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Abstract

The first written introduction to Dorothy Heathcote’s work was published in Swedish in 1974, while she herself visited Sweden to teach in the early 1980s. How has drama for learning, i.e. process drama, evolved since then? We will try to answer this question by looking into the Swedish context, including courses and publications that clearly connect to the work of Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton. We have used interviews with a few key informants to complement information from written sources. The investigation uncovered more publications and teaching events than expected, but the practice of Heathcote’s work does not appear to be well-defined or extensive. After a period of decline it looks like process drama is gaining renewed attention, as more workshops, university courses and new books have been available in the last few years than in many years before.
**Introduction**

In this paper we will explore the influence of Dorothy Heathcote’s work on the Swedish field of educational drama. Our intention is to describe and document the development of process drama in Sweden over four decades, more specifically the educational initiatives (e.g. where and how the work was spread), and the availability of information (e.g. textbooks). The current status of process drama in Sweden will also be examined, followed by some reflections regarding its future. Although it is important for us to apply a critical perspective and discuss the value and potential side-effects of process drama (Hallgren 2009, Österlind 2009), this is not our purpose here.

Our focus is on events, such as drama courses and publications, that clearly connect to that which we choose to call Process Drama; Teacher-in-Role, Mantle of the Expert and other indications of it having originated in the work of Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton (Heathcote et al. 1995, Bolton 2008). These methods can be applied in both formal and informal education although it seems clear that process drama was developed to enrich teaching in formal settings. Before a teaching practice like process drama can be applied in classrooms, it has to be introduced to in-service teachers, drama specialists and teacher educators. The opportunities to learn about these methods have been our primary focus.

Our point of departure is that process drama has proven to be a valuable way of teaching (e.g. McNaughton 2004, Stinson et al. 2006, Sæbø 2009, Taylor 1998, Warner et al. 2004), but seems to be very little used in Swedish schools (Fredriksson 2013, Öfverström 2006). This apparent inconsistency intrigues us. As a class teacher respectively a researcher, and as experienced drama pedagogues and teacher educators, we see the unexploited potential of process drama in Sweden as a great challenge. The observation that this drama genre is a rare classroom practice can be connected with the fact that it has hardly been researched as such (Österlind et al. 2005), until very recently (Jacquet 2011).

The aim of our retrospective journey is to describe the reception of process drama in Sweden, and to identify and discuss any particular conditions that may explain the current situation. Before we go into this we will present some background information about educational drama in Sweden.

**Drama in the Swedish educational context**

In the Swedish context ‘Educational Drama’ covers all aspects of drama work or what we today would call Drama in Education and Applied Drama as well as Applied Theatre and Community Theatre (cf. Österlind 2008). Most of those who work professionally with drama are to be found a) working with children and youth with drama and theatre in after-school activities like ‘Cultural Schools’ or youth clubs, b) teaching Theatre in Upper Secondary School, or c) teaching Drama at university level. Other areas in which drama pedagogues can work include amateur theatre,
workshops related to professional theatre performances, leadership and organizational development, and social interventions (e.g. working with unemployed youth).

In the Scandinavian countries, drama is clearly related to both theatre and education (Rasmusson 2000), while the educational aspect of drama is more evident in Sweden. Despite the fact that drama is so closely connected with education, it is not established as a teaching method in Swedish classrooms. Even though research on classroom drama, in terms of improvisation and role-play, was published quite early (Gralvik 1975, Wiechel 1976), and followed by other doctoral dissertations especially in the period 1995-2001 (Österlind 2008), this was not enough to get drama, and definitely not process drama, into the classrooms.

The by far best-known drama genre in Sweden is related to forum theatre. During the 1990’s Augusto Boal visited Sweden frequently and some of his books were translated to Swedish. Theatre of the oppressed/forum theatre became very popular in the Swedish drama field. Katrin Byréus, teacher and drama pedagogue, developed her own version called ‘forum play’ (Byréus 1990), initially for use in classroom settings, where core elements of forum theatre are combined with value clarification exercises (Österlind 2011).

**Drama in compulsory school**

Drama is mentioned in the national curriculum for pre-school and compulsory school, which states that drama should be integrated in the general education of all children and pupils. Drama, however, is not a compulsory school subject, there is no time allocated to drama lessons, there are no appointed drama teachers, and there are no explicit goals related to drama. In other words drama is, at a rhetorical level, supposed to be part of all basic education, but its occurrence as part of the classroom practice depends entirely on the individual teacher’s choice.

Mia-Marie Sternudd (2000: 191-200) conducted an analysis of drama literature and identified four different aspects of drama. The drama perspectives were designated i) the artistically oriented perspective, ii) the personal development perspective, iii) the critically liberating perspective, and iv) the holistic learning perspective. The artistically oriented perspective is characterized by focus on creating a performance; the personal development perspective encompasses drama as a means for communication and personal growth, while the critically liberating perspective aims at building consciousness regarding social and political issues. The holistic learning perspective focuses on drama for learning (process drama). Sternudd relies on the work of Bolton and Heathcote to describe the essence of this perspective.

Research into how Swedish compulsory schoolteachers perceive and use drama in their own teaching reveals a fairly limited conceptualization and utilization. Kristina Fredriksson (2013) reports that drama is mainly used to increase students’ social skills, and to create a friendly classroom environment. In connection with this, drama is used to foster moral values and good behaviour and reduce conflicts and bullying. Drama is also used for relaxation, and to fill out gaps between scheduled activities,
like waiting for the school lunch. What the teachers describe as drama is usually exercises and activities to get up and move around, to have some fun, and sometimes to illustrate and vary the teaching (e.g. running along a predetermined path in the school yard to understand how the blood circulates in the body). Examples in which the dramatic form is central are few. If any specific drama genre is mentioned, it is forum play. The teachers refer to obstacles such as a strong emphasis on curricular goals, the lack of time for planning and carrying out drama (as it is not a school subject), and their own limited competence in drama (a.a.: 120-121).

Christel Öfverström (2006) also investigated Swedish teachers’ views on drama and how they use it in their own teaching. Even though the teachers are generally positive and say that drama, due to its more interactive process, facilitates students’ learning, the analysis reveals that drama is seldom used for teaching the curriculum subjects. Öfverström concludes that: “the perspective of learning, in terms of achieving knowledge, is often overlooked or neglected” (a.a.: 127). In an ongoing study, Eva Österlind received similar answers from class teachers. Even though these studies are based on small samples, they have been carried out in different parts of Sweden and their results point in the same direction.

If we apply the four perspectives presented by Sternudd (2000) to the existing research about how Swedish teachers’ perceive drama it is clear that drama as a tool for personal and social development is the most established, including aspects of the critically liberating perspective since the use of forum play is fairly wide-spread. The artistic perspective, in terms of the connection between drama and theatre, is also known and theatre performances and art-specific training are mentioned, but seldom carried out, by most of the teachers. It seems obvious that the least known perspective among non-specialised teachers is drama for holistic learning/process drama. This is remarkable, and deserves further investigation, although some reasons can be found if we look at the conditions for professional drama education.

**Drama in tertiary education**

In Sweden there are two parallel tracks for educating drama practitioners, one within the university system and the other at Folk High Schools (FHS). Since 1975 FHS educate ‘drama pedagogues’ prepared to work in all sectors, such as formal and informal education, amateur theatre, drama and theatre applied in various settings, and with all age groups. The drama education at FHS’s is regarded as being equivalent to 2 years of university studies. Some universities and university colleges also offer drama courses, open for almost anyone and free of charge, (as is all education in Sweden). Many teachers have attended such drama courses in the past, as part of their continuing professional development. Some, although increasingly few, universities offer three semesters of drama studies (90 ECTS), but only one university provides a bachelor degree in educational drama. Drama in Sweden, and especially tertiary education of drama practitioners, has a close connection to education in a wide sense, and the strongest base for drama at

1 Folk High Schools in the Nordic countries has their roots in a political strive towards education for everyone, regardless of social background. It was and still is a preparation for, or an alternative to,
university level has until now been within teacher education. Drama has been part of teacher education since the late seventies. As drama is mentioned in the National Curriculum for Compulsory School until recently all student teachers had some, although usually very little, drama instruction during their teacher training. Today drama still remains as part of pre-school teacher education but it has been severely reduced, at some universities almost erased, from other types of teacher training programmes.

Strictly speaking, there are no drama teachers in Swedish compulsory schools as drama is not a school subject. In general, teachers have a fairly limited knowledge of drama, while drama pedagogues sometimes have a fairly limited understanding of classroom teaching.

Purpose

The first Swedish introduction to Dorothy Heathcote’s work was published in 1974 (Bjurström et al. 1974). She also presented her work when visiting Sweden twice in the early 1980s. Evidence indicates that, so far, her work is not well-known by class-teachers, nor widely used in Swedish classrooms. Why is this? The question is intriguing, especially as very close to us, in Norway, the situation looks quite different. Is it possible to identify some significant events or specific conditions that can explain the rather irresolute reception and implementation of Heathcote’s work in Sweden?

Our purpose here is to
a) describe the development of process drama in Sweden
b) extract and analyze some characteristics of this development
c) discuss possible reasons for the current situation.

Case study approach

To situate the study within a methodological frame, we chose a case study approach. Case studies are considered to be useful in specific, context-dependent situations (Stake 1995, Yin 2003), which mean that generalization is problematic (cf. Donmoyer 2000, Winston 2006). In relation to our purpose, being unable to generalize is not a problem, as we are investigating a special case rather than a typical case (Bogdan et al. 2007). Case study is often described as the product of a study. It can also be defined as an approach, or both (Stake 2005). Here it is most appropriate to say that we have conducted a retrospective study, applying a case study approach.

One aspect of this study, which can be both an advantage and a problem, is that we are at least partially investigating our own field of practice. The advantage is that we have some knowledge and inside perspective, “we were there” in some respect,

---

2 In Upper Secondary School, Theatre is an optional subject often taught by drama pedagogues or former actors, of which an estimated 30-40% (based on national statistics) lack formal teacher education.
which gives us access to information that would otherwise be difficult to find. On the other hand, exactly this position can also be an obstacle, as we already have some understanding and preconceptions of the situation. The collection and interpretation of data is always subjective in some respect, and obviously we cannot provide a complete picture of the impact of Dorothy Heathcote or process drama in Sweden.

According to one perspective, case studies are closely connected to different kinds of participant observation. Another approach, similar to ours, is that everything which can contribute to illuminate and understand the case, for example documents and formal interviews, is valuable. Such sources of information may well be combined with observations, but in this retrospective study no observations have been conducted.

An important aspect of any case study is to make sure the case is clearly defined, for example in time and space. We are investigating the impact of process drama, inspired by the work of Heathcote and Bolton, on the Swedish field of drama in education. The time span is a period of just over forty years, from 1972 – which is the first year from which we have reliable evidence that something actually took place – until the autumn of 2013. A case study cannot be planned in detail in advance. This is also true for our study. We have used a kind of ‘snowball sampling’ (Cohen et al. 2000), where information from one source – person or publication – led us to another source of information. The informants are considered to be experts, an approach recommended by John O’Toole (2006), which brings us close to a relation where informants and researchers are equals.

By searching databases for Swedish publications and consulting our drama network we were able to identify three key informants, who agreed to be interviewed. The interviewees pointed out other experts, who would have made substantial contributions to the study but, as a result of time limits, only three interviews were conducted. All key informants came in touch with the work of Heathcote in the early 70s to early 80s period, meeting her at courses in Sweden and/or going to England. The key informants were interviewed separately, and each interview lasted about two hours. The interviews, which were recorded, can be described as unfolding conversations, an ongoing exchange of thoughts and co-construction of meaning (cf. Kvale 1996).

All key informants have many years of teaching experience and have been in charge of drama education at different universities and FHS’s in Sweden. We are not mentioning their names, nor providing any specific background information, since this has been requested. This, in fact, became an issue as the informants held different opinions, demanding either anonymity or to be acknowledged by name. We considered, as researchers, the request for anonymity to be our primary responsibility, although we also recognize the right to not be made ‘invisible’. This unsolved ethical dilemma deserves further consideration, and might have caused some inconsistencies in the text.
Based on information from different sources such as the three interviews, our personal knowledge, drama books, articles, essays and a national database of Swedish literature (http://libris.kb.se), we were able to produce two documents which constitute the ‘database’ for the description below. One document lists about 25 publications, written in or translated to Swedish, or written in English by Swedish drama researchers. The other document lists about 30 events, like workshops and courses for teachers and drama pedagogues, as well as examples of individuals going abroad to learn more. The estimate of the number of items and events reflects the fact that unknown publications and events are still being brought to our attention. In other words, the following description is based on a combination of data sources. For reasons of integrity we do not specify the exact source in each case, unless it is based on a publication. When quoting, or referring to Swedish book titles, the translations to English are in most cases our own.

**Significant educational events and publications during four decades (1972-2013)**

Below we summarize the publications and educational events we have found, decade-by-decade. The overview serves as a basis for further analysis and discussion.

**1970-1979**

During this period we found three initial ‘sparks of inspiration’, a TV program and two encounters with people from US and Norway, which motivated people to go to England to learn about Dorothy Heathcote’s work, which in turn led to a couple of publications.

In 1972 two drama students, Cornelia Bjurström and Eva-Lotta Holmgren, saw a TV program about Heathcote’s work which inspired them to go to England. They visited Heathcote and were allowed to watch her teach in different places. What struck them was her charismatic persona and how she really demanded that both the pupils and the teachers should believe in the drama, the fictive story. Their visit resulted in an academic essay: An introduction to drama as education, a drama-technique, created by Dorothy Heathcote (Bjurström et al. 1974), published by Lund University. This is without doubt the first Swedish introduction to Heathcote’s work.

In 1978, teacher educator Lisa Henriksson attended a summer course in Washington. Other participants talked about Heathcote, and were surprised that Henriksson did not know of her work. Inspired to find out more, Henriksson visited Heathcote in England later the same year, as well as in 1979. Henriksson was amazed that drama could be so much more than just exercises, role-play and improvisation. She explains how she was being pulled into the zone of proximal development by Heathcote, realizing what one could achieve with drama – but still not knowing how. Henriksson described Heathcote’s way of working in an article in a teachers’ magazine in 1979, and later in a book. “It all begins with listening and trying to grasp what the kids already know” (Henriksson 1987: 28, our translation).
By 1979 this drama work method was already known in Norway. A Norwegian drama student at a Swedish FHS spread the word, and as a result a group of drama students and their teacher, Anita Grünbaum, went on a field trip to England. They visited the “Drama and tape center” in London, at that time managed by Cecily O’Neill. There they saw a video, The Outlaws, showing Gavin Bolton leading a complete drama process – a process drama – which made an ‘unforgettable imprint’ (Grünbaum, preface, in Bolton 2008).

**1980-1989**

During the eighties there was a small but steady flow of people travelling between England and Sweden. Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton came over to teach, and some school drama projects were carried out in connection with university courses and teacher education.

Dorothy Heathcote presented her work in Sweden when she visited Uppsala University and Södertälje preschool teacher education in 1981 and 1982. When Heathcote visited Uppsala the second time she declared that there was no need for her to come back again, since the Swedish organizers now would be able to ‘do it themselves’.

In 1983, Anita Grünbaum spent a month with Bolton (and Heathcote) after which she wrote an article: What can we learn from Gavin Bolton? (Grünbaum 1984). She also wrote an academic essay: Year 8, Sweden, The World. A study of how Drama in Education with teenagers may enhance awareness and empathy (Grünbaum 1986). It includes pre-texts to two process dramas, although these are not labeled as such. That essay is still being used in some university courses, but it is not obvious that it is about process drama, since the emphasis is not on the drama genre.

In 1983/84, a one year play and drama project and a related university course were conducted by Henriksson, with teachers at primary schools. It resulted in a book: Learning in play and drama (Henriksson 1987), which briefly describes the work of Heathcote and the drama projects at the participant schools. New editions of this book continue to be published, and in 2010 it was made available as an e-book. In Uppsala, Heathcote’s visits resulted in student teachers giving life to local historical sites. This was much appreciated by the school teachers who noticed the children actually learnt something when visiting, for example, the museum. A report: To bring life to a historic setting, using drama in education – two eras – two attempts, was published several years later by teacher educator Jacqueline Altberg (1997).

Both Heathcote and Bolton visited Sweden independently twice, and taught in different educational institutions such as universities and FHSs. In connection with these visits the Swedish National Drama Association (RAD) organized weekend courses for experienced teachers and drama pedagogues. John Fines, a History PhD, presented as a “disciple” of Heathcote and the “so-called Newcastle school” (quotes from the 1987 course certificate), lead a summer course once. These visits took place in 1981, 1982, 1986, 1987 and 1989 – a period in which there was a great deal of activity.
1990-1999
During this decade a doctoral dissertation and some books were published, and process drama was applied at a few historical sites, like outdoor museums, as part of their school programs. We have not been able to find any educational events for adults during this period.

The first book about the Heathcote/Bolton methods in a Scandinavian language was written by Charlotte Lorentzen, Drama and Insight (1992). It was used in Swedish drama education, even though it was written in Danish. Betty Jane Wagner’s book: Drama as a learning medium (1976), was translated to Swedish and published in 1993, with a foreword by Lisa Henriksson. Gunilla Lindqvist published several books on play and learning in pre-school and primary school, which we understand as very similar to process drama. She refers to the work of Heathcote and Bolton and the connection between play and drama, with the theoretical underpinning of Vygotskij. Her doctoral dissertation The Aesthetics of Play (1995), is based on empirical research of play worlds which are created by a drama pedagogue. Despite this, the work is labeled as ‘play’. Both Wagner’s and Lindqvist’s books were frequently used in teacher training, but often without an explicit connection to drama. During this period, process drama was applied in activities for school classes such as ‘time travelling’ at historical sites. A few books describe this, but they relate more often to the concept of play worlds and seldom relate to drama.

In 1999 Eva Hallgren read Wagner’s book and wanted to learn more. She visited her former university, but found that they were still using the same games as they had used more than ten years earlier, when she was a teacher student. As Heathcote and Bolton had retired, she went to Manchester where she visited the Dorothy Heathcote archive, and observed lessons at the university and primary schools. She was impressed by the knowledge the English pupils had about drama conventions, and how they actually were allowed to influence both form and content of the drama. Hallgren wrote an essay: Power to the pupils – Drama in Education, a way to let the pupils in (2000).

2000-2013
We found very little activity in the first seven years of this period while the period from 2007 to 2013, in sharp contrast, showed a great deal of activity in terms of teaching events and publications.

Sternudd’s dissertation: Educational Drama as a means of fostering democratic values? Four perspectives in educational drama – educational drama in four curricula (2000), had a powerful, clarifying impact on the Swedish drama field. The four perspectives enriched the terminology, thus increasing the level of accuracy in the drama vocabulary (cf. Rasmusson 2000). One of the four perspectives is ‘Holistic learning’. Here Sternudd describes the development emerging from the Newcastle School, including the point when the concept ‘process drama’ was taken up by O’Neill (1995) and O’Toole (1992). It is presented as a specific drama genre and positioned in relation to other drama genres. Sternudd’s work was, and still is, an important contribution to the Swedish body of knowledge on process drama.
Umeå University had a partnership with the Charles University in Prague, where Radka Svoboda worked as a drama teacher. She visited Umeå a couple of times between 2003 and 2008, and taught ‘structured drama’, as she preferred to call it. During those years the student teachers learnt process drama/structured drama as part of their Drama and Theatre courses. In 2013, as far as we know, Umeå University no longer offers any drama courses.

At the national drama organization’s (RAD) annual meeting in 2007 it was decided to start using the term process drama. A decision was also made to invite Allan Owens, Chester University, to hold a summer course. Since 2007 Owens has visited Sweden to teach four times, Patrice Baldwin, head of IDEA at that time, and Marie Jeanne McNaughton, Glasgow University, have both visited twice, all of them giving workshops and lectures for drama students, experienced drama pedagogues and teachers. We have also been able to organize courses clearly labeled Process Drama several times at Gävle University, and a couple of times at advanced level at Stockholm University, although not on a regular basis.

Work by our Scandinavian neighbours also contributed to the development of process drama in Sweden. Allan Owens’ and Keith Barber’s handbook Dramaworks – Mapping drama, was translated to Swedish and published in Finland (2006). In 2007, Hallgren visited the teacher education in Bergen, Norway, where process drama has been part of the training for many years. A Norwegian textbook, 7 ways to drama (Heggstad 1998/2012), has been used in Swedish teacher education. Aud B. Sæbø’s doctoral dissertation, Drama and student active learning – A study of how drama responds to the didactical challenges of the teaching and learning process (2009), about the understanding and use of process drama in Norwegian classrooms, is highly relevant also in a Swedish context.

In Sweden, Grünbaum edited an anthology based on Bolton’s writings (Bolton 2008). She also presented process drama as a concept, including 6 pre-texts, in a Swedish handbook called Equal and Unique – Drama in Education about Minorities (Grünbaum 2009a). In an article, The role of the leader in process drama, Sæbø (2011) reflects upon the concept of teacher-in-role. A book about using drama to enhance reading and writing, Text and Drama (Wilhelm 2009), was translated into Swedish. It is inspired by Heathcote, but does not mention process drama. A themed issue of the magazine Drama Forum was published, focusing on process drama, with contributions from several authors including an article by O’Toole (2009), and a review of the literature on process drama available in English and in Swedish (Grünbaum 2009b).

A research study by Holmgren-Lind (2007), Educational drama – the intersection between theatre arts and aesthetical practice, refers to process drama and language development in Swedish preschool. Ewa Jacquet (2011) conducted a study in grades 4-6 applying process drama to enhance students’ literacy and verbal skills; Using drama as a starting point. Educational drama as a resource for writing. In an ongoing study, Hallgren focuses on process drama: What facilitates, what restrains and what keeps the drama going? What happens when we meet in role? And finally, this
A retrospective study was conducted. Below, we will take a closer look into the reviewed areas of educational events and publications.

The (limited) impact of educational events

One of our informants describes how she experienced the work of Heathcote and Bolton as something completely different when compared with all other drama forms she had seen before. In Sweden the dominant tradition of making a play was to start with mime, follow this by improvisations, and then build to a performance. Teacher-in-role was of course new for her, as were the open starting points of the dramas and the creation of a story together with the children. Also the slow pace and the stopping for reflections she found different. "Swedish kids demand another tempo! Even at that time", she says. A similar experience is described by Henriksson (1987), who writes about the most important thing she learnt; that drama could be so much more than a few games, exercises, role-play and improvisation. Another thing that struck her was the differences between the English and the Swedish school system. She didn’t agree with Heathcote’s phrase “You're not in the pretending game, you’re in the real game.” Instead she claims the teacher’s playfulness is important: “it is possible to work with children with a humorous twinkle in one’s eyes /.../ without losing the depth of the drama” (Henriksson 1987: 26, our translation).

As far as we know, all pedagogues who travelled to England were impressed and inspired. Expressions used are for example ‘amazed’, ‘struck by Heathcote’s charismatic persona’, and ‘pulled into the zone of proximal development’. But did all this travelling across the North Sea during the 1970s and 1980s influence the Swedish drama community? To some extent it did. Swedish drama practice at that time was in need of development, and here was something completely new which attracted a great deal of attention. As an example: the course with Gavin Bolton, organized by RAD in 1989, drew so many participants that it had to be given twice, and still there were people on the waiting list. After her second visit, Dorothy Heathcote declared that the Swedish organizers were ready to ‘do it themselves’ and at least one of our respondents felt she was standing on steady ground.

But when process drama was introduced in Sweden in the 1980s there was a striking difference between this form and traditional drama work, which at that time mostly had to do with play and improvisation for personal development and/or performance. In reality, very few participants actually included process drama in their practice after taking a course, and those who did were mostly experienced drama pedagogues, not teachers.

According to one of our informants this lack of implementation can be explained by the complexity of the method, which demands a lot of the leader. You have to think twice, to open up a story from several angles and give it another learning perspective, all of which is more demanding than other more straightforward drama forms, she says. She continues: “It’s for example much easier to work with forum play, since that bears a resemblance to the drama tradition of choose a topic,
improvise and perform, and you as a leader are always on the outside.” Another informant also comments that in process drama you as a leader have to get into the drama together with the participants, using your own expression, giving of yourself in another way. In doing so, you are much more vulnerable than when standing on the outside, leading exercises. She also adds that there is an ethical dilemma – not to use the method to manipulate the participants – since process drama demands empathy and it is easy, as a leader, to expose participants to situations for which they are not prepared.

Two of the three people we interviewed had not thought much about why process drama did not expand in Sweden. “It is a pretty old way of working with drama”, one of them says, and dwells on who could be interested in that now. Another reason put forward is that “it is complicated to learn, and time-consuming to use”. “We never have that kind of time, neither during our university courses nor in the classrooms”, one says.

This complexity is also reflected in the available literature. The most commonly used book is Wagner’s Drama as Learning Medium, which in our experience many students find hard to grasp, even though it is available in Swedish, as the presentation is quite multifaceted. How to apply all this (e.g. segments, brotherhood codes, ways of classifying et cetera) in the classroom, when you at the same time are trying to listen to what the pupils want to make a drama about? It was and is quite a challenge, especially for beginners.

When Hallgren was looking for informants, willing to participate in her research project on process drama, it became clear that Swedish teachers and drama pedagogues were reluctant to say they were working within the tradition. Their hesitation was partly due to the feeling of not being sure if they were ‘doing the right thing’ and partly due to the fact that not many drama pedagogues were using process drama in our classrooms. It could also be explained by the lack of a specific Swedish term for this kind of drama. The latter is indirectly confirmed by one of our informants. She reports that, to her own surprise, former students tell her about how they work with pre-texts created some 30 years ago, adapted and updated, but actually still in use. This reminds us of the fact that process drama most certainly has been applied in educational settings which we have not been able to detect.

The problem of labeling and (lack of) publications

When the work of Heathcote and Bolton was introduced, it was labeled ‘The Newcastle School’ and ‘Drama in Education’. According to one of our informants, Bolton does not appreciate the term ‘process drama’. Instead he prefers ‘Drama in Education’. But ‘Drama in Education’ translated to Swedish is synonymous with ‘Educational Drama’, which is a much wider concept. And drama in educational settings, when it appears, is rarely process drama (Fredriksson 2013, Öfverström 2006). Instead, when pedagogues talk about this practice, the term ‘teacher-in-role’ is used. This is a much narrower concept, which excludes a range of other strategies and conventions included in process drama.
Over time, the negative aspects of lacking a label became evident and in 2007, at RAD’s annual meeting, it was decided to start using the concept process drama. But the term ‘process’ in process drama initially met a lot of objections since interactive and creative processes have been strongly emphasized in Swedish drama work, to point out the difference from a more product orientated theatre work. For the same reasons it can also be rather vague, or even confusing if taken literally, since paying attention to the process is claimed to be characteristic for all sorts of drama work. To make this drama genre visible and distinguishable from other drama forms, the label is crucial. Since ‘process drama’ is now becoming established, the task is not to find a better name but to give the concept meaning.

Handbooks about the Heathcote/Bolton methods were published in Danish (Lorentzen 1992) and Norwegian (Heggstad 1998), but there was still a need for textbooks in Swedish, which would provide an introduction to the theory and practice of process drama. Grünbaum planned such a book as early as 1979, when her students found Towards a Theory of Drama in Education (Bolton 1979) quite difficult to read. Almost 30 years later her plan was realized when some of Bolton’s collected writings were finally translated (Bolton 2008). The book was edited by Grünbaum, her selection of texts illustrating how Bolton’s explanatory models have been refined over time (Grünbaum, preface, in Bolton 2008).

The two most wide-spread, basic Swedish textbooks on drama (Hägglund et al. 1993/2011, Erberth et al. 1991/2008), are continuously published in new editions. Here the work of Heathcote and Bolton is mentioned, but the concept of process drama is only mentioned in the final sentence in one of the books. In the other book the use of teacher-in-role is presented in connection to Storyline. Storyline is quite well-known in Sweden and it might be fruitful to point out the resemblance, but by doing so there is also a risk of losing the drama connection.

Regarding publications as necessary resources, we can identify several problems. One is tied to the fact that Swedish is a small language area. The market for drama books is limited and it is not always easy to find a publisher. Another problem can be related to the indefinite labeling, as most of the texts we have become aware of, thanks to our informants, are not easily found by searching in databases. It is impossible to know what a text contains if it is not clear in the title or keywords. On the other hand, if a phenomenon, like process drama, does not yet have a name, research and writings must be connected to more well-known concepts, in this case ‘learning’ and ‘play’. And thereby the problem remains. Several of the publications we have tracked are academic essays. Unfortunately, this kind of publication seldom attracts many readers. For quite a long time there has been a lack of clearly defined teachers’ handbooks in drama (e.g. Baldwin 2009). Recently, Österlind found a publisher for Heggstad’s book (1998/2012), which is now being translated to Swedish. Our respective contributions to improve the state of affairs are a new handbook and a doctoral dissertation, both of which are work in progress.
Extracts of certain interest

Before summing up we highlight a few, to us significant, pieces of information embedded in the previous text (the years in brackets indicate the time period each extract refers to).

1. Drama could be so much more than just exercises, role-play and improvisation (1979)

2. They were still using the same games they had used more than ten years before (1999)


4. New editions /…/ continue to be published [e.g. school projects 1983/2010] (1983/84)

These short quotes point to some critical issues. They tell us that the view of drama was, and in some regards still is, fairly limited and quite dated. Drama teaching in tertiary education does not seem to be developing. The supply of new teaching materials, such as text books, is limited, while re-printing is frequent. Taken together this creates an impression of a field in stagnation, where only a few individuals manage to increase their knowledge and develop their practice. There are of course other aspects that could be emphasized, other interpretations that could be made, which would give quite another impression. But we are not interested in whitewashing, and choose to present this rather gloomy picture. Perhaps it will lead to a debate, in which our description is challenged by new evidence. If so, this would be most welcome.

What can we learn from this retrospective journey?

How has process drama evolved since it was introduced in Sweden? The study revealed more publications and teaching events than expected, but despite this the teaching practice doesn’t appear to be well-defined or highly profiled. The process of adopting and applying process drama seems to be fluctuating over time, with periods of intense development followed by periods of low activity. How can this be interpreted?

To begin with, there are some possible reasons related to the characteristics of process drama as such. Our informants point out that the method is complex and time consuming, and the time is always limited in classroom teaching as well as in university teaching. This is in line with Fredriksson (2013) who reports that according to the teachers, they lack time but also competence and/or confidence to use (process) drama as part of their teaching. One key informant also puts forward ethical dilemmas connected to the request for empathy and emotional involvement, dimensions considered as positive but sometimes difficult to handle. Another aspect is the vulnerable role of the leader. It is much easier to stay outside the drama,
leading games and exercises, as one informant puts it. Sæbø (2011) writes about the leader’s responsibilities in process drama, and emphasizes that the role of being a teacher must be clearly separated from being a teacher-in-role, otherwise the whole idea of process drama is endangered. Added to these intrinsic difficulties, there might also be external explanations.

Many of those who came in touch with process drama during the seventies and eighties probably went on to other forms of drama, especially those who were not teachers or teacher educators. As previously mentioned, most Swedish drama practitioners do not work in compulsory schools. This can be a reasonable explanation to why process drama, or as Bolton chose to call it Drama in Education, has not been adopted and developed within the Swedish drama field. The fact that drama is not a school subject is of course also part of the problem. Drama has, however, until recently been part of all teacher training, which makes it remarkable that process drama apparently has not been embraced by drama teachers within teacher education.

There is a serious lack of qualified further education in drama for teacher educators. Also, the possibilities for most teacher educators to conduct classroom drama projects or research parallel to teaching at the university are very limited. Another possible reason is that the Swedish drama organization, RAD, is directed towards the whole drama field regardless of social sector or institution. This differs from the situation in Norway, where the national drama organization always has been explicitly dedicated to developing drama in school.

Theatre of the oppressed and especially forum play (see Österlind 2011) is widespread in Sweden. In 1992 the ‘Association of Forum Theatres in Sweden’ was founded (under another name) and it is still active. Process drama does not have any special interest group similar to the organization that supports the development of forum theatre. Byrénus developed the concept of forum play and wrote a book that became incredibly well-known and still has a great impact (Byrénus 1990/2012). She and others have continually offered courses every year, all over the country. Compared to this successful approach, those of us who want to promote drama for learning have a lot to learn.

Class teachers claim they have insufficient drama skills (Fredriksson 2013), and until 2009 there were no university courses explicitly dedicated to process drama as far as we know. Access to PhD education has also been very restricted during the last ten years or so. Unlike Norway, we still do not have any full professor appointed in drama. As a consequence, the field is under-researched and there is a specific lack of comparative long-term studies, although the latter is not unique for Sweden (cf. Winner et al. 2013).

If we look at the frequency of teaching events and publications, the flow of publications is small but quite steady. When looking at teaching events there is a

3 The international DICE project (2010), in which Sweden participated, led to an ongoing study in a Swedish primary school.
remarkable dip, with no such events during the 1990s, and even after that. To be more precise, we found no open access teaching events between 1989 when Bolton came to Sweden and 2007 when Owens came to teach. This can probably be explained by a combination of several factors. For example, from 1990 onwards, forum theatre and forum play gained a lot of attention in the Swedish drama field. At a general level, what happened in 1990 was that Sweden faced the deepest economic crisis since the 1930-ies. This led to many years of cuts in public spending, which may be another reason for the decline in further education and international exchange.

Drama pedagogues with subject specific knowledge often work outside formal education. Teachers usually have very limited knowledge of drama. The current situation is shaped by there being very few handbooks on process drama, irregular further education, and no support functions like expert teachers or drama consultants. Despite all these obstacles, evidence shows an increasing interest in process drama, with several new books and more university courses available during the last few years than in many previous years. We are fully aware that we have not been able to draw a complete picture, but we have been able to shed some light on the Swedish reception of process drama. We found more than we expected, which in itself is interesting – there may be a lot more to discover.
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