

TRAINING DIRECTORS IN COMMUNICATION FOR
THE REHEARSAL PROCESS: A PILOT STUDY

by

DAVID ROGER ALLEN, B.F.A., M.A.

A DISSERTATION

IN

FINE ARTS

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for
the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved

May, 1994

AC
301
T₃
1994
NO.10
COP.2

AEI
JAC 8
XY

© 1994, David Roger Allen

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgments have become so ubiquitous as to be almost meaningless. Such is not the case herein. My sincere and most heartfelt thanks go to the those mentioned below.

First, I thank my committee members, Richard Weaver, Dan O'Hair, Janet Cooper, and especially Co-Chairs, George Sorensen and Katherine Hawkins for their patience, advice, criticism, and unfailing support. Secondly, I thank my family and friends especially my parents Barbara (proof-reader extraordinaire) and Merton, my brothers Richard and Randy and their families, the Goldsteins, the Perrones, and the Winograds for their encouragement and belief in me through the writing of this dissertation and throughout my life.

As a student, I am only one part of an educational team. The other part of that team consists of the teachers and mentors who made a difference in my life. I thank, therefore, Miss Smith, Mrs. Cook, Alan Jakeman, Linda Witkowski, Frank Ballard, Ardele Striker, Roger Pollack, Roseann Mandziuk, Charles Hill, and George and Kate for the examples they set and the guidance they provided.

Last, but by no means least, I thank Katherine Grace. Without her kindness, humor, gentleness, intelligence, faith, understanding, and love this dissertation, and indeed my life, would be of a much lesser quality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Status of Director Training.....	1
The Role of Communication Studies.....	4
The Director as Communicator.....	7
The History of Communication Study.....	9
The Study.....	13
The Problem.....	13
Methodology.....	14
The Scope of the Project.....	14
Organization of the Study.....	15
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	17
Theatrical Directing Texts and the - Director/Actor Communication Process.....	19
Theatrical Research into the - Director/Actor Communication Process.....	38
- Defining Communication.....	49
- Systems Theory.....	51
- A Model of Communication.....	54
Small Group and Organizational Communication..	57
Aspects of Small Group Communication.....	57
Size.....	58
Definitional Types.....	58

Relational.....	59
Structural.....	60
Psychological.....	61
Mixed.....	61
Time	61
A Definition of Small Groups.....	62
Inclusion of Small Group Communication...	63
Element 1.....	63
Elements 2 and 5.....	64
Element 3.....	64
Element 4.....	65
Conclusion.....	65
— Aspects of Organizational Communication.....	66
— Inclusion of Organizational Communication.....	66
Organizational Structures.....	68
— Leadership.....	74
Inclusion of Leadership.....	74
Leadership Attainment and Authority.....	77
Leadership Functions.....	81
Leadership Styles.....	83
Interactionism.....	84
Skill Development.....	86
Conflict.....	87
Inclusion of Conflict.....	87
Conflict Development.....	89
Conflict Strategies.....	90

Conflict Management.....	91
Consideration of Other Topics.....	94
Conclusion.....	95
III. METHODOLOGY.....	97
Tyler' Four Questions.....	97
Question 1--Objectives.....	98
Sources of Objectives.....	99
Learners.....	99
Subject Specialist.....	100
Psychology of Learning.....	102
Screen 1--Objective Feasibility....	103
Screen 2--Requisite Conditions for Learning	107
Screen 3--Application of a Philosophy of Learning.....	108
Statement of Course Objectives.....	110
Question 2--Learning Activities.....	112
Principles to Guide Selection of Learning Activities	113
Principle 1.....	113
Principle 2.....	114
Principle 3.....	114
Principle 4.....	115
Selecting Learning Experiences for Knowledge Acquisition	115
Tyler's Rules.....	116
Course Learning Activities	117
Lecture and Discussion.....	118

Surveys.....	121
Group Role Self-Rater Survey.....	122
The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory II.....	123
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.....	125
Other Learning Activities.....	125
Question 3--Organization for Effective Learning.....	126
Part 1--Overall Structure.....	127
Part 2--Creating Manageable and Cohesive Sections.....	130
Question 4--Evaluation.....	132
IV. RESULTS.....	137
The Class.....	137
Ethical Issues.....	138
Weekly Classes.....	140
Week 1.....	140
Week 2.....	142
Week 3.....	143
Week 4.....	145
Week 5.....	147
Week 6.....	148
Week 7.....	149
Week 8.....	151
Week 9.....	153
Week 10.....	155
Week 11.....	156

Week 12.....	157
Week 13.....	158
Week 14.....	159
Week 15.....	160
Epilogue.....	162
V. DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS.....	163
Course Evaluation.....	163
Data Collection.....	163
Screens.....	165
1. Objective feasibility.....	165
2. Requisite conditions for learning.....	167
3. Application of a philosophy of learning.....	169
Conclusions.....	170
Principles	171
Principle 1.....	171
Principle 2.....	175
Principle 3.....	176
Principle 4.....	177
Conclusions.....	178
Rules	179
Rule 1.....	179
Rule 2.....	180
Rules 3 and 4.....	182
Conclusions.....	183
Answers to the Study's Questions.....	183
Question 1-Appropriateness of Material.....	183

Question 2-Appropriateness of Format.....	185
Limitations.....	187
Sample Size.....	188
Instrument Validity.....	189
Conclusions.....	191
VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	192
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	198
APPENDIX	
A. COMMUNICATION FOR THE DIRECTOR DURING REHEARSAL COURSE GUIDE.....	206
B. GROUP ROLE SELF-RATER SURVEY.....	292
C. "FINAL" EXAM.....	296

ABSTRACT

This pilot study evaluates the result of a course designed to train directing students in the art of communication for use during the rehearsal process. Specifically, it seeks to answer two questions: (1) what is the appropriate material for a course of this type; and (2) what is the appropriate format for a course of this type. In order to obtain answers to these questions, a course in communication for the director was designed and implemented.

The course studied was a one-credit-hour, pass/fail for graduate students given at a large southwestern university. Using a format consisting of approximately 50 percent lecture and 50 percent discussion, and the use of self-reporting surveys, the course presented material on general communication theory, small group communication, leadership, and conflict and its management. At the conclusion of the course a qualitative analysis helped determine whether or not the material and format used was appropriate for this type of course.

The study reaches the conclusion that, with the exception of highly technical material, the material used in the course was appropriate. In terms of format, the study reaches a conclusion that this format was partially inappropriate. Specifically, the use of lecture as a major mode of presenting the material was counterproductive. In

its place, the study recommends that out-of-class readings be instituted as the mode of presentation. The study also recommends the devotion of more class time to discussion.

Finally, the study presents recommendations for future research. These include the design and institution of a three-credit-hour class that will allow expanded use of out-of-class projects including, but not limited to directing projects, and journal keeping. In addition, the study suggests approaches for a quantitative study of the effectiveness of the class' effect on the students' directing abilities.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Status Of Director Training

The history of theatre stretches back through unrecorded eons of time, beginning in a place and with a style long forgotten. In Western culture, the recorded theatre history begins at the times of the Greeks. For example, the first actor, Thespis, is known because of records that show he won an award for acting in 534 BC. Through the Greek and Roman periods, theatre was the purview of the playwrights and the actors. The renaissance increased the importance of scene designers. The most recent artist to make an impression on the art of theatre is the director.

As the complexity of production rose, it became apparent that there was a growing need for a unifying visionary--a single person who could guide the disparate elements of the theatre to a unified whole. Hodge (1982) defines the role of the director:

The pressure of the nineteenth-century world of scientific discoveries, of inventions, and of mechanization so changed play scripts, acting, and the stage machine that a coordinating specialist was needed to hold these forces together . . . a skilled coordinator who understood all the crafts of the theatre and who could devote his full energies to bringing them all together into a single, artistic, rhythmic whole in order to express in the best possible way what the playwright had in mind. Thus was born simultaneously twentieth-century theatrical art and the director as the major theatrical artist. (p. 5)

The first modern director was George II, Duke of Saxe-Mieningen. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, he toured Europe with his court theatre, "revealing a new way of working that emphasized the collective personality of the group and inspired theatrical reforms wherever [they] performed" (Bartow, 1988, p. xiii).

Like other theatre artists through the ages, the first directors developed their individual discipline and passed their knowledge to each succeeding generation. Theatre crafts passed between the generations through apprenticeships and word-of-mouth. Generally, formal theatrical training was all but unheard of until the nineteenth century, when the first acting schools began to appear in England. It was not until the surge in creation of colleges and universities in the United States at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century that formal, degree driven education in theatre began to emerge (Langley, 1990).

As the university systems began to grow, the instruction of students in theatre also grew. Courses in theatre began to increase immediately after both World Wars. The 1920s saw theatre courses offered at institutions of higher education, such as New York University, Iowa, Yale, Northwestern and Cornell. Generally these courses provided training in theatre practice, history, and theory. The first large campus playhouse was built at Yale in 1926. Yale unsuccessfully attempted to entice George Pierce Baker, a

noted theatre teacher at Harvard, to join their faculty. When Harvard refused to create a separate theatre department and to replace its theatre after a fire; however, Baker moved to Yale in 1947 to form the nation's first theatre department (Langley, 1990).

Since then the number of schools offering study in theatre continued to multiply. Specific training for directors began in the late thirties and early forties (Vaughn, 1993). Today, there are nearly 900 schools offering degrees or certification in the dramatic arts (College Board, 1993). While schools differ in specific curricula, some focusing on baccalaureate degrees, others including graduate and doctorate degrees, most offer training in all theatre arts.

The National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) provides general standard guidelines for the various degrees and specialties. The NAST handbook only supports study in directing at the master's level. NAST encourages directors to gravitate towards Master of Fine Arts (MFA) programs that NAST describes as programs "that emphasize full-time, professionally oriented study of some aspect of theatre practice that prepares the student as a professional practitioner or a professional teacher of theatre practice" (NAST, 1992, p. 67). More specifically, work towards an MFA in directing should include study in theatre history,

dramatic literature, criticism, aesthetics, and directing, allowing the graduate to demonstrate the following:

- a. The ability to develop and guide fully mounted productions of a wide variety of plays from statement of concept through public performance
 - b. A broad knowledge of dramatic literature and theatre history, including a demonstrated ability to undertake research.
 - c. The ability to work with actors in their creation and performance.
 - d. An understanding of the basic principles of color, mass, line, and space in the theatre.
 - e. An understanding of all the theatre arts and crafts at a sufficient level of knowledge to communicate with other artists and to make critical judgments in all areas of theatre.
- (p. 69)

As a result of these guidelines, institutions of higher education instruct directing students about the theories and history of theatre in general, about the detailed theories and history of their specific area, and about the basic theories and history of the other theatre arts. Directors graduating from these programs are then sent into the professional world with the knowledge and skill needed to do their jobs that involve communicating with other artists. To communicate properly, however, a director needs to know more than just theatre-related knowledge and skills. A director must also have skill and knowledge about the process of communication.

The Role of Communication Studies

There are almost as many definitions of communication as there are books written on the subject. Differences in

definition signal differences in approach. Whereas some theorists study communication's transactional nature as a process that takes place between two people and influences both, others are curious about message interpretation and intentionalism (i.e., does communication take place only when communication is intended?), others investigate communication as a linear process (one that occurs between a source and a receiver through a single channel that affects the receiver only), and others pursue communication as a system made up of many parts acting in concert (Infante, Rancer, & Womack, 1990). The resulting definitions may not lead to agreement on the nature of communication, but they shed light on the process.

For any study, however, it is important to settle on one definition that will serve as a basis for discussion. This does not mean that we must settle on an absolute definition. As Infante et al. (1990) state:

It is not true that to study something we have to be able to define it. At any time in our study of a phenomenon we can stop and define it. The definition would simply represent our present thinking. As we learn more, we surely change our definition. (p. 9)

With that thought in mind and for the purpose of this study, communication shall refer to "the process of people sharing thoughts, ideas, and feelings with each other in commonly understandable ways" (Hamilton & Parker, 1990, p. 4).

The advantage to this definition is that it allows us to view communication in terms of a wide range of human

activity. This is necessary because humans communicate in a variety of situations and through a variety of media. We send and receive messages on an interpersonal basis with individuals with whom we are bound in dyads, small groups, and organizations. We exchange messages using verbal and nonverbal means, face-to-face, over telephones, through newspapers, books and magazines, via television and radio, and even using computer interface networks. Communication is a major human activity.

Because communication permeates all aspects of our lives, our ability to communicate affects the outcome of many endeavors. The level of that ability is known as the level of communication competence, which Devito (1986) defines as "the ability to interact interpersonally in ways to ensure the achievement of one's goals and the satisfaction of both interactants" (p. 61). Logically, the higher one's communication competence is, the higher will be one's satisfaction and the greater will be the number of one's achieved goals. The study of communication processes, therefore, offers the opportunity to increase one's communication competence. To that end, we train directors as persons who will engage in communication with the audience through the medium of theatre.

The Director as Communicator

In Book VII, Chapter 5 of Politics, Aristotle formulates the purpose of art as to entertain and to educate. Inferentially, this formula applies to the art of theatre as well. In order to educate, a production must convey meaning. Several models of theatre exist that attempt to illuminate how the meaning of a production is created and communicated to the audience. According to Meyerhold (1969), two of these models, the triangular and the straight line, see the actions of the director as central to the creation of meaning.

In the triangular model, "the playgoer sees the work of the author and actor through the work of the director" (p. 50). Essentially this means that the performance of a play is a communication process that takes place between the director and the audience. It also means that the actors, the playwright, and the other artists involved are tools that the director uses to establish or encode her message. In other words, the director manipulates them as she would any other medium through which she might communicate.

The straight line model suggests that the playgoer sees the work of the author and director through the actor (Meyerhold, 1969). This concept recasts the communication that takes place as one between director and audience to one between actor and audience. This does not mean that the director's effect on the process is lost. In this model the director hides her work behind the actor. She must still

interpret the script and aid the actors in their pursuit of the performance.

In either case, the director plays a pivotal role in establishing and communicating the play's meaning. Both models suggest that the director must work with or through the actors. This arrangement places the director in a position where she must communicate not only with the audience, but also with those with whom she works to present the play: actors, designers, and the many other artists involved in a production.

In his book, Play Directing: Analysis, Communicating, and Style, Francis Hodge (1982) supports this notion. He develops the thesis that "the director's core activity is communication" and that

it is precisely his capability of exact and imaginative communication with actors and designers (as distinct from his communication to an audience) . . . that will declare his effectiveness. (p. 7, emphasis original)

Communication, therefore, plays a key role in the directing process. It also follows that a director's level of communication competence will affect her success and that she should, therefore, receive training in the use of communication, just as she receives training in the use of blocking, script analysis, and the other tools of the trade, as the NAST guidelines require.

The History of Communication Study

It is interesting to note that Aristotle plays as large a part in the history of communication studies as he does in theatre. His work Rhetoric establishes the basis for the study of the speech arts which were the major thrust of communication training through history. Until approximately the middle of the twentieth century, the study of communication was the study of public speaking, known as "rhetoric." The field we know today as "communication science" or "studies" had its "initial coalescence . . . as a distinct domain in the 1940s" (Delia, 1987, p. 20).

Since that time the field has grown to encompass a wide range of study. In addition to rhetoric, those studying communication can now investigate communication across a wide variety of topics and fields, such as mass media, small groups, organizations, conflict, conflict management, the law, negotiation, health, politics, sales, teaching, industrial relations, and many more. As Pool and Schramm state, "communication permeates every process of man's life. The pervasiveness of communication is what makes it a useful object of study" (Pool, 1973, p. v.). This is also what makes the theories and discoveries in the field of communication studies so widely applicable to other fields.

For those interested, courses are readily available in general areas, such as small group, interpersonal, organizational, intercultural, and persuasive communication.

Within those areas exists the study of a myriad of other topics, including, but not limited to, small group phasic development, roles, norms, conflict management, gender differences, listening, interruption, leadership, and bargaining. The result of all these possibilities is a field alive with cross-topic and cross-discipline research and instruction.

Business majors can take a course in organizational communication that both presents information and helps increase the major's skills related to running a large business. Medical students can take a course in health communication that will teach them effective methods of communication within the medical field. Almost anyone interested in advancing their knowledge and skill regarding communication within their own discipline can take a course or a couple of courses that will be beneficial.

Even directing students have the opportunity to take courses in communication that will help them become more competent communicators. Or can and will they? The process of becoming a knowledgeable director is not simple. As pointed out above, the director must learn not only about her own art, but she must also learn something about all the other arts involved in the theatrical process. In addition, a directing student must also acquire practical experience in directing. The result of this intense curriculum is that the directing student has little time to shoulder the extra

course load necessary to understand communication theory and to acquire communication skills. Time constraints are further exasperated by the number of communication topics that apply to the rehearsal process.

Just as theatre incorporates the other fine arts (music and graphic art), it also crosses a number of communication oriented fields, such as small group, conflict, conflict management, leadership, and interpersonal communication skills. In order to understand all of those areas a prospective director must attend a series of classes such as small group communication, organizational communication, interpersonal communication, and rhetoric. Then, within each course, she must focus on several aspects. In the end, she will become quite knowledgeable in communication but will probably be far behind in her theatrical studies.

The remedy to this problem would be to teach directors the communication skills and theories that they will need in regular directing courses. Finney (1987) reported, however, that "although many director training programs exist in the United States, no program teaches the use of the director's communicative behavior in rehearsal" (p. iii). If there are no programs teaching the use of communication, then perhaps current courses fulfill this need. If this is true, then it is reasonable to assume that the amount of space that current texts devote to communication will reflect the amount of this training currently being done. In other words, the amount of

space devoted to communication in directing texts should roughly reflect the emphasis being put on communication in currently taught directing courses.

Unfortunately, as Marshall (1988) astutely points out, within these texts, "discussion of the communication transactions involved in the pre-performing [rehearsal process] is virtually non-existent" (p. 15). In addition, Finney (1987) concludes that directing texts:

do not tell directors how to help [actors], only that they should help; the means of transmitting that help are neglected. In other words, there has been little treatment in those directing texts of directors' communicative behavior. Nor has the treatment of directors' communicative behavior been nourished in American director training programs. (p. 2, emphasis original)

Finney (1988) also reports that this is an important oversight, considering the result of his survey of actors and directors at various professional levels which found that "48% of the respondents claimed that communication is one of the 'specific areas of training . . . lacking in director training in the U.S.A. today'" (p. 3). The conclusions reached by Wilson (1988) in her study of managerial techniques, including aspects of communication used by professional directors, support this position. She concludes that the data indicates that "it becomes apparent that very few, if any, of these directors received preparation sufficient to their present roles and responsibilities" (p. 67).

The solution to this lack of training in directors' communication behavior during rehearsal is the design and implementation of a course covering the subject. It is the intention of this study to undertake that project.

The Study

The purpose of this study is to gain insight into the training of theatre directors as communicators. The study investigates the professional theatre teacher's task of designing and implementing a course intended to train directors in the field of communication and the use of that new knowledge and skill during the rehearsal process. The study undertakes this course design project, intending to answer two questions regarding the fusion of training for the director and the field of communication studies. The first question focuses on the type of material this type of course should cover, and the second question regards the most appropriate manner of material presentation.

The Problem

As stated above, communication casts its net over a wide variety of topics. One problem faced by any teacher about to design a course for directors on communication during the rehearsal process, therefore, is to decide which topics apply to the rehearsal process. Because it may be impossible to fit everything a director might need to know into one course,

the teacher must make decisions regarding which communication processes affect the rehearsal process the most. Another problem facing the teacher is to decide the best manner in which to present the subject matter to the student. This comprises decisions regarding the use of pedagogical or andragogical approaches, as well as the course's length, in terms of time and depth and in terms of amount of information presented.

Methodology

In order to reach a better understanding of these problems, I (1) undertook an investigation of current theatrical directing and non-theatrical communication theory and practice (i.e., those theories and practices that impact the rehearsal process as opposed to those that impact the director's artistic endeavor to communicate to the audience through the production); (2) evaluated this information in the context of personal experience within both fields; (3) designed a semester-long course for directors; (4) taught that course; and (5) evaluated the success of the training.

The Scope of the Project

Situational restrictions force a narrowing of this project. The given circumstances are that (1) this is a pilot project, and (2) the course will only have a one-credit-hour status, making it impossible to assign the

students an intense load. As a result of these circumstances, the study will be unable to incorporate the depth of view or breadth in the number of communication topics covered. All decisions about content and presentation during the course of the project, therefore, took these facts into account.

Organization of the Study

This introduction previewed the study by (1) providing the background information on the project; (2) establishing a definitional framework for terms used throughout the study, (3) presenting an overview of the study; (4) outlining the methodology that guided the project; and (5) delimiting the scope of the study.

The second chapter consists of a literature review containing discussions of theatrical directing texts that speak to the director/actor communication process, theatrical research on the subject of director/actor communication, and communication research and texts on small group development, leadership, and conflict. This chapter also discusses how the communication theories and practices reviewed apply to the work of the director during rehearsal.

The third chapter presents the design of the course and presents the rationales behind the decisions that governed the course's shape.

The fourth chapter illuminates the course as it happened and includes a summary by week of the events that took place.

The fifth chapter discusses the success of the course and the limitations of the project.

The sixth chapter considers the implications of the results in terms of further research, making recommendations for future courses attempting to train directors in communication.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Because the major objective of the course that this project investigates is to embellish the director's knowledge of communication theories as they apply to the practical aspects of directing a play, the literature review contained in this chapter will focus on theories of communication and the practical job of the theatrical director. Specifically, the following review of literature consists of several sections: theatrical directing texts that speak to the director/actor communication process; theatrical research on the subject of director/actor communication; communication texts on small group development and organizational structure; communication texts on leadership; and communication texts on conflict.

It is important to note that the following reviews are not exhaustive in nature. Their limited scope takes into account the fact that this project is a pilot study that unites several fields. The reviews, therefore, are not intended to encompass all the material normally found in a complete course designed for any single area. Instead, the reviews will focus on a few of the key issues in each field that will arguably have the greatest effect on the work of the director. To this end, the reviews contained herein,

will present, for the most part, general information found in texts used to teach the fields covered.

Logic dictates that the designer of any course must first turn to the work currently available in the course's field before turning elsewhere. For this study, then, it is logical to turn first to works written about directing to extract information regarding the director's use of communication. The volume of works written on theatrical directing over the last century, however, make it impossible to report on every subject-oriented book, monograph, article, thesis, and dissertation available. The portions of the review dedicated to the field of directing will, therefore, concentrate on those works containing a significant reference to communication for the director (i.e., mention the subject more than in passing by devoting a section, chapter, or its entirety to the subject). Because the director to a greater extent communicates with actors than with other artists and managers involved in a production, the review will focus on that relationship.

There is a plethora of works written on communication. Philosophers, rhetoricians, teachers, psychologists, popular self-help authors, and many others have written on the subject. While most books take up a different point of view or focus on a particular area, specific theories are essentially the same throughout the literature. As a result an attempt to review every author who has written on the

subject of communication would be redundant and extremely lengthy. In order to prevent such qualities, the review of each area presented below will focus on general texts on communication theory written by well-respected authors. Other criteria for text selection also apply.

There is a significant difference between the criteria used to select theatre texts and communication texts. As stated above, the theatre texts chosen for review are those that contain a significant reference to communication for the director. Communication texts, however, do not focus on theatre whatsoever. The review of communication texts will focus, therefore, on those aspects of communication that are applicable to the rehearsal process, whether or not the texts involved make a significant reference to theatre. For each communication subject the review will present, an inclusion rationale is necessary. This rationale will illuminate how that particular subject impacts the director's job. Presentation of this rationale will be made at the beginning of each subject area unless otherwise noted.

Theatrical Directing Texts and the Director/Actor Communication Process

Practitioners of theatre have been writing about the complete theatre process for centuries, but it was not until the last quarter of the eighteenth century, with the emergence of director, that the rehearsal process became specific fodder for writers. Directors themselves and other

theatre participants and observers have written volumes, yet as stated above, Marshall (1988) astutely points out that within these texts, "discussion of the communication transactions involved in the pre-performing [rehearsal process] is virtually non-existent" (p. 15).

While there are many books that mention communication as part of the director's duties, only a few make that mention significant by devoting a section or chapter to the subject. This is not to say that most texts on directing do not acknowledge the importance of the director/actor relationship and the need for directors to communicate with them. Unfortunately, these texts do not give clear instruction and often reduce their advice to terms such as "cajoling," "bullying" (Morrison, 1973), and "wooing" (Roose-Evans 1968 p. 20).

A survey of directing texts shows that many of these books do not even mention the subject of communicating during the rehearsal process; and those that do, apply, on average, 3% of their volume (105 out of 3147 pages) on the subject of communicating with actors. The following texts were surveyed: Ball (1984) devotes 26 of 180 pages to a chapter entitled "Relation to Actors"; Bennedetti (1985) includes an 11 page chapter (of 237 pages); Carra (1985) contains no information about the actor-director relationship in 172 pages; Clurman (1974) in his respected 300 page book allots only 22 pages to the rehearsal process, only sharing

anecdotal evidence on the acting process and not specific data or techniques on how to work with actors (although some communication inferences can be drawn as elaborated below); Cohen and Harrop (1974) devote only 5 pages of their 296 page text to working with actors as people and the majority of the remaining pages to the acting process; Cole and Chinoy (1976) discuss everything imaginable in this book on directing, except communication, motivation and feed-back; Counsell (1973) assigns only 10 of his 129 pages to working with actors (only defining roles and types of actors); Glen (1973) contains no references in 247 pages to the working relationship of directors and actors other than through the technical aspects of rehearsing a script; Hodge (1982) contains the best argument for training the director in communication, but fails to elaborate (see discussion in main text); Johnson & Johnson (1970) pay no attention to communication in their 414 pages; Marowitz (1986) uses 18 of his 194 pages through the chapter titled "The Rehearsal Process, or Gloucester's Leap"; O'Neil & Boretz (1987), to stress the importance of effective communication, but devotes only three paragraphs to this discussion; while Morrison (1973) does not include a significant section on the artist-director relationship (within 143 pages), he does intersperse a few sentences of sound communication advice in the chapter titled "Shaping the Play: The Process of Rehearsal"; Sievers, Stiver, and Kahan (1974) include about 3 pages in

their 348 page book on communication between the director and actor; Staub (1973) presents two minor sections totaling 2.5 pages, one on discussions with actors about character analysis and a second on giving directions to actors about speeches in this 362 page book which contains some reference to communication (1.5 and 1 page, respectively); and Vaughn (1993) does not devote a chapter of its 254 pages specifically to the actor/director relationship, but presents some excellent short sections (e.g., note giving, problem solving, discussions, and interrupting actors) totaling 6.5 pages relating to communication.

The survey, in general, reveals the dearth of information within these texts and, as Marshall (1988) puts it, "little discussion is devoted to actual method or process to use in attaining the goals associated with the role of 'director/communicator'" (p. 12). A brief look at a few of the books in the field of director education, drawn from the books surveyed and which contain significant mention of the subject, supports this claim.

Dean and Carra (1980), like most texts, present information regarding the historical background of directing and the responsibilities of the director. It also includes discussions of acting, techniques used in staging a play, rehearsal schedule design methodology, and what the text calls the five fundamentals of play directing: composition; picturization; movement; rhythm; and pantomimic

dramatization. Communication is not one of the fundamentals they list. Dean and Carra (1980), however, do acknowledge the importance of the actor/ director relationship and suggest that communication is important to this relationship within the process of creating theatre.

The relationship between director and actor unquestionably varies according to personalities, philosophy of theatre, background, and circumstances involved, even accepting the talent, creativity, knowledge, and dedication of both. Whatever the balance may be, we still should expect from the director a compassionate understanding of the actor's problems, a facility for communicating his concepts of the play and its values, and a talent for inspiring actors and eliciting their best efforts. (p. 341)

Unfortunately, this is the sum total of their remarks on the subject of communication. The text fails to elaborate on exactly how the director communicates or inspires.

As mentioned above, another directing text still widely used is by Francis Hodge (1982). On the surface, this text promises proper examination of communication in the rehearsal process. Hodge devotes two of the four parts of his book to communication. Part two investigates the director-actor relationship, and part three summarizes the director-designer relationship. Hodge begins his text by stating that the director is "the dedicated communicator-leader of all those who work with this art form" (p. 3), and that directing is a "primary study in communication and artistic leadership" (p. 2). Hodge then goes on to state that the director's "primary work is communication--not directly to the audience

but to actors and designers who then transmit his ideas . . . to the audience" (p. 6 emphasis original). In fact, Hodge states that one of the five basic assumptions of the entire book is that "the director's core activity is communication. It is precisely his capability of exact and imaginative communication with actors and designers. . . .--on a sublimated level as well as on a conscious level--that will declare his effectiveness" (p. 7 emphasis original). At the beginning of a chapter titled "Directing is Communicating," Hodge amplifies his previous comments on the director as communicator by stating that:

once the learning director recognizes that communication is his corework, he will concentrate on using every device he knows to get through. But at the same time, because he expects people to pay attention to him, he must go out of his way to pay the closest attention to them. . . . A director communicates when he is a natural leader who knows how to work with, and not at other human beings.
(p. 64)

This discussion of leadership leads into a brief discussion of the relative positive and negative aspects of certain leadership styles, such as the humanist director, the strong director, and the dictator director. Unfortunately, Hodge (1982) is long on principles, but short on specific practical advice. As Marshall (1988) noted, Hodge urges the director to talk with designers but to limit discussions with actors and concentrate on "doing." Improvisation, movement, and gesture provide some of the channels for this doing. In essence, the traditional tools of staging are seen as

vehicles for communication. At times, Hodge treats communication as an integral aspect of the process; at other times, communication becomes simply a means to an end (p. 23).

In the final analysis, the great majority of Hodge's (1982) text examines artistic considerations and how the director can assist the actor in the acting process. The information, either practical or theoretical, regarding communication during the rehearsal process is negligible.

Another well-regarded text in the field is Harold Clurman's 1972 book, On Directing. Like Hodge (1982), Clurman insists that communication with the director's fellow artists is an important function. He posits that the director must be a teacher, a politician, a lay analyst who understands the psychology of the actor, and the source of inspiration, as well as the artistic leader of the production. Accomplishment of this monumental task is subject to the director's ability to collaborate with her fellow artists. Clurman (1972) elaborates by stating that "it is not the director alone who shapes the production, he employs everyone's talent" (p. 173). He goes on to suggest that, at all turns, directors refrain from becoming dictators and that it is very important for directors to discover the appropriate communication manner for each individual early in the rehearsal process. Specifically, Clurman (1972) advises,

when discussing work with difficult actors, that directors should follow,

my principal maxim in cases of difficulty with an actor: Never, never, never win an argument with him, never persuade him that he is 'wrong,' just get him to do what you want! The director who beats an actor down by the force of his own authority does so at his own cost. (p. 166)

Clurman, we can infer, also speaks to non-verbal communication, as well as the role and status of leadership, when he writes that the director, "does not influence by verbal explanation only. There are eloquent directors who are very nearly mute. In one way or another the director must impress his company, make it feel that he merits his leadership and their confidence" (p. 72).

The problem with this work is clear. On Directing is full of sage advice, but does not reveal how to achieve the goals it advises. This problem probably has to do with Clurman's belief that, "the director's essential qualities as a human being, which he perhaps unconsciously communicates, cannot be pinned down. There are no lessons for acquiring this inalienable personal touch" (p. 173). In essence, he has said that communication skills are a part of one's personality and that, as such, become unteachable.

Therefore, like the other texts on directing, this text indicates the importance of communication, but in the end does not deliver any salient data or practical advice on the subject.

The two books which contain, perhaps, the best discussions of the actor/director relation in terms of communication are Charles Marowitz's Prospero's Staff (1986) and William Ball's A Sense of Direction (1984). Marowitz's book uses 18 of its 194 pages (9 percent) through the chapter "The Rehearsal Process, or Gloucester's Leap," and Ball's book devotes 26 of its 180 pages (14 percent) to a chapter entitled "Relation to Actors." Although neither of these chapters deal in their entirety with communication, nor do they use the grammar of communication, each has something to offer. Both explicate ways to manage conflict through communication between director and actor, and both may seek to "create a basin in which the actor can freely swim" (Marowitz, 1986, p. 60), but their approaches vary widely. Marowitz seeks psychological control over the actor. Ball (1984) seeks to establish a collaborative relationship.

Marowitz (1986) sees direction as the "activation of certain parts of the actor's personality over others" (p. 56). He also tends to apply labels such as "neurotic" (p. 57) to the actor. Marowitz suggests that it is fashionable for directors to emphasize a collaborative relationship with actors, but that, in the end, one must accept the dominant role of the director. The director, however, cannot directly impose authority over the actor. A round-about, "devious" approach, one that uses the "slyness

and taciturnity, [that] are sometimes the director's most effective tools" (p. 58), is best.

Marowitz (1986) also realizes that "every moment of communication between actor and director is an opportunity for artistic interchange" (p. 65), and that "working with the actor means entering into a relationship" (p. 67). This relationship, like any other, holds the possibility of disagreement. Marowitz breaks these disagreements into two categories. The first is one in which the disagreement is based on an intellectual or emotional objection to a particular interpretation. In this case, he believes that "the tension is healthy and creative" and that it may lead to "new and startling insights" (p. 68).

The other type of disagreement is one in which the actor, seeing the director as the authority figure, will transfer "irrational feelings to thwart the will of a figure who, in the actor's unconscious, stands for someone else" (Marowitz, 1986, p. 68). In such cases Marowitz suggests that the director must take on the role of psychological analyst. The director must attempt to help "the actor [outside of rehearsal] distinguish between personal obsession and artistic direction" (p. 69). Immediately after suggesting this approach, Marowitz contradicts this approach and his belief that direction is the "activation of certain parts of the actor's personality over others" (p. 56). He

does this by saying that the role of analyst is not a role that the director is qualified to enact.

As an alternative the director becomes "an advocate forced to argue his case for the sake of the recalcitrant actor" (Marowitz, 1986, p. 69). Marowitz suggests that

by constant reference not to his hang-ups or his unconscious drives but to the logic and unity of his own conception, he may bring the actor around. Commanding [the actor's] obedience will only strengthen the transference and cause it to become even more solidly entrenched. Gentle, firm, or even emphatic persuasion with reference to the common object is [the director's] only hope.
(p. 69)

In other words, the director should not manipulate the actor emotionally, but appeal to the actor's logic. Perhaps what Marowitz is attempting to imply through this contradiction is that each situation is different and must be handled differently. This idea is made clearer in the final few pages of the chapter when Marowitz discusses the difference between the "Laissez Faire" and the "Faire Comme-Ça" director.

Marowitz (1986) sees the difference between these two methods as the difference between a Spontaneous and Consciously Induced approach to creating the production. He associates spontaneity with the Laissez Faire Director when he states:

the Laissez Faire method is by far the most popular with actors, in that it encourages them to perform comfortably and is based on the assumption that the actor gives and the director receives. In this relationship, the director . . . is not to interfere with the natural flow of the actor's invention. (p. 72)

Marowitz associates the conscious induction with the Faire Comme-Ça director when he states:

under the Faire Comme-Ça method, the director formulates a specific blueprint that the actor is then expected to realize. The director working from a master plan expects the actor to raise himself to his standard and refuses to accept results, no matter how "natural," that fall short of that mark. (p. 72, emphasis original)

This approach creates rehearsals that "are often turbulent and filled with stress" (p. 72) and which see "a constant struggle for supremacy--the actor resisting ideas he finds unconvincing, the director imposing ideas he believes to be vital" (p. 73).

In the end, Marowitz (1986) believes that what "becomes clear from an extended analysis of the rehearsal process is that a balance has to be struck between the Spontaneous and the Consciously Induced" (p. 73) that will help the director and actor establish "a healthy relationship [in which] neither artist is so fixated that he cannot concede the persuasive ideas of the other" (p. 72). The object then of a proper working relationship is to find a "golden mean" that Marowitz suggests "does not come about by magic." It must be cultivated from the first day.

Essentially Marowitz (1986) is arguing against three approaches to director's communication in conflict. He finds the Laissez Faire and Faire Comme-Ça approaches too extreme. Yet, at the same time, he finds a centralist collaborative approach, in which both director and actor share

responsibility, just as unacceptable. Instead, without specifically saying so, he argues for the idea of a Benevolent Dictator approach in which the actor is allowed input only to the point at which that input begins to interfere with the director's vision.

Prospero's Staff (Marowitz, 1986) is one of the best books on directing in terms of its discussion of communication issues. Its coverage of the subject gives importance to the subject of communication to the directing process. Unfortunately, like others, it relies more on personal experience and opinion than it does on solid communication theory, and its discussion is not clearly labeled as such nor discussed directly in terms of communication. Furthermore, by relying on personal opinion, it winds up painting a one-sided picture of the actor/director relationship with actors taking the short end of the psychological stick. Marowitz's discussion of the conflict situation is almost entirely limited to what the director should do after the conflict breaks out. It paints a negative picture of conflict and focuses only on how the director might regain control. Finally, its discussion of Laissez Faire versus Faire Comme-Ça approaches points astutely to the problems of the extreme and argues for a more moderate approach, failing to explain how one might accomplish that approach.

Ball (1984) agrees that the extreme approaches are fraught with problems, but argues instead for a collaborative

position. He believes that the director "blocks the path of creative flow by forcing his own ideas, his own solutions, and his own decisions, when he should be inviting [the actors] creative suggestions" (p. 52). In presenting this argument, Ball reveals an entirely different picture of actors and their relationship with directors. Where Marowitz (1986) sees the actor as being full of deep psychological problems, Ball (1984) sees actors as humans who engage in a constant battle against the fear of failure. With that state in mind, Ball counsels that "fear has to be superseded if a director expects to get the best out of an actor" (p. 45). To that end, he suggests that it "is essential that the director be the actor's ally" (p. 44).

In the chapter "Relations to Actors," Ball (1984) provides one of the only chapters in any directing text dedicated almost entirely to communication issues. Reciting the entire chapter here would be contrary to the purpose of this review. Therefore, the following section will highlight only parts of Ball's discussion. Specifically, this section will discuss the aspects of a director's communication that Ball believes will aid in the process of creating an alliance between director and actor when he states that:

each director must develop techniques that send messages quickly about that alliance--the kindness with which he speaks to actors, the way he touches them, the way he praises them, the way he always has time for their questions, the way he overlooks their mistakes. (p. 44)

In addition, this section will look at Ball's discussion of conflict.

Ball (1984) includes an insightful, if incomplete, section on touching and its importance to actors as people. He cites research showing that touching has a positive effect on people and their attitudes. While he recommends that careful consideration be given to how, when, and where on the body one touches an actor, he firmly believes that "a wise director touches" (p. 56). He concludes that

touching carries a wide variety of messages; the director learns to use those messages effectively, because the message in one touch is swift, efficient and clear. At the end of rehearsal one frequently does not have time to compliment each actor on his work that day, but one can casually stand between them and the door and touch them, each one, just lightly before they leave. It may be indiscriminate, but the message is complete.
(p. 57)

Another area of communication Ball (1984) speaks to is the use of praise. He believes that "a director must discipline himself to praise ceaselessly" (p. 46), because "to an actor praise is like food" (p. 46). In addition, Ball states that "habitual admiration is not usually a natural tendency. Most directors have to develop the technique" (p. 47). He then proceeds to cite examples of effective uses of praise both on and off stage. He concludes that:

praise is the musculature of directing. All the theories and concepts can be thrown out the window; they are a dime a dozen. Any director who has a long career is a good praiser. You can practically measure a director's career by his enthusiasm for what he witnesses. (p. 48)

Ball (1984) also discusses the use of questions by actors and directors. He reasons that when an actor raises a question that it is not really a question. Instead, it "is an innocent bid to draw the director's attention to something unresolved" (p. 49). As such, he suggests that the answer should not come from the director but from the actor who asked the question. The best way to resolve these questions is to answer with a question. The reason for this is two-fold.

The first is that answering the actor's question with a question allows the actor to resolve a difficulty for which he already has the answer in mind. Ball provides three examples of how this method works, one of which follows:

Actor: How should I do it, on the right or on the left?

Director: Which way is best?

Actor: If I do it on the right, I can arrive on time. If I do it on the left, I'll be late.

Director: Well, then do it on the right. (p. 50)

Because the actor already knew the answer and was therefore simply looking for help dealing with the fear of making a wrong decision, the director, by answering with a question reassures the actor, thereby building self-confidence and her sense of well-being. "Anything that will lessen an actor's sense of well-being" will cause the actor to "become less creative" (p. 68).

The second reason the director should use questions has to do with the building of a collaborative relationship. Ball (1984) mentions directors who clearly know what they

want. They come into rehearsal demanding: "I want this. I want that! I see it this way. My entire concept . . . I need so many people on this side. I want you here" (p. 51). This is an "amateur" director. By starting every sentence with the word "I," this director makes it clear that her ego is on the line.

"A director in an ego bind should not be given the leadership of a group of creative actors" (Ball, 1984, p. 51). By asking questions, the director allows the actor to "develop a habit of right answers" (p. 51). It also tells the actor that the director trusts the actor's ability to arrive at an intuitively correct answer. In addition, it saves the director from attempting to accomplish an impossible task of trying to figure out everything in advance. This approach is not only stressful, but it would mean that the director would enter rehearsals "trying to impose unilateral and nonorganic directives upon a cast prepared to unleash their own intuitive right knowledge into the situation. [The Director] only frustrates them" (p. 52).

This approach blocks the actor's creative impulses and intensifies rather than ameliorates their struggle against fear. It tells them that they are incapable of intuitively making the correct decision. In other words, this approach is the antithesis of collaboration.

Finally, Ball (1984) discusses the director/actor conflict in a section titled "Battles." Ball argues that whenever conflict develops between a director and an actor, the director always surrenders. That is the law. The reason for this is practical. If you win a battle with an actor, you lose. There's no such thing as a director winning a battle with an actor. So if the beginning of a battle occurs, you yield immediately. . . .As soon as you accept a supportive position, the next step is creative. (p. 48)

Through this approach the actor and director become allies and can work together on a collaborative basis.

Other communication topics Ball (1984) covers deal with discussion between actors, interruption, scapegoatism, and depersonalized direction. However, these sections tend to simply repeat the counsel provided in the areas reviewed above which is one of the largest problems with this otherwise fine chapter. Two other problems exist in regard to this chapter.

The first is that discussion is one-sided. For example, with the exception of one sentence that indicates that sometimes the director must push an actor, the chapter presents a point of view that is too general. It is as if Ball (1984) only sees one way to direct that works in almost every situation. By taking this stand, Ball lumps actors together in the same way as Marowitz (1986), except where Marowitz sees them all as neurotic, Ball sees them all as sensitive.

The second problem with the chapter is its scope. This chapter is arguably the best communication section in any book on directing because it speaks directly to the subject of communication and its effect on the director/actor relationship. It does not cover, however, a wide range of communication topics. For example, there is no discussion of the use of rhetoric during discussion, the positive aspects of conflict, or the various styles of leadership.

In summary, the majority of directing texts available do not cover director/actor communication in much depth. Those that do tend to do so only briefly, discussing the subject indirectly or without much depth. If the sections of Dean & Carra (1980), Hodge (1982), Clurman (1972), Marowitz (1986), and Ball (1984) were taken in sum, they would provide some insight into the sage advice regarding communication in the same way that a lay person offers insight and advice into the subject of medicine. For example, most of us understand symptoms and can prescribe patent medicine to relieve those symptoms. For a complete understanding of how to provide a cure, one must understand the inner workings of the body.

In the same way, in order to understand what we see happening in regard to communication during the rehearsal process and for us to treat successfully those "symptoms," we must have a deeper understanding of the inner workings. That information is clearly not available in directing texts which means that we must turn elsewhere.

Theatrical Research Into the Director/Actor Communication Process

The lack of information about communication within the rehearsal process is lacking in the obvious source--texts on directing. One must, therefore, turn to the vanguard of theatrical study, the research project, for theories about the communication/rehearsal process relationship. Unfortunately, for the traditional researcher, theatre is an art form that has little concern for empirical, data-based studies. It focuses instead on play production as its laboratory. Evidence of this focus exists in the fact that many colleges and universities accept credentials for tenure of their faculty on production experience rather than on traditional research. As a result, graduate students lead the way in research efforts. Several dissertations during the last twenty years have investigated various forms of communication within the rehearsal process. The next section reviews several of those studies.

Communication not only occurs through the transmittal of verbal messages, it also occurs through the transmission of non-verbal messages. "Aspects and Correlates of Directors' Nonverbal Behavior in the Rehearsal Process," a dissertation by James Reed Finney (1987), examines

specific nonverbal behaviors of successful directors in rehearsal in an attempt to discover the effects of those behaviors on actors and the rehearsal process. It also analyzes how those behaviors might influence the effectiveness of those directors professional products. The identification of those behaviors which appear

significantly to affect actor, rehearsal process, or theatrical process results in the development of suggestions for nonverbal communication for directors. (p. 30)

Finney accomplishes this task through two simultaneously conducted studies reaching the following conclusions:

1. Sitting at the rear of the house (auditorium), shouting instructions and ideas at the actors on stage, is not an appropriate way of directing actors.

2. Directors who enter an actor's Intimate Far space (6"-1'6" from the actor) are more likely to get positive actor response.

3. Shifting proxemic relationships with the actors, vis-a-vis from where the director conducts the rehearsals, will increase a director's influence. In other words, directors should spend time moving about several areas of the stage and auditorium rather than sitting or standing in one place.

4. In opposition to entrenched theatrical custom, directors should demonstrate movement for the actor.¹

5. Nonverbal feedback is as important to actor instruction as verbal feedback.

6. "Demonstration of excitement is crucial to the success of the rehearsal process" (Finney, 1987, p. 149).

Finney also includes a section on the study's limitations that refers to insufficient randomization in terms of directors, actors, participants, and scripts used,

¹ It should be noted that this survey does not reach a conclusion regarding line readings.

insufficient sampling size, the presence of Hawthorne², halo and gender effects, and lack of actor feedback as possible shortcomings.

To this list I would add the limitations of controlled or ad hoc groups. For example, the directors in this study may behave differently on their own turf and/or during a complete set of rehearsals for a real production. The study disregards this possibility. In addition, this study never makes clear exactly what criteria it uses to evaluate a director as a successful director. It seems that the only criterion used is the director's reputation. This leaves the reader wondering if Finney's successful directors produce productions that are commercially successful or critically successful, or simply create a positive communicative experience for the actors without regard for productions' critical or commercial success.

The stated intent of David Wohl's 1988 dissertation, "A Study of Group Phasic Development in the Theatre Rehearsal Process," is in part "to describe the nature of the rehearsal process in terms of its group dynamics, with special emphasis on phasic development" (p. 4) and "to provide a possible model of phasic development applicable to the theatre rehearsal process" (p. 5). Wohl's study also concentrates on three discrete aspects of small group dynamics--group task

² The theory that participants in experiments that are recorded on video may behave differently as a result of the camera's presence.

orientation; group/leader conflict; and inter-group unity and cohesion--to establish their relationship to the phasic development of the rehearsal process. Wohl bases the study's results on two studies, one quantitative, the other qualitative, of three productions at Kent State University, concluding that a model with five phases best characterizes the rehearsal process.

In the first phase, "Group Dependency," actors will question their basic goals and purposes. Actor insecurity and tentativeness mark the atmosphere of these early rehearsals. After a few rehearsals, actors begin to feel more confident and comfortable as patterns of behavior, such as seating arrangements, greetings, and entering and exiting patterns, begin to emerge. At this point the performance team moves into the second phase, "Conflict I." Throughout this phase, marked by dissent, the group primarily concerns itself with the role of director as leader. Resolution of this conflict phase occurs in two chronologically separate or interdependent ways. The first takes place when the actors "symbolically engineer the director's 'exit' " (Wohl, 1988, p. 189). A developing ambivalence toward the director's authority reflects this process. The other factor that signals the end of this phase (concern over leadership issues) and identifies the beginning of the next phase, in which inter-group issues are the major concern, is the existence of a crisis. The resolution of this crisis begins

the third phase of group development, "Group Interdependence." Harmony, happiness, and togetherness and a developing sense of ensemble exemplify this phase. The inception of the next phase, "Conflict II," however, reveals the illusory quality of this harmony. This second conflict phase includes "regression to themes which first surfaced during the Conflict I phase [including] leader/group conflict, independence and interpersonal hostility" (Wohl, 1988, p. 194). The final phase, "Group Effectiveness," results from the interplay of two major forces: the realization that the end of the group approaches (termination of rehearsal and beginning of performance); and the developing need to "establish criteria for evaluating the group experience" (Wohl, 1988, p. 196).

Wohl (1988) concludes his chapter on his proposed model of phasic development by indicating that several themes emerged through the course of the project: leadership (power and authority) and cohesion. Wohl willingly admits that the underdevelopment of these themes places qualifications on the study. He also sees this study as limited by its investigation of university (educational) productions. Professionals might behave differently and certainly the relationship between young actors and their older directors, who are often their out-of-rehearsal teachers, negatively reflects the relationships of their counterparts found in professional theatre. Wohl recognizes this lack of strong and sufficient statistical data. He bases this last limitation on the fact

that distribution of the questionnaire to the actors occurred only twice during each production's rehearsal period. If one adds to these limitations the fact that the study investigates only three productions at one university, one realizes that the study lacks a sufficiently broad base from which to draw confident conclusions that are generalizable across the field of theatre.

Segal (1978) also develops a theory of phasic development in theatre casts, but posits six phases. The first four of these deals with the rehearsal process, while the last two are applicable to the performance period (Performing) and the point at which the group disbands (De-forming). For this review, only the first four are relevant. They are: Forming, which includes the orientation aspects of Finney's work as well as the audition process; Norming is a phase indicated by the setting of patterns and rules regarding, behavior; Storming, which is equivalent to Finney's (1988) Conflict I phase, but which Segal (1978) proposes lasts until just prior to opening; Transforming is the period in which the actors begin to become the characters. Unlike Finney's model of phasic development, in which each phase's wax and wane occurs on a fairly well defined chronological basis, Segal's model tends to blur the distinction between phases. They seem to overlap, devoid of separation by any obvious event.

The advantage of this study, over the others reviewed herein, is that it took place over the course of four years and studied fifteen productions in a wide variety of theatrical situations. This fact broadens the data base enough so that, if not for other problems, it would hold greater significance than the others studied. The "other problems" revolve around Segal's use of different observation methods during the course of the study. Reliance on participant-observation by the author, in which she participated as an actor, assistant director, or director in a majority of the studied productions, prohibited gathering of complete data. As Segal (1978) points out about her own study: "participant observation interfered with the observer's ability to see things which happened when she was involved in task activities" (p. 63).

That is not to say, however, that a participant-observer methodology is without relevance. We can learn much from this type of investigation. The problem with Segal's study is that her use of data gathered from additional non-participant observation clouds the study. Had she used a single methodology, or had she correlated the data by gathering method, greater clarity of data interpretation would be possible. In addition, the study attempts to investigate too many concepts. Instead of attempting to consider leadership, cohesiveness, formal structure (including roles, norms, and status), interaction and

interpersonal attraction, phases, task, levels of reality, and play, the study should have focused its energy on just one topic, thereby avoiding the diluting shotgun approach.

The work of both Wohl (1988) and Segal (1978) reflect studies of small groups of a non-theatrical nature. Segal adapts the phasic development model described by Tuckman (1965). Tuckman posited that a usual sequence of group development includes four phases that he labeled as phases Forming, Storming, Norming, and Performing. Segal clearly adopts his language, but adds several phases, Transforming and Deforming, that are indigenous to theatrical performance teams. Wohl's five-stage model, on the other hand, seems to adhere to the five-stage model suggested by Caple (1975). The first three stages and the final stage of Caple's model, Orientation, Conflict, Integration and Order respectively, resemble the first three, Orientation, Conflict, and Interdependence, and final stage, Effectiveness, of Wohl's model. The major difference lies in Wohl's assertion that the fourth stage in the development of theatrical performance teams is not the Achievement stage as posited by Caple, but is a second stage of Conflict.

Setting aside the differences between the models suggested by Wohl (1988) and Caple (1975) and the models of Segal (1978) and Tuckman (1965), it is noteworthy that all the models closely follow the phases of development that Shaw (1981) suggests are similar across all groups.

Most groups require some time for orientation (deciding what the group is all about), experience a period of conflict regarding personal and authority relations among group members, usually resolve these conflicts (or eventually dissolve), and, if effective, achieve a productive state in which the energies of members can be used for goal achievement. (Shaw, 1981, p. 107. emphasis added)

As important as the similarities of the theatre studies reviewed above are to studies of phasic development in non-theatrical small groups, of equal importance is the fact that most non-theatrical small group studies also focus on the emergence of a leader. The significance of this lies in the fact that the vast majority of theatrical performance teams form around a pre-existent leader. The presence of a pre-existent leader alters all phases of performance teams' development. This is especially true of the first phase, during which the selection of a leader plays an important part in most small groups, but plays no part in performance teams and the final stage in which, unlike most small groups, the performance team forces its leader out of the group as public performances begin. Unfortunately, neither of the phasic development studies reviewed above examine this important difference between theatrical performance teams and most other small groups.

In her 1988 work, "A Semiotic Phenomenology of Directing," Brenda DeVore Marshall sets out to "explicate a theory of directorial communication" and to "determine the existence of essences that are universal within each unique process of directing" (p. 12). Through a non-empirical

approach, based on the tenants of semiotic phenomenology, Marshall looks at a production of Brecht on Brecht to illuminate the director's communication process. Relying on questionnaires and interviews with the actors participating in the production, Marshall concludes that, during the rehearsal or pre-performing process, directors communicate in three different contexts: the natural world, in which we find interpersonal communication regarding the everyday happenings of the people involved in the production; the artificial world, in which we find communication about the events and people found in the play; and the cultural world, in which all artistic efforts remain imbedded. Furthermore, four isomorphic patterns emerged through the course of rehearsal, each dealing with the interaction, or lack thereof, of authentic and sedimented communication. These patterns correlate to the actors' views of the degree to which the rehearsal process lived up to, or exceeded, their expectations regarding the ensemble, the director, and the rehearsal. From these patterns, Marshall (1988) concludes "that a pattern allowing the emergence of [authentic] discourse from [sedimented] speech in a manner that contributes to the resolution of dissonance is the preferred pattern" (p. 172), and that a director should design the rehearsal process around a "communication metaphor" that will allow this pattern to emerge.

There are two problems with this study. The first is that by focusing on only one production, the scope of the study is too narrow to reach secure conclusions about isomorphic patterns. The second problem with the study is that it relies not upon a non-biased review of what directors actually do, but on a biased perception of what they do by the people they do it to. In other words, it relies on the view of the actors, whom the director has manipulated, as the source for data--views clouded by the actors' relationships with the director. Therefore, the data is suspect.

In summary, the research work done in the last twenty-five years represents a seminal effort at investigating the use of small group communication theories by the director in the rehearsal process. This work responds to texts on directing which are high on emphasizing the role of communication within the directing process, but are low on empirical data or practical advice. The current research is also a response to the growth of the field of communication studies. Most current information about communication for the director in the rehearsal process is available only through review of dissertations focused primarily on Phasic Development, Non-verbal Behavior, and the establishment of a model of communication within the rehearsal process.

Therefore, we are only beginning to understand the inner workings of communication during the rehearsal process. If we wish to have a greater effect on the outcome of these

processes, as the doctor wishes to have a greater influence on the progress of illness in humans, it will be necessary for us to turn to studies of communication theories. Once we have an understanding of those, we can provide the director with another tool in her quest for a better production: she will be able to apply her knowledge of communication to the art of the director.

The purpose of the following section of the literature review is to present information on the areas of communication that will form the basis of the course content. It is not the intention of these reviews to present in detail all the content needed to fill the entire course. The reviews will focus, instead, on the major issues in each area. More detail on these areas is available in Appendix A.³

Defining Communication

There are over 126 different definitions of communication (Littlejohn, 1992). While there may not be a definition forthcoming upon which all scholars can agree, it is the search for that definition that bears important fruit. The problem with finding a unified definition of communication is the number of elements that separate the various definitions. Frank Dance lists fifteen of the components (cited in Littlejohn, 1992, p. 7). In the end,

³ Appendix A is the course guide from which lectures were given. As such, it represents a set of notes and does not, therefore follow strict rules of grammar, format, and citation.

Littlejohn says, "no single definition of communication will suffice" (p. 8).

The reason for this conclusion is that scholars are interested in a different components of communication, and, therefore, must reshape the definition of communication in order to meet research goals. Infante et al. (1993) list several of these definitions. They cite Stevens ("Communication is the discriminatory response of an organism to a stimulus"), Berelson and Steiner (Communication is "the transmission of information, ideas, emotions, skills, etc., by the use of symbols--words, pictures, figures, graphs, etc."), Dance (Communication is "the eliciting of a response through verbal symbols."), and others (p. 9). Infante et al. settle on a definition they use throughout their work: "Communication occurs when humans manipulate symbols to stimulate meaning in other humans" (p. 10). Hamilton and Parker (1990) provide another definition. They see communication as "the process of people sharing thoughts, ideas, and feelings with each other in commonly understandable ways" (p. 4).

What each definition of communication shares with every other definition is that it leads to a particular view of the hows, whys and whats of communication; that is, a particular theory of communication. Strict adherence to any one theory, however, is like putting on blinders; that is, it forces one to focus on certain aspects of communication and avoid

others. However, "human communication is such a complex phenomenon that it requires a broad-based, multi-leveled investigatory schema" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 94). One way to avoid counterproductive constriction is to look at communication in its entirety rather than focusing on any one particular aspect or theory. One theory that adapts such an approach is systems theory. This theory is promising because it incorporates the multi-variant nature of communication.

Systems Theory

Systems theory is a way of explaining the interrelations among "a set of objects or entities" that come together "to form a whole" (Littlejohn, 1992, p. 41). This approach, therefore, "is a flexible and open perspective from which to study human communication [because] it does not impose a series of perceptual constraints or biases on researchers to force them to focus only on certain elements in a communication situation" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 93). In order to understand why this is, one must first understand how the systems theory works.

Littlejohn (1992) attributes the origins of the concept to Georg Hegel and cites Ludwig von Bertalanffy, a well known biologist, as the person responsible for codifying systems theory. "A system is a set of interdependent units which work together to form a whole" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 90). A system that receives matter and/or energy from its

environment, transforms that matter and energy in some way, and passes the changed matter and/or energy back into its environment is an open system. A system that does not maintain an interchange with its environment and, therefore, progresses toward "internal chaos (entropy), disintegration, and death" (p. 41) is a closed system. A suprasystem is one that contains many subsystems. All systems attempt to maintain homeostasis--a balance between itself and its environment. All systems are teleological because "they are designed to reach specific end states or goals" (Infante et al. 1993, p. 91). The manner through which they attain those end states or goals is called "equifinality" because there are numerous ways a system can reach the same end state.

A bread factory is an example of a system. As part of the commercial environment, it imports the matter and energy needed to make bread (flour, water, electricity, workers, etc.), transforms that input (bakes bread) and exports a product (the bread). Rising or slumping sales reflect changes in the environment which the factory reacts to by buying (importing) more or less energy or material (homeostasis). The factory might react by maintaining the same levels of import, but reducing or increasing speed of production (equifinality). These processes will continue until, eventually, the factory closes or is merged into another system.

Littlejohn states that "system theory has had a major influence on the study of human communication and can be seen in many corners of the field in one form or another" (p. 54). The model of communication found below that will be used as the basis for the course is an example of a system. This, however, is not the sole reason that discussion of systems theory is contained in this review. The first of these reasons is that systems theory provides a helpful way to view the theatrical rehearsal process.

Each rehearsal uses actors, a director, and a script as input. During a rehearsal the processes of blocking, characterization, etc., transform the input. Rehearsals react to their environment in many ways. For example, a change in rehearsal space, actors, or director will force changes in the way the rehearsal approaches the production. At the close of each rehearsal a piece of the completed product exists and is, therefore, a form of export. Because there is no single correct way to create a play, rehearsals exhibit equifinality. In terms of teleology, all rehearsals reach an end state. Like the caterpillar in its cocoon, the rehearsal on opening night turns into a butterfly as the curtain rises.

The other reason systems theory is important to this review is that systems theory exhorts us to "focus on all patterns of interaction and relationship within a communication event" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 93). This

prevents us from losing sight of the fact that the various aspects of communication that take place during the rehearsal process (e.g., small group communication, organizational communication, conflict, and conflict management) are equally relevant. In addition, the use of systems theory helps us view communication as only one aspect of the rehearsal process--as only one tool among many the director uses while creating a production. With the system theory in mind, it is possible to come to an understanding of a particular model of communication that will infuse the content of the course.

A Model of Communication

Because models derive from various definitions, they do not always include the same descriptive elements. There are, however, certain elements that recur often enough for Infante et al. (1993) to notate. These elements include: the "source" or "sender" which "in the context of communication models designates the originator of a message" (p. 31); the "message" which "is the stimulus which the source or sender transmits to the receiver" (p. 31); the "channel" which "is the means by which the message is conveyed from source to receiver," such as air waves, light waves or anything else that "makes use of the five senses of human perception" (p. 32); the "receiver" which "is the destination of a given message" (p. 32); the "noise" which "is any stimulus [that] inhibits the receiver's accurate reception of a given

message" (p. 32); the "feedback" which is a message returned by the receiver to the sender that allows the sender to assess the accuracy of the receiver's understanding of the message.

Infante et al. (1993) also explain several specific models of communication. One of these models is the Schramm Model which presents

the concept that we as communicators act as both source and receive, encoder and decoder in a given communication interaction. Encoding is defined as the process of taking an already conceived idea and getting it ready for transmission. Decoding, on the other hand, is the process of taking the stimuli that have been received and giving those stimuli meaning through your own individual interpretation and perception. (p. 33)

An individual's interpretation and perception is a product of her experiences. Hamilton and Parker (1990) call these experiences a "frame of reference" (p. 8). In order for communication to be successful, the participants must share a similar frame of reference. For example, persons who do not share a common language have difficulty understanding each other's linguistic communication because they do not share the same frame of reference--the same language.

Hamilton and Parker (1990) add another element to the model of communication: motivation. Communication interactions ensue from a motivating stimulus acting on the source. Hamilton and Parker explain that stimuli can be either external or internal.

External stimuli are those things within the sources environment that cause the sender to transmit a message. For example, one might comment upon entering a room that the room is cold. An internal stimuli comes from within the sender. For example, while thinking of tomorrow's schedule, one might realize that today is a friend's birthday. This stimulus might cause one to telephone that friend.⁴

With motivation in mind, generation of a rough general model of communication that reflects system theory is possible. Person A is stimulated (input) to encode (transmutation of input) a message which will be sent (export) to Person B. Person A chooses a channel, such as the sound waves created by the human voice, over which to send this message. The message is acted upon by noise, such as Person A's thick foreign accent, two unmatched frames of reference, or the sound of a jet taking off across the street. Person B receives the message which she decodes. Person B is stimulated by reception and decoding of the message to code and send her own message (feedback). This creates a cycle which will continue until broken by one or both participants.

⁴ Students of theatre will recognize this as the unsettled argument over character motivation. The internal argument is that of the "method" actor. The external argument is that of the "technique" actor.

With this model of communication in mind, the following section will discuss definition and aspects of small group and organizational communication.

Small Group and Organizational Communication

The following sections of this chapter will present a review of literature on the subjects of small group and organizational communication.

Aspects of Small Group Communication

At the beginning of this chapter a statement was made that an explanation of the reasons for inclusion of each aspect of communication in the course would be made at the beginning of each section. In terms of small group communication, it is impossible to present this explanation without first coming to an understanding of the particular definition of small groups that the course will use. This section of the review, therefore, will first explain and present that definition, and then explain why the subject of small group communication is contained in the course and this review.

The sense of agreement among theorists on a definition of a small group is as fleeting as that of a definition of communication. The arguments over definition are wide ranging. There are several elements that must be considered in any successful definition of small groups. These include group size, types of definitions (structural, relational, and

psychological), and time. The following sections will discuss each of these aspects.

Size

One argument among theorists regards how many people constitute a small group. How small does a group have to be in order not to be an organization? How big does a group have to be in order to be a group and not something else?

Shaw (1981) defines small groups in terms of "two or more persons" (p. 8). Hawkins (1992) disagrees with the lower end of this scale because two people form only a dyad, and, as such, they do not experience the same type of communication situations that three people might. Infante et al. (1993) solve this problem by defining the size of small groups as "from three to fifteen" (p. 320). Devito (1988) supports this position when he argues that a small group is one in which "all members may communicate with ease as both senders and receivers" (p. 247). In other words, they must be able to switch between both functions. Devito points to twelve members as the largest possible small group because "if a group gets much larger than twelve this [functioning-switching] becomes difficult" (p. 247).

Definitional Types

Establishment of size is not the only thing considered when defining small groups. Pavitt and Curtis (1994) list

several types of definitions including relational, structural, psychological, and mixed. Each one of these definitional types explains a different aspect of small group communication.

1. Relational. Cartwright and Zander (1968) define a group as "a collection of individuals who have relations to one another that make them interdependent to some significant degree" (p. 46). This is an example of a relational definition. A relational definition views small groups as a collection of interdependent people. Interdependence is a principle drawn from system theory that "suggests that all members of a system influence all other members of a system" (Infante et al., 1992, p. 456). In a group this interdependence is the foundation of relationships.

The concept of interdependence leads to another aspect of small group communication--sociology. Deutsch (1968) explains that "a sociological group exists (has unity) to the extent that the individuals composing it are pursuing promotively interdependent goals" (p. 467). Looking at small groups from this perspective leads to discussion of position, status, and power.

People gain status by means of their position. These positions, in turn, come through . . . society. When people believe that someone's position gives him or her legitimate power over others, that person has status. Studies have shown that people in positions of authority influence others. (Pavitt and Curtis, 1994, p. 150)

This explanation of authority as it relates to the relational aspects of small groups is important to discussions of leadership (see below).

2. Structural. Merton's structural definition of small groups sees small groups in terms of the "patterned expectations of forms of interaction which are morally binding [only] on them and on other 'members'" (cited in Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 13). These expected patterns of interaction are further defined as norms of the group. Always calling meetings of the group to order on time is an example of a norm.

Another element of group structure is role. Pavitt and Curtis (1992) explain that roles in groups are similar to roles on stage. "A role is a part played by a member that interlocks with parts played by other members" (p. 13). Infante et al. (1993) list three types of roles: group task, those roles which "pertain to group discussions aimed at selecting, defining, and solving problems" (p. 322); group building and maintenance, those roles "concerned with the socio-emotional climate in the group" (p. 323); and individual, those roles enacted by group members interested in their own needs rather than the needs of the group. Infante et al, (1993) break each of these categories into as many as twelve separate roles. The "follower," for example, falls under the category of group building and maintenance, and the "orienter" falls under the category of group task.

3. Psychological. Pavitt and Curtis (1994) break the psychological approach into "two subtypes: the motivational and the perceptual" (p. 15, emphasis original). Motivational approaches look at the reasons people join groups. Infante et al. (1993) point to the fact "that human beings are goal oriented" (p. 79). Pavitt and Curtis show how this concept translates into group definitions. They quote Bass as explaining group as being "rewarding to the individual" (p. 15); Cattell as including "the satisfaction of certain individual needs" (p. 15); and Mills as expressing the idea that people in groups "come into contact with a purpose" (p. 16). Those who study groups by their purpose or goals investigate groups that accomplish a specific task such as problem-solving, decision-making, and idea-generation (Infante et al., 1993).

4. Mixed. The final approach Pavitt and Curtis (1994) mention is the mixed definition. Those who use this approach use an amalgam of the definitions presented above. They suggest that this approach "supplies a more complete description of what a group is than other definitions" (p. 18). Hawkins (1992) proposes a mixed definition explained below.

Time

Another aspect of small group communication is time. The theories regarding time deal with the idea that a group does not take form in an instant, but that the structure,

relationships, and goals often form over a period of time. Pavitt and Curtis (1994) discuss several theories regarding group development. Linear models of group development concern themselves with a group's social and task structures. Tuckman's linear model (1965) exhibits a four-phase sequence of development⁵: (1) "forming," during which group members come to a common understanding of the group's tasks or goals and begin to establish a group identity; (2) "storming," during which group members experience conflict as they "polarize around interpersonal issues⁶" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 290); (3) "norming," during which group members create "a structure of interpersonal relationships" (p. 291); and (4) "performing," during which group members begin to find solutions to interpersonal difficulties and to make attempts to complete the group's task.

A Definition of Small Groups

Hawkins (1992) suggests the following definition because it meets many of the requirements of the relational, structural, and psychological models of small groups, and accounts for size and time considerations: "small groups consist of from three to approximately twelve interdependent individuals who share a sense of group identity and who

⁵ A discussion of Wohl's theory of theatrical phasic development can be found above.

⁶ A more detailed discussion of conflict can be found below.

interact together over time in pursuit of some goals." This is the definition, therefore, that will appear throughout this study.

The Inclusion of Small Group Communication

The idea behind the inclusion of small group communications in the course rises from the definition of small group explained above and the relation of the rehearsal period to that definition. Hawkins' (1992) definition can be broken down into 5 elements: a small group consists of (1) from three to approximately twelve (2) interdependent individuals who (3) share a sense of group identity and who (4) interact together over time (5) in pursuit of some goals. If the people who join together to rehearse a script (referred to hereafter as the performance team or cast) fit each element of this definition, then it would be logical to include information about small groups and their communication processes in the course.

Element 1--From three to approximately twelve. One person cannot fill all the functions necessary to produce a play, except in the rare case of a performance artist such as Spalding Gray (and even he uses a director). At the very least, other performers must participate by creating the other characters that will appear on stage simultaneously. A cast of a hundred, as in the case of a large Broadway musical like Grand Hotel, is also rare. Due to financial considerations, as well as the length and style of current dramatic

literature, most current productions⁷ on average, involve plays with eight characters. Therefore, with the addition of directors, assistant directors, and understudies, ten to twelve people comprise the performance team, satisfying the size component of the small group definition (3-12 persons).

Elements 2 and 5--Interdependent individuals and in pursuit of some goals. Each actor must depend on her fellow actors for achievement of the group's goal--the production of a play. They must also rely on each other to obtain at least one of their personal goals as well: giving their best performance. This structure satisfies the second component (interdependence) and the fifth component (the pursuit of some goals) of the definition.

Element 3--Share a sense of group identity. The casting process separates, from all auditioned actors, those whom the director believes are capable of portraying the characters. This process places the chosen actors in a special group, the performance team, to which only they belong. In addition, they all share the same purpose--creating a theatrical work

⁷ Based on a survey of 16 randomly selected non-musical plays produced in New York in the last ten years: True West (4 characters); Danny and the Deep Blue Sea (2 characters); Come Back to the Five and Dime, Jimmy Dean, Jimmy Dean (11 characters); The Marriage of Bette and Boo (11 Characters); Laughing Wild (2 characters); Breaking the Code (9 characters); Lend Me a Tenor (8 characters); The Road to Mecca (3 characters); Frankie and Johnny at the Clair De Lune (2 characters); Six Degrees of Separation (17 characters); Prelude to a Kiss (14 characters); Nice People Dancing to Good Country Music (5 characters); Hurlyburly (7 characters) The Woolgatherer (2 characters); The Speed of Darkness (5 characters); A Few Good Men (20 Characters). Total Characters = 122. 122 divided by 16 = 7.625. Rounded up to 8.

of art--and the same fate--fame and fortune in a successful production, obscurity and unemployment in a failure. These conditions satisfy the third component of the definition (a shared sense of identity) as well as reinforcing the fifth component (the pursuit of some goals).

Element 4--Interact together over time. Unlike the popular myth, actors do not sit around on a Saturday afternoon wondering what they will do, eventually deciding to rehearse and present a show in the barn by eight o'clock that evening. In reality, play production is hard work, necessitating effort over a long period of time. Rehearsal schedules rarely call for less than three weeks. More often, rehearsals take place over the course of several months. In addition, the schedule may require a minimum of three hours to a maximum of eight hours, five to seven days a week. This satisfies the fourth component of the definition: the group must interact over time.

Conclusion. Clearly, the performance team qualifies as a small group under the definition stated above. Therefore, the communication processes, as described in the review of literature above, will also exist during the rehearsal process. A complete outline of these subjects as intended to appear in the course can be found in Appendix A.

If a small group consists of from three to twelve individuals, gatherings of more than twelve people who join together to accomplish individual and collective goals in a

coordinated manner become an organization (Kreps, 1990). Size becomes a factor when small groups grow large enough to differentiate subgroups that interact with each other, thereby creating an organizational structure. For example, if twelve neighbors (i.e., a small group) gather to create a party and word of the party spreads through the neighborhood, more neighbors may wish to participate. As the group grows, it may no longer be possible for the group as a whole to handle all the tasks required to put on the party. In this case, the group will set up separate committees to handle specific aspects of the party. These committees are subgroups of the whole system, and an organization develops.

Aspects of Organizational Communication

Before presenting the review of literature, this section will present an argument for the inclusion of Organizational Communication in the course.

Inclusion of Organizational Communication

While the cast is considered a small group (explained above), the process of mounting a production includes many more people. Stage crews, box office personnel, marketing specialists, designers, ushers, and many others must participate if a production is to be successful. This means that most theatres are organizations. The director, however, comes into contact with the theatre organization in only a

limited way. She serves a supervisory function as part of that larger theatre organization (i.e., the director reports to a superior, such as an artistic director, and is responsible for the work of the performance team), she works with a group (subsystem) that is also part of a larger theatre organization (i.e., the cast is only one group among others, such as the technical crew); and, as leader of that group, she becomes involved with other groups (the cast and technical crew must work together to perform the play). As a result of these contacts, it is as important for her to understand the dynamics of organizational communication as it is for her to understand the dynamics of small group communication.

The importance of organizational communication to the director was the reason for its inclusion in the course. The coverage of organizational communication, however, will only extend as far as the needs of the theatrical director; that is, it should only cover those aspects of an organization with which a director will come into contact while working with the cast.

This section of the review, therefore, will only review organizational structures, work teams, and intergroup conflict. In addition, because organizational communication is not a major topic within the course, this review will be brief, supplying only enough information for a general understanding of the subjects discussed. A complete outline

of these subjects as intended to appear in the course can be found in Appendix A.

Organizational Structures

Littlejohn (1992) explains that a great deal of communication takes place in organizations and that a great deal has been written about that communication. Over the years a number of metaphors for organizations have ascended to prominence and then fallen away. Organizations have been compared to brains, political systems, psychic prisons, and others. The current metaphor that theorists use to "organize a variety of theories of organizational communication . . . is the network" (p. 317). Littlejohn goes on to describe networks as "social structures created by communication among individuals and groups" (p. 317).

Networks, therefore, describe the connections between members of an organization. These connections or links tell us about an organization's structure (Littlejohn, 1992). Organizational structure, in turn, reflects an organization's internal lines of communication. Kreps (1990) states:

Formal communication channels are dictated by the planned structure established for the organization, which includes the arrangement of organizational levels, decisions, and departments as well as specific responsibilities, job positions, and job descriptions that are assigned to organization members. (p. 201)

Kreps also explains that organizational structure takes two basic forms: horizontal and vertical.

These two terms indicate the direction of communication flow. Vertical flow means that a message from the head of an organization flows down through various levels of management to the line worker or flows upward from the line worker through levels of supervisors and management to reach the head of the organization (Kreps, 1990). The fewer levels of management, in a vertically oriented organization, the clearer the communication. Some organizations reduce their levels of communication enough that they become what Kreps labels as "horizontal." In horizontal structures communication flows from side to side so that communication becomes peer communication throughout the organization.

Organizations often use work groups or teams to implement horizontal structures. While there has been a considerable amount written on work teams in the first few years (e.g., Bolman & Deal 1992; Fisher, 1993; Goodman, 1986; Hitchcock, 1991; Hitchcock, 1993; Horton, 1992; Jessup, 1992; McKee, 1992; Odiorne, 1991; Orsburn, Moran, Musselwhite, & Zenger, 1990; Scarr, 1992; Wellins, Byham, & Wilson, 1991; Zenger, Musselwhite, Hurson, & Perrin, 1991; to name a few), perhaps the best overall review of the subject belongs to Sundstrom, DeMeuse, and Futrell (1990). Sundstrom et al. define work teams as "interdependent collections of individuals who share responsibility for specific outcomes for their organizations" (p. 120). Work teams can take several forms, depending on the level of autonomy the group

has within its organization. That level reflects the type of leader and the manner in which the leader's authority is distributed.⁸ Semi-autonomous groups are those that are lead by a supervisor, but which have control over the manner in which their task is accomplished. Self-managed or directed teams are those that elect their leaders and control their division of labor, yet they must answer, in some fashion, to the external organization. Finally, self-designating teams are those that have total control over all aspects of their work and their relations with those outside the group.

Theatre organizations are generally horizontally oriented. This is because they are small organizations made up of several groups that work within the organization. Theatre "companies are comprised of three levels of personnel and three divisions of labor" (Langley, 1990, p. 84). These levels are: Leadership (producer), Management (general manager and artistic director, sometimes combined into one position), and Staff. It is on the staff level that one finds the work groups.

One is the administrative group which works on box office, marketing, and other front of house activities. Another group is the production team which is responsible for design and construction of the visual and aural elements of a production and in charge of all backstage activities. The

⁸ A more detailed discussion of authority can be found below.

final work team is the cast which is responsible for creating and performing the roles and any other physical activity required by the production. As a work team, the cast is an example of a semi-autonomous team because they are lead by a supervisor who controls the manner in which they accomplish their task.

Sundstrom et al. (1990) continue their discussion by stating that another, and perhaps more important, defining aspect of a work team is its boundaries. Boundaries intermediate between the group and the organization and have a direct impact on the group's effectiveness. Intermediation takes two forms--integration and differentiation--both of which affect the effectiveness of the work team, and by extension, the organization as a whole. Differentiation is the degree of specialization, independence, and autonomy a team has in relation to other groups in the organization. Team differentiation occurs through exclusive membership, extended working time or team life span, or exclusive access to physical facilities. Integration is the amount of coordination and synchronization the group requires with the parent organization. In groups that require a high degree of coordination, effectiveness will depend on the quality of that coordination or linkage. In groups that require little coordination with outside groups, effectiveness will rely more on the group's internal processes (Sundstrom et al., 1990).

As a work team, the cast's boundaries only intermediate to a certain extent. Because during the majority of rehearsals the cast is highly specialized, independent from any other group, and has autonomy over how it will work out its task, and because during the majority of rehearsals, it requires little coordination and synchronization with other groups in the organization, the cast's boundaries are firm. At the end of rehearsal period, however, the cast must begin to work closely with the production team. This reduces independence and autonomy and increases the need for coordination and synchronization as the two teams come together to achieve a common goal--the production. It is important for the director, therefore, to understand intergroup conflict.

When two independent work teams come together to accomplish a common goal, the possibility of intergroup conflict may exist. Reviewing current research one finds intergroup conflict studies (Wong, Tjosvold, & Lee, 1992; Thalhofer, 1993; Morrill & Thomas, 1992; and Insko, Shopler, & Drigotas, 1993) that concern conflict among groups that in themselves comprise organizations (e.g., Skin Heads against the NAACP or Pro-Choicers against Anti-Abortionists) or studies that focus on interpersonal conflict within organizations. Not as much has been written about conflict among groups that together form a single organization; that is, the organizational use of employees formed into work

groups or teams to accomplish tasks under the umbrella of the parent organization. The best review of this subject, however, is found in Hellriegel, Slocum, and Woodman (1992).

Hellriegel et al. (1992) state that, as a result of intergroup competition, "each group becomes more cohesive and gets greater loyalty from its members" (p. 357). This means that members will bury their interpersonal problems and present a united front. In addition, "each group may begin to see the other as its enemy" (p. 357). This means that perceptions of the other group begin to become distorted. Members will begin to view their own group only positively and the other group negatively. As the groups begin to form stereotypes regarding the other group, hostility begins to rise and communication declines. This leads to poor communication in which each side is interested in stating its own view and not interested in listening to the other group's view.

There are ways to alleviate or prevent this competition from breaking into conflict. Allen (1993a) found that the relationship between the leaders of each group will affect conflict outcomes. Nelson (1989) found that "low-conflict organizations are characterized by higher numbers of intergroup strong ties, measured as frequent contact, than are high-conflict organizations" (p. 377). Based on this, a director should promote a good relation through continuous intergroup contact with the production team and its leader.

With the understanding of the general small group and organization situations found above in mind, discussion can now turn to leadership concerns.

Leadership

Before proceeding to the review of literature of leadership, this section will present an argument for the inclusion of Leadership in the course.

Inclusion of Leadership

Shaw (1981) and Infante et al. (1993) agree that leadership is important in group situations. Shaw goes on to define leader as "a position within the group structure or [the] person who occupies such a position" (p. 317). He defines leadership as a process and "a special case of social influence" (p. 316). Based on this definition, a theatrical director is a leader because she holds the position of leader and through that position attempts to influence the cast to perform in a manner consistent with her view of the production.

It is, therefore, as important for the director to understand leadership as it is for her to understand organizational communication and the dynamics of small group communication. While a complete outline of these subjects as intended to appear in the course can be found in Appendix A, the following review will explain the aspects of leadership

that effect the director. Before presenting that review, it is necessary to explain certain factors considered in designing the presentation.

A major factor affecting this review of communication literature has been the number of definitions and views that exist for each subject area. The literature on leadership is perhaps the most confusing of all. One reason for this is the wide variety of typology for approaches used by various authors. These typologies include, but are not limited to (1) trait, style, emergent, functional, interactional, perceptual, and gender (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994); (2) trait, functional, style, and situational (Infante et al., 1993); (3) traits, behavioral, contingency, attributional, and charismatic (Hellriegel et al., 1992); (4) trait, function, and situational (Hamilton, & Parker, 1990); and (5) trait, styles, situational and interactionism (Shaw, 1981).

Further confusion results, on one hand, from the fact that authors use different words for the same typology. For example, Hellriegel et al.'s (1992) definition of contingency concerns "the variables that permit certain leadership characteristics and behaviors to be effective in a certain situation" (p. 394), and Infante et al.'s (1993) definition of situational as those theories that "stress using different styles of leadership approach appropriate to the needs created by different organizational situations (contingencies)" (p. 354) are essentially the same. They

both stress leadership in terms of the specific situation the group finds itself in. Grouping different typologies together by use of the same wording and/or similarity of definition would, presumably, solve some of this confusion. Unfortunately, the opposite is true.

Many authors discuss the same aspects of leadership under different approaches. For example, leadership orientation to task and group maintenance (interpersonal relations) are found under: traits (Shaw, 1981), a nonleadership discussion of general group membership (Hamilton & Parker, 1990); functional (Infante et al., 1993; Pavitt & Curtis, 1984); and contingency (Hellriegel et al., 1992). The result of these shifts of emphasis and differentiation of definition through either same or different word usage is that this review of the literature cannot present the content regarding leadership via a typology based on any single author's work. This review, therefore, will create its own typology based on the needs of the theatrical director.

As a director studies leadership, she must ask herself four basic questions regarding leadership. (1) How do I become a leader? (2) Once I become a leader, what are my responsibilities or functions? (3) What are my leadership style options? (4) How do, or should I adjust my style of leadership based on a particular situation? (5) What skills can I develop that will help me be a better leader? These

questions translate into five basic headings for the following discussion: leadership attainment and authority; leadership functions; leadership style; interactionism; and skill development.

Leadership Attainment and Authority

There are several ways to attain leadership: emergence, election, and appointment. While directors are usually appointed by the theatrical organization, it remains important for them to understand other reasons for leadership attainment because they have things in common. The first commonality, according to some researchers, is that they share common traits. Some researchers believe that these traits help members emerge as and remain leaders. This approach assumes that there is a certain set of personal qualities that set leaders apart from the rest of a group (Hamilton & Parker, 1990; Infante et al., 1993; Pavitt & Curtis, 1994).

Leaders are more likely to "be high on traits such as self-esteem, extroversion, open-mindedness, aggression, achievement, motivation, analytical thought, sociability, and argumentativeness" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 324). Shaw (1981) also suggests that leaders' traits include initiative, self-confidence, persistence, etc.; that is, those traits that reflect a desire for group recognition and individual prominence.

The trait approach, however, is not widely accepted.

Hamilton and Parker (1990) point out:

Stogdill reviewed more than 25,000 books and research articles on leadership and management and failed to find any "magic" traits that fit all leaders in all situations. Good leaders are not born, they are trained. Practically anyone willing to spend the time for training can become a small group leader. (p. 298, emphasis original)

This conclusion leads one to believe that anyone can become a group's leader. Infante et al. (1993), in fact suggest that leadership of a group is not necessarily the purview of a single person, but that a number of persons can function in leadership roles. Further discussion of this concept will occur below.

Shaw (1981) believes that leadership attainment is not simply a matter of chance. Leaders, instead, emerge from a group as "a function of numerous personal, situational, and group variables" (p. 319). Among these variables Shaw cites behavior patterns (e.g., a person with a high rate of participation is more likely to emerge as a leader), and personal abilities (e.g., the person who possesses "task-relevant knowledge and abilities" [p. 320] is more likely to emerge as leader). In other words, the leader exhibits behaviors and abilities "which are needed by a group to accomplish its goals" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 324).

This view of leadership attainment focuses on the group's "election" of a group member as leader based on the group's observations of the potential leader. Geier (1967)

studied how leaders emerge from leaderless groups. He found that groups reject possible leaders because the group believes they have observed negative traits such as lack of task-oriented knowledge, lack of participation in the group, and rigidity. Other researchers take an opposite approach--they look for the positive reasons leaders emerge.

Morris and Hackman (1969) found that "the more a person speaks, the more likely it is that he or she will become a leader" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 350). Baird (1977) found a correlation between a person's physical activity and leadership attainment. He found that active, non-nervous styles of personal movement guide a group to judge an individual as a potential leader. Another factor of leader emergence focuses on proximity.

Pavitt and Curtis (1994) explain that other research shows:

Perceptual salience can increase the odds that a person will become leader for two reasons. First they are more likely to be in the normal line of sight of other group members. The other group members are then more likely to direct their attention to them. Second, placing group members where they will receive the comments of other members is likely to lead them to talk frequently.
(p. 351)

These studies focus primarily on emergent leaders. Other studies focus on appointed leaders.

Shaw (1981) points out that leaders are not always emergent or elected from within a group. At times, appointment of the leader comes from outside the group.

Mortensen (1966) concluded that, for an assigned leader, the approval of the group is important. If the group approves of an assigned leader, assumption of the leadership role will take place quickly. In terms of group success based on the method of leadership attainment, Goldman and Fraas (1965) found that the groups which performed best were those with elected leaders. Groups that appointed leaders based on ability performed nearly as well as those with elected leaders. The appointed leader, however, fares better when things do not go well. Hollander and Julian (1970) found that in the event that the group considered elected leaders incompetent or if the elected leader failed, group members lost confidence in that leader. Appointed leaders, however were subject to rejection only if the group lost confidence in them and they failed.

For appointed theatrical directors, it is important to note Pavitt's and Curtis' (1994) conclusion:

Generally, competence and group acceptance appear to be the most important factors in how a group will behave with a certain leader. A leader can be elected, emergent, or appointed. A group can behave as well and be successful under any of these conditions. As long as the group accepts the leader and he or she is competent, the group can function well with the leader. (p. 355)

The concept of leader acceptance is significant to the discussion of authority.

Shaw (1981) believes that the manner in which the leader attains that position will affect the group because it affects the amount of authority the leader maintains.

Authority is related to power. Power is the ability of a person to influence others (Infante et al., 1993; Littlejohn, 1994; Shaw, 1981) often through the control of reinforcers--rewards and punishments (Shaw, 1981). Power becomes legitimate by approval of the group or when given by the parent organization (Littlejohn, 1992; Pavitt & Curtis, 1994; and Shaw, 1981). Legitimate power means that the leader has the authority to control the reinforcers.

Leadership Functions

Once a director becomes the leader and has authority, she must turn to the job of providing leadership. Barnlund and Haiman (1960) believe that the leader should provide "leadership behaviors which are needed by the group to accomplish its goals" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 324). These behaviors "serve functions that help a group" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 360). There are three areas in which leadership behaviors serve this function: task, group maintenance, and procedural.

Infante et al. (1993) explain that task related behaviors include contributing, seeking, evaluating, and promoting ideas and asking others to evaluate ideas. Group maintenance functions are deal with interpersonal relations such as those that relieve group tension by "regulating participation so that no one feels 'left out,' creating a positive emotional environment, instigating self-analysis,

resolving conflict . . . and instigating conflict in order to stimulate a more thorough examination of issues" (p. 325). The leadership behaviors that serve a procedural function are setting group goals, preparing agendas and outlines for the group to follow, clarifying ideas, summarizing issues and discussions, and verbalizing group agreement.

As discussed above, Infante et al. (1993) propose that the responsibility for enactment of leadership functions can fall to any one or several members of a group. For example, Person A may have the task related knowledge to function in procedural areas, while Person B might have the sense of humor to function in interpersonal group maintenance areas. Pavitt and Curtis (1994) dispute this claim however. They state that "only one or two members perform the bulk of leadership functions, despite the claim that any group member can perform them" (p. 363). As support of this position, Pavitt and Curtis cite the studies conducted by Geier (1967) and Mortensen (1966), discussed above, that found that "one person tended to take over all leadership functions" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 363). This point may seem moot to the director who is appointed as sole group leader, but the director must realize that there may be others in the group who will serve, at least to some extent, as a leader. Knowing this is a possibility, the director can take it into account as communication events unfold.

Leadership Styles

With an understanding of what she is supposed to do, the director must wonder how she will execute the behaviors that serve to aid the group. The answer to this lies in the style she chooses as a leader. Theorists agree on the definitions and results of three basic styles of leadership: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire (Hamilton & Parker, 1990; Infante et al., 1993; Pavitt & Curtis, 1994; and Shaw, 1981).

"The authoritarian style involves the leader being very directive in terms of the group goals and procedures, the division of work, and deciding the outcome of conflict" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 325, emphasis original). As a result of this style groups tend to be productive, but members report dissatisfaction with the experience.

In the democratic style "the leader suggests alternatives, but the group decides the specific policy procedure, and tasks and roles of members" (Hamilton & Parker, 1990). The key term in this style is participation. Members are encouraged to participate in discussion designed to reach a majority opinion or consensus. This approach leaves members with a feeling of satisfaction regardless of productivity (Infante et al., 1993).

In the laissez-faire style,

leaders refuse to help the group choose its policy. They also never volunteer information on the stages or methods necessary to attain the group's goals. . . . They also do not evaluate work. [They] only answer questions and provide work materials. (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 345)

This style of leadership can be counter-productive unless the group is made up of self-starters who work well together (Infante et al., 1993). Group members often report low satisfaction from experiences with this style of leadership (Hamilton & Parker, 1990), although studies indicate that "laissez-faire groups were also fairly cohesive, perhaps in response to their 'nonleading' leaders" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 346).

Interactionism

There are no requirements that a leader must stick with a single style, either throughout her tenure as leader or during a particular event. Because neither a democratic nor an authoritarian style is inherently better, a good leader will select the style appropriate for the particular situation or variable (Hamilton & Parker, 1990; Pavitt & Curtis, 1994). "Variables might include personality traits, experience, group performance, or any other of a number of aspects of a group" (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994, p. 367). The approaches that study how leadership style adjust to situational variable are called interactional.

The best known of these approaches is the contingency theory of leadership. Contingency theory is based on the work of Fred Fiedler (1964, 1972, & 1978).⁹ The contingency

⁹ Pavitt and Curtis (1994) present a thorough summary of Fiedler's work (pp. 369-379).

theory measures the effectiveness of leadership as a correlation of interpersonal relationship factors (leader interest in good relations of task accomplishment), task structure (the degree of task clarification), and leader position power (the degree to which the position of the leader enables the leader to get followers to comply and/or accept leadership).

Hamilton and Parker (1990) summarize Fiedler's findings:

He found that authoritarian leadership is effective when the leader is powerful, the task well defined, and group/leader relations are good. Authoritarian leadership is also effective at the extreme--the leader has little power, is disliked by the group, and the task is poorly structured. Democratic leadership is more effective when the three conditions are somewhere between the other two extremes. (p. 301)

Shaw (1981) suggest other interactional approaches to leadership that include transactional, vertical dyad linkages, and transformational. In the transactional approach, leadership is seen as a social exchange relationship. In this light, leadership is a two-way set of influences, similar to economic exchanges. These exchanges between the leader and the followers provides each with rewards or benefits (Shaw, 1981). The vertical dyad linkage approach assumes that a unique relationship exists between each member and the leader, making leadership the reflection of the evolution of that particular relationship (Shaw, 1981).

Bass and Avolio (1990) explain that the transformational approach sees the leadership process as an attempt by the

leader to develop followers into leaders by (1) raising their consciousness of the importance and value of the group's goals and the means of achieving those goals; (2) motivating them to overcome self-interest for the sake of the group; (3) becoming a source of inspiration; (4) understanding the needs of individual group members; (5) stimulating re-evaluation of situations; and (6) attaining their trust. This type of leadership is the result of the interplay of three factors: charisma/inspiration; individualized consideration; and intellectual stimulation.

Skill Development

Now that the director has a better understanding of leadership, she can develop skills that will help her lead.

Motivating group members is an important task leaders undertake. In their discussion of roles, Infante et al. (1993) suggest that one type of role related to accomplishment of task is that of the energizer who motivates the group. In addition, Bass and Avolio (1990) explain that transformational leaders attempt to motivate group members (see also Fisher, 1993; Zenger et al., 1991). Because motivating others is important, any of her own motivational skills a leader can increase or develop will be to her benefit. Specific motivational skills a leader should seek to work on are building a follower's self-respect and being an effective communicator (Toys R Us, 1986). As described

above, giving feedback is an important part of the communication process. A leader will increase her effectiveness by working on her feedback skills.

Conflict

While each of us encounters conflict in our everyday lives, it is important to know why it is important for directors to have a greater understanding of conflict. The following section will, therefore present an argument for inclusion of Conflict in the course before it presents the literature review of conflict.

Inclusion of Conflict

As cited above, all groups go through phases of development. Not all models of group phasic development concur as to the number of phases or in describing those phases. Shaw (1981) states, however, that, "it is probable that the kinds and sequences of phases in group development are similar for all groups" (p. 99). Among these common phases of development is conflict. Shaw includes conflict in a consistent four-phase pattern that emerges from most phasic development models. The consistency of conflict within group development makes it an important area for study by anyone interested in group development.

The study of conflict is even more important to the director. Wohl (1989) posits a five-phase model of theatri-

cal group phasic development that includes two phases of conflict. In other words, a director will spend approximately 40 percent of the rehearsal period dealing with conflict. Inclusion of conflict studies in the course was made based on this reasoning. Specifically, the course design included the study of conflict in terms of its development and management.

Like other definitions found above, there is little consistency between definitions of conflict (Littlejohn, 1992). Pavitt and Curtis (1994) attribute this to the number of types of definitions of groups as described above. Some definitions are simple. Conflict is "overt disagreement" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 326). Others are more complicated. Charles Watkins (cited in Littlejohn, 1992) lists six conditions of an operational definition of conflict.

1. Conflict requires at least two parties capable of invoking sanctions on each other.
2. Conflicts arise due to the existence of a mutually desired but mutually unobtainable objective.
3. Each party in a conflict has four possible types of action alternatives:
 - a. To obtain the mutually desired objective.
 - b. To end the conflict.
 - c. To invoke sanctions against the opponent.
 - d. To communicate something to the opponent.
4. Parties in conflict may have different value or perceptual systems.
5. Each party has resources that may be increased or decreased by implementation of action alternatives.
6. Conflict terminates when each party is satisfied that he or she has "won" or "lost" or believes that the probable costs of continuing the conflict outweigh the probable costs of ending the conflict. (Littlejohn, 1992, p. 284)

These definitions may lead one to believe that conflict is a negative experience that should be avoided. As Goss and O'Hair (1988) point out, however, "conflicts can have beneficial effects. For one thing, conflicts can create unity and open communications. [Conflicts also benefit] issue clarification, and social change/growth" (p. 214). Goss and O'Hair also point out that "how much value [conflicts] have is often dependent on how well we manage them" (p. 215).

Conflict Development

In order to manage a conflict properly, the director must first understand how conflicts develop. Pondy (1967) suggests a four-phase model of conflict development. The first phase is latent conflict. In latent conflict conditions are "ripe" for a strong disagreement between parties, but there have been no overt disagreements.

The second phase is perceived conflict. In this phase, group members begin to be aware of the possibility of conflict. In other words, they sense a growing tension.

The third phase of Pondy's (1967)'s model is felt conflict. In this phase of conflict development, the conflict is starting to become personalized. Each participant no longer feels like an outside observer of the conflict. Instead, they begin to feel like principal parties to the conflict.

The final phase is manifest conflict. Manifest conflict exists when the participants engage in behaviors "deliberately and consciously designed to frustrate" (Pondy, 1967, p. 305) their conflict counterpart. This phase reflects Watkins' discussion of the use of sanctions.

Conflict Strategies

Once conflict is manifest, participants will use a variety of strategies. Conrad (1990) and Littlejohn (1992) present summaries of works that discuss these issues. Conrad concludes that there are three basic strategies: structuring, confrontive, and avoidant. Littlejohn also concludes that there are three strategies for conflict engagement that he labels as avoidance, cooperative, and competitive. Littlejohn and Conrad basically agree in terms of avoidance and confrontive (competition).

In confrontive strategies participants will resort to coercion either through displays of power or the use of threats and/or promises, personalization by, for example, using ad homineum attacks, or toughness, by "digging in her heels." In avoidant strategies participants will delay by, for example, focusing the communication over the rules for the argument, or refusing to admit that a conflict exists.

Conrad (1990) and Littlejohn (1992) disagree on cooperative and structuring strategies. In Conrad's structuring strategies participants will spend time defining

issues by, for example, seeking constant clarification, establishing criteria, and/or manipulating relationships by, for example, appealing to the opponents sense of guilt. In Littlejohn's cooperative strategies participants engage in many of the same communication acts (e.g., issue clarification and relationship manipulation), but in Littlejohn these acts are of a positive nature. Issue clarification becomes a "nonevaluative, nonblaming factual description of the nature and extent of the problem [or issues]" (p. 288). Relationship manipulation becomes "expressing understanding support or acceptance of the other person" (p. 288).

In essence, therefore, there are four strategies for engaging in conflict: three which have negative connotations (confrontive, avoidant, and structuring) and one with positive connotations (cooperative).

Conflict Management

Because a leader has authority and, presumably, an understanding of conflict development and strategies for engaging in conflict, she can develop a strategy for managing conflict. Conflict strategies

vary according to two dimensions: cooperation (willingness to work together) and assertiveness (amount of personal; initiative and aggressiveness demonstrated. (Goss & O'Hair, 1988, p. 215)

The interplay of these two dimensions yield five different strategies: avoidance, accommodation, competition,

compromise (negotiation), and collaboration (Goss & O'Hair, 1988; Infante et al., 1992).

Avoidance "involves little cooperativeness or assertiveness" (Goss & O'Hair, 1988, p. 216). The leader handles the conflict by avoiding it. This may seem like a poor strategy, but when the problems are inconsequential, this strategy may work well. This strategy should not be used as a replacement for dealing with a serious conflict (Goss & O'Hair, 1988).

Accommodation is low in terms of assertiveness, but high in terms of cooperativeness. The leader's primary goal is to avoid damage to the relationship. To do this the needs of the other are met without regard for one's own needs. This strategy is used when the leader has little to lose by giving in to the demands of the other. This is a win/lose power struggle strategy that often does not settle the conflict. (Goss & O'Hair, 1988; Infante et al., 1993).

Competition is a selfish strategy that employs little cooperation and a great deal of assertiveness. This is a win/lose strategy similar to accommodation. The difference is that the leader does everything to win. This strategy may seem to settle a conflict, but the loser often harbors resentment. This strategy, therefore, risks the loss of the relationship (Goss & O'Hair, 1988; Infante et al., 1993).

Compromise (negotiation) is a middle-ground strategy that uses moderate levels of both cooperativeness and

assertiveness. Using this strategy signals that each party has a legitimate claim to some extent. It is a "win-part, lose-part approach" (Goss & O'Hair, 1988, p. 217) that may seem to settle the conflict, but both parties may harbor resentment because neither got exactly what was wanted (Goss & O'Hair, 1988; Infante et al., 1993).

Collaboration involves the highest levels of both assertiveness and cooperation. "It is a problem-solving method calling for solutions that are beneficial to all concerned" (Goss & O'Hair, 1988, p. 217). This is a win/win situation in which both parties consult in order to develop a creative solution to the conflict that is mutually satisfying and allows for both parties to get what they wanted (Goss & O'Hair, 1988; Infante et al., 1993).

Goss and O'Hair (1988) also advise improving skills regarding assertiveness and confrontation as a way to prepare for managing conflict. In addition, Infante et al. (1993) state that the expression of emotion can accompany an open conflict. Logically then, any skill that allows control of disruptive emotional displays, such as planning conversations and confrontations in advance when possible and using responsive listening (Roach & Wyatt, 1988), will aid conflict management.

Consideration of Other Topics

While the study of communication on groups is not limited to the areas mentioned above (e.g., interpersonal, intercultural, gender, rhetoric, and many other aspects that come into play during rehearsal), the line must be drawn somewhere. To include more than four areas in the time allotted (see discussion of time constraints below) would not do justice to any of these subjects. Instead it would leave the students with little information on any specific area, thereby making the course superficial.

The decision as to whether or not to include a topic was made based on its relative importance to the rehearsal process and on the ability to cover properly the subject within the time allotted. Intercultural communication is an example of a topic with low relative importance. Intercultural communication might become a factor during a rehearsal process when and if a director deals with cast members from cultures greatly different from her own. Since this situation is not usual, the subject of intercultural communication was not made part of the design.

An example of a topic not covered in its own section due to the time allotment was interpersonal communication. Wilson, Hantz, and Hanna (1989) define interpersonal communication as a "transactional process of exchanging messages and negotiating meaning to convey information and to establish and maintain relationships" (p. 7). This subject

is so broad in its application to the director/actor relationship that it alone could be the focus of a course. Although aspects of interpersonal communication were not a main focus area of the course, the topic was nonetheless incorporated into the course whenever it intersected with the subject at hand. For example, because "listening plays a crucial role in determining what's expected of us as participants in the relationship and what's appropriate or valuable in the relationship" (Roach & Wyatt, 1988 p. 75), the study of listening is important for anyone studying interpersonal communication. The course design, therefore, contains a section on active listening within the section on conflict management skills even though it does not feature a complete section of the subject of interpersonal communication.

Conclusion

The separation of theatre and communication is made clear by this review. Theatre texts rarely mention the subject of communication. Communication texts touch on many topics that directors need to know, but do so without specific reference to theatre. In addition, the information contained in the literature is spread out over many books and articles, making it extremely important for the director to acquire that knowledge easily. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to unite the two fields through the execution

of a course in communication for a director's use during rehearsal and to determine the appropriate content and format for that type of course. The next chapter continues the study by presenting an outline of the methodology used to design the course.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used to develop this course came from the work of R. W. Tyler (1949). This chapter will first present some general background on Tyler's work. The chapter will then explain each of the questions Tyler raises and how they affected the development of the course.

Tyler's Four Questions

In Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, R. W. Tyler (1949)¹⁰ presents a guide for persons preparing to develop an effective school-wide or class-specific curriculum. The rationale that he develops begins with a statement of "four fundamental questions which must be answered in developing any curriculum and plan of instruction" (p. 1). In terms of teaching a specific course these questions are:

1. What educational purposes or objectives do you seek to obtain?
2. What educational experiences can you provide that are likely to attain those objectives?
3. How can you effectively organize those experiences?

¹⁰ All further reference to Tyler in this chapter will be to this work; therefore, future references will not provide the date.

4. How can you evaluate your success in attaining the objectives?

While the rationale Tyler develops founded on these questions is not at the chronological forefront of instructional research, it is nonetheless still cited by those writing on the process of teaching (Daly, Friedrich, & Vangelisti, 1990; Gagné, Briggs, & Wagner, 1985; Johnson & Foa, 1989; Orlich et al., 1990). In addition, Tyler's work provides a structure and a grammar on which to base a discussion of the development, implementation, and implications of the course presented in this study. This chapter and the next two, therefore, will use Tyler's rationale as a guide. This chapter, as described above, will now proceed to explain each of the questions Tyler proposes and illuminate how answers to those questions affected the outcome of the course design.

Question 1--Objectives

Before beginning any educational project one must have a clear idea of one's objectives. On one hand, it is possible to teach a course based solely on a subjective, "intuitive sense of what is good teaching, what materials are significant, what topics are worth dealing with and how to present material and develop topics effectively with students" (Tyler, p. 3). On the other hand, Tyler believes that a teacher who prepares a set of goals in advance has an

objective criteria on which to base decisions regarding material selection and outline, development of procedures of instruction, and exam preparation. The process of objective development reflects the experience of most travelers. If you know your destination before you set out, you are better able to select the best route before you embark.

Sources of Objectives

With that in mind, Tyler suggests several sources of objectives including learners, subject specialists, and the psychology of learning.

Learners

How is the teacher to create these objectives? Tyler points out that "in the final analysis objectives are matters of choice, and they must therefore be the considered value judgments" (p. 4) of those making the choices. He also suggests, however, that one can look to sources outside the individual making the choices for guidance during objective development. The first source Tyler suggests a teacher make reference to is the learners themselves. An insight into their needs will lead to certain objectives.

The introduction and review of literature found above outlines the need of students who might take this course. They need knowledge of and skill in communication if they are to be prepared for the work of directing. At this time texts

and courses on directing do not provide the information students need. Likewise, courses in communication are either not specific enough or are too time-consuming to be practical for directing students. As a function of student needs, an objective for this course is to impart knowledge and increase student skills related to communication used by directors during the rehearsal process.

Subject Specialists

Tyler points out that in colleges the most common sources of suggestions regarding course objectives are subject specialists (i.e., schools hire an expert in a particular field to teach a course in that field--the geologist teaches geology, the actor teaches acting, the psychologist teaches psychology, etc.). This means that the subject specialist can separate important subject matter in the field from that which is not. Based on that knowledge the specialist can develop objectives for the course. This course requires a specialization in several fields including theatre, communication and teaching.

As the researcher, I am uniquely qualified to undertake this study as a result of my extensive background in theatre, communication, business management and teaching. I hold a B.F.A. degree in theatre (Acting/Directing) from Ithaca College and a M.A. degree in theatre (Directing and Theatre History) from the University of Connecticut. Following an

eighteen-year career in theatre management that culminated in a position as Director of Box Office Operations for the Dallas Symphony and included management positions with the Light Opera of Manhattan, the Pandemonium Puppet Company, and the Colonie Coliseum Summer Theater, I began a new career in retail management.

In 1989, I left the position as an Assistant Regional Manager for Toys R Us to return to theatre and teaching. Since then, I have held positions with Austin Community College and Texas Tech University, teaching a variety of subjects including Acting, Introduction to Theatre and Introduction to Cinema. In addition to degrees in theatre, I have extensive training in communication and management both on an academic level through Southwest Texas State University and Texas Tech University, and in the professional world through seminars attended while working as a manager for Toys R Us and Toys by Roy.

My resume includes credits for acting in over twenty-five plays and films, directing a wide variety of plays, conducting numerous workshops on various directing topics, and the presentation of a paper at the Texas Communication Conference in 1993. I also edit a monthly business-oriented newsletter, titled "Management Matters."

Based on my knowledge and experience in these fields, I have the qualifications as a subject specialist to be able to set objectives for the course regarding which communication

topics hold importance for the theatrical director. The literature review above presents the subjects to be included in the course and the reasoning for their inclusion.

Based on the knowledge brought to the study by the subject specialist, the course objectives should include reference to the impartation of knowledge and skills regarding small group communication, organizational communication, leadership, and conflict and conflict management. A complete outline of these subjects as intended to appear in the course can be found in Appendix A.

Psychology of Learning

Another source that Tyler discusses is the psychology of learning. Tyler explains this topic by saying that objectives are the ends to which the course aims, and, as such, these ends must be "in conformity with conditions intrinsic in learning [otherwise] they are worthless as educational goals" (p. 38). Tyler suggests that the course designer use psychology of learning to screen possible objectives to ensure their worth. Among the screens he suggests are: (1) distinguishing feasible from unfeasible objectives; (2) establishing that conditions are requisite for learning of the objectives; and (3) application of a particular philosophy of instruction to the objectives.

Because each of these screens plays a role in course design, the following section will explicate each and

illustrate the role each played in determining the course objectives. Examples showing how the screen operates throughout all the course objectives can be found at the conclusion of each of the following sections. Due to the large number of objectives, two examples, one of a content-oriented objective and one of a behavioral oriented objective, will represent the whole.

Screen 1. Objective Feasibility. Objective feasibility refers to questioning whether or not the objectives are accomplishable within the situation in which the learning is to take place. Situational factors involve such things as time availability and ability of the students to understand the material. For example, a course designed to teach airplane mechanics to elementary school students would be level inappropriate, dooming it to failure. Likewise, the same course designed to be taught to adults, but limited to just a few hours, would probably fail based upon severe time constraints. Screening for these factors was part of the design process in this study.

The original conception of this course was of a three-credit-hour semester long class. It was thought that this would allow enough time to cover properly all the material and reach all the objectives. In addition, the original intention was to present the course to undergraduates because the information and skills acquired through the class would be of greater benefit to them. The alternative, graduate

students, looked less attractive because by the time the older, more experienced student reaches the course, she would have already established communication patterns that would be difficult to change. Undergraduates would get more from the course because they would have an easier time accepting the material.

Even though the three-credit-hour course for undergraduates was originally the basis on which the course was to be planned, it soon became clear that, under the circumstances of the department through which the course would be offered, it would have been impossible to meet these goals. The first problem was that of finding undergraduates who had already completed their initial training in directing. The course was to focus on the process of working with people, not on the artistic aspects of rehearsal.

For example, during a discussion of the period in which the director blocks the actors, we would discuss how to get the actor to understand the director's wishes, not how a director should go about deciding on the blocking itself. If the course included untrained directors, there would have been a greater risk of getting off subject and into the artistic discussion better left elsewhere. By limiting the class to those with some training, the course would be clearly focused on communication.

The problem was that the department's curriculum generally did not allow undergraduates to take directing

until the fall of their senior year. My time requirements precluded a spring semester course. This meant that the participants would have to be drawn from the graduate students. This, in turn, led to problems of its own, the largest of which was finding students who had enough time in their schedule for an additional three-credit-hour course.

The solution to this problem was to reduce the scope of the course. Instead of offering a three-credit-hour class, the decision was made to offer a one-credit-hour course. This meant that the conception of the class would undergo considerable alteration. As a one-credit-hour class, we could no longer expect the students to devote as much time, resulting in changes in the course's objectives.

Additionally, because there was an ethical question regarding my standing as a graduate student who would teach fellow graduate students, the decision was made to offer the class on a pass/fail basis. This put further constraint on the amount of extra activity expected from the students and forced further reconsideration of the course objectives, the selection of learning experiences (discussed below) intended to achieve those objectives, and the amount of material included in the course.

For example, organizational communication underwent a reduction in status within the course. Instead of having an equal share of the course with small group communication, leadership, and conflict, organizational communication became

a subheading under small group communication. This reduction resulted in less time spent on organizational communication and a shift in an objective of the course. The course shifted from an unfeasible objective of covering directorial communication with all members of the theatre organization during the rehearsal process to a feasible focus specifically and almost exclusively on the director/actor communication process and relationship.

This meant that, instead of directly presenting, for example, director/designer communication, the students would study director/actor communication only, inferring from those studies lessons regarding communication between the director and designer and others. Director communication with others would become part of the design as part of the space left within the design for subsidiary discussion rather than as a major objective of the course.

The preceding discussion illuminates the role situational factors of time and student ability played during the course design phase of the study. As a result of these considerations, the objectives of the course were believed to be feasible. For example, the content-oriented objective that the students will, by the end of the course, understand the principles of conflict management is feasible because the quantity of the material necessary to understand the subject (see Appendix A) can be taught within the confines of a one-semester, fifty minute per week course. In addition,

graduate students, who have backgrounds including directing experience and a certain level of education, have the intellectual ability to understand the theories of conflict management. The behavioral objective that the students will, by the completion of the course, be able to apply the principles of conflict management to the directing process, is also feasible because the time available will be sufficient for them to have the opportunity to practice (see learning activities below) conflict management skills. In addition, as graduate students with previous experience as directors, these students have the ability to understand how to apply these theories to conflict.

Screen 2. Requisite Conditions for Learning. Tyler (1949) explains this screen for objectives as it relates to "the opportunity to use this knowledge in daily life" (p. 39). The objectives of a course focused on the attainment of a specific body of knowledge have a greater chance of being achieved when the knowledge is "used in the daily lives of the students" (p. 39). Additionally, the body of knowledge has a greater chance of becoming a permanent part of the student's knowledge base if it is part of the student's daily experience. Consideration of these factors was also part of the objective screening process.

As stated above, communication is an intimate part of the directing process, making it part of the director's "everyday," artistic experience when she directs.

Communication, however, is also an intimate part of a director's non-artistic experience. She must communicate with the individuals with whom she comes into contact in her non-artistic everyday life. The content objectives of this course (e.g., gaining an understanding of communication theory) that focus on the impartation of a specific body of knowledge and the behavioral objectives (e.g., gaining the ability to apply communication theories to her directing projects), therefore, stand a good chance of being achieved, and the knowledge the student gains stands a good chance of becoming a permanent part of the student's permanent knowledge base.

Screen 3. Application of a Philosophy of Learning. A philosophy of learning is a conception of how learning takes place. Tyler believes that, "a unified formulation of a theory of learning helps to outline the nature of the learning process, how it takes place, under what conditions, what sort of mechanisms and the like" (p. 41). Tyler outlines two theories of learning. The first he calls the "theory of specific stimulus-response learning," and the second he labels as the "theory of generalization" (p. 43).

The theory of specific stimulus-response is a learning process that builds connections between certain stimuli and certain responses. Learning becomes a type of habit formation. This type of learning is often used to teach arithmetic, specifically learning the times table. The

answer to two times three is a response to habit. When one is stimulated, the habitual response is invoked.

The theory of generalization views learning as "the development of generalized modes of attack upon problems, generalized modes of reaction to generalized problems" (p. 42). Learners develop an understanding of general principles that they can utilize to solve unforeseen problems. For example, the Stolpa family survived becoming lost and stranded in the middle of a high mountain blizzard because they understood a principle that stated that in survival situations one should not panic.

While a major objective of this course is to familiarize the students with theories regarding communication, it is not a major objective to habitualize their response to specific situations. Instead, an objective of the course is to prepare the students to handle situations as they arise based on an understanding of the communication principles active in any situation. For example, in achieving the behavioral objective that the students will be able to apply the principles of conflict management, no claim will be made that if an actor responds negatively to an instruction that the director should react in only an authoritarian manner. The course will support, instead, the principle that each situation requires different tactics and that it is up to the director to choose the appropriate response, which may or may not be authoritarian. Similarly, in achieving a content

objective, such as that the students will gain an understanding of leadership, the course will not attempt to have the students memorize specific sets of definitions or specific facts (e.g., that the authoritarian style of leadership contains 30 percent more hostility than the democratic style [Shaw, 1981]). Instead, the expectation will be that they remember the general concept (i.e., that the authoritarian style of leadership generally creates more hostility).

Statement of Course Objectives

Tyler completes his review of question 1 with a section that explains how objectives should be stated. Objectives should be stated in a way that "makes them most helpful in selecting learning experiences and in guiding teaching." In addition, they "should be a statement of changes [that will] take place within the student" (p. 44). Objectives should not be over generalized. For example, an objective stated as "To develop an interest in communication," may indicate a change that will take place in a student, but it is so broad that it becomes more of a goal than an objective.¹¹

¹¹ A goal is unquantifiable, while an objective is quantifiable. For example, a goal might be to do well in a school, but that is subjective; what might be doing well to one person is not doing well for another. An example of an objective would be to maintain a 4.0 average in all your classes. This is an objective because it is not open to interpretation and because you know for sure whether or not you have achieved it.

Tyler also states that formulation of objectives should occur along two dimensions simultaneously. The first is behavioral (i.e., it should reflect a change in the student). The second is related to content. This means that each objective should contain a verb that indicates behavioral change and a noun that relates to the material. For example, one objective of this course is for the student to be able to apply (verb) communication theories (subject matter) to her directing process.

Based on Tyler's first question, the objectives of this course are as follows:

During the course of or by the end of the semester the students will . . .

- Come to a better understanding of the Director's role.
- Advance her definition of the art of directing.
- Attain a better understanding of the directing process as a management process.
- Have strengthened her ability to use communication theory and skills as another directing tool.
- Gain an understanding of communication theory.
- Be able to apply the communication theories to her own directing process.
- Participate in discussions of rehearsal situations as related to communication.
- Gain an understanding of leadership.

- Gain an understanding of leadership traits and techniques.
- Develop and/or improve her leadership communication skills.
- Be able to apply knowledge of and skill at leadership to the directing process.
- Gain an understanding of conflict.
- Understand the principles of conflict management.
- Be able to apply the principles of conflict management to the directing process.
- Participate in communication and personality self-discovery activities.

Tyler believes that the process of objective creation is the most important part of developing a course because it will guide all further development. He states:

by defining these desired educational results as clearly as possible the [planner] has the most useful set of criteria for selecting content, for suggesting learning activities, for deciding on the kind of teaching procedures to follow. (p. 62)

Now that the objectives for the course are available, it is time to deal with Tyler's second question--the process of learning activity selection.

Question 2--Learning Activities

The second question Tyler poses as part of his rationale deals with the set of educational experiences or activities

necessary to accomplish the objectives previously set forth.

He states:

Essentially, learning takes place through the experiences which the learner has; that is, through the reactions he makes to the environment in which he is placed. Hence, the means of education are educational experiences that are had by the learner. (p. 63)

Tyler defines learning experiences as an interaction between the student and the environment. In this manner learning takes place through the active participation of the student. It is the teacher's responsibility to "provide an educational experience through setting up an environment and structuring the situation so as to stimulate the desired type of reaction" (p. 64).

Principles to Guide Learning Activity Selection

The following sections explain several principles Tyler suggests to guide learning activity selection and presents the type of learning activities that Tyler's writing suggests will be best for this course.

Principle 1

The first principle Tyler suggests to guide selection of learning activities is giving the student the opportunity to practice the behavior being taught. This means that simple intake of material is insufficient for real learning to take place. The student must have the opportunity to put into action that which she learns. For example, if the behavioral

objective is to improve the student's ability to solve problems within a certain field, the student must have the opportunity to undertake problem solution within that field. Another example is an objective to develop an interest in reading books on a particular subject. Without giving the student the opportunity to read books on that subject, one cannot hope to achieve that objective.

Principle 2

The second principle states that the student must receive some satisfaction from the instigation of the change in behavior. In other words, the learning experience must satisfy the student in some way. If the learning "experiences are unsatisfying or distasteful, the desired learning will not take place" (p. 66). For example, a student engaged in a course that objectifies development of an interest in reading about a particular subject will fail if the books selected are among the least engaging on the subject.

Principle 3

The third principle Tyler suggests is that the teacher should ensure that the reactions desired to the learning activity be within the range of the student. As explanation he cites "the old adage that: 'the teacher must begin where the student is'" (p. 67). For example, a teacher cannot generally expect a science student to engage in a discussion

of aesthetic theory. The teacher must be sure that the student has the background to understand the material that the course will cover. Without that background the student will never reach the education objectives of the course.

Principle 4

The last principle Tyler mentions is that each learning experience may result in multiple educational outcomes. Thus, a student working on the objectives of a class on aesthetics may also, through the learning activities designed to reach that course's objective, learn something about communication. Similarly, a single learning activity in a class may achieve more than one objective for that course.

Selecting Learning Experiences for Knowledge Acquisition

Tyler closes his discussion of the second question of his rationale with a discussion of types of learning experiences which might be useful based on the type of objectives. Of those that he reviews, his discussion of learning activities that aid in acquiring knowledge seem best to fit the needs of this course.

Tyler explains these activities by stating that:

this type of learning experience includes such objectives as developing an understanding of particular things, developing knowledge about various things, and the like. Usually, the kind of information to be acquired includes principles, laws, theories, experiments and the evidence supporting generalizations, ideas, facts, and

terms. It is assumed that such an objective is important only if the information is viewed as functional; that is, being useful in connection with the student's attack upon problems. . . . It is not assumed that information is of value in itself. (p. 72)

In essence he is describing the objectives of this course. As stated above, two of the major objectives are to enable the student to understand better and apply communication principles and theory, including ideas, facts, and terms. Activities based on Tyler's suggestions, therefore, are appropriate for inclusion in the course design.

Tyler's Rules

Tyler puts forth several rules for selecting activities intended to reach the objective of knowledge acquisition. The first rule is that the activities should allow information acquisition to become "part of a total process of problem solving" (p. 73). To accomplish this, learning activities should allow information acquisition to happen along side problem solving. This procedure avoids rote memorization and the pitfalls of the theory of specific stimulus-response learning as described above.

The second rule Tyler offers is "to select only important information to include as worthy of remembering" (p. 73). In other words, an attempt should be made to reduce the number of terms in order to increase the accuracy and precision with which the students will remember the information. The third rule is based on the adage that

"variety is the spice of life." Tyler suggests that important pieces of information should be "brought up in various ways with a considerable degree of intensity" in order to "increase the likelihood of remembering these important items" (p. 74).

A corollary to the third rule is Tyler's final proposal that teachers should use "important items of information frequently and in varied contexts" (p. 74) in order to increase chances for accurate recall at a later time and to give greater significance to the information imparted. The final rule Tyler suggests is that information presented during the course should be organized under several different schemes. By reorganizing the information, the student will be able to see how it can be appropriate in a variety of situations.

Course Learning Activities

There were several facets considered as part of the process of selecting learning activities. These included the short amount of time available, the presence of experienced graduate students in the class, and a concern that the course would become balanced towards communication rather than towards theatre (i.e., instead of being a course that used communication to understand theatre, it would become a course that used theatre to understand communication). As it turned out, the final solution to these considerations also fit neatly into the principles and rules outlined by Tyler.

Lecture and Discussion

Given the short amount of time allotted to the course and the load already required of the students involved, it would be impossible to ask for much out-of-class work by the students. This meant avoiding directing projects that would allow them the opportunity to practice what they were learning (principle 1), give them some satisfaction (principle 2), and ensure remembrance of important information by placing information acquisition alongside problem solving (rule 1). The lack of time also put a limit on the amount of material coverable and the manner of student exposure to that material. The students would not be able to take time to read outside class or prepare written and/or oral reports. One solution considered to these problems was to select weekly lectures as the learning activity.

This solution, though, created other problems relating to the level of the students and the balance of the class. As a graduate student myself, I realized that graduate students have enough experience and personal opinions to make sitting through a lecture a chore. They no longer respond well to a pedagogical approach; instead they prefer more of an andragogical approach in which they have control and input into the learning process. A lecture format would also tip the balance almost completely toward communication because the majority of the time would be taken up explaining communication theories. In addition, a straight lecture

format as the basis for learning activities would violate the principles and rules established by Tyler.

Another considered solution to the problems was to select discussion as the main learning activity. This approach would be a form of seminar; that is, it would entail a weekly, in-class round-table discussion of problems the students had faced in the past and were facing currently in the productions in which they were involved either as actors or directors. The advantages to this approach include providing opportunities for the students to practice behavior in their production work (principle 1), giving the students satisfaction through the process of practicing (principle 2), bringing the learning activity up to the level of the students (principle 3), and creating a situation in which the discussion could lead to multiple educational outcomes as a single activity might cover several objectives. At first glance this might seem to be a viable approach. A deeper look, however, reveals difficulties related to the transfer of information on communication theory, as well as Tyler's rules.

Any intelligent discussion is predicated on the idea that the participants have an understanding of the subject being discussed. A discussion in this class would not suffer from a lack of understanding of theatre. Instead it would suffer from a lack of understanding of communication theory. In a three-credit-hour course, outside reading assignments

would provide the students with the information they needed. The one-credit-hour format, however, would not allow that process to happen. This means that the discussion-only format would violate rule 1 by not coupling information acquisition with problem solving, rules 2 and 3 because the lack of information acquisition negates the possibility of variety in the intensity of information delivery or variety in context of that delivery, and rule 4 because what little information transfer that might occur would only happen through one scheme--discussion. Violation of these rules could result in students who retained little from the learning experience.

The eventual learning activities choice included a combination of lecture and discussion formats. Half of each class would be dedicated to a brief lecture on a segment of communication theory. Following the lecture, the class would engage in a discussion of those theories in terms of the rehearsal process.

This approach satisfied all of Tyler's principles and rules regarding selection of learning activities. It gave the students an opportunity to practice the behavior and to attain satisfaction through their work in production, through analyzation in discussion, and through participation in the discussion which in itself is a group communication process (principles 1 and 2). As stated above, discussion allows graduate students to react at their own level (principle 3).

In addition, each discussion--each learning experience--could result in multiple outcomes as students make connections between different objectives since any one discussion could focus on multiple communication topics. This dual approach also satisfies Tyler's rules because the lecture/discussion format allows information acquisition to happen alongside problem solving (rule 1). In addition, because the dual approach will use two different activity schemes, the presentation of information will vary in terms of intensity and context (rules 2 and 3). The use of lecture and discussion, however, were not the only two learning activities incorporated into the course's design.

Surveys

Because the objectives of this course, as stated above, are to help the student gain a better understanding of her own skills in several areas of communication, learning activities that compelled the student think about how she uses communication during rehearsal were appropriate for inclusion. To this end, I conducted a review of survey instruments in the areas of group role enactment, leadership, and conflict management in order to locate surveys that would ask the students to evaluate their own feelings and behavior regarding each area. Furthermore, because the requirements of this study, in addition to those of the course, called for a measurement of the effect the course had on the students,

the execution of pre- and post-course surveys might reveal changes that occurred as a result of the course (see discussion of evaluation below). These two objectives place certain criteria on the surveys considered for selection. The surveys selected would have to measure the students' actual communication behavior rather than their opinions on which behaviors they might deem correct.

The survey would also have to measure behaviors that could reasonably be thought to change, based on the acquisition of new information and an increase in communication skills. The following section will present information about the three surveys included as part of the learning activities within the course design.

The Group Role Self-Rater Survey. One of the areas of study included in the course is small group development. Within the structure of a group, individuals take on certain roles. A role is defined as the set of behaviors the occupant of a position enacts. (Shaw, 1981) Infante et al. (1993) break roles down into three groups: group task; group building and maintenance; and individual.

Group task roles are those behaviors that aim at selecting, defining and solving problems that face the group. Group building and maintenance roles are those behaviors concerned with the socio-emotional interplay within the group regarding each group member and the group's task. Individual roles consist of those behaviors that center on the

individual and her needs rather than those of the group. Infante et al. (1993) list sets of behaviors that identify each role. The purpose of this survey, therefore, is to identify which sets of behaviors the students will exhibit within a group. This information helps to define what role they will play within the group.

Because a survey could not be found that accomplished this task, I created my own survey based on the sets of behaviors found in Infante et al. (1993, p. 322). Appendix B is a copy of this survey. No claim is made for the reliability of this survey. It is primarily designed to function as instigator of student thought on the subject rather than as an accurate measure of group role enactment.

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory II (ROCI-II).

Another area of study included in the course is conflict management. Goss and O'Hair (1988) state that, "a conflict occurs when two or more people have a strong disagreement that is driven by a clash of goals, perceptions, and/or values" (p. 213). Furthermore, they propose that strategies for managing conflict takes place along "two dimensions: cooperation (willingness to work together) and assertiveness (amount of personal initiative and aggressiveness demonstrated)" (p. 215). Various combinations of cooperativeness and assertiveness make up the different strategies. For example, a strategy consisting of high cooperation and low assertiveness is called "Accommodation."

On the other hand, a strategy consisting of high assertiveness and low cooperation is called "Competition." There are five strategies in all: Accommodation, Competition, Avoidance, Collaboration, and Compromise (a.k.a. Negotiation).

The survey included in the course design was the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory II (ROCI--II). The design of this survey included attention to its use "to measure the amount of conflict and the styles of handling conflict of the participants in . . . training programs" (p. 22). In addition, the survey states that, "the inventories may be completed by subjects before and after a training program so that changes in the . . . subjects styles of handling conflict can be assessed" (p. 22). The ability to use the survey in this manner, in addition to its function as an instigator of student thought on the subject, made it a good choice as a learning activity for this course.

The three-part survey measures Intrapersonal, Intragroup, and Intergroup conflict. This course only used the section related to Intragroup conflict. As recommended in the material supporting the survey, the survey was "altered slightly to measure conflict within a specific group" (p. 22). Specifically, the survey inventoried conflict management styles within the performance group. It was also altered "to measure how a person handles his or her conflict with his or her group members" (p. 22).

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Another area of that of importance to the course is leadership. Leadership does not refer directly to the leader--the person who "exerts more positive influence on others" in a group (Shaw, 1981) or the person who does "the right thing to accomplish their team's vision" (Hellriegel et al., 1992). Leadership refers, instead, to the process by which the leader influences the other members of the team or group. Several approaches to and styles of leadership were presented in Chapter 1 above. Among these were transactional and transformational approaches and the laissez-faire style.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass and Avolio, 1990) provides "a method of reliably measuring the behaviors constituting transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire [i.e., non-leadership] leadership" (p. 5). In addition, the questionnaire's designers recommend its use to provide leaders with individualized feedback regarding their leadership styles. Therefore, the Self-Rater form of this questionnaire became part one of the learning activities included in the course design.

Other Learning Activities

Hellriegel et al. (1992) point to importance of self-understanding as an important part of leadership. "Effective leaders have the skill to recognize their strengths and weaknesses" (p. 387). The learning activities cited above begin

the process of self-discovery necessary to achieve that goal. Other activities are available to further that process and are part of the course design. Included are the Keirsey Temperament Sorter/Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Test (Keirsey & Bates, 1984), Goss and O'Hair's (1988) exercises entitled "Taking Criticism Yourself" and "A Family Fighting Inventory," and several role playing scenarios I constructed.

In summary, Tyler's second question asks the course designer to select learning activities that will satisfy the course objectives. For this course those learning activities consist of lecture, discussion, and the completion of surveys and exercises designed to encourage the student to engage in self-discovery. The establishment of the course learning activities finishes Tyler's second question and leads to his third question regarding the organization of the learning activities

Question 3-Organization for Effective Learning

Tyler's third question deals with the establishment of an organization of the learning skills into an effective instructional plan. He states:

In order for educational experiences to produce a cumulative effect, they must be so organized as to reinforce each other. Organization is thus seen as an important problem in curriculum development because it greatly influences the efficiency of instruction and the degree to which major educational changes are brought about in the learners. (p. 83)

Establishing the structure of a course is a two-part process. The first considers an overall structure based on three criteria (continuity, sequence, and integration). The second part considers how to break the course down into manageable, cohesive sections known as either a lesson (the daily plan), a topic (the weekly plan), or the unit (the large scope plan). The following sections will define these concepts and discuss how they apply to the design of this course.

Part 1-Overall Structure

A course is made up of a series of learning experiences that do not exist in isolation from each other. They co-exist along two dimensions: time and interrelation.

Tyler labels the time as a "vertical" relationship (p. 84). By this he means that the learning experience taking place at the start of a course has a relation to the learning experience taking place at the end of the course. If learning experiences at the start of the course are built upon by experiences later in the course, "there will be greater depth and breadth in the development of . . . concepts, skills and the like" (p. 84) for that subject. For example, in a course in general math a learning experience at the beginning may involve the development of skill at multiplying. By including practice of that same skill later during work on algebra, the student will gain a better understanding of multiplication.

He defines the interrelational dimension of learning experiences as "horizontal" (p. 84). By this he means that different subjects can reinforce one another. This approach avoids ineffective compartmentalized learning and "provides for larger significance and greater unity of view" (p. 84). Tyler cites the cross-over between history and geography as an example of this type of relationship.

These vertical and horizontal dimensions play an important part in three organizing criteria. Continuity represents a vertical relationship among course elements in which there should be a "recurring and continuing opportunity" (p. 84) for the student to practice skills and to use concepts. The use of multiplication cited above is an example of this principle. "Sequence" refers to the use of each successive experience to build on the previous experience. For example, a course in general math starts with addition and subtraction, progresses to multiplication and division, and follows on through simple math, algebra, geometry, etc., with each experience building on the foundation of the previous one. "Integration refers to the student's increased unity of behavior in relating the elements" (p. 96) of the course. Integration, therefore, takes place in the horizontal dimension in which subjects interrelate as cited above.

Based on these criteria, organization can occur around several principles, including, but not limited to, chronology,

increasing the breadth of application, increasing the range of activities included, the use of description followed by analysis, the development of specific illustrations followed by broader and broader principles to explain these illustrations, an the attempt to build an increasingly unified world picture from specific parts which are first built into larger and larger wholes. (p. 97)

These principles are differentiated by their adherence to logical or psychological factors. This differentiation connotes the point of view from which the course flows. A logical organization looks at the course from the expert's or instructor's point of view. The psychological organization is one that looks at the course from the student's point of view. The difference between the two is that the expert may not see the material in terms of how it best can be learned.

In order to achieve the objectives of this course the decision was made to organize the structure of the course around Tyler's suggestion of building "an increasingly unified world picture from specific parts which are first built into larger and larger wholes" (p. 97). In other words, the learning activities would center around an attempt to work from a specific germinal concept and to add informational and skill development activities in a way that created a larger and better-defined picture of what happens during the rehearsal process. The first section became centered on establishing a basic understanding of communication. For example, the course design begins with a definition of communication. This beginning leads to two possible approaches.

The first is to explain a model of communication, followed by an explanation of system theory of which the model is an example. The other avenue is to explain system theory and then present the model of communication. It was decided that the first choice was moving in the wrong direction. It presented a general model and then explained the underlying theory. The second avenue presented the underlying theory and then built on it by providing information on the communication model. The second choice became part of the design.

Broadly speaking, the learning activities were laid out in the following order: Introduction to the course and communication; Small group communication; Leadership; Conflict; and Conflict management. This order allowed the students to begin with basics and then build on the knowledge and skill they gained with each succeeding subject. This order also meets the criteria of continuity, sequence, and integration. Each subject area was, in turn, laid out using the same principle. Appendix A contains a complete course lay out.

Part 2--Creating Manageable and Cohesive Sections

Tyler explains three types of structure related to creating manageable and cohesive sections: Lesson, Topic and Unit. The most commonly used of these is the lesson, "in which a single day is treated as a discrete unit and the

lesson plans for the day were more or less separate from other lessons which were planned for other days" (p. 99). The second structure is the topic, which includes events "which may last for several days or several weeks" (p. 99). The last of these is the increasingly common structure called "the unit." "The unit usually includes experiences covering several weeks and is organized around problems or major student purposes" (p. 99).

The unit became the structuring force behind the course. The reasons for this include the fact that, as a partially discussion-oriented course, the amount of time spent on discussion and the amount of discussion overflow into the next class were difficult to predict. This meant that daily or even weekly lesson plans would be of little use. As Tyler points out, unit plans are more flexible.

Another reason for this structure choice was that it allows the design to orient itself to major student problems. In other words, it allows the student the ability to concentrate on learning experiences grouped together by major subject matter. In the case of this course, those subjects include Introduction to communication, Small group communication, Leadership, and Conflict and its management.

Once the unit format is chosen, the next step in creating the course is to plan specific units. To this end, Tyler suggests that most units should include a statement of major objectives, a description of the experiences planned to

meet those objectives, a detailed outline of the culminating experiences that will assist the students at the end of the unit to integrate and organize what they got from the unit, a list of source materials, and an indication of the level of development of the major elements of the design in order to avoid omissions or duplications and to ensure a proper progression of subject matter. Appendix A meets these requirements by providing a bibliography for the entire course and an outline of activities for the entire course, as well as each unit.

Question 4--Evaluation

The last question Tyler poses in his rationale deals with course evaluation. Evaluation is not a straightforward process because the process of teaching involves a great number of variables

including variations in individual students, the environmental conditions in which the learning goes on, the skill of the teacher in setting the conditions as they are planned, the personality characteristics of the teacher, and the like.

(p. 105)

Tyler describes evaluation as the process of finding out whether or not the chosen learning activities and their organization produces the desired results. The process also illuminates the strengths and weaknesses of the course as planned. Evaluation

helps to check the validity of the basic hypotheses upon which the instructional program has been organized and developed, and it also checks the

effectiveness of the particular instruments, that is, the teacher and other conditions that are being used to carry forward the instructional program. As a result of evaluation it is possible to note in what respects the [course] is effective and in what respects it needs improvement. (p. 105)

Essentially evaluation determines if the course's objectives have been met. Because objectives fall along two dimensions--behavioral and content--objectives in both dimensions must come under scrutiny. In the case of this course, the behavioral objectives deal with the development of communication skills, and the content objectives deal with the acquisition of knowledge pertaining to communication theory. In addition, in order for an evaluation to be considered accurate it must meet certain criteria.

All evaluations must meet the criteria of objectivity, reliability and validity. Objectivity is "the degree to which two different persons, presumably competent, would be able to reach similar scores or summaries when they had the opportunity to score or summarize the same records" (p. 118). A well-constructed multiple choice exam is an example of an objective evaluation because the answer either is correct or not without regard for the beliefs or opinions of any individual scoring the exam.

The findings of an evaluation "are reliable if they can be repeated so that anyone who follows the same procedure will achieve the same results" (Infante et al., 1993, p. 56). For example, if one were to test the hypothesis that striking a human finger with a hard, heavy object would cause pain,

one might develop a test whereby a finger is struck with force by a hammer. The reliability of this test is found in the fact that no matter who repeats this test, the results will always be the same: a subject in pain.

Validity refers to "the degree to which an evaluation device actually provides evidence of the behavior desired" (Tyler, 1949, p. 119). Validity is measurable in two ways. The first is to sample directly the behavior tested. For example, if the behavior under scrutiny was children's food habits, an observation of their selections in the cafeteria at lunch would provide a direct sample of that behavior. The other way to achieve validity is to correlate the results of the evaluation device (e.g., a questionnaire about children's food choices) with the results obtained from an actual recording of the behavior (e.g., the cafeteria's record of what was eaten at lunch).

Tyler makes another suggestion about evaluation that should be taken into account: evaluations should occur at least twice during the period of the course. In other words, in order to test properly the advancement of the students, it is necessary to evaluate their standing in relation to the course at the beginning of the class. This procedure will establish a base-line against which future evaluations will take place. This process makes the student's progress clear.

Finally, Tyler turns to appropriate instruments for use during evaluation. He states that, "since evaluation

involves getting evidence about . . . changes in the students, any valid evidence about [attainment of] educational objectives provides an appropriate method of evaluation" (p. 107). Tyler then provides a list of possible evaluation instruments. These instruments include direct observation, paper and pencil tests, questionnaires, and records made for other purposes (e.g., books withdrawn from the library to evaluate new reading skills).

Another approach that Tyler describes is sampling. Sampling is the testing of a portion of the whole group to evaluate the outcomes of behavioral objectives. Results then are used to infer conclusions about the whole group. Sampling for content understanding involves testing the whole group over a portion of the content. The results then are used to infer conclusions about the complete content.

The methods for evaluating this course derive from Tyler's appraisal of evaluation outlined above. The establishment of a base-line for each student will occur at the beginning of the course. The method for establishment of the base-line will be the three surveys outlined above in the section explicating learning activities. A final evaluation will also take place at the end of the course. It will consist of a repetition of the three surveys and the execution of a multiple choice exam.

The survey instruments will objectively and reliably (reliability and validity of each instrument, except the

Group Role Self-Rater, is established in the material accompanying the questionnaires) establish the progress made by the students in terms of behavior.¹² The multiple choice exam designed to evaluate the success of content objectives will operate under the concept of sampling. It will, therefore, only test the students on a portion of the content and infer conclusions about the entire content. Changes in the results of the surveys and passing of the exams will indicate, at least partially, the success of the course.¹³

Further evaluation will take the form of student evaluations of the course and instructor observations of the course and the students. The combination of these evaluation instruments and techniques will establish the extent to which the course met its objectives. In addition, they will point the way for improvements in the course design and further research.

¹² The reliability and validity of each instrument, except the Group Role Self-rater, is established in the material accompanying the questionnaires.

¹³ Due to partially lost data for the first set of surveys, this evaluation technique was incompletable. The validity of this technique for this course, however, became all but irrelevant when only four students signed up for the class. This sample was far too small to allow the drawing of any meaningful or reliable conclusions. The survey's remained part of the course for the main purpose of providing stimulus for thought and discussion.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

As discussed in the previous chapter, the basic structure of this course design is the unit. There are four units in the design: (Unit 1) Introduction to the Course and Communication Studies; (Unit 2) Small Group Communication; (Unit 3) Leadership; and (Unit 4) Conflict and Conflict Management. Each unit represents a specific subject matter that took several weeks to cover adequately. Based on the amount of material in each unit, the once-a-week fifty minute time limit, and the calculated 15 week duration of the semester, decisions were made regarding the amount of time allotted for completion of each unit. Unit one was allotted three weeks, and all the other units were allotted four weeks each for a total of 15 weeks.

After presenting some background information, this chapter will review each week's class, reporting on the progress made, problems that arose, and both successful and unexpected learning activities.

The Class

Tyler (1949) states that "the teacher must have some understanding of the kinds of interests and background the students have" (p. 64). This knowledge will aid in designing specific learning activities by allowing prediction of

student response. In addition, this knowledge will assist in evaluating the course at its end by establishing a base-line of student ability and knowledge. This section will, therefore, briefly introduce the members of the class.

It was originally hoped that the class would consist of six to eight students. In the end, the class consisted of four students. The class was broken down evenly between men and women and students working on Master of Fine Arts and on Doctor of Philosophy degrees. Three of the four students were in their first semester of study at this large southwestern university. The third student was already well into the program. Two students were majoring in acting, and two were majoring in Acting/Directing. All the students had acting and directing training and experience, but two were more experienced than the others. The student's ages ranged from early twenties to early forties. Previous education in communication was, for the most part, nonexistent among the students, although one had taken some general courses.

Ethical Issues

During the course of the semester, each student became engaged in at least one production and took part in at least one rehearsal process, giving them the opportunity to view a rehearsal process from a communication perspective. Because the design of the course called for discussions based on their experiences during their production work, it became

imperative that each student was made to feel free to speak his or her mind without fear of having any comments reach those participating in the situation under discussion. Normally this might not be to great a problem; however, in a class with only four students, identification of a specific individual's comments would be easy to make if those comments were repeated. An additional problem was the fact that the class was being used as the basis of a study; it was, therefore, necessary to tape-record the proceedings to aid my future reference to educational events that took place.

Understandably, these issues caused trepidation on the part of the students, as well as myself. I, therefore, gave the students a solemn promise that they would not be directly quoted at any time, that their identity would be kept anonymous within this document, that transcripts of the class would not be made and would not appear in the written portion of the study, and that no one other than myself, for purposes of memory refreshment, would listen to the taped classes. In addition, I promised not to identify the productions discussed or the identities of any person working on productions with the students. These promises will affect the this and following chapters. References to events that stimulated discussion, as well as the details of specific class discussions that might identify the participants, will only be of the grossest and most general nature.

Weekly Classes

The following section will present a week-by-week synopsis of the course's progression.

Week 1

The first meeting was held on the first Friday of the semester in the theatre's Green Room. During this meeting I arranged for a permanent time and place for class meetings (the course was scheduled as an independent study), discussed the syllabus (Appendix A) that explained the class rationale, objectives, grading policy, attendance requirements, and Americans with Disabilities Act (A.D.A.) statement, and explained the class structure (i.e., the lecture/ discussion format) and requirements. The class then began the learning process through execution of the three self-rating surveys.

The first survey taken was the Group Role Self-Rater. No attempt was made on this survey, or on any of the others, to explain the survey's meaning either before or immediately after survey completion. This was done to make the students question themselves about the subjects covered in each survey. In addition, any explanation beforehand might skew the results through an inadvertent remark I might make. Finally, no explanation was given post-test in order to allow the accumulation of knowledge on the subjects covered by the survey to occur in its proper sequence.

The scores among the students showed no significant difference. All scores fell into a range between 3.2 and 3.8 on a scale of 5 for the first two sections, Group Task and Group Maintenance. Each student's lowest score (all below 2) came on the questions related to individuality. The only difference between the students is that one scored highest on Group Maintenance while the others scored higher on Group Task, but this difference was barely perceptible. The result of this survey implies that this group of students was oriented to working in small groups and generally away from individual efforts. Because of the similarity on the task and maintenance portions of the survey, no definitive conclusion about specific role orientation at the start of the course could be made.

After the surveys were completed and scored, the students began on the second survey, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Unfortunately, time ran out while they were in the middle of this survey. As a way to save time, they were asked to finish that survey at home.

In addition to the learning activities accomplished during this session, a decision was made to hold class on a regular basis on Monday afternoons. All of the rest of these classes were held in a small classroom in a building not associated with either the theatre department or the communication studies department.

Week 2

This session began with execution of the two remaining surveys. As with the results on the Group Role Self-Rater, the scoring differentials between the individuals were negligible on both surveys. Generally, on the ROCI-II they scored highest on the integrating (collaborative) questions. On the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, they generally scored highest on transformational factors.

After completion of the surveys, presentation was made of the first material. Included in this information was a rationale for the first learning unit, a list of objectives for the unit, and presentation of an outline for the entire course. The students were also informed that a complete guide to the course was available.¹⁴ At this point the first lecture was given.

The subjects covered in this lecture were an argument for director's study of communication (paralleling the one found in the Introduction above), a definition of communication, and an explanation of Von Bertalanffy's theory of systems. After the lecture, the class engaged in a discussion of the relation of system theory to the rehearsal process. The group identified input to the system of rehearsal as including actors, script, director, rehearsal props, costumes, and the daily life experiences of the cast.

¹⁴ Only one student acquired the course guide during the course. A second student acquired a course guide in the last week of the class.

The most interesting conclusion the group reached was that each rehearsal is input for the following rehearsal.

From here the discussion turned to questioning the application of the concept of homeostasis (i.e., roughly meaning that all systems try to reach a steady state of existence between chaos and stagnation) to both the production and the rehearsal. Does production reach homeostasis? Does it even seek homeostasis as do all systems? Is homeostasis the antithesis of a good production? The discussion of homeostasis led to the idea that rehearsals become a closed system when the production begins and that eventually the production itself becomes a closed system.

The group reached no specific conclusions regarding the questions it considered that day. Reaching conclusions, however, was not important. What was important was the way the discussion of the materials presented in lecture began to stimulate the student's thinking about communication and theatre.

Week 3

The lecture portion of this class presented the final section of the first unit: a model of communication and Marshall's (1988) model of communication during the directing process.

This was the first session in which the discussion turned away from the process of directing in terms of the

actor/director relationship and towards the communication the director has with the audience. The discussion centered on the interrelationship of the director as sender, the channel or media of the communication, and the two receivers, the audience and the actor. As explained below, the class discussed the balance between media richness (i.e., greater richness being the result of a greater number of channels through which communication can occur) and noise (i.e., anything that interferes with the accurate transmission and reception of the director's message).

Directors do not generally get up on stage and speak directly to the audience. The communication between the director and the audience is indirect, therefore, because it takes place through the medium of the performance. The director communicates to the audience through the unified elements that make up the production (e.g., the actors, the set, the lighting, the music, etc.). While a production creates a media rich environment, it also contains a great deal of noise. This noise comes from the other artists involved in the production as they too use the elements within the production to communicate their own messages to the audience.

The communication between the actor and the director occurs between the two people engaged and is, therefore, more direct. This directness creates an environment less complicated by, although not free from, noise. The

director's message is not interfered with in the same way it is during a production. On the other hand, the class considered whether or not this communication was less media rich in that the director only has her voice and body with which to communicate. During a performance she has a much greater number of channels available.

The communication act between the director and the audience was not meant to become part of the course. This particular discussion continued because it allowed the students to investigate the differences in the two types of communication. By the end of the class they established a firm view of the differences between the two acts directors engage in and which act would be the focus of the course. In addition, this session completed the presentation of the first unit of the course within the time limit expected.

Week 4

The lecture portion of this class began Unit 2. The class received information on a definition of small groups and on small group structure including differentiation, status, roles, and some information about norms. The lecture ended without finishing norms in order to allow adequate time for discussion. This week's discussion focused on how the definition of small groups and how the structure of small groups applies to a theatrical production.

The discussion turned to the relation of script to structure. During the lecture, the only mention of task was in relation to the definition of small groups. Task did not receive elaboration because the task of all productions is essentially identical--to produce a play. The class, however, realized that differences in scripts were task variants that effected the group structure. In other words, if a director gave a different script to the same cast and all other factors (e.g., time, space, etc.) remained the same, the group structure would develop differently. For example, the actor who had a large role in one script, allowing her to develop into a member with high status, might only have a small role in the new script, giving her a different status, thereby changing the structure of the group.

The discussion of status reminded one student of a book by Keith Johnston entitled Impro. This book assists actors interested on working on character in relation to the character's status.

The class meeting concluded with a lengthy discussion of holding multiple roles within a single group. This discussion focused on attempts made by directors to act in a production they are directing. Several of the students had experience with this situation as a director and/or actor. It was difficult to keep this discussion focused on communication. The students wanted to discuss the artistic

merits of the problem and to tell "war stories" about their own experiences.

Week 5

The lecture during this class finished the presentation of material related to small group structure and proceeded on to the section on skills development as outlined in the course guide. This took up more of the period than anticipated, leaving a shorter time for discussion.

Discussion centered on the discussion questions in the course guide at the end of the skills development section. Specifically, we discussed feedback in terms of note giving during rehearsals. How and when should notes be given, and are there set patterns that we develop as directors during feedback? The students used and knew of a variety of methods for note giving. Suggestions and experience ranged from personally written notes, to assistant written notes, to use of a tape-recorder. Delivery of notes varied in regard to the point in the rehearsal process. Early in rehearsal there was more interruption and immediate notation of areas that needed more work. Later in rehearsal, notes tend to become more formalized and given either en masse at the conclusion of rehearsal or individually through oral or written communication after rehearsal or before the next rehearsal.

This class meeting initiated a sense on my part that all the material planned for coverage might not reach the

students. The result for this particular session was that we did not do some role-playing exercises which, although not a part of the original course design, would have been helpful.

Week 6

Because of the length of the previous week's lecture, we did not finish the discussion topics. This week, therefore, began with discussion of feedback in relation to proximity and the use of non-verbals. The discussion of proximity detailed the students' experience with the effect of giving notes from the house and on stage and the effect that proximity had on their actors. The discussion of non-verbal feedback centered around explaining the difference between the use of language and the use of tone, pitch, etc. Later in the course, one student had trouble grasping the difference and insisted that any use of the voice was verbal communication.

After this brief discussion, we turned to theories of small group phasic development. The lecture outlined a general theory (Tuckman's theory, 1965) and Wohl's (1988) theory of theatrical development. The important part of these theories, for the discussion, turned out to be the inclusion of periods of conflict.

Our discussion began with Wohl's (1988) theory which, unlike other theories of phasic development, contains two periods of conflict. The end of each period is marked by a

crisis. Knowing that the effect a crisis has on a conflict phase (bringing it to a close), should a director purposefully create a crisis? In particular there was discussion of experiences we had all had in which directors had lost their tempers in front of, and sometimes at, an entire cast. The general consensus of the group that purposeful initiation of this was a bad thing. One student went so far as to say that this was the sign of a bad director. My notes for this class (Allen, 1993b) stated that, "I don't think I got them to see [director vocalization of agitation as crisis point] as natural or OK in some cases" (p. 10).

This discussion was cut short by the end of the period. We decided to take it up again during the next class meeting.

Week 7

This class consisted entirely of discussion regarding phasic development and the role of the director. We considered how a director can use her knowledge of group phasic development to steer the rehearsal process. The discussion began with a suggestion that conflict in rehearsal is a product of particular activities taking place rather than as a function of the phasic development process. For example, most of the students agreed that the process of blocking often leads to conflict, no matter where in the

rehearsal period this activity takes place. The reason for this is that the process of blocking increases ambiguity.

We also discussed the fact that blocking usually takes place during the earlier periods of rehearsal, intersecting with the first phase of conflict. This led to a discussion of ways to get through the first phase of rehearsal as quickly as possible by using exercises to introduce the actors to each other. Exercises can decrease the ambiguity rife in any new situation and communicate the director's intentions about rehearsal patterns to the actors. For example a director who enters directly into blocking has a different view of the rehearsal process than the director who starts with interpersonal familiarization exercises. Likewise, a director who abdicates responsibility for blocking sends a different message about norms than the director who takes those responsibilities to heart. This discussion included references to personal experiences we had both as actors and directors in all types of situations.

This session concluded with a brief discussion of the second conflict phase which often happens near the final rehearsals. In educational theatre this often involves a period when the cast and the crew begin to work together. We discussed the effect of making one working unit out of two small groups, each having a clear self-image.

The fact that this class skipped the lecture segment began to put us behind schedule. The two weeks needed to

complete the second half of this unit passed without fulfillment of that objective. The fear of falling behind was growing.

Week 8

Before this week's meeting I decided to skip over the final section of the second unit--Organizational Communication. The reasons for this parallel those mentioned above for the reduction of its importance to the entire course. Because the focus was now almost exclusively on the director/actor relationship, it was no longer central to the course to explain or discuss the director's relation with the other elements of the theatre organization. In addition, given the fact that we had discussed intergroup conflict (one of the headings in the organizational part of the course guide) during the previous week's discussion of conflict phases (see above), I felt that the subject could be skipped at that time. If time permitted or the subject came up of its own accord, the presentation of that information could take place later.

This week's lecture presented information on leadership; its definition and its attainment in small groups. Most studies of leadership focus on leadership attainment as a function of group development. Leadership in theatre, however, is a product of pre-group formation decisions. This does not mean that the study of leadership attainment cannot

shed light on the work of the director. A leader only holds legitimate power if the followers are willing to let the leader lead. Therefore, the reasons one attains leadership in a group will still affect the director's ability to lead.

While this week's discussion focused on these issues, that focus was not what became the most important part of the discussion. What became important was a breakdown in the functioning of the class as a group as the discussion got off the track of small group and onto personal views of societal issues. We were discussing leadership traits, specifically the fact that leaders exhibit abilities relevant to goal facilitation, sociability, and individual prominence. The suggestion was made that in managerial promotions the person promoted often had abilities related to goal facilitation and was well received on a social basis, but often did not have the desire for prominence. This situation often leads to managers who do not do well. From here the discussion turned to the reflection of this issue in society as a whole.

As the leader of the group, I realized that this conversation was moving us away from goal facilitation--away from our discussion of communication issues. The question from my view was how to get the discussion back on track without challenging the point of view being espoused by one member of the class. While I tried to bring the class back on subject, an accusation of sarcasm was made against me. The accuser, and other members of the class, read sarcasm

based on my non-verbals. I apologized for this impression and explained that I was thinking about my problem as a teacher/leader in terms of getting things back on track at the moment of the "sarcastic" non-verbals (rolling eyes and looking away from the speaker). This explanation was found to be satisfactory. The class would have proceeded, but the time was up.

After class, I wrote in my journal (Allen, 1993b) that this had not been "one of the best classes" (p. 16). In addition, I questioned what I had done and how I might have handled it differently. This questioning led me to the realization that the day's discussion was a perfect example of a communication problem within a small group. During the next class I would turn back to this day's discussion in order to help the students come to a better understanding of small group communication and leadership.

Week 9

Before class I reviewed the course syllabus to determine how close to the original time frame the course was holding. With six weeks remaining there was approximately seven and a half weeks worth of material to cover. There seemed to be four options open: (1) reduce the amount of material covered in the lectures again (see Week 8 above); (2) reduce the amount of time spent in discussion; (3) speed up the delivery of the lecture; and/or (4) add an extra class meeting.

Because the first two options would seriously interfere with accomplishment of the course objective, they were considered to be emergency options only. The best option was number 3, which I decided to accept. The next best option was number 4, but I would wait until later in the semester to see if adding another class was needed or possible schedule-wise.

As mentioned above, this class began with a return to the previous week's "problem." The discussion that ensued was fruitful. We discussed the effect of leader "Leakage," that is, the leader letting her thoughts show through via non-verbal communication. In addition, we discussed how the events of the previous week altered the group structure, especially in terms of norms. For example, it was now clear that discussions of extracurricular subjects was off limits during the class. Finally, we had an extended discussion of non-verbal behavior and its effect on communication.

Unfortunately, only one of the two individuals directly involved in the previous week's "problem" was in attendance. Had the other individual been present, the discussion could have been even more effective as a learning experience.

After this discussion, I lectured on leadership styles. A brief discussion of directors' choices regarding style followed the lecture. The discussion centered on a few questions. For example, do the students choose their style as a conscious effort to manage the particular situation, or do they rely on a personal style they have built through

previous experience? Another question we discussed regarded which is more common: directors who stick to a single style or those who use a combination of styles?

The general consensus was that most directors develop a style of their own. The better directors seem to use some type of combination that allows them to react to particular situations. The class believed that in the future they would keep to their own style, adjusting it to the particular overall situation (e.g., cast size, time, script requirements, etc.).

Distribution of the Keirsey Temperament Sorter and a key to the results of that survey took place at the end of the class. Originally, this survey was to take place during this class. The objective of using this survey was to lead the students to a better understanding of their own leadership traits. As such, taking the survey and reporting the results in class would not be of as much educational benefit as taking the survey itself. This reason, coupled with the time constraints, led me to ask that the survey be taken at home rather than during class.

Week 10

This class unexpectedly turned into a period long lecture on approaches to leadership. The following section from my journal (Allen, 1993b) explains what occurred.

While I made up some of the lost time, I did so at the expense of the discussion. The flattest class

so far. There was a lot of terminology introduced. I could not stop midway because each piece of information was part of the whole. If the train of thought was broken, then the whole idea would become incomprehensible. . . . I am feeling the pinch of putting the 3 hour class into one hour. When I went through my notes in advance, I should have realized that today's class would be pretty much straight lecture, and delivered it as such. Instead I just sat there. I was anticipating questions that did not come. (p. 16)

Another factor that affected the success of this week's class was the presence of a member of my advisory committee. Discussion during this session was all but nonexistent. At the end of the session, the visitor and I believed that this extra presence had an effect. The next week's discussion confirmed this thought (see below).

Week 11

This week's class opened with a discussion of the previous week's work. Specifically, we looked at the poor response to that lecture. The class concluded that some of the fault with the session had been mine (i.e., being ill-prepared for a lecture) and that the material covered was of a dry nature, that is, it contained a great deal of technical terminology. The consensus was that they felt a more interactive format would have worked better. The class also discussed how the presence of an individual from outside (one member of my committee) affected the group's norms.

This discussion focused on how the group dynamic was changed simply by the physical position of the visitor. The

presence of the visitor led to a brief exploration of proximity. From where should one deliver feedback to the group? From the stage? From the audience? Also, where should the rest of the production staff stand? By getting them behind the director, they symbolically reveal themselves to be standing behind the instructions the director gives.

After this discussion, I delivered a brief lecture on leadership skills and effective communication. The discussion after the lecture included investigation of several scenarios. While these were originally intended to become role-playing exercises, the time constraint led to a decision just to discuss the scenarios. After discussing several of them time ran out. After class one of the students expressed regret that we did not have more time for that type of discussion.

This class completed the lecture portion of the third unit. The next unit's schedule called for four weeks, but only three weeks remained. To alleviate that problem, I asked the class if an extra class meeting was possible. A suggestion for a date and time was made, but at least half the class had other commitments. This shelved, at least temporarily, the idea of an extra class.

Week 12

This class began the fourth and final unit of study as outlined in the course guide. It was at this point that I

realized that there had been a miscount in the number of weeks in the semester. Instead of the fifteen weeks around which the course plan developed, there were only fourteen weeks of class. This explained the fact that there were only three weeks left in which to complete the course. As a result, the amount of material covered in each lecture and the length of each lecture increased in order to assure completion. In addition, as a result of the time constraint, I canceled the tail end of the discussion from the previous week (on the leadership scenarios).

The lecture portion of this class dealt with the defining of conflict, outlining conflict development, and explaining conflict strategies. The following short discussion, based on the discussion topics listed in the course guide (Appendix A), began with conversation about how conflict development and conflict strategies occur during rehearsal. The class referred to situations encountered in actual productions, such as coalition building, and felt and perceived conflict. These situations illustrated for the students theories of group phasic and conflict development.

Week 13

Once again the class consisted mostly of lecture on conflict management processes and conflict management skills. This allowed completion of all but one page of the material in the course guide, the self-discovery surveys (e.g., taking

criticism yourself and the family fighting inventory), and the final case study/role-playing activities. In addition, the class agreed to meet for an extra session that would allow time for a summation of the course and provide time for the students to take a short test over the material covered during the course.

Week 14

The lecture this week was brief. It completed the material in the fourth unit and focused on responsive listening skills. The self-discovery learning activities were distributed and assigned as homework in order to save time. The discussion this week began with the scenarios found in the course guide.

The situations found in these scenarios forced the students to backtrack through the course to discuss much of the material covered in lectures and discussions. The students suggested approaches to each scenario that balanced their own styles of directing with the needs of the situation. For example, how does one handle a situation in which individuals who do not get along must work together? Does one discuss differences before the beginning of the work, or does one ignore it for fear of mucking up something laid to rest? The students suggested that the answers depended on the situation. One student suggested that, in

these situations, the director must know in advance what items she can and cannot give in on.

The discussion also circled back to the original discussions regarding the difference between aesthetic differences and interpersonal differences. One student suggested that in aesthetic issues, little compromise is possible. In interpersonal issues, there is more room for compromise. There was also discussion about how the particular situation (i.e., professional, amateur, or academic venues) will effect the approach to any problem.

Week 15

This session reviewed the course by going back and explaining the original surveys in terms of the material covered over the past fourteen weeks. Due to time constraints the retake of the first set of surveys (Group Role Self Rater, ROCI-II, and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) was not done in class. Instead, the students were to take it during the semester break and report the results at the beginning of the next semester.

I also spent time in this session to summarize the course. This summary was meant to give the students an overview of the course and to encourage them to take what they learned during the semester and apply it in the real world. They were told that they had a choice at the end of the class they did not have at the start: the opportunity to

choose communication strategies instead of simply reacting to each communication situation as it occurs. This summary also stressed the idea that the students should not see the course as a plea for them to make the communication theories and techniques learned during the semester their primary goal as directors. Instead, the hope was that they would use what they learned through the course as another tool at their disposal, just as blocking, play analysis, and knowledge about acting are tools each director uses to during the rehearsal period.

After the summary, the class took the short "final" exam. The exam, based on sampling (as described in the previous chapter) consisted of 25 multiple choice questions (see Appendix C¹⁵). The questions covered, at least in part, all four units of the course. Three of the students scored in the eightieth percentile on the exam and one in the fiftieth percentile, making the average for all the students 77 percent.

Finally, at the conclusion of this class meeting the students turned in their brief essays about the course. These responses ranged from positive to luke warm. While one student would "recommend the course to any persons pursuing endeavors in the theatrical arena," and another felt that "I

¹⁵ During scoring of the exams, I noticed an error in question 20. The scores reported below reflect an adjustment for this error. The version of the exam in Appendix C contains the corrected question.

learned a good bit," the general consensus was that the class was informative, but dry. They felt that I had spent too much time on the material and not enough time using discussion as a learning activity.

Epilogue

At the start of the following semester, the students were contacted regarding retaking the surveys. Over the course of the next few weeks, results began to arrive. Once again, some of the results were incomplete. In addition, one student provided raw scores as well as final totals. A review of these materials uncovered math errors on that student's scores and led to a review of other students' scores. These reviews also found math errors. This means that the results of all the surveys are questionable, and, therefore, unusable as quantitative data.

In the end, the only purpose these surveys served was to bring the students' minds to bear on the subjects under investigation.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

As Tyler (1949) suggests, no class is complete until an evaluation reveals the extent to which it met its objectives. This chapter will begin by evaluating the course objectives found above (page 111). The results of this evaluation will provide answers to the study's questions posed in the introduction. Discussion of those answers will, therefore, make up the second part of this chapter. The conclusion of this chapter will discuss the limitations of the study.

Course Evaluation

This section will evaluate the course by comparing the course results to Tyler's (1) screens for objective selection, (2) principles for selection of learning activities, and (3) rules for the selection of learning activities for knowledge acquisition. Before making this comparison, it is first necessary to make note of several issues regarding data collection

Data Collection

The evaluation section in Chapter II outlines a plan for evaluating the success of the course. The plan was to collect quantitative data on each student before and after the course in order to reveal any behavioral changes that

might occur as a result of taking the course. Unfortunately, the sample size (four students) makes any conclusions about the effect of the course unreliable.¹⁶ Reference to this data as part of this evaluation, therefore, will be minimal.

Tyler (1949) also points out that two sets of evaluative procedures is insufficient to reach conclusive results. It is true that one must test students before and immediately after a course. It is also true, however, that evaluation of the persistence of the learned behavior and retention of the content is only possible after an interstitial, post-course period. In this case, because the students did not have the opportunity to put their modified behaviors into practice through an actual directing experience, it will only be possible to evaluate properly the course's success after they have had at least one of these experiences. Due to the timing of the study, it will be impossible to conduct continuing evaluations for presentation here. An evaluation of the course objectives, however, can still take place.

Tyler (1949) states that "any valid evidence about behaviors that are desired as educational objectives provides an appropriate method of evaluation" (p. 107). Based on this notion, observations made by a teacher of changes in the students' behavior and their retention of the course content becomes a relevant source of evaluation. Any changes toward

¹⁶ For further discussion, see "Limitations" below.

or away from the behavioral or content objectives of the course indicate the level of success regarding those objectives. For example, one objective of the course was that the students would strengthen their ability to use communication theory and skills as another directing tool. Any observed improvement in their ability to use communication theory in this manner noted by myself or reported by the students would be evidence of achievement of this objective. Qualitative data collected throughout the course rather than quantitative data, therefore, will be the primary source of data for the following evaluation.

Screens

1. Objective feasibility. As stated above, objective feasibility refers to questioning whether or not the objectives are accomplishable within the situation in which the learning is to take place. Situational factors include such things as time availability and the ability of the students to understand the material. Prior to the actualization of the course, I believed that the objectives of the course were feasible within the given situation. The experience of the course showed that this conclusion was overly confident.

At several points during the course it became necessary to reduce the amount of material. This was done in an attempt to cover as much of the material as possible by the

end of the semester. In addition, time constraints led to a fundamental change in the class learning activities format (away from lecture/discussion and towards straight lecture in the last three weeks of the course). We did, however, cover a great majority of the material. In addition, the changes in the learning activity format occurred late in the course which means that the majority of the classes held to the format.

In terms of the other situational screen, the ability of the students to understand the material, the course came closer to meeting its objectives. These objectives were those that were content-oriented. If the students learned the material, then, logically, they must have been able to understand the material. Proof of the success of the content objectives comes from two sources: observations and quantitative data.

In their written evaluations of the course several students indicated that they learned something about communication and directing from taking the course. My observations of their discussions in class confirm this conclusion. As the course progressed the students exhibited a growing understanding of communication and its application to the rehearsal process. This was especially evident during the discussions in Week 14 as described in the previous chapter.

The results of the "final" exam, even if the sample size is insufficient, also point to this conclusion. As a whole, the students' average score was 77 percent. While this is passing, it does not show a strong understanding of the material. Removal of the one low grade (58 percent), however, raises the average to a stronger 84 percent. Given the fact that the students did not study for this test, these results clearly indicate that they understood the material and that the course achieved its content objectives.

In summary, the majority of the material was coverable within the time frame and the students were capable of learning the material. Changes were necessary, however, in both the amount of material and the learning activity format. In terms of feasibility, therefore, I can conclude that the objectives of the course were partially successful.

2. Requisite conditions for learning. As stated in Chapter 2, this screen refers to the fact that objectives focused on the attainment of a specific body of knowledge have a greater chance of being achieved when the knowledge is "used in the daily lives of the students" (Tyler, 1949, p. 39). Observations of and by the students provide evidence that the content and behavioral objectives of the course met this requirement. For example, the discussions throughout the course based on current and past experiences in rehearsal that related to the various aspects of communication theory under discussion means that theories acquired in the class

were part of the students' everyday professional lives. A specific example of an objective reached in this manner is the objective of students' understanding of leadership. At one point during the class a discussion took place regarding a situation experienced recently in a rehearsal. The students accurately diagnosed the situation and, based on that diagnosis, discussed different ways to handle that sort of problem.¹⁷

Furthermore, discussions of incidents that took place in class indicate that the theories presented in the course also apply to the students' everyday non-professional lives. For example, the discussions in Week 9 of the incident that took place in the previous class illustrate achievement of the objective that the students would gain an understanding of communication, in this case, small group structure. Their understanding of the implications of the previous week's incident on the class's (a type of small group) norms exhibited the achievement of this objective.

It is possible to reach a conclusion based on this evidence that the objectives of the course met the requirements of this screen. Caution, however, should be taken. Tyler also states as part of this screen that a body of knowledge has a greater chance of becoming a permanent

¹⁷ The conditions of anonymity discussed previously prevent any further explanation of this situation or any other that was taken directly out of the students' everyday professional lives.

part of a student's knowledge base if it is part of the student's everyday life. Because follow-up evaluations of the students is not part of the study, a conclusion regarding permanence is unreachable.

3. Application of a philosophy of learning. As stated above, Tyler (1949) believes that course objectives should reflect a specific philosophy of learning. He summarizes two such philosophies: stimulus-response learning approach through which students learn by habit, and generalizational approach in which students develop "generalized modes of reactions to generalized problems" (p. 42). The objectives of this course reflect the second philosophy in that they were meant to develop an understanding of general principles the students could apply to a variety of problems. If the objectives were successful, observations would illustrate that the students are able to use the knowledge and skills developed in the course to solve a variety of problems.

During Week 14 discussion of several scenarios took place (see Appendix A, Unit Four, Section VI). This discussion illustrated that the students achieved many of the objectives and that they are able to apply their acquired general knowledge and skills to a variety of problems. For example, behavioral objectives of the course included increasing the students' ability to apply their knowledge of leadership and conflict management to the directing process. One scenario involved a conflict crisis between a director

and a designer. The students understood that the fact that the conflict became critical was a result of previous mistakes by the director. They understood the general principle that conflict management, as part of the leadership process, is most effective when it is practiced from the beginning of the rehearsal process.

Observations of the students reflect their ability to use the knowledge and skills acquired through the course in a generalized manner. In terms of this screen, therefore, the objectives of the course were successful.

Conclusions

The evaluation of the course objectives discussed above leads to the conclusion that the objectives of the course were, for the most part, achieved. The exception to this regards the amount of material originally planned for coverage. Due to time constraints some material (see Appendix A, Unit Two, Section V) never reached the students. As a result, achievement of some of the content objectives was only partial.

Furthermore, adjustment was made to the learning activities. These adjustments may mean that the students do not have as thorough an understanding as possible of the material covered. This may also mean that they may not retain as much of the content as originally hoped. The adjustments to the learning activities and the reduction of

content, however, did not entirely prevent achievement of the course objectives. Both quantitative and qualitative data indicate general achievement of the course's content and behavioral objectives.

Principles

Principle 1. The first principle that guides selection of learning activities, as reviewed in Chapter II, is that learning activities should give students the opportunity to practice the behavior being taught. The learning activities selected for this course included lecture, discussion, and execution of self-rating and self-discovery surveys. In addition to the fact that the individuals who made up the class were an ipso facto small group, the course intended to use discussion to give the students an additional opportunity to practice the behaviors being taught. Discussion of scenarios and experiences the students had during the semester allowed this to occur. During the last few weeks of the course, however, the emphasis shifted from lecture/discussion to straight lecture, bringing the success of the choice of learning activities into doubt.

As the pressure grew to complete the course in the time allotted, it became evident that adjustment was necessary. The question that needed an answer regarded what to change or eliminate. I first turned to elimination of material as a possible solution. As described above, some material, such

as organizational communication was cut, but the rest of the material remained intact.

My experience as a director led me to understand the importance of conflict and its management on the rehearsal process. As a result, I believed that the course design should lay the ground work for understanding these processes. To do that, the student must first understand something about what communication is, how small groups function, and what role the director plays in the group as a leader. With that information in mind, the student could then approach conflict and its management in a way that would make it understandable and translatable to the rehearsal process. The course design reflects this progression.

As time grew short, I had a difficult time convincing myself that the content of the course should be cut. To do so would eliminate the underpinnings necessary for proper understanding of conflict and its management. Such a cut could also eliminate presentation and discussion of the subject of most importance--conflict and its management. This dilemma lead me to avoid eliminating content from the course. Instead, I looked for ways to squeeze the material into the time available. The result was that the balance of lecture and discussion changed as the course drew to a close.

Another factor that lead to the rebalancing toward lecture was my inexperience. While, as one student wrote, I am "well versed in communication theory," this was the first

time through this material as a teacher. In addition, I am an experienced teacher of undergraduates, but this was my first experience as a teacher of graduate students. This situation psychologically forced me to stick as close as possible to the guide. Sticking to the guide would ensure maintaining the proper order and veracity of the material delivered. In addition, I was highly confident of my ability to cover material via lecture and highly unconfident of my ability to lead graduate students through the material strictly through discussion. These two reasons were also factors in the decision to use additional lecture rather than either maintaining the lecture/discussion balance or using more straight discussion.

This change turned out to be unsatisfactory to the students and is partially responsible for their almost unanimous belief that there was too much lecture and not enough discussion in the course. A review of the course, however, reveals that through the first nine weeks of the course the balance between lecture and discussion was maintained. Beginning with the tenth week the amount of discussion began to shrink. Weeks ten, twelve, and thirteen were comprised almost entirely of lecture. This emphasis at the end of the course made the lecture predominant in the minds of the students as they wrote their reviews of the class.

Another factor which may pertain to the feeling that there was a major trend towards lecture in the class was that the students were all on the graduate level. As discussed earlier, as a graduate student myself in graduate level courses, I know that graduate students generally prefer an androgogical approach to learning. Given the limited time allotted to the course, both in and out of class, this approach did not seem possible. The negative response to the quantity of lecture, therefore, is not a surprise.

In the end, it does not matter what factors lead to the students' belief that the class contained too much lecture. The simple fact that they believed this to be true put an impediment between the material and their ability to learn. This reaction also indicates that the course did not give the students an appropriate opportunity to practice the behavior being taught. In fact, one student commented that it would have been nice to have the opportunity to direct a scene during class as a way of practicing. The success of the discussion that we did have, however, leads me to conclude that even though the discussion did not provide sufficient opportunity for practice, it did provide enough to allow the meeting of the course's objectives. I base this conclusion on the fact that the students demonstrated a better understanding of the course material. The inclusion of discussion, therefore, was partially successful as a learning activity.

Principle 2. The review in Chapter II of the second principle states that a student must receive some satisfaction from the instigation of the change in behavior. In other words, the learning experience must satisfy the student in some way. The students not only expressed a dislike for the manner of presentation (e.g., the lectures), but also expressed a dislike of the content of many of the lectures. They found the material covered to be dry and technical.

My own observations of their response to the lectures confirms their opinions. One student often had trouble keeping awake during the lectures. In addition, my reaction to the lecture given in Week 10 (see Chapter III) is a perfect example of the problem. The extent of the technical terminology in that lecture exceeded my ability to present it and their ability to absorb it.

Yet at the same time the students reported that they enjoyed the discussion which did occur. During these discussions their attention increased, and the class "came to life." Their interest also seemed to increase during the learning activities that focused on the use of surveys. As time became a problem these activities were done outside of class. This was another missed opportunity for them to get in-class satisfaction and probably contributed to their feelings about the amount of lecture.

The students stated that they received some satisfaction from the discussions. In addition, as Tyler (1949) states, if the learning "experiences are unsatisfying or distasteful, the desired learning will not take place" (p. 66). The fact that they learned a great deal of the material, therefore, must indicate that they received some satisfaction from the course. Based on this and their stated distaste for part of the course, I can only conclude that the second principle of learning activity selection was only partially fulfilled.

Principle 3. As stated above, the third principle Tyler (1949) suggests is that the teacher must be sure that the students have the background to understand the material. This principle, however, does not simply mean that they have achieved a certain level, but that they are at the appropriate level for the course. For example, not only should the teacher be sure that students taking Algebra II have completed Algebra I, but that teacher should ensure that they have not already taken and passed Algebra II, Trigonometry, or Calculus. With those subjects already learned, Algebra II would be below their level of understanding.

These students were graduates in theatre with extended experience in the rehearsal process. On one hand, they clearly had the proper background from which to understand the material. On the other hand, they may have been

overqualified for a course focused on bringing the students to a technical understanding of communication in rehearsal.

The level of experience they had as experienced theatre practitioners and as graduate students (some of whom are considered non-traditional in terms of age) meant that they already had a strong sense of the dynamics of communication during rehearsal. For them, a course that did slightly less to explain the technical "whys" of the communication situation and slightly more to explain how to handle certain situations may have been more appropriate. This conclusion, however, only looks to their experience as theatre practitioners.

As individuals, they were fairly naive regarding formal training in communication. As a course in communication, therefore, the material was at the proper level for them. The course, however, was a theatre course in communication and not a communication course in theatre. This means that the course should have been balanced towards their level as theatre practitioners and not towards their level as communicators.

The selection of learning activities, therefore, was somewhat less than successful in terms of beginning at the appropriate level for the students. It was not, however, a failure.

Principle 4. The final principle Tyler (1949) mentions is that learning experiences can result in multiple

educational outcomes. Single discussions during the semester presented opportunities for the students to bring to bear the results of several areas of study. For example, the discussion during Week 9 of the effect of an incident in the previous week's class allowed the students to concentrate on small group structure, small group development, and leadership strategies at the same time. The discussions later in the course showed that the students had an understanding of these areas. This level of understanding leads me to believe that the single learning activity had multiple learning outcomes. I cannot, however, from outside a student's mind, prove the veracity of that conclusion.

Conclusions

The evaluation of the principles Tyler (1949) presents for selection of learning activities suggests that the learning activities selected for the course were, for the most part, successful. The major exception to this success was the use of the lecture/discussion format which shifted as pressure increased to complete the course. The imbalance created by the shift to more lecture led to a situation that broke the second principle--students will learn more in conditions where they find satisfaction. The students did not like the lecture portions of the course. They did enjoy the discussion portions, and this enjoyment is partially

responsible for the success of the course in terms of objectives.

The course should have been aimed for a slightly more experienced theatre student and slightly less towards the novice communication student. In terms of multiple learning outcomes, no firm conclusion is possible. The final conclusion regarding the selection of learning activities, therefore, is that the selection was less than perfect, but not a failure. Future attempts at teaching this course should adjust the type, balance and aim of the learning activities (see Chapter IV for a discussion of this).

Rules

Rule 1. As stated above, the first rule Tyler (1949) presents regarding learning activities designed to help students acquire a body of knowledge is that the activities should allow the acquisition of knowledge to take place alongside a process of problem solving. The reflection of this rule was the lecture/discussion format of the course. As discussed at length above, the lecture/discussion format was not as successful as anticipated. Because there was a shift away from discussion, the students were not always given the opportunity to acquire information and then immediately use it to solve a problem.

When this approach was used, it was successful. For example, the lecture during Week 8 involved a description of

"leakage" (letting one's real feeling show through) on the part of the leader. A situation developed in class in which the leader, myself as the teacher, let his real feelings leak. The result was a conflict. Part of the next class was spent discussing the situation. This discussion allowed the students to use that information to solve the problem from the previous week; that is, it allowed them to discover what caused the conflict. The conclusion drawn from the use of this learning activity format is that, when it was put to proper use, it had positive effects.

Rule 2. The second rule explained in Chapter II is that one should "select only important information to include as worthy of remembering" (Tyler, 1949, p. 73). As discussed above, the students were almost unanimous in their opinion of the course content. They found the lectures dry and filled with technical terminology. Part of this opinion is traceable to the relationship of their status as graduate students to the lecture format. Other factors for this opinion included my delivery style (e.g., the fact that I stuck to the guide for reasons discussed above) and the fact that the last few weeks were devoted almost entirely to lecture. Yet not all the burden for these opinions is attributable to these circumstances.

A review of the content at the end of the course revealed that the content was in part overly technical for the needs of theatre directors. For example, the portion of

the course on Leadership Styles that presents information on Contingency contains a long technical explanation of Low and High Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scores. In the end, it does not really matter if a director understands these terms. What is important is that a director understands the behavioral choices these terms represent. For example, when the rehearsal is proceeding well or very badly, the director should consider concentrating more on task; and when the rehearsals are proceeding only fairly well the director should consider concentrating on interpersonal relations in order to complete the task at hand--producing a play. In addition, it is important that the director knows how and when to apply this knowledge.

Because the technical aspects of some of the material was not strictly necessary to the success of the course, it was not worthy of remembering. The inclusion of this material, therefore, represents a partial failure to adhere to the second rule. The majority of the material, however, was worthy of remembrance. In support of this conclusion I refer to the argument presented above that outlines the progression of knowledge necessary to reach the conclusion of the course. Each unit of information was necessary and, therefore, worthy of remembrance.

The conclusion regarding rule two is that for the most part the material was worthy of remembrance even if some was overly technical and of little long-term value.

Rules 3 and 4. Tyler's (1949) third rule, as presented above, states that it is important for pieces of information to be "brought up in various ways with a considerable degree of intensity" in order to "increase the likelihood of remembering these important items" (p. 74). His fourth rule was a corollary to the third that states that information should be used in varied contexts.

In this course, the third rule took the form of discussions of real events and scenarios. Each situation discussed provided the opportunity to review material already presented in lecture and discussed in previous sessions. This pattern reached fruition in the discussions of scenarios during Week 14. As discussed earlier, these scenarios allowed the students to return to the beginning of the course and discuss the effects of group structure and development, leadership, conflict and conflict management. In terms of this rule the course was a success.

The fourth rule also took advantage of the discussions, but included the use of lecture. This additional setting provide a varied context. Additionally, the use of the surveys provided other contexts through which the material was either presented or considered. In terms of this rule the course was also a success.

Conclusions

The conclusion based on the evaluation immediately above is that, like the application of Tyler's (1949) screens and principles, the application of his rules was only partially successful. The primary problem was the fact that the students were not consistently allowed an opportunity to acquire information alongside efforts at problem solving. In addition, there was extraneous material in some sections of the course that impeded the students' ability to benefit at times from the material as a whole.

Answers to the Study's Questions

The fact that none of the screens, principles, or rules were a total success might lead one to believe that the study was not a success, even if the course did meet its content and behavioral objectives. The truth is quite to the contrary. The purpose of this study as presented in the Introduction was to answer two questions: (1) What material is appropriate for a course of this nature? (2) What is the proper format for teaching that material? The evaluation of the course leads to answers to these questions. The following section will discuss those answers.

Question 1-Appropriateness of Material

The evaluations of the course suggest which material was inappropriate for the course and points the way to material

that should have been included. The conclusion of the screen portion of the evaluation was that the course met its behavioral and content goals. The fact that these objectives were met without the inclusion of organizational communication indicates that this material was not necessary. Another conclusion drawn from the evaluation is that, because the course met its objectives, the material presented was correct for the course. That is, both the subject matter (inclusion of general information on communication, small group communication, leadership, and conflict and its management) and the sequence of its presentation enhanced the effort to meet the course objectives.

The partial failure of the course to meet principle two (student satisfaction) and rule 2 (using only important information), however, suggests that the material was not completely justifiable. As a result one can conclude that elimination of extraneous, technically oriented material from the course, such as that found in the area of leadership (as described above), will improve the course's outcome. In addition, the elimination of extraneous material from the course will bring the material and the course into sharper focus. This new focus will make the course more interesting for the students. It will also have the effect of shortening the course, making it easier to maintain the balance between lecture and discussion.

The answer to the first question based on the evaluations, therefore, is that after elimination of the overly technical content and the section on Organizational Communication, the material included in the course is the material that is appropriate for the course. With only a few adjustments, the same outline will suffice for the next offering. The format of that next presentation, however, will have to undergo some major changes.

Question 2-Appropriateness of Format

The second question the study asks regards the appropriateness of the format. The evaluation of the course points to the format as a major problem with the course. The failure of the objectives to meet completely the feasibility screen, to give the students enough opportunity to practice what they were learning, to allow the students to acquire knowledge as a total process of problem solving, and to give the students satisfaction, are problems traceable to the format. Specifically, they are traceable to the imbalance in the format between lecture and discussion.

There are several options that might rectify the problems with the format. The first of these, as suggested above, would be to reduce the amount of material covered by the course. To do this would allow the format, which when used did function as planned, to return to a balance. This solution would seem to satisfy most of the problems regarding

balance of learning activities, practice for the students, and the acquisition of knowledge as part of a total process of problem solving. The solution would not, however, solve the problem of student satisfaction.

The lack of student satisfaction stems from the fact that, as graduates, these students prefer discussion over lecture. It is through discussion that they can both acquire information and apply that information to the solution of problems. The success of the discussions as noted above is proof of this conclusion. The best solution, therefore, would be to reduce the amount of lecture and increase the amount of discussion in the course. To do this, however, presents other problems.

As pointed out above, the students in this class were experienced theatre practitioners. They were not experts in communication. Given this fact and the fact that, as the teacher, I was not prepared to lead graduate students through discussion as the sole process of learning material, a way must be found to give the students the knowledge without necessitating lecture.

The solution to this problem is to require them to do some reading outside of class. Specifically, they should be given a copy of the course guide and a list of specific readings to accompany each section. If the students came into class with this information already in hand, extended lectures would be only necessary occasionally. The class

could consist of mainly discussion. This would allow them to couple learning with problem solving and to provide them with a greater amount of satisfaction. The downside of this solution is that it would require work not necessarily expected in a one-credit-hour pass/fail course, but I believe the benefits it provides far outweigh this relatively minor problem.

This solution, however, is not the only means to address the problems mentioned above. Another approach would be to change the basic situation; that is, create a course which allows time both in- and out-of-class for knowledge acquisition and which provides greater opportunity for discussion and other activities in which the students can apply what they are learning to problem solving. This solution entails creation of the three-credit-hour course which is beyond the scope of this project as a pilot study and. This solution will, therefore, be taken up in the final chapter on implications for future research.

Limitations

The problems surrounding data collection are the major limitations of this study. These problems include the size of the sample and the validity of the instruments used to collect the data. This section will discuss each of these problems as they relate to this course.

Sample Size

According to O'Hair and Kreps (1990), sampling as a survey method "requires that researchers obtain a sample of respondents who are representative of the population being studied" (p. 32). For example, it would be inappropriate to survey welders in an attempt to establish something about swimmers. A representative sample of swimmers would be a crowd at a beach during the summer. Another factor in establishing proper representation is the size of the sample. A group of the three members of a swim team might fall within the class of swimmers, but they are not representative of all swimmers.

For example, in an attempt to establish how swimmers would vote in an election, this small sample might consist entirely of democrats. The class of all swimmers is made up of democrats, republicans, independents, communists, socialists, libertarians, and others. By sampling that small group a true picture of how all swimmers as a class would vote on an issue would not be established. This is why a sample must be large enough to represent truly the population being studied.

This study focused on graduate theatre students with an interest in directing. The four students who took the course are too small a group to represent properly the 12 directing students in their program, much less the graduate students

throughout the United States currently studying theatrical directing on a graduate level.

There are several means by which these problems can be overcome in the future. The first is to increase dramatically the number of students in the class. This increase would lend greater validity to the resulting data. Another means is to increase the sample size by repeating the course several times. After several executions of the course, the total sample size would provide the needed validity.

Instrument Validity

With the exception of the Group Role Self-Rater that I designed, each of the other two survey instruments used in the study (ROCI-II and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) are well established in terms of objectivity, validity and reliability. They are all self-reports, however, which means that it is difficult, without the use of an independent observer, to establish external validity; that is, there is no way to know if the responses made by the participants are truly a record of their feelings and behavior. This is the first use of the Group Role Self-Rater and the exam given at the end of the semester, and, as such, they are totally unproved instruments.

Further problems regarding validity arise if one attempts to use these instruments to establish changes in the

behavior of the students based on their participation in the course. This is partially due to their lack of external validity. There is no way to know if any change in behavior was the result of the class or other factors within their lives. In addition, even if external validity were establishable, the fact that there was no exam given at the beginning of the course and that some of the data from the original application of the surveys was lost, it is impossible to establish accurately that any change in behavior or expansion of their knowledge base took place.

There are several means for increasing instrument validity. As suggested by Tyler (1949), evaluation should be an ongoing process. Regarding the exam, its execution should take place at the start as well as at the conclusion of the course. In addition, post-course follow-up should present the exam to the students at least twice after the conclusion of the course (perhaps at two six-month intervals). This same procedure will aid the validity of the behavioral survey instruments. Further, external validity can be established if individuals other than the student directors themselves report on their communication techniques (see the discussion in Chapter V regarding the student directing projects).

Finally, the Group Role Self-Rater is not a proven instrument. Efforts should be made to establish its internal

validity through independent testing on small groups before it is used again in this context.

Conclusions

These types of problems, however, do not make the findings of this study invalid because the purpose of the study was to determine the appropriate material and format for a course of this type and not to establish the success or failure of this particular class. In addition, the study used the surveys only as a tool to instigate thought and discussion on the various topics. No attempt was made to use the surveys as statistical proof of success or failure. Furthermore, use of the exam to prove that the students had successfully acquired knowledge was done only in conjunction with observable changes in the students' grasp of the knowledge and served only as an indication and not as absolute proof.

CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The previous chapter answers the questions posed in the introduction and provides some guidance for future presentations of the course. This chapter will present some of those implications regarding content and format along with some suggestions for content that have grown out of my experience with the course and research conducted since the end of the course.

The previous chapter suggests that the content of the course should be pruned to remove excessively technical content. The hope is that, in doing this, extra time would become available to accomplish changes in the format. In addition, a suggestion was made that the format undergo a shift to a balance toward discussion. Given the one-credit-hour time limit imposed on the pilot study, these suggestions make a great deal of sense. If consideration were to be given to other course design options, however, the results of this study would imply a different approach.

The original concept of this course was as a three-credit-hour full-scale class for undergraduates. Now that we have a better understanding of the material, the format, and the problems involved in a one-hour course, a return to that original concept is an appropriate avenue for future study.

With three hours available, the course format could be completely overhauled, turning it into either a true graduate seminar or class for undergraduates. Within this situational structure, the need for lecture would be reduced. The graduate students would have the time outside of class to read course material, to prepare reports for presentation in class, and so on. Class-length discussions of specific topics and situations, therefore, could occur.

Undergraduates would have the time to read selected portions of communication and directing texts that pertain to the course. Class time could be spent reviewing that material and in discussions of special topics and scenarios.

A class of this length would also allow time for out-of-class directing projects by either graduates or undergraduates. These projects would truly allow the students to practice what they are learning in terms of real problems, rather than through discussion based on hypothetical problems. In addition, a three-credit-hour course would allow time for other assignments and activities. For example, the class could visit several rehearsals during the course of a semester. These visits would give the students an opportunity to watch a rehearsal from the outside--a position in which they rarely find themselves.

From this relatively objective vantage point, the students would be able to witness communication processes as they occurred. This would allow them to see, in real time,

the interactions which they had read about and discussed in class. It would also provide fodder for class discussions of particular incidents which they might witness. As follow-up to these visits the students could prepare written reports. These reports would provide them with an opportunity to think through the communication processes as they apply to rehearsal and give the teacher an opportunity to evaluate the student's level of understanding.

Another outcome of the visits to rehearsal might be to have the director and/or the actors involved in the rehearsal visit the class to discuss the communication aspects of the rehearsal. This situation, of course, would be fraught with interpersonal, confidentiality, and political issues that might make it impossible. Thought should, however, still be given to the idea.

The reports of the visits to rehearsal are not the only possible way for the teacher to gain a better grasp of student progression. Other written assignments, such as journals reporting their thoughts about communication and/or on their communication experiences outside of class either in or out of rehearsal, would aid this evaluation process. In addition, the extra time available would allow for the execution of short quizzes to undergraduates, although some graduate students might find that exercise to be inappropriate. Finally, the directing projects would provide another excellent opportunity for student evaluation.

One of the limitations of the current study regarded the poor quality of the statistical data. Because the objective of this study was to determine the appropriate format and content of a course of this type, no effort was made to reach any quantitative-based conclusions about the effect the course had on the students' abilities as directors. As mentioned previously, only evaluation of the students after a directing experience would accomplish this task. In the revised format suggested in this chapter, the directing projects offer an excellent opportunity for both additional learning experiences for the students and a way to acquire the statistical data necessary to determine the course's overall effect on the students.

Directing a scene is not necessarily a short-term project. One can work on a particular scene over the course of several weeks or even months and still find ways of improving the outcome. Based on this premise, each student enrolled in this class should direct a scene through the course of the semester. With each rehearsal the student should have a better understanding of communication and improved skills based on readings, in-class lecture and discussion, and the previous rehearsal experiences. By surveying the actors for their reaction to the communication competence of the director, the director on her own communication competence, and an observer (presumably the teacher) for her independent observations of the director's

communication competence during rehearsal, a picture of the effect of the course on the student director can be drawn.

Execution of these surveys should occur at least three times during the semester--once at the beginning of the semester to establish a base-line, once in the middle of the semester, and once at the end of the semester. By using the same actors and the same script throughout the term, the variables being tested can be reduced to those surrounding the director's communication competence (e.g., leadership, conflict management, interpersonal communication, etc.) and the effect of the course thereon. Reduction of this data will then establish the effectiveness of the course, presenting additional opportunities for further research.

The suggestions made in this chapter would truly allow all of Tyler's (1949) screens, rules, and principles to be applied to the course. In addition, these suggestions would allow the teacher to obtain a better understanding of the students, as well as a better means to evaluate the course, its material, and its format. The teacher could then make further changes in the course as necessary.

In addition to the changes in format just discussed, there are some changes in the material that should be instituted. Aside from pruning the technical material from the course, some material should be added to the course. The class currently does not have a foundation in interpersonal communication. While that subject is very broad and cannot

be included in its entirety, some effort should be made to present the subject to directors because it is central to any communication act between two people. In addition, one subject should be added--resistance--and one subject should be expanded--intergroup conflict.

Since the original course guide was written, I have had the opportunity to do research in both of these areas. Peter Block's (1981) book, Flawless Consulting, contains two excellent chapters on identifying and managing client resistance. Because the act of directing is similar to the act of consulting (in a sense, both are forms of coaching), the information found in those chapters is directly applicable to working with resistant actors. I have also found an interesting article by Patton and Giffin (1988) entitled "Conflict and its Resolution" on intergroup conflict and its management that speaks to many of the problems faced by directors during the dress rehearsal period when the technical crew and the cast come together to achieve a mutual goal--producing the play.

The implications and suggestions found here point the way for future research. It is hoped that the opportunity will present itself for this course to be conducted again. That opportunity will allow testing of these suggestions and the cycle of raising new questions and finding new answers to continue--for such is the way of learning, teaching, communication, and theatre.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Allen, D. R. (1993a). A survey of intergroup conflict in a theatrical organization. Unpublished manuscript, Texas Tech University, Department of Communication Studies, Lubbock, TX.
- Allen, D. R. (1993b). Daily journal from the course "Communication for the director during rehearsal". Unpublished manuscript.
- Aristotle (1952). Politics (Jowett, B. & Twining, T., Trans.). New York: The Viking Press.
- Baird, J. E., Jr. (1977). Some nonverbal elements of leadership emergence. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 42, 352-361.
- Ball, W. (1984). A sense of direction. New York: Drama Book Publishers.
- Barnlund, D. C., & Haiman, F. S. (1960). The dynamics of discussion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bartow, A. (1988). The director's voice. New York: Theatre Communication Group.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Benedetti, R. L. (1985). The director at work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Berger, C. R., & Chaffee, H. S. (1987). The study of communication as a science. In C. R. Berger & H. S. Chaffee (Eds.), Handbook of Communication Science. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Block, P. (1981). Flawless consulting. San Diego: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). What makes a team work? Organizational Dynamics, 21, 34-44.

- College Board. (1993). Index of majors and graduate degrees. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). What makes a team work? Organizational Dynamics, 21, 34-44.
- Caple, R. B. (1978). The sequential stages of group development. Small Group Behavior, 9, 470-476.
- Carra, L. (1985). Controls in play directing. New York: Vantage Press.
- Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1968). Group dynamics: Research and theory, (3rd ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers
- Clurman, H. (1972). On directing. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
- Cohen, R., & Harrop, J. (1974). Creative play direction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cole, T., & Chinoy, H. K. (1976). Directors on directing: A source book of the modern theatre, (2nd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Conrad, C. (1990). Strategic organizational communication: An integrated perspective, (2nd ed.). Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Counsell, J. (1973). Play direction: A practical viewpoint. Great Britain: Newton Abbot.
- Daly, J. A., Friedrich, G. W., & Vangelisti, A. L.. (1990). Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Dean, A., & Carra, L. (1980). Fundamentals of play directing, (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart And Winston.
- Delia, J. G. (1987). Communication research: A history. In C. R. Berger and S. H. Chaffee (Eds.), Handbook of Communication Science. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Deutsch, , M. (1968). The effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), Group Dynamics: Research and Theory, (3rd. ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

- Devito, J. A. (1986). The communication handbook: A dictionary. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Devito, J. A. (1988). Human communication: The basic course, (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Dietrich, J. (1960). Play direction. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Fiedler, R. E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (Vol. 1, pp. 150-191) New York: Academic Press
- Fiedler, R. E. (1972). The effects of leadership training and experience: A contingency model interpretation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 453-470.
- Fiedler, R. E. (1978). The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (Vol. 11, pp. 59-112) New York: Academic Press
- Finney, J. R. (1987). Aspects and correlates of directors' nonverbal behavior in the rehearsal process. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 10A.
- Fisher, K. (1993). Leading self-directed work teams: A guide to developing new team leadership skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gagné, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1988). Principles of instructional design (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Gallaway, M. (1963). The director in the theatre. New York: Macmillan Co.
- Geier, J. G. (1967). A trait approach to the study of leadership in small groups. Journal of Communication, 17, 316-323.
- Glen, S. L. (1973). A director prepares. Encino, CA: Dickenson Publishing Company, Inc.
- Goldman, M., & Fraas, L. A. (1965). The effects of leader selection on group performance. Sociometry, 28, 82-98.

- Goodman, P. S. (Ed). (1986). Designing effective work groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Goss, B. & O'Hair D. (1988). Communicating in interpersonal relationships. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Gouran, D. (1982). Making decisions in groups. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Hamilton, C., & Parker, C. (1990). Communicating of results: A guide for business and the professions. (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Hawkins, K. (September, 1992). In COMS 5303 class lecture notes, Texas Tech University:
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., & Woodman, R. W.. (1992). Organizational behavior. (6th ed.). New York: West Publishing Company
- Hitchcock, D. (1991). Self-directed work teams and performance technology: A good marriage. Performance & Instruction, 30, 12-15.
- Hitchcock, N. (1993). Can self-managed teams boost your bottom line? Modern Materials Handling, 48, 57-59.
- Hodge, F. (1982). Play directing: Analysis, communication, and style. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hollander, E. P., & Julian, J. W. (1970). Studies in leader legitimacy, influence, and innovation. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 5, pp. 33-69). New York: Academic Press.
- Horton, S. (1992). Team effort. American Printer, 209,30-32.
- Infante, D. A., Rancer, A. S., & Womack, D. F. (1990). Building communication theory, (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Insko, C. A., Shopler, J., & Drigotas, S. M. (1993). The role of communication in interindividual-intergroup discontinuity. Journal of Conflict Resolution, 37(1), 108-138.
- Jessup, H. R. (1992). The road to results for teams. Training and Development, 46, 65-68.

- Johnson, K. A., & Foa, F, J. (1989). Instructional design: New alternatives for effective education and training. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Johnson, A, & Johnson, B. (1970). Directing methods. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co.
- Keirse, D, & Bates, M. (1984). Please understand me: Character and temperament types. Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Kreps, G. L. (1990). Organizational communication, (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Langley, S. (1990). Theatre management and production in America. New York: Drama Book Publishers.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1992). Theories of human communication, (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Marowitz, C. (1986). Prospero's staff. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Marshall, B. D. (1988). A semiotic phenomenology of directing. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 02A.
- McKee, B. (1992). Turn your workers into a team. Nation's Business, 80, 36-38.
- McMullan, F. (1962). The directorial image: The play and the director. Hamden CT: Shoestring Press.
- Meyerhold, V. (1969). Meyerhold on theatre (Edward Braun, Trans.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- Morrill, C., & Thomas, C. K. (1992). Organizational conflict management as disputing process: The problem of social escalation. Human Communication Research, 18, 400-428.
- Morris, C. G., & Hackman, J. R. (1969). Behavioral correlates of perceived leadership. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 350-361.
- Morrison, H. (1973). Directing in the theatre. New York: Pitman Publishing.

- Mortensen, C. D. (1966). Should the discussion group have an assigned leader? Speech Teacher, 15, 34-41.
- National Association of Schools of Theatre. (1992). NAST handbook, 1992-1993. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Theatre.
- Nelson, R. E. (1989). The strength of strong ties: Social networks and intergroup conflict in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 32, 377-401.
- Odiorne, G. S. (1991). The new breed of supervisor: leaders in self-managed work teams. Supervision, 52, 14-17.
- O'Hair, D., & Kreps, G. L. (Eds.). (1990). Applied communication theory and research. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- O'Neil, R. H., & Boretz, N. M. (1987). The director as artist: Play direction today. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Orlich, D. C., Harder, R. J., Callahan, R. C., Kauchak, D. P., Pendergrass, R. A., Keogh, A. J., & Gibson, H. (1990). Teaching strategies: A guide to better instruction. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Orsburn, J. D., Moran, L., Musselwhite, E., & Zenger, J. H. (1990). Self-directed work teams: The new American challenge. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Patton, B. R., & Giffin, K. (1988). Conflict and its resolution. In R. S. Cathcart & L. A. Samovar (Eds.), Small Group Communication (pp. 429-441). Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Pavitt, C., & Curtis, E. (1994). Small group discussion: A theoretical approach (2nd ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarsbrick, Publishers.
- Pondy, L. R. (1967). Organizational conflict: Concepts and models. Administrative Science Quarterly, 12, 296-320.
- Pool, I. d. S., & Schramm W. (1973). Preface. In I. d. S. Pool, F. Frey, W. Schramm, N. Maccoby, & E. B. Parker (eds.), Handbook of communication. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

- Rahim, M. A.. (1988). Rahim organizational conflict inventories (Experimental ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Roach, C. A., & Wyatt, N. J. (1988). Successful listening. New York: Harper and Row.
- Roose-Evans, J. (1968). Directing a play. New York: Theatre Arts Books.
- Scarr, L. E. (1992). Using self-regulatory work teams. Educational Leadership, 50, 68-70.
- Segal, J. S. (1978). A theory of group development in theatre casts: A special case of small group theory. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1978. Draft copy). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 08A.
- Shaw, M. E. (1981). Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Sievers, W. D., Stiver, H. E., & Kahan, S. (1974). Directing for the theatre. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Staub, A. W.. (1973). Creating theatre: The art of theatrical directing. New York: Harper & Row.
- Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. American Psychologist, 45, 120-133.
- Thalhofer, N. N. (1993). Intergroup differentiation and reduction of intergroup conflict. Small Group Research, 24, 24-43.
- Toys R Us. (1986). Effective management skills. Paramus, NJ: Author.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 384-399.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vaughn, S. (1993). Directing plays. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

- Wellins, R. S., Byham, W. C., & Wilson, J. M. (1991). Empowered teams. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wilson, K. P. (1988). A study of the managerial techniques practiced by directors of theatre at lort a, b+, b, c, and d theatres in 1987-1988. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 02A.
- Wilson, G. L, Hantz, A. M., & Hanna, M. S. (1989). Interpersonal growth through communication. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Wohl, D. (1988). A study of group phasic development in the theatre rehearsal process. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 07A.
- Wong, C. L., Tjosvold, D., & Lee, F. (1992). Managing conflict in the work force: A Chinese perspective on North America. Small Group Research, 23, 302-321.
- Zenger, J. H., Musselwhite, E., Hurson, K., & Perrin, G. (1991). Leadership in a team environment. Training and Development, 45, 47-52.

APPENDIX A
COMMUNICATION FOR THE DIRECTOR
DURING REHEARSAL:
COURSE GUIDE

Submitted to:

Dr. G. Sorensen, Committee Co-Chair

Dr. K. Hawkins, Committee Co-Chair

Dr. Weaver; Dr. D. O'Hair; & Dr. J. Cooper

by

David R. Allen

August 31, 1993

© 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Course Introduction.....	208
	Rationale.....	208
	Objectives.....	210
	Calendar.....	211
	Essential Elements.....	211
	General Content Outline.....	212
	Learning Activities.....	216
	Class Structure & Evaluation.....	217
	Bibliography.....	218
II.	Unit 1: Intro to the Course & Communication	221
	Introduction to Communication Studies.....	222
III.	Unit 2: Small Group Communications	230
	Small Group Structure	231
	Skills Development for the "Role" of Director.....	241
	Small Group Development.....	244
IV.	Unit 3: Leadership	250
	Leadership in Small Groups.....	251
	Approaches to Leadership.....	252
	Leadership Skills Development.....	263
V.	Unit 4: Conflict and Conflict Management	270
	Understanding Conflict.....	270
	Conflict Development.....	271
	Management Conflict.....	276
	Conflict Management Skills Development.....	281
VI.	Course Syllabus.....	286

COURSE INTRODUCTION

Rationale

The development of the Director as an important part of play production did not occur until late in the 19th century. Since that time the Director has taken on more and more significance, until he/she has become the artistic general around whom the production turns. Early directors "felt" their way through a production because they had no formal training in directing to guide them other than their own experiences as part of other productions. During the course of this century colleges and universities have developed courses of training for people interested in becoming theatrical directors. They believe that they teach the initiate all the he/she needs to know to become a director. Directors are taught blocking, play analysis, criticism, acting, design, and other artistically related subject areas and then sent off into the world to become directors. The schools believe they have taught them all they need to know, but have they?

A recent study of professional theatre directors (Wilson, 1988) indicates that directors are often called upon to use the same skills and techniques as those required of the professional manager. Wilson's research "revealed a need for the study of management techniques to be incorporated into the training of directors of theatre" (1988, p. 1). There are great number of skills and much knowledge needed to

manage efficiently any group or organization, making it impossible to focus on them all in any one course. Therefore, this class will train student directors in the basic communication skills and knowledge they need to manage their productions and thereby further defining the director's role.

The class will focus on three areas within the broad subject of communication: Small Group Communication; Leadership; and Conflict and Conflict Management.

Objectives

During the course of, or by the end of, the semester the students will . . .

- Come to a better understanding of the Director's role.
- Advance her definition of the art of directing.
- Attain a better understanding of the directing process as a management process.
- Have strengthened her ability to use communication theory and skills as another directing tool.
- Gain an understanding of communication theory.
- Be able to apply the communication theories to her own directing process.
- Participate in discussions of rehearsal situations as related to communication.
- Gain an understanding of leadership.
- Gain an understanding of leadership traits and techniques.
- Develop and/or improve her leadership communication skills.
- Be able to apply knowledge of and skill at leadership to the directing process.
- Gain an understanding of conflict.
- Understand the principles of conflict management.
- Be able to apply the principles of conflict management to the directing process.
- Participate in communication and personality self-discovery activities.

Calendar

Unit 1: Introduction to Course and Communication Studies	3 weeks
Unit 2: Small Group Communication	4 weeks
Unit 3: Leadership	4 weeks
Unit 4: Conflict and Conflict Management	4 weeks

Essential Elements Covered

- I A What is Communication.
- I B Types of Communication Used by Directors
- I C Course Rational & Outline of Topics to be Discussed
- II A Definition of a Small Group
- II B Group Structure
- II C Communication Skills Development for the Director
- II D Group Development
- III A Definition of Leadership
- III B Leadership in Small Groups
- III C Approaches to Leadership
- III D Leadership Skills Development for the Director
- IV A Definition of Conflict
- IV B Positive and Negative Aspects of Conflict
- IV C Conflict Phases
- IV D Strategies for Managing Conflict
- IV E Communication Skills Development for the Director

General Content Outline

I. Course Overview

A. Presentation of Rationale & Outline of Topics.

1. Small Group Communication
2. Leadership
3. Conflict and Conflict Management

B. What is Communication?

1. Systems Model
2. Communication Model

C. Two Types of Communication Used by Directors

1. To Audience
2. To Others Involved in the Project
3. How These Two Types of Communication Differ.
 - a) Parts of "A Semiotic Phenomenology of Directing"

II. Small Group Communication

A. Definition of a group

B. Group Structure

1. Differentiation
 - a) Extra-group Boundaries
 - b) Intra-group Boundaries--Positions
2. Status
 - a) Status and communication
3. Roles
4. Norms

5. The Relation of Status and Norms
6. Power
- C. Communication Skills Development for the Director.
 1. Performance Appraisal
 - a) Appraisal Systems
 - b) Appraisal Formats
 - c) Feedback
- D. Group Development
 1. Phasic Development
 - a) General Theory
 - b) Tuckman's Theory
 2. Wohl's Theatrical Phasic Development Theory
 - a) Rehearsal Schedules Based on Phasic Development
 - b) Rehearsal and the Acceleration of Group Development
- E. Groups as parts of organizations.
 1. Organizational structure

III. Leadership

- A. Definition
- B. Leaders and Leadership
- C. Leadership Attainment in Small Groups
 1. Emergent Leadership
 2. Appointed Leadership
 3. Source of Leadership Authority
- D. Approaches to Leadership
 1. Personality Characteristics

- a) High Self Motivation
- b) High Machiavellianism
- c) High Rhetorical Skills

2. Leadership Traits

- a) Goal Facilitation
- b) Sociability
- c) Individual Prominence

3. Self-discovery of Personal Leadership Traits

- a) The Keirsey Temperament Sorter/Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Test

E. Leadership Style

- 1. Authoritarian
- 2. Laissez-Faire
- 3. Democratic
- 4. The Consideration/Initiating Theory
- 5. Combination Styles of Directors based on 1, 2, & 3.

F. Situational

G. Interactionism

- a) Transactional Approach
- b) Transformational Approach
- c) Vertical Dyad Linkages
- d) Contingency

G. Leadership Skills Development for the Director

- 1. Motivating Others
- 2. How to be an Effective Communicator

IV. Conflict

A. Definition of Conflict

B. Positive and Negative Aspects of Conflict

C. Understanding and Agreement

D. Conflict Phases (Pondy)

1. Latent

2. Perceived

3. Felt

4. Manifest

a) Communication Strategies used during Conflict.

E. Managing Conflict

1. Avoidance

2. Accommodation

3. Competition

4. Negotiation

a) Bargaining

5. Collaboration

F. Important Management Skills

1. Planning

2. Assertiveness

3. Confrontation

4. Responsive Listening

G. Understanding conflict behavior through self-discovery

1. Taking Criticism Yourself (Goss & O'Hair)

2. A Family Fighting Inventory (Goss & O'Hair)

H. Theatrical Case Study and Role Playing

Learning Activities

I. Initial Activities

A. Participate in Pre-Course Tests

1. Small Group Role Self-Rater
2. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
3. ROCI-II (b)

B. Discussion of Communication

II. Developmental Activities

A. In-class discussions

1. The relationship of comm. to the directing process.
2. Case studies as experienced by participants.

B. Role playing

1. Turning knowledge into practical skills.

C. Self-Discovery Activities

1. Keirsey Temperament Sorter/Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Test
2. Exercises from Goss and O'Hair.

III. Culminating Activities

A. Participation in Post-Course Tests

1. Small Group Role Self-Rater
2. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
3. ROCI-II

B. Exam

1. Terms and theories presented during the course

DAILY CLASS STRUCTURE

This Course Guide primarily focuses on the communication content of the course. This may give one the impression that this is a communications class. It is not. To understand the dominant theatrical focus, one must understand the daily structure of the class. The communication material to be covered each day will occupy no more than half the period. This information serves as background for discussions of the rehearsal process in terms of the communication found therein. It is through this discussion that the student will begin to see the communication processes operating during rehearsal and to enhance her own communication skills as a directing tool.

EVALUATION

Due to the designation of this course as a one-hour workshop, a formal grading procedure is not requisite. The students will receive a grade of Pass or Fail at the end of the term. The grade will be determined by their attendance in class, as per departmental procedures, and the level of their participation in class. It is expected that all students will receive a Passing grade.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SUGGESTED READINGS

- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). What makes a team work? Organizational Dynamics, 21, 34-44.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). Transformational leadership development. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Caple, R. B. (1978). The sequential stages of group development. Small Group Behavior, 9, 470-476.
- Conrad, C. (1990). Strategic organizational communication: An integrated perspective (2nd. ed.). Fort Worth: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Fiedler, R. E. (1972). The effects of leadership training and experience: A contingency model interpretation. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 453-470.
- Finney, J. R. (1987). Aspects and correlates of directors' nonverbal behavior in the rehearsal process. (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1987) Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 10A.
- Fisher, K. (1993). Leading self-directed work teams: A guide to developing new team leadership skills. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Goodman, P. S. (Ed). (1986). Designing effective work groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Goss, B., & O'Hair D. (1988). Communicating in interpersonal relationships. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Gouran, D. (1982). Making decisions in groups. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Hamilton, C. (1982). Communicating for results: A guide for business and the professions (3rd ed.). Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Hawkins, K. W. COMS 5303 class lecture notes, Texas Tech University, September, 1992.

- Hitchcock, D. (1991). Self-directed work teams and performance technology: A good marriage. Performance & Instruction, 30, 12-15.
- Hitchcock, N. (1993). Can self-managed teams boost your bottom line? Modern Materials Handling, 48, 57-59.
- Hodge, F. (1982). Play directing (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Horton, S. (1992). Team effort. American Printer, 209, 30-32.
- Infante, D. A., Rancer, A. S., & Womack, D. F. (1993). Building communication theory (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Jessup, H. R. (1992). The road to results for teams. Training and Development, 46, 65-68.
- Keirse, D., & Bates, M. (1984) Please understand me: Character & temperament types (4th ed.). Del Mar, CA: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company.
- Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. Jr. (1987). Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 32, 106-128.
- Marshall, B. D. (1988). A semiotic phenomenology of directing. (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1988) Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 02A.
- McKee, B. (1992). Turn your workers into a team. Nation's Business, 80, 36-38.
- Mink, O. G., Mink, B. P., & Owen, K. Q. (1987). Groups at work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Odiorne, G. S. (1991). The new breed of supervisor: leaders in self-managed work teams. Supervision, 52, 14-17.
- Orsburn, J. D., Moran, L., Musselwhite, E., & Zenger, J. H. (1990). Self-directed work teams: The new American challenge. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.
- Rahim, M. A. (1983). Rahim organizational conflict inventories: Professional manual (Experimental ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

- Scarr, L. E. (1992). Using self-regulatory work teams. Educational Leadership, 50, 68-70.
- Segal, J. S. (1978). A theory of group development in theatre casts: A special case of small group theory. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1978. Draft copy). Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 08A.
- Shaw, M. E. (1981). Group dynamics: The psychology of small group behavior (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Spitzer, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). Interpersonal communication competence. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Sundstrom, E., De Meuse, K. P., & Futrell, D. (1990). Work teams: Applications and effectiveness. American Psychologist, 45, 120-133.
- Toys R Us. (1986). Effective management skills. Paramus, NJ: Author.
- Tuckman, B. W. (1965). Development sequences in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 382-399.
- Wellins, R. S., Byham, W. C., & Wilson, J. M. (1991) Empowered teams. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Wilson, K. P. (1988). A study of the managerial techniques practiced by directors of theatre at lort a, b+, b, c, and d theatres in 1987-1988. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 02A.
- Wohl, D. (1988). A study of group phasic development in the theatre rehearsal process. (Doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 07A.
- Zenger, J. H., Musselwhite, E., Hurson, K., & Perrin, G. (1991). Leadership in a team environment. Training and Development, 45, 47-52.

Teaching Learning Units

Unit 1: Introduction to the Course & Communication Studies--3 weeks

Application of Pre-tests	1.5 Periods
Syllabus, Course Rationale, & Outline of topics	0.5 Period
A Brief Introduction to Communication Studies	1.0 Period

Rationale:

The purpose of this unit is to familiarize the student with Communication Studies, to find a base-line for the student's understanding of the subjects to be covered, and to initiate thinking by the student on the subject of communication as part of the rehearsal process.

Objectives:

- The student will initiate an expanded definition of the art of directing.
- The student will learn system and communication models.
- The student will understand the difference between communicating to the audience through theatre and communicating to the participants during the rehearsal process.
- The student will identify rehearsal as a communication process.

Content Outline

Introduction to the Course and Communication Studies

I. Presentation of Course Rationale and Objectives

A. Why study communication?

1. Director as Artist

a) Benedetti

(1) Literary Scholar

(2) Acting Coach

(3) Production Manager

(4) Designer

(5) Critic

(6) Surrogate Audience

b) Hodge

(1) All of the above

(2) "The director's core activity is communication"

(p. 7)

(a) With actors and designers as distinct from her
communication with the audience

2. Director as Manager

a) Pass out Course Rationale as found above (page 2)

B. To expand the definition of the art and role of the
director.

C. To present knowledge about communication that is
relevant to the director.

- D. To initiate acquisition of communication skills applicable to rehearsal.

II. Outline of Specific Topics to be Discussed.

A. Small Group Communication

- 1. Aspects of Small Group Development
- 2. Aspects of Small Group Structure

B. Leadership

- 1. Attainment
- 2. Approaches to Leadership

C. Conflict and Conflict Management

- 1. Phasic Development
- 2. Management Skills

III. What is Communication?

A. Definition of Communication

- 1. Not simply the transfer of thoughts from one person to another
- 2. Thoughts, feelings, and idea must be understandable.
- 3. "Communication is the process of people sharing thoughts, ideas, and feelings with each other in a commonly understandable ways" (Hamilton & Parker p. 5)

B. What is a process?--Systems Model (A Bread Factory)

- 1. Input--Importation of energy
 - a) Ingredients--Flour, Sugar, Yeast, etc.
- 2. Throughput

- a) Assembly processes--Mixing and Baking
- 3. Output--Export
 - a) Product--A Loaf of Bread
- 4. Negative entropy
 - a) The energy need to fight entropy--Salaries, Vacations, Perks
- 5. Homeostasis
 - a) The system tries to find a steady state--The avoidance of constantly changing recipes
 - b) Co-Opting--Buy-out of smaller competition
 - c) Differentiating or Downsizing--Too much business in one factory leads to a second plant across town resulting in two smaller factories
- 6. Entropy the final state--The building and equipment are too old and the factory closes.
- 7. General truths about systems
 - a) You cannot look at any single part of them to understand the whole system.
 - (1) Looking at just the flour or just the equipment tells us nothing conclusive about the bread or even if bread is what they make.
 - b) A system is an organized, interrelated and interactive set of elements that strives to maintain its equilibrium among influences from within and without.
- 8) Open Systems

9) Closed Systems

DISCUSSION TOPIC: Is the rehearsal process a system?

C. Communication Model

1. Environment/Context

- a) Communication, because it is a system is both the message and the medium.

2. Sender

- a) Codes message
- b) Code is not message but symbol system that carries the message.

(1) Nonverbal

- (a) All intentional and unintentional means other than written or speech.

- i) Facial Expressions
- ii) Eye contact
- iii) Gestures
- iv) Appearance
- v) Posture
- vi) Size and location of Office
- vii) Arrival time at meetings

(2) Language

- (a) Either written or spoken words are used to communicate thoughts and emotions.

(3) Paralanguage

- (a) Verbal elements that accompany verbal language
 - i) Tonal qualities
- c) Message transmission is a two way street or system.
 - (1) Communication is transactional.
 - (a) Like a financial exchange
 - (2) For communication to be successful all parties must share a frame of reference.
 - (a) Symbols must have a shared meaning.
 - i) Chevy Nova in Spanish means "Chevy No Go."

3. Channels

- a) Media through which message is sent
 - (1) Speech
 - (2) TV
 - (3) A play

4. Noise

- a) Things that interfere with the transmission
 - (1) A Rock and Roll concert
 - (2) Rain on the satellite dish
 - (3) Bad acting

5. Receiver

- a) Decodes the message
 - (1) A process of interpretation
- b) Sends feedback thereby becoming the sender
 - (1) The verbal and visual responses to a message

Discussion Topic & Notes

- I. How does all this apply to Theatre?
 - A. With whom does the director communicate?
 1. The Audience
 2. Others Involved in the Project
 - a) Actors
 - b) Designers
 - c) Management Personnel
 - B. Must the art of the director take both into consideration?
 1. Isn't communication another tool for the director as necessary as blocking, acting, and design knowledge?
 - C. How do the two communication systems in which the director participates differ?

VI. Another View

- A. "A Semiotic Phenomenology of Directing" (Lecture post-discussion)
 1. "Theatre is only possible within the context of human communication."
 2. Communication can take place independently or simultaneously on three levels or worlds:
 - a) Natural World--The experiential world of living
 - b) Artificial World--The world of the play
 - c) Cultural World--The collective culture in which all human endeavor is embedded; therefore, it will be

assumed throughout that all theatre communication takes place in this realm.

3. A theatrical production goes through 3 phases.
 - a) Development of potential for performing--the playwrights inception of an aesthetic object
 - b) Pre-performing or creating known as rehearsal
 - c) Performance
 - d) The pre-performing phase will be the focus of this class.

4. Communication in rehearsal
 - a) Interaction of theatre artists with the text takes place in both the natural and artificial worlds
 - (1) The text is inanimate and therefore incapable of communication.
 - (2) Text causes intrapersonal communication as the artists contemplate the text's meanings.
 - (3) This is the beginning of the pre-performance phase.
 - b) Non-Creative Communication takes place in the Natural World.
 - (1) Interpersonal communication of non-artistic nature occurs as artists get to know each other.
 - c) Creative Communication takes place in both the Artificial and Natural worlds.
 - (1) Discussion of themes, actions, meanings, designs, etc.

- d) Creative and Non-creative communication can take place simultaneously.
5. In the theatre "artificial humans (characters) participate in artificial communication (the dialogue of the text), which is a representation or observation of humans communicating, while the actors portraying the characters are communicating with self and with each other about that portrayal." (Marshall)
6. Actors are involved continually and simultaneously in metacommunication about (control of) the characters they are portraying.

Unit 2: Small Group Communication--4 Weeks

Small Group Structure 2 Periods

Small Group Development 2 Periods

Rationale:

This unit will familiarize the student with small group communication, structure and development, will lead the student into investigating how these theories apply to theatre, and will help the student develop skills to use those theories to benefit her own rehearsal process.

Objectives:

- The student will understand the various aspects of small group structure.
- The student will learn to identify the aspects of theatrical group structure.
- The student will discern the Director's role, position, and status as appointed leader.
- The student will develop skills applicable to her group role as Director.
- The student will understand small group phasic development.
- The student will learn to identify the phases of theatrical group development.
- The student will understand how to apply Wohl's theory of phasic development in the theatre to their own rehearsal process.

Content Outline

Small Group Communication

I. Definition of a Small Group (Hawkins)

A. From three to approximately twelve

1. Two is a dyad, a part of a group but not necessarily a complete group.
2. Somewhere around twelve smaller groups can develop within the group turning it into an organization.

B. Interdependent individuals who

1. They must rely on each other either for the group to maintain itself or for the completion of a task.

C. Share a sense of group identity and who

1. They must feel as if they are part of the group

D. Interact together over time

1. A one-time meeting does not constitute a group because it does not allow for the dynamic processes to come into play.

E. In pursuit of some goals.

1. Goals can range from a specific task to just sharing time.

II. Group Structure

- A. "There is not a single group structure but rather many group structures" (Shaw)

1. Structure is "an integrated organizational pattern that reflects the totality of the separate parts that inhere in each individual group member." (Shaw)

a) Each production will have its own structure based on the group of individual's involved and their specific set of relationships.

2. Structure may be formal (in writing) or informal.

B. Differentiation--Group Identity

1. Extra-group Boundaries--Us vs. Them

a) The qualities of the group as a whole that set it apart from other groups.

b) This process begins with casting.

c) Permeability refers to a boundary which can be crossed.

2. Intra-group Boundaries--Positions

a) The individual qualities of a person that sets her apart from all others that is the basis for relationships.

b) Each group member will have a unique set of parts.

(1) Most talkative, most influential, least capable for the task at hand, etc.

c) The total characterization of these parts equals the person's position in the group.

(1) The pattern of relationships among the positions constitute the Group Structure.

3. The combined uniqueness of the Intra- and Extra-Group Boundaries makes up the group identity. (See above)

C. Status

1. Each position is evaluated by the group member, including the person holding that position, in terms of its relative importance, prestige, and/or value to the group as a whole.
2. Some positions may have equal status, but groups will always form a hierarchical structure--creating a high status (HS) to low status (LS) continuum.
3. Positions can be given status regardless of the person who holds it.
4. Ascribed status is that which individuals attain through no fault or action of their own.
5. Achieved status is that which individuals earn based on accomplishments.
6. Status is a cue to appropriate interaction.
7. Perceived status and actual status may not be the same.
 - a) When these two get out of line it can lead to social disorganization or maladjustment.
8. Group members usually evaluate their group as having a higher status than the products and members of other groups.
9. A person's self-esteem in a group is effected by her status.

- a) Persons placed in higher status than they thought they deserved have higher self-esteem.
- b) Persons placed in lower status than they thought they deserved have lower self-esteem.

10. Status and Communication

- a) The HS person is more likely to initiate and receive more communication from other group members.
 - (1) The content of these messages tends to be more positive than those directed down toward the LS holders.
 - (2) HS holders are more likely to get communication from others of equal status.
- b) LS members communicate more task oriented messages than HS members.
- c) HS person appears to refrain from communicating criticism of their own jobs to those of LS.
- d) Communication with HS individuals can serve as a substitute for upward mobility for LS people without such a possibility.
- e) Verbal aggression towards a person decreases as that person's status increases.
- f) HS persons feel comfortable being physically close to persons of equal or lower status while LS persons are restricted to an correct distance.

- h) Persons are more likely to ask for assistance from those of equal status over dissimilar status.

E. Roles

1. The person holding each position is expected to enact certain functions or behavior.
 - a) Role enactment is a function of status, position, and the personality of the occupant.
2. Perceived or Expected Roles
 - a) The set of behavior that the occupant of a position believes he/she should enact
3. Enacted or Actual Roles
 - a) The set of behaviors that the occupant actually carries out
4. The amount of group conflict and dysfunctionality increases as the difference between actual and perceived roles increases.
5. The role one enacts is a function of how one wants to be perceived by others.
6. The amount of influence one has on a group is generally correlated with role although this may also be an effect of status.
7. Perception of an individual is influenced by her role.
 - a) In interpersonal encounters roles can determine unequal control over the style, content, and duration.

- b) This control permits control over self-revelation.
- 8. An individual can occupy different roles in different groups.
 - a) This should not cause conflict unless the two roles are enacted simultaneously.
 - b) In these cases the individual will solve the conflict by acting for the group of greatest interest.

F. Norms

1. Rules keep chaos at bay.
2. Norms are rules established by the group (either formal or informal) that govern acceptable behavior in the group.
3. Norms enable prediction of behavior and reduce ambiguity.
4. Norms are not things like saying "good morning", but are instead that normal behavior would be to pleasantly greet your fellow group members.
5. Generally, groups form their own norms.
 - a) Standards for behavior enacted from outside the group are only accepted if they are deemed right and proper by the group.
 - b) Norms are rarely accepted by all members.
 - (1) If more than half agree, then a standard of behavior becomes a norm.

6. Groups do not create norms to deal with all possible situations, only to those things the group deems significant.
7. They may apply to all members of the group or only those in certain positions.
8. Roles are a type of norm, but not all norms are roles.
9. Conforming to norms may be as important for the individual as it is for the group.
10. Variables that influence conformity to norms
 - a) Personality characteristics of the individual
 - (1) Age--increased age = increased conformity
 - (2) People who take blame are greater conformers.
 - (3) Authoritarians conform more than non-authoritarians.
 - (4) Highly intelligent people are less likely to conform.
 - (5) Personality is the least likely of the variables to have influence.
 - b) Kinds of stimuli evoking the conformity/non-conformity response.
 - (1) The more ambiguous the situation, the greater the conformity. We yield to group pressure.
 - (2) Possibly the strongest influence on conformity
 - c) Situational Factors
 - (1) Group size, structure, unanimity, etc.

(2) Generally, the larger the group the greater the conformity because the individual is less likely to trust her own independent thinking based on that much peer pressure.

d) Intragroup Relationships--those among members of the group

(1) The degree of personal identification with the group

(2) The level of the group's previous successes

(3) Group composition

(4) Normative Social Influence--pressure to conform to positive expectations

(5) Informational Social Influence--the use of other's responses as a source of information about the external world.

(6) Conformity is greater in ongoing groups.

G. The Relation of Status and Norms

1. High status holders are more likely to conform to norms and those who hold up to norms are more likely to be awarded higher status.

2. "Idiosyncrasy credit" is the amount a person is allowed to deviate from the norms as a result of contributions to the group.

3. Deviation from norms will be sanctioned by group.

a) Severeness of sanction depends on status

- (1) High status holders will be given more leeway than low status holders.
 - (2) Sanctions for low status holders will be more severe than for high status holders.
 - (3) On the other hand, the reverse has also been found to be true.
 - (a) Such as in the case of military leaders
 - (b) Be careful not to confuse rank and status here. One can be a General and still be low person on the totem pole.
7. In situations that stress production (task orientation) the high status person is less likely to conform to the expectations of the low-status person.
- a) When high status must use that status to marshal efforts of the group, low-status expectation conformity may be seen as an erosion of high status.

H. Power

- 1. The ability of one person to control or influence another
 - a) Often through the use of rewards and punishments
 - (1) i.e., The Control Of Reinforcers
 - b) One can only control to the extent that one controls the reinforcing.
 - c) What may be one person's reinforcement may not be another's.

2. Power is a joint function of both parties: one only has the power that one is given.
3. Five kinds of Social Power
 - a) Attraction Power
 - (1) Based on identification or a liking relationship
 - b) Reward Power
 - (1) Based on the ability to control rewards such as pay
 - (2) Effective in maintaining conformity
 - c) Coercive Power
 - (1) Based on the ability to mediate punishments such as no overtime
 - (2) Generally an ineffective way of controlling behavior except in cases of extreme dislike or hostility in which this is the only avenue.
 - d) Legitimate Power
 - (1) Based on the belief that one person has the right to prescribe another's behavior
 - e) Expert Power
 - (1) Based on the belief by the less powerful person that the powerful person has the better resources to handle a given area
4. Authority
 - a) The use of legitimate power as awarded by the group
5. Leadership

- a) The exercise of power in situations by the occupant of a particular position in the group structure
6. The individual's behavior is influenced by her relative power level.
7. The reaction to an individual is influenced by her relative power.
 - a) The powerful member is seen as more likable and
 - (1) is treated differentially.
 - (2) is the target of more intragroup communication.
 - (3) is more likely to be complied with.
8. More rewards and fewer punishments are aimed at those with higher power.
9. When the powerful person uses power to punish those with lower power she is seen as unfriendly and self-assured.
10. The powerful person is seen as generally less socially attractive when compared to less powerful people.
11. Equal power structures produce more cooperation than unequal power structures.

III. Skills Development for the Role of Director

A. Performance Appraisal

1. Defined as the process of describing an individuals job-related strengths and weaknesses

2. Effective use of performance appraisal will lead to the accomplishment of the task or will discourage actions which interfere with task accomplishment.
3. Appraisal systems are formed by the union of two processes.
 - a) Observation
 - b) Judgment
 - c) Observation and Judgment are based on the raters knowledge of the skill area involved.
 - (1) Will be different for every task
 - (2) For Directors is based on knowledge of the Theatre
4. The success of an appraisal system is determined by two factors.
 - a) Appraisal Format
 - (1) Must be situationally appropriate
 - (2) Can be structured
 - (a) Hand written
 - (b) On pre-printed form
 - (3) Can be unstructured
 - (a) Comments around the watercooler
 - b) Interpersonal Reactions
 - (1) The expressions of judgments and the response to those expressions
 - (2) Known as feedback
5. Feedback

- a) The spirit in which the feedback is given may not be the way it is received.
- b) It takes both knowledge of the individuals involved and practice at the skill to give effective feedback.
- c) It comes in three ways.

(1) Positive feedback

(a) Approaches that center on praise for positive actions

- i) "Pat-on-the-back"
- ii) "Thank-you"
- iii) "Good Work"

(b) Most powerful type

i) Fulfills fundamental human need of feeling good about what we have done

ii) Promotes self-respect

(c) Should be used on small as well as large accomplishments

i) If small accomplishments are not praise they may cease.

(2) Negative Feedback

(a) Telling someone they have not succeeded

(b) Must be handled very carefully

(c) Be careful not to erode the person's self-respect.

- i) Direct comments at actions not at person to avoid anger and defensiveness.

(3) Neutral Feedback

- (a) Ignoring certain actions
- (b) Use as carefully as Negative Feedback
 - i) Ignoring positive actions will make them evaporate.

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

How do you give notes during rehearsals?

Should notes always be given the same way?

How do your non-verbals effect the actors?

Your physical proximity has an affect on your cast.--The study regarding proximity during rehearsal.

IV. Small Group Development

A. Groups go through phases

- 1. Phases vary depending on type of group (i.e., task-oriented, self-help, problem-solving, etc.)

a) We will cover three:

- (1) A General Theory
- (2) Tuckman's Theory
- (3) Wohl's Theory of Theatrical Group Development

B. A General Theory--Five Stages

1. Orientation Stage

- a) Marked by ambiguity and tentative member actions

- b) Uncoordinated activity
 - c) Members may not listen to each other.
 - d) Efforts started to establish traditional structure
 - e) The leader's tolerance is tested.
2. Conflict Stage
- a) Much dissension
 - b) Impatience and disagreements
 - c) Frequent interruptions
 - d) Ad homineum attacks
3. Integration Stage
- a) Period of reconciliation
 - b) Members begin to listen to each other.
 - c) Consensus-seeking appears
 - d) Polarization decreases
4. Achievement Stage
- a) This is the groups functional level--the ideal level.
 - b) Interpersonal relationships are strong.
 - c) Group roles and norms established
 - d) Group does its work well.
5. Order Stage
- a) Members are satisfied with the group.
 - b) No wish to reassess norms
 - c) Less likely to introduce new materials for consideration

- d) Members begin to wonder about the future of the group (entropy).

C. Tuckman's theory--Four Stages

1. Forming

- a) Orientation
- b) Defining interpersonal and task behaviors

2. Storming

- a) Conflict and polarization

3. Norming

- a) Beginning of conflict resolution
- b) Establishment of new standards and roles
- c) Cohesiveness and in-group feelings

4. Performing

- a) Roles are flexible.
- b) Energies directed towards task activities
- c) Interpersonal structure serves achievement of group goals.

D. Wohl's Theatrical Phasic Development Theory

1. Group Dependency

- a) Actors will question their basic goals and purposes.
- b) Actor insecurity and tentativeness mark the early rehearsals.
- c) After a few rehearsals, actors begin to feel more confident and comfortable as patterns of behavior begin to emerge.

- (1) Seating arrangements
- (2) Greetings
- (3) Entering and exiting patterns

2. Conflict I

- a) Marked by dissent
- b) The group concerns itself with the role of director as leader.
- c) Resolution of this conflict phase occurs in two chronologically separate or interdependent ways.
 - (1) The actors symbolical engineering of the director's 'exit' through a developing ambivalence toward the director's authority reflects this process.
 - (2) The existence of a crisis

3. Group Interdependence

- a) Harmony, happiness, and togetherness
- b) A developing sense of ensemble marks this phase.

4. Conflict II

- a) Reveals the illusory quality of this harmony
- b) Regression to themes found during the Conflict I phase
 - (1) Leader/group conflict
 - (2) Independence
 - (3) Interpersonal hostility

5. Group Effectiveness

- a) Results from the interplay of by two major forces

- (1) Realization that the end of the group approaches
(termination of rehearsal and beginning of
performance)
- (2) Developing need to "establish criteria for
evaluating the group experience"

DISCUSSION TOPICS:

- I. Application of Phasic Development Theories to the
Rehearsal Process
 - A. Rehearsal Schedule Design Based on Phasic Development
 1. Take into account the periods when conflict will
occur.
 - B. Acceleration of Group Development Process via the
Rehearsal Process.
 1. Develop exercises to get through the Group Dependency
phases as quickly as possible.
 - C. Are there sub-phases of development such as during
tech/dress rehearsals?

- V. Groups in the Organizational Structure
 - A. The acting unit is only one part of a larger system.
 - B. Organizational Structures
 1. Centralized (Vertical)
 2. Decentralized (Horizontal)
 3. Work Teams
 4. Intergroup Conflict

Unit 3: Leadership--3 weeks

Leadership in Small Groups	0.5 Periods
Leadership Traits	1.5 Periods
Leadership Styles	1.0 Period

Rationale:

The purpose of this unit is to familiarize the student with the issues and theories surrounding small group leadership, to lead the student into investigating how these theories apply to the role of the Director, to begin the student on an investigation of her own leadership abilities, and to help the student develop the use of leadership theories to benefit her own work as a Director of theatre.

Objectives:

- The student will understand different styles of leadership.
- The student will learn the various character traits that make up a good leader.
- The student will begin to understand her own traits.
- The student will understand the styles of leadership.
- The student will learn several approaches to leadership.
- The student will understand situational approaches to leadership.
- The student will develop skills the he/she can use as a Director.

Content Outline

Leadership

I. Definition

A. The following analysis of leadership is interesting and plausible, but it does not lend itself to easy predictions about leadership behavior and outcomes. It is intended as guidance.

B. There is a difference between leader and leadership.

1. Leader refers to a position or person occupying that position within the group structure.

a) The person who is the focus of group behaviors

(1) The person who is at the center of attention

b) The person able to lead the group to its goals

(1) This does not include persons who lead the group away from its goals even though that person may turn out to be a leader of sorts.

c) The person appointed to the role by the group

(1) Refers to headship

d) The person who has influence on group syntality

(character of the group)

(1) Changes in levels of group performance

(2) Any group member can be a leader to the extent that she influences group behavior (see above).

e) The person who engages in leadership behavior

(1) This results in a definition that depends on the list of leadership behaviors one lists.

f) The person who exerts positive influence over other group members or who exerts more positive influence over others than they do over her

2. Leadership refers to a process.

a) The process of influencing the group towards setting and achieving certain goals.

b) Interpersonal influence exercised in situations, and directed through communication processes toward the accomplishment of certain group goal(s)

c) Constitutes an influence relationship between two or more individuals who are interdependent while striving to achieve mutual goals within a group

d) The particular activities a person engages in while directing and/or coordinating the work of fellow group members

II. Leadership Attainment in Small Groups

A. Most studies are about Emergent Leaders

1. The person who possesses task-relevant knowledge and abilities

2. Location in Communication pattern

a) The most central person becomes leader.

3. The person who participates (communicates both verbally and non-verbally) most

B. Leaders appointed from outside the group

C. Source of Leadership Authority

1. Effects groups ability to function

a) Group are more likely to accept selfish action from emergent leader than an appointed leader.

2. Effects degree of legitimacy of leadership

a) The incompetent emergent leader is rejected while the incompetent appointed leader is not.

(1) Competent leaders are accepted either way.

3. Unfortunately most studies do not directly compare emergent and appointed leadership. (More study on this needs to be done)

III. Approaches to Leadership

A. Personality Characteristics

1. High Self-Motivation

2. High Machiavellianism

a) The ability to manipulate people

3. High Rhetorical Skills

a) The ability to persuade others through argument

(1) Ethos

(2) Pathos

(3) Logos

a) Control of personal thought leakage

B. Leadership Traits

1. Goal Facilitation (Task Relevant Competence)

a) The abilities necessary to assist group in goal achievement

(1) Insight

(2) Intelligence

(3) Knowing how to get things done

2. Sociability

a) Factors necessary to keep group operating smoothly

(1) Cooperativeness

(2) Popularity

3. Individual Prominence (Desire for Dominance)

a) Related to a person's desire for recognition

(1) Initiative

(2) Self-Confidence

(3) Persistence

C. Self-discovery of Personal Leadership Traits

1. The Keirsey Temperament Sorter/Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Test

Learning Activity:

Take the Meyers-Briggs Indicator Test

Distribute explanantions of the results

D. Leadership Styles

1. Authoritarian

a) Determines all policy

b) Dictates techniques and actions

- (1) Usually one at a time so that members are unsure regarding future action
 - (2) Assigns individuals specific assignments and work partners
- c) Subjective in praise and criticism
 - d) Impersonal and aloof
 - e) Group task results
 - (1) Fewer errors
 - (2) Fewer messages for problem solutions
 - (3) Gets things done quicker
 - (4) Rated as less satisfactory experience
 - (5) More productive under stress conditions
 - f) Easier to be a good at this than democratic style
2. Laissez-Faire
- a) Essentially a non-participant
 - (1) Allows group to make all decisions
 - b) Information supplied only when asked for
 - c) Infrequent comments on activities
3. Democratic
- a) Allows group to determine matters of policy
 - b) Sketches general approaches to goals
 - c) Makes suggestions when appropriate
 - d) Members free to chose own work partners
 - e) Objective in praise and criticism
 - f) Group task results
 - (1) Greater member satisfaction with experience

- (2) Produced more under less stressful conditions
 - g) More difficult to be than Authoritarian style
 - (1) If you doubt your ability to be a democratic leader, then be authoritarian (Shaw, 1955).
4. One experiment showed that Authoritarian styles
- a) Had 30 times more hostility than Democratic
 - b) Had 8 times more aggression than Democratic
 - c) Had more scapegoating than the other two styles
 - d) While there was no reliable difference in the number of products produced by each method, the democratic groups products were superior in quality.
5. The Consideration/Initiating Theory
- a) Consideration reflects the extent a leader is concerned about the feelings of followers.
(emotionally based)
 - (1) Democratic
 - (2) Effects satisfaction
 - b) Initiating is the extent to which a leader defines the leader-follower roles in relation to group goals. (structurally based)
 - (1) Authoritarian
 - (2) Effects productivity
6. Combination Styles of Theatrical Directors we can develop based on 1, 2, & 3.
- a) Benevolent Dictator

- (1) Combination of Democratic and Authoritarian
 - (a) Allows maximum Actor input but reserves absolute right to final decisions in all matters
 - (b) Objective praise and criticism
- b) Collaborative Facilitator
 - (1) Combination of Democratic and Laissez-Faire
 - (a) Loosely sketches approaches
 - (b) Allows Actors complete freedom in making choices
 - (c) Objective praise and criticism
- c) Dictatorial Traffic Cop
 - (1) Combination of Authoritarian and Laissez-Faire
 - (a) Dictates all in regard to blocking, pacing, and design
 - (b) Leaves all character decisions up to actors
 - (c) Comments on accomplishments rarely

E. Approaches to Leadership

1. The style of leadership should be influenced by situation.

a) Leadership traits are fluid.

(1) A trait that is positive in one situation may be negative in another.

b. Situational factors influence both the emergence and behavior of leaders.

F. Interactionism

1. A group of "contingency models" that attempt to explain the interrelationships of personal, situational, and group variable in regard to leadership
 - a) Leadership arises when group formation takes place, from the interaction of all aspects of group members and group structure
 - b) The leader position and leadership role are only one set that emerges through interaction.
2. Transactional Approach
 - a) Leadership is a two way set of influences.
 - (1) A social exchange, similar to an economic exchange
 - (a) Leader gives rewards, provides direction, reduces ambiguity, etc.
 - (b) Group members provide esteem, higher status, and other social rewards.
 - b) Exchanges must be perceived as equitable.
3. Transformational Approach
 - a) Leads with the intent of developing followers into leaders
 - b) Raises members consciousness to the importance and value of goals and means to achieving them
 - c) Motivates members to overcome self-interest for the sake of group goals
 - d) Becomes inspirational source to members

- e) Diagnose, meet, and evaluate the needs of members on individual basis
- f) Stimulate members to view situations from new perspectives
- g) Members place trust in them to overcome any obstacle.
- h) Three factors of Transformational Leadership

(1) Charisma/Inspiration

- (a) Leaders with personal charisma do not work at developing others to become leaders.
- (b) Socially-oriented Charisma empowers others.
- (c) Develop higher levels among members of Long-term performance, Autonomy, and Achievement
- (d) Articulate simple goals and mutual understanding of rights and wrongs (norms)
- (e) Provide vision of the possible
- (f) Promote positive expectations

(2) Individualized consideration

- (a) Understanding and sharing of member's concerns and developmental needs
- (b) Treats each member uniquely
- (c) Attempts to expand & evaluate member's needs to maximize and develop their full potential.
(Maslow's Self-Actualization)
- (d) Sets examples and assigns tasks on an individual basis.

- (e) Mentoring and Coaching
 - (f) Provides continuous feedback and follow-up
 - (h) Links member's needs to that of the group
- (3) Intellectual Stimulation
- (a) Helps members think about old problems in new ways
 - (b) Encourages questioning of old beliefs, assumptions and values (including own)
 - (c) Can occur on the dyadic (one-to-one, see below), group, or organizational level
- i) General conclusions about Transformational Leaders
- (1) Become so only to the extent they can discern, understand, conceptualize, and articulate the opportunities and problems facing the group--as well as its strengths, weaknesses, and relative advantages
 - (2) Success is measured not only by outcomes and productivity, but by the development of followers into transformational leaders as well.
 - (3) Compared to Transactional approaches, transformational approaches produce greater effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction among group members.
 - (4) Transformation should not replace transactional leadership, but should be used in concert to achieve goals.

3. Vertical Dyad Linkages

a) Assumes a unique relationship between each member and the leader

(1) Parameters of relationship are based on the characteristics of both members and the group environment.

b) Individuals through the development of the group work out together how they will behave in certain situations and reach agreement as to the general nature of their relationship.

(1) Levels of Dominance

(2) Degrees of Cooperation

(3) Level of Interpersonal Intimacy

c) Leadership is a process of vertical exchange.

4. Contingency

a) Correlates Leadership style with Situational factors

b) Based on Lowest Preferred Coworker (LPC) score)

(1) In an LPC the respondent is asked to rate her least preferred coworker on several characteristics.

(2) The High-LPC person sees her least preferred coworker in a relatively favorable manner.

(a) A person who derives satisfaction from interpersonal relationships

(3) The Low-LPC person sees her least preferred coworker very unfavorably.

- (a) A person who derives satisfaction from task performance
- c) Situational factors
 - (1) The leader's position power
 - (a) The degree to which the position itself enables leader to get followers to comply and/or accept leadership
 - (2) Structure of the task
 - (a) The degree to which the task parameters are clearly defined
 - (b) The degree to which the task is capable of being accomplished
 - (c) Four dimensions of task structure
 - i) Decision Verifiability--The degree to which a decision's correctness can be verified by an appeal to authority, logic, or feedback
 - ii) Goal Clarity--The degree to which the requirements of the task are known to the members
 - iii) Goal-Path Multiplicity--The degree to which the task can be completed by a variety of procedures.
 - iv) Solution Specificity--The degree to which there is more than one solution or decision.
 - (d) A task is well structured to the extent that it has...

- i) A clear goal.
 - ii) A single path to the goal.
 - iii) Only one correct solution or decision.
 - iv) An easily verifiable decision or solution.
- d) Favorability Factor
 - (1) When a leader has good personal relations with members the situation is considered favorable.
 - (2) Member relations exert the most affect on the following in the following order (highest first)
 - (a) Favorability Dimension
 - (b) Task Structure
 - (c) Position Power
 - (3) Accounting for all these factors allows hierarchical placement of situations in relation to favorability for leader.
 - (a) Most favorable situation
 - i) Good member relations
 - ii) Highly structure task
 - iii) Position power strong
 - (b) Most unfavorable situation
 - i) Poor member relations
 - ii) Unstructured task
 - iii) Leader's position power is weak
- e) Putting it all together
 - (1) The Low-LPC leader is more effective in highly favorable or unfavorable situations.

(2) The High-LPC leader is more effective when the situation is moderately favorable.

(3) Don't get frozen in either High or Low LPC, adjust as the situation changes in regard to your relations, the status of the task, and your relative position power.

IV. Skills Development

A. Motivating others

1. A key to leadership is motivation.
 - a) Getting your followers to do the tasks required
2. People are motivated to perform at a level consistent with their self-respect.
3. To increase motivation--increase follower's sense of self-respect.
4. Self-respect can be encouraged or discouraged through communication; both verbal and non-verbal.
5. Some ways to build a follower's self-respect:
 - a) Say thanks for a specific task.
 - b) Give special assignments.
 - c) Praise jobs well done.
 - d) Listen and respond to workers ideas.
 - e) Write down worker's ideas.
 - f) Accept differences in people.
 - g) Express your feelings.
 - h) Recognize other's feelings.

- i) Give tangible rewards when appropriate.
- j) Ask for opinions.
- k) Ask for help.
- l) Admit you are wrong.
- m) Tell followers when they are right.
- n) Express interest in follower's interests outside of group.
- o) Share information.

B. How to be an Effective Communicator--Director as giver of instructions.

1. In addition to being an effective listener, you must also be an effective speaker. This is especially true for the director when giving instructions.

2. Adequate Preparation

- a) Communication is irreversible.
- b) Messages must be prepared so that they are effective the first time.

3. Clear Instructions

- a) Vague instructions are easily misunderstood.
- b) Rules for giving clear instruction:
 - (1) Begin with an overall picture.
 - (a) Give a mental image allowing accurate follow-up.
 - (b) Give reason's for instructions.
 - (c) Establish the importance of the task.
 - (d) Set deadlines.

- (2) Use a minimum of words.
 - (a) Excess verbiage leads to confusion.
- (3) Use simple, easy-to-understand words.
 - (a) Do not assume everyone is familiar with every word.
 - (b) Use terms that are in everyone's frame of reference.
- (4) Be specific.
- (5) Use simple comparisons.
 - (a) People understand through comparison or metaphor.
- (6) Use Repetition.
 - (a) Summarize long directions.
 - (b) Use the same standard as used for writing papers.
 - i) Tell them what you are going to tell them.
 - ii) Tell it to them.
 - iii) Tell them what you told them.
- (7) Number or "sign-post" objects, steps, or sets of instructions.
 - (a) Avoid using phrases like "and the next step" or "When you get there do this."
 - (b) Use phrases that are numbered like "First walk stage right. Second, sit in the chair. Third say your line."
- (8) Use good delivery techniques.

- (a) Look at the person to whom you are speaking.
- (b) Watch for non-verbals that indicate confusion.
- (c) Look and sound confident.
- (d) Speak in a manner that is hearable and understandable.
- (e) Don't assume--Ask for feedback to check understanding.

C. Role Playing Scenarios

1. In role playing it is important not only to use the three skill areas we have just discussed, but to use all the information on leadership we have looked at in this unit, and information covered in the other units as well.
 - a. All scenarios should be played out, discussed, and played out again.
 - b. Alterations in the scenarios can and should be made based on discussions.
 - c. New scenarios can be discussed and played based on the experiences of others in the class.
2. You are directing The Real Inspector Hound on an arena stage. The actor, playing the Inspector, a character who is not aware that he is in a play, picks up the handbag of a woman sitting in the front row during a performance, and hands it to her. What do you do after the performance?

3. You are directing, Inherit the Wind. The actor playing the janitor is consistently late to rehearsal. He is late again today which is delaying your start. You barely have enough time to get the act done. What do you do when he comes in 15 minutes late with his hair wet?
3. You are seeing the painted set for the first time. The sight of it on stage is not the same as it was in the model or the elevation. You would like some changes made. What do you do?
4. You are directing a college production of Hamlet. The actor playing Hamlet is having trouble learning his lines. What do you do?
5. You are directing a college production of Hamlet. The guest artist, Donald O'Connor, is playing Hamlet and is having trouble learning his lines. What do you do?
6. You are directing a community college production of Harvey. One of your actors, a neophyte to acting, is constantly upstaging herself. You have given her notes about this on several occasions. What do you do?
7. Before rehearsal an actor comes to you to tell you that the cast is planning a surprise birthday party for your Assistant Director on stage immediately after the rehearsal. Some of the actors are late and

rehearsal is delayed In giving your pre-rehearsal notes you want to emphasize that everyone has to get right down to work because you have limited time. In closing you say, "And we have to be sure we clear everything off the stage immediately after the rehearsal for the birthday party." During a break in the rehearsal, the actor who informed you of the party comes up to you. She is angry. What do you do?

8. Etc.

Unit 4: Conflict And Conflict Management--4 weeks

Understanding Conflict	1.0 Period
Conflict Development and Management Strategies	1.5 Periods
Developing Conflict Management Skill	1.5 Periods

Rationale:

The purpose of this unit is to familiarize the student with theories concerning conflict, conflict development, and conflict management, to lead the student into a personal investigation of her own abilities at conflict management, to help the student learn to apply the theories of conflict and conflict management to her own work as a Director.

Objectives:

- The student will understand the nature of conflict.
- The student will learn that conflict has both positive and negative aspects.
- The student will understand the phases of conflict development.
- The student will understand the various approaches to managing conflict.
- The student will begin to understand her own conflict management style.
- The student will improve old and develop new conflict management skills.

Content Outline

Conflict

- I. Understanding Conflict (Goss and O'Hair)
 - A. Conflict occurs when two or more people strongly disagree.
 1. Disagreements are driven by differences in...
 - a) Goals
 - b) Perceptions
 - c) Values
 - B. Negative Effects of Conflict
 1. Too much conflict can destroy a relationship.
 2. Conflict can take emotional and physical tolls on people.
 3. Can prevent task accomplishment
 - C. Conflicts have positive effects.
 1. Create unity and open communication
 2. Assists issue clarification through identifying and highlighting key issues
 3. Promotes social change/growth
 4. Encouragement of fresh ideas
 5. The amount of positive effect depends on how conflict is managed.
 - D. Understanding and Agreement

1. An issue will lead to conflict if there is not enough understanding and agreement between the parties involved to lead to settlement.
 - a) Understanding is being able to predict how the other feels about the issue.
 - b) Agreement is the extent to which the parties hold similar views.
 - c) Settlement is a final product that binds the parties future actions.
2. Most conflict is over Agreement not Understanding.
3. Understanding/Agreement Matrix (Goss and O'Hair)
 - a) Understanding and Agreement
 - (1) No problem
 - b) Understanding and Disagreement
 - (1) Communication may or may not help reach a settlement.
 - c) Misunderstanding but agreement
 - (1) Communication offers a way to settlement by allowing understanding.
 - d) Misunderstanding and no agreement
 - (1) Avoidance may work

II. Conflict Development Phases (Pondy)

A. Latent Conflict

1. Conditions that provide sufficient grounds for conflict

- a) Generally exists whenever people are interdependent.
 - b) Whenever people have interactive relationships
 - c) The majority of conflicts involve mixed-motives.
 - (1) Participants have reason to compete & cooperate
 - (2) Participants who focus on reasons to cooperate have less conflict.
 - (3) When participants focus on reasons to compete, the conflict is difficult to resolve.
2. Participants unaware conflict is beginning
- B. Perceived Conflict
- 1. When one or more participants believes that the situation contains interdependence and/or incompatibility
 - a) Often stems from specific (precipitating) event
 - (1) A slight
 - (2) Annoyance build-up
 - 3. Participants becoming aware of the problem
 - 4. Perceived conflict can exist without a latent stage.
 - a) Ever fought with a sibling just because she is a sibling?
 - b) In these situations improving communication will help alleviate the problem.
 - 5. Latent conflict can exist without ever developing into perceived conflict.
 - a) A problem could develop but it doesn't.

C. Felt Conflict

1. Personalization of conflict
 - a) One participant realizes that she is a principal party, not just an observer.
2. Participants begin to define conflict.
3. Participants begin to orient themselves towards it.
 - a) Take sides
4. Make choices of communication strategies she will use
 - a) The silent treatment
 - b) Complain to the boss
5. Decide on range of acceptable solutions
6. In essence they create scenarios.
 - a) These are inhibiting.
 - (1) Reduce flexibility
 - (2) Reduce openness to persuasion
 - b) They are private.
 - (1) Conflict is like poker.
7. Participants chose opening play.
 - a) Open conflict
 - b) Accept situation as is

D. Manifest Conflict

1. Made up of a series of interactive communication cycles
 - a) Message
 - b) Response

- c) Counterresponse
- 2. Once begun, cycles gather their own momentum which nobody controls.
 - a) Self-perpetuating
 - b) Self-reinforcing
- 3. Communication strategies in conflict
 - a) Structuring Strategies
 - (1) Definition of issues
 - (a) Initiating focal or new issues
 - (b) Focusing issues through repetition or clarification
 - (c) Modifying scope of issue
 - i) Enlarging
 - ii) Narrowing
 - iii) Fogging
 - (d) Attaching emotional labels to the conflict or positions taken
 - (2) Establishment of evaluative criteria
 - (a) Must be overt
 - (b) Exclusion of alternative criteria.
 - i) Womanizing as opposed to ability to get bills through Congress for a Presidential conflict (race).
 - (3) Manipulation of relationships
 - (a) Bribery
 - (b) Altruism

- (c) Appeals to guilt
- b. Confrontive Strategies
 - (1) Coercion--Overt displays of power
 - (a) Position Power
 - i) Control of reinforcers
 - (b) Coalition Forming
 - i) Ganging up
 - (c) Expertise
 - i) I know more about this than you do.
 - (2) Coercion--threats or promises
 - (3) Personalization
 - (a) Moral accusations
 - (b) Ad Homineum
 - i) Attacking person instead of issues.
 - (c) Revelation of secrets
 - (4) Toughness
 - (a) Do not budge until others do
 - (b) Reformed sinner
 - i) Hold tight until it looks as if no one will move, then move on what looks like big issue but turns out to be small issue.
- c. Avoidance Strategies
 - (1) Delay/Procrastination
 - (a) Manipulating Procedures
 - i) The Filibuster
 - (b) "Putting off" communication

(c) Focusing on rules

i) Who is going to sit where.

ii) What shape will the table be.

2. Regression

(a) Refusing to admit there is an issue at conflict center

(b) Transcending to area of agreement

i) "We both know the show must go on."

3. Commitments to Revenge

(a) Silent obsessing

(b) Sulking

(c) Pouting

(d) Begging

DISCUSSION TOPIC:

I. Where do these strategies, not directly mentioned in the literature, fit?

A. The End-Run

B. The Preemptive Strike

C. The Curve Ball

III. Managing Conflict

A. Strategies for managing conflict vary along two dimensions.

1. Cooperation

a) Desire to satisfy others

2. Assertiveness

- a) Desire to satisfy self

B. Avoidance

1. Little cooperativeness or assertiveness

2. Strengths

- a) Simple response
- b) Avoids winner and loser labeling

(1) Reduces negative legacy

3. Weaknesses

- a) Does not resolve problem
- b) A temporary solution to real problems.

4. When to use:

- a) When consequences are insubstantial

(1) Where to go for dinner

5. When not to use:

- a) When it substitutes for an inability to deal with conflict.

C. Accommodation

1. Involves a high degree of cooperation, but low levels of assertiveness

2. One person meets the demands or needs of another.

- a) Plays down differences and emphasizes commonalties
- b) Responds to emotions
- c) Includes compromise

3. Strengths

- a) Exploits cooperative elements of conflict

4. Weaknesses

- a) Temporary solution
- b) Unresolved issues remain
- c) Outcome depends on relative power structure
- d) Can ignore legitimate arguments or complaints

5. When to use:

- a) When your ego is not involved
- b) When you have little to lose by acquiescing

D. Competition

1. Requires high levels of assertiveness while avoiding cooperativeness

2. Each participant attempts to meet her own goals without regard for the other participant.

- a) The classic power struggle
- b) Win-Lose

3. Strengths

- a) Time efficient
- b) Effective when participants accept power relationships

4. Weaknesses

- a) Fails to address real problems
- b) Temporary solution
- c) Leaves residue of undealt with emotions
- d) Can permanently weaken relationships

5. When to use:

- a) When you hold all the cards and are sure of the outcome

6. When not to use:

- a) When going up against a stronger opponent
- b) When unsure of the outcome

E. Compromising

- 1. Requires moderate levels of both cooperation and assertiveness

- 2. Attempts to minimize losses and maximize wins.

- a) Part win--part lose

- 3. Involves power struggle and manipulation

- 4. Strengths

- a) Nobody out and out loses
 - b) Solution will be mutually acceptable

- 5. Weaknesses

- a) No one will be completely satisfied
 - b) Will leave some issues only partially resolved

- 6. When to use:

- a) When playing field is equal
 - b) When communication is open

7 Bargaining

- a) A type of compromise used when several issues are at stake.
- b) The goals of bargainers is to reach a multifaceted solution through an ongoing process of offers and counteroffers which grow in complexity.

c) A variety of message strategies are used.

(1) Rhetorical arguments

(a) Long persuasive speeches can be counter-productive

i) Do not create change of opponents mind

ii) Delay the process

(b) Clarification of issues and providing pertinent information moves the process along.

(c) It is not amount of communication, but quality of communication that is important.

(2) Threats

(3) Promises

(4) Concessions

(5) Commitments

d. Bargaining principles

(1) Know the issues and your positions clearly.

(2) Maintain accurate information at your disposal during sessions.

(3) Have a clear understanding of your own and your counterpart's power.

(4) Know what your bottom line is, and project that of other party's.

(5) Sketch an outline of concession makeable and acceptable in return.

(6) Establish ground rules for meeting at start of talks.

- (7) Tackle issues separately if possible.
- (8) Address your proposals and counterproposals to the needs of the other party.
- (9) Follow-through on any commitments you make.
- (10) Communicate in an assertive, but non-belligerent manner.

F. Collaboration

1. Requires high levels of both cooperation and assertiveness
2. Solutions are beneficial to all involved.
 - a) The Win-Win Scenario
 - b) Creative problem solving avoids compromise.
3. Strengths
 - a) Effective when conflict erupts from communication breakdown
 - b) When used often it establishes norms of collaboration in problem solving.
4. Weaknesses
 - a) Time-consuming
5. When to use:
 - a) When the welfare of the other party is important
6. When not to use:
 - a) When there is no common ground between the two parties

IV. Conflict Management Skills

A. Planning

1. Do not go into conflict without first planning as stated in the bargaining section above.
 - a) A conflict is much easier to manage when you have a good idea of what you are going to do in advance.
 - b) Don't fly by the seat of your pants--you'll invariably crash.

B. Assertiveness

1. Self-disclosure
 - a) Be willing to say what is on your mind.
 - b) There is a difference between assertive and aggressive.
 - (1) Be non-threatening.
2. Be honest and tactful.

C. Confrontation

1. Giving constructive feedback
2. Intervention when you care for the other party
3. Rules for confrontation
 - a) Time the confrontation correctly.
 - b) Do not focus on the past or future, but the present.
 - c) Make tentative statements about your feelings and/or observations.
 - (1) Do not take a dogmatic stance.
 - (2) Use questions rather than statements.

- d) Use descriptive statements in terms of the effects unwanted behavior rather than the behavior itself.
- e) Use positive feedback.
- f) Use effective listening skills.

D. Use Responsive Listening Skills.

1. You must not only get the meaning of what is said, but let the speaker know that the message was accurately received.
 - a) Acknowledge that something has been heard.
 - (1) Use phrases like "I see" or "Go on."
 - b) This encourages speaker to provide more information.
2. You must accept what is being said.
 - a) This does not imply agreement with a speakers statements.
 - b) Accept that the words accurately reflect how the speaker thinks and feels.
 - c) By letting the speaker know you are emphatic, you create a better atmosphere for clear communication.
3. Paraphrase what has been said.
 - a) This activity lets the speaker know whether or not you truly understood what he/she said.
 - b) Also paraphrase the feelings you heard the speaker express.
 - (1) This activity lets the speaker know you understand her feelings and will help her get beyond

them, allowing you to direct her energies to problem solving.

4. Pause before responding.

- a) This allows time for the speaker to verify or clarify your paraphrasing.
- b) This allows time for you to think before speaking to clarify your own thoughts and its encoding into a message.
- c) Approach criticism from a positive position.
 - (1) Build the person's self-respect before discussing the problem.

LEARNING ACTIVITY:

- I. Understanding others behavior during conflict through self-discovery.
 - A. Taking criticism yourself (Goss and O'Hair)
 - B. A Family Fighting Inventory (Goss and O'Hair)

VI. Theatrical Case Study and Role Playing.

- A. Remember throughout these exercises to use not just the information gained through this unit, but information and skills learned throughout the course.
 - 1. All scenarios should be played out, discussed, and played out again.
 - 2. Alterations in the scenarios can and should be made based on discussions.

3. New scenarios can be discussed and played based on the experiences of others in the class.
- B. You are a Graduate Student directing a production of The Man Who Came to Dinner. Your costume designer, with whom you have worked before and with whom you have a mutual dislike, brings you a set of designs. She has dressed Sherry's secretary in a completely inappropriate manner. What do you do if:
1. The designer is a fellow Graduate student.
 2. The designer is a temporary faculty member.
 3. The designer is the head of the design program.
 4. You are a faculty member and the designer is a student.
 - a) The designer is another faculty member.
- C. You are directing a production of On Golden Pond. The actors playing the mother and the daughter do not get along. While they have always been civil in front of you, you have heard from reliable sources that they are not getting along offstage. What do you do?
1. What if the actor playing the daughter is one of your best friends?
 2. Your stage manager reports to you that the actor playing the mother, who has considerably less experience as an actor than your friend, has complained to the stage manager about the other

actress because she is giving her direction off-stage. What do you do?

3. During a slightly acrimonious scene between the two characters a prop is misplaced. One of the actors ad libs a line to ask for the prop back, and suddenly the two actors are tossing insults at each other and have clearly dropped out of character. What do you do?

D. You are directing The Beaux' Stratagem as your first production at your first Equity House. The actor playing Aimwell has been making outrageous demands throughout the rehearsal. During the first dress rehearsal he refuses to wear the costume designed for him. He demands a new costume be designed by someone from outside the theatre. The costume designer, who has been sitting in the house during his tirade, comes up to you and demands that the actor be replaced. What do you do?

E. Etc.

COMMUNICATION FOR THE DIRECTOR IN REHEARSAL

COURSE SYLLABUS

Fall 1993

Instructor: David R. Allen

Office: UT 202; Hours Monday through Friday 9:00 - 10:00 am.

Class Schedule: TBA

Text: None

Objectives of the Course:

During the course of, or by the end of, the semester the students will . . .

- Come to a better understanding of the Director's role.
- Advance her definition of the art of directing.
- Attain a better understanding of the directing process as a management process.
- Have strengthened her ability to use communication theory and skills as another directing tool.
- Gain an understanding of communication theory.
- Be able to apply the communication theories to her own directing process.
- Participate in discussions of rehearsal situations as related to communication.
- Gain an understanding of leadership.
- Gain an understanding of leadership traits and techniques.

- Develop and/or improve her leadership communication skills.
- Be able to apply knowledge of and skill at leadership to the directing process.
- Gain an understanding of conflict.
- Understand the principles of conflict management.
- Be able to apply the principles of conflict management to the directing process.
- Participate in communication and personality self-discovery activities.

Units of Study:

Unit 1: Introduction to Course and Communication Studies	3 weeks
Unit 2: Small Group Communication	4 weeks
Unit 3: Leadership	4 weeks
Unit 4. Conflict and Conflict Management	4 weeks

Course Requirements:

1) Attendance--After two unexcused absences, a student's earned semester grade will be reduced by one letter grade for each successive absence. The teacher has the discretion to consider tardiness as absence. Further, the teacher has the discretion to consider medical and special excuses.

2) Continual and effective class participation

Assignments and Grading:

Students will receive a grade of Pass or Fail at the end of the term. The grade will be determined by their attendance in class (see above), and the level of their participation in class. Due to the nature of the class, (e.g., one-hour Pass/Fail) there will be no assignments requiring work outside of class.

Special note:

Any student who, because of a disabling condition, may require some special arrangements in order to meet course requirements should contact the instructor as soon as possible so that the necessary accommodations can be made.

APPENDIX B

GROUP ROLE SELF-RATER

Directions:

Think about your behavior during participation in a group. Any kind of group, theatrical or otherwise, will suffice in whatever capacity you were involved. Then indicate below how frequently you engaged in each of the described behaviors. There are no right or wrong answers. The response which is most characteristic of your behavior is the best answer. Any other answer, which may be considered as more desirable or acceptable, will simply lead to misleading information. Please respond to all items on the scale. The alternative responses (1-5) are:

1	2	3	4	5
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

DO YOU . . .

1. Use standards to evaluate the group?
2. Provide positive feedback?
3. Interrupt?
4. Show warmth?
5. Reduce tension between members?
6. Ask questions about information?
7. Motivate the group towards a quality decision?

1	2	3	4	5
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

8. Keep records of the group's proceedings?
9. Clarify and/or extend the analysis of an issue?
10. Suggest standards to evaluate the group?
11. Argue the evidence and reasoning pertaining to issues?
12. Promote open channels of communication?
13. Argue for your "pet" ideas?
14. Conform to group ideas?
15. Propose procedures, ideas and/or changes?
16. Attempt to control others?
17. Manipulate others?
18. Act with insecurity?
19. Keep the group focused on and/or point out departures from goals?
20. Indicate a desire to be elsewhere (i.e., rather than in the group meeting)?
21. Oppose things unreasonably?
22. Attempt to have each party in a conflict gain something?
23. Feign confusion?
24. Present evidence relevant to the group problem?
25. Mediate conflicts?
26. State your position?
27. Perform routine tasks?
28. Attack the self-concepts of others to assert dominance?
29. Ask questions about the values guiding the group?

1	2	3	4	5
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

- 30. Want sympathy from the other members of the group?
- 31. Insert personal problems into the discussions hoping to gain insight?
- 32. Get people to function together and/or put information together?
- 33. Encourage participation by everyone?
- 34. Describe group processes to change/reinforce the group climate?
- 35. Call attention to yourself?
- 36. Act as a good listener?

NOTE: Instructions for scoring can be found on next page

Instructions for Scoring:

Group Task Oriented

Add up the scores for questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 19, 24,
26, 27, 29, & 32 Total: _____

Group Building and Maintenance Oriented

Add up the scores for questions 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12, 14, 22,
25, 33, 34, & 36 Total: _____

Individual Oriented

Add up the scores for questions 3, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21,
23, 28, 30, 31, & 35 Total: _____

The set of questions having the highest total represents the type of role you are most likely to play in a group. This does not mean that this role will be the only role you will play. Scores that are very close may indicate that you primarily play one type of role and are strongly adapted to another role as well.

APPENDIX C

FINAL TEST FOR COMMUNICATION FOR
THE DIRECTOR DURING REHEARSAL

1. How many people constitute a small group?
 - a. 2
 - b. 20-56
 - c. 3-12
 - d. None of the above

2. To be a group, individuals must be
 - a. independent.
 - b. strangers.
 - c. friends.
 - d. interdependent.

3. Norms
 - a. are rules established by the group.
 - b. govern acceptable behavior in the group.
 - c. enable prediction of behavior and reduce ambiguity.
 - d. all of the above.

4. Power is
 - a. the ability to control or influence another.
 - b. the same thing as authority.
 - c. unlimited.
 - d. solely a function of status.

5. Authority is

- a. the right of any leader.
- b. the control of the reinforcers.
- c. always based on coercive power.
- d. legitimate power as awarded by the group.

6. Appraisal systems are formed by the union of two processes:

- a. expert power and authority.
- b. observation and control.
- c. authority and judgment.
- d. observation and judgment.

7. Which of the following can be a type(s) of effective feedback?

- a. Positive Feedback
- b. Negative Feedback
- c. Neutral Feedback
- d. All of the above

8. Wohl's theory of Theatrical Phasic development has how many conflict phases?

- a. 1
- b. 2
- c. 3
- d. 4

9. The leader is the person who
- a. is the focus of group behaviors.
 - b. is able to lead the group to its goal.
 - c. is appointed by the group.
 - d. any or all of the above.
10. The authoritarian leader
- a. allows the group to make all the decisions.
 - b. sketches general approaches to goals.
 - c. dictates techniques and actions.
 - d. is none of the above.
11. The Laissez-faire leader
- a. allows the group to make all the decisions.
 - b. sketches general approaches to goals.
 - c. dictates techniques and actions.
 - d. is none of the above.
12. The Democratic leader
- a. allows the group to make all the decisions.
 - b. sketches general approaches to goals.
 - c. dictates techniques and actions.
 - d. is none of the above.

- 13 The Transformational approach to leadership
- a. is a type of social or economic exchange.
 - b. intends to develop followers into leaders.
 - c. motivates members to overcome self-interest for the sake of the group.
 - d. is b and c.
14. In the Perceived Conflict stage, participants
- a. begin to define the conflict.
 - b. are unaware that the conflict exists.
 - c. believe that the situation contains interdependence and/or incompatibility.
 - d. use structuring strategies.
15. Effective communicators use repetition.
- a. True b. False
16. Conflict does not have positive effects.
- a. True b. False
17. In the Felt Conflict stage, participants
- a. begin to define the conflict.
 - b. are unaware that the conflict exists.
 - c. believe that the situation contains interdependence and/or incompatibility.
 - d. use structuring strategies.

18. The conflict management strategy that reflects little cooperation or assertiveness is

- a. avoidance.
- b. collaboration.
- c. compromise.
- d. accommodation.

19. The conflict management strategy that reflects high levels of cooperativeness and little assertiveness is

- a. avoidance.
- b. collaboration.
- c. compromise.
- d. accommodation.

20. The conflict management strategy that reflects little cooperativeness and high levels of assertiveness is

- a. avoidance.
- b. collaboration.
- c. competition.
- d. accommodation.

21. The conflict management style that reflects high levels of both cooperativeness and assertiveness is

- a. avoidance.
- b. collaboration.
- c. compromise.
- d. accommodation.

22. When actively or responsively listening one should always respond before thinking.

- a. True
- b. False

23. When actively or responsively listening one should always agree with whatever the speaker says.

a. True b. False

24. When managing conflict one should always be aggressive.

a. True b. False

25. During a confrontation one should always focus on the past.

a. True b. False