Applied Theatre Research
Volume 8 Number 2

© 2020 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. https://doi.org/10.1386/atr_00037_1

JULIE DUNN

Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

PENNY BUNDY

Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

MADONNA STINSON

Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia

Process drama in five international contexts: Considering emotional responses and dramatic structuring

ABSTRACT

This article reports on the responses of 114 adult participants in a process drama delivered in five international contexts. Drawing upon the work of Gavin Bolton and key appraisal theorists, the aim of the article is to extend current understandings of how emotion is experienced within process drama, while also gaining new insights into the factors that impact its type and intensity. Using a framework that links emotion, connection and commitment, analysis of the data reveals that when individuals experience high levels of both commitment and connection, diverse emotions are generated. It also reveals that while these emotional responses are highly individual and generally independent of the strategies being employed,

KEYWORDS

commitment
connection
emotion
facilitation
process drama
tension

their intensity is associated with dramatic tension. The article suggests that an understanding of these findings is important for effective process drama structuring and facilitation.

INTRODUCTION

Preston (2017: 4) has recently suggested that within applied theatre, a critical facilitation practice is one where individuals engage in 'problem-posing' about their own practices, and in 'trying to understand what lies beyond people's responses in a moment'. The term 'problem-posing' comes from Freire (2003: 80), who tells us that, 'the problem-posing educator re-forms his (sic) reflections in the reflection of the students' and emphasizes the role of students working as 'critical co-investigators' (2003: 81) with teachers. In this article, we are interested in emotional responses, and particularly in exploring the type and intensity of participants' emotional responses to and within process drama. Allied to this, we are keen to identify possible relationships between these responses, the drama strategies being employed and the commitment and connectedness of the participants. We draw on the written reflective responses of 114 adult participants as we, and they, co-investigated the emotions experienced within a similar version of one process drama delivered across five international contexts. We say similar, rather than the same, as process drama is a co-constructed and spontaneous form where the contributions of individual participants impact its direction. These contributions are influenced by a range of personal factors, together with broader social, political, historical and cultural ones, and thus, no two process dramas experiences are ever the same.

The five international contexts where the workshop was presented were Paris, France; Dublin, Ireland; Bergen, Norway; Hong Kong; and Hobart, Australia. The Paris and Hobart workshops were conducted within drama conferences, while the participants in Norway and one of the Hong Kong workshops were post-graduate students enrolled in applied theatre programs. The two remaining workshops (Dublin and a second Hong Kong group) were open to the public. The drama, entitled *Creon's Decree*, was inspired by Sophocles' play *Antigone* and was designed to promote discussion and reflection about the tensions that might arise for individuals when their personal values clash with what is required of them by law.

In each of these settings, the participants were invited to select three moments from the drama, and to identify their levels of commitment and connection at these times using a framework (Dunn et al. 2015) that takes the form of a Cartesian grid. They were then asked to note the emotions, if any, that they experienced in each of these moments. This data-collection process produced a considerable amount of rich data, allowing us to consider our participants' responses from several different perspectives.

In this article, it is not possible to discuss all these perspectives, so we have chosen to focus specifically on those moments where participants reported the highest possible levels of both connection and commitment. To understand these, including the factors that might have informed them, we have chosen – as in our earlier work relating to the *Creon's Decree* drama (Bundy et al. 2015) – to draw upon the ideas of Gavin Bolton (1984, 1986), together with those of researchers interested in appraisal theories of emotion.

INFORMING LITERATURE

Many authors associated with process drama have considered emotion (Bowell and Heap 2017; Bundy 2003; Heyward 2010; Piazzoli 2018; Winston 1996). However, with the exception of Bolton (1984, 1986), who paid particular attention to emotion across the 1980s, this aspect of process drama has not been examined thoroughly. Bolton's interrelated ideas thus remain critical, including the notion that the responsibility of facilitators is not to protect participants from emotions but rather to delve into them (1984: 128); that drama does not require 'an avoidance of the fictitious so that nothing is felt, nor an escape into the fictitious so that everything is felt but nothing is understood' (1986: 92); that 'unless there is some kind of emotional engagement nothing can be learned' (1984: 128); and that the intensity of emotion experienced by each individual within drama is 'dependent on each participant drawing on relevant affective memories' (1986: 92).

Of key additional significance are Bolton's ideas about first- and second-order emotions (1984: 105). For him, first-order emotions arise in response to actual life events, while second order emotions while second order emotions emerge in response to fictional characters and events. Bolton argues that an engaged drama participant experiences first- and second-order emotions simultaneously, with the emotional responses to second order experiences potentially being as intense as those experienced in response to actual events. He also claims (1984: 105) that second-order emotions are different because they emerge in the knowledge that the experience itself is not real. These differences are important, as they allow the participants to take risks within the dramatic world – including emotional risks – that they might not take in the real one.

Of course, outside of the drama education literature, there has been extensive theorizing of emotion around emotion, including the work of appraisal theorists who consider how emotions emerge in response to events. Simply explained, appraisal theorists argue that when an event happens, an individual appraisal of that event triggers an emotional response. This appraisal process occurs rapidly, with the person experiencing it being unaware of its individual aspects. In their work, Roseman and Smith (2001: 6) suggest that 'appraisals intervene between situations and emotions'; they go on to argue that it is an appraisal that starts the emotion process, 'initiating the physiological, expressive, behavioural and other changes that comprise the resultant emotional state' (2001: 7).

Appraisal theorists therefore argue that different people can and do make different appraisals of the same situation, and as a result experience a range of varying emotional responses (Moors et. al. 2013; Tan 2008). This diversity of appraisals is influenced by factors such as prior life experiences, developmental differences, moral beliefs, values and cultural experiences. Appraisal theorists therefore see emotion as a process, not a state, and argue that emotion occurs in episodes. Tan (2008: 35) suggests that an episode is made up of three components: (1) a response to a specific stimulus; (2) an evaluation of events in terms of the person's concerns or fundamental needs; and (3) a motivation to act. Appraisal theorists also suggest that multiple episodes may run in parallel to each other. This latter point is of key significance in process drama because participants may be making in-role and out-of-role appraisals simultaneously (or close to simultaneously), so may be experiencing both first- and second-order emotions at the same time. However, rather than being seen as negative, Szauder (2005: 359) argues that this complex emotional layering is critical to meaning making in dramatic contexts. He proposes that it is

the ‘interconnectedness between the two layers of emotional involvement that makes learning through drama possible and relevant to the participants’.

In other work, specifically related to emotions experienced in response to arts engagement, Tan (2008) categorizes emotions, including basic emotions (sadness, fear, anxiety); social emotions (love, anger, contempt); and self-conscious emotions (envy, shame, guilt). In earlier work (Tan 1994: 23), he includes empathic emotions, listing them as ‘sympathy, pity, admiration, hope and fear’, together with hostile emotions, which he argues occur when a person appraises an event as being both deliberate and in opposition to their goals or values. In process drama work, these emotion types may be experienced within dramatic worlds or out of them, and may even be experienced in response to the way the drama is being managed.

Silvia (2009) also categorizes emotions, claiming that self-conscious emotions such as pride, shame, guilt, regret and embarrassment are the least understood in terms of arts experiences. For Silvia, these self-conscious emotions are fostered through self-reflection on one’s own actions or thoughts.

Finally, and importantly in relation to the framework that underpins this research, Silvia (2008) argues that in order for an individual to experience emotion, they must first be interested, with this interest being stimulated by an experience that is both novel and complex. Silvia warns, however, that to create interest, an experience shouldn’t be too complex, as an individual’s appraisal may be that they don’t have the skills, knowledge or resources to deal with it. Silvia also argues that interest varies from person to person – and indeed in the same person over time.

THE FRAMEWORK

To support our exploration of emotional responses across the five contexts, a framework made up of two axes was employed, with one axis relating to commitment and the other to connection (Figure 1). Here the term connection

Figure 1: The grid used to support the research process (Dunn, Bundy and Stinson, 2015).

is used to capture the level of interest an individual may feel at any given moment within the drama experience, while the term commitment describes an individual's willingness to engage within the drama work.

This framework suggests that the nature and intensity of emotions experienced at any given moment within process drama work are dependent upon appraisals of both the content and the form of the work, including (but not limited to) appraisals of the drama's roles, its dramatic focus, the situations or relationships explored within it, the strategies being applied and the tasks required of the participants within the drama.

In relation to the notion of commitment, we suggest that an individual's willingness to 'conserve the illusion' (Giffin 1984: 88) is of central importance. This term, originating from the field of play, describes what players and improvisers do when they participate in the active process of co-constructing dramatic worlds. We argue that within fictional worlds, individuals need to commit to a process of shared imagining and use the term 'commitment' to refer to each individual's willingness to engage with this process.

While considered individually within this framework, within a process drama commitment and connection are difficult to separate, given that a participant who is struggling to connect may also be likely to withdraw or limit their commitment. By contrast, a person who is revelling in the level of challenge associated with a particular dramatic focus, or who is keenly interested in one or more aspects of the drama's structure, is more likely to commit. For these participants, the blend of strong connection and high commitment brings with it the potential to create a range of first- and second-order emotions, with these being of many different types or categories.

The four distinct quadrants in the framework therefore represent the various ways in which individuals might experience commitment and connection. The lower left quadrant suggests weak or defensive commitment and low levels of connection, while the upper right quadrant represents strong commitment and connection. The remaining quadrants are more mixed, reflecting either strong commitment and weak connection or the opposite. Of course, connection and commitment shift continuously within any drama experience, as each participant is not only responding to the work of the facilitator and the other participants, but also actively co-creating the drama through their offerings. Factors outside the drama, such as the time of day, the level of trust within the group or even the physical space may also influence commitment.

RESEARCH APPROACH

At the commencement of each workshop, participants were informed of the research focus. Willing participants completed consent forms approved by our university ethics committee, while the remaining individuals joined in the drama but did not contribute to the data-collection process. At its conclusion, research participants were invited to recall three moments from the overall drama and to identify any emotions experienced at these times. We did not specify the types of moments. Following this, the framework described above was introduced, followed by an invitation for each participant to think back to their selected moments and try to self-evaluate their individual levels of commitment and connection at these times. To differentiate the moments, participants were asked to use the letters A, B and C (see Figure 2).

While not all participants offered comments beyond listing the emotions they identified in these moments, some did, and these additional details

Figure 2: An example of three marked moments (Bundy, Dunn and Stinson, 2015).

proved to be very useful in supporting our understanding of their experiences. For example, in some cases these comments helped us to differentiate between emotions relating to the dramatic world, those relating to the actual world or to both simultaneously.

After the six workshops had been conducted, the participant responses were collated, with the identified moments initially being sorted according to workshop location and then strategy. Next, descriptions offered and quadrants indicated were recorded. Finally, while we made no attempt to quantify or measure the markings *within* the various quadrants, we *did* make special note of any moments where the participant indicated their response as being at the extremes of the two continua (irrespective of the quadrant identified). Table 1 provides an example of this data-collation process in relation to Moment C within the Norwegian workshop. It reveals responses in the upper right, upper left and at the crossbars of the grid, with three of the upper right responses being located at the extremes of both commitment and connection. It also shows that Moment C occurred at different stages of the drama for different individuals, while it is also important to note that emotions and grid positions identified varied from participant to participant, even when the same strategy was being employed.

DIFFERENCES ACROSS CONTEXTS

The largest respondent groups were Dublin (24 participants), Hobart (23) and the Hong Kong public workshop (21), while the two student groups in Hong Kong and Norway were the smallest with thirteen participants each. Also different were the levels of experience within the groups. For example, in

Participant identifier	Strategy in use at Moment C	Moment C description	Grid position identified at Moment C	Emotions identified by participants at Moment C
1	Funeral with Creon	At the funeral when Creon took the purple away and was angry	Upper right*	Nervousness
2	Soundscape	The soundscape of voices	Upper left	Nervousness and frustration
3	Post-drama reflection	During the reflection when one of the participants cried because she felt a strong commitment to the drama	Upper right	Caring
4	Post-drama reflection	I thought this project can be used to help people face their true emotions.	Upper right	Transformations
5	Writing-in-role	Writing the letter about why/why not save the dead bodies from the birds	On crossbars	Disappointment
6	Teacher-in-role	Creon yelling (it was hard to listen to Creon yelling and being able to find the English word to announce my disagreement.	Upper right	Frustration
7	Funeral with Creon	When the rebels had used their ribbon in the funeral and Creon asked me to take these ribbons away!	Upper right*	Fear and frustration
8	Post-drama reflection	During the reflective discussion	Upper left	Sadness and irritation
9	Post-drama reflection	The reflection following the drama	Upper right*	I don't know how to explain the feelings. I was overfilled with every feeling in my body – like a volcano, an explosion. It was good and scary, sad and tiredness at the same time.
10	Funeral with Creon	Creon interrupting the funeral	Upper right	Worry
11	Paired role-play	Paired role-play	Upper left	Concentration

* Indicates moments identified as being at the extremes of each quadrant.

Table 1: Example of the data organization for Moment C (Norway).

Hobart the vast majority of participants were experienced in the art of facilitating process drama. By contrast, within the Hong Kong public workshop, several participants were new to the form and unused to adopting role. The workshop spaces also differed, varying from small rooms with no opportunity to manage light or sound to a black box theatre that provided far greater aesthetic potential.

Another variant was the level of cohesion and familiarity between participants, and potentially the trust and ease individuals may have felt as co-participants. For example, while the two groups of postgraduate students knew each other well and had collaborated on many occasions, the Paris conference participants were strangers to each other. In addition, while the Hobart participants and the Hong Kong students were reasonably familiar with Julie (the facilitator of all dramas), the participants across all other sites had little or no previous experience of working with her. It is likely that, for the latter, their commitment to the work – especially at the outset – would have been more limited than for those groups or individuals with whom she had an established relationship.

Of course, the most important differences were sociocultural, with five very different contexts in play. It is therefore not surprising that, in each drama, participants connected in different ways to the pretext and focus of the drama. Both current and historic circumstances relevant to each context influenced at least some participants' responses. These will be discussed later, but it is worth noting that the workshops in Hong Kong were conducted against a backdrop of simmering social unrest and pro-democracy activism that was later to become known as the Yellow Umbrella movement, while within the Dublin workshop it was apparent that the drama brought to the surface affective memories of the historical events that led to Ireland being divided.

THE SELECTED MOMENTS

In all, 309 moments were identified by our respondents. Of these, 227 fell within the upper right quadrant, 38 in the upper left, 26 in the lower right and 18 in the lower left. Those in the upper right quadrant therefore represent over 73 per cent of all moments recorded, with many reasons for this imbalance being possible. For example, the participants may have been more interested in moments where they felt especially committed and connected or, alternatively, due to the focus of the research they may have felt obliged to focus on these. A third explanation may simply be that the drama was successful in achieving high levels of both commitment and connection, and the statistics reflect this.

Irrespective of the reason for these outcomes, we became very interested in these 227 high-commitment, high-connection moments, and were particularly intrigued by the 54 moments where the participants marked the grid in the extreme upper right corner of this upper right quadrant, suggesting maximum levels of both commitment and connection. These moments were identified by 48 different participants across every context and in response to many different strategies, including whole group strategies (whole group role play, soundscape, post-drama reflection); small group strategies (paired role play, ritual enactment); performative strategies (soundscape of voices, ritual enactment); and strategies both within the dramatic world of the drama and those outside it (observing the rituals, post-drama reflection). Equally diverse were

the emotions participants identified in response to these moments, including anger, sadness, a sense of suffering, helplessness, disgust, defiance, fear, fury, rage, pride, nervousness and even love.

Below, we interrogate in detail six of these moments, selected on the basis of the frequency of their identification. In analysing them, we draw on Tan's categories of emotion and Bolton's (1984) ideas about first- and second-order emotions. We include information about the identified emotions and in some cases the supporting written comments offered by the participants.

ANALYSIS

Before commencing our analysis, we offer a brief vignette outlining how the dramatic context, roles and relationships were established.

The participants gathered in a circle as Julie (Author 1) explained that they would be taking role as the contemporary citizens of Sebeht, a country very similar to their own, recently ravaged by a brief but unsuccessful civil uprising against the President, Jane Creon. They were told that this conflict occurred amidst growing inequity and that there were many casualties on both sides.

Next, the participants were invited to create a role as one of these citizens, including deciding whether or not they had lost a friend or loved one in the uprising, and if so on which side or sides these loved ones had fought. In making these selections, they were reminded to consider their emotional safety.

Following this, Julie explained that a long-standing tradition of Sebeht was the donning of a red cloth wristband on the right wrist at times of death. She also indicated that since the uprising, Creon had decreed that the death of rebel soldiers would be marked instead by the donning of a purple band on the left wrist. In response, the participants selected relevant wristbands and began the enrolment process using a paired hot-seating strategy. Following this, groups of six were formed, with each group involving participants with different wristband combinations – some red, some purple, some both and some none.

A narration was then used to establish that earlier that day, lists of the dead were posted in the city centre, along with the announcement relating to the donning of the purple. In response to these events, many people had gathered in the city centre.

Moment 1: Paired role-play

Eight participants from across five different workshop contexts identified the paired role-play as a moment where they experienced peak levels of both commitment and connection. This strategy followed immediately from those described above and required the participants to engage in an in-role conversation with another character. Within the fiction, the event took place in the city centre immediately following the public release and display of the lists of the dead. As such, while individuals had known about the loss of their own loved ones, until this moment the scale of the tragedy had not been made public.

The emotions identified by these eight participants included basic emotions (Tan, 2008), such as grief ('when one of the members of the group walked towards me and said, "they killed my son"'); social emotions (Tan 2008), including compassion ('when hearing news about a death'); helplessness; and even hostile emotions (Tan 1994), such as exasperation and conflict when one participant was 'treated rudely because I had not lost anyone'. In addition, some participants experienced sadness – an emotion that Tan (2008) categorizes as empathic. For example, one Hobart participant suggested that they felt sadness as they talked about their friend who had died in the war, conceding, 'I had tears', while a participant in the Hong Kong public workshop described the paired role-play as 'bringing strong feelings of sadness'. Unfortunately, in many of these cases it was difficult to determine whether these were first- or second-order emotions.

In reflecting on why, for these eight participants, this moment might have kindled the highest levels of commitment and connection possible, it would seem that the most likely reason was that they were being asked to enact personal and communal loss. Supported by the earlier hot-seating strategy, which gave individuals the opportunity to create back-stories, the strategy seems to have created strong connections as participants drew on their affective memories of real or fictitious people. For example, a Paris participant noted that they felt both sad and happy when they 'shared a moment with their dead son's primary teacher – remembering him', while another in the same workshop recalled a painful feeling when they spoke about the death of their 'father' in the war. In terms of commitment, it could be argued that it was the intimate nature of the strategy, which required the participants to interact with just one other character on a deeply personal level, that may have served to heighten this aspect.

Moment 2: Creon speaks to her people – whole-group role-play

The second moment was a whole-group role-play. In this section of the drama, President Jane Creon was highly supportive of family members wearing red wristbands, but rude and off-handed toward those wearing purple. She also announced that the loyal troops would be buried first, with decisions about the burials of the rebels to be made later. Across all workshop contexts, these actions provoked considerable resentment, with five participants indicating peak levels of both commitment and connection. The emotions generated included rage, hatred, extreme anger and defiance – emotions that sit within Silvia's (2009) category of hostile emotions. These responses suggest that, for these participants at least, this step was creating conditions where their character's goals and values (or indeed their own) were being challenged.

For example, one Hobart participant suggested that she felt hatred for Creon 'when she was disrespecting the purples', going on to explain that their 'character did not want conflict and blamed her for all the deaths'. Another participant in that same workshop also expressed a hostile response, indicating that they felt extreme anger and defiance when they heard Creon speak, while a third was incensed at the way she 'talked down to all her people'.

However, amidst these hostile emotions (Tan 1994), the self-conscious emotion (Tan 2008) of pride also emerged, with one participant noting that they experienced this emotion 'when they were asked (by Creon) to verbalize who they had lost in the battle'. Pride was also identified by a Hong Kong

participant, who reported that they felt this self-conscious emotion when they banded together with two other characters to stand up to Creon.

Of interest to the broader focus of this article is the fact that this strategy is in strong contrast with the one preceding it. While the paired role play was intimate, involving two participants working independently of the other pairs, this strategy involved the whole group and the facilitator. Also different was the fact that tension was created here by the ideas offered by the facilitator and the manner in which the role of Creon was enacted, with these appearing to have an impact on the resulting emotion types. In this case, hostile and self-conscious emotions were added to the basic social and empathic ones created in the previous moment.

Moment 3: Ritual enactment

Five participants, one in Dublin and four in Hobart, indicated that they experienced the highest possible levels of both connection and commitment during the creation and enactment of a burial ritual for the loyalist soldiers. Within this step, tension was generated by the requirement to exclude the rebel soldiers from these events, but inevitably many groups chose to defy Creon and to include the purple wristbands in their enactments. In creating these rituals, individuals drew on personal and collective memories of burial rites and ceremonies, while also collaborating to develop creative ways to incorporate the wristbands.

In describing their emotional responses within this step, one Dublin-based participant was highly specific, suggesting that each time their group made a collective 'ahhh' sound within the ritual, it created both suffering and a release of grief. However, a Hobart participant offered a quite contrasting comment, noting, 'I felt supported during our ritual as the group chose to honour the red dead loyalists but also acknowledged the death of my father, a rebel, by touching my left hand as they offered individual condolences'. In the same session, another participant identified simultaneous feelings of pride and fear as their group 'flouted Creon's rules to bury my son'. In other groups, the rules laid down by Creon were respected, with one Hobart participant noting that they felt 'compassion during the burial ritual as those with purple wristbands stood and respected our dead – and I suddenly did not feel anger towards them any longer'.

This moment created a real mix of emotion types, including basic, social and self-conscious ones, with the hostile emotions of the previous step receding. This reduction in hostile emotions was most likely to have been influenced more by the absence of the facilitator than the strategy itself, for tension was clearly evident in both moments – albeit of different kinds, with tension of the task replacing tension of relationships. In addition, in terms of the order of these emotions, it was once again impossible to establish these with any certainty, but it does appear that they were mostly second-order emotions (Bolton, 1984), given that the descriptions offered mostly included comments about characters within the drama.

Moment 4: Interaction with Creon within ritual enactment

During some of the later ritual enactments, Julie – in role as Creon – intervened, stopping any that she saw as being disrespectful to the loyalist troops.

In response, moments of open conflict were created. Possibly due to these high levels of tension, more participants chose this moment as one of peak commitment and connection than any other across the data set, with eighteen participants from every workshop context identifying it, including eight from the Hobart workshop. In addition, a further 34 participants positioned this moment in other parts of the upper right quadrant, including respondents who indicated that they also experienced strong commitment when they were engaged as an audience to these interactions. In this case, one participant suggested that they felt disgust when Creon interrupted another group's ritual, adding that 'watching these was as important as the experience of doing'.

These outcomes are similar to those relating to Moment 2, where the facilitator's direct involvement in a role oppositional to that of the majority of the group not only built tension, but also influenced the emotional appraisals that occurred. A key factor in this process was how the roles were enacted, for Julie (as Creon) engaged in behaviours that were likely to impact on participants' connection and commitment. For example, a significant level of direct eye contact, close proximity and one-on-one verbal confrontations was employed, as Creon confronted defiant citizens, demanding they remove the offending purple bands. These confrontations often generated fiery exchanges, both between participants and between Creon and individuals or groups, with these needing to be managed in order to ensure that the goals of the drama remained in focus. To do this, Julie (as Creon) threatened to have loved ones buried by strangers, or when all else failed, called on imaginary guards to remove the defiant citizens before immediately cutting the action.

During these moments, Julie also had to maintain a firm commitment to the character she was playing. Preston (2017: 50), when discussing facilitation, draws upon Hochschild's work on emotional labour to suggest that 'the emotional labour of the facilitator can be generative and transformative (rather than passive or reactive) through the bringing of physical energy and focused commitment to the participative space that can infect the participants in a very positive way'. This seems to have been the case here, with written comments by some participants offering useful detail. For example, one Hong Kong postgraduate student explained that they felt irritation when 'Creon came to shake my hand', going on to say that in that moment they were afraid to show their real stance toward her. Similarly, a Dublin participant suggested they felt 'rage at their actionless response' when Creon 'forced me to put away the purple cloth'. A Norwegian participant indicated that they experienced fear at the funeral when 'I was asked if I shared the rebel's attitude (that is, my dead brother's attitude)', while in Dublin one respondent indicated that they (or their character) experienced compassion, anger and powerlessness all at the same time. Multiple emotions were also identified by a Hong Kong postgraduate student whose feedback form suggested they experienced anger, sadness and horror when 'the president asked/commanded us to take off the purple tag'.

At the Paris conference, one participant reported feeling 'incensed' when Creon 'interrupted the funeral ritual and had arguments with the family members who had lost loved ones', while another was quite explicit about the fictional frame suggesting they felt ashamed 'when the President asked me [in role of red] whether I would allow the family members of the rebels to bury

their dead bodies and I said no – bowing to the authority’. In a similar vein, one Hobart participant’s response reflected close alignment with the focus of the drama, indicating that in this moment they felt nervousness, ‘feeling very torn that my friends supported the burial of my family member but if I was to support them, I would be breaking the law’.

However, once again pride was a frequently reported emotion, with several participants indicating that they were proud of the way they stood up for their beliefs. This was especially the case in Hobart, where one participant outlined their sense of pride when they ‘turned their back on Creon’, while another felt surprised but justified when Creon called upon the guards to arrest them. A further participant in that same site also noted both fear and pride as they stood up to Creon, but in this case described feeling both first- and second-order emotions simultaneously, as they noted, ‘I felt both fear and pride when saying I was prepared to die to defy Creon ... while also thinking people I know in Hong Kong who are making that same decision today’.

This final comment is very important, as it reflects how this individual’s appraisal processes were simultaneously being influenced by events within the room and outside of it, with the result being the creation of empathic first-order emotions and both basic and empathic second-order emotions. The comment also reveals that tension was a key factor influencing both the type and intensity of the emotions created.

In terms of the overall goal of this article, namely exploring the relationship between the strategies and the emotions generated, this moment in the drama was clearly an important one. It reinforces that the involvement of the facilitator not only tends to lift commitment and connection, but also influences the type of emotions produced. In this case, as within Moment 2, the facilitator’s presence resulted in an increase in hostile and self-conscious emotions. This can be seen from the quotes above, where Creon’s name is repeatedly mentioned.

Moment 5: Writing in role and soundscape

Following the intensity of the interaction with Creon within the previous moment, the action in this step was intentionally slowed and distanced through the reading of a segment from the original playscript of *Antigone*. Here Sophocles’ words were used as a stimulus for a task where participants were asked to write a letter to their deceased loved one or another family member outlining their response to Creon’s ruling that the rebel soldiers would not be buried. Next, the participants were asked to create a spontaneous soundscape of voices, which reflected the ideas included in those letters. In each workshop context, the resultant soundscape was filled with emotion: compassion, hate, regret, sorrow and revenge.

Seven participants in total, including four in Dublin and three in the Hong Kong (public) workshop, identified this poetic strategy as creating for them a moment of peak commitment and connection. This is interesting, and suggests that it is not only those moments high in the tension of relationships that are capable of developing these kinds of outcomes, for this one was entirely dependent on the artistry of the participants who collaborated without input from the facilitator. It reinforces the importance of structuring process drama so that moments of high intensity are followed by those that are more reflective, offering a range of experiences for participants. Importantly, given the

two contexts where these peak levels of commitment and connection occurred (Dublin and Hong Kong), it also suggests that the broader social and political situations can be highly influential.

Finally, with the exception of some nervousness about contributing effectively to the soundscape, the emotions that emerged within this moment appear to be mostly second-order ones and included fury, sadness and suffering.

Moment 6: Square of action and post-drama discussion

This last step in the drama was aimed at providing participants with the opportunity to reflect on their experience and to consider the meanings it made for them. In the first part of this step, each participant had the opportunity to articulate their character's feelings about the uprising and to outline their views about the best way of responding to Creon's decree and indeed the broader uprising, with options including make peace or take action.

Six participants selected this reflective moment as one of peak commitment and connection, offering some interesting written responses in support, including those that clearly identified the order of the emotions generated. For example, one Hong Kong participant noted that they felt 'disappointment that there were so many young Hong Kong people standing on the "make peace" line'. This was clearly a first-order emotional response, suggesting that the lack of activism demonstrated by the workshop participants, in-role as the fictional citizens of Sebeht, was somehow reflective of a lack of activism in the real world of Hong Kong. Of course, in the light of the widespread citizen protests witnessed in that city across 2019, this concern was clearly unfounded.

In Hobart, one participant reported feeling a similar sense of desperation when they recognized that they were 'only one of three' who would choose to openly defy Creon and bury their loved one. However, in this case the order of this emotion was impossible to determine. By contrast, a response in Hobart, which indicated that pride and fear occurred simultaneously with the decision to 'bury my rebel son', tends to suggest second-order emotions.

Later in this same step, the participants worked out of role to consider explicitly the focus of the drama. In Dublin, a robust discussion began immediately, mostly driven by concerns about how Irish people respond to oppressive situations. One participant in particular was highly vocal, suggesting that the drama had mirrored for her the real world of Irish society, where anger and outrage are expressed, but in the end little action occurs when it is needed. Indeed, this discussion provoked such strong self-conscious emotions (Tan, 2008) that one participant, who identified this as a moment of peak commitment and connection, indicated that at that very moment she experienced a sense of hopelessness at her real-world lack of options, and a desire to emigrate from Ireland as a result.

A Paris participant also experienced a very strong reaction in response to this step, revealing that the drama had reignited her grief at the recent loss of her real-world father, going on to express concerns about the lack of protection the drama offered her. From our perspective, this lack of protection had occurred because she had joined the workshop late, entering the space without being aware of the focus and also without hearing the recommendations relating to role selection. She had also missed the research discussion at the start of the workshop and was therefore angry with us for the pain

and grief she experienced. Significantly, her anger and grief had a flow-on impact on another participant, who indicated that they had experienced a first-order empathic response of sadness 'when a participant shared that her father had died'.

Another participant, this time a Hong Kong postgraduate student, identified the moment when Julie, as facilitator and out of role, revealed to the group that she struggled to take on the role of Creon as the values expressed by the fictional president conflicted so strongly with her personal beliefs and values. They noted that at this moment they felt 'moved by her struggle'. Significantly, these last two moments both involve acts of self-disclosure. Cayanus, Martin and Goodboy (2009) point out that teacher self-disclosure has the potential to enhance the motivation and engagement of students. In this process drama, the public self-disclosure within the reflective phase, offered by both participant and facilitator, appear to have impacted the first-order emotions of others.

Given these various responses, it seems that this step created responses where first- and second-order emotions occurred simultaneously, with one Norwegian participant reporting: 'I don't know how to explain the feelings. I was overfilled with every feeling in my body, like a volcano, an explosion. It was good, and scary, sad and tiredness at the same time'.

These outcomes reinforce Silvia's (2009) claim that self-conscious emotions result from self-reflection on one's own actions or thoughts. Silvia also suggests that it is within the reflective steps that participants are most likely to experience first-order emotions. This reveals once again that high commitment and high connection can be generated by a range of strategies.

DISCUSSION

So what does this analysis reveal? Are there any overall patterns in this data in terms of the strategies and how they influence connection and commitment? Is this important anyway? Can the order and type of emotions created be anticipated? Does context make a difference?

In relation to the question of patterns, analysis of this data suggests, not surprisingly, that the presence of heightened tension and indeed open conflict clearly impact emotion, with those strategies highest in interpersonal conflict (Moments 2 and 4 involving interactions between Creon and the citizens) being those most often identified as generating the highest levels of both commitment and connection. However, also revealed was a range of other strategies with the capacity to generate peak levels of commitment and connection. For example, some participants experienced peak connection and commitment during the paired role-play, while others experienced them within the post-drama reflective discussions. Similarly, while some participants connected and committed strongly in response to strategies where the facilitator was not directly involved (for example, the soundscape), for others it was the presence of and indeed direct contact with the facilitator that had an impact on their commitment and connection. Further, while some participants reported being both strongly committed and connected on several occasions across the drama, others did not report any such moments, yet still recorded a range of emotions.

In terms of the emotions, the data revealed that individual strategies are capable of creating an extraordinarily diverse range of emotions

simultaneously, with the type of emotion created also being highly individual. This outcome seems to suggest that the types of emotions created within a process drama are more strongly influenced by appraisal processes than by the structure of the drama itself, with the only exception being that hostile emotions are more likely to occur when a facilitator takes an antagonistic role.

In addition, this analysis suggests that participants may be developing two appraisals simultaneously, especially during reflective strategies, where participants appeared to be experiencing both first- and second-order emotions at the same time. Of course, many drama theorists have discussed dual affect, including Vygotsky's (1976) famous notion that the child weeps in the play but revels as the player, but these investigations have provided some useful examples to extend this work.

Further, we have come to the realization that while commitment and connection are important, it is not useful for participants to be working at peak levels of these at all times. Nor is it useful for participants to be continually creating the same type of emotional responses. Instead, our analysis has revealed that individuals continuously move along continuums of both commitment and connection as a drama progresses, and that these highly individual shifts are a key part of the meaning-making work of process drama. For example, in this drama it was critical for meaning-making that the hostile second-order emotions that clearly emerged as a result of interactions with Creon did not dominate the drama, but instead were balanced by opportunities for participants to step outside the work in order to reflect and thus experience other types of emotions, including first-order ones. As Bolton (1984) warns, facilitators need to guard against creating experiences where individuals experience everything but potentially understand nothing or understand everything but feel nothing.

Finally, while our analysis has confirmed that when structuring a process drama facilitators should be keenly cognisant of the current and historical events that might influence the participation of individuals within a specific geographic or cultural context, they must also understand that each person brings to the drama room highly individual and personal realities that will also be just as significant, if not more so, than those commonly held. This understanding should help facilitators to recognize that while they need to be sensitive to local issues and circumstances, it is also essential to acknowledge in advance that the personal experiences of each individual, and the extent to which they draw on their affective memories, will influence their appraisals. Facilitators therefore need to avoid making assumptions about the groups with which they work, and should instead be ready to react in the moment – modifying the structure and/or their facilitation style as necessary. They must therefore recognize that they are not working with a group, but rather a room filled with individuals who will each appraise the drama and its focus differently – and indeed differently at various points across the work.

CONCLUSION

Close examination of six key moments from one process drama delivered in multiple international contexts has challenged us to think more deeply about the complex relationships between connection, commitment, emotion, dramatic structuring and the ways in which they are deeply entangled. Through

analysis of the data provided by the participants from these diverse contexts, and by considering that data using both appraisal theories and the notion of first- and second-order emotions, we believe that we have created some new and useful insights to inform our field. Nowhere else in the process drama literature has a research process like this one been employed, and we believe that more work of this kind needs to be done. In particular, we would be keen to see work developed that takes a closer look at Szauder's (2005) notion of emotional layering in order to identify in more detail how first- and second-order emotional responses impact and perhaps enable meaning-making.

Finally, this research process has reminded us of how important problem-posing is for those who wish to engage in critical facilitation, while also reinforcing our long-held belief that those of us who work in this field still have much to learn about this highly complex form. An understanding of emotion within process drama, including its type and intensity, would seem to be critical for facilitators working in applied theatre. Understanding the factors that influence these aspects of the work and responding to them as an active part of facilitation are key to this.

REFERENCES

- Bolton, G. (1984), *Drama as Education: An Argument for Placing Drama at the Centre of the Curriculum*, Harlow: Longman.
- Bolton, G. (1986), 'Drama and emotion: Some uses and abuses', in D. Davis and C. Lawrence (eds), *Gavin Bolton: Selected Writing*, London: Longman, pp. 89–99.
- Bowell, P. and Heap, B. (2017), *Putting Process Drama into Action: The Dynamics of Practice*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bundy, P. (2003), 'Aesthetic engagement in the drama process', *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, 8:2, pp. 171–81.
- Bundy, P., Dunn, J. and Stinson, M. (2015), 'Exploring emotion in participatory drama about social justice: A case study of Creon's decree', in K. Freebody and M. Finneran (eds), *Drama and Social Justice*, London: Routledge, pp. 40–52.
- Cayanus, J., Martin, M. and Goodboy, A. (2009), 'The relation between teacher self-disclosure and student motives to communicate', *Communication Research Reports*, 26:2, pp. 105–13.
- Dunn, J., Bundy, P. and Stinson, M. (2015), 'Connection and commitment: Exploring the generation and experience of emotion in a participatory drama', *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, 16:6, pp. 1–21.
- Freire, P. (2003), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*, London: Continuum.
- Giffin, H. (1984), 'The co-ordination of meaning in the creation of shared make-believe reality', in I. Bretherton (ed.), *Symbolic Play: The Development of Social Understanding*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 73–100.
- Heyward, P. (2010), 'Emotional engagement through drama: Strategies to assist learning through role play', *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 22:2, pp. 197–204.
- Moors, A., Ellsworth, P., Sherer, K. and Frijda, N. (2013), 'Appraisal theories of emotion: State of the art and future development', *Emotion Review*, 5:2, pp. 119–24.

- Piazzoli, E. (2018), *Embodying Language in Action: The Artistry of Process Drama in Second Language Education*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Preston, S. (2017), *Facilitation: Pedagogies, Practices, Resilience*, London: Bloomsbury.
- Roseman, I. and Smith, C. (2001), 'Appraisal theory: Overview, assumptions, varieties, controversies', in K. Scherer, A. Schorr and T. Johnstone (eds), *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–19.
- Silvia, P. (2008), 'Interest – the curious emotion', *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17:1, pp. 57–60.
- Silvia, P. (2009), 'Looking past pleasure: Anger, confusion, disgust, pride, surprise, and other unusual aesthetic emotions', *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 3:1, pp. 48–51.
- Szauder, E. (2005), 'Weaving the threads together: The role of emotions', Ph.D. thesis, University of Central England, Birmingham.
- Tan, E. (1994), 'Film-induced affect as a witness emotion', *Poetics*, 23, pp. 7–32.
- Tan, E. (2008), 'Entertainment is emotion: The functional architecture of the entertainment experience', *Media Psychology*, 11:1, pp. 28–51.
- Vygotsky, L. (1976), 'Play and its role in the development of the child', in J.S. Bruner, A. Jolly and K. Sylva (eds), *Play: Its Role in the Development of Evolution*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 537–54.
- Winston, J. (1996), 'Emotion, reason and moral engagement in drama', *Research in Drama Education*, 1:2, pp. 189–200.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Dunn, Julie, Bundy, Penny and Stinson, Madonna (2020), 'Process drama in five international contexts: Considering emotional responses and dramatic structuring', *Applied Theatre Research*, 8:2, pp. 177–195, doi: https://doi.org/10.1386/atr_00037_1

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Professor Julie Dunn, Adjunct Professor Penny Bundy and Associate Professor Madonna Stinson are all members of the Griffith Institute for Educational Research, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. As Griffith colleagues for more than ten years, they have collaborated across a range of arts-focused research projects and together supervised a significant number of doctoral students. Individually and collectively, they are widely published, while having also presented keynotes, masterclasses and workshops in various international sites. This article is the result of an extended study of emotion in process drama that has thus far resulted in additional publications including within the *International Journal of Education and the Arts* and a chapter in the Routledge volume *Drama and Social Justice* (edited by Kelly Freebody and Michael Finneran). Most recently, they have worked with colleagues on a large-scale four-year study entitled *Y Connect*. This funded research examined the application of artist/teacher partnerships and arts-based pedagogies in one culturally diverse secondary school (<http://www.yconnectproject.com>). All three co-authors have been chief investigators on Australian Research Council projects.

Contact: Griffith Institute for Educational Research, Griffith University, Mt Gravatt Campus, Messines Ridge Rd, Mt Gravatt Qld 4122, Australia
E-mail: j.dunn@griffith.edu.au

Julie Dunn, Penny Bundy and Madonna Stinson has asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the author of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.