young people have to be educated to appreciate a theatrical experience, and to identify how specific characteristics contribute to the significance of a whole dance. However, dance educators argue that dance artists continue to rely too much on effects of various kinds, including techniques, rather than on analysis and skilful educational presentation.

While little is likely to change unless dance artists shift towards the position held by dance educators, the inclusion of appreciation elements under evaluation in Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) provides an appropriate climate for new developments. However, curriculum concerns arise as appreciation elements are used neither as frequently nor as effectively as they might be. But if the arguments presented in 8.6 are pursued viewing could be used to enable young people to understand choreography, and to gain insight into dance understanding. Hence, it is an enabling tool to allow a particular kind of access into dance. Moreover, if all project activities including practical work provide different opportunities for the growth of intelligent understanding, they need to be used in such a way that facilitates this focus. However, some situations, such as lecture demonstrations, "open" rehearsals and choreographic sessions, present added scope to help young people acquire a greater appreciation of dance.
Discussion in 8.6 shows that there is little difference between a lecture demonstration and a performance when analysis remains at the level of generalities. In such situations the lecture demonstration continues to be a peripheral activity and is not used as effectively as it might be. However, it could become the central feature of a project if detailed reference is made to movements or structures inherent in the dance and these are then built on to initiate practical work. But even then the success of the lecture demonstration as a learning tool will still be highly dependent on the discourse which takes place between the presenter of the dance work and the audience. This, too, requires preparation if observers are to enter the world of the choreographer, and to gain some insight into the ideas which inform the dance and its making.

Consideration of "open" sessions notes that the decline of these particular activities might in part be due to the anxieties of dance artists. It also reveals that the particular potential that open technique, choreography and rehearsals hold for appreciation has not yet been realised. But if dance artists are to share these very different but valuable experiences with participants three fundamental issues have to be resolved. First, dance artists need to identify whether it is the activities themselves which are threatening or the likelihood of critical appraisal. While this problem is not likely to disappear totally it might be eased if dance educators could prepare young people for the different types of activities they are likely to experience. But dance educators could only do this effectively when dance artists identify and plan clearly for what they are going to do. Second, dance artists need to consider relinquishing some of the responsibility for presenting the activity to dance educators. The presenter could then elucidate to the audience particular insights into the work and engage
at planned intervals in a dialogue with dance artists and students. This would allow dance artists to concentrate more fully on the dance. Third, as discussion in 8.6 highlights, it is crucial that lecture demonstrations are designed for selected audiences.

To reiterate a point made in 8.6, the focus placed on "appreciation" in practical activities is highly dependent upon the significance given to it by individual dance artists. Discussion also reveals different practices in "technique" and "workshop" sessions and suggests that, in general, dance artists fail to give young people something specific to look for. This contrasts with the ongoing attention to explicit elements experienced by those involved in an intensive choreographic process. However, debate implies that young people cannot come to judge either the work they compose themselves or that of others without access to appreciation elements. If this is so, critical appraisal is just as important to workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction or choreographic principles as it is to the development of a dance. But while this is an important aspect of projects it is only likely to occur if dance artists accept that young people acquire dance knowledge from a number of sources. Significantly, workshops, each in their own way, provide ideal opportunities for dance artists to guide participants to look at the individual and particular features of a single dance. Thus, as dance artists illuminate the dance and its particular characteristics, workshops might enable young people to gain ease of access to the work in its own right. Hence, it is argued here that it is the marrying of appreciation aspects, together with imaginative engagement in a dance, which allows participants to understand the distinctive features identified and something about the meaning and significance of the work. Once these are assimilated, viewers might then apply such perceptions when viewing other dance work, transfer them into
practical choreographic contexts, and make them relevant for their own developing work. New strategies which place a prime emphasis on appreciation elements are discussed in 11.83.

11.7 Extending the in-depth experience.

Discussion of the educators' debate in 11.83 and 11.84 exposes the interrelationship between the diversity of activities offered, timetable patterns and work with "special" groups (normally termed "intensive") in projects of any length. This thesis clarifies for the first time how the transitory nature of minimal and disjointed contact with dance artists results in a superficial concern for learning. Issues arising from the unique debate are compounded when the premise for much dance artists in education practice is the excitement generated. However, as such motivation is short lived, singly it initiates neither short nor long term development. In contrast, debate in 8.4 reiterates the value gained from working intensively towards an end product. The marked difference is a direct result of the concentrated development of work which leads to a deep extension and understanding of knowledge. Yet a situation now exists whereby the selection of special groups is equated with concern about who will gain most from an intensive experience. This, together with the growing focus on reconstruction with examination groups, takes this work into new directions. However, whether it is good educational practice to select some young people for, while excluding others from, an in-depth experience remains a question which dance educators must resolve.

It is argued that it is possible to counteract the wide gap which currently exists between selected and curriculum groups if those vital questions are resolved. First, could this way of working be equally
successful with the majority of young people as, for example, with curriculum groups in the lower secondary age range? Second, how might projects be designed to ensure that all participants have an equal right of access to intensive work? Third, could in-depth work be built into a rolling programme of dance artists in education programmes as an integral part of curriculum development?

Involvement in an intensive experience appears to be valuable. First, the experience of being "choreographed on" by a dance artist with choreographic expertise is likely to effect a change of emphasis as it allows participants to gain insight into professional dance-making from the initial ideas to the finished performance. Second, as young people develop a dance in an in-depth manner they gain an understanding of choreography through the articulation of compositional principles particular to, and characteristic of, the selected genre and style. Third, it allows participants to appreciate in their own right both the process and the completed dance. Fourth, engagement with dance artists as choreographers raises awareness of the diverse possibilities inherent within choreography. Fifth, young people as makers and presenters of work become involved practically in new skills and concepts.

It is argued that the selection of young people on the grounds of individual prowess, or the ability to gain the most from this kind of experience, needs to be redressed. It is proposed that young people with minimal dance knowledge, as well as those in examination groups, could also profit from the benefits which can accrue from in-depth work with dance artists if certain conditions are set. Once this principle is adopted dance educators could design project work as an
integral complementary feature of an overall syllabus. However, to do this successfully they would have to consider five key elements:

1) Planning for aims, objectives, and content has to take into account the particular requirements of a specific year group. For example, a lower school project might well utilise a key work from the repertoire for workshop activity based on the idea of the dance; or pupils in GCSE examination groups could focus on the use of more complex choreographic principles in the creation of a new dance. Alternatively, A level students a more sophisticated and complex experience through focusing on the reconstruction of sections from a dance. While this would allow pupils to come to know a piece in a particular way it also carries the expectation that those involved will be capable of meeting para-professional standards of performance.

2) Joint partners would need to set clearly-agreed criteria for the selection of the dances performed and the approaches involved.

3) Dance artists and dance educators would need to agree the focus to be placed on choreography, performance and appreciation. For example, the choreographic principles to be taught would need to be defined together with how these might be interpreted in particular kinds of workshops. This might help participants to come to a greater understanding of the choreographic process, together with performance and appreciation elements.

4) Both parties need to explore together the teaching implications for each area of work including the possibilities of team teaching in workshop or choreographic situations.

5) The framework for any project has to be clearly defined and agreed so that material can progress and develop with a concern for selected choreographic concepts. However, if in-depth work is to become a common feature of projects, careful consideration will need to be given to the selection of dance artists undertaking the choreographic role. The appropriateness of the dance artist for the young people involved and the specific nature of choreographic work is vital to the success of intensive work. The demands that this will place on dance artists to shape material
with a concern for form has implications also for how they teach. Hence, recommendations for the training of dance artists are proposed in Chapter 12.

11.8 New models: a working framework.

Although three main characteristics are common to the proposed models they are of different orders. First, all the models are derived from the dance as art context, since this embraces the genre and styles of dance which are taught in education. Acknowledgement that each model needs to be capable of refinement and adaptation for the work of companies and dance artists which fall under this large umbrella heading enables them to be used by ballet, modern or new dance, Asian or Black dance artists. Furthermore, the structures presented could be modified at the local level for a variety of education contexts. While guidelines for time allocation are given for particular activities, local conditions will need to prevail.

Second, it is assumed that all the necessary prerequisites outlined in 11.2 and 11.7 are followed during the planning, implementation and evaluation stages of any project.

Third, the new models are built around a number of features which have been largely associated with project work for more than a decade. However, while these are retained for continuity they are also reconceived in a particular way to enhance the proposed three stranded approach to dance artists in education programmes.

The lecture demonstration is a fundamental format which is used in the models to serve many purposes. It is used to set a project within the curriculum of a specific education context, or to introduce and to
draw attention to particular characteristics. Additionally it is used at particular times to demonstrate, or to explore, or to provide specific examples including anticipated difficulties and their resolution. Although much of this is not new what is redressed is the expectation that the lecture demonstration should be more analytically biased and planned as a means of learning. This also allows it to be used, at times, as an intermediary rehearsal and performance tool which leads participants towards production and dress rehearsals and final public performance situations. These proposals necessitate dance artists and dance educators generally agreeing on the nature of appreciation, and on who is the best person to explore and to present information in the lecture demonstration situation. There is also a hidden inference that discussion has a vital part to play in all the activities offered so that those involved might come to an enlightened understanding of the aims and objectives of a particular project, how these are to be interpreted en route, and how intended outcomes are to be achieved.

"Sharings" differ from lecture demonstrations. They allow dance artists, participants and dance educators to come together to rehearse, to perform and to view work in a semi-performance situation so that constructive critical appraisal provides the base for further work. Choreographic and performance perfection is also striven for at specified times through the making and viewing of video recordings of the developing work. This could then be used to illustrate the difficulties which arise and how these might best be resolved. Rehearsals alert participants to the professional demands of performing particular dances. Production rehearsals permit dance artists to establish the technical requirements of the dance and to ensure that young people, as dancers, know their roles. Dress
rehearsals finally establish the mood and atmosphere of the piece in a performance situation.

While an importance is placed on the monitoring and evaluative process, the two are separated. Ongoing meetings enable dance artists, dance educators and selected participants to overview and to discuss the work undertaken, to identify the difficulties that arise and how to resolve them, and to agree any tasks that the dance educator might undertake. Culminating meetings allow for the evaluation of the overall project.

11.81 **Choreography: Project Models 1 and 2.**

Involvement in choreography as the central core of project work allows an integrated approach in which knowledge of the craft of choreography could be taught alongside performance and appreciation aspects (see 11.4). However, to do this dance artists and dance educators need to understand both the specific characteristics common to the making of dances and how the use of these differs depending on the genre of the dance studied.

Although Models 1 and 2 have a choreographic focus they stem from different sources and each one is developed in a particular manner. While they are presented here for a specific age range, they could each be adapted for other year groups. Also they could be adapted to a focus on the abstract principles of choreography if parameters are defined and aims and objectives state clearly how the developing work might progress choreographically. The argument is put forward that choreographic principles are more likely to become known, and
therefore understood, through a focus on either repertoire-based work or on making new dances. However, each of these two approaches requires partners to state precisely what is required if they are to result in an experience which leads to an appreciation of works as artistic statements.

Model 1: Choreography: a new dance.

Parameters.
While the project focuses mainly on a dance artist as a choreographer creating a new dance participants are expected to make an ongoing contribution to the process. An emphasis on choreographic principles and their use within a particular (named) style of dance is underpinned and enhanced through a secondary emphasis on performance and appreciation. Performance aspects draw upon the physical and interpretive skills necessary to the developing work. "Guided looking" at video recordings of exemplars from the choreographer's own work and participants' ongoing choreographic work leads to critical appraisal of the developing and finished dance. Throughout, the intention is to provide those involved with a coherent dance experience so that they come to realise the interrelationship between choreography, performance and appreciation.

Introduction to the project.

The residency is based on one dance artist working with one group (approximately 25-30) of year 9 pupils (aged 13–14 years) for a period of a week in order to choreograph a dance to be presented at a final
1.0. AIMS.

1.1 To provide a selected group of Yr. 9 pupils with the opportunity to extend their own choreographic, performance and appreciation skills thorough working with a dance artist, who is also a choreographer, on the creation of a new (named) dance based on the idea of (....).

1.2 To engage pupils in a cohesive dance experience through an interrelated focus on choreography, performance and appreciation aspects.

1.3 To provide a bridge between lower school dance activity and the more demanding expectations of examination work.

1.4 To provide young people with the opportunity to perform in an audience situation.

2.0. OBJECTIVES. Participants will:

2.1 be involved in the creation of a new dance from its inception to its final performance within an audience setting;

2.2 understand how choreographic devices such as motif development, unison and canon, group relationships and stage space are used in relation to the developing dance idea;

2.3 improve their own performance standards through engaging in technique work focused on movement principles and phrases from the developing dance;

2.4 critically appraise the developing and final work paying particular attention to the choreographic devices used and how these enhance the mood, qualitative and interpretive aspects of the dance;

2.5 perform the work in a public performance to parents, school governors, invited guests and upper school pupils;

2.6 perform the dance in feeder primary schools at a later date to help form a bridge for the young people about to transfer to secondary education.
### OVERALL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td>Sharing / L.Dem. 1</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td><strong>P7</strong></td>
<td>Production Rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P7</strong></td>
<td>Dress Rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Sharing / L.Dem. 2</td>
<td>P6</td>
<td><strong>P8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.Dem. 4 + Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L.Dem. 4 + Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPLANATION OF STAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td>Sharing/L.Dem.1. Viewing video extracts DA own choreographic work. Explanation project. Set expectations.</td>
<td>(T) Movement phrases from developing work.</td>
<td>(T) Movement phrases from dance — new movement principles, e.g., swing, suspension, release.</td>
<td><strong>Production rehearsal.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dress rehearsal.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1</td>
<td>(CH) Continuation, development and structuring 1st section of the dance.</td>
<td>(CH) Exploration / development 2nd section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CH) Exploring movement ideas. Set and develop initial motif phrases. Group design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td><strong>Sharing/L.Dem.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sharing/L.Dem.3</strong></td>
<td>L.Dem. 4 DA/DE part. Practical examples, work difficulties / resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viewing video extract leads to choreographic work.</td>
<td><strong>Viewing video extract DA work and ongoing work.</strong></td>
<td>Viewing completed dance. Clarification of material.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CH) Reviewing 1st section. Focus on union / canon / group relationships / exits / entrances / Video Record 1 — Section 1.</td>
<td>Focus on mood/qualities and interpretation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P8</strong> Rehearsal. Professional expectations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P8</strong> Rehearsal. Professional expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td>Monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
- DA: Dance Artist
- DE: Dance Educator
- L.Dem.: Lecture Demonstration
- P: Practical work
- T: Technique
- CH: Choreography
- MPM: Monitoring and Planning Meeting
- VR: Video Recording
sharing/lecture demonstration and performance. In this instance, the project could be used intentionally by a dance educator as a means of motivating young people prior to the selection of GCSE options. While most pupils would be involved in a self-selection process others who show interest in the GCSE course, but who are unsure of their own dance ability, could be invited to participate. Its implementation at some point in the Spring term would coincide with the timing of the annual selection option process which occurs prior to young people embarking on upper school work.

Model 2. Choreography: in the "style of" a key work.
Parameters.

A company is to work alongside a selected group of approximately 36 upper secondary school pupils from yrs 9-11 (i.e. 13–16 years of age) over a four week period. This is a borderline example as the intention is to produce a new work, approximately 15 minutes long, in the "style of" the choreographed work. Throughout, use is made of the ideas, main actions, movement principles and set phrases from the original work. While dance artists take on the prime responsibility for the form of the dance, the dance educator develops and refines agreed choreographic tasks and rehearses the ongoing work in the middle two weeks. Therefore, a subsidiary focus on performing and appreciation skills underpins and enhances the choreographic process. While choreography emphasises the main concepts used throughout the piece, performance focuses on selected movement
1.0, AIMS.

1.1 To engage a group of self-selected young people from yrs 9 – 11 in the making and performance of a dance based on “the style of” the selected work from the company repertoire.

1.2 To provide participants with a cohesive dance experience through an interrelated focus on choreography, performance and appreciation.

1.3 To provide young people with the experience of performing in an audience situation.

2.0. OBJECTIVES. Participants will:

2.1 be involved in the making and performance of a dance based on “the style of” the selected work from its inception to its final performance within the audience setting;

2.2 come to gain a greater understanding of the cohesive nature of the dance experience through an interrelated focus on choreography, performance and appreciation;

2.3 use choreographic devices such as motif development and variation, group shape and stage spacing;

2.4 improve their own performance standards and develop the accuracy, skill and interpretive qualities demanded through engaging in technique work focused on main actions, movement principles, set phrases and specific skills from the dance;

2.5 gain an understanding of the professional demands of the rehearsal process which leads to the performance of a dance within a theatre setting;

2.6 critically appraise the interrelationship between technique and interpretive skills and choreographic devices used in the developing work in order to resolve any difficulties as they arise, and the final overall form of the dance with specific attention to how their use affects what the audience sees;

2.7 perform the completed dance as part of a company performance which includes selected pieces from the repertoire in a theatre venue, or as part of a dance evening in the school which includes a range of lower and upper school work and a company performance of the dance focused on throughout the project;

2.8 post-project — perform the choreographed work in a feeder primary school, as part of an LEA “showcase” for dance and to an invited audience from other schools.
CHOREOGRAPHY IN THE 'STYLE OF' A KEY WORK FROM THE REPERTOIRE — OVERALL STRUCTURE, WEEKS 1–4

**KEY:**
- DA: Dance Artist
- DE: Dance Educator
- L.Dem.: Lecture Demonstration
- P: Practical work
- T: Technique
- CH: Choreography
- MPM: Monitoring and Planning Meeting
- VR: Video Recording

**WEEK 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA + DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion (SP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WEEK 2</strong></th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WEEK 3</strong></th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WEEK 4</strong></th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Rehearsal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Week 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Dem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Performance**
**CHOREOGRAPHY IN THE ‘STYLE OF’ A KEY WORK FROM THE REPERTOIRE — EXPLANATION OF STAGES, WEEKS 1 AND 2**

**KEY:**
- DA Dance Artist
- DE Dance Educator
- L.Dem. Lecture Demonstration
- CH Choreography
- P Practical work
- T Technique
- Part Participants
- MPM Monitoring and Planning
- VR Video Recording

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
<th>DAY 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td><strong>K</strong></td>
<td><strong>AM</strong></td>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (DA) (T) Actions / movement principles from dance</td>
<td>P2 (DA) (T) Actions / movement / principles set phrases from dance.</td>
<td>(CH) Use of stage space, interrelationship technique / interpretation 1st section.</td>
<td>Rehearsal sections 1 and 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITORING</td>
<td>L Dem. 2 (DA) Identification of movements to precisely learn difficulties.</td>
<td>‘Rehearsal’; (VR 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>MPM 1 Overview week Discuss + agree tasks for week 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Evening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P1 (DE) Rehearse set choreography. Explore + Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P2 (DE) Rehearse set choreography. new ideas / set tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P3 (DA + DE) Rehearsal / feedback. DA extend work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P4 (DE) Rehears new tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Day 1

- **AM**
  - Sharing (DA + DE)
  - Rehearse 1st + 2nd section
  - Show new work developed by DE feedback

- **PM**
  - (CH) New movement + set phrases to be used
  - (CH) Development material
  - Accuracy / skill / interpretive qualities

- **Evening**
  - Rehearsal: Day 1 by DA
  - Rehearsal: Day 2 by DE

### Day 2

- **AM**
  - P1 (DA), (T) New movement + set phrases to be used
  - (CH) Refine new work. Choreographic principles, group relationships, use stage space

- **PM**
  - Rehearse Sec. 1, 2, 3
  - VR 3

- **Evening**
  - VR 3

### Day 3

- **AM**
  - L. Dem. 4 (DA + DE)
  - DA develop new movement ideas, set phrases from dance + how to be used in dance

- **PM**
  - VR 3
  - Rehearse and refine new work

- **Evening**
  - VR 3

### Day 4

- **AM**
  - P2 (DA), (T) Teach new movements and phrases

- **PM**
  - Rehearse CH
  - P3 (DA + DE)
  - (CH) DA develops and refines last section assisted by DE

- **Evening**
  - MPM 3

### Day 5

- **AM**
  - Rehearsal: Day 5 (DA + DE + Part.), present / demonstrate / discuss examples from work. Difficulties / resolution. Perform dance - L. Dem 5 (DA + DE + Part.)

- **PM**
  - Rehearsal for public performance

- **Evening**
  - Overview: set tasks

---
characteristics and skills. Ongoing critical appraisal in relation to given criteria enables participants to evaluate both the developing and finished work. Overall Model 2 provides a composite approach so that those involved come to experience the interrelationship between choreography, performance and appreciation.

**Introduction to the project.**

Model 2 is based on the assumption that an institution can neither release pupils from normal workloads for an extended period nor has the financial support required to fund a full-time, long-term project. A compromise is therefore proposed in which a one-week residency by a company is followed by selected dance artists returning at intervals over a span of three weeks. It assumes, also, that the dance educator, as an experienced choreographer, has the knowledge to develop the work further when the dance artists are not in the school context. As dance work is well established in the school, a policy of self selection is to be adopted which allows participants to follow their interests in dance beyond their normal curriculum performance levels.

**11.82 Performance: Project Model 3.**

It is proposed that all projects with a performance focus should engage participants in the explicit relationship between technique, interpretation and choreography. This should occur either within the context of an evolving work, or in choreographic work based on repertoire, or in the reconstruction of repertoire (see Table 17). Aspects of "theatrical presentation" could then become a necessary pre-requisite for work performed within an audience situation.
While Model 3 has primarily a performance focus this is integrated into work based on: a) the reconstruction of a section from a named dance; and b) the development of a new choreographed work. It also serves as an in-service course for teachers.

**Model 3: Performance/reconstruction. Choreography/reconstruction.**

**Parameters.**

This is fundamentally an in-service development project for dance educators who teach examination groups in 6 local comprehensive schools. In total 3 dance artists each work with 24 participants (12 dancers from the GCSE, or A/S, or A level groups from six schools). Throughout a focus is placed on performance in its widest sense for two main reasons. First, the understanding exemplified in the reconstruction of a section from a dance gives young people the opportunity to demonstrate expressive and interpretive skills together with technical abilities. Second, performance is considered to be an integral part of the development of a new choreographed work. In this instance performance, therefore, provides a meaningful interface between dance artists, dance educators and participants.

A formal performance initiates project proceedings and provides a showcase from which all other activities stem. This exemplifies how a company technique policy is interrelated with interpretive aspects particular to selected dances and their theatrical presentation. The performance also supports directly the practical activities offered as it influences the selection of the performance elements and appreciation characteristics. Hence, performance is exemplified as the central integrating factor of the project through the reconstruction of the
1.0 AIMS

1.1 To extend the physical, interpretive and expressive abilities of participants through engaging them in the reconstruction of a section from a (named) dance

1.2 To identify the movement principles and characteristics used in the original themes of the identified section

1.3 To identify the choreographic structure of the selected excerpt so that the participants might gain insight into and thus come to a sense of meaning in relation to the overall dance

1.4 To provide dance educators with new ideas and material as well as insights into the choreographic principles and processes involved

1.5 To conclude the project with a performance to an invited schools audience and a public performance

2.0 OBJECTIVES. Participants in examination groups will:

2.1 Be able to perform the selected excerpt with a central concern for artistry through interrelating physical skill with interpretive and expressive qualities;

2.2 Understand and be able to use the main movement principles focused on as they perform accurately a range of selected movements, steps, skills and phrases from the dance;

2.3 Gain an insight into how the set movements are used within the original theme of the section and how these relate to the choreographic structure of the selected excerpt (including use of group shape, relationships and the use of stage space) and how this relates to the overall meaning of the dance;

2.4 Experience the professional demands of rehearsal situations including production and dress rehearsal and how these relate to the final performance;

2.5 Present a lecture demonstration to yr 9 and upper school pupils from the host school plus invited groups from participating schools;

2.6 Perform the reconstructed section alongside the new dance created by the dance educator at a performance to an invited schools audience and a public performance.

3.0 Participants involved in the choreographed work will:

3.1 Be involved in the creation of a new dance from its inception to its final performance within an audience setting;

3.2 Understand how selected choreographic concepts such as motif development and variation are used in relation to the developing dance;

3.3 Improve their own performance standards through engaging in technique work focused on movement principles and phrases from the developing dance;

3.4 Critically appraise the developing and final dance, paying particular attention to the expressive and interpretive aspects of performance and how these relate to the choreographic devices used;

3.5 Perform the new dance at the same performance at which the reconstructed dances are presented.
### KEY:
- **DA**: Dance Artist
- **DE**: Dance Educator
- **L.Dem.**: Lecture Demonstration
- **Part.**: Participants
- **P**: Practical work
- **T**: Technique
- **R**: Reconstruction

#### WEEK 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>3 DA</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td><strong>Production rehearsal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>3 DA</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td><strong>Dress rehearsal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>P5 (DA)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>L. Dem. 3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td><strong>Production rehearsal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td><strong>Dress rehearsal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td><strong>Performance 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td><strong>Performance 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Performance 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td><strong>Performance 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td><strong>Performance 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>EVENING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>P1</td>
<td><strong>Performance 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td><strong>Performance 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERFORMANCE/RECONSTRUCTION, WEEKS 1-8
### PERFORMANCE/CHOREOGRAPHY — EXPLANATION OF STAGES

**KEY:**
- DA: Dance Artist
- DE: Dance Educator
- L.Dem.: Lecture Demonstration
- Part.: Participants
- P: Practical work
- T: Technique
- R: Reconstruction

#### DAY 1
- **AM:** L Dem. 1 Establish performance requirements. Demonstrate movement ideas/main choreography principles. View video selected work.
- **PM:** (R) Tech sections. Attention to use of group spaces, stage space entrances, exits. Company rehearsal.
- **Evening:** PERFORM: Range from current repertoire.

#### DAY 2
- **AM:** 3 DA
- **PM:** (R) New section taught.

#### DAY 3
- **AM:** 3 DA
- **PM:** (R) New movements practiced and developed in relation to 3rd section.

#### DAY 4
- **AM:** 3 DA
- **PM:** (R) Detailed planning and design section 3.

#### DAY 5
- **AM:** 3 DA
- **PM:** Rehearsal + professional demands of piece.
- **Evening:** Public performance. Theatre venue. Sections from 3 pieces + Extracts by DA.

#### DAY 1
- **AM:** 1A, 1B, 1C Groups in lower schools
- **PM:** 2A, 2B, 2C Groups in 2nd schools

#### WEEK
- **AM:** 1A, 1B, 1C Host School
- **PM:** Rehearse reconstructed sections from Week 1.

#### DAY 4
- **AM:** Focus on performance demands selected movements.
- **PM:** Production rehearsal.

#### DAY 5
- **AM:** To invited audience from other schools in LEA.
- **PM:** Planning meeting for future INSET work.

---

### Breakdown of Activities

#### AM: 1A, 1B, 1C
- **1A:** Host School
- **1B:** Rehearse reconstructed sections from Week 1.
- **1C:** Focus on performance demands selected movements.

#### PM: 2A, 2B, 2C
- **2A:** Production rehearsal.
- **2B:** Dress rehearsal.
- **2C:** Performance 1 to invited audiences + parents from participating schools.
selected section and the focus placed on movement principles. A second integrating factor comes through the performance demands placed on the participants involved in the creation of the new work developed by the dance educator within the school situation.

**Introduction to the project.**

The project is designed in two sections with the initial work with dance artists being used to stimulate further work in schools by dance educators. The project culminates with each of the participating schools contributing two dances to a performance. Although the project extends over an eight week period, its central thrust is in week 1 when 3 dance artists each reconstruct a section from a dance with a group (3 groups). While the focus of work for pupils is repertoire-based, dance educators are expected also to collect new ideas and material, to familiarise themselves with the choreographic process and principles involved, and to consider the overall form of the selected dance. This provides the ideas, content and choreographic knowledge which dance educators rework in their own schools during weeks 2-7 with at least one group from years 9-13 in both contact and extra-curricular time. The project culminates in week 8 with each dance artist visiting the "paired" school to appraise and to develop further the work of the dance educator. Dance artists now focus on performance expectations and rehearse the two dances to be performed. Two public performances, one to an invited schools audience and the other to parents and guests, conclude the project. Evaluation of the project considers its outline and implementation. Proposals for developing future work in the area involve dance educators from participating schools being used as curriculum leaders for a cluster of between 3/4 schools.
Appreciation: Project Model 4.

The starting point for any alternative strategy must be, firstly, the notion that, in order to enjoy and to learn to appreciate dances, young people need guidance in how to view complex works; and secondly, recognition that for the beginner even a simple dance is complex. Viewers, however, might only come to know something of what the work is about, if consideration is given to its framework and constituent features. It is this guidance which leads an audience to recognise the characteristics or distinguishing elements of different styles within general groupings and thus the uniqueness of each. It is, therefore, proposed that all projects with an appreciation orientation should focus on the special characteristics of selected dances in order to inform both the choreographic and performance endeavours of young people.

Model 4: Appreciation.

Parameters.

The emphasis on appreciation throughout this project is based on the assumption that viewers may gain in-depth insight into and appreciation of a specific dance, and thus a greater understanding of dance as art, through a focus on its particular characteristics and choreographic concepts. This is achieved as a result of young people being given the opportunity to view one dance in-depth through a series of lecture demonstrations, each one deliberately building onto the next in a coherent manner. Parallel choreographic work facilitates a practical understanding of selected features from the dance. The number of dance artists available as choreographers will determine how many groups are involved in practical work. Those dance artists
1.0 AIMS

1.1 To enable young people to understand the meaning and significance of a particular (named) dance as an artistic statement.

1.2 To gain an in-depth understanding and appreciation of its particular characteristics and choreographic concepts.

1.3 To use the lecture demonstration format as the central organising focus for choreographic, performance and appreciation elements.

2.0 OBJECTIVES. Participants will:

2.1 Recognise the characteristics and distinguishing elements of the dance in relation to a particular (named) style;

2.2 Be able to evaluate in an informed manner, ascribe qualities to art work and come to a greater understanding of the work;

2.3 Understand the interrelated nature of choreography, performance and appreciation through engaging in practical work which epitomises the three-stranded approach.
### APPRECIATION MODEL: CHOREOGRAPHY — OVERALL

### PLAN AND EXPLANATION OF STAGES

#### KEY:
- **DA**: Dance Artist
- **DE**: Dance Educator
- **L.Dem.**: Lecture Demonstration
- **Part.**: Participants
- **P**: Practical work
- **T**: Technique
- **R**: Reconstruction

#### PLAN:

**DAY 1**
- **WEEK 1**
  - **AM**: L. Dem. 1
  - **PM**: **MONITORING**

**DAY 2**
- **WEEK 1**
  - **AM**: L. Dem. 2
  - **PM**: **MONITORING**

**DAY 3**
- **WEEK 1**
  - **AM**: L. Dem. 3
  - **PM**: **MONITORING**

**DAY 4**
- **WEEK 1**
  - **AM**: L. Dem. 4
  - **PM**: **MONITORING**

**DAY 5**
- **WEEK 1**
  - **AM**: P 5
  - **PM**: **MONITORING**

#### DAY 1 EXPLANATION:
- Focus on movement ideas integral to dance.
- Use and development within section.

#### DAY 2 EXPLANATION:
- Movement ideas from second section.
- Emphasis on how specific movements used. Group share.

#### DAY 3 EXPLANATION:
- Development of 2nd section through exploration, development of motifs and their use in group design.

#### DAY 4 EXPLANATION:
- Further development of 1st and 2nd sections in relation to choreographic principles.
- Extension of 3rd section.

#### DAY 5 EXPLANATION:
- Consideration of group relationships, use of stage in selected sections and effect on audience.

#### CLASSES:
- **1A, 1B, 1C**: Groups in lower schools
- **2A, 2B, 2C**: Groups in 2nd schools
who are not choreographers either work physically alongside participants, or dance artists take on an assistant apprentice role, or perform the selected section from the dance.

Introduction to project.

The lecture demonstration format is the central integrating feature of all project activities. A series of presentations introduce the repertoire both prior to the company performance and throughout the project to consolidate the work in progress. Prior to practical work sections are performed, discussed and placed within the context of the dance. All practical work emanates from what has been viewed and also relates to the focus of the next lecture demonstration. For example, performance and discussion of one section could lead to practical work focused on how the ideas of the dance are embodied into the choreographed form. Alternatively, the lecture demonstration and practical work could stress how particular choreographic principles are used to vary and to develop movement material in the dance. Attention could also be given to the types of problems encountered by the choreographer in the making of the dance, together with examples of how these are resolved. Although Model 4 is based on a week-long project with dance artists, the principles adhered to could be adapted to one of a longer length with more participants. This might allow choreographic or reconstruction work to be further developed.

11.9 Summary.

The underlying premise throughout this Chapter is that dance artists in education projects need to be organised around the conceptual basis of dance as art. Interpreted into a theoretical framework, this
allows new parameters to be defined which stem from choreography, performance and appreciation. Exploration of policies which centre around each of these concepts opens up new possibilities. It is argued that this could enable each project to have a primary and secondary focus. Hence, young people might become engaged in a more integrated dance experience. This proposition, together with the notion of widening the extensive experience to include more young people than hitherto, provides the foundations on which new models are based.

Each of the four Models presented has a central focus, underpinned with a complementary concern for the other two concepts. As the aim is to involve young people in a coherent dance experience, lecture demonstrations, all practical work and sharings are intended to build onto each other so as to lead to a significant dance experience.

Finally, the Models offered as a new approach to project work are able to be adapted to local circumstances. Furthermore, when they are put into practice they would need to be monitored, evaluated and further refined.
Chapter 12

New Policy: Training for Dance Artists in Education Programmes.

12.1 Introduction.

The models presented in Chapter 11 require a new way of working from both dance artists and dance educators. This necessitates consideration of two interrelated issues. First, in spite of a relationship between one-off teaching experiences and the difficulties encountered, dance artists are placed increasingly in an instructing or facilitating role. As well as passing on their skills and knowledge directly to pupils and teachers there is a growing escalation of demonstration classes by dance artists at in-service courses. Hence, duplication of the teacher and adviser roles is re-examined. Second, the challenging concept of training for those engaged in dance artists in education practice is discussed. Finally, one of the two proposals put forward is considered in depth and its implications highlighted.

12.2 The centrality of the teaching issue.

Discussion in 9.3 and 9.5 uncovered that how successful dance artists are is largely determined by the activity they teach. It revealed that while there are evident similarities between teaching technique
and reconstructing a section from a dance a further dimension occurs when dance artists teach creative workshops based on repertoire or on choreographic principles. In particular, it noted the discomfort felt by dance artists when having to take into account a number of considerations such as shaping material. In general, they are unsure of how to develop, appropriately, material produced by pupils unless they have choreographic experience. Furthermore, debate also discloses how dance artists revert to the use of familiar practices from the professional world which are either inappropriate for many young people or not always used as effectively as they might be.

It is argued that the centrality of the teaching issue is likely to remain unless the haphazard practice highlighted in 9.3 and 9.5 is replaced by dance artists acquiring skills so that they might teach in a structured manner. Therefore, it is proposed that a number of steps are taken to introduce dance artists to a range of teaching styles such as those exemplified in the Mosston "Spectrum" (Mosston and Ashworth, 1986). This might then allow dance artists to make more informed decisions than hitherto about the teaching approaches they employ. The universal acceptance of this model by the DFE, LEA advisers and initial teacher trainers rests on the importance of preparation, performance and evaluation decisions. Implicit within these is the concept of a teaching/learning contract, an emphasis on preparation (i.e. aims, objectives and detailed planning) and the adoption of anticipated teaching and learning behaviours related to a range of styles. As implied in 6.7, this demands an objectivity which enables content to be separated from methodology.

The position taken here is that three positive effects could emerge if dance artists are familiar with the teaching-styles spectrum. First,
dance artists should be able to modify, and to apply more effectively than before, such professional practices as the use of feedback (i.e. correction), demonstration and repetition. Second, dance artists could become more familiar with the roles assumed for a specific project if parameters are more clearly defined than hitherto. Third, if these two proposals are implemented, models of "good enough practice" could be identified to which other dance artists might aspire. Fourth, if a company adopts a coherent approach and teaching policy to a particular project this might ensure that dance artists have common expectations for the aims, objectives and content of a particular scheme. This could then be interpreted appropriately for the age, ability and experience of participants.

12.3 In-service work—the professional development of teachers.

Discussion in 9.3 highlighted that despite dance artists having no educational expertise themselves their skills and knowledge continue to provide the foundation for education programmes. In particular, the growing trend and increasing assumption that dance artists can take on the role of curricula leader, and thus be responsible for the professional development of teachers, is worrying. If followed through to its ultimate conclusion, it could result in the professional world influencing dance education more than hitherto. Therefore, in-service providers need to resolve two main concerns. First, LEA advisers, or their equivalents, have to consider how they might best engage teachers in professional development. While dance artists have much to offer, LEA advisers should ideally facilitate in-service work which allows dance educators to update their knowledge and skills so that they can carry out their work as effectively as they might. But problems arise when LEA advisers themselves do not have the
appropriate expertise. Yet they could gain assistance from a higher education establishment, or nominate one or more specialist dance teachers to undertake this particular work. This would allow the dance teacher and adviser to translate artistic modes of working into educational practice, and to encourage discussion between dance artists and educators. For such a model to be implemented effectively as part of a project the adviser must be seen to support, and to work with, the selected dance specialists.

Second, advisers and teachers need to explore together appropriate forms of evaluation procedures for dance artists in education projects. Contrary to present practice curriculum development should not be expected to take place overnight. It is a long term process especially if large scale change is planned.

Third, current practice also suggests that all too often teachers are left to their own devices once the support of an artist is withdrawn. But it is crucial that towards the conclusion of a project the adviser, specialist dance teacher, dance artist and local teachers discuss ways forward so that the impetus for teaching dance is not lost. While networks are vital, those currently on offer to teachers frequently span a range of age and expertise. These need to be replaced by new ones which focus on particular KSs in the National Curriculum and/or cater for teachers with specific knowledge and skills. If the purpose of such courses is to develop new work, or to extend dance in a distinct way, the professional development of teachers must be a priority. This holds true for courses which take place throughout a project and also for those which occur after its conclusion. But if anything is to be achieved in the long term, projects must be integrally tied to aims and
objectives which are realistic for the dance artists and dance educators involved.

Fourth, ways also need to be found to disseminate good practice both at national and local level. While publication of material could enable dance educators to come to terms with the principles and practice of project work, this on its own is not enough. To develop this area of work in line with National Curriculum recommendations, a rolling programme of standing conferences might need to be set up. While this might encourage dance educators and dance artists to engage in ongoing debate those teaching dance under the PE umbrella are only likely to take this seriously if HMI are seen to take an active lead in this direction. Recommendations in this crucial area are made in Chapter 13.

12.4 Partners in Provision.

The initial training of dance artists and dance educators leads to very different outcomes. Dance programmes in a range of degree courses focus on dance as art, and those leading to current B.Ed (Hons.) and B.A. (Hons.) QTS courses also provide students with educational perspectives and skills. In contrast, such elements offered within vocational courses located in the private sector are limited, and modules of an "educational" nature taught by dance artists do little to rectify present practice. The general assumption that the training of professional dance artists provides them with an almost automatic entry into dance artists in education practice is questioned. But to date the ACGB has made limited provision for artists in general (see 2.5) and no public debate has explored whether dance artists should undergo some form of recognised training. Moreover, despite the very
demanding nature of the work the expertise of the dance artist continues to predominate. Even though dance educators have skills that dance artists do not have they are still passed over. Perhaps equally significant, there is no recognition that working with dance artists adds another dimension to the work of dance educators.

It is put forward here that two current moves within the education world make training for dance artists in education programmes a realistic proposition. First, the official recognition given by the DFE to 'Partnerships' within Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) gives more credence to the dance artists in education movement than ever before. The stated requirements for dance implies that dance educators have to be more accountable for both short and long term learning effects. This, together with the responsibility placed on teachers for the monitoring and evaluation of 'Partnerships', suggests that future projects are likely to be scrutinised much more carefully than before. If this is so then dance artists too will have to be more answerable than before for any work they undertake, including the processes followed and their outcomes.

Second, the emergence of National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs), together with the growing recognition by the artistic world that these might benefit careers in dance, could be used to advantage. But, as with all other NVQs, these would need to be based on standards of competence, to ensure that qualifications are relevant to existing employment opportunities, and to be acceptable to both employers and employees. Potentially this could develop the dance artists in education work force as well as provide opportunities for dancers to gain skills and knowledge needed for a changing career in an increasingly competitive world.
Proposals for the training of dance artists are on two levels. First, initial training might incorporate aspects of dance artists in education practice for those who wish to engage in work of this nature either within a company or in a freelance capacity. Any proposed NVQs could be built out of a number of units of competence accredited separately under a modular structure. This would allow for progression and transferability, and enable dance artists to acquire professional expertise in dance artists in education practice. Other skills particular to project work such as administration, funding, and planning would also feature. Hence, vocational schools which primarily train professional dancers would have a responsibility to instruct students for the secondary yet complementary activity of dance artists in education.

The adoption of NVQ standards and qualifications by professional training providers could be seen as a way of rationalising current practice as it might help to clarify the relevance of courses to arts funding bodies and to LEAs. In particular, LEAs might then consider linking discretionary awards for dance to programmes leading to NVQs. Furthermore, it should alert companies to those trainee dancers who have an interest in dance artists in education practice as well as performing. On completion of the course newly trained dance artists might then work as "apprentices" alongside other more experienced professionals. Companies could then approach LEAs and individual education institutions confident in the knowledge that their dance artists have some relevant knowledge of, and beginner experience in, project work. Those students who opted out of the module would automatically be excluded from project work in any role other than that of performer. Furthermore, it could also provide opportunities for those who wish to change their career patterns after
their initial training, as, for example, those who wish to work with a company as an outreach worker. However, as vocational establishments might find it difficult to achieve the depth of training required this might need to be undertaken by dance educators who teach within initial teacher training courses in higher education.

Discussion of initial teacher training in 1.7 identifies two alternative routes for intending dance educators. It also reveals a wide difference between the contact that students have with dance artists in Performing Arts courses (and their equivalents) and the minimal acquaintance that those studying dance within a PE context have with the professional dance world. The situation is even more drastic for trainee primary school teachers. It is argued here that it is imperative that students involved in dance programmes within teacher training contexts should follow a course which parallels the one put forward for dance artists. This should alert them to the potential and ongoing concerns of the dance artists in education movement.

It is suggested that students involved in dance work within initial teacher training contexts could follow a module in this specific area. Recommendations are two tiered. First, all students studying PE, and therefore dance, might follow a module which alerts them to the range and possibilities of dance programmes possible under the National Curriculum "Partnerships" requirements. Second, intending specialists within the field might follow a further course to make them more familiar with, and knowledgeable about, such work. This could form the base for involvement in projects once they enter the teaching profession. Satisfactory completion of the module for the degree might go some way towards the requirements for the diploma outlined in
12.5 so that the fieldwork requirement can be undertaken once in a teaching post.

Currently, company education officers are not specifically trained for their role. Even though they may have knowledge of dance artists in education programmes, and the ACGB provides a forum for them to share their experiences, they are not specialists in the field. Yet these are the very people who control many of the decisions surrounding dance artists in education programmes. While their backgrounds may be from either the educational or artistic world they come, in general, from a professional dance training route. Therefore, the case is made that those currently in post, and those appointed in the future, might be expected to complete successfully the Diploma in Dance Artists in Education discussed in 12.5. This could only be to the advantage of the dance artists in education movement as it would allow company education officers, dance artists and educators to engage in debate from a similar knowledge base.

12.5 A Diploma for Dance Artists in Education Practice.

The NVQs outlined in 12.4 are viewed as only the first step; a second more in-depth rung is also proposed. Those who wish to take on more responsibility, and to gain a deeper understanding of dance artists in education practice, could study for a Diploma in Dance Artists in Education. This would enable dance artists to develop a thorough understanding of the principles and procedures for projects, to explore the planning and execution of new frameworks, and to develop appropriate teaching skills.
Such a diploma could be offered within an initial teacher training institution in which dance plays a significant role. This would allow it to be designed either as a separate course for dance artists; or as part of in-service development for local teachers; or as a joint module for dance artists and trainee dance educators or for all three parties. Such a course would incorporate fundamental elements, including work-based experience, combined to make a unit leading to the qualification. While its focus might at times differ depending on client groups it could, to varying degrees, build a bridge between dance artists and dance educators through an exchange of ideas and expertise at grass roots level.

Ideally the course leading to the Diploma in Dance Artists in Education should be open to dance artists, dance educators and trainee specialist dance teachers. Only one course is outlined here as the fundamental aims and content that dance artists and educators need to explore are similar: hence, where appropriate, "dance educator" may be inserted in place of "dance artist". However, when the course is offered it might need to vary for different client groups. For example, for dance artists and teachers already in the field it could take place over a number of weekends and weeks or as a concentrated short course. Alternatively, within degree courses for trainee teachers, it might run as part of a continuous modular structure over a span of fifteen weeks.
A Diploma for Dance Artists in EducationPractice:  
a training course for dance artists,  
dance educators and students.

Aims.
Overall, this module is designed to promote the positive attitudes and understanding necessary to create effective partnerships. It aims to increase dance artists' understanding of the agencies of provision, their roles and fundamental concerns; and to expand their knowledge, range and expertise. To facilitate this the fundamental principles of dance artists in education programmes are considered and applied to practice. In particular, dance artists, dance educators and students will consider their future roles, and how these might best be implemented within a variety of project situations.

Learning outcomes.
At the end of the module dance artists, dance educators and students should be able to:

1) differentiate the roles and understand the positive contribution of the varied agencies involved in dance provision as well as appreciating the barriers preventing effective partnerships;

2) understand administration, funding and planning procedures;

3) appraise the current roles of dance artists and dance educators and design new collaborative ways of working;

4) critically review case studies of partnerships;

5) recognise the issues involved and explore alternative strategies for developing projects;

6) communicate effectively in a variety of modes for different purposes;

7) understand the similarities and differences between such varied education contexts as primary, secondary, further and higher education;

8) draft policy statements and action plans for field work.

Indicative content.
Participants in the module will:

1) overview agencies of provision such as the ACGB and the DFE, their support structures, interrelationship and partnership concepts;

2) examine the roles of agents involved in education and arts provision, relevant policy statements and funding proposals together with consideration of administration and planning procedures and how these might affect all stages of a project;
3) clarify the roles of dance artists and dance educators, their particular strengths and limitations and how these are directly linked to activities and project design;

4) examine dance artists in education practice from 1980 to the present and identify factors blocking effective collaboration;

5) identify the priorities, principles, criteria and procedures required to enable joint decision-making to take place throughout the preparation, implementation and post project periods;

6) consider the language used by dance artists and dance educators, both in practical and audience settings, in order to define a common terminology for use in future debate;

7) clarify the artistic and educational implications of new project models together with their aims, objectives, monitoring and evaluation processes;

8) examine a number of alternative models which focus on either choreography, performance or appreciation, or a combination of these as the focal point for a specific project and agree appropriate criteria for the selection of material;

9) appraise the role of technique as an integral aspect of projects and consider how its use might vary depending on different circumstances;

10) compare and make explicit the workshop activities currently on offer to facilitate informed dialogue between dance artists, dance educators and students;

11) explore ways in which the lecture demonstration could be used in a more effective manner than hitherto through dance artists and dance educators together providing insight into specific dance works;

12) identify how dance educators might help dance artists to use a variety of teaching styles so that they might pass on their skills and knowledge in a more structured manner;

13) focus on how dance artists and dance educators, who are also dance specialists, could collaborate to make in-service provision more meaningful for teachers;

14) draft policy statements, action plans and project models implemented in field work;

15) interview individuals working in the field.
12.6 Implications.

While these proposals are highly provocative they are vital to the development of the dance artists in education movement in an era when the artistic and education worlds are suffering from both ever-increasing demands and shrinking resources. However, initial training programmes could automatically provide a "beginner licence" for dance artists in education practice. This could provide new entrants to both professions with a basic knowledge in, and an understanding of, how project programmes relate to the different needs of young people. An equally ambitious proposal suggests that a Diploma in Dance Artists in Education might provide the necessary qualification for the professional development of those artists and educators who take on a major responsibility for this area of work. Successful completion of the Diploma could lead to an automatic right of entry to the "Register" held by NCDAE (see Chapter 10: and Chapter 13, recommendation C1.5) and to the consultant role (see Chapter 10: and Chapter 13, recommendation C1.2). While it is anticipated that this would take five years to put in place, during the interim period dance artists and dance educators with some expertise could apply to the NCDAE for entry onto the register. Equally essential is the parallel proposal in Chapter 10 that the NCDAE places priority on the provision of ongoing professional development. Once established the rolling programme of dance conferences could enable those dance artists and dance educators already in the field to keep abreast of new developments and to respect the two very different, yet equally valuable, professions.
The financial implications for these proposals are crucial. It is imperative that the DFE and the ACGB collaborate about funding procedures. Likewise relevant higher education bodies and LEAs need to be persuaded to plan for the initial and ongoing training of dance artists and dance educators. During the initial and interim periods the establishment of a "bursary scheme" or mandatory award might help to convince those artists and educators in the field who wish to study on the diploma course of the value of training.

For the training proposals to be effective several concerns are crucial. First, time needs to be allocated in initial training institutions for this area of work. Second, dance artists and companies are only likely to be interested and involved in such a scheme if the major issue of funding is taken on board by the ACGB and RABs. Third, the question of who would train dance artists will require careful negotiation with the ACGB. Fourth, the ACGB, together with the DFE, might consider the possibility that dance artists who wish to involve themselves in dance artists in education practice should be required to undergo a form of recognised training. The ever increasing accountability demands of the National Curriculum might make such a "licence" a necessity. Fifth, in the long term professional training centres need to be encouraged to include courses as an integral part of the initial training programme. Sixth, in-service courses for teachers are vital so that those already in the profession are able to keep abreast of developments.

12.7 Summary.

Discussion on "Shaping Future Policy" in Chapters 10 and 11 lays the foundations on which the future dance artists in education movement
could be based. In particular, the theoretical frameworks and the new models put forward in Chapter 11 demand a fresh approach from dance artists and dance educators if they are to be as effective as they might be. Hence, the time has come to confront and to resolve the teaching issue. To this end two highly provocative proposals are put forward for the training of dance artists and dance educators which obviously require the backing of both arts and educational organisations. However, recent restructuring in higher education, and the move towards a modular format in most institutions, makes this an opportune time for the development of such work.

Finally, although some dance artists and educators might be suspicious of the proposals, the concern is to engage them in work with young people which has both artistic and educational integrity and which fosters a "good enough" active learning process for those involved.
Chapter 13

Recommendations.

13.1 Introduction.

This Chapter presents recommendations both of a main and subsidiary nature which could enable the dance artists in education movement to mature and to do so alongside the implementation of the National Curriculum. To date "good practice" is sporadic and seen to be reliant upon those individual dance artists and dance educators who have acquired some expertise in this area. As this is normally founded on "trial and error" experiences any advances that have occurred since the pilot projects of 1980 tend to be at a personal level rather than as part of some form of consistent approach. In contrast, the implementation of the National Curriculum makes it crucial that dance artists in education practice is now seen to take place within a coherent policy structure.

Prior to the presentation of the recommendations it is vital to state that four basic premises underlie each one, although to varying degrees. These are that dance artists in education programmes must:
1) be located in the dance as art model;

2) be designed to focus on choreography, and/or performance and/or appreciation and that this intent will determine the content taught, and thus what young people might learn;

3) provide the potential for curriculum development through complementing the National Curriculum guidelines for dance, KSs 1-4, or the dance programmes followed in further and higher education contexts;

4) engage participants in an in-depth learning experience through an emphasis on choreography, and/or performance and/or appreciation.

It is assumed that all long term projects should adhere to these four axioms, particularly in secondary, further and higher education, and that those of a shorter nature which have featured hitherto ought gradually to cease to be funded. In the interim period any one off projects should endeavour to adhere to the first three principles while aiming to provide participants with a worthwhile, if limited, learning experience.

13.2 Presentation of Recommendations.

The recommendations are divided into three main areas which deliberately lead from the macro to the micro level. Hence, Policy Recommendations at both a national and local level precede Professional Area Recommendations so that Project Specific Recommendations might be placed in the wider context of the dance artists in education movement. There are 11 main recommendations under the above three major headings, each of which is distinguished by a letter in the alphabet:
Each recommendation follows a common format: the recommendation area is discussed; the recommendations are stated; and any implications or implementation concerns are addressed.

**Policy Recommendations A-D** focus on the formation of new policies which enable dance artists in education projects to develop alongside, and to become integrated into, the dance provision outlined in *Physical Education in the National Curriculum* (DES, 1992). When the ACGB and the DFE become collaborative agents of change this could provide a mirror for RABs and LEAs as these in turn become the interpreters of national policy at local level. The effect that this should have on funding is then addressed prior to consideration of the appointment of consultants for dance artists in education projects.

**Professional Area Recommendations E-H** relate to Professional Area concerns. These focus on the training of dance artists and dance educators in initial higher education programmes, and on further professional development for those already established in particular fields. A consideration of the responsibilities placed on dance artists
and dance educators precedes an emphasis on the roles of the RAB, the LEA and their representatives.

**Project Specific Recommendations I-K** concentrate on the interpretation of Project Specific issues as particularised for individual local contexts. These are considered in the three phases common to any project: pre planning, implementation and post-project contact. In particular, recommendation K integrates recommendations I-J into a coherent package by presenting new project frameworks.

### 13.3 Recommendations

#### 13.3.1 Policy Recommendation Areas A-D

**A The Department for Education.**

Recommendations made in this area rest on the more realistic joint ownership of dance artists in education projects. Much of the earlier work undertaken in the research for this thesis anticipated some of the outcomes of the *Physical Education in the National Curriculum* (DES, 1992) document. In particular, the two fundamental premises outlined in the introduction to this Chapter, i.e. the dance as art model and the notion of "Partnerships" (DES, 1992, p H1) are congruent with guidelines set out in the National Curriculum. Indeed, the inclusion of "Partnerships" provides a new impetus and opportunity for educational engagement to have equal parity with artistic needs. But it also places new responsibilities on dance educators and empowers them to build project work into the overall
dance programme of a particular context. It is, therefore, crucial that the specific contributions dance artists could make to projects are identified and clearly articulated. Only then might they be interpreted appropriately for primary, or secondary, or further, or higher education contexts.

The following recommendations aim to redress the situation which exists whereby the professional world dominates the dance artists in education movement. Therefore, proposals advocate the importance of "guidance" to the education profession from the DFE as the body with ultimate responsibility for overseeing what actually takes place in schools, or further, or higher education. It is argued that when the DFE accepts the principle that dance artists in education projects are distinctive from, yet complement, the National Curriculum, planning might proceed on a co-operative basis at national level.

**Recommendation A**

A 1 The DFE should appraise its present position on the dance artists in education movement and state clearly the nature and extent of its contribution to future practice.

A 2 The DFE, or its equivalent, should promote, through the National Curriculum Council, and interested professional organisations such as NDTA and SCODHE, the educational perspectives of dance artists in education practice. This should enable the school, or further, or higher education curriculum to become the starting point for project programmes.

These recommendations can only be met by the DFE. This is the body which has to deliberate and to identify how it is to support the involvement of the profession in the dance artists in education movement. A positive and pro-active lead in new developments will determine the growth (or otherwise) of "Partnerships" in dance
including the opening up of new avenues and fresh collaborative ventures. However, for this to happen a number of pre-conditions will need to be met. First, the DFE must clarify that "Partnerships" are a required element of the new curriculum. Second, the role and responsibilities placed on educators in project design needs to be defined, and explicit guidelines given for educational and artistic aims to have equal parity. This might necessitate consideration of the precise nature of the contribution that dance artists can make to KSs 1-4, to examination work in schools, and to dance programmes in further and higher education contexts. To what extent these proposals are implemented will be determined by the stance taken by the DFE and the ACGB, and the effectiveness of proposals A, B and C. It is projected that a five year programme of concentrated activity could result in dance artists in education practice being accepted as an integral part of dance programmes.

**B The Arts Council of Great Britain.**

The absence of a coherent approach makes it crucial for the ACGB to reclaim from the RAB responsibility for the artistic development of dance artists in education programmes. Recommendations in this area are centred on the essential need for the ACGB to be seen at the forefront of the debate. The formulation of a National Policy for the professional dance world could underpin the artistic contribution of dance artists to education projects. This might enable dance artists to develop their contribution alongside emerging changes in education and to complement more effectively than hitherto the artistic education in dance for young people.
**Recommendation B.**

B 1 The ACGB should, alongside the DFE, review current practice and redefine its own role and that of RABs in a National Policy for the dance artists in education movement.

This proposal is likely to have significant implications. The lead taken by the ACGB together with the evolvement of a National Policy should encourage dance artists to approach education work with a concern for both artistic and educational needs. Ultimately, this might result in an exploration of new collaborative ways of working and to a maturation of dance artists in education practice.

C  The Department For Education and the Arts Council of Great Britain.

While the thesis clearly reveals that the DFE and the ACGB have quite distinct roles, recommendations within this area emphasise the essential need for them to collaborate and to weave their current different ways of working into a coherent process. From the arguments presented in 7.3, it is concluded that education and artistic policies have to merge. Hence, a central requirement of these recommendations is that the ACGB and the DFE accept the principles of collaboration and joint ownership, assume equal leading positions, and are at the forefront of national debate.

The following recommendations are based on the assumption that the present ad hoc approach to dance artists in education practice is no longer viable. Hence, proposals are on three levels. First, a focus is placed on establishing a National body and a networking system. Second, an emphasis is placed on the formation of regional groups to
oversee the interpretation of National Policy at local level. Third, the advent of the National Curriculum makes it crucial that clear guidelines are given for features common to all projects. These include contracts, aims, planning procedures, monitoring and evaluation, meeting structures and schedules, and familiarisation policies. When followed in practice all three stages should ensure that the present ad hoc attitude to projects is replaced by a more systematic approach.

**Recommendation C.**

C 1 The DFE and the ACGB should collaboratively fund, plan, promote and evaluate a four-tiered network of support structures through the establishment of:

C 1.1 an NCDAE which is responsible for:

C 1.2 commissioning a "neutral" dance specialist consultant to research and to overview dance artists in education practice at National level;

C 1.3 financing and promoting research through the establishment of a "monitoring/study group;

C 1.4 setting up a rolling programme of National Conferences with such National bodies as NDTA and SCODHE;

C 1.5 establishing a register of dance artists in education consultants.

C 2 The NCDAE should produce clear guidelines to ensure that a LCMG is set up at regional and local level to plan and to oversee all major projects. This should be responsible for:

C 2.1 encouraging equal representation of artistic and educational interests, appointing a neutral consultant to specific projects, and facilitating procedures for good practice;

C 2.2 setting up new meeting patterns.

C 3 At project specific level the NCDAE should provide clear guidelines to ensure that:

C 3.1 formal contracts become an accepted part of common practice;
the aims and objectives of a project have choreography or performance or appreciation as their main and subsidiary focus;

appropriate monitoring and evaluation procedures are planned and implemented;

a familiarisation period is built into all major projects of any length;

post-project contact becomes an integral part of all projects of any length.

Funding from the ACGB and the DFE is essential if the above recommendations are to be met. The formation of the NCDAE is particularly important as this would be the body which forms and oversees the implementation of National Policy through recommendations C 1.2 and C 1.3. Indeed, the role of consultant could become crucial in the identification of new models and how these might inform future practice. The networking systems facilitated by C 1.4 and C 1.5 are also significant as they render a framework for consultation between educators and artists. They also provide a support service for the dissemination of the new collaborative national artistic and educational policies.

The setting up of LCMGs is likely to have implications on the design and practical interpretation of projects. The anticipated pairing system should enable all parties concerned to be equally served, and facilitate collaboration with others from outside agencies who have experience of dance artists in education practice. While RAB officers and LEA advisers currently undertake this task, the demise of the advisory service may result in alternative personnel having to be targeted. Hence, the system of networking identified in C 1.4 and the "register" referred to in C 1.5 are essential elements of this proposal. Re-designed meeting and planning schedules could allow for a
concentrated focus on project design at phased intervals. However, while these proposals could help to resolve many project design and implementation concerns they will not be effective unless the personnel involved have an understanding of dance artists in education practice.

Recommendation C 1.3 has a number of implications for individual projects. Acceptance of the principle of contracts by the NCDAE has serious implications on the way artists and educators negotiate, on the decisions that are made, and on how these are formalised. Proposals for aims rest on the assumption that educational and artistic aims must have equal parity, and that the special contribution that dance artists can make to education stems from their professional uniqueness. However, aims will only be successfully implemented when learning objectives are stated unambiguously and agreed. As argued in 11.3 limitation of project parameters to a focus on either choreography, or performance or appreciation might enable main and subsidiary aims to be more easily identified. Short term learning objectives could then complement the overall dance programme of a particular context.

Equally important, more structured monitoring and evaluation procedures than hitherto should enable project partners to be more objective and analytical in their reporting of projects. Similarly, acceptance of the fundamental premise of "familiarisation" time has implications for the separation of the principle involved from financial and planning implications. Alternative strategies could then be explored in relation to new project models such as those outlined in Chapter 11. Therefore, it is crucial that any financial and
organisational implications are addressed by the NCDAE, the ACGB, the DFE, dance artists, dance educators and local agencies.

The proposal for planning post-project contact into aims and objectives, and building a reassessment period into the project proceedings is also significant. This could lead to both parties respecting and following through proposals more realistic than hitherto. However, several pre-conditions are vital. Recommendations about contracts (C 3.1), aims and objectives (C 3.2), and new project frameworks (K) would need to be securely in place. The "Monitoring/Study Research" group might also be commissioned by the NCDAE to explore and to design alternative models of post-project contact suitable for different types of programmes.

Overall, it is anticipated that documentation from the NCDAE would guide all Professional Area and Project Specific Recommendations.

**D Funding.**

The question of funding is fundamental to the future of the dance artists in education movement. While present procedures restrict the design of projects, changing contexts within both the education and artistic worlds are likely to result in even more complex financial pressures and funding patterns. The new National Policy proposals have financial and organisational implications for the ACGB, the DFE, RABs and LEAs. However, any additional new expenditure must be considered in relation to the concept of accountability now demanded of dance artists and dance education when entering into partnership agreements.
Recommendation D.

D 1 In the light of recommendations A--C the ACGB, the DFE and the NCDAE need to review present funding strategies and establish a high funding profile for dance artists in education projects which could be adapted from national, to regional and to local levels. The possibility of access to money from the National Foundation for Sports and Arts and the National Lottery should be explored.

If the ACGB and DFE fund the NCDAE and its constituent networking system, this could help to raise the profile of dance artists in education practice. In turn this might encourage regional and local agencies to find matching funding, and provide the impetus for schools to join together in a consortium.

13.32 Professional Recommendation Areas E-H.

E  Professional

All recommendations in this area relate to professional expertise and thus to how dance artists and dance educators could be prepared to become proficient planners and participants in projects. While disputes generally centre on the teaching ability of dance artists, or on the dance knowledge/experience of the dance educator, at present the concept of accountability is hardly addressed.

Recommendation E.

E 1 The ACGB and the DFE, through the NCDAE, should promote the provision of training opportunities for dance artists in education practice. Three tiers of training are recommended:
E 1.1 "beginner" competence courses during initial training leading to an NCVQ qualification for dance artists or as a module in initial teacher training courses.

E 1.2 a Diploma in Dance Artists in Education, which is open to dance artists, dance educators and company education officers working in the field.

E 1.3 courses organised by LEA advisers in line with recommendation H 1.1.

The radical proposal that training must become, in the long term, a pre-requisite for dance artists in education practice is highly provocative. While the concept of training must be accepted in principle additional financial pressures would be incurred by the ACGB, the DFE and training providers within both the artistic and education worlds. However, it is crucial that these bodies find an appropriate level of funding, and accept that it is financially expedient to ensure that resources are used more effectively and qualitatively than they are at present.

As time and funding implications will delay those recommendations of a more controversial nature they are placed here in order of priority.

The following plan of action is recommended:

1. the ACGB and the DFE issue a statement which clearly identifies the crucial importance of training for those from the artistic and educational worlds who wish to involve themselves in dance artists in education practice.

2. LEA advisers, or their equivalent, and RAB officers plan and implement in-service work at a local level in line with recommendations made in H 1.1.

3. a) Higher education contexts incorporate modules of study focused on dance artists in education practice for trainee artists and educators.
b) The DFE and the ACGB invite higher education institutions to design and run a "Diploma in Dance Artists in Education" for artists and educators already experienced in the field.

F Artists and Educators — Roles and Responsibilities.

Recommendations in this area focus on the roles that dance artists and educators are expected to undertake in projects and the responsibilities these engender. Arguments in Chapter 10 conclude that the territories in which dance artists and dance educators operate, together with their expertise, determines the roles assumed. The proposal for new project frameworks in Chapter 11 anticipates a redefinition of current roles to those of a primary and secondary nature based on either choreography, or performance or appreciation. This should clarify the main functions expected of dance artists within a particular project.

Recommendation F.

F 1 Dance artists and dance educators should reappraise the various roles and responsibilities that operate for both parties at project level and explore new collaborative ways of working which utilise their particular expertise.

Dance artists are more likely to adopt reciprocal and/or complementary roles when the ACGB accepts the principles on which new project frameworks are founded and encourages dance artists to plan and to proceed on this co-operative base. Similarly, education institutions are more likely to give priority to the role of project co-
ordinator during the pre, implementation and post-project periods when the new meeting strategies referred to in 10.3 are implemented.

G  Role of Regional Arts Boards.

Proposals within this area focus on the part played by the RABs in the initiation and support of dance artists in education projects so that they might take on increased responsibility for this area of work. While the recommendations are contrary to present practice they would enable RABs to improve the quality of their contribution to the wider debate and to specific project design.

Recommendation G.

G 1  The composition of RAB officers and their remit should be reviewed and RABs encouraged to appoint dance specific officers who could promote the growth of qualitative dance artists in education practice within their geographical area.

G 1.1  RABs should consider appointing consultants from the dance education world to inform officers of national developments and to brief them on the educational needs within the region.

While these recommendations are likely to have financial implications for RABs these must be considered in relation to the concept of "Partnerships" advocated within the National Curriculum. Liaison with specialist dance educators could also enhance the contribution of RAB officers. In particular, dialogue about future projects could take place from an informed base, and with concern for both artistic and educational needs. This might enable RAB officers to seek more appropriate levels of funding than presently occurs for the development of good dance artists in education practice.
Although the future of the LEA advisory service is questionable the recommendations within this area centre on the role of the PE/Dance adviser or their alternative replacements. While debate in 10.3 highlights the crucial need for advisers to take on more responsibility for projects, this is only likely to happen when they take advantage of in-service developments. This is crucial if they are to adapt the NCDAE networking system to local level, to engage more fully in the wider debate, and to curtail the use of the dance artist as a replacement adviser.

**Recommendation H.**

**H** LEA advisers should review their present practice in line with the new National Policy recommendation, C, actively participate in the networking process outlined in C 1.5, and take on added responsibility for the development of dance artists in education projects within their given area.

**H 1.1** LEA advisers should work with the RAB and other agencies (such as the Sports Council) to ensure that local and regional financial resources are used effectively. Collaboration between the LEA adviser and the RAB dance officer could result in the development of a five year rolling programme of in-service courses for dance educators within the region. (Possible strategies for different types of training are outlined in 10.3.)

The above recommendations could encourage advisers to be more pro-active in dance artists in education projects. Collaboration with other local agencies could only be to the advantage of the growth of dance in the area. The provision of regional or local in-service courses at different levels (see 10.3) might provide a logical pathway which teachers could move through to gain further understanding and experience of dance artists in education practice. As discussed in 10.3
the specialist dance educator could be used as an interpreter of professional practice and as the facilitator of curriculum development.

13.33 Project Specific Recommendation Areas I-K.

Recommendations I-K focus on what actually takes place during the three phases of a project (pre-planning, the project itself and post project) and allow for the resolution of wider issues debated throughout this thesis. All three recommendations are based on the fundamental foundations outlined at the beginning of this Chapter and reiterated in recommendations A—H. These provide the necessary concepts and frameworks on which all future dance artists in education projects should be based. The following recommendations are intended to clarify precisely how common principles and policies might be addressed in specific projects.

I Contexts.

Recommendations A--D pave the way for new policies to inform future dance artists in education practice. Proposals for training in E-H provide the knowledge base and skills which could underpin what actually takes place together with the support expected from RAB and LEA personnel. These ought to result in projects which are planned and carried through more effectively than hitherto. However, how far projects are successful is also determined by the contexts in which they take place.

Recommendation I.

I The NCDAE should publish guidelines which clarify that in general long term projects are only likely be placed and funded in education contexts in which there is a
commitment to dance artists in education programmes and a dance as art tradition.

1.1 The DFE should clarify, through HMI and LEA advisers (or their equivalents), the responsibility that headteachers (or their counterparts) and the project co-ordinator bear for ensuring that the education component of a contract is honoured.

Commitment to dance artists in education programmes is a vital prerequisite to the placement of projects. The new dimension added by the National Curriculum together with the implementation of contracts places more responsibility on headteachers and dance educators than hitherto. Therefore, one of the conditions of a project could be that a headteacher (or equivalent) and experienced dance educator are able to guarantee support from the education context. A stress also needs to be placed on the project co-ordinator keeping the headteacher (or equivalent) fully informed of what takes place throughout the planning, monitoring and evaluation stages of any project. This might enable the dance educator to articulate and to resolve the local concerns which arise in relation to National Policy.

The above recommendations will obviously restrict the contexts in which long term projects take place. However, RAB officers and LEA advisers could, through the use of consultants (see recommendations C 1.2 and C 1.5), support others who show an interest in developing a commitment to dance artists in education programmes.

J Content.

The recommendations made in this area are to do with what is actually taught in dance artists in education projects. This,
surprisingly, is shown in this thesis to be an area of contention. Many of the "territorial disputes" between dance artists and dance educators emerge because of the material focused on. Yet such debate could become null and void when what is brought by the dance artist, i.e. the repertoire, is balanced with the education expertise of the dance educator.

Recommendations in the area of content rest particularly on one of the fundamental premises articulated at the beginning of this chapter, i.e. that dance artists in education projects must be based in contexts which practice the dance as art model. Hence, it is axiomatic that choice of content must stem from choreography, or performance, or appreciation and their inter-relationship. In particular, the National Curriculum makes it crucial that decisions about content are appropriate for the needs of young people (as laid down in KSs 1-4, or examination syllabi or higher education programmes) and thus relevant to the overall dance programme of a specific context. Indeed, the maturing of future work is likely to be partially dependent on content being precisely defined in relation to the conceptual basis of dance and on this being separated from pedagogy. Moreover, acceptance that content could derive from repertoire provides the potential for curriculum development.

**Recommendation J.**

J. The NCDAE should encourage dance artists and dance educators to define content in choreographic, or performance or appreciation terms, and where possible to place an emphasis on the use of repertoire as a bases for all project activities.

J 1.1 The NCDAE should provide clear guidelines which state that dance educators should build, as an integral feature of curriculum development, dance
artists in education programmes into the overall dance programme in an education context.

The acceptance of the premise that dance artists in education programmes must be located in the dance as art model has implications for the content focused on and how this is taught. It, too, has repercussions for the design of projects. In particular, project planning should ensure that more young people than previously are involved in an in-depth experience, while projects should take a choreographic, or performance, or appreciation focus. What takes place could be further enhanced if repertoire became the focal point for all project activities. Equally crucial, steps need to be taken to ensure that appreciation aspects are articulated clearly in all projects.

The above recommendations are integrated into the new models proposed in Chapter 11. While these each take a different focus they should all engage young people in an experience which increases their knowledge of dance and widens their horizons. Moreover, while each new project focuses on a particular aspect the distinctive yet interrelated nature of technique/interpretation, choreography and appreciation is respected.

K New Project Frameworks.

This recommendation is based on the fundamental foundations articulated in Chapter 11, and in particular on the premise that the tri-partite dance as art model is the key stone on which the new project frameworks are based. "New" is used deliberately to distinguish these models from the non-coherent frameworks evident in Chapter 7. The guiding principle underlying each new model is that choreography or performance or appreciation could become the main
focal point for project design with the other two in a subsidiary interdependent role. Quite deliberately the anticipated projects are capable also of adaptation by a range of companies and to a variety of local contexts.

The proposed integrated approach for the new models is built on the premise that project work is an essential feature of curriculum development. Hence, it is vital that project designers comply with the demands of specific KSs within the National Curriculum and the overall dance programme of a school (or further, or higher education) context. In the long term, the recommended frameworks might become an established feature of a rolling programme of dance artists in education projects as outlined in 10.2. This would give added importance to dance artists in education programmes.

**Recommendation K.**

K New project frameworks should cohere around one central activity and lead to a presentation of work at the conclusion of a project. This would allow aspects of choreography, performance and appreciation to contribute towards a coherent dance experience.

Since this recommendation departs radically from current practice a strategy for implementation must be devised. First, the ACGB and the DFE together with the NCDAE should fund, plan, carry out, monitor, evaluate and publish reports on a number of pilot projects which take as their main focus either choreography, or performance or appreciation. Findings then need to be disseminated through the NCDAE to the rolling programme of dance conferences and through the LEA advisers to local in-service courses. Second, project designers are required to take a new approach to technique which emphasises the reciprocal demands of physical skill with choreographic and
performance features. Third, dance artists and dance educators should redefine their strengths and explore new collaborative ways of working which utilise their expertise. Fourth, the NCDAE must establish new criteria for funding.

13.4 Summary.

The above recommendations, both separately and as a body, are intended to be facilitators for the future development of dance artists in education practice. They are proposed in the hope that they might help to remedy current concerns. While each one addresses issues which arise throughout the thesis collectively they are intended to provide an impetus for new practice. Each recommendation, together with sub-recommendations could form an early agenda for the ACGB and the DFE. While the detail provided might prove helpful, the recommendations are also flexible enough to allow the appropriate bodies to place their own interpretation on them. However, overall, whether the recommendations are followed as presented here, or adapted by the ACGB and the DFE, the support of both these bodies is vital to their success. It is anticipated that if the ACGB and the DFE collaborate and support these recommendations in principle, they could be in place by the late 1990s.
Conclusion.

The study has investigated the nature of the dance artists in education movement and clarified current policy and practice. Observations throughout have gone some way towards informing future developments in the area, and have led progressively to recommendations which represent the conclusion. Overall, it has been anticipated that the study could enrich future "Partnerships" between the artistic and educational worlds.

The in-depth insight that the case study gave into dance artists in education practice has been added to and substantiated from 1985 by other project experiences and literature in the area. This was done to update the research and to see how the ideas from the residency were followed through and interpreted in more recent practice. In particular, the implementation of the Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992) document has had a significant effect on the debate in Part 4 of the thesis.

Overview of the research.

The thesis has clarified and extended knowledge in the research topic in the following ways. Part 1 revealed how the development of dance in education (Chapter 1) affected the growing relationship with dance in the theatre (Chapter 2). In particular, it disclosed that the artistic world has dominated the dance artists in education movement since the initiation of the ACGB's pilot projects in 1980 (Chapter 2). Debate also clarified that projects have remained, in general, isolated ventures. Thus issues which recurred at a micro level have not been
resolved. These require confronting on a macro level now that "Partnerships" in dance are written into the Physical Education in the National Curriculum (DES, 1992, p H 1) document.

In Part 2, an overview of EDT and CSHM established the background from which both partners approached the residency, including their previous experience in dance artists in education projects (see Chapter 3). Discussion of the case-study explained what took place during the different phases of the residency and provided the context from which the discussion of results stemmed (see Chapter 4). Reflections on the research methodology revealed a number of significant issues. First, the researcher's background allowed critical inside knowledge of, and a certain degree of familiarity with, the research area. This was instrumental in gaining access to, and cooperation from, the company in the case study phase. Second, the multi-layered approach taken to the field work yielded valuable information. Most marked was the facility that video recordings, observation records and interviews provided for in-depth scrutiny of the case study. In particular, the methodologies employed facilitated constant access, comparison, and cross-referencing of material after the event. Subsequently, when observations were drawn together, the identified issues went beyond any research to date in dance artists in education practice.

Parts 1 and 2 together provided the foundation for the discussion of topics which recurred throughout the dance artists in education movement. This enabled seemingly disparate concerns to be consolidated into a more coherent framework than hitherto. Thus, in Part 3 the data from the field work informed and extended investigation of the topics embedded in Part 1. From the outset it was anticipated that in-depth analysis of a single case-study could promote an understanding of the patterns which emerged in literature and other situations. Discussion in Chapter 6 exposed that the gap
between the artistic and educational worlds became manifest in the planning, implementation and post-project phases. In how these were monitored and evaluated (6.2), and in the structures followed (6.3). Significantly, the nature of content (6.4, 6.5) was separated from the recurring technique (6.6) and teaching (6.7) debates. Examination of the roles of dance artists, dance educators and students highlighted the need for these to be re-addressed.

Chapters 7, 8 and 9 explored the above issues in more depth in relation to the interface that has taken place between dance artists and dance educators. Exploration of topics in Chapter 7 opened up some of the underlying causes which have prevented the maturation of the dance artists in education movement (7.2), and exposed the need for a more formalised structure for projects (7.3-7.9). Chapter 8 affirmed the importance of the contexts in which projects have taken place (8.2), stressed the crucial need for participants to have more in-depth contact with dance artists (8.3), and revealed tensions related to curriculum content (8.4-8.6). Chapter 9, concluded that the roles assumed by dance artists, dance educators and participants needed to be rethought. Overall, discussion in Part 3 enabled a framework to emerge on which future considerations could be built.

In Part 4 a policy for dance artists in education practice was shaped from the macro to the micro level (Chapter 10). Interpretations of principles for good practice were interwoven with a concern for long-term curriculum development and, therefore, with dance in the National Curriculum (10.4-10.7).

In Chapter 11, a theoretical foundation for projects based on dance as art (11.3-11.6) was applied to an extension of the in-depth experience (11.7). New models, set within the parameters of choreography, performance and appreciation were proposed (11.8). These placed an emphasis on the value of equal responsibility in "Partnerships" of
dance artists and dance educators. While the proposed models were based on dance artists working in modern dance, they could be adapted to a range of genres and to local circumstances.

The training of dance artists and dance educators is crucial to future work in this area. The need for in-service training for dance educators already in the field was discussed in Chapter 12. This was followed by an innovative proposal which suggested a new NVQ course based on dance artists in education practice, designed for dance artists during their initial training. This chapter also presented an original course outline for a "Diploma for Dance Artists in Education Practice"; such a course could function either as post-graduate study for experienced dance educators and dance artists, or as a module in undergraduate courses.

Finally, policy, professional and project-specific recommendations to guide future "Partnerships" were presented in Chapter 13, ranging from the general to the more specific "grass roots" level. It was anticipated that these could enhance dance artists in education practice as envisaged within "Partnerships" in the National Curriculum.

For the future ...

It has been an explicit aspiration of the author that the project findings would be used to contribute to wider debate and thereby inform policy and decision-making. Therefore, it is hoped especially that the recommendations presented in Chapter 13 will stimulate debate and action from the ACGB and DFE.

The present climate of accountability in education, together with LMS, the possible demise of the LEA service, and the redefinition of roles for HMI could result in uncertainty about the direction of the dance
artists in education movement. The author recommends, therefore, that to safeguard the future of the movement the two main policy-making agencies, the DFE and the ACGB, take joint action to ensure that dance artists in education practice complements and extends dance within the National Curriculum. Towards this aim, recommendations from this research could have particular value; in particular, the setting up of the NCDAE (recommendation C 1.1) and the provision of training (recommendation E 1.1 and 1.2).

Other outcomes from the study include the contribution the findings might make to dance research. In particular, the strategy of combining video-recordings, techniques and tools developed for recording observations, and interview techniques (Chapter 5) could be applied to other research situations. The combined method provided a wealth of accessible material, and made constant cross-referencing possible. Significantly, it also brought to light, for example, the relationship between teaching-content and methodology, in ways which might not otherwise have been revealed.

The study could also serve as a springboard for further research by the author. Not all the data generated in the fieldwork phase has been cited or drawn on, and many more issues have been raised than could be considered within the parameters of this thesis. There is further data on technique and repertoire which could contribute to further work towards greater understanding of these aspects of dance.

The author hopes that the focus here on repertoire could lead other researchers into further work on appreciation of live performance and video-recorded masterworks as a means of resource-based teaching. It is also hoped that the study will encourage others into a more specific examination of the contribution that dance artists might make to specific KSs.
If recommendations presented in this study were to be acted upon, then a crucial area for future research would lie in monitoring and evaluating the policy, planning and interpretation of projects which derive from their implementation.

Implementation of the recommendations would lead to the understanding of dance artists in education practice becoming more sophisticated. Policy-makers would be better informed than hitherto, dance artists and dance educators could enter projects from a sound knowledge-base, and the relationship between the artistic and educational worlds would mature.
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INTERVIEWS.

1. Interviews with dance artists, tutors and students, conducted as part of the EDT/CSHM residency.

   A-J  with EDT dance artists: interviews conducted during and after the case study, February 1985 and April 1985.

   D 1-4 with CSHM tutors: interviews conducted during and after case study, February and March 1985.

   S 1-14 with CSHM students: interviews conducted during the residency, February 1985.

2. Interviews with dance educators and animateur.

   Carlisle, A. Head of Dance, Lewes Tertiary College.

   Childs, L. Free lance dance animateur.


APPENDIX 1:

RESIDENCY TIMETABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY/SUNDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company Class 9.00 - 10.00 JF or H</td>
<td>Company Class 9.00 - 10.30 JF/H</td>
<td>Core Groups 9.00 - 11.00 JF/H</td>
<td>Year 3 8.45 - 10.45 JF</td>
<td>Year 1 11.00 - 1.00 JF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 + Ex. Arts 11.00 - 12.15</td>
<td>Lecture Dem. 11.00 - 12.30 JF</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A/2D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1C/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Performance Group 11.05 - 12.45 JF</td>
<td>1A1 11.05 - 1.05</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>Annelies</td>
<td>Dance 'A'1 + 3A + 3B</td>
<td>3A/6</td>
<td>JF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Arts Tam Ward Hall</td>
<td>Ex. Arts 9.30 - 11.00 JF</td>
<td>'A'1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1B/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 - 12.45 JF</td>
<td>'A'2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1C/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'A'2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1D/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'B'</td>
<td></td>
<td>1E/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'B'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2A/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 3, 4 + Ex.Art 2.00 - 4.00/4.30</td>
<td>Years 1, 2 + Ex. Arts Lecture Dem. JF</td>
<td>Company Class + Core Group 'A' 1.30 - 3.30</td>
<td>Years 2, 3, 4'B'</td>
<td>2 Teachers 1.00 - 4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A+4A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.15 - 3.30 JF/H</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B+4B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C+4C</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>'B'</td>
<td></td>
<td>2B/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D+4D</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1C/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Arts Pr.</td>
<td>Ex. Arts</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1D/6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Groups 4.30/5.00 - 6.00</td>
<td>Discussion 3.30 Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students) 2</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A'</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Older Sec. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B'</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Do - Supper&quot; Informal Hillbrow</td>
<td>Open Rehearsal 3.30 - 5.30 JF</td>
<td>Company Class</td>
<td>Company + Core gp. 'A'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30/8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ ex. Arts</td>
<td>+ Ex. Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.30/5.00 - 6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday P.M.: Technical people in JF.**
### Schedule

#### Monday
- **Core Groups**
  - 'A' 6.00 - 8.00
  - 'B' 6.00 - 7.30
- **Open Technique**
  - 6.00 - 7.30

#### Tuesday
- **Core Groups**
  - 'A' 7.00 - 9.00
  - 'B' 7.00 - 8.30
- **In-Service Course**
  - 6.30 - 8.30
- **Primary**
  - Sec.

#### Wednesday
- **Core Groups**
  - 'A' 6.00 - 8.00
  - 'B' 6.00 - 7.30
- **Open Technique**
  - 7.30 - 9.00
- **Cipher - Palmer**
  - 6.30 - 8.30

#### Thursday
- **Core Groups**
  - 'A' 6.00 - 8.00
  - 'B' 6.00 - 7.30

#### Friday
- **1A** 9.00 - 10.50
- **1B** 11.00 - 12.00

#### Saturday/Sunday
- **Core Groups**
  - 'A' 6.00 - 8.00
  - 'B' 6.00 - 7.30
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY/SUNDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company Class</strong>&lt;br&gt;9.30 - 11.00 JF&lt;br&gt;Movement Research&lt;br&gt;11.00 - 4.30 JF</td>
<td><strong>Company Class</strong>&lt;br&gt;9.30 - 11.00 JF&lt;br&gt;Movement Research&lt;br&gt;11.00 - 4.30 JF</td>
<td><strong>Company Class</strong>&lt;br&gt;9.30 - 11.00 JF&lt;br&gt;Movement Research&lt;br&gt;11.00 - 4.30 JF&lt;br&gt;Performance Group&lt;br&gt;11.05 - 1.00 H</td>
<td><strong>Company Class</strong>&lt;br&gt;9.30 - 11.00 JF&lt;br&gt;Movement Research&lt;br&gt;11.00 - 4.30 JF&lt;br&gt;Performance Group&lt;br&gt;11.05 - 1.00 H</td>
<td><strong>1G</strong>&lt;br&gt;9.50 - 10.50&lt;br&gt;<strong>1A</strong>&lt;br&gt;11.00 - 12.00 H</td>
<td><strong>Saturday Teachers and possibly older Sec. Pupils</strong>&lt;br&gt;2 Teachers&lt;br&gt;10.30 - 12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Movement Research</strong>&lt;br&gt;JF</td>
<td><strong>Movement Research</strong>&lt;br&gt;JF</td>
<td><strong>Open Technique</strong>&lt;br&gt;2.00 - 3.30&lt;br&gt;<strong>Core Group 'A'</strong>&lt;br&gt;4.30 - 6.30 H</td>
<td><strong>Movement Research</strong>&lt;br&gt;JF</td>
<td><strong>Company Class</strong>&lt;br&gt;1.00&lt;br&gt;Movement Research&lt;br&gt;Pr.</td>
<td><strong>1.00 - 4.30</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;'A' 6.00 - 8.00 JF&lt;br&gt;'B' 6.00 - 7.30 H&lt;br&gt;Open Technique&lt;br&gt;6.00 - 7.30 M</td>
<td><strong>Core Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;'A' 7.00 - 9.00&lt;br&gt;'B' 7.00 - 8.30&lt;br&gt;Cecilia&lt;br&gt;In-Service Course&lt;br&gt;6.30 - 8.30&lt;br&gt;Supper&lt;br&gt;Primary&lt;br&gt;Sec.</td>
<td><strong>Core Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;'A' 6.00 - 8.00&lt;br&gt;Edgar&lt;br&gt;M&lt;br&gt;'B' 6.00 - 7.30&lt;br&gt;H</td>
<td><strong>Core Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;'A' 6.00 - 8.00&lt;br&gt;'B' 6.00 - 7.30&lt;br&gt;Open Technique&lt;br&gt;7.30 - 9.00&lt;br&gt;Cipher - Farmer&lt;br&gt;6.30 - 8.30</td>
<td><strong>Core Groups</strong>&lt;br&gt;'A' 6.00 - 8.00&lt;br&gt;'B' 6.00 - 7.30&lt;br&gt;H</td>
<td><strong>426</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONDAY</td>
<td>TUESDAY</td>
<td>WEDNESDAY</td>
<td>THURSDAY</td>
<td>FRIDAY</td>
<td>SATURDAY/SUNDAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 Meeting Day</td>
<td>Year 1 Meeting Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3 10.45 - 10.50</td>
<td>1A 9.50 - 10.50</td>
<td>Sharing 1.00 - 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 - 1.00</td>
<td>11.00 - 1.00</td>
<td>11.05 - 12.05</td>
<td>11.05 - 1.05</td>
<td>1B 2.20 - 3.20</td>
<td>Year 1.2.3.4. Forum, Discussion. Possible sharing of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Class and Core Groups</td>
<td>Company Class and Core Groups</td>
<td>Company Class and Core Groups</td>
<td>Dance 'A'2 + 'C3'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video. Talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Edgar H</td>
<td>C JF</td>
<td>JF/H</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 - 5.00</td>
<td>1.30 - 7.00</td>
<td>5.00 - 4.30</td>
<td>Notes/Rehearsals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Technical Rehearsal Company + Core Groups</td>
<td>Dress Rehearsal Company + Core Groups</td>
<td>Technical Rehearsal Company + Core Groups + Ex-Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd years only available from 5.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 3rd years to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Work</td>
<td>Education Options</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 - 9.50</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td>JF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Movement Research</td>
<td>Party in Poly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Company Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Core Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Company pieces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 2:

QUESTIONNAIRE EXAMPLES
DANCE ARTISTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION RESIDENCY

EXTEMPORARY DANCE THEATRE AND CHELSEA SCHOOL OF HUMAN MOVEMENT, BRIGHTON POLYTECHNIC

QUESTIONNAIRE 1

Please place a tick in the appropriate boxes and/or answer questions in the given space.

Your answers are confidential.

If you have any additional comments on the forthcoming residency, please write them at the end of the questionnaire.

1. Have you heard of Extemporaneous Dance Theatre prior to the beginning of this term?
   - Yes
   - No

1.1 If yes, in what context have you heard of them?

____________________________________________________________________

2. Have you seen Extemporaneous Dance Theatre perform?
   - Yes
   - No

2.1 How often have you seen the company perform?
   - 1 - 3
   - More than 3
   - If more than 3, state how many times you have seen them perform.

2.2 How many of these were college arranged visits?
   - Yes
   - No

2.3 Have you seen the company perform other than on a college arranged visit?
   - Yes
   - No

2.4 If you have seen them dance on other occasions, where did you see them dance?

____________________________________________________________________

2.5 Did you go to see them dance:
   - with school
   - with parents
   - as part of a scheme
   - any other way

____________________________________________________________________
1. If you can, fill in the names of the following:

1.1 The Artistic Director of Extempory Dance Theatre

1.2 The Manager of Extempory Dance Theatre

1.3 Can you fill in the names of any members of the company who are going to be in residence?

1.4 Any dancer/teacher who specifically does Educational Liaison/teaching work for the company

4. Are you aware that any pre-planning for the residency has taken place?

4.1 Do you know of any members of staff who are to be involved in the residency?

4.2 If yes, state name and roles

5. The residency will involve many dance activities and it may not be possible for all students to participate in all activities. Tick those activities you would most like to be involved in:

- observing dance classes
- participating in technical work
- participating in creative work
- participating in repertory work
- selective watching of video tapes
- selective watching of dance artists at work
- discussions with artists
- observation of lecture demonstrations
- observation of company performances
- observation of movement research
- others ... please state:


6. Using a 5-point scale where 5 indicates great agreement and 1 indicates great disagreement, indicate the role(s) you consider to be important for the dance artists in this residency situation
   a) as performer
   b) a choreographer
   c) a teacher
   d) any other ... please state:

7. Do you think that the residency will have implications for the dance curriculum as a whole in C.S.E.H.?

   Yes No

7.1 Do you think that the residency will have other outcomes which might be important to you at this stage as B.Ed. students training to teach dance within a P.E. context?

   Yes No

7.2 If yes, state what you think these outcomes might be ...

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

7.3 What impact do you think that the residency will have on you as an individual irrespective of your training? Please state:

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

8. Have you seen any other dance companies perform?

   Yes No

[see over]
4.

8.1 If yes, name the companies seen


Additional comments:

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Please hand in to the C.S.M.H. School Office by 3 p.m. on Friday 25th January 1985.
**BRIGHTON POLYTECHNIC**

**CHELSEA SCHOOL OF HUMAN MOVEMENT**

**Dance Artists in Higher Education Residency**

Extemary Dance Theatre and Chelsea School of Human Movement, Brighton Poly.

**QUESTIONNAIRE 2**

Please place a tick in the appropriate boxes and/or answer questions in the given space.

Your answers are confidential.

If you have any additional comments on the residency, please write them at the end of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 The residency is making dance more widely available to B.Ed. students at C.S.H.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 The residency is generating interest in dance amongst B.Ed. students at C.S.H.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 The residency is not generating new ideas in dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 One of the aims of the residency is to improve dance knowledge generally in C.S.H.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 The residency is having no effect on my understanding and knowledge of dance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 The residency is not benefiting students taking part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 The residency is benefiting the dance artists taking part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 The residency is not benefiting dance tutors at C.S.H.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 The residency is equally benefiting students, dance tutors and dance artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 The residency is facilitating a constructive exchange of ideas between: students and dance artists; dance tutors and dance artists; students, dance tutors &amp; dance artists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

3.1 Dance artists and dance tutors are in agreement concerning methods of teaching

3.2 Dance artists are not adapting their way of teaching to suit the needs of the student groups that you have worked with.

Please state student groups that you have worked with and name the dance artists that have taught these groups.

3.3 Dance artists and dance tutors are in agreement concerning the choice of content/dance material that the dance artists are using with students during the residency

3.4 Dance artists have not adapted the dance material to suit the needs of the student groups that I have worked with

4. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

4.1 The dance artist is not being used predominantly as a teacher

4.2 The dance artist is not being used predominantly as an artist

4.3 The dance artist is being used predominantly as a resource

5. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

5.1 The residency could influence dance curriculum planning in C.S.H.M.

5.2 The residency will not influence what you teach in schools

5.3 The residency could lead to curriculum innovation in dance in schools
1. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

1.1 Dance artists and dance tutors are in agreement concerning methods of teaching

1.2 Dance artists are not adapting their way of teaching to suit the needs of the student groups that you have worked with.
   Please state student groups that you have worked with and name the dance artists that have taught these groups.

1.3 Dance artists and dance tutors are in agreement concerning the choice of content/dance material that the dance artists are using with students during the residency

1.4 Dance artists have not adapted the dance material to suit the needs of the student groups that I have worked with

2. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

2.1 The dance artist is not being used predominantly as a teacher

2.2 The dance artist is not being used predominantly as an artist

2.3 The dance artist is being used predominantly as a resource

3. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements.

3.1 The residency could influence dance curriculum planning in C.S.H.M.

3.2 The residency will not influence what you teach in schools

3.3 The residency could lead to curriculum innovation in dance in schools
6. **Tick the most appropriate box for the following questions.**

6.1 **The level of planning for the residency was:**
   - (a) not enough
   - (b) adequate
   - (c) too carefully planned
   - (d) too rigid to allow it to develop en route

6.2 **Discussion with students and dance tutors about the residency has been:**
   - (a) too much
   - (b) not enough
   - (c) adequate

6.3 **A residency of 4 weeks is:**
   - (a) an appropriate length in relation to the degree course
   - (b) too long in relation to the degree course
   - (c) too short in relation to the degree course

If you think that the four week period is either too long or too short, please give your ideal length:

__________

Please indicate any other comments on the residency that might be useful for future planning: (continue overleaf if necessary)

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please hand into C.S.H.M. Office by 10.00 a.m. on 4 February, 1985.


[Signature]

Anne Cole
BRIGHTON POLYTECHNIC
CHELSEA SCHOOL OF HUMAN MOVEMENT

Dance Artists in Higher Education Residency

Contemporary Dance Theatre and Chelsea School of Human Movement,
Brighton Polytechnic

Questionnaire 3

Please place a tick in the appropriate boxes and/or answer questions in
the given space.

Your answers are confidential.

If you have any additional comments on the residency, please write them at
the end of the questionnaire.

PREPARATION FOR THE RESIDENCY

1. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

1.1 Previous experience in residency work by the company was not necessary.

1.2 Prior to the residency dance tutors prepared students for the work of the dance artists.

1.3 Prior to the residency dance artists were unaware of the dance work already being undertaken in C.S.H.M.

2. To what extent do you agree/disagree that the pattern of dialogue and familiarisation that took place between dance artists and dance tutors led to a residency designed to suit:

2.1 The needs of the B.Ed. students concerned.

Please state year and group

Please state if in core group A or B

2.2 The needs of dance tutors at C.S.H.M.
**RESIDENCY ACTIVITIES**

1. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

| 3.1 Continuity is not important between the work undertaken in a residency by a dance artist and the dance artist's own life & work as a dancer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.2 The residency made it possible for B.Ed. students to share something of the lifestyles and demands of being a professional dancer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.3 It was important that there was continuity between phases of a dance residency |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.4 The company were not clear about the range of dance activities that they could offer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.5 The work of the dance artists and the company was consistent in all activities |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.6 The kind of technique experienced in class was not seen as part of the company's preparation for performance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 3.7 It was essential that dancers from the company demonstrated in classes taught by dance artists |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

**REPERTORY**

4. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

| 4.1 It was essential that students saw a dance choreographed by one of the dancers performed by the company |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 4.2 The company lecture demonstration did not suggest ways of selecting material for workshops led by dance artists in college |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 4.3 It was important that the company lecture demonstration examined choreographic ideas which were related to the Extemporary Dance Theatre performance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 4.4 It was not important that the company repertory was used as a basis for selecting dance material used by dance artists with students in workshops in college |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

| 4.5 Workshops taken by dance artists related to performances |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No Opinion | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
CONSIDERATIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY

5. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

5.1 Dance artists were convinced of their contribution to the residency

5.2 Dance tutors were not convinced of the value of the dance artists' contribution to the residency

5.3 Acceptance of residency work by dance artists carries with it a responsibility to reconsider:

- methods of working
- teaching methods used
- dance material taught to students
- ways of presenting dance material
- attitudes to dance

5.4 Acceptance of residency work by dance tutors does not carry with it a responsibility to reconsider:

- methods of working
- teaching methods used
- dance material taught to students
- ways of presenting dance material
- attitudes to dance

CURRICULUM IMPLICATIONS

6. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

6.1 The dance artists see the residency as having curriculum implications for dance at C.S.H.M.

6.2 The residency will not influence established dance provision at C.S.H.M.

6.3 The residency will have an impact on the "hidden curriculum" at C.S.H.M.

6.4 The dance artists do not see the residency influencing the dance curriculum in schools
### OVERVIEW OF RESIDENCY

7. Listed below are some positive and negative statements which may or may not be applicable to the residency. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Overall the residency was good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 It was not a worthwhile residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3 Generally the residency was not well organised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Most students seemed uninterested in the residency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 The residency held my interest at times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 The residency held my interest throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7 Dance artists did not seem to be interested in helping students as individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.8 Dance artists did not seem to be interested in helping dance tutors as individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.9 Dance artists were interested in the dance classes students normally have at C.S.H.M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.10 Dance artists did not encourage the development of new viewpoints and appreciation of dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.11 Dance tutors did not seem interested in the work students were doing with dance artists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.12 The pace of the residency classes/workshops was too slow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13 The pace of the residency classes/workshops was too fast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.14 The way in which classes/workshops were taught did not result in good student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.15 The dance material taught in the residency was easy to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.16 The dance residency did not increase my general knowledge of dance technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.17 The residency increased my general knowledge of compositional/choreographic skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18 Technical work in the residency did not introduce material that would be applicable for technical work in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.19 Workshop sessions introduced ideas that I could use for dance composition in schools

7.20 Workshop sessions introduced dance content that I could use in schools

7.21 Lecture demonstrations did not introduce ideas that could be used for dance composition in schools

7.22 Other sessions introduced dance material that could be used for dance in schools. If you agree give details:

7.23 I found the various teaching methods used by dance artists useful to use as a potential teacher

If you agree, give details:

7.24 During the residency there was insufficient use of dance artists

EVALUATION

8. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the following statements:

8.1 Ongoing evaluation throughout the residency was:

- too much
- sufficient
- insufficient

8.2 The most useful form of evaluation for this residency was informal discussion with:

- dance tutors
- students
- dance artists
8.3 The least useful form of evaluation for this residency was formal discussion with:

- dance tutors
- students
- dance artists

8.4 It was necessary to evaluate the residency by the administration of questionnaires to:

- B.Ed. students
- dance artists
- dance tutors

8.5 It was not necessary to evaluate the residency by in-depth recorded interviews with:

- B.Ed. students
- dance artists
- dance tutors

9. Indicate your views in terms of agree/disagree on the dance activities which were important to you during the residency.

1. Preparation and training directed by dance artists
2. Observation of company performances
3. Observation of lecture demonstrations
4. Participating in company activities
5. The making of a new dance piece by a choreographer and a group of students
6. Selective watching of dance artists at work
7. Performing
8. Any other - please state

10. Please tick the most appropriate box for the following statements:

10.1 The central experience of the residency for me was:

- the performance
- the lecture demonstration
11.8 Put the 3 most important of the above in a rank order where 3 is the most important and 1 the least important:

(3) ___________
(2) ___________
(1) ___________

12. Indicate with a tick:

12.1 What you perceived to be the dance artists dominant role in the residency:

catalyst
innovator
performer
choreographer
teacher
Any other ... please state: __________________________

12.2 Whether you perceived that dance artists found this way of working:

exacting
a strain
pressured

12.3 Whether contact with dance artists was at a

formal level
informal level
Of these, state which was the most important for you.

12.4 Whether the workload for you during the residency has been:

excessive
just right
too light
Additional comments

This residency

Any future residency at C.S.H.M.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Please hand in to the C.S.H.M. School Office by 3.0 p.m. on Friday, 1 March, 1985.
DATE:  
GROUP:  
DANCE ARTIST WORKING WITH GROUP:  
NO. PRESENT:  
LENGTH OF SESSION:

A. TECHNICAL WORK  

1. CONTENT  

1.1 TECHNIQUE TAUGHT:  

1.2 ADAPTATION OF TECHNIQUE TO GROUP:  

1.3 RESPONSE OF GROUP TO TECHNICAL WORK  

2. COMMUNICATION  

2.1 LANGUAGE USED:  

2.2 INTERACTION OF DANCE ARTIST WITH:  

GROUP  

INDIVIDUALS  

2.3 IMAGERY USED:
3. ARTISTRY

3.1 DEMONSTRATION

3.2 PERSONAL IMAGERY/DANCE RATIONALE

4. PACE

4.1 SENSITIVITY TO LEVEL OF GROUP TAUGHT

5. CREATIVE WORKSHOP

5. CONTENT

5.1 DANCE IDEA PRESENTED TO GROUP

5.2 CONNECTION WITH EXISTING REPERTOIRE

5.3 INTERACTION BETWEEN TECHNICAL WORK AND IDEA PRESENTED

5.4 INITIAL PRESENTATION OF DANCE IDEA/TASK

5.5 DEVELOPMENT OF GIVEN DANCE IDEAS

6. COMMUNICATION

6.1 LANGUAGE USED
6.2 INTERACTION OF DANCE ARTISTS WITH GROUPS:

INDIVIDUALS:

6.3 USE OF IMAGERY/INTERNAL RATIONALE

7. ARTISTRY

7.1 DEMONSTRATION OF GIVEN DANCE IDEAS

CONCERN FOR QUALITY

EXPRESSIVE USE OF MOVEMENT

APPROPRIATE SELECTION OF MOVEMENT IDEAS WHICH EMBODY THE DANCE IDEA/THEME PRESENTED AS THE TASK

7.2 USE OF PERSONAL IMAGERY/INTERNAL RATIONALE

7.3 CONCERN WITH ARTISTRY OF STUDENTS

CHOREOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT

PERFORMANCE
8. PACE
8.1 SENSITIVITY TO LEVEL OF GROUP TAUGHT

9. APPRECIATION OF DANCE AS AN ART FORM
9.1 VIEWING DANCE WORK
9.2 CRITICAL APPRAISAL

10. AIMS OF SESSION
10.1 MONITORS PERCEPTION
10.2 DANCE ARTISTS INTENDED AIMS

11. FULFILMENT OF AIMS
11.1 MONITORS COMMENTS
11.2 DANCE ARTISTS COMMENTS

STUDENTS COMMENTS ON SESSION
1.

P.T.O.
5.

STUDENTS COMMENTS ON SESSION (continued)

2.

3.

OVER-ALL IMPRESSION
Supplementary Tables

Artists often mistakenly believe that content and presentation are indistinguishable. Therefore, in this thesis the decision was made to separate the analysis of content from how dance artists present material in a variety of practical activities.

Analysis of the content of the residency from video-recorded and monitored records took place under the headings of technique and workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction and principles of choreography. These reveal significant elements — detailed in the exemplars given in Tables A-F — which provide the base-line from which the discussion in 5.7 is derived.

Examination of the methods employed by some artists to present material in technique and workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction and principles of choreography provides evidence of specific features.

Each type of activity was analysed indepedently and then evaluated to give an overall impression of selected exemplars — detailed in the exemplars given in Tables G-J. This aids in the justification on which the discussion in 5.7 is derived.

The twelve tables presented in this Appendix have been selected as representative examples of the main elements of observation and monitoring records taken during the 2005 residency process and analyses of material post-residency.

APPENDIX 3:

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES
Supplementary Tables

Artists often mistakenly believe that content and presentation are indistinguishable. Therefore, in this thesis the decision was made to separate the analysis of content from how dance artists present material in a variety of practical activities.

Analysis of the content of the residency from video-recorded and monitored records took place under the headings of technique and workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction and principles of choreography. These reveal significant elements — detailed in the exemplars given in Tables A–F — which provide the base-line from which the discussion in 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 stems.

Examination of the methods employed by dance artists to present material in technique and workshops based on repertoire, reconstruction and principles of choreography provides evidence of specific features.

Each type of activity was analysed independently and then tabulated to give an overall impression of selected categories — detailed in the exemplars given in Tables G–L. This data provides the foundation on which the discussion in 6.7 is based.

The twelve tables presented in this Appendix have been selected as representative examples of the many dozens of observation and monitoring records taken during the ACGB residency project and analyses of material post-residency.
As a guide, their titles are first given, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A</th>
<th>Workshops: based on repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table B</td>
<td>Workshops: reconstruction focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C</td>
<td>Workshops: principles of choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table D</td>
<td>Analysis of the range of technique taught to curriculum groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table E</td>
<td>Analysis of the range of technique taught to core groups and performance group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table F</td>
<td>Identification of the range of technique taught to curriculum, core groups and performance group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table G</td>
<td>Presentation of content to general groups: technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table H</td>
<td>Presentation of content: workshops based on repertoire and principles of choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table I</td>
<td>Use of correction: technique — general groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table J</td>
<td>Overall use of correction/feedback: workshops based on repertoire and principles of choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table K</td>
<td>Use of demonstration: technique — general groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table L</td>
<td>Use of demonstration: workshops based on repertoire and principles of choreography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Ombres Electrique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENCE TO DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Focus placed on robotic section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Ombres Electriques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENCE TO DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Locomotion and robotic sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>DA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Field Study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DANCE</strong></td>
<td>Spiked Sonata. Trio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PG</strong></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREATMENT</strong></td>
<td><em>Abstract.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STYLE</strong></td>
<td><em>Based on Katie Duck's work.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOVEMENT</strong></td>
<td><em>Steps.</em> <em>Tilt.</em> <em>Triplets.</em> <em>Sequence.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DYNAMICS</strong></td>
<td><em>Flow of dynamics.</em> <em>Clap rhythm.</em> <em>Tension/force.</em> <em>Stillness.</em> <em>Duration.</em> <em>Use of energy.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHOREOGRAPHY</strong></td>
<td><em>Direction.</em> <em>Relationship 4s.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AURAL</strong></td>
<td><em>No music.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCUSSION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHAPING</strong></td>
<td><em>3s, 1s.</em> <em>Dao with set sequence.</em> <em>4s.</em> <em>Finished product complicated.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPRETATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITICAL APPRAISAL</strong></td>
<td><em>Viewing but little criticism.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSIFICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2C, 3C** | D | 13 |
| **TREATMENT** | *Abstract.* |
| **STYLE** | *Contemporary.* |
| **MOVEMENT** | *Use feet/gestures.* *Clapping.* *Stamping.* *Walking-Gestures.* |
| **DYNAMICS** | *Different rhythms using set 4 beats.* |
| **CHOREOGRAPHY** | *No given choreographic principles.* |
| **AURAL** | *Counts/claps.* *Music.* |
| **DISCUSSION** | |
| **SHAPING** | *1s, 3s, 4s.* *Simple individual tasks.* *Clear development from tasks to get movement each other in 3s.* |
| **INTERPRETATION** | |
| **CRITICAL APPRAISAL** | *Little viewing.* *Minimal appraisal.* |
| **CLASSIFICATION** | |

| AS ART FORM |
| AS ART FORM |

| LINK WITH TECHNIQUE | |
## Table D

**ANALYSIS OF THE RANGE OF TECHNIQUE TAUGHT TO CURRICULUM GROUPS**

**KEY:**

A. Focus on Graham-based technique work. Use of contractions and spirals in a variety of:
1. Floorwork exercises
2. Standing exercises
3. Combinations in place
4. Travelling sequences

B. Focus on principles of Cunningham-based work:
5. Clear clean lines of the body
6. Constant shift of weight and focus
7. Rapid rhythmical and directional changes
8. Flexed and pointed feet
9. Curved upper back/tilted torso
10. Pedestrian movements combined with highly technical movement
11. Precision in phrases which had an oddity about them

C. Focus on Cunningham/Graham modified in relation to use of a curved or straight back:
12. Exercises
13. Combinations in place
14. Travelling sequences

D. Actions and principles derived from a range of styles including Graham, Cunningham and N.D. Idiosyncratic and personalised form of technique work:
15. Exercises
16. Combinations in place
17. Travelling sequences

E. A general form of warm up through:
18. Generalised movement
19. Series of running and dodging activities
20. Body conditioning exercises
21. Massage-like actions

| STUDENT GROUP | 1A | 2A | 3A | 2D | 1A | 1B | 1B | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3C | 3D | 1C | 1C | 3A | 2C | 3C | 3D | 3A | 3A | 3A | 2A | 2C | 3D | EA | 1B | 1A | ID | 2A | 2B | 3A | 3A | 3A | 3A | 4+ | 4+ | PG |
|---------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| DANCE ARTIST  | C  | F  | J  | B  | D  | H  | E  | I  | G  | |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
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Table E  ANALYSIS OF THE RANGE OF TECHNIQUE TAUGHT TO CORE GROUPS AND PERFORMANCE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT GROUP</th>
<th>Core Group B</th>
<th>Core Group A</th>
<th>Performance Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DANCE ARTIST</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**

A. Focus on Graham-based technique work. Use of contractions and spirals in a variety of
- 1 floorwork exercises
- 2 standing exercises
- 3 combinations in place
- 4 travelling sequences

B. Focus on principles of Cunningham-based work
- 5 clear clean lines of the body
- 6 constant shift of weight and focus
- 7 rapid rhythmical and directional changes
- 8 flexed and pointed feet
- 9 curved upper back/tilted torso
- 10 pedestrian movements combined with highly technical movement
- 11 precision in phrases which had an oddity about them

C. Focus on Cunningham/Graham modified in relation to use of a curved or straight back
- 12 exercises
- 13 combinations in place
- 14 travelling sequences

D. Actions and principles derived from a range of styles including Graham, Cunningham and New Dance. Idiosyncratic and personalised form of technique work
- 15 exercises
- 16 combinations in place
- 17 travelling sequences

E. A general form of warm up through
- 18 generalised movement
- 19 series of running and dodging activities
- 20 body conditioning exercises
- 21 massage-like actions
Table F

IDENTIFICATION OF THE RANGE OF TECHNIQUE TAUGHT TO CURRICULUM, CORE GROUPS AND PERFORMANCE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curriculum Groups</th>
<th>Core Group A</th>
<th>Core Group B</th>
<th>Performance Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham technique</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham technique</td>
<td>1 (8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Graham/</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham technique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of styles including</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4) (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Cunningham and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General form of warm-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No technique</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

( ) = Elements also included in sessions
### Table G

**PRESENTATION OF CONTENT TO GENERAL GROUPS: TECHNIQUE**

<p>| Key:                           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  | 24  | 25  | 26  | 27  | <strong>COMMENTS:</strong> |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Demonstration                 | I   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 25 Inconsistencies/groups |
| Demonstration and explanation | J   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 25 Slow |
| Mark through with students    | C   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 25 Good | 26 Good | 27 High Level |
| Feedback: points to work for  | D   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 10 Sketchy | 11 Sometimes | 24/25/26 Inconsistencies |
| Feedback: emphasised points   | H   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 5 Lengthy | 10 Lengthy | 11 Sometimes |
| Feedback: reinforced points   | G   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 25 Fast |
| Dance artists danced          | B   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | Instructions 8, 4, 2 etc.| 10 Lengthy | 24 Too simple |
| through movements             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Repetition some material |
| independently                 | E   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | Instructions 2/3 of those | 10 Too general | 11 Not related to corrections | 24 Too complicated | 25 Too fast |
| Dance artists danced          | F   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 5 Unclear | 10 vague | 24 Too complicated | 25 Slow/stand around |
| through movements             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | Students confused |
| with students                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
| DA = Dance Artist             |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstration</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. explanation of subject matter</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. question/explanation/clarification</td>
<td>3A2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>FS/ OE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. second demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. demonstration to reproduce known material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. reproduction of demonstration</td>
<td>3A2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. leading to known answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. leading to divergent answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2A+2D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. guided learner through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- = inaccurate; O = consistent; + = frequent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. on role (-A/++)</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. on subject matter (-A/++)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. task specific (-A/++)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. identified errors (-A/++)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. enabled individual/group to correct movement (-A/++)</td>
<td>3A2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. assess performance against criteria (-A/++)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence</td>
<td>3C+3D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>12XU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. set tasks to establish learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. set environment to bring about procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ongoing assessment/learning achievement</td>
<td>2C+3C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. effectiveness teacher/learner interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. resetting learning objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. adaptation work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. adapting teaching approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. pace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. refines, modifies, reinforces learning in behaviour</td>
<td>1B</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>OE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. interest in session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. rapport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. security: expression of work</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>FS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. security: performance expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. policy and behavioural expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. reference to dance as an art form</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table H** PRESENTATION OF CONTENT: WORKSHOPS BASED ON REPertoire AND PRINCIPLES OF CHOREOGRAPHY

**KEY:**
- DA = Dance Artist
- V = no. of video-recorded session
- M = no. of monitored recorded session
- Focus of session:
  - SS = Spiked Sonata; OE = Ombres Electriques; 12XU = 12XU; FS = Field Study
  - E = everyday gesture; A = actions; G = games; T = technique; R = rhythm; I = improvisation
### Table I

#### USE OF CORRECTION: TECHNIQUE — GENERAL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong> = Verbal correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> = Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> = Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong> = Physical correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong> = Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong> = Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example = Correction by example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong> = Peer / student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA</strong> = Dance Artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction = Correction by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong> = Peer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA</strong> = Dance artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong> = Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position = Correction given from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> = Front of class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MA</strong> = Moved around class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY</strong> = By student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> = Student/s embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong> = Dance Artist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DA</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>VERBAL G I</th>
<th>PHYSICAL G I</th>
<th>EXAMPLE P DA</th>
<th>CORRECTION P DA S</th>
<th>POSITION F MA BY</th>
<th>REPERTITION E</th>
<th>OBSERVED NO. + -</th>
<th>NO. + -</th>
<th>VIDEO</th>
<th>STUDENT COMMENT + -</th>
<th>Comments from monitored records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2A+2D</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3A2</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1C</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3C+3D</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3A2</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2A+3A</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>3A1</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2C</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4EXA</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1A</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>292 ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1C+2C</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comments from monitored records**
- **Travelling caused embarrassment**
- **Language difficulty**
- **Attitude**
### OVERALL USE OF CORRECTION/FEEDBACK:
#### WORKSHOPS BASED ON REPERTOIRE AND PRINCIPLES OF CHOREOGRAPHY

**Table J**

| Group | DA | Focus | V | M | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 |
| 1A    | C  | FS    | 6 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A2   | C  | FS/OE | 11| 9 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2A+2D | C  | E     | 2 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1C    | D  | SS    | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A2   | D  | SS    | 3 | 3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3C+3D | D  | 12XU  | 2 | 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2C+3C | D  | R     | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| PG    | J  | SS    | 17| 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| PG    | J  | SS    | 26| 6 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1B    | J  | OE    | 13| 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1A    | E  | SS    | 22| 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3C    | E  | FS    | 10| 5 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**Key:**
- **DA** = Dance Artist
- **V** = no. of video recorded session
- **M** = no. of monitored recorded session
- **E** = everyday gesture; **A** = actions; **G** = games; **T** = technique; **R** = rhythm; **I** = improvisation

**Focus of session:**
- **SS** = Spiked Sonata; **OE** = Ombres Electriques; **12XU** = 12XU; **FS** = Field Study

**Comments from monitored report:**
- frequent feedback
- little feedback
- vague; little feedback
- little feedback

**How corrections are given:**
1. verbal correction to 1 (individual) G (group)
2. physical correction to 1 (individual) G (group)
3. correction by example to 1 (individual) G (group)

**Correction given by:***
- Dance Artist
- 5 peer students
- self

**Correction given on:**
- new movement
- known movement
- developing work: known answer
- developing work: divergent answer
- in place / in front of class
- different locations
- next to students

**Type of feedback:**
- value/neutral/corrective/ambiguous
- provide feedback on role
- provide feedback on subject matter
- repetition
- refine, modify, reinforce learning behaviours
- provide knowledge for further choreographic work

**Instructions:**
- unclear, lengthy, clear, precise
- use of imagery
- use of imagery to aid feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>DA Group</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>HOW</th>
<th>INSTRUCTIONS</th>
<th>DA DEMONSTRATION</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>VIDEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH 1A</td>
<td>C 2A+2D</td>
<td>C 3A2</td>
<td>D 1C</td>
<td>D 3C+3D</td>
<td>D 3A2</td>
<td>H 2A+3A</td>
<td>H 3A</td>
<td>H 3A1</td>
<td>E 2C+3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA S</td>
<td>E C S T</td>
<td>IP DT</td>
<td>I CP</td>
<td>AT B</td>
<td>U C L I</td>
<td>U C G E A Q</td>
<td>NO. +</td>
<td>NO. +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from monitored records

- DH Dance Artist
- ST Student
- E Exercise
- C Combinations
- S Sequences
- T Travelling
- IP In place
- DT Demonstrated through
- Isolated
- CP Corrective process
- AT Altered tempo
- B Break down movement

INSTRUCTIONS
- U Unclear
- C Clear
- L Lengthy
- I Use of imagery

DA DEMONSTRATION
- U Unclear
- C Clear
- G Good
- E Excellent
- A Artistry
- Q Concern for quality

OBSERVED SESSION
- No. Number of session
- + Positive response
- - Negative response

VIDEO RECORDED SESSION
- No. Number of session
- + Positive response
- - Negative response
### Table L

**OVERALL USE OF DEMONSTRATION:**
**WORKSHOPS BASED ON REPERTOIRE AND PRINCIPLES OF CHOREOGRAPHY**

| Group | DA | Focus | V | M | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 |
| 3D    | E  | A     | 3 |   | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |   | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1B+1D | I  | 12XU  | 25.1 | 26 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1A+1C | I  | 12XU  | 25.1 | 26 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2A+2B | I  | OE/SS | 16.1 | 16 | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A+3B | I  | OE    | 14  |   | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3A1   | I  | OE    | 23  | 23 | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 3A2   | I  | 12XU  | 32  | 2’s | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 4     | I  | 12XU  | 24  |   | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 1D    | I  | T     | 18  |   | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1D    | I  | T     | 162 |   | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| 2D    | I  | T     | 17  |   | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1C+2C | B  | G     | 12  |   | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4+    | A  | I     | 14  |   | ✓ |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

**Comment about second demonstration**

- Worked in with groups; student material →
  - delayed

- no use demo

- no use demo

- DA late

**KEY:**
- DA = Dance Artist
- Focus of session:
  - SS = Spiked Sonata
  - OE = Ombres Electriques
  - 12XU = 12XU; FS = Field study
- E = everyday gesture
- A = actions
- G = games
- T = technique
- R = rhythm
- I = improvisation
- V = no. of video-recorded session
- M = no. of monitored recorded session
- Demonstration by:
  - 1 Dance artist
  - 2 Individual student
  - 3 group of students
- How demonstration is given:
  - 1 explanation of subject matter
  - 2 demonstration
  - 3 questions/explanation/clarification
- Focus of demonstration:
  - 4 new movement
  - 5 known movement
  - 6 to initiate new work: known answer
  - 7 to initiate new work: divergent answer
- Demonstration given from:
  - 8 in place/front of class
  - 9 different locations
  - 10 next to students
- Reason for demonstration:
  - 11 provide model to be emulated
  - 12 refine/modify/reinforce learning behaviour
  - 13 provide model for inspiration
  - 14 provide model for appreciation
- Instructions:
  - 15 unclear
  - 16 clear
  - 17 lengthy
  - 18 precise
  - 19 use of imagery
  - 20 use of imagery
  - 21 clear
  - 22 clear
  - 23 clear
  - 24 clear
  - 25 clear
  - 26 clear
- Demos: unclear