



## Creating Cultures of Teaching and Learning: Conveying Dance and Somatic Education Pedagogy

Donna A. Dragon PhD, CMA, SMT NDEO Outstanding Dance Educator (Post-Secondary), 2014

To cite this article: Donna A. Dragon PhD, CMA, SMT NDEO Outstanding Dance Educator (Post-Secondary), 2014 (2015) Creating Cultures of Teaching and Learning: Conveying Dance and Somatic Education Pedagogy, Journal of Dance Education, 15:1, 25-32, DOI: 10.1080/15290824.2014.995015

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15290824.2014.995015>



Published online: 16 Mar 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 512



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Creating Cultures of Teaching and Learning

## Conveying Dance and Somatic Education Pedagogy

**Donna A. Dragon, PhD,  
CMA, SMT  
NDEO Outstanding Dance  
Educator (Post-Secondary),  
2014**

Department of Theater and  
Dance, Bridgewater State  
University, Bridgewater, MA

---

**ABSTRACT** Often in teaching dance, methods of teaching and learning are silently embedded into dance classroom experiences. Unidentified and undisclosed pedagogic information has impacted the content of dance history; the perpetuation of authoritarian teaching practices within dance technique classes and in some dance classes deemed “somatics”; and the perception of the field of dance as “dance as art” or “dance as education”. This research illuminates a history of dance pedagogy in United States higher education. Dance pedagogy is aligned with current educational theory and practice, which reveals the impact of pedagogic choices on creating student-centered and teacher-centered cultures of teaching and learning. This article calls upon dance educators to be cognizant of the implications of pedagogic choices and to be transparent to students about pedagogy in their classrooms.

---

The discussion of creating cultures of teaching and learning through somatic education in higher education dance is deeply enmeshed in our identities as teachers. A culture of teaching and learning is the full range of learned, taught, and expressed perceptions and behavior patterns within a specific classroom. Our values and beliefs govern what we think it means to be dance educators in specific societies and settings, which have particular norms, conventions, obligations, rights, and responsibilities. Based on our values and beliefs, we embody ways of knowing about, participating in, and contributing to the teaching and learning of our students—a dance teacher identity. Through the lens and embodiment of dance teacher identities, consciously or unconsciously, dance educators create and have created cultures of teaching and learning that have impacted individual teachers, students, and the field of dance, historically and in the present.

This article examines dance teacher identity and its effect on dance educators’ pedagogic choices. Through historical research in dance pedagogy in the fields of somatics, dance, and dance therapy, I illuminate a history of U.S. higher education pedagogic choices that created and continue to create specific cultures of teaching and learning in dance classrooms, and that defined and continue to define dance as art and dance as education.

### SILENTLY EMBEDDED: PROBLEMS WITH UNIDENTIFIED AND UNDISCLOSED DANCE PEDAGOGY

Often in teaching dance, methods of teaching and learning are silently embedded into dance classroom experiences without explicit explanations to students of the origins, purposes, or philosophies underlying the methods. This knowledge is key to understanding pedagogic innovations in the dance field and current conceptions of dance in higher education.

Address correspondence to Donna A. Dragon, PhD, CMA, SMT, Department of Theater and Dance, Bridgewater State University, 131 Summer Street, Bridgewater, MA 02324. E-mail: [donna.dragon@bridgew.edu](mailto:donna.dragon@bridgew.edu)

Unidentified and undisclosed pedagogic information in the dance classroom can and has affected the content of dance history, the perpetuation of authoritarian teaching practices within dance technique classes as well as in some classes deemed somatics, and the perception of the field of dance as dance as art or dance as education.

One problem with undisclosed pedagogic information is that dance students fail to gain knowledge of contributions made by dance educators, artists, and therapists to pedagogic developments and understanding of the impact that these contributions had and have in the fields of dance and education. This lack of knowledge has led to a limited dance history focused primarily on contributions of dance artists to dance technique, performance, and culture.

Another problem is that many dance education students enter higher education dance classrooms expecting to be taught as they were taught. They often believe there is only one way to teach and to learn—generally through traditional authoritarian paradigms based in hierarchical systems of privilege, or the “demonstrate and do” model. This expectation poses many challenges for dance educators offering differing teaching methodologies, especially for those using more democratic or somatic paradigms.

In an environment of unnamed pedagogy, students are usually expected to follow or obey the teacher without questioning methods or practices. This silence communicates to students that the teacher holds the knowledge about best practices for their learning. Students are often unaware that the dance educator has teaching values, philosophies, and practices (a dance teacher identity) that can be situated historically and culturally, and that create specific learning environments or classroom cultures. They gain little or no understanding that teaching and learning methods are choices, not only for themselves as students, but as future dance educators. Ultimately, the lack of pedagogic information perpetuates the “teach as I was taught” paradigm, both for students and for teachers.

## DANCE TEACHER IDENTITY: CALLS FOR PEDAGOGIC CHOICE AND CHANGE

Within the field of dance, the discourse of identity has been focused mainly in relation to the performing dance artist or the dancing body (Burt 1995; Albright 1997; Desmond 1997, 2001; DeFrantz 2001; Dixon-Gottschild 2003, 2012; Manning 2004; Sandahl and Auslander 2005; Shapiro 2008; Paris 2010). Discourses of identity can also be found in the dance therapy field where the focus is more on the use of dance practices to impact identity formation (Lee 2001; Ballard 2002; Hanan 2010).

Literature for teachers in K–12 dance education such as Anne Dunkin’s (2006) *Dancing in Your School: A Guide for Preschool and Elementary School Teachers*, Brenda McCutchen’s (2006) *Teaching Dance as Art in Education*, and Theresa Purcell Cone and Stephen Cone’s (2005) *Teaching Children Dance* provide discussions about teacher responsibilities and teaching styles. Sue Stinson (2004), in “My Body/Myself: Lessons

for Dance Education,” and Sherry Shapiro’s (1998) compilation of many dance educators in *Dance, Power and Difference* focus on examining conscious choices in teaching pedagogy that reflect an educator’s perspective.

In literature for higher education dance teaching, Melanie Bales and Rebecca Nettle-Fiol’s (2008) *The Body Eclectic: Evolving Practices in Dance Training* examines strategies and problems for dance teachers and students in navigating diverse techniques and methods of training dancers in the post-Judson era (8). Most significantly, in relation to this discussion of creating culture in the classroom, Joshua Legg’s (2011) *Introduction to Modern Dance Techniques* offers an examination of selected classical modern dance techniques (e.g., Cunningham, Dunham, Graham, Hawkins, etc.) with practical studio applications. Legg situates the selected techniques historically and culturally and provides philosophies and beliefs for each artist innovator. This perspective enables the reader to see the interconnectedness of the choreography, pedagogic methods, principles, and exercises in relation to the “identity” of the innovator/artist/teacher.

Recently, there is a developing interest in the impact of specific teaching values, philosophies, and strategies on student learning and the classroom environment (Burnidge 2012; Alterowitz 2014; Purvis 2014). Anne Burnidge (2012) examines her somatics-based teaching practices in higher education dance through a feminist pedagogic lens, which results in her moving away from authoritarian paradigms to a democratic feminist paradigm in “Somatics in the Dance Studio: Embodying Feminist/Democratic Pedagogy.” She illuminates the impact of hierarchies and privilege on pedagogic and dance technique selection and implementation within the use of somatic pedagogy.

Similar to Burnidge, university ballet educator Gretchen Alterowitz (2014) identifies a feminist or democratic ballet pedagogy that interrupts traditional authoritarian ballet teaching practices and normalizing aesthetic values in “Toward a Feminist Ballet Pedagogy: Teaching Strategies for Ballet Technique Classes in the 21st Century.” Alterowitz critically reflects on her values and pedagogic choices in the classroom in attempts to reconcile what she teaches with how she teaches (16). She closely examines the patriarchal roots of ballet and questions the value of ballet ideologies and principles in an effort to meet the needs and concerns of twenty-first-century dance students.

Denise Purvis (2014) argues for a somatics-based pedagogy directed toward multiple intelligences to assist Grade 9 to 12 dance educators “to create a classroom environment conducive to students’ technical, artistic, personal and spiritual growth” (35). Like Burnidge and Alterowitz, Purvis addresses the tendency for high school dance educators to focus more and more on technique through traditional “demonstrate and do” pedagogy by providing alternative methods to create a culture of learning where students discover their individual strengths and challenges and set their own technical goals (38).

Clearly, there is a desire among some dance educators to transform pedagogy through identifying the impact of

teacher values, aesthetic values, and teaching practices on students' learning and on the field of dance education. The voices of these dance educators provide insight to their teaching identities and provide alternate models for cultures of teaching and learning.

## A HISTORY OF CREATING CULTURES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING: THE IMPACT OF DANCE PEDAGOGIES IN DANCE EDUCATION

Dance teacher identity is a malleable and evolving center of connections where all that constitutes an individual's life coalesces to inform teaching beliefs, values, and behavior both consciously and unconsciously. Throughout our lives, we have diverse experiences, both positive and challenging, that affect and continue to contribute to our dance teacher identities.

For example, Mary Wigman studied with Rudolf Laban when Laban was at Ascona in Switzerland in the early 1900s (Riley 2004–2005, 4–5). Some say Wigman helped Laban develop his system through embodying his concepts. Although Laban's theories supported a holistic approach to moving, according to Wigman ([1970] 1983), his teaching practices were relentless and repetitive (303–04). In "My Teacher Laban," Wigman paints a picture of Laban as an impatient, explosive and volatile teacher (304). When Wigman deviated from Laban's instructions, he shouted, "You clown, you grotesque monster, with your terrific intensity you ruin my whole theory of harmony" (304).

Despite Laban's authoritarian teaching methods, Wigman credits her work with Laban for creating foundations for her dance pedagogy. In 1920, Wigman ultimately split from Laban. She organized her own performance tour and opened a school in Dresden in 1923 (Partsch-Bergsohn and Bergsohn 2003, 31). Wigman blended and embellished on the theory that Laban had developed so far and her knowledge of Dalcroze Eurhythmics to create her own system—"Dance Gymnastics," a natural system of rhythmic exercises (Hodgson 2001, 84). Wigman's teaching focused on subjective and emotional forces combined with consciousness of the moving body in space, rhythm, and volume toward creating dance forms (Wigman 1935). She believed that it is necessary for dancers "to develop and to prepare themselves, inwardly and outwardly, for the responsibility of their profession" (Wigman [1927] 1998, 37).

According to Wigman's student, Mary Whitehouse (who later became a dance therapy pioneer who developed "authentic movement"), Wigman created a climate in her classroom that "made room for improvisation, placing value on creativity of the people moving. It assumed that you would not be learning a dance if you had nothing to say" (Whitehouse 1979, 62).

Although Wigman was trained in an authoritarian paradigm, she made conscious choices in teaching practices to create a more inclusive, holistic culture of teaching and learning where students were empowered to be creative, critical thinkers and doers.

## A HISTORY OF "TEACHING AS I WAS TAUGHT"

Margaret H'Doubler established the first university dance degree-granting program in the U.S. at the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 1926 by situating dance in academe through a conceptually based and student-centered model with creative inner investigation of embodied knowledge at the center of teaching and learning. Graduates from H'Doubler's dance program began teaching in 14 universities, five teacher's colleges, six women's colleges, and many public schools throughout the United States (Ross 2000, 201–16). H'Doubler's approach to dance education shifted perspectives in the ways teachers think about learning and about their choices of actions in the classroom (Ross 2000, 209). In an educational and social climate where women were expected to forego self for the care of others, dance in higher education offered women a classroom culture to focus on self-expression and personal creativity (H'Doubler 1925, xiii–8). Through H'Doubler's values and classroom experiences, women gained skills to be "successful human-beings" (5).

In the 1930s, another dance educator named Martha Hill chose a different path for educating dancers, one that diverged from H'Doubler's student-centered beliefs and practices. Hill (1982) believed that "the aim of dance is to do dance as dancing, and to teach it as dance" (D30). She (along with Mary Josephine Shelly) organized the Bennington College program using a teacher-centered curriculum, selecting Graham, Humphrey, Weidman, and Holm as the first faculty (Mazo 2000, 136). The purpose of the teaching and of the practices was to train students in the innovators' modern techniques for performance of their choreographic works and "the curriculum was closely tied to individual personalities" (Van Tuyl, n.d., quoted in Ross 2000, 203). Dance techniques and teaching philosophies and practices of this faculty became models for higher education dance teachers affecting dance curriculum and pedagogy.

Hill ultimately was invited to direct the dance program at the Julliard School, where she taught for 40 years. Julliard became an artistic institution where its students are chosen "on whether they have the potential to be good performers" (Hill 1982, D7). Hill developed what would become a revolutionary profession-based dance education model, which would later become known as the conservatory model of dance education.

This curriculum paradigm separated knowledge areas similar to many current higher education dance programs where the body is trained in one class and the mind in another. Most classroom cultures were created by the expert teacher and artist who successfully trained and molded dancers' bodies for stage performances according to the teacher's authority and an external ideal.

Many students of the Bennington Summer School of Dance and the Julliard School would later develop and chair college programs, including Helen Alkire, Jean Erdman, Eleanor Lauer, Gertrude Lippincott, Barbara Mettler, Ruth



Murray, Alwin Nikolais, Florence Warwick, and others (Noble 2005, 55).

Although overlap occurred in philosophies and practices within a single class and over lifetimes, tendencies toward two pedagogically distinct classroom cultures emerged in higher education dance based in differing beliefs and practices (Dragon 2008).

## TWO CULTURES OF TEACHING AND LEARNING: STUDENT-CENTERED AND TEACHER-CENTERED

Paradigm 1, a more student-centered model, emerged as holistic philosophies were applied in teaching beliefs and practices to support learning and performing in diverse dance forms. Methods for educating future teachers were articulated and practiced particularly by Alma Hawkins and her students.

The outcomes of applying holistic philosophies to teaching practices not only represent the impact of John Dewey's progressive education, but also align with current educational philosophies and practices, including holistic learning, humanism, and constructivism. Holistic learning emphasizes the interconnectedness of the individual's body, mind, spirit, and emotions. The goal of holistic learning is to assist the student in bringing forward her or his highest potential and to create a classroom culture where this is possible.

Both holistic learning and Dewey's progressive education can be considered humanistic education. Humanistic education rests on the belief that thinking and learning are motivated by self-growth of the whole human being (Mautner 2000, 256; Leonard 2002, 86). Philosophically, humanism conceives of human beings as autonomous and capable of making choices that positively affect society and the course of history, as well as advancing themselves physically, intellectually, spiritually, emotionally, and morally (Mautner 2000, 256; Leonard 2002, 86). As in holistic education, individual knowledge centers on learning experiences of the learner and is viewed as a growing process that can lead to self-actualization. Humanistic education focuses on developing a student's autonomy, authority, and ability to make effective decisions as well as to be self-directed and self-teaching. Humanistic education processes can lead to a classroom culture of greater tolerance of ambiguity and difference, and a greater acceptance of self and others.

Like progressive, holistic, and humanistic education, constructivism is a learner-centric educational paradigm. Similar to Dewey's progressive education, constructivism is based in problem solving done in communities or in collaboration with others where meanings are co-constructed. The instructor is a catalyst, a coach, a guide, or a manager, directing curriculum that centers on students' problem solving. A discovery process is paramount and learning occurs through taking action, questioning, reflecting, and interpreting (Leonard 2002, 38; Greene 2005, 115–16). Like humanistic education, the focus creates a culture where

students are more self-directed and self-motivated where autonomy and individual growth are supported through the inquiry processes in a community of learners and teachers.

Beside this more holistic, student-centered paradigm, teacher-centered beliefs and practices similar to those in current traditional dance paradigms grew (see Paradigm 2). This paradigm, named the conservatory model of dance education, focused on training dance performance artists. It emerged in higher education dance with curriculum that separated knowledge. In this model, dance education was beginning to be based on personal rituals of innovating artists. Many future dance educators learning from Paradigm 2 began to focus on external goals of replicating individual artists' movement precisely, and teaching students as they were taught by the innovating, expert artist-teachers—a more teacher-centered approach.

Paradigm 2 resonates with current behaviorist and cognitivist educational approaches. From a behaviorist's perspective, instructors set objectives that can be observed, measured, and controlled. Students are trained by the teacher to respond to the teacher's objectives in specified ways (Leonard 2002, 16), which can include physical actions, thought processes, and emotional expression. Student success is based totally on achievement of the teacher's objectives through the responses specified by the teacher. Behaviorism focuses on external output or products. In a behaviorist classroom, processes and successful outcomes tend to be predictable.

Like behaviorism, cognitivism focuses on accurate transmission of knowledge based on the objective reality of the expert teacher; the teacher knows the facts. Student success is achieved when students have the same mental perspective as the teacher (Mautner 2000, 97–8; Leonard 2002, 29–30). A cognitivist teacher is concerned with accurate depictions.

Behaviorism and cognitivism are concerned with the objective outcome or product. The classroom culture is created so that students gain skills in being compliant with the rules and standards of an external expert. They learn to be available—present, ready, and accessible—according to the needs of the external expert and often through accurate replications of the expert's designated processes. Students learn to rely on the expert to set goals and objectives and to assess their accomplishments.

## PRACTICE-BASED DIVISIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION DANCE

The two emerging pedagogic paradigms began to cultivate a practice division in higher education dance, supporting conceptual perceptions of a division between those who viewed dance as education and those who viewed dance as performance art. The more vigorously these groups engaged in and promoted their ideas, the more divisive they became. Each hardened to defend its fixed position. As a result, little was learned or taught about pedagogy, and dance educators taught as they were taught. Those focused on education tended to use Paradigm 1, the student-centered paradigm

Beliefs include:

1. Individual perspectives are significant to learning.
2. The overriding purpose in education is to encourage self-learning/teaching.
3. History and culture can be learned and taught through dancing and observing dance.
4. Dance can offer tools to create and to navigate change.
5. Dance can offer tools to navigate life.

Practices include:

1. Improvisation.
2. Aspects of reflective practice.
3. Development and utilization of inner awareness practices.
4. Student-centered pedagogy.
5. Emergent curriculum.
6. Development of dance curriculum based on movement principles.

**FIGURE 1 Paradigm 1: Holistic Philosophies Applied to Teaching: Student-Centered Paradigm**

(see Figure 1), whereas those who focused on dance as performance art tended to use Paradigm 2, the teacher-centered paradigm (see Figure 2). Despite appearances and beliefs that two disparate fields in dance existed or exist, overlap occurred and occurs in pedagogic beliefs and practices even among individual practices.

Beliefs include:

1. Dance training is for creating future professional artists.
2. The overriding purpose in dance education is dedication to a single philosophy.
3. The body is a tool.
4. The purpose of the body is to be molded by an expert artist.

Practices include:

1. The teacher as expert/authoritarian.
2. Use of mimicking as a primary mode for learning and teaching.
3. Class structure based on ballet pedagogy.
4. Class content based on the innovating artist's body and her or his personal and artistic needs or teacher-centered curriculum.
5. Development of dance curriculum based on movement principles.

**FIGURE 2 Paradigm 2: Holistic Philosophies Applied to Teaching: Teacher-Centered Paradigm**

## SOMATIC EDUCATION: STILL "TEACHING AS I WAS TAUGHT"

In 1990s' higher education dance, a somatic education discipline was identified primarily through the research of Maxine Green (e.g., Green 1991, 1993, 1994, 1996, 1999) and Sylvia Fortin (e.g., Fortin 1992, 1994, 1995, 1998). Green and Fortin provide process-oriented education and research paradigms and examine the impact of these paradigms on teaching and learning—the "doing" of somatic education. A "new" somatic alternative to traditional authoritarian education paradigms emerges (see Figure 3).

This "new" somatic education paradigm perpetuates educational and artistic practices of pioneering dance artists and educators (Dragon 2008). Somatic education beliefs and practices build on those that emerged when dance educators and artists applied holistic philosophies to teaching practices from 1913 through the 1950s (see Paradigm 1).

The term *somatic* derives from the Greek word *soma* and means "of, relating to, or affecting the body; corporeal or physical experience." Although Hanna (1976) identified a field of somatics in 1976, "somatic" perspectives

Beliefs include:

1. Individual perspectives are significant to learning.
2. Body, mind, and emotions are integrated.
3. A purpose in education is to encourage self-learning/teaching.
4. History and culture can be learned and taught through dancing and/or observing dance.
5. Knowledge gained through subjective experience and inner/somatic awareness practices can lead to self-empowerment.
6. Somatic education can offer tools to create and to navigate personal and social change.
7. Somatic education can offer tools to navigate life.

Practices include:

1. Improvisation.
2. Creative process.
3. Aspects of reflective practice.
4. Inner awareness practices.
5. Use of anatomy, kinesiology, and physiology.
6. Student-centered pedagogy.
7. Emergent curriculum.
8. Development of dance curriculum based on movement principles.
9. Somatic principles, practices, and techniques.

**FIGURE 3 Paradigm 3: Somatic Education Paradigm**

and practices have been used since preliterate times by African, Asian, and Native American cultures, and spread to European (or Western) cultures (Dragon 2008).

Somatic education is a discipline that consists of combinations of dance techniques, practices, and principles from the sciences, education, and somatics. Somatic education is used toward goals of teaching dance technique, theory, methodology, pedagogy, choreologic process, and choreography, to heal and prevent injuries, and for body conditioning. Somatic education values creative process, subjective experience, and reflective practice. It supports individuals to pay attention to their internal sensations, to become sensorily self-aware and to use sensed information for the purposes of empowering themselves to make meaning and decisions and to take action in educational, therapeutic, and life situations.

Premises underlying somatic education include that the body, mind, spirit, and emotions are integrated; and a belief that practices engaging the whole person (in body, mind, spirit, and emotions) can lead to meaningful educational experiences. There is an assumption that greater somatic awareness can lead to embodied authority and personal growth, development, and integration.

Although somatic education can be aligned with student-centered pedagogy, progressive education, holistic learning, humanistic education, and constructivist education (Paradigm 1), Green and Fortin align somatic education with feminist pedagogy (Green 1994, 1999; Fortin 1998). Somatic education as feminist pedagogy requires not only the use of embodied practices and subjective experiences, but also rigorous reflective practices based in embodied research.

Somatic practices are eclectic. They vary based on training, personal philosophies, the context of the application, the user's culture, and the historical period. They are viewed as holistic and integrated approaches to inquiring, knowing, learning, creating, and living. Historically, the names linked to somatic education have included bodily knowledge, body awareness, kinetic awareness, and many others.

## STILL "TEACHING AS I WAS TAUGHT" IN SOMATIC EDUCATION

Somatic education is a discipline consisting of combinations of dance techniques, practices, and principles from the sciences, education, and somatics with the goal of body conditioning, injury prevention, and healing. The behavior of "teaching as I was taught" in somatic education in U.S. higher education has its origins in two fields: dance and somatics. Similar to traditional dance education classrooms, many of us learned to teach somatics through absorbing practices nonverbally. Historical evidence suggests that crucial process information has been lost, covered, or moved into the unconscious of the higher education dance body through the silent treatment of pedagogic practices and their origins in both fields (Dragon 2008).

Currently, the field of somatics suffers from a divide similar to higher education dance. There is a fragmentation in the

somatics community based on a "principles vs. techniques" focus (Johnson 1986–1987, 4). Similar to higher education dance, some teachers and practitioners focus on the underlying principles that generated the method, whereas others emphasize the techniques peculiar to a specific method.

Similar to those aligned with Paradigm 1, those who focus on somatic principles create learning and healing cultures that unleash ingenuity, invoke participants to inquire about life and to organize their experiences in their unique ways of perceiving the world (Johnson 1986–1987, 7–8). Those who emphasize techniques create cultures of learning and healing that require imitation, repetition, and obedience to the practitioner's expertise in applying the technique similar to Paradigm 2.

For example, Joseph Pilates first named his work "Contrology" (Mangione 1993, 27; Chaback 1999, 261; Thomson 2007, 3). It is now known as the "Pilates Method of Body Conditioning™." Although the Pilates Method of Body Conditioning™ has underlying philosophies of integrating body, mind, and spirit, according to Thomson (2007), when training with Pilates himself, "ballerinas, modern dancers, and actors would subject themselves to his authoritarian control" (6). Somatic educator and theorist Don Hanlon Johnson (1986–1987) states, "An emphasis on technique creates a society of disciples and masters; principles generate communities of explorers" (7–8).

A similar dilemma exists in somatic education in higher education dance. In the use of a somatic education discipline, the dance educator's focus is on holistic, humanistic, student-centered pedagogy and the understanding of underlying principles of movement to create conceptually based class content.

However, the application of somatic techniques such as Bartenieff fundamentals or body-mind centering, where the expert teacher focuses on delivering a series of steps or exercises and students are expected to replicate the ideal movement precisely, is a more teacher-centered approach, much like current traditional dance paradigms that focus on dance techniques. Like dance techniques, somatic techniques can be taught without using holistic, student-centered methods. Therefore, dance educators can maintain traditional authoritarian dance education paradigms while teaching somatic techniques.

## SHIFTING FOCUS: FILLING THE DIVIDES WITH PEDAGOGICAL INFORMATION

Historically an educator's focus on either technique or process in both the dance and somatics fields has created tendencies toward teacher-centered and student-centered cultures of teaching and learning. The either-or focus fueled divisiveness in both fields as well. What might be the outcome of shifting the focus from technique versus process to dance teacher identity?

From this perspective, we can examine the beliefs and values that shape our dance teacher identities and share our values, choices, and their origins with students and colleagues.

Through examining our teaching methods, situating them historically and contextually in a specific teaching and learning environment, and sharing our pedagogic choices, we (students and faculty) can be empowered to consciously create our teaching and learning cultures. We can see common origins and diverse influences. Furthermore, when we are vocal about our pedagogic practices and their origins, students can gain knowledge of dance history that has often been invisible or omitted. Students can perceive dance practices as fluid choices (rather than steadfast rules). In *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher's Life*, Palmer (1998) vehemently claims “good teaching cannot be reduced to technique; good teaching comes from the identity and integrity of a teacher” (10).

Our history demonstrates that our dance and somatic education traditions have been transferred from generation to generation, often unconsciously. With the shift to globalization and cultures that exist in virtual space, it is vital that we awaken our collective unconsciousness around teaching and learning. We can then thoughtfully engage in communicating substantial information about values, meanings, hierarchies, notions of time, spatial relations, behaviors, and motives regarding our pedagogic choices.

This knowledge is learned. We teach it through our classroom cultures and through and to the bodies, minds, and spirits of our students—the next generation of contributors to our fields and to the world. What cultures of teaching and learning are we creating now? What cultures of teaching and learning will we choose to create to support the needs of twenty-first-century dance students—our future dance educators, artists, therapists, researchers, and advocates?

## REFERENCES

- Albright, A. 1997. *Choreographing difference: The body and identity in contemporary dance*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Alterowitz, G. 2014. Toward a feminist ballet pedagogy: Teaching strategies for ballet technique classes in the 21st century. *Journal of Dance Education* 14(1):8–17.
- Bales, M., and R. Netti-Fiol, eds. 2008. *The body eclectic: Evolving practices in dance training*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Ballard, A. 2002. Dance movement therapy and dissociative identity disorder. Master's thesis, Columbia College, Chicago, IL.
- Burnidge, A. 2012. Somatics in the dance studio: Embodying feminist/democratic pedagogy. *Journal of Dance Education* 12(2):37–47.
- Burt, R. 1995. *The male dancer: Bodies, spectacle, sexualities*. New York: Routledge.
- Chaback, L. 1999. Pilates method of conditioning™. In *The illustrated encyclopedia of body–mind disciplines*, ed. N. Allison, 260–63. New York: Rosen.
- DeFrantz, T. 2001. Simmering passivity: The black male body in concert dance. In *Moving history/dancing cultures: A dance history reader*, eds. A. Dils and A. C. Albright, 241–349. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Desmond, J. 1997. *Meaning in motion: New cultural studies of dance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2001. *Dancing desires: Choreographing sexualities on and off the stage*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dixon-Gottschild, B. 2003. *The black dancing body: A geography from coon to cool*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- . 2012. *Joan Myers Brown & the audacious hope of the black ballerina*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dragon, D. A. 2008. Toward embodied education, 1850s–2007: Historical, cultural, theoretical and methodological perspectives impacting somatic education in United States higher education dance. Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Dunkin, A. 2006. *Dancing in your school: A guide for preschool and elementary school teachers*. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- Fortin, S. 1992. Content knowledge in dance education. In *Dance in higher education*, ed. W. Oliver, 35–40. Reston, VA: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance.
- . 1994. When dance science and somatics enter the dance technique class. *Kinesiology and Medicine for Dance* 15(2):88–107.
- . 1995. Toward a new generation: Somatic dance education in academia. *Impulse* 3(4):253–62.
- . 1998. Somatics: A tool for empowering modern dance teachers. In *Dance, power and difference*, ed. S. B. Shapiro, 49–71. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Green, J. 1991. A somatics approach to dance. Paper presented at the National Dance Association and AAPHERD National Convention, San Francisco, CA.
- . 1993. Fostering creativity through movement and body awareness practices: A postpositivist investigation into the relationship between somatics and creative process. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- . 1994. Gender and the body politic: Researching women's experiences in somatics and creativity. Paper presented at the Congress on Research in Dance Conference, Denton, TX.
- . 1996. Choreographing a postmodern turn: The creative process and somatics. *Impulse* 4(4):267–75.
- . 1999. Somatic authority and the myth of the ideal body in dance education. *Dance Research Journal* 31(2):80–100.
- Greene, M. A. 2005. A constructivist perspective on teaching and learning in the arts. In *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives and practice*, ed. C. Twomey Fosnot, 120–41. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hanan, M. E. 2010. Embodying identity: A qualitative case study of dance movement therapy for people transitioning genders. Master's thesis, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Hanna, T. 1976. The field of somatics. *Somatics: Journal-Magazine of Bodily Arts and Sciences* Autumn 1(1):30–4.
- Hawkins, A. [1954] 1982. *Modern dance in higher education*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teacher's College, Columbia University.
- H'Doubler, M. 1925. *Dance and its place in education*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Hill, M. 1982. The innovations of Martha Hill. Interviewed by A. Kisselgoff. *The New York Times* March 28:D6–7, D30.
- Hodgson, J. 2001. *Mastering movement: The life and work of Rudolf Laban*. New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. H. 1986–1987. Principles versus techniques: Towards the unity of the somatics field. *Somatics: Journal-Magazine of Bodily Arts and Sciences* Autumn/Winter:4–8.
- Lee, S. A. 2001. Adolescent issues in a psychological approach to dancers. *Journal of Dance Medicine & Science* 5(4):121–26.
- Legg, J. 2011. *Introduction to modern dance techniques*. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- Leonard, D. C. 2002. *Learning theories A to Z*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Mangione, M. A. 1993. The origins and evolutions of somatics: Interviews with five significant contributors to the field. Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Manning, S. 2004. *Modern dance, Negro dance: Race in motion*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mautner, T., ed. 2000. *The Penguin dictionary of philosophy*. New York: Penguin.
- Mazo, J. H. 2000. *Prime movers: The makers of modern dance in America*. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- McCutchen, B. P. 2006. *Teaching dance as art in education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Noble, C. N. 2005. *Bessie Schonberg: Pioneer dance educator and choreographic mentor*. Lewistown, NY: Edwin Mellen.



- Palmer, P. J. 1998. *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Paris, C. 2010. (Re)-presenting the black masculine: Reggie Wilson's "big brick-a man's piece." In *Society of dance history scholars conference proceedings*, ed. K. Pierce, 229–243. Surrey, UK: University of Surrey.
- Partsch-Bergsohn, I., and H. Bergsohn. 2003. *The makers of modern dance in Germany: Rudolf Laban, Mary Wigman, and Kurt Jooss*. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- Purcell Cone, T., and S. L. Cone. 2005. *Teaching children dance*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Purvis, D. 2014. Meeting students on their own ground: Best practices in teaching dance technique, grades 9–12. *Journal of Dance Education* 14(1):35–8.
- Riley, R. 2004–2005. The work of Gertrude Falke Heller. *Somatics* 15(1):4–9.
- Ross, J. 2000. *Moving lessons: Margaret H'Douler and the beginning of dance in American education*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Sandahl, C., and P. Auslander. 2005. *Bodies in commotion: Disability & performance*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Shapiro, S. B., ed. 1998. *Dance, power and difference: Critical and feminist perspectives on dance education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- . 2008. *Dance in a world of change: Reflections on globalization and cultural difference*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Stinson, S. W. 2004. My body/myself: Lessons for dance education. In *Knowing bodies, moving minds: Towards embodied teaching and learning*, ed. L. Bresler, 153–67. Boston: Kluwer.
- Thomson, B. 2007. *Joseph Pilates, life and biography*. [http://www.easyvigour.net.nz/pilates/h\\_biography.htm](http://www.easyvigour.net.nz/pilates/h_biography.htm) (last accessed October 28, 2014).
- Whitehouse, M. S. 1979. C.G. Jung and dance therapy: Two major principles. In *Theoretical approaches in dance movement therapy*, ed. P.L. Bernstein. Iowa: Kendall-Hunt.
- Wigman, M. V. S., ed. 1935. *Modern dance*. New York: Kistler.
- . [1927] 1998. Stage dance—stage dancer: Mary Wigman, 1886–1973. In *The vision of modern dance*, eds. J. M. Brown, N. Mindlin, and C. H. Woodford, 33–40. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- . [1970] 1983. My teacher Laban. In *What is dance?*, eds. R. Copeland and M. Cohen, 303–05. New York: Oxford University Press.