

‘WHAT IS TO COUNT AS KNOWLEDGE’:¹ THE EVOLVING DIRECTING PROGRAMME AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DRAMATIC ART

CHRISTOPHER HAY

At the 2010 Australasian Association for Drama, Theatre and Performance Studies (ADSA) Conference, held at the Australian National University, staff and students from the National Institute of Dramatic Art (NIDA) presented some of their work for the first time. Their very attendance at the conference was a sign that NIDA was reaching out to the Theatre Studies Academy.² It reflected the view on the part of some departments within NIDA, if not from the institution as a whole, that they do have a relationship with and a place within the Academy. At the 2010 conference, Karen Vickery, then Head of Performance Practices, gave a paper, and Egil Kipste, Head of Directing, led a session with three of the six students enrolled in the Graduate Diploma of Dramatic Art (Directing), demonstrating his particular application of the late Stanislavskian theory of Active Analysis (AA). Given that Sharon Carnicke, whose work is the most comprehensive articulation of that theory, had been the keynote speaker earlier that day, there was a – partly implicit – suggestion that the NIDA-led session was a practical demonstration of the theory-driven world which Carnicke represented.³

NIDA's appearance at ADSA is part of a broader reorientation currently taking place in relation to the Academy. As I argue in this article, this event represents an historically loaded exchange with important implications for NIDA's future teaching practice. NIDA's engagement with ADSA also had an important result for me: as a direct result of the paper I presented at that conference, after a few one-off classes, I was invited to become a casual tutor in the Directing programme. The

ADSA conference led to my becoming what Georgina Born characterises as 'a full participant' in the graduate Directing programme.⁴ As well as taking it as my object of study, I am involved in the teaching and in a small way am responsible for some of the course outcomes which my research is examining. This requires me to describe the 'familiar world' on which Pierre Bourdieu would encourage me to exert 'the detached scrutiny which, with no special vigilance, the ethnologist brings to bear on any world to which he is not linked'.⁵

My findings in this article have also been inflected by my 'parallel selves': as a research student trained in the overtly theoretical study of performance, I read academic study in a positive way and assign a value to it accordingly.⁶ Further, at my home institution, the University of Sydney, I have been exposed to and involved with the recent curriculum review within the newly minted Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. With the removal of caps on student numbers from 2012 onwards, higher education institutions throughout the country have been investigating the true value of their qualifications. In many cases, including at my own institution, a profitable by-product of these examinations has been the return of modes of knowledge transmission to the forefront of teaching concerns. Alongside specific questions about knowledge, there has also been a general enquiry into what attracts students to any particular programme. Often this has been with a view to establishing what can be thrust front-and-centre to retain this crucial point of difference, as well as to boost student numbers. As training conservatories in the creative arts become more closely aligned with the rest of the higher education sector – in some cases even by being amalgamated into universities they, too, are subject to these examinations.⁷ These conservatories – whose primary teaching mode continues to be the practical study of different arts practices – are increasingly required to meet the same benchmarks as their university peers. In many cases, the power to award degrees – granted by the Dawkins higher education reforms of the early 1990s – has necessitated this stricter adherence to academic standards.

In order to investigate the evolution of the training offered at NIDA, I wish to offer a brief analysis of the current structure of the graduate Directing programme, including its relationship with modes of knowledge transmission. In so doing, I first offer a brief history of NIDA, concentrating on its relationship with the Theatre Studies Academy, before turning to my case study. The reason for my concentration on the Directing course is threefold: as a postgraduate course, it is required to be more overtly academic in nature; as a one-year course, it has had to respond to these concerns more quickly than the longer courses also taught at NIDA; and my own involvement in the course allows me to be as reflexive as possible about the teaching within it, in the manner promoted by Rob Moore, among others.⁸

A BRIEF HISTORY OF NIDA

In the context of performance, there has always been a loaded exchange between the Academy and training conservatories. In her survey of the development of the field, Shannon Jackson suggests that the tussle between theory and practice, which colours so much of that development, stems from 'the opposition between the intellectual and the manual on which so much humanistic knowledge-making exists'.⁹ This tension is embodied by the balancing act which institutions like NIDA must now perform. On the one hand, NIDA acts as an educational institution, which awards academic qualifications to students who meet the precise requirements that it sets down. Yet on the other, it is also an industry gatekeeper which certifies students as professionals ready for release into the wider industry as a result of their practical experience. The situation is particularly acute at NIDA, due to both the small size of the industry in relation to the number of aspiring professionals, as well as the almost unique reputation that NIDA has developed as the flagship cultural training institution in Australia. In all of its courses, NIDA must seek to balance these competing obligations which are further intensified by the historical antipathy often displayed by the performance industry to any signs of academia – outlined at length, for example, in the work of Rachel Forgasz.

In her recently published article in *Australasian Drama Studies* (October 2010), Forgasz asks if 'the field of academic theatre studies [is] a source of inspiration, or just a lot of intellectual mumbo-jumbo?'.¹⁰ Her work interrogates the relationship between the Academy and the profession by interviewing high-profile directors and writers. All of her respondents exhibited various degrees of hostility, lining up behind a position which 'identified *intellectual* labour as the key activity of the [A]cademy and that which sets it apart from the *creative* work of the professional theatre'.¹¹ NIDA's alignment with the professional world makes any tentative embrace of 'intellectual labour' all the more telling. It is important to note that Forgasz's work also reveals a generational bias amongst her respondents: all the professionals whom she interviews were trained in the 1970s and 1980s, including some who trained as actors.¹² None of the directors she interviews studied directing at drama schools, and indeed many of them – including Michael Gow, Michael Kantor and Stephen Sewell – studied primarily at sandstone universities.¹³ To carry further a suggestion that Forgasz makes towards the end of her article, it could well be conservatory-trained directors who are best able to respond to this 'fracture between fields'.¹⁴

NIDA has an especially conflicted relationship with the Academy, which stems from its very founding. After being invited to take up residence on the grounds of the University of New South Wales (UNSW) in arrangements formalised in 1958, the first students arrived at the Institute in 1959, graduating as the class of 1960. The first history of NIDA, published by the UNSW Press in 1979 and written by former director

Robert Quentin,¹⁵ notes that the buildings which had been offered to NIDA when the school first took up residence on campus were 'an old totalisator, a beautiful two-storey timber house used by jockeys of the Kensington racecourse and a lot of ancient huts'.¹⁶ They soon lost space when the theatre was given over to the Old Tote company, all while the school was expanding at a rapid rate, especially when the three-year Design and one-year postgraduate Directing courses began in 1972.¹⁷ In the same year, both the Acting and Technical Production courses were also extended to three years.

The more contemporary history, written in 2003 by then-director John Clark, echoes Quentin in presenting the history of NIDA as a continual resistance to overtures from different institutions to compromise what is seen as its institutional integrity.¹⁸ Writing with hindsight, Clark observes: 'while the buildings had a romantic charm in the early days, they lost their appeal as they fell into disrepair at a time when both NIDA and the Australian entertainment industry were expanding rapidly'.¹⁹ Despite a seeming crisis of disrepair in their buildings in the late 1970s, Clark continues, 'NIDA was unwilling to compromise its independence by becoming part of the Sydney College of the Arts'.²⁰ Something, however, had to be done, and the Institute now had a high enough profile to receive attractive offers:

In 1981 the Commonwealth Government offered NIDA \$3 million for a new building to be constructed adjacent to the Seymour Centre at Sydney University ... However, a change of policy at both the University of Sydney and the University of New South Wales brought about a dramatic change in NIDA's fortunes. In 1982 the new Vice-Chancellor of the University of New South Wales, Professor Michael Birt, offered NIDA a magnificent location on Anzac Parade. At the same time, Sydney University withdrew the offer of the Seymour Centre.²¹

Finally, in 1988, the new complex opened on Anzac Parade – the majority of it still standing as the part of the Institute furthest north on Anzac Parade. The new Parade Theatres building, which includes the cavernous Nancy Fairfax Foyer, followed in 2001.

NIDA has consistently maintained this fiercely guarded independence, built into its very structure. The first history of the Institute explains:

NIDA is a private company, limited by guarantee, with a Board of Directors ... the Director is responsible to the Board for the artistic and administrative conduct of the Institute. A Board of Studies advises the board through the Director in matters concerning curriculum and scholarships.²²

The same book states that NIDA 'rejoices in its association with the university [of New South Wales], *and in its independence*'.²³ This was particularly significant in the case of NIDA's early days because the Institute developed in opposition to a model being proposed in Victoria, in which a training academy would be created under the auspices of the University of Melbourne. NIDA has formed alliances and links with other interests only on its own terms – the most famous of these being the formation and subsequent independence of the Old Tote Theatre Company, as well as the Jane Street Theatre. In part, this resistance is so consistent precisely because of NIDA's geographical location: being literally in the midst of UNSW is not only a constant reminder, but requires a very practical and sustained effort to avoid confusion about the relationship between the two institutions. As the 1979 history reminds us, 'the staff of NIDA are not formally members of the university, and academic qualifications may not be relevant to their needs'.²⁴

Its history, then, suggests that NIDA embodies one half of the distinction which Forgasz's interview subjects see 'between the creative act of making theatre and the intellectual work of researching theatre'.²⁵ Indeed, NIDA has in the past sought to distance itself from that second task, leaving intellectual labour to the University which now literally surrounds it. In the current educational climate, however, where many universities are now offering practice-based training inflected with academic study, NIDA is seeking to redefine its teaching and expand the scope of its qualifications.²⁶ Although it remains the first choice for many aspiring professionals, the Institute must ensure that its qualifications remain in step with competing courses offered around the country. In this way, despite the historical antipathy displayed by the industry towards the Academy, NIDA is moving to incorporate more overtly academic material into its coursework units. I now turn to how this is playing out in particular in the Graduate Diploma of Dramatic Art (Directing), by way of offering a practical illustration of the negotiation to which I referred above.

KNOWLEDGE AT NIDA

So much of NIDA's identity lies in its not being like 'over the road' that it is very possible to forget that, like UNSW, the Institute in fact awards degrees, and has done so since 1994.²⁷ As well as meeting practical performance benchmarks, all students – whichever programme they are enrolled in – take a number of performance practices coursework units, the successful completion of which is required to progress through the qualification. Interviews suggest that for most students, these are viewed as anything from, at best, a fascinating curiosity to, at worst, a distracting burden.²⁸ In the postgraduate programmes in Directing and Playwriting, the question of what to cover in these coursework units is complex, particularly since many – though certainly not all – of the students enrolled in them have some academic grounding in

performance theory before they arrive to study at NIDA.²⁹ The coursework units taught to the postgraduate students, therefore, can afford to be more academically rigorous than the necessarily introductory, survey-style courses taught to undergraduates.

These postgraduate coursework units focus on overtly academic material drawn from the Theatre Studies Academy, and mark a broadening of the modes of teaching which NIDA offers its students. Within the dominant practical culture of the Institute, they are a concrete example of the negotiation taking place to incorporate some features of academic culture. This negotiation relates to what educational sociologist Karl Maton describes as 'languages of legitimation'. Reframing the work of Basil Bernstein,³⁰ Maton and Moore propose that:

Languages of legitimation [are] claims about what is to count as knowledge and the procedure and criteria that members of the field can legitimately employ in its production.³¹

They are thus 'claims made by actors for carving out and maintaining intellectual and institutional spaces within education'.³² While the broader theory, which has implications for the symbolic control and domination of knowledge, is beyond the scope of this article, I will investigate two provocations in the model raised above. These are the questions of 'what is to count as knowledge', as well as the 'criteria that members of the field can legitimately employ in its production'.

In general, Maton and Moore note that 'any specific intellectual field is organised in such a way as to make certain things visible and potential objects for knowledge, and other things invisible within its current field of vision'.³³ Higher education institutions, which mark knowledge as legitimate by including it as part of their curricula, can be seen to be responsible for this organisation. In the specific case, NIDA as an institution is able to arrange the field of knowledge appropriate to artists-in-training to privilege what they see as legitimate knowledge. In terms of this legitimation, Maton identifies 'a distinction between legitimating educational knowledge by reference to procedures appropriate to a discrete object of study (the *knowledge mode*), or personal characteristics of the author or subject (the *knower mode*)'.³⁴ Institutes like NIDA, which run primarily on a conservatoire model, typically teach in the *knower mode*; that is, '*who* you are is more important than *what* you are discussing or *how*'.³⁵ This is true on both a micro level, in that students are asked to follow the teaching of a charismatic few – particularly in the case of much actor training – but also on a macro level, in that teachings have been passed down through generations of 'masters'.³⁶

Further, *knower modes* are in part 'legitimated on the basis of the inability of existing educational knowledge to articulate the voice of this previously silenced

knower'.³⁷ That is, knowledge in the *knower mode* gains legitimacy based precisely on the fact that it has not been accepted into the traditional halls of knowledge – an observation given credence by NIDA's relationship with the Academy, for example. *Knower modes* therefore also have links to the idea of a 'radical break', as a schism from traditional modes of knowledge.³⁸ Knowledge legitimated in this way is more susceptible to sharp changes in fashion or trends, as 'the criteria of legitimate membership of the "knower" category are inherently unstable'.³⁹ University teaching, on the other hand, is typically characterised by teaching in the *knowledge mode*, by proposing that there is a limited set of legitimate knowledge, and that mastery of the discipline relates to understanding most of that set. To an extent, this is based on the academic capital possessed by universities as traditionally stable seats of learning. Whatever the reality, they are seen to represent intellectualism and an objectivity seen as lacking in more vocational institutions.

Maton's model is of course more nuanced than my explanation may have suggested; it would perhaps be best characterised as a continuum, with each intellectual field negotiating its own languages of legitimation somewhere between these poles. In the specific case of the graduate Directing programme at NIDA, knowledge legitimated by the *knower mode* relates to situating it within an apostolic succession which leads back to Tovstonogov and Stanislavski as *ur*-directors, with reference to other totemic figures throughout directing history.⁴⁰ As well, there is the presence of Egil Kipste as head of course – in the words of one of his students, 'presiding over us' – whose knowledge is legitimated by virtue of his institutional position. Also, the invited guests from the industry – who provide insights into their area of expertise, and later in the year act as professional mentors for the students as they prepare the graduation productions which mark the endpoint of their qualification – transmit knowledge in the *knower mode*. The knowledge that they provide, of course, is primarily legitimated by the positions they hold in their field – this personal characteristic defines and legitimates the knowledge to which they have access. To take a further specific example, in 2011 Kipste restructured the graduate Directing programme to make visible new objects of knowledge. His students that year were required to take a compulsory coursework unit entitled 'Directors and Directing'. It was this unit which I was engaged both to rewrite and then to teach. Kipste explained to me that he wanted the unit, like the other units they undertook, to stretch the directors academically, and give them a broader grounding in theory. From the very first, then, this particular coursework unit has been marked as 'academic' and linked to ideas of canonicity – of giving the students access to a sanctioned knowledge set drawn from the academic discipline of Performance Studies. In asking me to teach the unit, Kipste is not suggesting that I personally have characteristics that legitimate the knowledge that I teach, but rather that the

access I have to a 'university' set of knowledges legitimates my teaching. As a young doctoral candidate with little access to specialised areas of knowledge but a general appreciation of what is 'trendy' or dominant in my very academic field, I teach material that – along with what is presented by my colleagues teaching other coursework units – may be seen as an attempt to invoke the *knowledge mode* represented by university teaching in Australia.

As the coursework units which the students are required to undertake become more and more overtly academic, the modes of knowledge transmission sanctioned by the course are broadened. For example, it is crucial to note that the version of 'Directors and Directing' which I was teaching that year was not an entirely new course. Rather, it was a reframing and refining of previously taught material, further reinforcing the idea that there is a negotiation and translation happening here between practical and academic cultures. In this way, I would argue that Maton's writing offers three important results of the negotiations taking place within the Directing programme: the discipline is strengthened by the different modes of transmission, making it more resistant to sharp changes in trends and demand; it allows NIDA to 'revalorise different forms of capital active within [the discipline]', therefore allowing the Institute to improve its function as an industry gatekeeper; and the criteria by which achievements in the field are measured – another function Maton ascribes to languages of legitimation – are broadened.⁴¹ In the midst of the negotiations that NIDA is currently undertaking, the model of director training is shifting and expanding, and becoming more accountable to the kind of academic standards which the higher education sector is required to meet.

FROM STUDENT TO PROFESSIONAL

Having discussed how NIDA goes about fulfilling its role as an educational institution, it seems pertinent to touch briefly on some of the ways in which it marks its graduates as professionals. The NIDA Graduate Diploma and Masters of Dramatic Art (Directing) qualifications are markers of professionalisation and the first step of a transition to the positions of cultural authority occupied by those involved in Forgasz's research. Part of this comes from their degree status – a standard marker of professionalism in the field of higher education – and another part is drawn from NIDA's status as a flagship institution. It is interesting, therefore, to consider Samuel Weber's definition of the professional:

He has undergone a lengthy period of training in a recognised institution (professional school), which certifies him as being competent in a specialised area; such competence derives from his mastery of a particular discipline, an esoteric body of useful

knowledge involving systematic theory and resting on general principles. Finally, the professional is felt to 'render a service' rather than provide an ordinary commodity, and it is a service that he alone, *qua* professional, can supply. The latter aspect of professionalism lends its practitioners their peculiar authority and their status: they are regarded as possessing a monopoly of competence in their particular 'field'.⁴²

Weber here suggests that the professional is legitimated in part through the *knowledge mode*, given the reference to a sanctioned knowledge set to which the professional has access.

There remains a question of the service which these professionals can provide. Looking, for the sake of example, at the profession of the law, the service which the professional is perceived to offer is clear. In this case, the capacity to provide this service is linked to a lawyer's professional training. In addition to their purely academic studies, often taught by academics in the *knowledge mode* to give students access to a set body of legal knowledge, lawyers undergo formal procedures in order to confirm their professional status. In New South Wales, solicitors must pass through the College of Law, where they are often taught by practitioners who lend a wealth of professional experience in the *knower mode*, in order to demonstrate their professional capabilities before they are admitted to practice. The Admission Ceremony, which takes place in the Banco Court of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, is an imprimatur of this 'monopoly of competence', designed to welcome young lawyers to the profession: in order to be admitted, they must be moved by another legal practitioner.⁴³ Although the analogy is not precisely the same, it is possible to construe the graduation production which the Directing students present at the end of their training as a similar demonstration. It is designed to demonstrate, in the words of Burton Bledstein, 'a special power over worldly experience, a command over the profundities of a discipline'.⁴⁴

Although the word 'capstone' is not used at the Institute, the equivalent conclusion of the year of study in the Graduate Diploma of Dramatic Art (Directing) is the presentation of a short play in one of NIDA's spaces. These pieces generate considerable interest – John Clark calls them 'a special event in the NIDA calendar'⁴⁵ – not only because they are the publicly accessible showing of the students' work, but also as they often present a rare chance for students to work alongside professional actors.⁴⁶ The successful graduation production thus not only marks the completion of a year's work, but also demonstrates each student's professionalism, by showing his or her 'command' of the goods. Furthermore, it is the culmination of an academic course of study, during which the students have been taught various skills, and this

production is usually the first large-scale opportunity to put these skills into practice. Although not directly assessed, at the time of the production, the directors are still considered students, and it has been the first chance that they have had to direct a full production in the twelve months during which they have been studying at NIDA. This final production, far removed from the academic coursework discussed above, is the final culmination of teaching in the *knower mode*. Having been given access to industry professionals, mentors and technical support staff, the students are invited to demonstrate their mastery of their discipline.

Bledstein offers one further description of the professional which might well have been written with the creative professions in mind:

the professional ... never lost faith in the promise of his 'becoming', despite adversity. He never gave up on 'making it'. He stuck by his training and discipline, was patient and trusting, contained his anger, never committed himself to extreme judgments or actions that might jeopardise a career, and refused to blame the social system for the momentary irrationality of a life.⁴⁷

Compare this to the observation which one of the students made in an interview:

This is where we start having that conflict where there is an institution that is both educational but also an industry figurehead, where the process I realised was going to produce a product that was not really good as a product to showcase my work. About a week or so before we went into tech, we sort of dropped the process completely and said 'OK, look, let's make it this way'. And I think there were still elements of the more experimental side in there.⁴⁸

That particular student could be read as responding to the same pressures which Bledstein identifies. Having realised that the work being produced was not going to be the kind of artistic product that it needed to be to fulfil the showcase aims of the graduation production, the student decided to abandon the AA approach to directing which the course had taught, and to use other methods to create a work which would function more effectively as a declaration of newly acquired professional status. In part, then, this very realisation could be seen to mark the student as a professional: the student less attuned to the competing concerns of the course may well have stuck to the original process and delivered a less palatable product. The graduation production, then, is a deceptively simple capstone, given the number of different expectations which are swirling around it, and the diverse programme of study which it is designed to showcase.

There is a further complication for the graduation productions, in that much of the course is predicated on the idea of 'collegiality' – another manifestation of Maton's *knower mode*. The idea of working together, with fellow students and fellow creatives, is ingrained in the structure and practice of the course: Quentin notes that 'it is essential for the young director to gain knowledge and experience of acting, design and stage-management, to develop qualities of leadership, and to learn to *work creatively and harmoniously* with artists, technicians and administrators'.⁴⁹ On one level, this plays out in the delivery of the course because, for the majority of the year, the students are taught as a body of six, challenging and informing each other in seminar-style learning. Later in the year, Quentin's idea of creative and harmonious work is carried through on another level to the teaching offered, which former students characterised as 'cross-pollination'. One described the following:

Later in the year – and this is part of a strategy that is less academic and maybe more pragmatic – [Kipste's] plan is that the directors are confident now in who they are, what they want to achieve, how they can present it to people, all of that kind of stuff, so that's when things become more fluid. And so that, for example, offers are made: 'Oh, you're more interested in movement: show us; teach us; share with us.'⁵⁰

What the student is describing is quite a nice effect: once the groundwork has been laid, there is scope for them to stretch and challenge each other, to build and share knowledge.

The image of collegiality is carried through even to the structure of the graduation productions, which are organised into two programmes with three shows in each. NIDA emphasises the directors as a group: in the case of the Class of 2009, the programme featured a smiling portrait of all of the students together, rather than individual headshots. Nevertheless, such collegiality clashes with the reality at the end of the course: the graduates will be competing for the same, very limited, pool of jobs. This is obviously a similar situation in the vast majority of conservatory programmes – the NIDA actors being a prime example, given that they present their work on Agent's Day as a cohort, but are competing for a limited number of spots on any given agent's list. The students are supported throughout the year by the teaching staff, who assist them in their choice of repertoire; this can be seen as an early acknowledgement of the strategic decisions that will have to be made in the preparation of their graduation production. As they mount their productions – throughout casting, rehearsal and technical preparations – the students will be forced to make a series of decisions as to how they can present their work in the best light. In so doing, they deploy the knowledge taught to them throughout the year

from a wide range of 'knowers', including their fellow students.

CONCLUSION

NIDA's control of what Maton and Moore describe as 'the epistemic device' to broaden the field of potential objects of knowledge for directors-in-training is a conscious effort to strengthen the programme.⁵¹ These shifts are also a calculated, astute response to the increasing pressures on the Institute to meet the same academic standards as other higher education institutions in Australia. By reframing the material taught into a self-conscious *knowledge mode*, the Directing Department is able to make visible, and indeed highlight, the academic credentials of the programme. At the same time, the knowledge which the students take into their graduation production remains steadfastly transmitted in the *knower mode*. Given its position as an industry gatekeeper, the Institute may be able to affect the often frosty relationship between the industry and the Theatre Studies Academy in the years to come. By having received training sensitive to 'the symbiotic relationship between theory and practice', NIDA's director graduates can strive to 'offer to the industry a methodological approach to performance-making that draws simultaneously on intellectual and creative processes'.⁵²

In an educational climate where students have more choice than ever before, but also greater expectations of professional success as an outcome of their training, institutions around Australia are being forced to re-examine their qualifications. This article has considered how these examinations can be assisted by an understanding of the differing modes of knowledge transmission. Analysing current developments in both the Academy and training conservatories from such a perspective points to how NIDA is beginning to strengthen and differentiate the qualification it offers in the postgraduate Directing programme. Similar negotiations will doubtless take place in the three-year undergraduate qualifications offered at NIDA in the years to come, as the Institute determines its position in the field of performing arts education in Australia and beyond. These negotiations can only be assisted by an increased dialogue which flows both ways between training conservatories and the Theatre Studies Academy. The clichéd model of both fields as being hermetically sealed bubbles answering only to themselves ignores a potentially fruitful dialogue valuable to teachers, students and practitioners. Whatever comes of these current institutional reviews, the increased focus on answering the question of 'what is to count as knowledge' can only strengthen the qualifications which higher education institutions will struggle to market to ever more discerning students.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Particular thanks to the Publishing Group of the Department of Performance Studies at the University of Sydney: Aine de Paor, Cassie Duell, Adrian Johnson, Dr Daniel Johnston and Dr Glen McGillivray. As well, to Egil Kipste for his support and rigorous criticism, and the 2010 and 2011 cohorts of the Graduate Diploma of Dramatic Art (Directing) at NIDA.

NOTES

- 1 Karl Maton and Rob Moore, 'Founding the Sociology of Knowledge: Basil Bernstein, Intellectual Fields and the Epistemic Device', in Ana Morais *et al.* (eds), *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy: The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001) 164.
- 2 In this article, I use 'Academy' to refer to the world of academic, university-based teaching, to avoid confusion with 'academy', used to refer to training institutions.
- 3 Sharon Carnicke, *Stanislavsky in Focus* (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1990).
- 4 Georgina Born, *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC* (London: Vintage, 2005) 16.
- 5 Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988) xii.
- 6 Born 16.
- 7 As early as 1990, the Sydney Conservatorium of Music became a Faculty of the University of Sydney as a result of the Dawkins reforms, and more recently in 2007 the Victorian College of the Arts (VCA) was amalgamated into the Faculty of the VCA of the University of Melbourne. In 2010, it was further renamed the Faculty of the VCA and Music.
- 8 Rob Moore, *Towards the Sociology of Truth* (London: Continuum, 2009) 13.
- 9 Shannon Jackson, *Professing Performance: Theatre in the Academy from Philology to Performativity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 6.
- 10 Rachel Forgasz, 'What in the World Do They Think We're Doing? Practitioners' Views on the Work of the Theatre Studies Academy', in *Australasian Drama Studies* 57 (October 2010): 214.
- 11 *Ibid* 219, my emphasis.
- 12 Rosalba Clemente, NIDA Class of 1985; Maude Davey, VCA Class of 1985.
- 13 Gow holds an Arts degree in English Literature from the University of Sydney, Kantor a similar degree from the University of Melbourne, and Sewell a Bachelor of Science from the University of Sydney.
- 14 Forgasz 226.
- 15 Robert Quentin was the inaugural director of NIDA, from 1959 to 1962.
- 16 Robert Quentin, *NIDA Comes of Age: The National Institute of Dramatic Art at the University of New South Wales, 1958–1979* (Kensington: University of New South Wales Press, 1979). This book has no page numbers.
- 17 The Old Tote Theatre Company was established in 1963 in a converted tin shed on the UNSW campus, as NIDA's standing theatre company. The two organisations were separated in 1968, and the Old Tote went into liquidation in 1978. It is considered to be the precursor to the Sydney Theatre Company.
- 18 John Clark was director of NIDA from 1969 to 2004, and continued to serve on the Board of Directors until his resignation in 2010.
- 19 John Clark, *NIDA* (Bondi Junction: Focus, 2003) 63.
- 20 *Ibid*.
- 21 *Ibid* 64, 69.
- 22 Quentin.
- 23 *Ibid*, my emphasis.
- 24 *Ibid*.
- 25 Forgasz 223.
- 26 Monash University, for example, offers a Bachelor of Performing Arts course, in which students must complete both a performance major, and an academic theatre studies major. Similar courses, although with different names, are offered around the country.
- 27 The expression 'over the road', used among the staff at NIDA, refers to the main campus of UNSW, now directly across Anzac Parade from the NIDA premises. It is often accompanied by a jab of the head in the relevant direction.
- 28 Two personal interviews conducted on 23 January 2011, for example, offer the differing views.
- 29 The entry requirement to apply for the Directing course, for example, is a relevant undergraduate degree or five years' industry experience.

- 30 Basil Bernstein, *Class, Codes and Control* (London: Routledge, 1975). This work, along with Bernstein's later contributions, is seen as central to the development of the modern sociology of education to which scholars like Maton and Moore are contributing. For a fuller exploration of the influence of Bernstein on later research, see Moore.
- 31 Maton and Moore, 'Founding the Sociology of Knowledge' 164.
- 32 Karl Maton, 'Languages of Legitimation: The Structuring Significance for Intellectual Fields of Strategic Knowledge Claims', in *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 21.2 (2000): 147–67.
- 33 Maton and Moore, 'Founding the Sociology of Knowledge' 157.
- 34 Maton 155, my emphasis.
- 35 Karl Maton and Rob Moore, 'Historical Amnesia: Victims of Fashion and Outbreaks of "Breaks" in the Disciplinary Map', paper presented at British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of York (April 2000) 8.
- 36 See Ian Maxwell, 'Do You Really Want It?', in *Australasian Drama Studies* 57 (October 2010): 10–21, for a compelling account of teaching in the *knower mode*.
- 37 Maton 161.
- 38 Maton and Moore, 'Historical Amnesia' 6.
- 39 *Ibid* 8.
- 40 See, for example, the A4 flyer which prospective students can pick up from the foyer of NIDA, or download from the website, available at <http://www.nida.edu.au/Directing/default.aspx>.
- 41 Maton and Moore, 'Founding the Sociology of Knowledge' 161.
- 42 Samuel Weber, *Institution and Interpretation* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987) 25.
- 43 Banco refers only to a courtroom with a bench, but in this case it is the highest Court of Appeal in the New South Wales Supreme Court; i.e. the highest court in the jurisdiction in which the young lawyers are being admitted to practice.
- 44 Burton J. Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (New York: Norton, 1976) 90.
- 45 Clark 97.
- 46 The directors are allowed to cast their shows as they wish, and so many casts are a balance of trained actors and students. Students are said to be particularly keen to work on the shows as well, as they are a rare opportunity for a number of weeks of full-time rehearsal, which is not often possible within the confines of a drama school.
- 47 Bledstein 113.
- 48 Personal interview, 23 January 2011.
- 49 Quentin.
- 50 Personal interview, 23 January 2011.
- 51 Maton and Moore, 'Founding the Sociology of Knowledge' 161.
- 52 Forgasz 226.