alcohol and alcohol problems in the region. For example, in the entry for October 1932, Storrs noted that the Montney was particularly plagued with moonshiners and the bad influence of drink (p. 87). Drinking was a concern and Storrs never shied away from noting the problem while, at the same time, it's arguable that local drinkers were likely to give Storrs a wide berth and thus she probably did not see how widespread alcohol use and abuse really was. And there is no question about it; the provincial police records make it abundantly clear that alcohol was a public issue in the Peace as it was elsewhere in the province. For the editors to misstate the content of the Storrs record on this particular point, especially since they highlight it in their introduction, is, to say the least, unfortunate.

Even in light of these concerns, there is no question that Fast's completion of the Storrs record is long overdue and greatly welcome. As a representative of a type of individual who answered the call to spread the gospel in western Canada, Monica Storrs is intriguing. And for the light her observations and reflections cast upon those who turned to the Peace region in hope of finding the good life in the two decades before World War II, there are few sources that offer so much. That it took twenty years for the project to be completed is testament to Fast's perseverance and there is no question that those interested in the settlement history of western Canada will profit from the labour.

Jonathan Swainger
University of Northern British Columbia

Kathleen Gallagher. *Drama Education in the Lives of Girls: Imagining Possibilities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001. Pp. 144.

In her book based on her doctoral research, Kathleen Gallagher asks whether a same-sex class could be the setting and drama the process whereby Grade 10 girls might more freely

explore aspects of their world. The author claims that girls in a same-sex school can learn without distractions and that they are freer to explore "male" topics when unhindered by male peers. She refers to a discussion held in a co-educational setting where males dominated the discussion on war because they believed the topic was their domain. Conversely, in her all-female drama class, the students not only explored the topic using drama structures, but they also created and presented a Remembrance Day Assembly for the school—one that was even highly regarded by teachers not involved in the arts.

The type of drama that Gallagher describes is process drama—a way of teaching and learning that developed in the 1970s from the work of Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton in the U.K. Gallagher says that this type of work is concerned with "foregoing a production aesthetic during the process and, equally importantly, teaches students about the social constructs that shape their lives while allowing them to shift perspectives and seek truth in opposites—to alter action, slow down processes and create meaning collectively." Gallagher's objective was to find out "whether this type of curriculum can allow for growth and change in the way that students perceive themselves and their peers in their experience of schooling." In order to achieve this, she posed questions such as: "Why did you take Drama?" "Do you see yourself as different in this class as compared to your other classes?" "Do you think there are characteristics or aspects of yourself and your life experience that you brought into the dramas we worked on together?" "Are there other areas of the school where you think your personal/cultural experiences are included or important?" "Do you think that being in a classroom of all girls makes a difference in how you work as a class?"

Gallagher uses ethnography and reflective practitioner methods because she believes not only that they value the knowledge of teachers but also that, because the students have a closer relationship with the teacher than they would with the objective researcher, they may feel more comfortable sharing their ideas and feelings. She finds this approach is especially suitable for process drama as the teacher often takes a role and therefore stands at times both inside and outside the action of the

drama; also, she claims that this type of research "captures the process of classroom action as well as the spontaneity of reflection." In order to capture these moments from the drama, which is ephemeral by nature, and to inject a degree of objectivity, Gallagher employed students to videotape the classes and comment on them. She also used open-ended interviews and discussions with her drama students.

Gallagher not only describes and reflects on her classroom practice but also adds to the research in drama education in several significant ways. First, in Chapter Two, she categorizes and describes the types of learning that take place in process drama. Gallagher found that four areas of learning emerged: Drama and Expressive Learning, Drama and Intelligence, Drama as Collective Process, and Drama as Personal Development. While these categories are of necessity arbitrary, they do help to delineate the learning that comes from this type of drama. As an illustration, she describes a class in detail under each heading. In each case, Gallagher used a story as a springboard, involved the students in the narrative by using drama structures such as forum theatre and hot-seating, and quoted student voices and student writing to highlight the learning that took place.

Second, Gallagher examines the role of the drama teacher. She refers to Heathcote's idea that drama teachers know how to give up power to students because they participate in the drama. Gallagher sees the teacher as one who "creates the spaces of possibility, who does not find solutions but nurtures the questions, while asking the learners to bring what they already know to bear on what they are learning." Gallagher suggests that this role requires the teacher to be flexible and creative. When teachers take a role within the drama, they also step inside the learning process. They become "players in the game instead of controllers of its outcomes." Like the students, they need to bring all aspects of their lives to bear in their teaching; and because of their place within the drama and the learning, it follows that they, too, will be changed by the experience. Perhaps the authenticity that results from this involvement prompted Dorothy Heathcote to say that, in drama, "it's not what you do, but what you are that matters."

Third, while Gallagher stresses the importance of drama and experiential learning in schools, she acknowledges the difficulties of goal-setting in the arts. In drama, students are constructing a world in order "to discover how reality is constructed." Even though important learning results from this process, she suggests "there is far more learning in a curriculum moment than can be categorized in the limiting objectives that can be set out." In an attempt to satisfy policy-makers who require specific measurable outcomes, on the one hand, and to ensure that the work which is experiential, essentially personal, and focuses more on process than product is given its due, on the other, Gallagher formulates a set of objectives that address both the social nature of drama and its form, as well as the importance of reflection.

Linked to the topic of aims and objectives is the thorny issue of evaluation in drama. Gallagher says that arts educators "must struggle with the assessment of artistic processes" in the face of a trend toward "testable" student outcomes. She believes this could be achieved through holistic scoring instruments. She suggests evaluation strategies such as teacher checklists and anecdotal comments as well as listening to student voices through writing, writing in role, and open-ended interviews. She claims that these strategies allow for the diversity of ideas and viewpoints and the personal quality of the learning that results from this type of spontaneous role-playing.

In summarizing her findings, Gallagher returns to the notion that girls in a same-sex class might have more freedom to explore their world. She concludes that when the focus is not on gender, "other categories of identity emerge more strongly." She claims that drama in such a setting "draws upon the differences among girls and is propelled by the tensions and contradictions within such a diverse group." In creating their fictional worlds, the girls were able to draw on their experiences and knowledge in a way that was not diluted by issues of gender; thus, in reflecting on the experience, they would explore aspects of themselves and their world more fully than would be possible in a co-educational setting. Gallagher also goes a long way to examine those specific issues that challenge drama teachers. She

categorizes the types of learning that result from process drama, suggests ways that learning might be assessed, and creates a set of learning objectives.

However, even though her book deals specifically with drama in a same-sex class, it also speaks to all educators about issues such as the role of the teacher, experiential learning, assessment, and, perhaps most significantly, how the theory of knowledge as a construct might translate into classroom practice. It is ironic that the form of drama Gallagher so eloquently describes needs to be experienced, or at least seen, to be fully appreciated. While this book will be a valuable addition to the shelves of drama teachers who have worked in process drama, one hopes it will also inspire others to experience this form first-hand, so that they, too, might imagine the possibilities.

Jane E. Powell
University College of the Cariboo

Gary McCulloch and William Richardson. *Historical Research in Educational Settings.* Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000. Pp. 154.

The virtue of *Historical Research in Educational Settings* is that it accomplishes, in brief fashion, exactly what it advertises in the introduction. It serves as a useful handbook for the novice researcher intending to incorporate history as part of their studies, and for the "seasoned campaigner" as well. The reader is advised that the "researcher experienced in education may be new to history, and, similarly, that those experienced in history may be new to education" (p. 1). Thus, the book is aimed at a potentially broad and diverse audience: educationists seeking to incorporate historical methods; historians seeking insight into how to relate their training to education; and those with a social science background seeking to "develop both their historical awareness and their sensitivity to educational issues" (p. 4). The