

Emma Vestal

Mr. Speice

ISM - 4B

8 September 2017

Introduction to Professional Theatre

Research Assessment One

8 September 2017

Theatre

Mrocza, Paul. "Paul Mrocza." *Broadway Educators*, 3 Jan. 2014,

[broadwayeducators.com/what-is-a-career-in-the-professional-theatre/](http://broadwayeducators.com/what-is-a-career-in-the-professional-theatre/).

The overall topic for my year in ISM is theatre. There are many different subtopics and careers that can be created through theatre. This is why I chose an article that describes many different occupations that are involved in professional theatre.

There are many different ways to become involved in theatre aside from being on Broadway. For both acting and technical theatre, there are theaters that pay their cast and crew, in everything from regional theaters, to cruise ships, to touring companies. All of these options hold auditions just like Broadway, but perform in different scenarios. Regional theaters are much smaller than Broadway, but are basically the same concept. Cruise ships often put on musicals as a form of entertainment for their passengers. Prime examples of this are the Disney cruise ships that have different Disney shows for the children and families on board. The type of performance theatre that most interests me that was mentioned in the article is touring theatre.

This is when one company of a show travels around the world and performs their show in different cities. This would be absolutely incredible because not only would I be getting to perform, but I would also be getting to travel, which is another passion of mine.

The great thing about wanting to pursue theatre is that there really aren't any requirements of schooling to be a part of it. For different career fields it is recommended that a degree is earned. Obviously, becoming a theatre teacher of sorts requires an educational certification. For being any sort of director, it could be useful to have a degree in some sort of theatrical field. For theatrical entrepreneurship, it would be smart to take classes in business.

Theatre is at a very pivotal time in its history. The arts were going downhill for quite a while, but with recent shows such as Hamilton and Dear Evan Hansen, it has gone back into the spotlight. With these turn of events it is a critical time for those that are passionate in the arts to take this chance and run with it. I want to keep theatre as a very prominent part in today's culture. Making a difference and making a change in this community is what I strive to do by utilizing theatre.

The main subtopic that I want to pursue further is theatrical entrepreneurship. There are a lot of ways to go about being more involved in the business aspects of theatre. The one way that I have realized that I would want to become a theatrical entrepreneur is through starting up my own community theater. This seems like the best option because I could utilize every aspect of theatre through this occupation choice. I could be an entrepreneur by creating the business

myself, a director by directing the shows that the theater is putting on, an actor if there were to be adult shows, as well as many other roles.

Through reading this article, I learned that I should not limit myself to one aspect of theatre. I should spread my talents around and do whatever comes my way.

Students in high school and even in college are often confused as to what a career in the theatre really means? Although it is hard to believe, many still think that to have a professional theatre career you must go to New York and aspire to be on Broadway.

If that were true, then very few would have theatre careers, as at any given time there are less than 2,000 acting jobs on The Great White Way. And yet there are a lot more actors making their living in the profession. So, what is a career in the professional theatre?

## **Working in the Theatre**

There are 40 Broadway theatres and a few hundred Off-Broadway venues. Those are the major theatres that pay actors and others in NYC. Yet, there are hundreds of thousands of professionals in the theatre who have had full careers but have never worked on or off Broadway.

This includes actors, directors, designers, stage managers, playwrights, dramaturges, technicians, public relations people, and many more. Here are a few places where very talented, skilled, and dedicated theatre professionals work.

## **Full Season Regional Theatres**

There are many regional theatres throughout the U.S. Some are members of Actor's Equity association, others use A.E.A. guest artist contracts, and others are non-equity but still pay their

actors (and many pay well). Of course, all of these theatres have jobs for those in production, design, marketing, etc.

## **Summer Theatres**

Summer theatres are working starting from some time in June, when rehearsals begin, through to the end of August. Some perform into September. There are more than one thousand different venues, presenting everything from educational theatre to Shakespeare to musicals to new works to classic drama. By the way, all of these theatres are outside of New York City.

## **Touring Companies**

Although many think of national touring companies for Broadway shows when touring is mentioned, there is a broad range of touring companies, including regional touring theatres, local tours, educational touring companies and more. Again, some of these offer Equity contracts, while others do not. Tours can be a few weeks or a up to a few years.

## **Theme Parks**

There are numerous theme parks that hire throughout the year, and others that are seasonal. Seasonal includes those that run only in the summer or produce holiday shows such as those with Halloween and Christmas themes. Theme park shows tend to call on performers to sing and dance, so musical theatre performers are in demand.

## **Cruise Ships**

Cruise ships are noted for putting on everything from musical revues to large musicals. These can be huge shows. Again, musical theatre performers are in-demand for these shows. Great dancing chops are especially needed.

## **Many Other Places**

There are many other venues for performers, including a major market in Chicago and other fairly active markets in Los Angeles, Washington, D.C., and Boston. Chances are if you go to New York City to live and audition that if you are working, you are doing so outside of the City.

The basic thing to remember is that a career in the theatre can include working regionally, creating your own theatre, devising your own plays, and more. A career in the theatre is about enduring and

creating your own opportunities. It's not all about New York, Broadway and Off-Broadway. That's only part of the equation.

Mroczka, Paul. "Paul Mroczka." *Broadway Educators*, 3 Jan. 2014,  
[broadwayeducators.com/what-is-a-career-in-the-professional-theatre/](http://broadwayeducators.com/what-is-a-career-in-the-professional-theatre/).

## Theatrical Entrepreneurship

The idea of utilizing theatre in a business sense has quickly become an idea that has stuck with me. Seeing so many community theaters within the DFW community, has formulated an idea that perhaps that is something that I would be interested in. This was the first and most important thing that needed to be researched due to the interest level and the lack of knowledge that accompanies this topic.

I chose to read a biography on Beatrice deMille for many reasons. The first being that, as an actor, it is always important to familiarize yourself with as many people from the industry as possible. The second reason is that Beatrice seemed to be a very confident, young, and lively woman who followed her dreams to the fullest, and that is exactly what I want to do with my future. It was simply luck that her life and my future dreams seemed to somewhat align.

Reading Beatrice's biography has brought many new pieces of knowledge as well as some helping tips to my repertoire. DeMille was the kind of person that did not care in the slightest what other people thought of her. She was in her life to live her life and to do with it what she felt was right, and that is something that I personally admire greatly. She exudes confidence and that is something that anyone pursuing the arts must obtain in order to keep going.

The biography discussed how after her husband passed away, she had decided to make an all girls school in order to pay for her children to go to school. On the side she basically became a play broker. After a while, her school stopped making profit, and she had to file for bankruptcy. Instead of letting this occurrence hinder her future, DeMille took this experience and ran with it. She began to produce plays and even became a playwright herself. After many

years of writing stage plays, she moved to L.A. and began to write film productions for her sons to direct.

Reading DeMille's biography has already assisted me a lot in the ISM process. This was a healthy reminder that in order to make it in any form of theatre, it is crucial that I remain true to myself, and do what is right for me. I absolutely love how both her and her husband used theatre to make it work for them. Whether it was writing or producing or performing, they used theatre to continue their lives, and that is something that I hope to be able to do. It does not have to be that I pick just one aspect of theatre to pursue for my whole life. Making this realization is something that may seem small, but is actually wholeheartedly important. It is extraordinarily hard wanting to pursue an art already, and then adding the idea of not really knowing what direction that art should be taken in makes everything ten times worse. By reading this passage on Beatrice DeMille, I was able to fully understand that there is not a necessity in narrowing oneself to one aspect of anything. I learned to try and even do absolutely everything.

Beatrice deMille was born Matilda Beatrice Samuel in Liverpool, England. She immigrated with her family to New York in 1871. Though her family and friends called her Tillie growing up, when she met Henry deMille, he immediately started calling her Beatrice, after Dante's Beatrice. According to her son, the director-producer Cecil B. DeMille, when Beatrice told her family that she intended to marry Henry, a Christian, they said they would disown her for converting from her Jewish faith (12). Never one to obey the rules, Beatrice married Henry deMille in Brooklyn, New York, in 1876. Henry had always wanted to be an actor. To make money when they were first married, they both taught—he composition and she elocution—at a preparatory school. When school was out for the summer, they would work as traveling actors, Beatrice always using the stage name Agnes Graham. Programs from a number of the theatrical productions in which they performed are found in the DeMille collection at Brigham Young University. To secure his success as an actor, Henry began writing plays in which he would play the lead role. Soon he formed a partnership with future theatre impresario David Belasco, and the two wrote and produced a number of theatre productions, most of which starred Henry, that were enormously successful. Henry was able to buy a large house in Pompton, New Jersey, for the three children he had with Beatrice—William, Cecil, and Agnes, who would die at age four of spinal meningitis. Then, at the height of his success, according to his obituary, Henry deMille contracted typhoid fever and suddenly died (5).

Beatrice DeMille (w). BYU

Beatrice knew she would have to support her children. Within weeks of his death, she converted the Pompton house into the Henry C. deMille Preparatory School for Girls. Although she was not particularly good with money, Beatrice managed to save enough to send William to Germany for an education and Cecil to a boy's school in exchange for educating the daughter of the school's president. To make additional money, she convinced Belasco to let her work as exclusive agent of the plays that he and deMille had written, and from there she began to represent other writers. During an era when very few women worked outside the home, Beatrice became a play broker and authors' agent (Louvish 13).

By 1907, the school was no longer profitable. The final blow came in 1907, when former student Evelyn Nesbit made national news headlines. Nesbit's husband, Harry Thaw, shot and killed architect Stanford White after Thaw realized Nesbit was having an affair with White. Alarmed parents stopped trusting Beatrice and removed their daughters from the school, and Beatrice was soon forced to declare bankruptcy (Louvish 29). Never one to focus on the negative, Beatrice sold the house and added new writers to her stable, including sons Cecil and William, as well as female playwrights who fought for

women's equality (Long 21). She became successful enough in the New York theatre world that she was able to finance and produce plays for many of the writers she represented. According to her granddaughter, Agnes deMille, Cecil went to work for his mother at that time, and later credited her with teaching him how to write, direct, and produce (Easton 19).

Soon Beatrice herself turned to writing. Collaborating with Harriet Ford, she wrote her first published play, "The Greatest Thing in the World," which was performed on Broadway and in Washington DC. Beatrice continued to grow her company of playwrights, and, even if she was never very good with money, she was good at making deals. It was Beatrice who introduced her son Cecil to Jesse Lasky and then arranged for Cecil to write and direct and Lasky to produce (Wellman 100). This collaboration led to what would later become Paramount Pictures, a company that produced Cecil's major silent era motion pictures. Clearly Beatrice was good at spotting talent, also starting the career of actor Victor Moore and writer [Beulah Marie Dix](#), whom she had represented in New York (Birchard 166).

In 1914, Beatrice finally moved to Los Angeles (Louvish 68). Although she was in her sixties by then, she did not sit still. While William was a bit wary of his mother during this time, Cecil doted on her, and she, along with her sons, worked for the Lasky Company, where she collaborated with fellow playwright Leighton Osmun on a series of scenarios. The films she wrote, from 1914 to 1917, were usually sentimental, but she was respected enough that she wrote not only for her sons, but for other directors as well. While most of the deMille/Osmun scenarios were based on their own stories, they also collaborated with other Lasky writers such as [Jeanie Macpherson](#) and [Eve Unsell](#). Slightly more than half of the films Beatrice wrote are still extant and held by the Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress.

By the late teens, Beatrice had stopped writing. The 1920 census lists her profession as a writer for motion pictures, but as Cecil wrote in his autobiography, she was doing anything but settling down. She spent lavishly—buying huge hats for herself and paying rent for less fortunate friends—but then claimed poverty and sent the bills to her sons. She drove around in a car that would often break down, and she habitually abandoned it anywhere, including once in the middle of Sunset Boulevard where it blocked traffic for hours. Cecil, who claimed that his mother was the single most important influence in his life, recognized that she was a character. As he wrote in his unpublished papers, "My mother always had a scheme for making large sums of money. Once she had a cactus, withered and old, in a pot on her porch. She said, 'that is my secret—it is wealth. We will ship it to Australia where they have lots of cattle. This is a spineless cactus. They will

plant it there and have food for the whole country.' The cactus was shriveled and dead in a week."

Buck, Julie. "Beatrice deMille." In Jane Gaines, Radha Vatsal, and Monica Dall'Asta, eds. *Women Film Pioneers Project*. Center for Digital Research and Scholarship. New York, NY: Columbia University Libraries, 2013. Web. September 27, 2013. <<https://wfpp.cdrs.columbia.edu/pioneer/ccp-beatrice-demille/>>

Emma Vestal

Mr. Speice

ISM - 4B

22 September 2017

### Is Broadway Becoming Too Mainstream?

This was a random story that I found on an academic database that I began to read just for fun, and ended up really enjoying it. There was a lot about the business side of theatre that I did not know before that I now know some about. The article is basically an overview with some specific examples on how the theatre industry is resulting to some very corrupt ticket sales. Once I began reading this article, I became very intrigued because if I do end up taking the business route with theatre, I want to be able to know what appeals to audiences and ticket-buyers.

To begin, it's obvious that when a show becomes popular, the producers and really everyone involved with the show is going to want to raise the ticket prices. This used to be a good idea when it came to premium seats. Premium seats are seats that are set aside and are typically the most expensive seats in the house. This is due to their location in the theatre; typically orchestra seats. When this trend originated, it was a great idea to bring in a little more revenue for shows. However, as time as gone on, it's become a more ridiculous ordeal. More and more seats are being sold at premium seat price, leaving very few to be sold at any sort of affordable price.

There is also the fact that the majority of tickets are now sold online, much like sporting event or concert tickets. Bots online buy as many tickets as they can, and then sell them for profit on their websites. These include websites such as StubHub and Ticketmaster. The issue with these is that so many people buy tickets online, not in person. This means that these websites can raise the prices as much as they want because they know that people will pay the extra money.

These issues are very important for someone like me to know about. As someone who wants to pursue theatrical entrepreneurship, it's vital that I know about these trends and how to avoid them or use them in the future. Obviously, it will be at a smaller level because I don't think that I will be a Broadway producer, but ticket sales is a very important aspect of the theatrical business.

From this article, I was able to learn that there needs to be a balance between profit making, and appealing to the crowds. It's obviously necessary for a business to thrive by making money. Without the money businesses cannot be continued unless they are being sponsored by someone. However, it's also important to remember what the crowds are craving. If people are going out of their way to write articles such as this one, there's obviously a problem. People are becoming increasingly irritated with this way of ticket sales. If I am to conduct a project that somehow reflects a community theatre of some sort, then I need to keep in mind the ticket sales. This article has helped me to build up some of my business knowledge to propel me in my ISM experience to come.

## Works Cited

Smith, Wendy. "The price isn't right: premium ticket costs mean that Broadway shows are increasingly the province of tourists with deep pockets." *The American Scholar*, vol. 86, no. 4, 2017, p. 101+. *Academic OneFile*,  
[go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&u=j043905010&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CA504054592&it=r&asid=89925cd5d83265d080ab49b5d9610813](http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&u=j043905010&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CA504054592&it=r&asid=89925cd5d83265d080ab49b5d9610813). Accessed 18 Sept. 2017.

I'm a native New Yorker and frequent **theatre**-goer, which means I pay full price for Broadway shows as seldom as possible. But last January, after obsessively listening to the soundtrack for months, I broke down and decided to buy tickets for *Hamilton*. Although I knew they wouldn't be cheap, we have a family tradition of splurging on orchestra seats for a Broadway musical to celebrate my son's birthday. I also knew that in the mega-selling case of *Hamilton*, getting tickets for a show anytime soon was unlikely. Still, we were willing to wait--and pay full price.

When I walked into the box office of the Richard Rodgers **Theatre**, a man who had clearly been posted to forestall clueless folks like me asked, "Are you picking up tickets?"

"No," I replied cheerily, "buying."

"It's sold out through August," he said. "There are some tickets beginning in September, from \$449."

Those are premium tickets for the best seats in the house, set aside by the producers of hit shows for anyone willing to pay top dollar for a hot ticket. *Hamilton*, at the time, had the highest premium prices on Broadway: up to \$849 apiece for the most desirable dates.

"How about the regular tickets for \$179 and \$199?" I inquired.

"A new batch will go on sale online in a few weeks."

"Are you telling me that the *only* tickets I can buy here at the box office are premium tickets?"

He didn't answer, but he didn't have to. I stomped out onto West 46th Street and took the subway home to Brooklyn, berating myself all the way for my naïveté. A few lucky friends of mine had managed to get tickets online, but popular Broadway shows have fallen victim to a plague that has afflicted rock concerts and sports events for years: software programs known as bots, which are used by ticket brokers to grab as many tickets as possible the moment an online sale begins--more than 1,000 tickets in a single minute in at least one instance. The brokers resell these tickets for a profit, which is perfectly legal. The ticket bots themselves are not; they turn online ticket buying into what the New York State Attorney General's Office bluntly calls "a fixed game," in which individual consumers appear to have access to tickets but are essentially shut out. It's too soon to say whether Ticketmaster's fledgling Verified Fan system, which restricts each user to two tickets per performance, can stymie the bots, but it won't do anything to change the economics that gave birth to them. In the past two years, the attorney general's office has collected millions of dollars in penalties from more than a dozen ticket brokers. Compared with the money that brokers can make, however, the fines are insignificant. When composer-lyricist-librettist Lin-Manuel Miranda gave his final performance in *Hamilton's* title role on July 9, 2016, resale tickets were going for as much as \$20,000 apiece.

If some people are willing to pay those kinds of prices, Broadway producers contend, then the money should go to the shows' creators and investors rather than to the middlemen. That's their justification for premium tickets, which have been unpopular with the average theatergoer ever since they were introduced in 2001 (appropriately enough, for a hugely successful musical called [The Producers](#), with premium seats going for \$480). This rationale would be more persuasive if premium tickets had eliminated the secondary market, but resale platforms such as StubHub and Vivid Seats are booming. Premium tickets simply add to the total number of seats that are not actually available for what is allegedly the standard price. And that number is growing. At first, shows set aside roughly a dozen prime seats per performance to be sold at premium prices; by 2006, the biggest hits were holding back 100 or more seats. Today, *Hamilton* reserves 200 center orchestra seats--roughly 15 percent of house capacity--at premium prices. After the brokers and their bots finish grabbing tickets online, there aren't a lot of seats at "regular" prices left.

I don't want to pick on *Hamilton*, which also sets aside 46 tickets at each performance to be sold (via a same-day lottery) for \$10. Its producers are not uniquely rapacious; on the contrary, as *The New York Times* reported more than a decade ago, "the premium-pricing model has been considered a necessary development by the industry, finally [bringing] [theater](#) into line with the business models of sports teams and pop musicians." That's correct, but hardly good news. By embracing "dynamic pricing," the generic name for adjusting ticket prices to meet demand, Broadway producers are participating in a disheartening trend that applies to hotel rooms, airline tickets, and seats for sporting events.

"It really is simple market capitalism: supply and demand," *New York Post* theater columnist Michael Riedel told me. "Unlike [movies](#), which play many theaters across the country, there are a limited number of seats on any given night to the hottest shows. New York has become a tourist attraction for people from all over the world, and as long as you have rich people from South America and Asia coming here who want to see a hit Broadway show on short notice, producers will be able to raise those premium prices to \$800 or \$1,000. It's unfortunate, because it's one more aspect of New York City that's become for the one percent."

The situation is less drastic outside New York, but theaters in many other cities now have premium seats, VIP boxes, or even private lounges from which the happy few can view performances while taking advantage of an open bar and free hors d'oeuvres. My husband, who works on the construction and renovation of theaters across America, tells me that providing something extra for well-heeled patrons is often a consideration when seating areas are being designed. Again, the trend follows sports, where virtually all stadiums and arenas accommodate club-level seating. This past season's receipts show Broadway finances bearing an alarming resemblance to those of the film industry: a few big-budget, high-profile hits make lots and lots of money while everything else struggles to earn even a modest profit. A *New York Times* article published in May noted that half of Broadway's box-office revenues went to 10 of the 81 productions mounted in 2016-17. Granted, the artistic level of these big hits is still considerably higher than the average superhero movie: *Hamilton* and this year's Tony Award-winner for Best Musical, *Dear Evan Hansen*, are excitingly innovative works, and star vehicles such as the revival of *Hello, Dolly* with Bette Midler are a venerable Broadway tradition (though the \$998 it costs to view the Divine Miss M from the front row of the Shubert Theatre is not). Nonetheless, the rise of "jukebox musicals" like *Beautiful* (Carole King) and *Jersey Boys* (The Four Seasons), not to mention the seemingly endless parade of Disney remakes (*The Lion King*, *Aladdin*, *Cinderella*, etc.)--precisely what tourists want to see and are willing to pay top dollar for--suggests that Broadway producers may be following in the footsteps of the movie studios that craft action-heavy, dialogue-light films for an overseas market of non-English speakers. Straight [plays](#) rarely appear on Broadway anymore, and when they do, they struggle. Of this year's Tony nominees for Best Play, *Sweat* and *Indecent* closed prematurely, and *A Doll's House, Part 2* and *Oslo* (the winner) were presented as limited runs by producers well aware of the limited economic prospects for serious [drama](#) on Broadway.

I saw all four plays, but not at full price. Theater professionals point out correctly, albeit defensively, that discounted Broadway tickets are often available for people willing to stand in line at the TKTS booths, which sell same-day tickets at half price, or monitor online for last-minute offerings from brokers stuck with unsold premium tickets the day of the performance. This simply underscores Broadway's membership in the new Gilded Age economic order, in which everything is priced for whatever the market will bear on any given day.

As a consequence, New York City residents, the mainstay audience for drama, are increasingly irrelevant to the financial calculations of Broadway producers. So we find ourselves drawn away by the more substantive fare offered at nonprofit theaters off Broadway and in Brooklyn, where ticket prices are lower and premium seats are nonexistent. Sure, we like musicals too, and we understand that Broadway has always been expensive, but we also know that it was not always as relatively expensive as it is now. The \$12 orchestra ticket my parents gave me for my 13th birthday in 1969 would now cost about \$80 if Broadway had simply kept up with inflation, not the \$150 or \$200 that is now standard. Premium ticket prices add insult to injury.

I still haven't seen *Hamilton*. How ironic that this brilliant musical about one of our Founding Fathers, a show that asks probing questions about the content and structure of democracy, should have helped transform Broadway into a luxury item. New York theater will always have an audience beyond tourists and the well-to-do, but I fear that premium tickets are hastening the day when they are the only people you will see in a Broadway house.

**Wendy Smith**, a contributing editor of the SCHOLAR, is the author of *Real Life Drama: The Group Theatre and America, 1931-1940*.

Emma Vestal

Mr. Speice

ISM - 4B

29 September 2017

Citation:

"Saving the world: the limits of humanitarianism." *The Nation*, 19 May 1997, p. 11+. *General*

*OneFile*,

[go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=ITOF&sw=w&u=j043905010&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CA19406253&it=r&asid=aa1e4fbe5eed43fe711a3d7666e03e9a](http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?p=ITOF&sw=w&u=j043905010&v=2.1&id=GALE%7CA19406253&it=r&asid=aa1e4fbe5eed43fe711a3d7666e03e9a). Accessed 28 Sept. 2017.

For this week's assessment, I had a random calling to look at humanitarianism. With all of the disastrous occurrences that have been going on in the world around us, something was sparked in me. I wanted to help, I wanted to be able to make life a little bit better for someone else; someone who needs it. I found an article that was basically a written out interview involving people's opinions on current humanitarianism.

This article/interview focused mainly on the United Nations. Most of the opinions given were actually very critical of the United Nations. While some quotes seemed to contradict one another, the overall message I got from this article was that humanitarianism is a great idea, but only if it's done well and correctly. As of right now, there are a lot of issues within the United Nations. The fact that there really isn't an infrastructure or a common goal within the United Nations makes it very difficult for anything to actually come out of their efforts. There are issues

between whether or not military intervention is a good or bad idea, what disasters should require the help of the United Nations, and to what extent. There are clearly many efforts that need to occur to revise the current state of the United Nations, and many smaller humanitarian organizations as well. It's just a matter of time and cooperation to see if these things can get done.

To be completely honest, this article confused me so much. I expected to read a beautiful article about the positive effects of humanitarianism and how we can all make the world happy and wonderful. What I ended up reading was an article on how even humanitarianism has become corrupt and ineffective. This has honestly made me heart so sad to read. Something as fragile and as simple as helping one another has become so much about politics and money and media representation. This is not the kind of world that I want to be part of. I want to be part of a world where we help each other because it's the right thing to do. I want to be able to know that the person sitting next to me knows that even if I've never spoken a word to them, I would still have their back in any situation. I want to live in a world where people don't even have to worry about terrible things such as genocide or inequality or anything that would require so much humanitarian effort in the first place.

This has sparked a fire in me. I have no idea how I want to do this or what I want to do, but I want to change the world. I want to make this world a place where people get along. Where love is love and everyone can be happy. I know this is a shot in the dark and it is entirely impossible, but if I can change at least one person's life, I will have done my duty on this earth. I want to make change, I want to have an impact on someone or something, and not something

superficial and materialistic, but something that truly matters. I want to inspire, and create, and teach, and learn. I want to make this world a better place.

The recent crisis in eastern Zaire has raised questions about the central role **humanitarianism** has come to play in the West's response to the conflicts of the post-cold war world. Has **humanitarianism** been misused, as some critics claim? Has it become an inappropriate substitute for political action and [military intervention](#) by Western powers who no longer care enough about these regions to risk their [soldiers'](#) lives? Have humanitarian organizations themselves overstepped the limits of their historical mission of alleviating human suffering in such crises? And in so doing, have they become unwitting accomplices to the perpetrators of these conflicts? In light of the evidence that humanitarian organizations are often at the mercy of the local warlords in these conflicts, do we need new rules for governing humanitarian operations? The Nation recently discussed these questions with David Rieff and Brian Urquhart. David Rieff is a senior fellow at the World Policy Institute at the New School for Social Research and the author of Slaughterhouse: Bosnia and the Failure of the West. Brian Urquhart is a former Under Secretary General in charge of peacekeeping for the United Nations.

The Nation: How do you explain the rapid growth of **humanitarianism** that we have seen since the end of the cold war?

Brian Urquhart: In the absence of any coherent view of the world—whether that imposed by an imperial power or powers or that of a truly multinational community -- this humanitarian idea has taken off. In Western Europe, in particular, the enthusiasm for **humanitarianism** is quite strong. According to a recent survey, something like 60 percent of the Spanish people polled favor humanitarian intervention in eastern Zaire. There is quite a lot of pressure from influential and vocal sections of the public for these operations, whatever their consequences and whether or not the means are there to undertake them effectively. Moreover, **humanitarianism** is now a business. It is not just the [United Nations](#) that is engaged in humanitarian missions but hundreds of nongovernmental groups with elaborate fundraising operations.

Unfortunately, these humanitarian operations have been premised on a somewhat naive idea that there is a great difference between humanitarian action and political action, or indeed, quasi-military action, when in fact the three are connected. For example, a humanitarian action, such as setting up a refugee camp, can have major political consequences, as it did in eastern Zaire, for a refugee camp can also become a base for political and military operations. Thus, **humanitarianism** brings with it its own risks and problems. On the other hand, if you don't do something, people will -- rightly -- complain of the callous disregard of terrible human suffering. So [international organizations](#) are damned if they do and damned if they don't.

David Rieff: It is the so-called CNN effect that has made it more difficult for even our own hypocritical societies to do nothing. In most of these places -- Rwanda, [Somalia](#) Washington would prefer not to be involved either because there is no compelling national interest or because the Pentagon has for its own reasons wanted to stay clear of these conflicts. But in the face of graphic images of dying [women](#) and children in eastern Zaire, say, the Clinton Administration is unwilling to act effectively and unequally unwilling not to act at all. Enter **humanitarianism**, the perfect substitute for political action, or military intervention, which in most cases is the only thing that would make a real difference.

But in reality, **humanitarianism** can never be more than a stopgap. By definition, it is always a failure: You don't put humanitarian-aid workers in except when the disaster has already happened. But it allows great powers who are no longer interested in Zaire or the former Yugoslavia but who are unwilling to admit as much publicly to be seen as doing something. The public is mollified by the deployment of aid workers -- our dedicated consciences--and usually the United Nations is also

drawn in, as, increasingly, one of its principal functions seems to be to deal with hopeless questions in regions of the world the important states no longer care about.

TN: Isn't **humanitarianism** also a reflection of the failure of a certain hope associated with the United Nations, namely, that in the post -- cold war world the ideal of preventive [diplomacy](#) and collective security would be extended to these conflicts?

BU: In spite of the euphoria in and around the United Nations in the early post -- cold war years, the organization was not prepared to deal with the kinds of conflicts we have witnessed in this decade. These conflicts are prima facie not caused by national governments or even under the control of national governments. The U.N. system of collective security was set up basically with 1930s state-against-state aggression in mind. It does not have the resources, infrastructure or, until the recent precedents of northern Iraq and Somalia, even the legal authority to intervene in these largely civil conflicts.

The failure of the United Nations in this regard is a function of the state of its institutional development. Global institutions today, like the United Nations, are somewhere between the old model of associations of governments empowered to do a few very circumscribed things, and institutions that embody a kind of global conscience with some independent authority to respond to serious human problems. Politicians love to refer to the international community or the world community. It does not exist. A community is a group of people who have a common interest, common concerns, common institutions, common rules of behavior and more or less a shared view of the future. That's not true of the United Nations. The U.N. is at what I would call the sheriff's posse stage. There are a lot of people who don't really agree with each other very much most of the time who suddenly are shocked by some horrendous human event into putting together some ad hoc and improvised posse to do something about it after the fact. It is better than doing nothing, of course. But we've got to move on from this stage.

TN: Is one of the basic requirements of an effective United Nations a standing volunteer army, which you have written about?

BU: I don't think my idea of a volunteer force was ever practical. What I wanted to do was to try to highlight the fact that national governments have reached the limit of sending their own armies into situations that are dangerous and not of genuine national concern. And that therefore, unless you begin to think about an international capability, you are not going to be able to do much to prevent or stop these conflicts.

That turned out to be terribly true in Rwanda in 1994. At that point, the United Nations had standby arrangements with twenty national governments. Not a single one would respond to a request to send troops to Rwanda. Eventually, the French did it on their own. Prevention is the big buzzword now, but to be serious about prevention, the United Nations needs the infrastructure that allows it to actually prevent such outbreaks of [violence](#). But at present the United Nations doesn't have a permanent infrastructure or a capacity to respond quickly to a disaster.

If the United Nations could respond quickly to a situation like that in Rwanda, it's possible that it could prevent it from reaching the point of [genocide](#). In fact, the Canadian general Romeo Dallaire, who was in charge of the U.N. mission in Rwanda when the genocide took place, has said that if he had had even 1,000 well-trained troops, he almost certainly could have done something to prevent the worst of the killings there. But instead most of his forces were actually withdrawn by the Security Council. If one could get a U.N. operation into such situations early enough to calm everybody down before there are heavy casualties, it might be possible to prevent a permanent blood feud, which is what now seems to exist in Rwanda.

DR: The United Nations has not worked effectively in this area because it is wedded to outmoded notions of impartiality and neutrality. Until the United Nations can take sides in a conflict, then giving it its own flag with its own military establishment not only will not make much difference, it may well make the situation worse. The United Nations intervenes only at the behest of the great powers, and their motives may well be evil -- to put it bluntly. Had, for example, the proposed humanitarian intervention in eastern Zaire been allowed to take place, it would have had the effect of keeping Mobutu in power. That was what the French wanted -- and, to their enormous discredit, what many relief agencies, unable to see the political forest for the humanitarian trees, were pressing for. It's all very well to talk about preventive diplomacy, but the kinds of crises we're likely to face -- namely, those in which we are going to have to deploy troops -- are the very ones in which preventive diplomacy is likely to have failed. This is so because the United Nations is still dominated by a peacekeeping culture that is inappropriate for effective military action in most of these conflicts. For those of us who favored the Bosnia side, the U.N. rules of engagement, which allowed the Serbs to shell Sarajevo uncontested seemed utterly immoral. Yet U.N. officials argued that they were only following the mandate given them by the Security Council and that a stronger mandate was not possible given the composition of that body.

BU: I agree that in Bosnia it was not possible to do more, not least because the Russians would not have allowed it and they have a veto in the Security Council. Europe was also divided on the matter. But we are not talking here about situations with well-defined adversaries that would require the Security Council to make a decision that one is an aggressor. The situation in eastern Zaire, and to a lesser extent in Rwanda, as far as I can make out, is one of a total lapse of authority. In such a situation, what one needs is not so much a military force as a police, antiviolence operation that may be tougher than an equivalent peacekeeping effort but is not ostensibly military in its nature. With such a law-and-order force, one could prevent the strongest from preying on the weakest, which is what happens in these situations.

DR: We have a tendency to assume that because things are cruel, they are more chaotic -- that is, less political -- than they in fact are. I think that was the mistake we made in Somalia, and also more recently in the Great Lakes region of Central Africa. I would even go so far as to suggest that some of these conflicts are inevitable; that they have a certain political logic and also a certain political function; and that in the long run we're actually doing no one any favor by trying to intervene and prevent them.

TN: How do you distinguish between these conflicts? In Bosnia you favored Western intervention while in Zaire you seemed to question its utility.

DR: There was no contradiction in my position. I have never supported humanitarian interventions. I was for the military defense of the Bosnian state, because I thought the Bosnian state as it existed then was infinitely preferable and represented far superior values than those of its adversaries, and that those values were worth defending. I am not sure that the same claims can be made of the current Bosnian administration. But at the time, the right thing to do would have been for the Security Council to declare the Serbs the aggressor and authorize member states to come to the defense of the Bosnian state. I thought that Bosnia was worth defending and that it was worth campaigning for its defense.

In contrast, a humanitarian intervention in Zaire, coming to the rescue of suffering people victimized by a state of civil strife and lawlessness, is an effort to stop history in its tracks. Of course, I am sympathetic to the moral impulse to help these people, but it would have been a mistake. The kind of quick-fix operation the Canadians and the French had in mind -- namely, providing some temporary

military support for humanitarian aid and then getting out-solves nothing. Either they would have secured Mobutu's rule or, after they pulled out, the war would have erupted again. If the will and the money existed, I suppose that it might have been possible to put Zaire under U.N. transitional authority while the political problems underlying the violence were worked out, as was done in Cambodia -- a kind of humanitarian [colonialism](#).

In any case, we have turned die Rwanda affair into a morality play and truth has been one of the casualties. In reality, the people in those Zairian camps were loyal to the old regime. They were not a bunch of hostages. Of course, that loyalty was not absolute. Most of them were not hard-liners. But the purely humanitarian actions of the donor countries and the nongovernmental organizations did not address this problem. As a result, they contributed to the problem. By spending a million dollars a day on those camps, they in effect made it possible for the militia controlling them to buy the loyalty of the bulk of the [population](#).

BU: This suggests that we need to establish some clear conditions for future humanitarian efforts: one being no weapons; another being no political or paramilitary activity in the camps. We need to develop the kind of rules of engagement for humanitarian operations that we developed for peacekeeping operations. The rules of engagement for peacekeeping were very simple: You did not use force, you did not allow any side to gain an advantage from the arrangement and you did not take sides. It was relatively simple. And it worked, provided you were dealing with governments who wished to stop fighting, and provided you used all the political leverage you had on all the parties to the conflict to adhere to the agreement. I do not see why you can't work out some similar rules of engagement for humanitarian operations.

In addition, I think we need to develop the minimum institutions that are needed to carry out those guidelines. We need, as I suggested earlier, a law-and-order capability separate from [peacekeeping forces](#) to police humanitarian operations. If you had such a capability made up of highly trained police you could provide security to [refugees](#) and humanitarian workers in the camps and prevent the camps being taken over by thugs. As it is now, humanitarian organizations are put in this very compromising position of having to negotiate with the thugs that come to control these camps.

DR: I agree that in the absence of such rules, humanitarian organizations have placed themselves in a very compromising position. The I.C.R.C. -- the International Committee of the Red Cross -- has avoided this problem to some degree by having very limited goals and norms of withdrawal, and a realistic sense of what they can and cannot accomplish. They are not trying to save the world, or abolish war, as too many humanitarian organizations seem to believe is within their ability to accomplish. Many of the I.C.R.C.'s delegates believe that the humanitarians are trying to act like politicians at the expense of their humanitarian mission. For example, I am a great admirer of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, but I don't think the U.N.H.C.R.'s special envoy in the former Yugoslavia should have been the principal representative of the international community in that conflict, which he was in the early years of the war. It was he who would negotiate cease-fires. He should never have been put in that position. It was a misuse of **humanitarianism**. **Humanitarianism** can only be an adjunct to political action. If it's done in a void, it's only going to support the people with the guns.

TN: Yet some humanitarian organizations have eagerly embraced this political role, while at the same time lobbying Western governments to take more concerted action. Have humanitarian groups become too politically involved? For example, some charges have been leveled at humanitarian organizations for hyping the crisis in eastern Zaire.

DR: I hope the Rwandan and eastern Zairian crisis will prove to have been as much of a cold shower on the more exuberant interpretations of **humanitarianism** as Bosnia was for U.N. peacekeeping. We can now see that **humanitarianism** provides tools or modalities that have certain uses that can't be stretched to fit every situation. Moreover, there is a problem with the fact that humanitarian groups have come to have vested interests of their own. After each humanitarian disaster -- from Somalia to Bosnia to Rwanda -- if one looks at the record one sees that they overestimated how many people were going to die. Understandably, in trying to mobilize public opinion, they tend to exaggerate the crisis. I probably would do the same if I were in their position. Take Bosnia as an example. Every winter, all the humanitarian agencies would tell us how people in Sarajevo were going to starve to death. As far as I know, almost nobody in Bosnia ever did. Partly that was because the U.N.H.C.R. carried out its operation very well, but partly it was because the threat of starvation was never as serious as it was then presented.

Humanitarian agencies have increasingly learned to play to the cameras, and a very curious and worrying symbiosis has arisen between the press and the private humanitarian groups. In a sense, a relationship between the [humanitarian aid](#) workers and journalists has developed that is similar to that which the US. Army enjoyed in Vietnam before the press turned against the war. In Vietnam, the Army gave you a helicopter or took you around the countryside. Now, it is the humanitarian worker who gives you a jeep and takes you into southern Sudan or to eastern Zaire, and you are grateful. And there's an added problem, which is the disaster-development continuum, a ghastly bit of jargon that I learned recently, meaning that humanitarian groups move from [disaster relief](#) to dispensing development aid once the crisis is over. A lot of the humanitarian agencies are involved in both, so it will be difficult to establish norms for these groups since they have a vested interest in staying in a place no matter how much they are manipulated by the local thugs.

TN: How does one go about establishing this new regime for **humanitarianism**?

BU: Instead of talking about donor fatigue and humanitarian hangovers, we should be developing a more tough-minded approach to humanitarian assistance. With the current unregulated approach, we are rewarding failure and irresponsibility by creating an expectation that the "international community" is always going to bail you out no matter how bad a mess you have made of things. I think a tougher line at the beginning of these operations would be a good idea. That means establishing some rules that govern the giving of aid. If you break those rules, you lose access to emergency assistance. This, I believe, could stop some of the abuses we have seen in Somalia and Zaire. After all, a million dollars a day isn't small stuff.

DR: The funding of expensive humanitarian operations is almost entirely provided by donor governments and by the United Nations through donor conferences. Most of the money comes from the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.), the European Community Humanitarian Office (ECHO), the Dutch government, the U.N.H.C.R., UNICEF, the World Food Program and one or two others. So it is possible for the donor community to regulate and organize the activities of the N.G.O.s. That's the positive side. The negative side, of course, is that both in the case of A.I.D. and ECHO political considerations intrude into the decision-making process relating to the allocation of funds. For example, the French government was very skeptical of the new regime in Rwanda, to put it charitably -- deeply hostile would be more accurate. Paris, therefore, stymied a lot of ECHO grants and put a lot of conditions on the grants that were approved for Rwanda, whereas ECHO was quite free to give money for the camps in eastern Zaire. A.I.D. has similarly been politically driven in some of its decisions on grants. Bitterly pro-Bosnian though I was during the war, I think it is a huge mistake that most of the international assistance has been earmarked for the Bosnian Federation

side and very little for the republic of the Serbs. It's a recipe for disaster. But donors earmark funds and that's the way it works.

TN: You seem to be assuming that the amount of humanitarian assistance now given actually provides enough leverage to matter with the people who have an interest in perpetuating a conflict. How much leverage does the humanitarian community really have power the hard-liners? A million dollars a day is a lot of money, but it may be too small a sum to provide real political leverage in most of those situations.

DR: I don't agree. The international community is responsible for something like 80 percent of the jobs in Bosnia. Even the hard-liners who want to perpetuate the conflict must worry about the consequences of an aid cutoff. They have their constituents; they don't want people dissatisfied with them. One must not underestimate what humanitarian aid can accomplish if it is properly administered. These humanitarian agencies and N.G.O.s are tremendous forces for good in a cruel world -- at least in terms of alleviating human suffering in a crisis. But, as it is now, this humanitarian international operates like a strange kind of free agent. It needs to come to terms better with its limitations, and we need to harness it a lot better than we are doing now and, also, reintroduce a degree of reality into our thinking about what humanitarian aid can and cannot accomplish. That should be the lesson we draw from our recent experience in Zaire.

Emma Vestal

Mr. Speice

ISM - 4B

30 November 2017

Research Assessment #5

November 15, 2017

Theatrical Education

*How To Become A Drama Teacher* . [Tobecomeateacher.org](http://Tobecomeateacher.org),  
[tobecomeateacher.org/how-to-become-a-drama-teacher/](http://tobecomeateacher.org/how-to-become-a-drama-teacher/).

This article was extraordinarily helpful. It was very informational, and helped me to gain knowledge about what it takes to become a theatre teacher. When I decided to choose this article, I knew that I wanted to know more about being a theatrical teacher. One thing that I really wanted to learn was how vastly the salaries range for theatre teachers throughout the nation. I needed to know how much the average was and then how they change throughout different places. After reading this article, I feel as though I have grasped a better understanding of what it takes to not only become a theatre teacher, but the benefits and final products of doing so.

This article talked a lot about how most middle school and high school theatre teachers and directors also work outside of the school place. Going into the profession, there seems to be a lot of opportunities given and leniency. This is extremely important to me considering that I

am interested in all aspects of theatre. This was something else that was discussed. Theatre teachers are not only teachers. They are directors and costume designers and writers and often so many other things. While this sounds daunting to a lot of people, this is actually exactly what I want. I have always been the kind of person that likes to have a lot going on, and I like to dip my toe into a little bit of everything. If I became a theatre teacher, especially in high school, I would be able to practice a lot of what I am interested in.

Another thing that was talked about a lot is the requirements that it takes to become a theatre teacher. It's very interesting because depending on where you want to teach, some places might want you to have a Master's in theatre. However, there are also instances when theatre teachers and professors don't have a degree at all, they were simply hired because of their experience and wisdom. There's wiggle room in theatre professions like this. That's something that I also liked learning because there's a large possibility that I may not want to be a teacher after I go to school and see what I do and don't like to be a part of. By being reassured that there's opportunities that can be taken if plan A or plan B fails is very comforting when analyzing what I want to do with my future.

There's many different salaries when it comes to teaching theatre. Depending upon the level of education and the place that you're working. Higher levels of education typically pay higher. Depending on the state that you are teaching in, they will pay more. Typically places that are in higher need of teachers will pay higher.

Overall, this article helped me a lot to learn about whether or not teaching would workout for me. I think I would be able to provide for myself as well as I would be able to be happy in

this occupation. Not saying that I am for sure going to do this with my life, but I definitely am considering and feel more confident after reading this.

*How To Become A Drama Teacher* . [Tobecomeateacher.org](http://Tobecomeateacher.org),  
[tobecomeateacher.org/how-to-become-a-drama-teacher/](http://tobecomeateacher.org/how-to-become-a-drama-teacher/).

Teaching drama, also known as theatre arts, is a discipline often centered on flexibility and creative expressive. Drama teachers are hired to educate students on different acting styles, methods and techniques, from learning how to project their voices across a stage to conveying emotion on cue. In addition to planning lessons and assessing the performance of their classes, drama educators also teach theatre history, assist students in writing their own dramatic pieces, as well as organize and direct performance rehearsals and school plays.

In middle and high schools, drama teachers are nearly always involved in extra-curricular activities, typically holding auditions and rehearsals for plays outside of the normal school day. The minimum requirement to teach drama is a bachelor's degree, with many earning a master's degree to work with students on the collegiate level. However, unlike most teachers at postsecondary schools, drama teachers belong to a unique category of educators that do not necessarily need a doctorate-level degree to qualify for employment at a college or university.

## **HOW CAN I BECOME AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DRAMA TEACHER?**

---

With very few exceptions, elementary schools do not employ full-time drama teachers.

While some schools may hire teachers with a background in drama to introduce young students to the basics of theatre arts (either as part of the school's required curriculum or on an extra-curricular

basis), opportunities for elementary-level drama teachers are limited outside of specialized performing arts schools.

## HOW CAN I BECOME A MIDDLE OR HIGH SCHOOL DRAMA TEACHER?

---

A selection of middle schools and many high schools employ full-time drama teachers.

At the middle and high school levels, drama teachers are responsible for introducing students to acting methods and to all of the other elements associated with launching theatrical productions (from costume and set design to lighting and direction). Students are taught how to read plays with the proper feeling and expression, as well as understand the overall genre of theatre. Role-playing and improvisation may also become part of a student's curriculum.

In addition to producing small plays within the classroom, many drama teachers guide their students towards putting on a school production for their peers and parents. Generally, classes are assigned various duties related to acting, directing, lighting, costume design, stage design (and building), props, music and supervising the overall production. Many drama teachers are also expected to hold after-school student auditions and rehearsals, in conjunction with their regular classroom curriculum.

To become a drama teacher at a middle or high school, the following steps are typically completed by qualified job candidates:

- A [bachelor's degree](#) in Education with a specialization in theatre arts, or a BA in Theatre Arts. In some cases, teachers may have completed a bachelor's degree in another discipline but have also completed a required number of courses in drama or theatre (usually at least 30 semester credit hours).
- Completion of teacher education program. Drama majors with an interest in pursuing an education-related job must complete the necessary coursework required of future teachers, and have gained experience working with middle and high school students.
- [Certification or licensure to teach](#) in their state. Requirements vary by state, but often include passing a criminal background test, holding a bachelor's degree, paying applicable license fees, and passing examinations.

- Experience working in theatre at a community or professional level is often considered highly desirable for a job candidate to demonstrate. Those who hold a master's degree in a performing arts field may also qualify for positions offering higher pay, as well as greater job options, such as becoming a drama director at a high school with a reputable theatre arts department.

## HOW CAN I BECOME A COLLEGE DRAMA PROFESSOR?

---

College-level drama teachers may teach courses in drama, theatre or theatre arts programs. Some college-level professors teach at schools exclusively dedicated to the performing arts (such as [The Julliard School's Acting Programs](#)). Most drama teachers working at the college level are affiliated with a drama or theatre arts program, or department within a broader college.

To teach in a college drama program, one may or may not be expected to hold a bachelor's degree and/or master's degree in drama or the theatre arts. As with teaching visual arts at the post-secondary level, many college drama programs prefer to hire teachers based on their professional experience rather than formal credentials. At some colleges, part-time faculty may be hired solely on the basis of experience, while only full-time faculty is required to hold formal educational credentials. At other colleges, professional experience is the only consideration but titles may vary in this case. It is not uncommon to see faculty hired without formal academic credentials referred to as "teaching faculty" or "instructors" rather than assuming the rank of professor.

College-bound theatre professors increase their attractiveness as a job candidate, and qualify for a wider scope of employment opportunities when they are able to demonstrate the following:

- A master's degree, preferably a Master of Fine Arts in Theatre, MA in Theatre Education, or similar degree.
- Teaching experience that includes the ability to teach courses related to specified instructional areas, such as theatre history, musical theatre and stage production.
- Recent experience in the field, which shows the ability to produce, direct and/or write high quality work for theater productions.

# HOW CAN I BECOME A UNIVERSITY DRAMA PROFESSOR?

---

Drama and theatre arts programs at universities across the U.S. offer programs for students looking to pursue a career in the arts, and those interested in taking an elective associated with the fine arts. On the college level, expectations for theater arts faculty, especially part-timers, are typically different than they are in regards to most other arts and science disciplines. While some university drama or theatre arts professors hold PhDs, most do not since there are few institutions where one can obtain a [PhD](#) in theatre arts. For example, Yale University is one of the few universities in North America that offers a DFA or [Doctor of Fine Arts in Theatre](#).

With few exceptions, the terminal degree in the theatre arts field is a Master of Fine Arts in Theatre. In many cases, however, a combination of education and experience is still preferred in a qualified job candidate. As such, faculty, even at top-ranked theatre schools, such as the [Yale School of Drama](#), may hold a [Bachelor of Fine Arts](#) in theatre. In the case of part-time faculty, universities have been known to hire drama teachers who demonstrate an outstanding track record of achievement in the theatre field, and have no formal education in the field.

Once hired, professors of drama or theatre arts are expected to teach courses in their area of specialization (from acting to stage direction), participate in the governance of their program, and continue to stay active in their profession as actors, directors, set designers, or in some other capacity related to the theatre arts.

# WHAT IS THE JOB OUTLOOK FOR DRAMA TEACHERS?

---

Higher paying job opportunities for drama teachers are generally found at colleges, universities and professionals schools, which employed 71,050 of the 97,500 postsecondary teachers representing

art, music and drama in 2014. Junior colleges hired 18,970 teachers within this category, followed by performing arts companies, technical and trade schools, and other schools of instruction.

Employment opportunities for drama teachers outside of the higher education environment are expected to show above average growth in school districts situated in rural areas and inner cities. High schools in the West and South are also anticipated to welcome increased student enrollment, which translates into an escalating demand to hire more teachers across the board, including those who teach theatre arts.

Every year, the U.S. Department of Education releases a listing of teacher shortages for grades K-12, which identifies the states and districts in need of hiring educators to fill subject- and grade level positions. The department noted the following states for experiencing a [statewide shortage of drama teachers](#) for the 2015/2016 academic year: Idaho (Drama for grades 6-12), California (English/Drama/Humanities), Arkansas (Drama/Speech), and Colorado (Art/Music/Drama). Educators who live in these areas, or who are willing to relocate, can take advantage of the increased job prospects available in the above-mentioned states.

## WHAT IS THE COMPENSATION FOR DRAMA TEACHERS?

---

The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) groups theatre arts teachers into a category of educators that combines professional that teach art, music and drama. According to the BLS, those who taught drama or theatre arts in 2014 earned the following average salaries:

- Elementary and middle school teachers – \$53,760 – \$54,940
- High school teachers – \$56,310
- Postsecondary teachers – \$75,350

Drama teachers employed at colleges, universities and professional schools earned the highest salaries, taking home an annual mean wage of \$76,350 in 2014. Other top-paying industries for

professors and instructors associated with theatre arts that same year included junior colleges (\$75,460), performing arts companies (\$67,650), and other types of schools (\$66,260).

The BLS also shows differential pay for drama professors that takes place when teachers reside in a certain geographic location, as some states are known for offering higher salaries than others. For example, in 2014, the following states (with their annual mean salaries listed) [paid the most to drama teachers](#) employed in postsecondary schools: New York (\$111,960), California (\$89,290), Maryland (\$86,540), Connecticut (\$84,470), and Massachusetts (\$84,440).

In conclusion, individuals who enter the education field to teach drama or theatre arts often enjoy a certain level of flexibility, where experience in the field means just as much (if not more than) educational credentials. Even at the college and university level, professors are not required to hold a PhD to qualify for a teaching position. When interviewing a pool of candidates for an open position, it is not uncommon for schools and employers to hire a theater arts instructor or teacher that possesses the most experience and clout within the creative arts industry.



