

**Integrating Dance into the Public School Curriculum:
Embracing the Complexities in Order to Gain Acceptance**

Emily Bickford

Senior Seminar in Dance
Fall 2008

Thesis Direction: Professor L. Garafola
© Emily Bickford (2008)

Integrating Dance into the Public School Curriculum:

Embracing the Complexities in Order to Gain Acceptance

What does the term “dance education” bring to mind? Individually, each word, dance and education, offers an opportunity for endless interpretation, and the combination of terms fails to provide any additional simplicity. The diverse perceptions of dance education and what it can or should be, have led to a trend of narrowing definitions of dance education as an attempt to focus on, and thus clarify, the benefits of individual forms. How has this trend affected the successful integration of dance into the public school curriculum, and what has it meant for the understanding of dance education as a whole?

Narrowing my own lens so as to find an entry point for exploration of my opening inquiries, I specifically focus on the way that creative movement has been manipulated to support dance education’s integration into the public school curriculum. I look at how it has been transformed by the perceptions of dance education, and also how it has effected change in the broader definition of dance education. Creative movement becomes a way of deflecting resistance to dance education’s integration into the public school curriculum, resistance that has been attributed to teachers’ insecurities with dance and the misconception that its use in the classroom requires an understanding of its codified

vocabulary and base of knowledge. The pairing of the terms, creative and movement, is recognized for its ability to reduce discomfort for the teacher by dismissing a need for content knowledge of dance and focusing on the exploratory aspects of movement instead. This focus on the exploratory benefits of dance is essential to its full acceptance into the public school curriculum, insofar as all teachers will be able to use dance; otherwise, this would raise concerns about teacher quality and qualifications to teach a codified version of dance. The belief is that teachers will feel comfortable using dance in the classroom once they understand that the argument for dance education implies a use of dance that is limited to creative movement. The development of this realization, however, has led to the acceptance of dance in the classroom but would be further enhanced by emphasizing the benefits of creative movement to student self awareness. Creative movement, however, is more than just the exploration of one's own self, insofar as almost all concepts can be explored kinesthetically, thus potentially supporting the student's comprehension of an endless number of subject areas through a kinesthetic approach. And so a potential, and significant, benefit of using dance in the classroom is lost in the attempt to alter the definition of dance education in such a way as to respond to resistance. Insofar as there are bound to be many diverse and even contradictory forms of resistance to dance education, the full vision of dance's use in the classroom will be lost unless dance education takes ownership of its many definitions. This conclusion is the result of a comparative analysis, between the use of creative movement and humor in the classroom.

While finding numerous benefits supporting the use of creative movement and humor, I found that dance was able to provide all of the same benefits as humor, and more. The ability of creative movement and humor to encourage learning suggests the importance of their widespread acceptance into the classroom. Creative movement and humor are both beneficial insofar as they are teaching tools that can enhance classroom learning. More specifically, they increase learning by strengthening the relationship between student and teacher, and also among students in order to foster an environment that is conducive to learning. An analysis of these shared benefits, however, will reveal creative movement as superior to humor in its ability not only to support learning, insofar as it shapes the student's environment in a way that makes it more conducive to learning, but by additionally providing the student with an entirely new, kinesthetic lens through which to learn. This results in learning that may never have occurred without the use of creative movement in exploring the content of the main subject area.

Humor and creative movement both support learning by strengthening teachers' relationships with their students. In an article entitled "Humor as a Teaching Strategy," a biology teacher named James Wandersee refers to ideas presented in *The Art of Teaching*, a book by Gilbert Highet published in 1950.¹ In the following excerpt, Wandersee is referring to Highet's argument, "He maintains that although humor can help students remain lively and attentive, its real purpose it to link the pupils and the teacher through enjoyment. Humor can mold a collection of individuals into a group. Togetherness,

¹ "Gilbert Highet," *Dictionary of American Biography* 10: (1976-1980).

Highet asserts, is the very essence of teaching.”² Thus, we see a teaching strategy, in this case humor, enhancing learning in the classroom. Wandersee highlights the element of Highet’s argument that says humor can “link,” or strengthen the bond between student and teacher; however, he also points out Highet’s claim that humor has the ability, additionally, to strengthen the relationship between students in the classroom. As relationships between students grow, so does the potential for communication and shared exploration, which results in a deeper understanding of knowledge for both or the many students involved in partner or group work.

Dance can also serve as an additional tool for teachers in reaching out to students, thus increasing the student’s desire to learn. Wrenn Cook, the director of the South Carolina Center for Dance Education, suggests, “By using aspects of the dance teaching process, teachers of all subjects can enliven their delivery of content and reach students who are unable and often unwilling to learn through the lecture format.”³ Although Cook uses the term “dance teaching,” her claim that this includes movement taught in conjunction with all different subject areas in a classroom setting suggests that she is actually referring to what I am defining as creative movement. The benefit that Cook describes implies that creative movement is an additional tool to be used by teachers as a way of relating to students who may otherwise be overlooked, thus resulting in their

² James H. Wandersee, “Humor as a Teaching Strategy,” *The American Biology Teacher* 44 (1982): 212-218.

³ Wrenn Cook, “Benefits of Dance Education in the Middle School Setting,” *Journal of Dance Education* (2005): 30.

increase of learning. Although this benefit is similar to humor in its ability to engage students' who may otherwise be lost, it also suggests the appeal of dance. Using kinesthetic exploration, has a way of helping students understand content in an entirely new way. This benefit begins to reflect the theory of multiple intelligences by Howard Gardner of Harvard University, which suggests that people learn in many different ways and includes "bodily-kinesthetic learning" as one of them.⁴

Additionally, we see that both humor and dance promote socialization; however, dance goes beyond humor's ability simply to connect children by additionally providing their relationships with substance based on a shared appreciation of their collaborative process and subsequent deeper understandings of content, related or unrelated to dance. In her article "5 to 6: Joking Around," Ellen Booth Church, an early childhood consultant, speaks about the ability for humor to encourage socialization as well as an increase in focus, both of which separately contribute to student's learning.

When children share a laugh, they bond. Boundaries break down. They can make friends and be 'seen' in a group giggling over the same common thing with other children...laughter even increases blood flow to the brain—after a good laugh, we generally feel energized and

⁴ Susan Koff, "Toward a Definition of Dance Education," *Childhood Education* 77 (2000): 4.

alert. This can set the stage for learning by helping children release tension and focus.⁵

Church suggests that humor has the ability to bond students, thus releasing tension and stress, which encourages the student's ability to gain a deeper level of understanding, when studying certain content areas. Although she acknowledges that this process supports the development of students' learning, her argument cannot be compared to the argument that dance encourages socialization through collaboration.

Creative movement encourages socialization through collaboration, thus providing students with a process to bond over, as well as the ability to compare and share discoveries, thus further strengthening their individual knowledge. Giguere Miriam, affiliated with the Department of Performing Arts at Drexel University, presents a study that compares the cognitive processes of children when engaged in dance versus poetry. In the following passage, Miriam describes a section of the study in which the students take part in creative dance as a group in order to supplement their comprehension of the poems "We Real Cool," by Gwendolyn Brooks, and "Dreams," by Langston Hughes.

Students began the choreography in this activity with a movement phrase they created during the "across the floor" section of the class...students created movements to "Dreams" by Langston Hughes, a poem with no

⁵ Ellen Booth Church, "5 to 6: Joking Around," *Scholastic Parent & Child* 12 (2005): 81.

narrative and a more abstract, multi-layered message.

Students were encouraged to see from this process how dance can be more than simply acting out the literal meaning of the text, and how each individual dancer can contribute to the creative process.⁶

In this passage we see how a more expansive definition of creative movement can thus increase peer interaction in such a way as to enhance both individual students' and in this case, the groups' comprehension of the subject matter. Interestingly, Miriam also suggests that this study reveals creative movement's ability to provide the students with an entirely new way of viewing the poem and its meaning. In the excerpt we see how movement helps students to engage with the text in an entirely new way, consequently providing each student with a new vision of the poem shaped by their own creative process, as well as the creative process of their peers'. Thus, creative movement, insofar as it is defined as a teaching tool to be used as an aid in the learning of content even potentially unrelated to dance, benefits learning by encouraging collaboration among students. People who have subscribed to the assumption that creative movement is only a matter of self-exploration, however, would fail to appreciate creative movement's ability to increase socialization through collaboration. Although the narrowing of the definition of dance education is responsible for a loss of potential benefits such as

⁶ Giguere Miriam, "Thinking as They Create: Do Children have Similar Experiences in Dance and in Language Arts?" *Journal of Dance Education* 6 (2006): 41-47.

socialization, it is a deliberate reduction based on the belief that the many benefits of dance are in fact responsible for its resistance.

Thus, although it would be logical to think that the additional benefit of creative movement above that of humor—to provide students with an entirely new way of approaching content knowledge—should result in a greater acceptance of creative movement into the classroom, evidence reveals that such is not the case. Although there are still teachers skeptical of using humor in their classroom,⁷ Arthur Bradford, a professor at the State University College of Buffalo, argues that humor has become successfully integrated into teaching. He states, “Savants of education would doubtless express the idea with more gravity, but they would say something of the same sort. Whatever is learned, they would say, is better learned...if some ‘pleasure is ta’en’.”⁸ Additionally, the sheer amount of resources promoting the use of humor in the classroom, based on its ability to enhance the focus of students, suggests that the benefits of humor are common knowledge now. Also, most adults, when asked to refer back to their “favorite teachers,” will describe some element of respect for that teacher that grew based on a lively relationship between the student and the teacher.⁹

There are also a great number of articles written on the benefits of creative movement; however, unlike humor, we see that the number of articles written on the benefits of creative movement reflect a greater need to argue for its importance, rather

⁷ Sudol, David. “Dangers of Classroom Humor.” *English Journal* 70 (1981): 26-28.

⁸ Arthur Bradford, “The Place of Humor in Teaching,” *Peabody Journal of Education* 42 (1964): 67-70.

⁹ Phillip Done, “Make ‘em Laugh (& They’ll Learn A Lot More),” 115 (2007): 34-35.

than confirming its acceptance into mainstream education. Joseph E. Marks III addresses this struggle in the preface of his book *America Learns to Dance*, “Both Dance and Education are as old as man himself. Both have had their periods of rise and decline...Dance, possibly more than education, has had a rough path to follow, being, at various ages during the history of man, sometimes an adjunct to religion or a means of education, as well as a recreation and an art form.”¹⁰ Marks suggests that dance has met resistance because of its many different definitions and purposes historically in our culture. He is not referring explicitly to the confusion that I am proposing as a result between the definitions of the different sectors of dance education, but he does acknowledge that the acceptance of dance has been hindered by its complex existence insofar as it has served so many different purposes. Thus, Marks’ suggestion here that dance’s rough path has come from its complex existence, serving so many different purposes, supports the counterintuitive idea that creative movement actually has more difficulty being accepted into the classroom than humor because of the fact that it has more uses and benefits than humor. Although there has been some recognition of this phenomenon, there is little evidence concerning dance education’s innate complexity, in which a full potential for dance is maintained.

In her article “Toward a Definition of Dance Education,” Susan Koff, a childhood dance educator, suggests that dance education needs to be distinguished from what she defines as dance training in order for dance to be seen as necessary in the classroom. Her

¹⁰ Joseph E. Marks III, *America Learns to Dance* (Brooklyn, NY: New Horizons, 1957), p.1.

suggested redefinition, however, alienates her subsequent vision of dance education, thus limiting it solely to represent the benefits that she recognizes as essential.

Critics often object that not every child needs dance training, and they therefore oppose the inclusion of dance in the curriculum. Their objections appear to derive largely from not discriminating between the terms “dance training” and “dance education”. Dance education does not seek to prepare children to become performers. Dance training, however, dictates movements and strategies for learning specific motor skills with the aim of mastery and future performance...dance education seeks the development of self-expression an interpretation through motion, with self-knowledge as its aim.¹¹

Koff is right to acknowledge a need to root through the many definitions of dance, in order to identify the reasons for resistance to dance education. Her suggestion that dance training has become synonymous with what she defines as dance education, leads her to argue that this misconception is responsible for resistance to the inclusion of dance within the school curriculum. However, she then fails to provide a definition of dance education that manages to capture its full potential. She is focused on the idea that the failure to

¹¹ Koff, 2-3.

distinguish these two definitions is debilitating to the potential acceptance of dance into the curriculum; however, by defining dance education as merely a means to self-awareness, she falls prey to the trend of dismissing components that might potentially strengthen support for her argument. Koff's struggle to propose a full definition of dance education helps to reveal the need for a unification of the many terms of dance, so as to include the many benefits, while distinguishing the different components of dance education.

Although Koff's argument has its limitations, the following research study demonstrates tangible gains in the acceptance of dance education when taking Koff's concerns into consideration. Insofar as the resistance to dance education is attributed to its complex array of benefits, it seems logical to reduce the resistance by removing certain aspects of creative movement from the definition altogether. In a study by Colla H. MacDonald of the University of Ottawa, we see an attempt to simplify the definition of creative movement so as to avoid resistance, by removing the additional potentially beneficial aspect of creative movement that promotes kinesthetic learning of additional content knowledge. In "Effects of an In-Service Program on Eight Teachers' Attitudes and Practices regarding Creative Dance," MacDonald defines creative movement as limited to "physical activity that focuses on the child's inner thoughts and feeling and enhances the expression of those thoughts and feelings." However, we see that this definition of creative movement is problematic insofar as it undermines the potential for creative movement to allow students to make discoveries that are unique to kinesthetic

exploration. Still, although it is not the ideal solution based on its limiting tendencies, it does prove to be successful in reducing the hesitancy of some teachers to use dance in their classroom; thus, rectifying its limiting definition of creative movement by overcoming resistance to creative movement. The study suggests that the misunderstanding of dance education's potential is responsible for its struggle by juxtaposing the preconceptions of hesitant teachers who have never danced before with the excitement of teachers who consider themselves dancers. By providing the teachers with a clear presentation of MacDonald's definition of creative movement, the study successfully enhances acceptance of creative movement as a useful tool by bringing the non-dancer's understanding of movement up to the dancer's. The teachers participating in the study, who had not danced before, originally showed resistance to using creative movement in the classroom. "Wendy's initial attitude toward creative dance was negative. She was also confident that her students would react negatively." MacDonald continues, "These views seemed due to Wendy's not knowing what creative dance is or how to teach it...and she admitted that she did not feel confident or competent about teaching creative dance...Wendy's attitude changed...when she implemented creative dance, Wendy found that her students reacted positively to it."¹² By clarifying to participants that creative movement did not mean that a teacher had to know the codified history of dance, less resistance was shown to creative movement.

¹² Colla MacDonald, "Effects of an In-Service Program on Eight Teachers' Attitudes and Practices regarding Creative Dance," *The Elementary School Journal* 93 (1992): 99-115.

This finding is important to my argument because it suggests that the clarification of what creative movement actually is can lead to a greater acceptance of dance education within the classroom. However, I am committed to clarifying the definitions of creative movement and dance education in order to result in their greater acceptance in the classroom, without decreasing the potential benefits of using dance, as in the previous study. MacDonald did not have to reject dance as a kinesthetic lens to explore content knowledge in new ways in order to achieve acceptance of creative movement on the part of non-dancers. There has been a historical trend, however, to respond to assumed causes of resistance by completely removing the accused form from one's definition of dance education.

Historically, the relationship between the physical benefits of dance, the cognitive benefits of dance, and the artistic benefits of dance has been manipulated as a way of addressing and undermining certain stereotypes that have limited the acceptance of dance in the public school curriculum. Dance was first integrated into schools in order to promote wellness and was chiefly praised for its physical health benefits. Gradually, however, this new image of dance education came to be understood as limiting because it ignored its benefits as an art form. Although one can see value in acknowledging both of these benefits of dance education, the trend has been to ignore one or the other when proposing redefinitions of dance education. This has affected our perceptions of dance education as a whole, and consequently the progress of its integration into the public school curriculum.

By considering the specific realm in which dance was introduced into the school—the gymnasium—one can understand the reasoning behind a rejection of this particular representation of dance education. Although private dance lessons have a much longer history in America, dance was introduced into schools only in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In *America Learns to Dance* Joseph E. Marks reveals that the inclusion of dance was based on a popular belief at the time that education must be “both *solid* and *useful*.” Marks goes on to say that these values, in addition to “the growing interest in physical education” were responsible for dance “being stressed as a healthful and valuable form of exercise. It was on this basis that it gradually became a part of the school curriculum.”¹³ Because dance was originally accepted into schools based on its physical health benefits, it is not surprising that there was an eventually a movement to draw attention to the other beneficial aspects of dance that would support its use in schools.

Margaret H'Doubler was a major figure in evaluating the benefits of dance and emphasizing the importance of dance education based on its merits as a creative art form alone. She was one of the first women to establish a university dance program in America in the early twentieth century. Her program at the University of Wisconsin rested solely on the artistic value of dance, regarding this as a necessary component of

¹³ Marks, 84.

education.¹⁴ H'Doubler immediately differentiated her instruction from what Susan Koff refers to as dance training.¹⁵ By rejecting the structured approach of classical dance, H'Doubler made room for exploration in her classes, teaching her students that dance was important and necessary in learning based on the self-exploration and self-expression deriving from improvisational movement alone. Reviewing Janice Ross' *Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and The Beginning of Dance in American Education*, Jeanne Goddard described what H'Doubler's classes involved:

She dismissed typical imitative methods of teaching dance technique, and she rarely demonstrated an exercise. Rather, her aim was to operate “transparently,” as a conduit through which her students might themselves experiment and learn. While Ross regrets that it is nearly impossible to know what H'Doubler's classes actually looked like, the abundance of delightful anecdotes and heartfelt tributes from former students testify to her inspirational qualities. Of course, she was not loved by all, and Ross is quite candid about the shortcomings some students felt in her classes.¹⁶

¹⁴ Jeanne Goddard, “Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and The Beginning of Dance in American Education,” *Journal of Dance Education* 5 (2005): 33-34.

¹⁵ Koff, 27-31.

¹⁶ Goddard, 34.

Goddard begins by describing H'Doubler's classes as a guided exploration of creative movement, rather than a class structured by the teaching and practice of dance technique. This passage demonstrates H'Doubler's shaping of dance education away from the common model of the dance class in which the teacher leads his or her students through a variety of codified exercises. Thus, H'Doubler's approach to teaching sought to provide the student with the tools for self-exploration and self-expression. It is important to note this because it helps to explain the resistance to H'Doubler's approach to dance education. However, it is also important to acknowledge the importance of H'Doubler's work in contributing to the current definition of dance education. H'Doubler was one of the pioneers in challenging the assumptions of what dance education could be. Thus, her rejection of dance education as only promoting physical health redefined dance education, and opened the door to further critical analysis as to what dance could and should be.

H'Doubler's rejection of the earlier definition of dance education encouraged others to criticize her own definition of dance education in addition to offering a new one. In reaction to H'Doubler, dance educators reduced her focus of dance in their own definitions of dance education. Fearing that the emphasis on expressive form might undermine the potential of dance education, dance educators concerned with the acceptance of dance, specifically returned in some ways to the *useful* aspects of dance at the heart of earlier definitions of dance education. In *Dance: A Basic Educational Technique*, published by Frederick Rand Rogers in 1941, we see a return to focusing on

the multiple benefits of dance—physical, social, mental, and cultural. In the first chapter, “Meanings of Education and Dance,” Rogers suggests that his definition of dance education is based on using dance to focus on improving the whole person, in order to eventually contribute to what he refers to as the ideal society:

[T]his book is concerned, not with dance as an art, but only as a “basic educational technique.” However, this function of dance greatly increases our concern with its ends, if only because educational aims are intangible.... The importance of considering aims in a book on the use of dance in schools is much more emphasized by the fact that education is a program of action whose aims is not only to create material goods... not even to contribute to the present happiness of men... Actually the aim of any rational education is almost supremely intangible: it must be to achieve, in the indefinitely remote future an ideal society.¹⁷

It is clear that Rogers’ vision of dance education is a strong reaction against H’Doubler’s use of dance merely as a vehicle for self-expression. Rogers attempts to expand the definition of dance education so far beyond what H’Doubler proposes that he actually loses sight of the fact that dance can and does support education by providing enjoyment to the student, something we see most clearly in the parallels between creative movement

¹⁷ Frederick Rand Rogers, *Dance: A Basic Educational Technique* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1941), pg. iii-vi.

and humor. It is evident that Rogers is determined to defend dance as a serious form of discipline that has the ability to encourage learning and even to better society as a whole; however, this approach to redefining dance education as a way of making dance appealing to educators brings the argument too close to requiring comprehensive dance knowledge, which reduces the likelihood of dance being used in schools. Still, Rogers moves toward the argument that I'm proposing by acknowledging dance's ability to affect the whole person. This suggests an interest in developing a definition of dance education that includes its many benefits, so as to encourage its acceptance.

The current trend has been to present dance as an interdisciplinary tool, which acknowledges dance's use in the classroom, as a discipline in itself. Redirecting the focus to dance's ability to provide students with new learning tools, this approach also acknowledges the existence of a codified vocabulary and knowledge basis; it also reflects a need to embrace the many components and benefits of dance as necessary to its acceptance. In her article "Dance in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning," Alison Rhodes of the Harvard Graduate School of Education seeks to define the term "interdisciplinary":

The term "interdisciplinary," as defined by Veronica Boix Mansilla and Howard Gardner, posits that interdisciplinary understanding involves the "integration of knowledge and modes of thinking from two or more disciplines in order to create products, solve problems, and offer explanations of

the world in ways that would not have been possible through single disciplinary means.”...It calls for a rigorous integration of disciplinary knowledge and methods where disciplinary standards are appropriately upheld.¹⁸

The interdisciplinary model that Rhodes describes returns to Howard Gardner’s (1983) theory of multiple intelligences, which suggests that people learn in many different ways, including kinesthetically.¹⁹ Rather than rejecting self-exploration or the codified version of dance, however, this approach additionally embraces all of these elements, thus potentially gaining acceptance based on the argument that attention to their separate but equal existence within dance education will result in the full potential of dance education. When paired with this potential use of dance in the classroom, the additional inclusion of an awareness of dance’s independent merits as a discipline based on its own content knowledge encourages the acceptance of dance education. The ability for this new definition of dance education to embrace the codified elements of dance is ideal because it shows that by acknowledging, rather than denying, the presence of the codified vocabulary and base of knowledge of dance, support can still be gained and even enhanced. Insofar as teachers realize that they can pair dance with another more familiar discipline, we now see educators empowered to employ the use of dance in their classrooms at the extent to which they feel comfortable. Thus, we see how a more

¹⁸ Alison Rhodes, “Dance in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning,” *Journal of Dance Education* 6 (2006): 48.

¹⁹ Koff, 4.

complex definition of dance education, intensified by an awareness of its many definitions, can in fact lead to acceptance of, rather than resistance to, the integration of dance into the classroom.

There has been recent evidence of growth in the acceptance of integrating dance into the public school curriculum. The growing acceptance of dance education as an important component of education in schools does not need to be measured by the number of schools that currently have an active dance program. Rather I am basing the claim of growth on the increased effort and number of people arguing for the necessity of dance education in schools. A speech given by Hillary Rodham Clinton in 2007 speaks to the importance of dance education.

So the National Dance Education Organization is the collective voice for dance education and you're working hard to help states increase the availability and quality of dance instruction. I applaud the work you do, with your help our children can become not only the brightest and most creative that they possibly can be, but the kind of future leaders that our nation needs.²⁰

Clinton's rallying behind dance education as an important component of education suggests that there has been some clarification as to what dance education's potential actually entails. By thanking the National Dance Education Organization (NDEO),

²⁰ Hillary Rodham Clinton, "The Importance of Dance Education," *Journal of Dance Education* 7 (2007): 37.

Clinton suggests that the organization is capable of and thus responsible for, igniting change in the perception and misperceptions of dance education. Clinton does not specifically address the way to do this, but it is through their ability to provide unification to dance education, by responding with support of and standards for individual aspects of dance education, while unified by their place within one large organization. Thus, the fact that this organization deals with dance studios, and dance education in classrooms, of all ages, suggests an ability to define the multiple sectors that fall under the sweeping umbrella term of dance education. The NDEO, the current national organization working in the favor of dance education, thus becomes the portal through which my argument might be converted into action.

Clinton errs on the side of presenting dance education as most beneficial based on its support of cognitive development, as well as self-discovery; however, by inconspicuously referring to the ability for dance to provide students with creative tendencies, she manages to present an impressively all-encompassing definition of dance education. It is possible that she focuses on the cognitive benefits of dance, because to the everyday public there is still a need to raise awareness of dance's ability to support learning; while an appreciation of dance's ability to increase creativity and appeal to one's artistic self is better understood. By presenting the description of a student who has received dance education as "bright and creative," Clinton suggests equality between these two benefits, and even a relationship between them. Whether aware of it or not, Clinton is thus confronting the misguided belief of one to be more important than the

other, in favor of the successful integration of dance into the public school curriculum.

This kind of national support for dance education is sure to be essential and effective in the integration of dance into the public school curriculum.

This support will develop based on a National, unified understanding of what dance is, as defined by the inclusion of its many different forms and their distinction as separate but equal entities within the definition of dance education. Once this definition is realized, dance education will thrive, because of its avoidance of the internal strife that has harmed its successful integration into the public school curriculum for so long.

Extreme versions of dance education will be dismissed and necessarily redefined once the different definitions of dance are understood to be representative of the many benefits of dance. As dance education becomes more widely understood as representative of its many sectors of dance, thus consequently showing an embracing of its vast and complex array of benefits, its acceptance and successful integration into the public school curriculum will grow and grow accordingly.

Bibliography

- Barnes, Clive. "Attitudes." *Dance Magazine*, July 2007, 98.
- Bergmann, Sheryle. "Creative Dance in the Education Curriculum: Justifying the Unambiguous." *Canadian Journal of Education* 20 (1995): 156-165.
- Bonbright, Jane M. "National Agenda for Dance Arts Education: The Evolution of Dance as an Art From Intersects with the Evolution of Federal Interest In, and Support of, Arts Education." Revised January 2007, <http://www.ndeo.org> (20 October 2008).
- Brodzinsky, David M. "Children's Comprehension and Appreciation of Verbal Jokes in Relation to Conceptual Tempo." *Child Development* 48 (1977): 960-967.
- Church, Ellen Booth. "5 to 6: Joking Around." *Scholastic Parent & Child* 12 (2005): 81.
- Clinton, Hillary Rodham. "The Importance of Dance Education." *Journal of Dance Education* 7 (2007): 37.
- Comedy and Outrage in Dance. Produced by Celia Ipiotis and Jeff Bush, directed by Richard Sheridan. 28 min. ARC Videodance, 1 April 1982. Videocassette.
- De Mille, Agnes. *The Place of the Arts in the Everyday and Educational Life of America*. De Mille, Agnes. 45 min. Analog, mono. Sound cassette, 1961.
- Fraser, Diane Lynch. *Playdancing: Discovering and Developing Creativity in Young Children*. New Jersey: Princeton Book Company, 1991.
- Goddard, Jeanne. "Moving Lessons: Margaret H'Doubler and the Beginning of Dance in American Education." *Journal of Dance Education* 5 (2005): 33-34.
- Groch, Alice S. "Joking and Appreciation of Humor in Nursery School Children." *Child Development* 45 (1974): 1098-1102.
- Hall, Clifton L. "Humor in Teaching." *Peabody Journal of Education* 47 (1969): 3-5.
- Hanna, Judith Lynne. "Dance and the Child." *Current Anthropology* 24 (1983): 222-224.

- Koff, Susan R. "Toward a Definition of Dance Education." *Childhood Education* 77 (2000): 27-31.
- MacDonald, Colla J. "Effects of an In-Service Program on Eight Teachers' Attitudes and Practices regarding Creative Dance." *The Elementary School Journal* 93 (1992): 99-115.
- Marks, Joseph E. *America Learns to Dance*. Brooklyn, NY: New Horizons, 1957.
- Miriam, Giguere. "Thinking as They Create Do Children have Similar Experiences in Dance and in Language Arts?" *Journal of Dance Education* 6 (2006): 41-47.
- Morreall, John. "Humor and Aesthetic Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 15 (1981): 55-70.
- Rhodes, Alison. "Dance in Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning." *Journal of Dance Education* 6 (2006): 48-56.
- Riggs, Maida L. *Jump to Joy: Helping Children Grow Through Active Play*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980
- Rogers, Frederick Rand. *Dance: A Basic Educational Technique*. Toronto, Canada: The Macmillan Company, 1941.
- Schwartzman, Helen B. "The Anthropological Study of Children's Play." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5 (1976): 289-328.
- Sommerville, John C. "Puritan Humor, or Humor, for Children." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 21 (1989): 227-247.
- Spitz, Ellen Handler. "Aesthetics for Children: Some Psychological Reflections." *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 28 (1994): 63-78.
- Stinson, Susan W. "Piaget for Dance Educators: A Theoretical Study." *Dance Research Journal* 17 (1985): 9-16.
- Strong, Debbie. "Age-Appropriate Teaching." *Dance Teacher*, May 2008, 62-66.
- Sudol, David. "Dangers of Classroom Humor." *English Journal* 70 (1981): 26-28.

Tamashiro, Roy T. "Children's Humor: A Developmental View." *The Elementary School Journal* 80 (1979): 68-75.

The Concert. Choreographed by Jerome Robbins. Music by Frederic Chopin. Presented by New York City Ballet. 31 min. U.S., 17 November 1987. Videodisc.

Wagner, James. "Songs in the key of blue, or red, or green; To teach her toddler the piano, a mom devises a colorful songbook. It works, and the boy plays on," *Los Angeles Times*, 4 October 2008, sec. B, 3.

Wandersee, James H. "Humor as a Teaching Strategy." *The American Biology Teacher*. 44 (1982): 212-218

Zimmer, Elizabeth. "Comedy Central." *Dance Magazine*, January 2006, 74-78.