

Rehearsing the Revolution: Language Teaching and the Theatre of the Oppressed

Edward HAIG

Introduction

It has been over twenty years since the original publication of *Theatre of the Oppressed*, the radical polemic in which Brazilian theatre activist Augusto Boal both deconstructed western aesthetic philosophy since Aristotle and explicated his own system of political theatre.¹ Influenced by Paulo Freire's dialogic philosophy of education (*Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 1970), Boal's vision is embodied in dramatic techniques that activate passive spectators to become 'spect-actors' — engaged participants rehearsing strategies for personal and social change. Although founded in theatrical exploration, the techniques, all based on transitive learning² and collective empowerment, are not limited to the stage; educators, political activists, therapists and social workers devoted to critical thought and action have adapted the work to address issues ranging from racism and sexism to loneliness and political impotence. Having won acclaim for its social relevance and adaptability, the work had entered global circulation as a composite system known as Theatre of the Oppressed (TO). In this paper I shall discuss TO in relation to the teaching of English as a foreign language (EFL), with particular reference to Japan. Since Boal's work seems to be virtually unknown amongst EFL teachers in this country I will begin with a brief introduction to his life and work. I will then proceed from an examination of TO to argue for its adoption as a uniquely valuable system of EFL drama teaching.

Background to Boal

Augusto Boal began developing the aesthetic philosophy that led to Theatre of the Oppressed while director of the Arena Theatre in São Paulo during the 50s and 60s. While most companies in Brazil in the 1950s modeled themselves on European theatre, Boal and his collaborators wanted to create a theatre founded on local rather than foreign experience and sensibilities. In the most innovative of Arena's stages of development, Boal and his collaborators created a new genre called the 'Joker System'. It was characterized by several techniques that challenged the theatrical conventions of Brazilian realism. These techniques included the blurring of fact and fiction, use of standard ritual masks to signify social habits, shifting of roles within the play so that all actors played all characters, and the introduction of the 'Joker' as a link between audience and actors.

In 1964 Brazil experienced a military coup followed by an even more repressive one in 1968. Boal was working to foster democracy through both theatrical work and political activism, seeking socio-dramatic means of collectively surviving or even challenging the harsh conditions under dictatorship. It was while touring an agit-prop production in northern Brazil for peasants and workers that Boal recognized that the play's propagandistic style was revolutionary only in theory; the mainly white middle-class actors were prescribing behaviour for peasants in situations they had not themselves experienced. Boal's response to this was to design a new format — Forum Theatre — that gave spectators themselves the opportunity to discover their own solutions to their collective problems. Through storytelling techniques, Boal worked with groups to create a scene in which a protagonist is failing to achieve what she needs or desires. Audience members stop the dramatic action at any moment they feel the protagonist has an option she is not exercising. They then physically replace the protagonist in the scene and improvise their alternative action, thus rehearsing for social change.

In 1971, having continued to work in opposition to the military regime, Boal was arrested at the Arena Theatre, and subsequently jailed and tortured. After his release he moved to Argentina where he lived until 1976. Between 1971 and 1976 Boal further developed the techniques of the Theatre of the Oppressed. While working on a literacy campaign in Peru in 1973 he developed the technique of Image Theatre, a technique that operates by privileging physical expression over the spoken word. Through a series of workshop-based exercises, the human body is used as an expressive tool to represent, non-verbally, a wide repertoire of feelings, ideas, and attitudes. This versatile form reflects Boal's belief in the body as one's most essential tool in transforming physical sensations into a communicable language and altering everyday space into a theatrical arena, or aesthetic space.

In Argentina, once again forbidden to partake in activist theatre under an increasingly repressive regime, Boal devised another technique, Invisible Theatre, as a way of continuing the debate on current political issues. Staged in public spaces and masquerading as real life, actors 'performed' rehearsed scenes that uncovered social injustices, drawing people's attention to the issues and leading to impassioned discussions. The audience, never aware that they were watching theatre, were able to transcend, to a certain extent, the silencing effect of the ubiquitous 'cop-in-the-streets'.

From 1976 to 1986, Boal was in exile in Europe. As a result of the workshops he conducted there and the international availability of *Theatre of the Oppressed*, Boal's reputation expanded throughout the world. Europeans have had as much impact on Boal as he has had on them, and it is due to this influence that TO has acquired the characteristics which make it especially useful in language teaching. Boal's newer therapeutic techniques, colloquially known as 'Cop-in-the-Head', have evolved since 1980 as the techniques of TO became established in Europe and North America. With oppression having different resonances for the bourgeois westerners with whom Boal often worked during this period, participants brought themes of race, gender and class discrimination, loneli-

ness and alienation to his workshops. At first frustrated by these seemingly insignificant hardships, Boal began to realize the depth of pain these oppressions produced. The influence of Boal's wife, Cecilia, an Argentine actress who later became a psychoanalyst in Paris, further enhanced Boal's receptiveness to therapeutic interpretations of these oppressions. He came to conceptualize them as responses to internalized 'cops', related to but different from the external ones, and requiring a unique methodological approach. The notion of oppression thus extended to include societal values — moral dictates pronounced by parents, peers, teachers, politicians, media, etc. — that obstruct our wills and foster passivity. Through TO methods, these persistent and often disembodied voices are physicalized, animated, and addressed as 'real' antagonistic forces, in spite of their absence in the literal sense. By the early 1980s these techniques had become established as part of the TO repertoire and are presently referred to as the 'Rainbow of Desire' (Boal, 1995). After a favourable change of government Boal returned to Brazil in 1986 and founded the Rio de Janeiro Centre of Theatre of the Oppressed. He remains based in Brazil and is a Worker's Party *vereador* (City Councilor) for Rio de Janeiro where he is experimenting with yet another development, Legislative Theatre — a way of using theatre within a political system to produce a truer form of democracy. He was awarded the UNESCO Pablo Picasso Medal in 1994.

The Theatre of the Oppressed

In *Theatre of the Oppressed* Boal points out that all theatre is necessarily political, 'because all the activities of man are political and theatre is one of them' and concludes that his poetics of the oppressed represents, 'the conquest of the means of theatrical production'. This radical phraseology sets the tone for the book and indeed the whole TO project and in doing so speaks eloquently of the time and place in which it was made: the 70s in Latin America were a time of intense ideological struggle when cultural imperialism was being vigorously challenged alongside the wider issue of neo-colonial power relations.³ Although such rhetoric might strike the modern reader as naive and perhaps more suited to addressing the problems of peasant revolts fighting against fascist dictatorships than middle-class Japanese students studying English, as we shall see in the next section, the world-wide popularity of Boal's ideas today stems from their capacity for confronting oppression in all its many guises.

Once one becomes used to the book's rhetorical style it soon becomes clear that it is a remarkable work of scholarship, combining sober analysis and daring imagination. The first half deals with the evolution of the Western theatrical tradition beginning with the ancient Greeks. In his foreword Boal reminds us that the idea of theatre as we know it today has moved far from the spirit of the earliest Greek festivals:

"Theatre" was the people singing freely in the open air; the theatrical performance was created by and for the people, and could thus be called dithyrambic song. It was a celebration in which all could participate free-

ly. Then came the aristocracy and established divisions: some persons will go to the stage and only they will be able to act; the rest will remain seated, receptive, passive — these will be the spectators, the masses, the people. And in order that the spectacle may efficiently reflect the dominant ideology, the aristocracy established another division: some actors will be protagonists (aristocrats) and the rest will be the chorus — symbolizing, in one way or another, the mass. Aristotle's coercive system of tragedy shows us the workings of this type of theatre.⁴

After a detailed analysis of the aesthetic philosophy of Aristotle's *Poetics* — what Boal describes as the 'poetics of oppression' — he discusses the subsequent theories of theatre propounded by Machiavelli, Hegel and Brecht.⁵ Since Aristotle, bourgeois theatre has been the *finished* theatre. The bourgeoisie already know what their world is like. Their theatre presents the spectacle of the perfect world, or the world about to be perfected, and all of its values are imposed on the spectators, who passively delegate power to the characters to act and think in their place. In so doing, the spectators purge themselves of their tragic flaw, that is, of anything capable of changing society. A catharsis of the revolutionary impetus is produced and dramatic action substitutes for real action. Boal goes on to propose a way of returning to the true nature of theatre. For him, theatre is a dialectical process concerned with the movement of people and matter: 'theatre is change and not simple presentation of what exists. it is becoming and not being.' The Brechtian model is, he admits, an important step in the cycle of democratic transformation but ultimately this cycle can only be completed via Boal's own poetics, the Theatre of the Oppressed:

In order to understand this *poetics of the oppressed* one must keep in mind its main objective: to change the people — 'spectators' — passive beings in the theatrical phenomenon — into subjects, into actors, transformers of the dramatic action. I hope that the differences remain clear. Aristotle proposes a poetics in which the spectator delegates power to the dramatic character so that the latter may act and think for him. Brecht proposes a poetics in which the spectator delegates power to the character who thus acts in his place, but the spectator reserves the right to think for himself, often in opposition to the character. In the first case a 'catharsis' occurs; in the second an awakening of critical consciousness. But the poetics of the oppressed focuses on the action itself: the spectator delegates no power to the character (or actor) either to act or to think in his place; on the contrary, he himself assumes the protagonistic role, changes the dramatic action, tries out solutions, discusses plans for change — in short, trains himself for real action. In this case, perhaps the theatre is not revolutionary in itself, but is surely a rehearsal for the revolution. The liberated

spectator, as a whole person, launches into action. No matter that the action is fictional; what matters is that it is action!

The final section of the book describes Boal's experiments with People's Theatre in Peru and his work with the Arena Theatre in São Paulo where the earlier forms of TO were developed. It is no coincidence that this crucial stage in the evolution of his work occurred while he was working on a literacy project in Peru inspired by the methods of Paulo Freire. Boal sought means of achieving the transference of control over the weapon of theatre back to the people. His starting point is the human body, 'the first word of the theatrical vocabulary'. To control the means of theatrical production man must, first of all, control his own body in order to make it more expressive. Boal's plan for transforming the spectator into actor, as set out in *Theatre of the Oppressed*, is systematized in the following four stages:

Stage 1: *Knowing the Body*: a series of exercises by which one gets to know one's body, its limitations and possibilities, its social distortions and possibilities of rehabilitation.

Stage 2: *Making the Body Expressive*: a series of games by which one begins to express one's self through the body, abandoning other, more common and habitual forms of expression.

Stage 3: *Theatre as Language*: one begins to practice theatre as a language that is living and present, not as a finished product displaying images from the past. This stage is further sub-divided into the following three 'degrees':

First degree: *Simultaneous Dramaturgy*: the spectators 'write' simultaneously with the acting of the actors;

Second degree: *Image Theatre*: the spectators intervene directly, 'speaking' through images made with the actors' bodies;

Third degree: *Forum Theatre*: the spectators intervene directly in the dramatic action and act.

Stage 4: *Theatre as Discourse*: simple forms in which the spectator-actors create 'spectacles' according to their needs in order to discuss certain themes or rehearse certain actions.

The exercises of the first stage, Knowing the Body, are designed to 'undo' the muscular structure of the participants. To take them apart, to study and analyze them. Not in order to weaken or destroy them but to raise them to the level of consciousness. It is necessary for each individual to feel the 'muscular alienation' imposed on his or her body by their societal role. If one is able, in this way, to disjoint one's own muscular structures, one will be able to assemble structures characteristic of other types of individuals, that is, to physically interpret characters different from oneself.

In the second stage, similar games are used to help participants begin to use their bodily resources for self-expression. These are often simple adaptations of familiar par-

four games rather than technical exercises from the theatrical laboratory. At this stage, participants are invited to 'play', not to interpret characters. Nevertheless, they will play better to the extent that they interpret better. For example, in one game, pieces of paper containing names of animals, male and female, are distributed, one to each participant. For ten minutes, each person tries to give a physical, bodily impression of the animal named on his or her piece of paper. Talking or making noises that would suggest the animal is forbidden. The communication must be effected entirely through the body. After the first ten minutes, each participant must find his mate among the others who are imitating the animals, since there will always be a male and a female for each one. When two participants are convinced that they constitute a pair, they leave the acting area, and the game is over when all participants have found their mates, through a purely physical communication, without the utilization of words or recognizable sounds. What is important in games of this type is not to guess correctly but rather that all the participants try to express themselves through their bodies, something they are not used to doing. Without realizing it they will in fact be giving a 'dramatical performance'.

This type of game can be varied *ad infinitum*: the slips of paper can bear, for example, the names of occupations or professions. If the participants depict an animal, it will perhaps have little to do with their ideology. But if, for example, female college students are called upon to act as recruiting officers in a Japanese company or *salarymen* in a bar, all their ideology counts and finds physical expression through the game. Boal has compiled a series of 200 games which are designed to achieve the transformations of these first two stages (Boal, 1992), but he insists that the participants should be encouraged to invent their own games and not be passive recipients of an entertainment that comes from the outside. This learner-centered approach is of course a much-needed experience for young Japanese people who have been exposed to an education system predicated on uncritical absorption of vast amounts of information dished out by the omniscient *sensei*. Moreover, because the games are largely non-verbal, when used in the language classroom they give an added incentive for weaker learners to gain confidence and establish their position in the group before moving on to more demanding exercises.

The preceding two stages are preparatory, centering around the work of the participants with their own bodies. The third stage, Theatre as Language, focuses on a particular theme chosen by the participants and furthers the transition from passivity to action. In its first degree, Simultaneous Dramaturgy, the spectator is invited to intervene in the action without having to be physically present 'on stage'. Here it is a question of performing a short scene, of about ten minutes, proposed by a participant or arising out of a group discussion. The actors may improvise with the aid of a script prepared beforehand or, more commonly, compose the scene directly. Having begun the scene, the actors develop it to the point at which the main problem reaches a crisis and needs a solution. Then the actors stop the performance and ask the audience to offer solutions. They improvise immediately all the suggested solutions, and the audience has the right to intervene, to correct the actions or words of the actors, who are obligated to comply strictly

with these instructions from the audience. Thus, while the audience 'writes' the work the actors perform it simultaneously. The spectators' thoughts are discussed theatrically on stage with the help of the actors. All the solutions, suggestions, and opinions are revealed in theatrical form. The discussion itself need not simply take the form of words, but rather should be effected through all the other elements of theatrical expression as well. This form of theatre creates great excitement among the participants and starts to demolish the wall that separates actors from spectators. The action ceases to be presented in a deterministic manner, as something inevitable, as Fate. All can be changed, and at a moment's notice.

In the second degree, Image Theatre, the spectator has to participate more directly. A participant is asked to express her views on a certain theme of common interest, either a far-reaching one such as sexism, or a more narrowly-defined problem such as the trials of riding crowded commuter trains. The participant is asked to express her opinion, but without speaking, using only the bodies of the other participants and 'sculpting' them to make a group of statues, in such a way that her opinions and feelings become evident. Only after organizing the group of statues can she enter into a discussion with the others in order to determine if all agree with her 'sculpted' opinion. The intense interest and suspense aroused during the silent sculpting process is usually so great that the 'models' are positively bursting to give their opinions. At this stage language learners are often so eager to communicate that they cease worrying about the niceties of grammar but speak *with meaning* to each other. Once the participants have agreed on the form of this first or 'actual' image, then the spectator-sculptor is asked to show an 'ideal' image of how she would like the situation to be. Finally, and most challengingly, she is asked to show a 'transitional' image, to show how it would be possible to pass from one reality to another. In other words, to carry out the change, the transformation, the revolution, or whatever term one wishes to use. This form of Theatre as Language is without doubt one of the most stimulating techniques in the TO 'arsenal' because it is so easy to practice and because of its extraordinary capacity for making thought visible. For this reason too it is one of the most suitable for use in the language classroom. Boal outlines several variations on this basic theme but points out that the important thing is always to analyze the feasibility of the change.

In the third degree, Forum Theatre, the participant has to intervene decisively in the dramatic action and change it. This procedure Boal describes as follows:

First the participants are asked to tell a story containing a political or social problem of difficult solution. Then a ten- or fifteen-minute skit portraying that problem and the solution intended for discussion is improvised or rehearsed, and subsequently presented. When the skit is over, the participants are asked if they agree with the solution presented. At least some will say no. At this point it is explained that the scene will be performed once more, exactly as it was the first time. But now any participant in the audience has the right to re-

place any actor and lead the action in the direction that seems to him most appropriate. The displaced actor steps aside, but remains ready to resume action the moment the participant considers his own intervention to be terminated. The other actors have to face the newly created situation, responding instantly to all the possibilities that it may present. The participants who choose to intervene must continue the physical action of the replaced actors; they are not allowed to come on the stage and talk, talk, talk: they must carry out the same type of work or activities performed by the actors who are in their place. The theatrical activity must go on in the same way, on the stage. Anyone may propose any solution, but it must be done on the stage, working, acting, doing things and not from the comfort of his seat.

Here the Aristotelian cathartic effect is entirely avoided. Instead of presenting spectacles which purge or eradicate alienated feelings and desires, Forum Theatre stimulates the practice of the act in reality. Far from taking something away from the spectators, it evokes in them the desire to practice in reality the act they have rehearsed in the theatre. Indeed, the three stages of the TO system discussed so far can all be described as forms of rehearsal-theatre as opposed to the conventional or spectacle theatre. But nothing in TO prohibits a popular audience from participating also in more 'finished' forms of theatre should they so wish. Clearly, Forum Theatre is a move in this direction and the fourth stage, Theatre as Discourse, utilizes several techniques, including Invisible Theatre and Newspaper Theatre to accomplish just this. However, since these techniques either require greater involvement of trained actors, or greater time and resources than are usually available to language teachers and are in any case primarily spectator- rather than actor-oriented they will not be discussed further here. In the language classroom, although groups of learners will occasionally perform the scenes they have devised to other groups this is not, in my opinion, the essential purpose of drama activities. Rather, the activities should be designed in a way which allows all learners to become spect-actors. The organization of lessons to this end is the main task for the TO language teacher and it is now necessary to examine in more detail the teacher's role in a Forum Theatre session.

The Teacher as Joker

The key figure in the Forum Theatre process is the 'Joker'. The joker is the facilitator,⁶ the direct link between the audience and the dramatic action; she or he has the responsibility for orchestrating the whole event. Although with an exceptionally able group it may be possible, as it certainly would be desirable, for a learner to be the Joker, in practice this role will normally fall to the teacher. The Joker must encourage and enable the spect-actors to intervene. This entails taking time to clarify the possible courses of action and making sure that learners who wish to intervene are clear about the situation,

and their intentions within it, before the intervention begins. After each intervention, the Joker is responsible for developing the analysis of what has happened. Contributions are elicited by a questioning process, beginning with the individual who has intervened and opening it to those who have been watching: How did you do?, Did you achieve what you intended?, What stopped you?, How did you feel?, What power does the central character have?, What else can be done? and so on, helping the group to develop a wider understanding of the situation and to formulate more informed courses of action for testing by means of further dramatic interventions. No two Forum sessions will ever be the same and it is impossible to predict all the suggestions the learners will make. Like the learners, the teacher must respond 'in the moment' through drama. This requires intense concentration and continuous reassessment of theatrical and educational strategies. At all times the Joker must transmit energy, excitement and enthusiasm but above all she must structure and deepen the learning experience for the spect-actors.

Evidently the role of Joker is extremely demanding. While the Joker must be responsive to the desires of the spectators, nevertheless choices have to be made: not all interventions are equally productive and not all suggestions can be pursued. The Joker has to judge when to move from one line of enquiry to another, select the appropriate questions to further the dramatic debate, know when to listen, when to speak and when to insist on action ('Don't tell me, show me!'). On the other hand, the Joker must be cautious about imposing her own solutions. All teachers, particularly EFL teachers, need to be aware of the fine line to be drawn between challenging the views of the learners and forcing their own upon them. But there is an important pedagogical distinction to be made between the imposition of a dogma, which closes debate and inhibits thought, and a dialectical process which recognizes bias, admits of real contrary positions and acknowledges the conflict of opposites. It has long been an accepted wisdom within educational theatre that an absence of bias is neither possible nor desirable. Indeed, the overt challenging of received truths and accepted norms is seen as an essential step towards encouraging learners to deepen their own thinking. The Joker should not impose her own views but should most certainly accept the responsibility of the teacher to challenge assumptions, highlight contradictions and pursue disagreements. These views do not imply that the educators should know all the answers in advance or ignore the need for others to find their own solutions. But they do mean that we must abandon a position which says that all points of view are equally valid and that the teacher should only present the alternatives. As TO practitioner Chris Vine notes in his study of TO in British schools: 'It is the great fallacy of democracy that choice itself is beneficial: unless people are equipped to understand the true nature of the choices given, and can create their own agendas, the existence of alternatives is meaningless' (Vine, 1993).

Conclusion : Putting the TO into EFL

In many countries drama has long been accepted by progressive educators as having an

important position in the curriculum of schools, colleges and the community.⁷ Quite apart from its obvious function of training future actors and theatre professionals, drama is seen as a uniquely valuable tool for engaging learners in a whole range of issues from history and literature to health and the environment (Jackson, 1993). Moreover, despite being marginalized by ever more politicized education policies and starved of funding, many groups in the British and European Theatre-in-Education (TIE) movements and elsewhere have developed a range of dialectical and materialist practices (all more or less consistent with Boal's methods) which actively engage learners as *subjects* while simultaneously challenging them to take a critically *objective* view of their experience in society.⁸

Given this recognition afforded to drama in education generally, the ambiguous status of drama in language education is a matter for concern and undoubtedly reflects the inherent conservatism of the EFL profession. Certainly a number of other reasons can be adduced to account for this, not the least of which is probably confusion in the minds of many teachers about what drama actually means. Other factors include lack of confidence and fear of loss of control among teachers, their lack of training in this area and the difficulty of assessing learners' work within the institutional framework of examinations. But as Robert Phillipson has shown, the normalizing function of EFL teaching has, since its inception, served the hegemonic interests of the 'core' English speaking countries (Phillipson, 1992). While it may be difficult to argue that EFL has had the same adverse effects on Japan as it has on Third World countries in terms of perpetuating inequality and exploitation, the idea that the EFL profession in this country is not an agent of cultural and linguistic imperialism is one which can only be denied by those who deny the political dimension of language teaching itself. It is to be regretted that such a denial (which is itself, of course, a political judgement) is so widespread in the profession. Yet such being the case, it is not surprising to note for example that all three of the most well-known books on drama in EFL, each otherwise admirable guides to specifically language learning techniques, include warnings to the teacher about the dangerous potential of drama for self-liberation.⁹

Like all revolutionary ideas, TO is simple, accessible, unpretentious, and, above all, based on transferable skills and techniques. For language teachers concerned to develop a critical drama-based praxis in opposition to the prevailing professional conservatism, one which examines the relations between speech, discourse and power, one which seeks the empowerment of learners (and teachers) as engaged and informed participants in their own learning, their own liberation, Theatre of the Oppressed offers a much needed radical alternative.

Notes

1. The British English spelling of the word 'theatre' is used throughout this paper, including in quotations from translations of Boal's works wherein it originally appeared as a variant

form.

2. Transitive learning posits a learner who is both subject and object: that is, instead of being merely a vessel into which information is deposited, the student is actively engaged in educating him/herself.
3. *Theatre of the Oppressed* was written just three years after the publication in Chile of Dorfman and Mattelart's seminal deconstruction of the Disney myth, *How to Read Donald Duck* (1971, trans. D. Kunzle, International General, New York.)
4. All quotations are from *Theatre of the Oppressed* (Boal, 1979) unless otherwise indicated.
5. For a more detailed account compare *Stages of Terror: Terrorism, Ideology, and Coercion as Theatre History* by A. Kubiak (1991), Indiana U. P.
6. In fact, Boal describes the Joker as a 'difficultator', undermining easy judgements, reinforcing our grasp of the complexity of a situation, but not letting that complexity get in the way of action.
7. See G. Bolton, 1984. *Drama as Education – an Argument for Placing Drama at the Centre of the Curriculum*. Longman, London.
8. See for example A. Campbell, *Re-inventing the Wheel: Breakout Theatre-in-Education* and B. Fisher, *Feminist Acts: Women, Pedagogy, and the Theatre of the Oppressed* in Schutzman and Cohen-Cruz, 1994.
9. The three referred to are Karbowska-Hayes, 1984; Maley & Duff, 1982; and Porter-Ladousse, 1987.

References

- Boal, A.** (1979) *Theatre of the Oppressed*, tr. C.A. and M.L. McBride. Pluto Press, London.
- Boal, A.** (1992) *Games for Actors and Non-actors*, trans. A. Jackson. Routledge, London.
- Boal, A.** (1995) *The Rainbow of Desire*, trans. A. Jackson. Routledge, London.
- Freire, P.** (1972) *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Penguin, London.
- Jackson, T.** (1993) *Learning through Theatre*. 2nd. edn. Routledge, London.
- Karbowska Hayes, S.** (1984) *Drama as a Second Language: a practical handbook for language teachers*. National Extension College, Cambridge.
- Maley, A. & Duff, A.** (1982) *Drama Techniques in Language Learning: a resource book of communication activities for language teachers*. CUP, Cambridge.
- Porter Ladousse, G.** (1987) *Role Play*. OUP, Oxford.
- Phillipson, R.** (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. OUP, Oxford.
- Schutzman, M. & Cohen-Cruz, J.** (eds.) (1994) *Playing Boal: theatre, therapy, activism*. Routledge, London.
- Vine, C.** (1993) TIE and the Theatre of the Oppressed. in *Learning through Theatre*. 2nd. edn. (ed. T. Jackson) Routledge, London.