



Drama-action Model of Educational Theatre as the Place for Overcoming Negative Prejudice and Discrimination toward Vulnerable Groups*

Summary

This article raises a question „can negative prejudice and discrimination toward vulnerable groups, which is especially strong during economic or humanitarian crisis, be overcome through a shift in education and implementation of theatre principles in education process?”. It is argued here that stronger introduction of educational theatre and drama-action model in education would be beneficial for both the receiving culture (Europe) and the migrant populations, especially during economic and humanitarian crisis that we witness today (European migrant crisis). Namely, it is argued that use of educational theatre in working with migrants and local population would help overcome negative prejudice and consequential discrimination that is on the rise in most of today’s Europe. The introduction of educational theatre in education would be a sign of change from positivist and exclusive world view (which is being conveyed by contemporary formal education in most of Europe) to a more inclusive and dialectic education that allows introduction of the Other. Article then continues to show why theatre is the most appropriate instrument for this challenge. Furthermore, it is argued here that introduction of educational theatre would be beneficial in any *Us vs. Them* social situation as it is highly adaptable and „naturally” pre-set with all prerequisites for overcoming negative prejudice and discrimination. Educational theatre is defined by theatrical values of freedom from roles, intense interaction and critical thinking – all of which prerequisite overcoming prejudice and discrimination, and are sorely missing

* Članak je na upit autoru dostupan i na hrvatskom jeziku.

from contemporary formal education. Finally, an drama-action model of educational theatre is proposed for educational systems – a model that has been developed during years of research that showed just how beneficial this model is in working with vulnerable groups and in overcoming prejudicial attitudes and discrimination practices by bridging the Us vs. *Them* social divide into one group of Goffman's Wise.

Key words: formal education, educational theatre, drama-action model, vulnerable groups, European migrant crisis, migrants, refugees, humanitarian crisis

Model obrazovnog kazališta „Drama-akcija” kao mjesto prevladavanja negativnih predrasuda i diskriminacije ranjivih skupina

Sažetak

Ovaj članak postavlja pitanje „može li se nadići negativne predrasude i diskriminaciju ranjivih skupina, koji su posebno snažni u doba ekonomske ili humanitarne krize, kroz zaokret u edukaciji i uvođenje principa teatra u obrazovni proces”. Ovdje se tvrdi da bi snažnije uvođenje edukativnog teatra i dramsko-akcijskog modela u obrazovanje bilo korisno i za primajuću kulturu (Europu) i za migrantske populacije, posebice tijekom ekonomske i humanitarne krize kojima danas svjedočimo (Europska migrantska kriza). Točnije, tvrdi se da bi korištenje edukativnog teatra u radu s migrantima i lokalnim stanovništvom pomoglo nadilaženje negativnih predrasuda i posljedične diskriminacije koji su u porastu u većini današnje Europe. Uvođenje edukativnog teatra u obrazovanje bi bilo znak promjene od pozitivističkog i isključivog svjetonazora (koji suvremeno formalno obrazovanje prenosi u većini Europe) prema više inkluzivnom i dijalektičkom obrazovanju koje dozvoljava uvođenje Drugoga. Članak dalje pokazuje zašto je teatar najprikladniji instrument za ovaj izazov. Nadalje, ovdje se tvrdi da bi uvođenje edukativnog teatra bilo korisno u svakom Mi protiv Njih društvenoj situaciji pošto je visoko prilagodljiv i „prirodno” predodređen sa svim preduvjetima za nadilaženje negativnih predrasuda i diskriminacije. Edukativni teatar je definiran kazališnim vrijednostima slobode of uloge, intenzivne interakcije i kritičkog promišljanja – svim onime što je preduvjet za nadilaženje predrasuda i diskriminacije, te što bolno nedostaje u suvremenom formalnom obrazovanju. Na kraju je obrazovnim sustavima predložen dramsko-akcijski model edukativnog teatra – model koji je razvijan tijekom godina istraživanja koja su pokazala koliko je ovaj model koristan u radu s ranjivim skupinama i nadilaženju predrasudnih stavova i diskriminacijskih kroz premošćivanje Mi protiv Njih društvene podjele u jednu grupu koju Goffman naziva Upućenima (engl. Wise).

Ključne riječi: formalno obrazovanje, edukativni teatar, dramsko-akcijski model ranjive skupine, Europska migrantska kriza, migranti, izbjeglice, humanitarna kriza

Introduction: Can negative prejudice and discrimination be overcome if theatre principles were implemented in educational system and lecturing process?

Viewing the global trends and crisis' from a peripheral position, as a person who originates from Croatia – country that was behind the famous Winston Churchill's iron curtain for almost half a century; country that has experienced one of the last wars that took place on European soil and a country that is nowadays popularly (and long lastingly) placed in transition (with all of the problems that this term implies¹) has its „advantages”. From that position, both the economic and the humanitarian (migrant/refugee) crisis do not seem to be something completely „new”, unknown or scary (since citizens of Croatia have lived in a state of constant crisis – pick your favourite: economic, social, cultural, ethnic, war etc. - for the most of their lives. Of course, the „advantages” end there as this constant crisis experience reflects negatively not only on Croatia's present situation but also influences negatively the future since the crisis is also present in Croatian educational system, on all of its levels. From elementary schools to the Universities, the dominant trajectory is one of decline in quality (Bačić, 2009; Tatalović, 2014) and of divide between those in favour of new trends and those in favour of „the good old days”. These problems of the educational system and constant economic crisis reflect on the social level and stir up negative prejudice and discrimination that are (on paper, or in law, „diminishing” but in reality) still present, strong and problem productive as it always were (United States Department of State, 2016; Amnesty International, 2017). And with the contemporary humanitarian crisis, this trend is expanding to the migrant/refugee populations whose importance and voice in the whole crisis can be „heard” from the media and politician title of the crisis – who dubbed it the „European migrant crisis”.

This combination of 1) constant crisis experience (which, as such, becomes either an unbearable burden or a strong motivator for action); 2) personal interest in development of scientifically sane method for overcoming negative prejudice and discrimination, along with 3) firm belief that science and education are the answer to (dare I say it?) *any* social problem imaginable has inclined me to try and present in this article one possible answer to the question: *Can negative prejudice and discrimination toward vulnerable groups, which is especially strong during economic or humanitarian crisis, be overcome through educational shift and implementation of theatre principles in education process?*

Next chapters are an effort to answer this general question by answering some of the questions that were firstly presented during presentation of this idea at IUC *Challenges*

¹ One of them being corruption. Corruption index in Croatia seems to be on a rise since the 1990ties (Cvitić, 2004; Trading Economics, 2017) , followed by the high perception among the population of an overbearing corruption that has infiltrated all sections of the society (Malenica & Jeknić, 2010; The European Commission, 2014)

of a New Europe: Chances in Crises course² in April of 2010. The goal is to show all of the potentials and advantages that educational theatre model possess, not only for overcoming prejudice and discrimination, but also for more positive worldview (which is sorely needed in contemporary time of economic and humanitarian crisis).

First chapter will try to show the reason why prejudice persists, from sociology of knowledge standpoint. In short, the main reason lies in education which conveys a selective body of social knowledge (that which is „normal” for the given society) and is not able to include the Other³ into the overview of the society. Therefore, it cannot answer, to the extent it claims to answer, to all problems that transitional and/or postmodern times (which have been enriched by these economic and humanitarian crises) impose on societies and individuals. Of course, education is „just” a tool for conveying desirable worldview - and nowadays dominant world view in education and science is one based on the legacy of positivism. So, it is implied that there is a need for paradigm shift from positivism toward some more inclusive world view, and this could be through dialectics. Before the final discussion chapter, the second chapter shows educational theatre model as a practical receptacle which can receive and process the paradigm shift described in the chapter before. In this chapter, the reader can find main theories upon which this model is constructed; a step-by-step description of educational theatre model itself and a short overview of the potentials and benefits that implementation of this theatre model in education and science has to offer.

Education in Economic Crisis - Source of a New Exclusion or an Opportunity for a New Inclusion?

A radical inner transformation and rise to a new level of consciousness might be the only real hope we have in the current global crisis brought on by the dominance of the Western mechanistic paradigm.

Stanislav Grof

Today, the debates about the economic and humanitarian crisis are vibrant all over the world. Should we exclude more in times of crisis; times in which we have (once again)

² Information about the course can be found at <http://www.inclusionexclusion.nl/site/?Welcome>

³ The term includes all individuals who, for any reason, are not able to achieve socially imposed norms. Following Erving Goffman's categorisation of stigmatised individuals, the group of Other can be distinguished by: 1) physical differences (Other = individuals with various handicaps); 2) character differences (Other = individuals with biographical stigmas like addiction, alcoholism, mental sickness, history of violence etc.) or; 3) tribal differences (Other = usually minorities in given society; e.g. Romani people in European countries and in the Balkans) - in other words - discrimination by affiliation (Goffman, 1974).

became consciousness of our own vulnerability; in the ever globalising and, ultimately, uncertain (postmodern) and aggressive world? Or should we include more? Should we be more opened, help others and try new economic and social solutions? These questions and their following debates usually are not strictly confined to the economic sector. They often expand to the wider social questions and topics such as inclusion, prejudice and discrimination where one of the main concerns (or predictions) is that social exclusion of vulnerable groups will enhance during an economic or humanitarian crisis and that social inequality will rise (again). Applied in a context of negative prejudice, this means that new prejudices will be born, old prejudices tightened, with new intra- and international conflicts and, basically – with new problems. The usual defence says something along the lines of „It is nobody’s fault - it is just the way it goes; it is the way the world spins”. Because, in harsh times, we need to take care of our own. Of course, this line of reasoning is usually presented as rational thinking and wise decision making. But, as the etymology will once again show - crisis does not have to be a bad phenomenon a priori.

Deriving from the Latinised version of the Greek word crisis, or, the „turning point in a disease” (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2017) – crisis in reality is not, figuratively speaking, the exclusive right of Tanathos, but also of Eros. Its definition is not value based (as we usually perceive it) and it is just a turning point - for better or for worst). In other words, crisis can have a positive side which is usually blurred by our first (and arguably, logical⁴) perception of crisis as a negative phenomenon that inclines us to take restrictive and exclusionist actions. Having said that, one can ask her or himself: *If crisis is not predestined to be something bad – why don’t we see its positive potential?*

As always, when it comes to addressing economic or social crisis, the „answer lies” (or is sought) primarily, but not exclusively, in education and science. Although there is still a strong belief that science and education are the answers to social problems – at the same time they are sources of those same problems. Simply said, if education and science can provide „the answers” for economic or social crisis’ (and to the undelaying problems of negative prejudice, discrimination and exclusion) by means of educational system, then the contemporary reality of a worldwide rise of discrimination hints that education and science must be doing something wrong.

Contemporary education in Croatia looks upon the tradition of enlightenment and the positivist way of defining reality as its role models. Positivism, as a doctrine, perceives the world in a manner that in this article will be called the FORM. This approach claims to be focused on facts and that which is observable, rational and measurable. To explain the term more closely, we can describe the FORM with a series of statements:

⁴ If we look at the situation from a long term perspective – history has shown that every economic, social or cultural exclusion of parts of society was in fact more expensive and counterproductive, not to mention inhuman (e.g. exclusion of women).

These are the Facts.

Because they are Observable.

This is Rational.

Because it is Measurable.

In other words - only this FORM is relevant. Or, as members of the 1922 Vienna Circle, who have started the logical positivist programme in philosophy, would postulate – only that which can be „verified or falsified by evidence” is to be considered meaningful and granted scientific consideration (Caldwell, 1994:14). Even though the members of this Circle did acknowledge the existence and importance of metaphysical statements (or of the alternative Otherness - author’s comment), they were the ones who decided which statements will be granted the status of knowledge (Caldwell, 1994). One could say that this standpoint forms a stabile FORM perspective that is limiting on the one hand and reassuring on the other.

FORM is then transmitted to the next generations primarily through education, together with a „set” of social knowledge, including negative prejudice and patterns of discriminatory actions. Of course, no one can deny that focusing on observable, measurable and rational facts is a desirable standpoint - especially so in these times of „alternative facts”.

However, this standpoint is extremely problematic when it comes to the subject of overcoming negative prejudice and discrimination. To elaborate, positivism is not the problem, but the problem is the idea (the one which strives from the positivistic educational system) that positivism is the only „truth” and not only one of many ideological doctrines. Positivism itself is not the problem, but the belief that it is based solely on facts and free from ideological distortions is. This belief often prohibits questioning and, ultimately, change. Simply said, when it comes to the subject of overcoming negative prejudice and discrimination, the problem positivistic point of worldview is that it is not „designed” to include the alternative point of view. It is designed to follow the FORM and only include in its worldview that which it perceives as acceptable, normal, rational, truthful... Unable to include the complexities of the society, the FORM worldview reduces the reality, contorts it to its ideological needs and polarises the societal reality on two opposing sides - the *Us* and *Them* – often helped by the „objective” educational system⁵. And it does so in the same manner and with the same prejudicial enthusiasm for *Us* and disregard for *Them* as any other ideology.

⁵ For example, during the war in Croatia, Croatian pupils learned lots of untrue information about the Serbs (and vice versa). These information were presented as „facts” or unquestionable truths by the official school books and also by some of the teachers. Seven respectful Croatian historians agree that history school books are problematic. For instance, they still show some of the Croats as war heroes even though there are many indications that they are at the same time war criminals and/or war profiteers (Kalodera Brkić, 2007)

Of course, the positive prejudice is always reserved for those with power, for *Us*, and the negative prejudice and discrimination is always reserved for *Them*. Perceived from the positivism FORM view, this issue does not exist. Because, there is only the divine FORM – the only acceptable, rationale norms and values that are to be acknowledged. *Us* is normal and *Them* is not a part of that. *Them* are described with a set of statements:

Everything else is not a Fact.

Because it is not Observable.

It is not Rational.

Because it is not Measurable.

In other words – everything outside of FORM is irrelevant. Translated to human destinies, this means that *Them* and *Otherness* of any kind (alternative people, ideas, worldviews etc.) have no value in the positivist state of mind. When it comes to the negative prejudice and *Us* vs. *Them* polarisation, this means that *Them* and their culture, norms, world view etc. are irrelevant and are to be ignored (at the very least). What is important is that this problem would not be so significant if it were more of an individual and not social phenomenon that is transmitted through education to younger generations. But this is not the case, on the contrary. Contemporary education system prefers positivist worldview; it prefers the *Us* perspective and it perceives *Them* as unchangeable facts or truths⁶.

In reality, every society has the Other side that is ignored - the discriminated *Them*. They, on the other hand (being the silent segment of the given society and having different experience of the world) use a worldview that differs from the positivist FORM. Generally speaking, their worldview is constructed so that it allows the inclusion of *Them* and of other worldview into the world of the *Us* – by means of dialectics. This dialectical worldview is much more open to the Other and therefore should be more inclusive and, be extent, closer to the „real” image of the complexity of the society. Stemming from the dialectics, their worldview can be shown in a simple equation:

$$\text{Thesis (T) + Anti Thesis (A) = Synthesis (S)}^7$$

implemented to the negative prejudice and discrimination problem and the inevitable *Us* and *Them* social division. Dialectics shows that *Us* (T) is just one part of equation and not the whole truth, the whole fact – as positivists likes to perceive it. There is also

⁶ Perhaps the best example of this situation is Physics which changes almost on daily basis, even thou it is one of the natural sciences which social sciences look upon as being one of its the role models. For instance, Reginald T. Cahill has been advocating for Process Physics that radically changes today dominant non-Process Physics and its geometrical perception of time and space (Cahill, 2005)

⁷ In Reason and Revolution : Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory, Marcuse argues that only Synthesis creates the Mind as a true form of reality which includes all of the oppositions of subject and object in a single unified truth (Marcuse, 1987)

the Other (A) which have to be heard, perceived, and included in order to grasp the true situation or to find a solution (S) that will be sustainable as it includes both sides of the equation⁸. In other words, contemporary education should teach young generations that the Other have to be heard and excepted if society and science want to find a sustainable social *truth* and overcome social discrimination or contemporary economic and humanitarian crisis. This brings us to the next question that needs to be answered is: *How can this paradigm shift in education from positivism to dialectics be of any help in working with vulnerable groups during economic and humanitarian crisis?*

To understand the potential of this paradigm shift in education, it is best to view crisis through the perspective of Thomas theorem: If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences (Thomas & Thomas, 1928: 571-572). This means that crisis and its endurance depends solely on our orientation: will we be positive about our future or defeatist. Defeatist world view is one of positivism because it is inclined to look at the historical time line as a series of facts that follow one another. In linear, positivistic view of history, it starts with Modern positivism, switches to the Postmodern and its value crisis that proceeds further to the contemporary economic and humanitarian crisis. Positivism and FORM world view say that this crisis is now a reality, it is an observable and measurable fact that stems from earlier activities. This does not say anything about the future. This is where dialectics can be of help. If we learn to view crisis and historical timeline through dialectics and $T+A=S$ equation, the worldview of the future looks much brighter. According to that equation, the Modern (T) plus Postmodern/Crisis (A) will come to some Solution (S) that will have elements of both modern and postmodern worldview. Looked from this perspective – this crisis is just one step toward the goal of more inclusive society.

Having presented the need for more positive stand for inclusion of new ideas and other people (*Others*) on a general level, the paper will now go on and use this approach on a specific subject – the subject of negative prejudice and discrimination toward them

⁸ The elite, while in position of power and wealth, usually do not see anything wrong with the world. They see it through positivism - as a fact: „Social reality is natural, God given or logical and if someone is, let's say, poor – it is their own fault. We are the elite because we deserve it and others do not”. On the other hand, the discriminated ones look at things in a different way, through Dialectics. They are saying to the elite: „We are also humans and we deserve the same treatment that you get”. Being outside of the Norm and normal, they are drawn to the inclusive potential of Dialectics. But, there is a history paradox which shows the persistence of positivistic FORM state of mind. It can be seen in the process of change: the paradox occurs when there is a revolution – when those who were once discriminated get in positions of power, they also start to use positivism as their world view. This paradox happened to communism, to Napoleon and even to science. All of them have [in times when they were not in position of power and in times when they were Antithesis themselves (e.g. pre-enlightenment times when religion more or less constricted science)] cried out for Dialectics ($T+A=S$) and acceptance of different (their) world view (Hromatko and Matić, 2009). But, once they got in position of power, they themselves started to practice positivism and exclude other world views (Hromatko and Matić, 2009).

(migrants, asylum seekers and alike) – where it is implied that one of possible solutions for the problem of prejudice is implementation toward those groups in times of humanitarian and economic crisis is the described paradigm shift in education: the one dialectical education that embraces both *Us* and *Them* by utilising all of the advantages of educational theatre.

Drama-action model in educational Theatre: Theatre as the Place for Overcoming Negative Prejudice and Discrimination

Adiatur et altera pars.

(Let the other side be heard too.)

Now we come to the main question: *How can we implement this paradigm shift in education and everyday life and really try to overcome negative prejudice and discrimination toward the Other (migrants, asylum seekers etc.)? How can we put together two groups of people who base their relation on prejudice and therefore avoid, discriminate and even hate each other in everyday life?* Theoretically, it is *easy*: we just have to create a theoretical *bricolage* of 1) Berger and Luckmann's social construction theory; 2) Goffman's dramaturgy world view perspective and 3) Turner's theatre interpretation of Arnold van Gennep's *rites de passage* (Hromatko, 2009).

This combination of theoretical and empirical approaches shows that social reality and its institutions (prejudice included) are constructs made by human actions and as such - can be changed (Berger and Luckmann, 1992) if there is a change in the body of social knowledge conveyed via education. This means that the main problem of acceptance that not only migrants, but all individuals who are discriminated and who suffer from social prejudice stems from stereotypes learned through education and perpetuated by avoidance of any real contact with the Other. As Goffman has shown, acceptance by others - which is elusive for persons who bear some social stigma – is the biggest problem simply because the *Us* people⁹ are deeply convinced that stigmatised people deserve their faith and should be avoided for the contingency of their stigma by affiliation (Goffman, 1974). Goffman has shown that the „normal” usually do not see the „stigmatized” as human beings, to the fullest extent (Goffman, 1974). They are always something less, something other than *Us*, and are to be avoided (Goffman, 1974). In other words, there is little or no interaction between *Us* and *Them* or which, obviously, creates fruitful ground for stereotypes and becomes a problem for inclusion. Since people avoid each other and, therefore, do not have any direct or „real” experience

⁹ Members of society who are within the norm in a given space and time.

with one another - they are inclined to use their previous knowledge and prejudices when they try to define the Other (Goffman, 1974). That knowledge is conveyed by the society through education, family and social circles and includes knowledge of prejudice and welcomed discrimination towards the Other (Berger and Luckmann, 1994). Viewed from sociology of knowledge point of view prejudice and discrimination patterns are no more than elements of general corpus of social knowledge that individuals fall back to in everyday, routine situations and interactions that require little energy or cognitive input (Berger and Luckmann, 1994). This phenomenon cannot be negatively valued as it is a biologically set: we, as humans, live within biological boundaries that force us to find economic and practical solutions and definitions¹⁰ for our inevitably ungraspable environment (Pusić, 1977; Berger and Luckmann, 1994). However, it has to be said that this „first answer” solutions are often presented in the education system as being the sole truths and indisputable facts – even though the real life only shows just how ideological or, „porous” (as Charles Lemert describes it) are social definitions of what is „normal” and what is „deviant” in a given society (Lemert, 2003).

Furthermore, not only that humans are not only biological short term beings, humans are also *long term* cultural beings that are able to go beyond the biologically immanent needs and that which seems, on the first glance, rational. In other words, even though the first, *short term* logical reaction in time of economic, humanitarian (or any other social) crisis is to preserve our resources, exclude *Others* and unorthodox ideas/solutions; the human, cultural and *long term* rational thing to do is to include others and unorthodox ideas/solutions - since history has shown that humans develop in time of crisis¹¹.

Finally, this paper will argue that the one of the ways to implement and test this theory and to try resolve the main problem of prejudice, discrimination and stigmatization of the *Other* (low or absent interaction and face-to-face experience) is to implement Victor Turner’s theatre, educational version of *rites de passage* or the initiation process. Working with performance studies scholar Richard Schechner, Turner has implemented the initiation process of the Zambian Ndebu tribe in a classroom in order to allow the students to really „experience” the Ndebu culture (Turner, 1989). Instead of sharing stories or anthropological diaries, Turner used theatre to recreate Ndebu culture and present it to his students in a more realistic way – through experience of their culture

¹⁰ Berger and Luckmann refer to this prejudice as „recipes” for defining reality and finding solutions for social situations in a stress free and a less time and energy consuming manner. These recipes are learned through socialisation and education (Berger and Luckmann, 1992).

¹¹ In a sense, this can be shown through scientific revolutions analogy described by Thomas Kuhn in his masterpiece *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn argues that science develops through revolutions that are preceded by some science crisis which happens when normal science is no longer able to give satisfying answers (Kuhn, 1999). This can be broadened to individual growth and society development in general – humans and human societies develop through revolutionary ideas and these ideas occur because humans live in an ultimately uncertain environment and constant state of survivor crisis.

(Turner, 1989). The students were role playing and acting the Ndebu tribe initiation process¹² and learned about the tribe through acting experience. Here it is argued that this process can be used to present migrant cultures to the host cultures and help overcome prejudice that exists on both ends. But, before description of this process, there is a need for answering one more question: *Why theatre?*

There are at least three reasons why *Theatre* is the best candidate for overcoming prejudice. First, theatre is the place where participants are free of roles, to the farthest possible extent. Second; historically Theatre has (more or less) been the place for criticizing existing norms, social relations, power figures etc. If we accept that societies today have negative prejudices and that prejudice derives from social knowledge, it is obvious that we need to be able to criticize that same knowledge and its norms. Third, among the media, theatre is one that allows the most interaction as possible¹³. Thus combined, Theatre does not mean a building specialized for performing plays; it means a symbol: symbol for any space that allows and cherishes: 1) Freedom (from everyday roles); 2) Critique (of existing norms and values that promote prejudice and discrimination) and 3) Interaction between *Us* and *Them* (Turner, 1989; Hromatko and Matic, 2008). Additionally, theatre is an economic way of educating. Instead of unrealistic efforts to bring the Ndebu tribe and students together in one place, Turner used theatre and role playing and it has shown that it can be just as effective (provided that this role playing is intensive enough). This process, once implemented between the local and migrant cultures can therefore help overcome prejudice and break stereotypes even before the first contact. This is certainly an additional value and most welcome, as it lowers the costs while providing in-depth experiential education.

The following table shows the proposed educational theatre model and its process that it is suitable for education. Besides showing the strong educational side of the model, the table shows the activist or advocacy element of the model – as it is suitable for social work and for advocacy or inciting of positive social change (e.g. inclusion of migrants, working on self-esteem of vulnerable groups etc.). Finally, the table shows that this educational model can be used by researchers as a research tool for measuring change in prejudice views and discrimination practices. Especially so if a drama-action model is implemented during the liminal stage of symbolic theatre rites de passage. Of course, drama-action model is just one of possible models of work that can be used in working with vulnerable groups. Some of the models are international while others are local. For example, the „Small Creative Socialisation Groups” approach is known to use certain drama techniques and is used in working with children from vulnerable

¹² Initiation process consists of three stages - separation stage, liminal stage and reincorporation stage (Turner, 1989).

¹³ Even if there is a division between the audience and the actors, they still interact. Actors are always under the influence of the audience and its reactions and vice versa.

groups (Janković, Blažeka, Rambousek, 2000). The same can be said for sociodrama and psychodrama that both use aspects of drama in their work (Kellermann, 2007, Đurić, Veljković and Tomić, 2004). However, those approaches are focused on „damage control” and empowering of specific vulnerable groups and individuals while drama-action model is focused on accomplishing mixed interaction between *Us* and *Them* and finding sustainable solutions to social problems to which both sides agree and are willing to work toward together. Therefore it is a model that includes both sides in its work and it also ends with a public performance, which is not usual in any observed methods or models. With that public performance, this model transcends from realms of scientific research and education into civil society and advocacy work for social inclusion. This is drama-action model’s main difference and, perhaps, an advantage. It is also a flexible model that can be used with any age group.

Table 1. Comparison of Tribal initiation process and drama-action model in educational theatre

Arnold van Gennep`s TRIBAL RITES de PASSAGE (Initiation process)	
PARTICIPANTS	SEPARATION STAGE
CHILD Ndebu tribe (Zambia)	The child enters the initiation process by being separated from the tribe (which includes family and parenthood protection) and from its community role. The initiate is left on his own so he can experience life outside of the tribe (life reserved for all those who oppose already established tribal norms).
Victor Turners Rites de Passage developed into THEATRE RITES de PASSAGE: DRAMA-ACTION	
THEATRE- RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS	SEPARATION STAGE „LOBBY” STAGE Participants enter the symbolic space of theatre; a space of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FREEDOM • CRITIQUE • INTERACTION
THE „NORMAL” Anyone who is capable of fulfilling norms in given society and time (or is perceived as being capable) (DIALECTICS: THESIS) ***MAJORITY***	PRINCIPLES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FREEDOM From roles, everyday knowledge, prejudice • CRITIQUE Of existing norms and values that promote prejudice • INTERACTION With members of the „Otherness” group

MODEL OF EDUCATIONAL THEATRE	
LIMINAL STAGE	REINCORPORATION STAGE
The child is completely ignored by the tribe members. He/she is basically free from tribal norms. This is the time of solitude and adaptation to new situation. This can be a frightful time, but it can also be the time for exploring, playing, testing boundaries and development of alternative practices...	The initiate is re-incorporated into the community – having learned what it means to disobey social norms and confront values. The child is now symbolically „reborn” into the tribal community and it is now its full member – with rights and, more importantly, obligations. Obligations are imposed through the child's knowledge of consequences for disobedience.
LIMINOID STAGE THEATRE - EXPLORE & PLAY STAGE Participants are invited to create theatre play. While in process, they role play, explore perception of others, debate and experience social/world view from the Other side (whether it is the „Normal” or Otherness/Deviant side)	REINCORPORATION STAGE RESULTS STAGE Participants create and play out their theatre play to the public. Preferably, the play represents some of their negative social and personal experiences to the audience. After the plays, they return to normal, everyday life, but (!) - enriched by their new dramaturgical experience with people that they usually avoid or discriminate in everyday life
PROCESS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROLE PLAYING • INTERACTING • CRITIQUE • DEBATING • DRAMA-ACTION RESEARCH (dialectic spiral learning process with stages: reflection, planning, action/ observation, reflection)	GOALS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS (CONSCIOUSNESS) • DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITIQUE MIND • DEVELOPMENT OF SOLIDARITY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF „NORMAL” AND „OTHERNESS” GROUPS • INTROSPECTIVE SEARCH OF ONE OWNS PREJUDICE • PUBLIC SPEAKING/ACTING TRAINING

<p>THE OTHERS Anyone who is deviant or incapable of fulfilling norms in given society and time (or is perceived as being incapable) (DIALECTICS: ANTI-THESIS)</p> <p>***DEVIANT/MINORITY***</p>	<p>PRINCIPLES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FREEDOM From roles, everyday knowledge, prejudice+ • CRITIQUE Of existing norms and values that promote prejudice • INTERACTION With members of the „Normal” group
<p>THE „WISE” Anyone who has, through their own personal or professional experience with Otherness, become sensitive to their problems. (DIALECTICS: SYNTHESIS)</p> <p>*** RESEARCHERS / EDUCATORS SOCIAL WORKERS / EXPERTS ***</p> <p>Sociology... Psychology... Drama... Acting...</p>	<p>METHODS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW (Qual data) • SURVEY (Quan data)

In the first row of the table 1, there is a description of Arnold van Gennep’s *rites de passage*, as it happens in the tribal communities of the Ndebu and as it has been described by Victor Turner (Turner, 1989). In the second part of the table there is Turner’s interpretation of van Gennep’s *rites de passage* which has one significant difference from van Gennep’s version: the Liminal or Limbo (transformation) stage is replaced by Liminoid stage – stage that resembles the tribal Liminal stage in all segments except in social repercussions for exploration and ludic behaviour within this stage¹⁴. Turner has

¹⁴ Liminal stage is typical for pre-modern societies and it is obligatory for all members of the tribe since it is their initiation process which is inevitable tribal tool for socialisation of members and for continuation of tribal cohesion. Breaking of this rule leads to serious social repercussions. In modern societies, this stage has changed in form but not in substance and it has moved to leisure section of social reality – namely, to theatre – where it continues to explore reality and try different ideas, but it does not lead to serious social repercussions and it is not obligatory (Turner, 1989). This is the space in which existing social knowledge, norms, prejudice, power figures and social relations can be examined, ridiculed, tested and confronted without bearing consequences. Obviously, this shows potential for confronting the prejudice and discrimination problem which has been characterised by acceptance of *Us* norms, exclusion of *Them* and ignorance of their perspective.

<p>PROCESS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROLE PLAYING • INTERACTING • CRITIQUE • DEBATING • DRAMA-ACTION RESEARCH (dialectic spiral learning process with stages: reflection, planning, action/ observation, reflection) 	<p>GOALS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS (CONSCIOUSNESS) ABOUT THEIR PARTICULAR PROBLEMS • DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRITIQUE MIND • DEVELOPMENT OF SOLIDARITY BETWEEN MEMBERS OF „NORMAL” AND „OTHERNESS” GROUPS • INTROSPECTIVE SEARCH OF ONE OWNS PREJUDICE • PUBLIC SPEAKING/ACTING TRAINING • THERAPEUTIC „BONUS”
<p>METHODS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OBSERVATION + PARTICIPATION • MONITORING • GUIDING (WHEN NEEDED) • AUDIO/VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCESS 	<p>METHODS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IN-DEPTH INTERVIEW (Qual data) • SURVEY (Quan data) • *** CONFIRMATION OF HYPOTHESIS OR „OLD” SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE • *** NEW INSIGHT/THESIS/THEORY

developed his symbolic theatre based on that process (Turner, 1989) and it has latter been implemented into drama-action model of educational theatre. This model is based on interdisciplinary but complementary bricolage of theories Berger and Luckmann's theory of social construction of society, Goffman's dramaturgical perspective, Turner's modern (or theatrical) *rites de passage*, and drama/theatre version of Lewin's action research (Hromatko, 2016). In short, during drama-action educational theatre model work, the participants are invited to exchange roles (between *Us* and *Them*), interact and explore each other's perspectives. This, combined with goal-oriented interaction (creation of theatre play about mutual experiences) and drama-action research model in the Liminoid stage, has the potential to change recipes and prejudices that individuals use in everyday life. The goal of this educational theatre model is to develop individuals from both sides of the *Us* vs. *Them* polarisation into one unified group of people that Goffman has referred to as being *Wise*¹⁵ (Goffman, 1974).

¹⁵ As shown in the table 1. the *Wise* are all of those who have, through their own personal or professional experience with *Others* (stigmatised persons), became sensitive to their problems (Goffman, 1974).

The process is framed within Turner's theatre version of *rites de passage* and follows its stages of separation, transformation (Liminoid stage) and reincorporation that Turner sees as the basic process for any learning (Turner, 1989). Both sides of the social issue (the Normal and the Other) enter the space of symbolic theatre that Turner described as any space that is defined by the basic values (or principles) of theatre: freedom from everyday roles, intense interaction, and welcomed critical thinking. Both sides enter the „lobby” area of the symbolic theatre and agree to use the same values. On a meta-level, this is a meeting of the thesis (*Us*, Normal) and anti-thesis (*Other*, Deviant). For example, a meeting between the migrants and their new hosts – which, in most parts of Europe has been a difficult process. But, that which is difficult or even unimaginable process in everyday life, in theatre is possible and exportable. That is the main advantage of masking this interaction between *Us* and *Them* in theatre – since they will be willing to explore subjects that are, in everyday life, considered taboo. As the participants enter the „Lobby” area, the facilitators of the process (researchers, educators, social workers, other experts in fields of psychology, sociology etc.) conduct their preliminary investigations to establish the attitudes and define the social issue that is being researched in more detail. For example, researchers conduct introduction survey and focus groups or interviews with the participants in which they will aim to establish the socio-demographic characteristics of those involved and of their attitudes toward the other side.

Once the basic values of this new, mixed „society” have been established, the participants undergo drama practitioners' exercises that will help them symbolically separate from their everyday roles and develop group cohesion within their new society. This symbolic separation is best achieved through intensive drama practitioners' exercises or through deep relaxation through meditation.

After separation comes transformation or Liminoid stage. This is the crucial stage as the participants are most free to explore the given social issue, their roles in that issue and the positions of others. They are invited through the use of various drama practitioners', actors and other exercises of performance arts to explore, exchange roles, debate and interact with one another. Basically, they are invited to play with each other and to play each other. Important element is that this interaction must be as intense as possible and definitely more intense than that in everyday life. This is important since change of attitudes toward the Other is more likely possible during an intense interaction that conveys the humanity of the Other – which does not happen in non-intensive interactions in everyday life (Goffman, 1974).

Since drama practitioners' exercises and play can be quite free and open, it is important to add a segment of play that is more focused on the subject at hand. This is where drama-action research model comes in. It is a research model developed on the legacy of action research by Kurt Lewin. It follows the basic spiral steps of action research

that Lewin has defined as reflection, planning, acting/observing, and reflecting again (Lewin, 1946). This basic learning process is compatible with the basic learning process of Turner's *rites de passage* and helps the facilitators and participants to keep their focus on the social issue they are exploring. The participants are guided to reflect on their problem and define negative and positive actions. In other words, they are invited to define that actions that embody that which is negative (stereotypes, prejudice) and actions that embody that which is positive (positive actions that overcome prejudice and stereotypes and work toward inclusion). Then they are invited to plan the execution of their positive actions. Once their plan is ready, they are invited to act it out and to observe the implications that their actions have on the subject they are exploring and the negative-positive division they have set earlier). Finally, they again reflect on the general subject they are exploring and try to define if their actions will act as agents of positive (inclusion of migrants, mutual respect) or negative exchange (e.g. exclusion of migrants, mutual disrespect). The drama-action research model is compatible with participatory action research model which, as Appadurai claims should be a human right in a sense that citizens should have „the right to the tools through which any citizen can systematically increase that stock of knowledge which they consider most vital to their survival as human beings and to their claims” (Appadurai, 2006: 168 in Cammarota and Fine, 2008). Not less important, the drama-action model helps all those involved to be focused on the final goal of their exploration – joint presentation of their work in a public performance. Final performance is of the highest importance as it helps develop group cohesion across everyday life boundaries of *Us* and *Them* (by achieving a mutual goal) and it also helps share the positive images in their society and spread messages of inclusion beyond the confounds of the educational theatre workshop.

Coming to the public performance, the participants from both groups are entering the final reincorporation stage of Turner's *rites de passage*. In this stage they are symbolically reunited with their everyday roles. If during the educational theatre workshop they had experiences that opposed their stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes, there is a potential that they changed their attitudes toward the Other side. In any case, they have become Wise as they now have a direct and intense experience with the Other side and have first-hand information on which they can base their attitudes toward members of that group (on opposed to drawing from social knowledge and relying on recipes, stereotypes and prejudice). Since theatre performance is an intense experience for anyone (even professional actors), the final performance serves as a final „stamp” that seals the experience and (hopefully) develops a small group of Wise individuals who are capable to anticipate the standpoint of others and work toward development of inclusive practices in their communities. With organisation of further such educational theatre events, the number of those who are now Wise should increase and this becomes

a potential for a wider change in attitudes. Of course, the public performance also serves as a vehicle for sending positive messages of inclusion outside the limits of the educational theatre workshop.

This framework of educational theatre is flexible and can accommodate various research approaches that can differ in their design, measurement instruments and analysis¹⁶. As such, it is a powerful tool that can help researchers in their work on taboo social subjects such as prejudice, social stigma and discrimination of the migrants and, as the same, time allow the researchers to bring their sociologist research closer to that which Michael Burawoy calls the „public sociology” - an approach that recognizes the issues of public issues and aligns itself with the public rather than with the political or economic powers and defend the civil society (Burawoy, 2004, 2005). In other words, it can be used in working with any *Us vs. Them* social issue and help them to reach an sustainable solution through experiential education and recruitment of the „wise” or those who can perceive the given social issue from both sides and act as agents who will bridge the differences and show the advantages of inclusion of the Other.

Conclusion

Being aware that the educational theatre model and the need for shift in educational system worldview from positivism to dialectics described in this article will seem very utopistic, especially to the scientific community, the conclusion chapter will be dedicated to emphasising the empirical background of this proposal for educational shift by the guise of educational theatre and drama-action research. As any model in education or research, it has to be tested and indeed it has been. Additionally, since it is a dialectical process of gathering knowledge, the model is still being developed and improved. If approached in nonchalant manner, the persisting problem of negative prejudice will not be really addressed.

By now, it has been tested in a two year research of social stigma in which social issues of social exclusion, prejudice and discrimination between all three of Goffman's types of social stigma (physical, character and tribal) in Croatia's capital city of Zagreb (2011-2012); two years of international research about the effects of educational theatre on raising employability skills of people with disability and its role in non-formal education (conducted in seven countries of Europe between 2015 and 2017); and two separate

¹⁶ For example, table 1 of this article shows a drama-action model variation of Patton's mixed model that includes experimental design, qualitative data and statistical analysis (Tashakkori and Teddlie 1998). However, different research models can be implemented, depending on needs of the specific researchers problem (for example an experimental design, qualitative data, and content analysis or naturalistic inquiry, qualitative data, and statistical analysis).

researches of bullying at a workplace conducted in city of Zagreb in 2016 and 2017. All those researches involved hundreds of individuals and has gather plethora of data (both quantitative and qualitative; from surveys, interviews, focus groups, video and audio recordings). Some of those research findings are already published, while others await publication. Videos of final performances of those researches are available online and continue to spread messages of inclusion. All in all, an effort that tries to influence an audience wider than that of scientific community has been made.

Even with all that data and confirmation, it is of utmost importance that this approach continues to be tested through implementation in the field (education, science, civil society work). It is, in the end, a dialectic inspired model and as such it has to be critical to itself and always strive to improve. Educational theatre model shown in this article is just one way of addressing the problem of exclusion, prejudice and discrimination. It is based on one possible and compatible bricolage of theories that allow implementation of its findings in the „real” life (and not only publishing of articles in science journals).

Of course, those theories are interpreted by author of this paper and interpretations are never free from values and personal biographies, nor they should be. Maybe there are better solutions for the problem of prejudice, problem which gains weight in times of (contemporary) economic and humanitarian crisis' but prior research implies that this model certainly should have a place in working on taboo social subject and when working with and *Us* vs. *Them* social relations. It also has a place in educational system as a tool for showing to younger generations that differences and alternative views are not to be avoided by rather to be cherished - especially in times of crisis. Crisis is not just something threatening, it is also a potential. A potential for new, different and, perhaps, better.

To conclude, this task is vast and, perhaps unreachable. But, humanity is certainly not just about history, boundaries and limits. Humanity is also about future and possibilities. Societies are not bipolar and do not consist only of the „normal” (*Us*) and the „deviant” (*Them*). Societies also include the Wise. By enlarging the number of the Wise, in any society, is the ultimate goal of described educational theatre model as the more Wise agents of inclusion are present in the society, the greater the inclusion will be. Other option is to simply do nothing or to abide by the limitations and recipes provided by positivist educational system. The choice is always ours. Some my chose that which Burawoy calls the strong programme in sociology (Burawoy, 2005), others can chose public sociology. And both have their place in sociology. Those who chose educational theatre will recognize the warning that H.C. Bukowski's poem „The Genius of the Crowd” conveys and that implementation of educational theatre in educational system aims to change:

there is enough treachery,
hatred violence absurdity
in the average
human being to supply
any given army on any
given day

and the best at murder are
those who preach against
it

and the best at hate are
those who preach love
and the best at war finally
are those who preach
peace

those who preach god,
need god

those who preach peace
do not have peace

those who preach peace
do not have love

beware the preachers
beware the knowers
beware those who are
always reading books

beware those who either
detest poverty
or are proud of it

beware those quick to
praise
for they need praise in
return

beware those who are
quick to censor
they are afraid of what
they do not know

beware those who seek
constant crowds for
they are nothing alone

beware the average man
the average woman

beware their love, their
love is average
seeks average

but there is genius in their
hatred

there is enough genius in
their hatred to kill you
to kill anybody

not wanting solitude
not understanding
solitude

they will attempt to
destroy anything
that differs from their own
not being able to create art
they will not understand
art

they will consider their
failure as creators
only as a failure of the
world
not being able to love fully
they will believe your love
incomplete

and then they will hate
you
and their hatred will be
perfect

like a shining diamond
like a knife
like a mountain
like a tiger
like hemlock

their finest art.

Bibliography

- Amnesty International (2017). *Amnesty International Report 2016/2017*. London: Amnesty International Ltd.
- Bačić, M. (2009). *Prosvjetni kadrovi i belosvetske cajke*. Zagreb: H-ALTER URL: <http://www.h-alter.org/vijesti/ljudska-prava/prosvjetni-kadrovi-i-bjelosvjetske-cajke> [accessed: 16. 5. 2017].
- Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. (1992). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Zagreb: Naprijed.
- Bukowski, H. C. *The Genius of the Crowd*. <http://www.americanpoems.com/poets/Charles-Bukowski/4442> [online: 7. 6. 2017].
- Burawoy, M. (2004). For Public Sociology. 2004 Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 70 (4-48): 4-28.
- Burawoy, M. (2005). Third-Wave Sociology and the End of Pure Science. *The American Scientist*. Fall/Winter - Essay.
- United States Department of State Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (2016). *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2016*. USA: United States Department of State.
- Cahill, R. T. (2005). *Process Physics: From Information Theory to Quantum Space and Matter*, in book series *Contemporary Fundamental Physics*, edited by V. V. Dvoeglazov. NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Caldwell, B. J. (1994). *Beyond Positivism: Economic Methodology in the Twentieth Century*. London: Routledge.
- Cammarota, J. Fine, M. ed. (2008). *Revolutionizing Education. Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion*. New York: Routledge.
- Cvitić, P. (2004). *Dramatic Warning by Transparency International - Business people claim: Croatia is corrupt*. Zagreb: Nacional online edition, no. 467 (26. 10. 2004) URL: <http://www.nacional.hr/en/clanak/18428/business-people-claim-croatia-is-corrupt> [online: 16. 5. 2010].
- Đurić, Z., Veljković, J., Tomić, M. (2004). *Psihodrama*. Zagreb: Alinea.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Jason Aronson, Prentice-Hall.
- Hromatko, I. and Matić, R. (2008). Stigma – theatre, a place above stigmatization. *Sociology and Space*, Vol. 46 No.1 (179): 77-100.

- Hromatko, I. and Matić, R. (2009). The Elite and Discriminated between Positivism and Dialectics – the Need for Change in Educational Process. *Sociology and Space*, Vol. 47, No.3 (185): 285-304.
- Hromatko, I. (2016). Kamenčić u cipeli: Dramsko-akcijsko istraživanje mobinga na radnom mjestu. *Socijalne teme*. Vol. 1. No.3: 113-142.
- Janković, J., Blažeka, S., Rambousek, M (2000). Dramske tehnike u prevenciji poremećaja u ponašanju i funkcioniranju djece i mladih. *Annual of social work*. Vol. 7. No.2.
- Kalođera Brkić, I. (2007). Sedam povjesničara o Domovinskom ratu u udžbenicima. Zagreb: *Jutarnji list* (02. 05. 2007) URL: <http://www.jutarnji.hr/7-povjesnicara-o-domovinskom-ratu-u-udzbenicima/172564/> [online: 7. 6. 2010].
- Kellermann, P. F. (2007). *Sociodrama and Collective Trauma*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1999). *Struktura znanstvenih revolucija*. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Hrvatsko sociološko društvo.
- Lemert, Ch. (2003). *Goffman's Enigma: Series Editor's Foreword*. *Goffman's Legacy* (ed. Trevino, J. A). Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Lewin, K. (1946) Action Research and Minority Problems. *Journal of Social Issues* 2(4): 34-46.
- Malenica, Z. and Jeknić, R. (2010). Percepcija korupcije i borba protiv korupcije u Republici Hrvatskoj. *Zbornik Pravnog fakulteta u Splitu*. Vol. 47, No: 3: 837-859.
- Marcuse, H. (1987). *Um i revolucija: Hegel i razvoj teorije društva*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša - Svjetlost (Biblioteka Logos).
- Online Etymology Dictionary (2017). Crisis. URL <http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=crisis> [accessed: 1. 11. 2017].
- Pusić, E. (1977). *Vrijednosti i društvena regulacija / Vrijednosti i društveni sistem – Prilozi izučavanju društvenog sistema*. Zagreb: Odsjek za sociologiju, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu. Biblioteka Čovjek i sistem, svezak 4:11–35.
- Tashakkori, A. and Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology. Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks-London-New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

- Tatalović, M. (2014). Croatia 'must change its outdated education system to get people into work', says European Commission. *Homo Scientificus Europaeus*. Published June 2, 2014. <https://blog.euroscientist.com/croatia-must-change-its-outdated-education-system-to-get-people-into-work-says-european-commission/> (accessed: 9 October 2017).
- The European Commission (2014). *Special Eurobarometer 397 Corruption Report*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Thomas, W. I. & Thomas, D. S. (1928). *The child in America: Behavior problems and programs*. New York: Knopf.
- Trading Economics (2017). *Transparency International's Croatia Corruption Index 1999-2017*. <https://tradingeconomics.com/croatia/corruption-index>, (visited: 11 October 2017)
- Turner, V. (1989). *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. PAJ Publications