

identity of a good teacher presented seems unified and fixed; it is somehow supposed to be suited to an infinite range of pedagogical situations.

A postmodern view of what makes a good teacher takes issue with the quest for certainty of standards outside and above historical reality that characterizes the modern view presented in this book. It recognizes that the construction of meaning by the self is heavily influenced by the tradition in which it is embedded. In contrast to the modern view which elevates ideals, a postmodern view turns to teacher experiences to show the different ways they dwell in the tensions of practice. Many possibilities for good teaching emerge from teacher narratives. Together these form a constellation which resists reduction to essential first principles. Stories of teachers from a variety of situations speak more loudly to what makes a good teacher than does a list of ideals.

This book stimulates teacher educators to think beyond what teachers should know and do, to think about what kind of person a teacher should be. Although disappointingly short on how this might be accomplished in teacher education programs, it is a valuable contribution to the crucial dialogue on the meaning of good teaching.

David W. Friesen
University of Regina

Courtney, R. (1990). *Drama and intelligence: A cognitive theory*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 190 pp. (hardcover). \$34.95.

Richard Courtney opens his book with a preface in which he outlines his intent — to employ the tools of several disciplines to examine "the central drama act, as an intellectual and cognitive activity." Drama is a cognitive

tool to transform what we know by providing participants with a comparison between actual and fictional worlds.

Chapter one examines the fictional and the real in interaction. Courtney rejects structuralist and philosophical approaches in favor of an hermeneutic approach in which the drama act engenders belief in individuals as they *compare* the real and the fictional.

Chapter two makes a case for dramatic activities as a means to improve cognition and as a means to learn. Both goals are achieved through transformation (similarities and doubling) in an atmosphere of trust. This activation of fundamental mental structures and dynamics also improves intelligence.

Chapter three relates the drama world to constructions of reality. From this perspective the drama act is seen as a complex series of ontological essays which examine present and future modes of being — cognitive meaning created in the dynamics of interaction.

Examination of the drama world in chapter four provides a model of the steps in dramatic structuring culled from Courtney's previous writings, from theater artists, and from Jean Piaget. Through figurative reasoning in drama, it is possible to specify meanings which have epistemological, ontological, mediational, metaphoric, and practical parabolic characteristics.

In chapter five Courtney focuses on the dramatic metaphor operating as a series of mental acts. He considers six functions of metaphor and seeks support for the notion of the dramatic metaphor as cognitive activity by relating dramatic activities to the cognitive and semiotic squares of Greimas and to the aesthetic development schema of Witkin.

In chapter six Courtney advances the notion of performance logic as a means to ensure that the cognitive use of dramatic metaphor results in truth. Thus the author seeks to establish that the dramatic metaphor is embedded in logical and reasoned positions where hypotheses are explored in homologous actual and fictional worlds.

However drama has more to offer cognitively than all the claims made up to now. In chapter seven, Courtney claims that dramatic action educates the intuition, a cognitive capacity. Intuition improves intelligent human interaction and communication. He cites writers on creativity to make his case.

Symbols in drama (chapter eight) manipulate multivariate meanings in aesthetic and artistic modes to enable participants to grasp ultimate cognitive and social meanings. Participants manipulate these understandings to achieve organizational, moral, psychological, and biological meanings which they mold into balanced dramatic form (chapter nine). The form so achieved provides objectivity if the quality of the performance is adequate to the task, i.e., if it meets aesthetic and artistic criteria. When such criteria are met, the drama can sustain paradox and ambiguity and lead the mind to explore, to master, and to learn.

The learning that can be achieved through adequate drama action is of four types — intrinsic, extrinsic, aesthetic, and artistic (chapter ten). Each type of learning is related to the mental structures on which they depend. In the penultimate chapter, dialogue is seen as superior to dialectic and is extended to include all interactions within and outside the drama as it evokes individual responses. Such responses are characterized as catalysts for philosophic inquiry which improves the potential of intelligence.

As the last chapter reiterates Courtney's well known belief that "drama is life," he now extends that claim to characterize developmental drama as both experimental (like science) and experiential, as both the objective and the subjective study of knowing.

How is the reader to assess the large claims made for drama in this book? In broad perspective, it seems consistently to argue from the outside in. That is, the claims depend on the degree of fit between the external discipline which is employed to support them and the Courtney view of the nature of drama. One problem with this approach is the impression that the drama itself has been left far behind as it is molded to fit the stringencies of the discipline concerned. A second problem is the

degree of fit achieved by the use of such a method. Too often the multi-disciplinary garnering of support leaves the reader with a sense of unease on this very point. For the text seldom completes an argument by a clear ranging of the findings of drama research against compatible findings from another discipline. Rather, the steps in the argument are cobbled together from many sources until the reader is left wondering how far beyond mere assertion the author has travelled.

The author's summary dismissal of Strawson in his discussion of fiction is surely suspect, as is his heavy reliance on Pavel. What of Bruner's work? The dismissal of Gardner's work increases the reader's dis-ease as does the insistence on the work of Greimas. Where are the references to research in drama? Beyond Witkin, the text refers only to research by the author himself, to method texts by Johnston, Way and Slade, and to theoretical works in the arts, none of which are more recent than 1979.

Yet this author is a visionary as well as a scholar of considerable scope and depth and some of the ideas in the book are exciting ones. The main question to be answered is, Does this book offer a coherent, cognitive theory of drama?. The answer must be no. What it does offer is a series of ways in which drama might contribute to everyday life, to social concourse, to meaning making, to learning, to cognitive activity, and to intelligence. The book does not, "like science," move from experiment to replication to theory, nor does it move experientially from the data supplied by drama participants about the nature of drama as they employ their cognitive powers. Courtney's visionary and creative approach presents drama researchers with such challenges as: "What is the nature of the operation of the dramatic metaphor?" and "What is the function of the multivariate symbols of drama in the intellectual activity of meaning making?" Beyond such challenges there is little that is new here.

Roberta Bramwell
University of Calgary