

Performativity and Intercultural Drama Pedagogy: **Two Key Expressions from the German-language Literature on** **Drama Pedagogy in Foreign Language Teaching**

Peter HOWELL

Institute for Foreign Language Research and Education

Hiroshima University

It has been claimed that in the 1990s and the first decade of the present century, a conceptualization and systematization of a new field of research and practice that linked drama pedagogy and foreign language teaching was developed, and moreover that this development occurred to a large extent outside Great Britain, where the linkage had its origins. The claim is made explicitly in the entry on drama pedagogy in the *Handbuch Fremdsprachenunterricht* (“Handbook of Foreign Language Teaching”) by Dr. Manfred Schewe (2016, p. 355), a professor of German as a Foreign Language. Dr. Schewe alludes, somewhat immodestly but with considerable justification, to the importance of his own doctoral dissertation, presented to the University of Oldenburg and published in 1993 under the title, *Fremdsprache inszenieren: Zur Fundierung einer dramapädagogischen Lehr- und Lernpraxis* (“Staging Foreign Language: The Foundation of a Drama-Pedagogical Practice of Teaching and Learning”). Indeed the Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg in the federal German state of Lower Saxony is a location of considerable historical importance in the development of drama pedagogy, as it is also there that Professor Ingo Scheller (2014) developed his approach to “scenic interpretation” in the teaching of German literature. Schewe later became Professor of German at the University of Cork, and in 2007 founded the bilingual English-German journal *Scenario* as an online journal for articles in the area of performative teaching, learning and research.

However, if one conducts an online search for Manfred Schewe’s name in English-language professional TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) journals, resultant hits are few and far between, if existent at all. For example, a search in August 2020 for “Schewe” on the websites of *ELT Journal* and JALT’s *The Language Learner* produced zero hits. References to the German-language literature have tended to be sparse, even in specialized English-language writings on the subject of drama in language teaching. It is true that in one of the most recent English-language monographs (Piazolli, 2018), reference is made to the English-language works of Manfred Schewe and Susanne Even – although not to their research published in German – and so it is possible that awareness of the German-language literature may be growing among non-German speakers. The author hopes to foster and accelerate this awareness. The intention is certainly not to blame native English or Japanese teachers for their lack of awareness, because our differing native languages are at the same time a tool for and a barrier to communication. It is not reasonable to expect all teachers of English to be able to read academic German. What follows is a sparse and rudimentary outline of some of the rich German-language literature, summarized for the benefit of teachers of English in Japan who may not be familiar with it. Readers should bear in mind that the author is not claiming any expertise in drama pedagogy for himself and presents no ‘data’ of his own, but is rather hoping to offer some helpful

information as an interlingual mediator. Nor is a claim being made for exhaustivity in the review. Unfortunately, some books could not be accessed for reasons of cost, in particular those by Tselikas (1999) and Huber (2003). The article will be structured around two key expressions to be found in the German-language literature: *performativity* (“Performativität”) and *intercultural drama pedagogy* (“interkulturelle Dramapädagogik”).

PERFORMATIVITY (“PERFORMATIVITÄT”)

Performativity in Classroom Process Drama

Manfred Schewe’s (2011) fundamental belief is that foreign language teaching can benefit greatly by adapting concepts from theatre and drama pedagogy, in particular the notion of performativity. This should not be misunderstood as implying simply that it is the teacher’s role to be dynamic, charismatic and entertain the students. Rather it implies that lessons themselves can involve an aspect of performance jointly constructed by both teachers and students. Schewe’s claim is that the use of process-drama techniques is enabling of a more fully communicative approach to language teaching, an approach that engages the whole person rather than just mental cognition. By process drama is meant the use of performative techniques to facilitate learning, and with a focus on the participants rather than on a product or an audience. Process drama is to be embraced because classroom activities need to take into account the use of body, voice and space, so that students learn not just with the ‘head’, but also, following the humanistic, holistic tradition of Pestalozzi, with ‘heart, hand and foot’. Interestingly, Schewe’s commitment to drama pedagogy grew out of his experience as a native-speaker teacher of conversation classes. He (Schewe, 1993, p. 20) criticizes his own classes as *konzeptloser sprachpraktischer Unterricht* (“practical language teaching lacking in any [theoretical] concept”). He is also critical of a ‘dramatic deficit’ in the conventional use of dialogues in language textbooks (Schewe, 1993, p. 137):

Dialoge erfüllen in den Lehrbüchern entweder eine Alibifunktion für grammatische Übungen [...] oder sind meist – wie in den kommunikativ angelegten Lehrwerken – das Ausgangsmaterial für Übungen zum Lesen, Hörverstehen, Schreiben und Sprechen (“Dialogues in textbooks serve either as an alibi for grammar exercises or – as in communication-oriented textbooks – as a starting point for exercises in reading, listening, writing and speaking”).

A similar criticism of textbook dialogues is made by Franziska Elis, who claims that they tend not to be embedded in meaningful and motivating contexts, and therefore do not prepare learners for language use outside the classroom. A teacher simply saying “now act out the dialogue” is not an example of true drama pedagogy (Elis, 2015, p. 8).

Instead of merely memorizing dialogues, Schewe (1993, p. 87) takes theoretical inspiration from British innovators in general drama education to conceptualize language classes as including directed scenic improvisation (“gestaltete szenische Improvisation”). He draws a distinction between large and small forms of drama-pedagogical approaches: theatrical approaches in which a final product is developed for an outside audience are included in the category of large forms, whereas process drama and improvisational approaches are included in the category of small forms (Schewe, 2016, p. 356). It is the multiplicity of smaller forms with which most of the German-language literature is concerned. The present author uses film dialogues in

his teaching (Howell, 2015, 2016) and, bearing that in mind, three ‘small-form’ techniques can be mentioned that seem to have the potential for relatively easy adoption into classes using movies. These techniques are:

- *Standbilder* (“tableaux or frozen images”),
- *Heißer Stuhl* (“hot seat”)
- *Chorsprechen* (“choral speaking”).

A *Standbild* is defined by Schewe (1993, p. 236) as an expressive visual tableau in which a small group of students freeze with a certain body language — pose, proximity, facial expression, gesture, etc. (Schewe, 1993, p. 236). They are encouraged by the teacher to give a lot of thought to the details of their body language. Although the group tableaux are themselves silent, other class members are then invited to offer commentary and build up an interpretation of what they see. Tableaux can represent both actions as well as attitudes between people. In Schewe’s example from his own practice, international students in Germany were asked to make tableaux representing what image Germany had for them as foreigners residing in the country. A possible adaptation for a movie-based lesson in Japan would be to use the technique as a pre-viewing activity: give pairs or small groups of students a Japanese translation of the dialogue from a dramatic scene and ask them to represent it visually in a tableau. As well as offering an opportunity for students to use their creativity, curiosity would be aroused for viewing the actual scene in the film, and comprehension of the input would be enhanced.

The technique of *hot seating* has been explained clearly by Susanne Even (2011a). In this technique, insight into a fictional character is constructed by having a volunteer answer questions from the class, not as themselves but in-role. The character may be one newly created in the class or alternatively a character in a work of fiction or film. One aim of this kind of activity is that participants will feel fictionally protected (“fiktiv geschützt”). The fictionality of the character helps to reduce pressure and anxiety about being observed and evaluated by a group of other participants, with the performative pretence that it is the character who is speaking, not the learner him- or herself. In hot seating, a volunteer sits in the middle of the class in character and answers questions posed by other class participants. Even points out the advantages of multiple hot seating in which three people sit either beside each other or with their backs to each other in a star-shaped configuration. This takes pressure off the participants in the hot seat, allowing them the option of occasionally remaining silent, and also helps them develop their turn-taking skills in a more complex group dynamic.

The technique of choral speaking does not necessarily require linguistic creativity and is, quite literally, an ancient practice. Schiffler (2012, p. 48) links it with the medieval practice of *Mönchgesang* (“monks’ singing”) in which monks would memorize Latin prayers by reciting them in choral unison while walking in a circle. For Schiffler, the idea of movement is the key aspect of the technique, and he recommends that gestures (suggested by the teacher) accompany the oral output to reinforce the meaning of the language being recited. There is empirical evidence that movement and gesture promote better vocabulary learning in modern-day teaching of Latin. Hille et al. (2010) report the results of an experimental intervention in a *Gymnasium* (academically-oriented secondary school) in Munich, in which comparable classes from three different year-levels were selected for 10-minute experimental and non-experimental vocabulary teaching. All the classes were taught the same 20 vocabulary items, using either traditional chalk-and-talk methods or ‘scenic learning’ in which repetition of the words was combined with the use of movement and gestures. The

students who received ‘scenic learning’ obtained higher scores in post-tests, and what was particularly noticeable was that the outperformance in vocabulary memorization increased with the passage of time. In other words, movement and gesture seemed particularly helpful in counteracting forgetting vocabulary.

An interesting application of process drama to the learning of German grammar is offered by Schewe’s doctoral student, Susanne Even (2003), who published her dissertation under the title *Drama Grammatik* (“Drama Grammar”). Her aim was to offer holistic grammar instruction that systematically combined cognitive learning thinking with play, *studiosus cognens* with *studiosus ludens* (Even, 2011b). The dissertation describes how Even used drama pedagogical methods, mostly at the University of Leicester, to construct two substantial instructional units, one focusing on word classes and the other on the *Konjunktiv II* (“the second subjunctive”). For example, in the course of lessons for the second subjunctive, she attempted to have students experience communicatively and ludically how that particular grammatical structure is used in fostering politeness, making hypothetical comparisons, making conditional sentences, and expressing irrealis wishes. The course combined systematicity with continuity, as two 15-person groups of Leicester students were taught using weekly double-period drama activities over the course of an academic year from October 1999 to May 2000, with each double-period being divided into phases of drama-grammatical activities such as sensitizing, contextualizing, structuring, staging, presenting, and reflecting. Even’s hope was that, although quantitatively fewer areas of grammar could be covered, they could be processed qualitatively by students in a more intensive way than in traditional approaches to grammar teaching. To gain insight into how students reacted to this novel kind of instruction, Even conducted interviews with the participants after the completion of the course, and they appeared to have found the experience of drama grammar fun and interesting. Comments such as the following were obtained that confirmed that the hoped-for more intensive learning had been achieved (Even, 2003, p. 251):

[...] rather than doing, covering everything, we’ve done a few things in detail but we’re going to remember them. I mean I’ve learnt adjective endings so many times, and I still don’t know them. Whereas I think the way we’ve done it [in the dramagrammar class], it’s going to stick in our minds more.

Of course, it is unlikely that all participants found the approach congenial, and indeed the adjective “strange” is to be found more than once in the feedback transcripts. But although Even does not adduce numerical evidence as to the ‘effectiveness’ of process grammar for teaching grammar, she does show that it is at least possible and feasible to combine progressive pedagogical methods with traditional linguistic concerns such as grammar.

Performativity in the Wider Culture of Teaching and Learning

Beyond a knowledge of process drama as part of a methodological toolkit, Schewe and colleagues (Jogschies, Schewe, & Stoßver-Blahak, 2018, p. 47) advocate for a wider use of drama pedagogy in the overall culture of teaching and learning foreign languages:

Eine performative Lehr-, Lern- und Forschungskultur kann überall dort entstehen, wo die Fachwissenschaft bzw. Fachdidaktik in einen konstruktiven Dialog mit den performativen Künsten eintritt (“A performative culture of teaching, learning and research can come into being in any place the subject and pedagogical disciplines engage in a constructive dialogue with the performative arts”).

Thus, an important area for this wider culture of performativity is teacher education which, in Germany as in many countries, tends to be divided into a theory-heavy stage provided by universities and a more practical school-based stage. The university-based stage is sometimes seen as overly abstract, removed from practical concerns, and ultimately of limited use (Haack, 2018, pp. 2-3). It was partly to overcome this theory-practice divide that Ingo Scheller developed his *scenic learning* concept of drama pedagogy at Oldenburg, with the aim of facilitating a single-stage approach to teacher education that integrated theory and practice (Scheller, 2008). Schewe (1993, p. 424-429) initially proposed some tentative considerations (“vortastende Überlegungen”) about reforming teacher education, repeating his call eight years later for a balance between the sciences and the arts (Schewe, 2001). In 2018, in the article referenced above (Jogschies et. al., 2018, p. 49), he and his colleagues were still citing the need for convincing performative concepts and training programs (“überzeugende performative Konzepte und Trainingsprogramme”). It might seem as if little progress has been made. However, Sambanis (2016) has reported the introduction of drama pedagogy into teacher education in German universities such as the Free University of Berlin, and Haack (2018) has documented in considerable detail in his Ph.D. dissertation developments at the University of Göttingen. Haack advances the claim that drama pedagogy is not merely important in teacher education programs because it is an integral part of a repertoire of communicative teaching methods; it also offers a process which helps start teachers on the path to creating their own individual identity as professionals (Haack, 2018).

Haack gave three types of intensive courses for a total of 54 would-be teachers at the University of Göttingen, working on the project over a period of six years from 2009 to 2015. One seminar type involved students in planning and carrying out a theatre project for pupils in grades 4-6, while a second was centred on a drama-pedagogical holiday camp with teenagers. The third was not focused on language teaching directly, and had more to do with developing the expertise and skills of project planning and managing groups. The purpose of the courses was not simply to introduce drama techniques which students could then use when they became teachers, but also to provide an experience that would initiate a career-long reflection upon their professional selves and identities. In order to gain an insight into whether this goal was achieved, Haack carried out an extensive range of qualitative investigations, including questionnaires, group interviews, and observation videos and protocols. One student did report a negative reaction to the seminars, in part influenced by her own negative experience of drama pedagogy in school. But, from the overall feedback and documentation, Haack concludes that the drama-pedagogical seminars delivered long-term benefits for the students, particularly in the areas of openness, creativity, spontaneity, and flexibility. He believes that the active participation of students in co-creating the seminars fostered teamwork and self-evaluation skills, as well as incidentally improving their oral communication ability in the foreign language.

As mentioned above, the performativity movement goes beyond simply an advocacy for process drama as an effective teaching method. It also envisions a certain culture of learning and research based on beliefs and values which are inevitably political. The philosophy of performativity tends to be anti-elitist.

For example, Scheller developed his ideas of experience-based German literature classes while working in a ‘non-academic’ secondary school in Germany (“Hauptschule”) and after noticing how his attempts to simply transmit ‘high culture’ to predominantly working-class young students met with alienation and failure (Scheller, 1987). One of the founders of drama pedagogy, whom Scheller referenced, was the Brazilian activist Augusto Boal. Boal, a victim of abduction and torture by the military regime in Brazil in the 1970s, used drama as a means of resistance to and protest against political elitism and its economic counterpart of poverty for the majority of the population. Performativity entails a democratic educational philosophy that devalues hierarchies and values participation. Individual meaning is prioritized over individual achievement. Barbara Schmenk (2004, pp. 7-8), writing in English, has highlighted the clash of cultures between a rhetoric of output-oriented standards, including the Common European Framework, which tends to view language learning “in terms of scaled competences and strategic behaviours”, and drama pedagogy which tends to view language learning as “a very personal process that involves aesthetic, emotional and intercultural dimensions and that ought to be considered an identity-related phenomenon”. For Schmenk (2019, p. 161), drama pedagogy is not compatible with the neoliberal discourse of outcomes and accountability:

Trying to make the arts and any creative endeavour accountable is an attempt at squaring the circle, and is futile if one truly wants to foster artistic, aesthetic dimensions of education and language learning in particular.

It is indeed noticeable that most of the literature on drama pedagogy in foreign language teaching is discourse- rather than data-driven, and it is therefore to be hoped that drama advocates will remain open to critique and evaluation from more conventional practitioners and other sceptics. In fact, ideology notwithstanding, major figures such as Schewe and Even have systemically collected and documented learner feedback using qualitative methods. And there has been at least one recent quantitative study involving 60 subjects: Georgina Dragović (2019) carried out an interventional study with a control group in German-language classes in two primary schools in Serbia. Test scores and other quantitative data yielded partially conflicting evidence. The impressive array of data is too extensive to be adequately discussed in this short report, but overall an advantage in terms of both motivation and linguistic progress was claimed for drama pedagogy over conventional textbook-only teaching.

INTERCULTURAL DRAMA PEDAGOGY (“INTERKULTURELLE DRAMAPÄDAGOGIK”)

Studying a foreign language has often been associated with acquiring a knowledge of the canonical literature of the language. In German-speaking countries it was also thought important to acquire *country knowledge* (“Landeskunde”), that is to say knowledge about the history, geography, social institutions, etc. of the nations in which the language is spoken. In recent decades, and in line with trends towards globalization, there has developed a concern for knowledge and skills that are not merely cultural, but also *intercultural*. In Berlin for example, intercultural behavioural ability (“interkulturelle Handlungsfähigkeit”) is an explicit goal in the curricular goals for English language teaching (Wedel, 2010, p. 19). The goal of foreign language teaching is not just linguistic communicative competence, but intercultural communicative competence.

There is an explicit aim to develop positive feelings and open attitudes towards people from other linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, this is considered to entail a critical view of one's one history and culture, and indeed a movement away from a notion of *one culture – one nation* that tends to see cultures as monolithic and unchanging, and otherness as “a negation of one's national and cultural identity” (Bouchard, 2017, p. 35, 236).

Benedikt Kessler's 2008 monograph builds on Michael Byram's knowledge-skills-attitudes model to posit four dimensions of intercultural competence: affective, cognitive, procedural, linguistic; and claims that intercultural learning has a “shared mission” with drama pedagogy. They both share a turning away from the sole objective of transmitting linguistic-cognitive competence and a turning towards the more holistic goals mentioned above. For Kessler (2008, p. 51) the intercultural goals of empathy for and identification with others are also those of drama pedagogy:

Durch das Hineindenken in und das Praktizieren von verschiedenen Rollen schult Dramapädagogik somit besonders intensiv und nachhaltig die Identifikationsfähigkeit und Empathiefähigkeit der Lernenden mit fremden und unbekannten (kulturellen) Sicht- und Handlungsweisen (“Through the thinking-into and practicing of different roles, drama pedagogy develops particularly intensively and durably the capacity for identification and the capacity for empathy with foreign and unknown (cultural) ways of seeing and acting”).

The book describes an intercultural drama pedagogy project which was conducted with 30 students from differing cultural backgrounds in an academic high school (“Gymnasium”) in Frankfurt-am-Rhein, using as a textual basis the short story *A Pair of Jeans* by Qaisra Shahraz. This is a story dealing with cultural clashes within the Pakistani immigrant community in the United Kingdom. The appendices to the book list a selection of activities (“Konventionen”) originally disseminated in general English-language drama education. For illustrative purposes, I have listed in the following tables speaking and writing activities that also might be applicable to my own teaching in the future.

TABLE 1. Five Types of Speaking Activities from Kessler's Intercultural Drama Pedagogy

Name of Activity Type	Description of Activity Type
<i>Improvisation</i>	Students make up a scene with no planning in advance.
<i>Collective character</i>	One character from the book is played by a group of students.
<i>Re-enactments</i>	A scene from the book is re-enacted.
<i>Teacher-in-Role</i>	The teacher plays the part of a character in the book.
<i>Thought tracking</i>	The inner thought world of a character is recounted by a student or group of students.

TABLE 2. Five Types of Writing Activity from Kessler’s Intercultural Drama Pedagogy

Name of Activity Type	Description of Activity Type
<i>Circle of Life</i>	Students write how they imagine a character’s life under categories such as home, family, work, etc.
<i>Group Poem</i>	Groups of students write a collective poem on the basis of one given word.
<i>Iceberg</i>	The teacher draws an iceberg on the board. Students write the said and the unsaid from a dialogue in the parts of the iceberg above and under the water.
<i>Letter Writing in Role</i>	Students write a letter from the perspective of a character.
<i>Unwritten Scene</i>	Students write a scene which is not present in the book, for example an alternative ending.

Kessler planned and implemented four 90-minute instructional sessions using these and other techniques with the story as a textual basis. The end of each session was comprised of a reflection stage in which students were able to give voice to what they had learned during the lesson. According to Kessler, mostly positive comments were received; students appeared to be stimulated to think about their own culture and what the word *culture* actually meant. In addition, the regular classroom teacher, who observed the sessions, reported being very impressed with the students’ positive participation in the activities. Kessler also solicited feedback from students in the form of a 10-item questionnaire. He found the comments he received gratifying, confirming for him the students’ positive evaluation of the variety of drama activities, and the fact that they were given the opportunity to use English in an imaginative and creative way. They also felt their ability to mediate between cultures (“interkulturelle Mediationsfähigkeit”) had improved: 26 out of 30 students affirmed a positive effect of the sessions in this regard. While acknowledging such a project cannot constitute evidence that intercultural competence is developed by limited exposure to drama pedagogy, he claims the students did appreciate the intercultural *potential* of drama pedagogic techniques. Kessler’s only disappointment was with what he perceived as the limited perception of the role of the body in intercultural communication, with only slightly more than half the students indicating that their awareness of non-verbal factors had increased.

A study not dissimilar to Kessler’s was conducted by Anja Jäger in the German federal state of Baden-Württemberg (Jäger, 2011) between 2007 and 2008. Jäger aimed to find out if using drama pedagogy with a text from youth literature (*Bend It Like Beckham* by Narinder Dhani) could foster intercultural communicative competence in 87 high-school students of English. Interestingly, as with Kessler’s book choice, the setting features an immigrant community in the U.K., in this case the Indian community. Jäger points out (p. 119) that role-playing in class has often not gone beyond memorized reading-aloud, without any truly drama-pedagogic preparation, staging, or reflection. In her project she therefore adopted a range of scenic tasks (“Szenische Aufgaben”) drawing on her own experience as well as published pedagogical literature, including the writings of Ingo Scheller and Manfred Schewe. The nine types of activity she used are listed below in Table 3.

TABLE 3. Nine Types of Drama Activity from Jäger’s Intercultural Drama Pedagogy

Name of Activity Types	Description of Activity Type
<i>Warm-up</i>	The teacher directs a range of physical and vocal exercises.
<i>Developing an atmosphere</i>	The teacher describes a fictional environment, students decide on and procure costumes and props, conduct in-character interviews.
<i>Characterizing and acting</i>	Students write role biographies and prepare role-plays to develop non-superficial characters.
<i>Doubling</i>	A character in a drama activity is played by two actors (alternating between students is signalled by a tap on the shoulder).
<i>Scenic interpretation of a text extract</i>	Students express their ideas and feelings about prose extracts in scenic form, followed by reflection and discussion.
<i>Staging of texts written by students</i>	Students write and perform speculative, alternative versions of dialogue or plot.
<i>Improvisation</i>	The basic background of a scene is given to students, who perform it without a script.
<i>Tableaux (building statues)</i>	An expressive visual tableau in which students freeze with a certain body language - pose, proximity, gesture, facial expression, etc.
<i>Speech Theatre</i>	The teacher directs choral speaking of prose or poetry to produce a certain atmosphere or effect.

The study was conducted in consecutive cycles at three different schools, which allowed for activities to be improved over the course of the whole project. For example, the third cycle placed more emphasis on improvisation as role-plays had tended to be merely read rather than acted in the first and second cycles. The project was evaluated using classroom observations, interviews and questionnaires, and Jäger concludes that the students developed their intercultural competence in terms of attitudes, knowledge, skills, and critical awareness.

Kessler’s and Jäger’s intercultural drama projects were both literature-based. But in her review of Jäger’s book, Küppers expresses some reservation about intercultural drama pedagogy being based on readings of overlong passages of literature. Instead, she suggests extracting “critical incidents” from stories (Küppers, 2012, p. 5). She and her colleagues (Küppers, Trautman & Wolf, 2009) had earlier proposed the use of fictional critical-incident situations in which intercultural conflicts were likely to arise. In this variation of drama pedagogy, materials describing the situation are provided to students, who are asked to use drama techniques to role-play and reflect on the conflict. A fictional example given by the authors is an overly ‘direct’ German boy interacting with an English homestay mother who is more used to indirect ways of expressing negative opinions. It is suggested that this kind of activity would be particularly appropriate before student trips abroad. Unlike Küppers, whose approach is still situated in the subject of English as a Foreign Language, Wedel and Hachemer (2016, p. 82) propose that, rather than drama methods being imported into the teaching of foreign languages, intercultural communicative competence might well be developed by importing other languages into the already existent subject of mother tongue drama (“Darstellendes Spiel”):

Die Kombination von Fremdsprachenunterricht mit Theater als Fach (nicht nur als Methode) weist weit über das hinaus, was beim Einsatz von szenischem Spiel im Fremdsprachenunterricht möglich ist (“The combination of foreign language teaching with theatre as a subject goes far beyond what is possible with the use of scenic play in foreign language teaching”) (Wedel and Hachemer, 2016, p. 82).

Bilingual classes have tended to be offered in Germany in other subjects such as sport, art, and music, and Wedel and Hachemer’s concept is not as yet based on any actually implemented project, as Kessler’s and Jäger’s are. Wedel and Hachemer’s ideas are conceptual and analytical in nature, rather than descriptive, and represent, in their own words, *a vision of the future* (“eine Zukunftsvision”).

CONCLUSIONS

This article has presented an outline in English of writing in the German language on the use of drama pedagogy in foreign language teaching. The author believes this has several useful insights for English teachers in Japan. First, even from a purely methodological point of view, the abundance of techniques described in the literature could prove stimulating for the Japanese educational environment, which is still dominated by washback from written tests of vocabulary and grammatical structure. Second, a performative approach to teaching, learning and research would provide a potential pathway to reintegrating literature teaching, and the arts in general, with language teaching. Third, the notion of intercultural drama pedagogy offers a route to intercultural communicative ability for Japanese students that is a better fit with an interconnected global world than notions of exchange based on essentialist and nationalistic perspectives. It is perhaps also worthwhile pointing out that the intercultural drama projects mentioned in this article were not carried out by L1 teachers of English. This is a reminder that the use of drama in language teaching is not the prerogative of or limited to ‘native speaker’ teachers.

REFERENCES

- Bouchard, J. (2017). *Ideology, Agency, and Intercultural Competence: A Stratified Look into EFL Education in Japan*. Singapore: Springer.
- Dragović, G. (2019). *Fremdsprachenunterricht (ent-) dramatisieren: Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Effizienz des dramapädagogischen Ansatzes im schulischen DaF-Unterricht mit speziellem Fokus auf Grammatik* (“(De)dramatizing Foreign Language Teaching: An Empirical Study on the Efficiency of Drama-Based Pedagogy in German as a Foreign Language (GFL) Teaching in Regular Schools with a Special Focus on Grammar”). Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation presented to the University of Fribourg. Retrieved on September 9th, 2020 from <http://doc.rero.ch/record/327181>
- Elis, F. (2015). Mit dramapädagogischen Methoden sprachliche und kommunikative Kompetenzen fördern (“Developing Linguistic and Communicative Competences with Drama-Pedagogical Methods”). In W. Hallet & C. Surkamp. *Dramadidaktik und Dramapädagogik im Fremdsprachenunterricht* (“Teaching of Drama and Drama Pedagogy in Foreign Language Teaching”) (pp. 89 – 115). Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Even, S. (2003). *Drama Grammatik: Dramapädagogische Ansätze für den Grammatikunterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (“Drama Grammar: Drama-Pedagogical Approaches for Grammar Teaching in

- German as a Foreign Language"). Munich: Iudicium.
- Even, S. (2011a). Multiple Hotseating. *Scenario* (2), 113-114.
- Even, S. (2011b) *Studiosus cognens und studiosus ludens* – Grammatik inszenieren. In A. Küppers, T. Schmidt, and M. Walter (eds.) *Inszenierungen im Fremdsprachenunterricht* ("Stagings in Foreign Language Teaching") (pp. 68-79). Braunschweig: Diesterweg.
- Haack, A. (2018). *Dramapädagogik, Selbstkompetenz und Professionalisierung: Performative Identitätsarbeit im Lehramtsstudium Englisch* ("Drama Pedagogy, Self-Competence, and Professionalization: Performative Identity Work in the Course of Study to be an English Teacher"). Wiesbaden: J.B. Metzler.
- Hille, K., Vogt, K., Fritz, M. and Sambanis, M. (2010). Szenisches Lernen im Fremdsprachenunterricht: die Evaluation eines Schulversuchs ("Scenic Learning in Foreign Language Teaching: Evaluation of a School Experiment"). *Diskurs Kindheits- und Jugendforschung*, 5 (3), 337-350.
- Howell, P. (2015) Using Movies and their Novelizations in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. *Hiroshima Studies in Language and Language Education* 18, 213-228.
- Howell, P. (2016) Reflections on the Three-Block-Movie-English Method: Adjustment and Supplementa-tion. *Hiroshima Studies in Language and Language Education* 19, 141-150.
- Huber, R. (2003). *Im Haus der Sprache wohnen: Wahrnehmung und Theater im Fremdsprachenunterricht* ("Living in the House of Language: Perception and Theatre in Foreign Language Teaching"). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jäger, A. (2011). *Kultur Szenisch Erfahren: Interkulturelles Lernen mit Jugendliteratur und szenischen Aufgaben im Fremdsprachenunterricht* ("Experiencing Culture Scenically: Intercultural Learning with Youth Literature and Scenic Tasks in Foreign Language Learning"). Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.
- Jogschies, B., Schewe M., and Sto-ver-Blahak, A. (2018). Empfehlungen zur Förderung einer performativen Lehr-, Lern- und Forschungskultur an Hochschulen ("Recommendations for the Promotion of a Performative Culture of Teaching, Learning and Research in Universities"). *Scenario* (2), pp. 47-51.
- Kessler, B. (2008). *Interkulturelle Dramapädagogik: Dramatische Arbeit als Vehikel des interkulturellen Lernens im Fremdsprachenunterricht* ("Intercultural Drama Pedagogy: Dramatical Work as a Vehicle for Intercultural Learning in Foreign Language Teaching"). Frankfurt-am-Main: Peter Lang.
- Küppers, A., Trautman, M. and Wolf, T. (2009). Interkulturelle Konflikte inszenieren mit critical incidents ("Staging Intercultural Conflicts Using Critical Incidents"). *Praxis Englisch* (5), pp. 18-22.
- Küppers, A. (2012). Cultural learning through drama tasks: An action research approach. *Scenario*, (1), 1-7.
- Piazolli, E. (2018). *Embodying Language in Action: The Artistry of Process Drama in Second Language Education*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sambanis, M. (2016). Dramapädagogik im Fremdsprachenunterricht – Überlegungen aus didaktischer und neurowissenschaftlicher Sicht ("Drama Activities in the Foreign Language Classroom – Considerations from a Didactic-Neuroscientific Perspective"). In Even, S. und Schewe, M. (Eds.) *Performatives Lehren Lernen Forschen* ("Performative Teaching Learning Research"). Berlin: Schibri-Verlag.
- Scheller, I. (1987). *Erfahrungsbezogener Unterricht* ("Experience-Based Teaching"). Frankfurt-am-Main: Scriptor.
- Scheller, I. (2008). Literatur und szenisches Lernen: lebensgeschichtliche Erfahrungen, die mich zur Szenischen Interpretation gebracht haben ("Literature and Scenic Learning: Autobiographical Experiences

that have brought me to Scenic Interpretation”). Retrieved on August 27th, 2020 from <https://www.ingo-scheller.de/autobiografie/literatur-und-szenisches-lernen/>

- Scheller, I. (2014). *Szenische Interpretation: Theorie und Praxis eines handlungs- und erfahrungsbezogenen Literaturunterrichts in Sekundarstufe I und II* (“Scenic Interpretation: Theory and Practice of an Action- and Experience-based Literature Teaching in Secondary Stages I and II”). Seelze: Klett / Kallmeyer.
- Schewe, M. (1993). *Fremdsprache inszenieren: Zur Fundierung einer dramapädagogischen Lehr- und Lernpraxis* (“Staging Foreign Languages: The Foundation of a Dramapedagogical Teaching and Learning Practice”). Oldenburg: Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg.
- Schewe, M. (2001). Zukunftsgemäße Deutschlehrerausbildung – einige Assoziationen, Thesen, offene Fragen und Reformvorschläge (Future-appropriate Education of German Teachers – some Associations, Theses, Open Questions, and Suggestions for Reform”). *Gfl-Journal* (2), pp. 20-40.
- Schewe, M. (2011). Die Welt auch im fremdsprachlichen Unterricht immer wieder neu verzaubern – Plädoyer für eine performative Lehr- und Lernkultur (“The Continual Enchantment of the World in Foreign Language Teaching Too – A Plea for a Performative Culture of Teaching and Learning”). In A. Küppers, T. Schmidt, and M. Walter (eds.) *Inszenierungen im Fremdsprachenunterricht* (“Stagings in Foreign Language Teaching”) (pp. 20-31). Braunschweig: Diesterweg.
- Schewe, M. (2016). Dramapädagogische Ansätze [“Dramapedagogical Approaches”]. In E. Burwitz-Melzer, G. Mehlhorn, C. Riemer., K-R Bausch, and H-J. Krumm (Eds.) *Handbuch Fremdsprachenunterricht: 6. Auflage* (“Handbook of Foreign Language Teaching: 6th edition”) (pp. 354-358). Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Schiffler, L. (2012). *Effektiver Fremdsprachenunterricht: Bewegung – Visualisierung – Entspannung* (“Effective Foreign Language Teaching: Movement – Visualization – Relaxation”). Tübingen: Narr.
- Schmenk, B. (2004). Drama in the Margins? The Common European Framework of Reference and its Implications for Drama Pedagogy in the Foreign Language Classroom. *Gfl-Journal*, (1), pp. 7-23.
- Schmenk, B. (2019). Drama for neoliberals. In S. Even, D. Miladonovic, and B. Schmenk (Eds.). *Performative Zugänge in der Sprach-, Literatur- und Kulturdidaktik* (“Performative Paths in Teaching Language, Literature, and Culture”) (pp. 151-164). Tübingen: Narr.
- Tselikas, E. (1999). *Dramapädagogik im Sprachunterricht* (“Drama Pedagogy in Language Teaching”). Zürich: Orell Fuessli.
- Wedel, H. (2010). Alles auf den Kopf stellen: Zur besonderen Qualität interkulturellen Lernens im bilingualen Sachfachunterricht, ‘Darstellendes Spiel’ (“Turning Everything Upside Down: On the Special Quality of Intercultural Learning in Drama as a Bilingual School Subject”). *Scenario* (1), pp. 18-34.
- Wedel, H. and Hachemer, M. (2016). Sprachen spielerisch erproben, Theater interkulturell erleben: Darstellendes Spiel als Fach der Mehrsprachigkeit (“Probing Languages Playfully, Experiencing Theatre Interculturally: Drama as a Multilingual Subject”). *interjuli: Internationale Kinder- und Jugendliteraturforschung*, (1), pp. 72-86.

ABSTRACT

***Performativity and Intercultural Drama Pedagogy:* Two Key Expressions from the German-language Literature on Drama Pedagogy in Foreign Language Teaching**

Peter Howell

Institute for Foreign Language Teaching and Research

Hiroshima University

This article summarizes recent German-language writings about the use of drama pedagogy in foreign language teaching focusing on two key expressions, *performativity* and *intercultural drama pedagogy*. The work of Professor Manfred Schewe is highlighted, in particular his advocacy of drama pedagogy as a wide-ranging approach to teaching, learning, and research that goes beyond just classroom methodology. An outline is also given of recent German doctoral projects integrating the use of literary texts with drama activities aimed at developing intercultural communicative competence in high school learners of English.

要 約

パフォーマティヴィティ（遂行性）と異文化演劇教授 — 外国語教育における演劇教授に関するドイツ語文献にみる二つの重要語 —

ピーター・ハウエル

広島大学外国語教育研究センター

本稿は、外国語教育における演劇教授の使用に関わる二つの重要語、つまり「パフォーマティヴィティ（遂行性）」と「異文化演劇教授」を扱った、近年のドイツ語文献をまとめ、報告しようとするものである。具体的には、Manfred Schewe 教授の文献を扱い、とりわけ、教授や学びはもとより、教室内での教授を超えた研究への幅広いアプローチとしての演劇教授の推奨に焦点をあてている。さらに、高等学校英語学習者の異文化コミュニケーション能力の伸長を目指した文学テキストの使用と演劇活動の統合を扱った、近年のドイツにおける博士課程研究のいくつかを約言している。