Online Theatre Voice Pedagogy: A Literature Review

Shannon Vickers

Department of Theatre and Film, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Canada

s.vickers@uwinnipeg.ca

Shannon Vickers is a Professor in the Department of Theatre and Film at the University of Winnipeg. She has served as a voice, speech, and/or text coach on over 30 professional theatre productions in Canada. She earned a BFA in acting at the University of Windsor, an MFA in theatre voice pedagogy at the University of Alberta and is a Certified Teacher of Knight-Thompson Speechwork. Shannon recently served as a co-investigator for the SSHRC-IDG funded Best Practices in Indigenous Accents.

Online Theatre Voice Pedagogy: A Literature Review

This article is a comprehensive literature review of e-learning research, particularly as it relates to equitable teaching practices and to the field of theatre voice studies. This literature review (1) highlights effective, non-discipline-specific online pedagogical practices, (2) offers considerations toward equity and accessibility in a digitized and online education context, and (3) examines these online pedagogical practices for theatre performance. The Covid-19 Pandemic resulted in an interruption to in-person classes worldwide in 2020, and an unprecedented pivot to teaching online maintained continuity in many North American universities. What was initially accepted as a stop-gap measure may become the educational context for many students for the foreseeable future. Thus, the concepts and theories in this literature review are correlated with the learning modalities in theatre performance education, offering instructors versed in embodied pedagogical practices a framework to support the design and facilitation of online courses. Specifically, the applicable focus is for theatre voice, speech, and text classes for acting students in theatre training programs.

Keywords: online learning, distance learning, theatre, voice, speech, Shakespeare, acting

Introduction

On May 6, 2020; eight weeks after classes were unexpectedly cancelled due to the Covid-19 pandemic; it was announced at an online department meeting at my institution that the upcoming academic year would involve an unprecedented pivot to teaching studio theatre classes online. I was excited at the possibilities for innovation and creative problem solving and deeply curious about how best to (re)design, adapt, and facilitate my courses for this new digital context.

I engaged in a literature review in an effort to create a comprehensive resource that would be supportive of successful theatre voice pedagogy within this new digital context. What follows is a distillation of the research (to date) in equity and accessibility considerations for online learning. This effort is accompanied by an overview of the history of e-learning research, beginning with the work of pioneer Canadian researchers Randy D. Garrison, Terry Anderson, and Walter Archer and their Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework and its impact on the field of online pedagogy. Three key elements of the CoI framework are introduced as themes for the literature review: Cognitive Presence, Social Presence and Teaching Presence. Each of these concepts are further contextualized with indicators that can serve educators with actionable reference points when designing online courses. This framework is also cross referenced with a

comprehensive literature review of journal publications, investigative studies, and research that support the findings of the CoI framework and offer educators further insights into how to successfully design and facilitate effective online courses that promote student success. The final section of the literature review offers an overview of the literature and research to date that can support theatre instructors who teach courses focused specifically in voice, speech, and/or text in acting programs, as they pivot to a digital context with course planning and facilitation. The references offer educators many entry points to support the planning and facilitation of discipline-specific online pedagogy, with knowledge mobilization efforts from experts worldwide.

Equity Considerations

The literature suggests that successful online courses require mindful consideration of equity issues in order to ensure course design is accessible, engaging, and able to mitigate predictable barriers to diverse student populations (Lior 2020; Raygoza, León, and Norris 2020; Darby and Lang, 2019; Phirangee, Denmans Epp, and Hewitt 2016; Tanner 2013; Lorenzo 2010).

In *Small Teaching Online*, Flower Darby and James M. Lang (2019) advocate for cultural inclusion in course design and facilitation:

> An often-overlooked yet increasingly important issue in online education is the lack of provision for the needs of culturally diverse learners. Differences in ethnicity, sexual orientation, political affiliation, gender identity, faith backgrounds, and many other nuanced and multifaceted forms of culture exist in the online classroom, but these differences are rarely planned for or accommodated in the design and teaching of online classes. In order to build community, support all of our learners, and help each individual feel a sense of belonging, we must begin to increase our awareness of the ways that cultural contexts influence online student behaviours and levels of engagement. (92-93)

For students from diverse ethnocultural backgrounds, equity-minded course design and facilitation requires educators to engage in critical review in order to facilitate students' learning in equitable and empowering classes, regardless of context (Oram 2019; Bensimon, Dowd, and Witham 2016; McAllister-Viel 2016; Mihyang Ginther 2015; Sujo de Montes, Oran, and Willis 2002). Informed course design and facilitation also supports accessible education for neurodivergent theatre students in both face-to-face and digital contexts (Oram 2020, 2018).

Accessibility is an important consideration in designing and delivering equitable digital course content, and educators may not be able to easily identify students with disabilities (Massengale and Vasquez 2016). Conversely, a student in an online class may have a disability that they do not disclose to an instructor (Dell, Dell, and Blackwell 2015). Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a framework that educators can use to promote accessible online course content through effective course design that offers a variety of learning methods (Darby and Lang 2019; Massengale and Vasquez 2016; Dell, Dell, and Blackwell 2015).

Darby and Lang (2019) highlight UDL principles throughout their book, offering practical suggestions for implementation to support educators pivoting to online contexts:[1]

As we examine small teaching strategies in multiple areas of online classes, we'll seek to expand our understanding of how UDL principles can benefit a diverse student population. "In addition to respecting the ethnic, gender, socioeconomic, and ability-based diversity on our campuses, we can design courses…that expand the reach and efficacy of higher education." […]

And there are many good reasons for doing so, notably that UDL increases all of our learners' ability to engage with our content and demonstrate their knowledge in ways that they might prefer: "UDL is a way of thinking about creating the interactions we have with our learners so that they do not have to ask for special treatment, regardless of the types of barriers they may face – time, connectivity, or disability." When we reframe our thinking about how UDL can help all our learners engage and succeed, we see the value of the approach in every course design decision we make, whether teaching online or in person. (xxiv-xxv)

Jamie Buffington-Adams, Denice Honaker, and Jerry Wilde (2017) draw on sociocultural theory in their work in education:

[Learning] does not happen in isolation, but each human's development occurs within specific historical and cultural contexts which have a profound impact on the individual's identify formation and knowledge construction. […]

To teach from a sociocultural perspective is to acknowledge that each student brings with him or her into the classroom particular bodies of knowledge and ways of being and that none of these is greater or lesser than another. To teach from a sociocultural perspective is to approach students holistically and to recognize that one's social, emotional, physical and spiritual life and wellbeing should not, and in truth cannot, be separated from one's intellectual growth and development. To teach from a sociocultural perspective, one must attend to human connections and relationships…Our conceptual framework holds that an effective teacher is a change agent who keeps the learner at the heart of the classroom by being a global citizen, reflective scholar, and instructional leader. As global citizens, we recognize the value and necessity of multiple perspectives and challenge our students as well as ourselves to purposely interrogate biases, to think critically about global issues, and to seek to change the future. (235-236)

Community of Inquiry Framework

A team of e-learning researchers pioneered and collaboratively documented the evolution of their Community of Inquiry Framework (CoI) through various knowledge mobilization activities (Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000). Their findings culminated in a book which explored practical implications for online education. Based on their research, the three key elements that should be considered in online education design and implementation are Cognitive Presence, Social Presence, and Teaching Presence (Garrison and Anderson 2003).

These three distinct elements quite obviously work most effectively when they work in concert. The teacher begins by establishing her presence in the design of a learning

experience through taking into account the actual learners who will be in the course, and builds into the structure of the course plenty of opportunities to engage with those learners through direct instruction and feedback. But a well-designed course will also provide opportunities (and incentives) for learners to interact with one another, both to help each other learn and to build that sense of community. When these two forms of presence have been established, the learners in the course are more likely to engage in the kinds of active, collaborative processes that help them construct new knowledge through their cognitive presence. (Darby and Lang 2019, 80)

These key presence elements also serve to categorize the breadth of material within this literature review. The researchers identify the most salient aspects of their research findings and how they connect in their initial publication:

The element in this model that is most basic to success in higher education is cognitive presence. This term here is taken to mean the extent to which the participants in any particular configuration of a community of inquiry are able to construct meaning through sustained communication. Although this is far from unproblematic even in traditional face-to-face educational settings, it is particularly worthy of attention when the medium of communication changes, as in the adoption of CMC$_2$ for educational purposes. Cognitive presence is a vital element in critical thinking, a process and outcome that is frequently presented as the ostensible goal of all higher education. (Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000, 89)

Cognitive Presence

In their book, Garrison and Anderson (2003) further illuminate the role cognitive presence plays in higher education. Reviewing this information through the lens of theatre education, familiar and identifiable themes of process, outcome, and collaboration correlate with the experiential knowledge of teaching theatre students in practical work:

At its core, education is about learning, but a specific kind of learning defined by process and outcome. To this end, cognitive presence speaks to intent and actual learning outcomes. We see cognitive presence "as the extent to which learners are able to construct and confirm meaning through sustained reflection and discourse in a critical community of inquiry." In essence, cognitive presence is a condition of higher-order thinking and learning.[3] (Garrison and Anderson 2003, 28)

How we (as instructors) teach to promote cognitive presence in practical theatre training, and how our students learn is often through a process of physical and vocal exploration in studio and rehearsal. These embodied learning modalities are also possible in digital contexts, and recent research highlights these findings (Vuuren and Freisleben 2020; Allain 2019; Gorman, Syrjä, and Kanninen 2019; Lind 2012).

Current exploration in digitized theatre training and rehearsal offers instructors insights into the creative possibilities of embodied artistic learning experiences in online contexts:

When acting in a digital environment, the lack of the immediate touch of the hands and the skin must be replaced by other sensory means, for example by the tactility of the voice or the touch of the eyes. And, of course, some element of make-believe was needed. When speech and voice are understood as something material which can be sensed and touched, their function is not just to convey meaning but to make an embodied connection with the other. Our ability to empathise aurally/kinaesthetically with the speaker's body allows us to receive the other's body through the voice inside our own bodies. This is what Ronald Barthes[4] in his seminal essay of the same name calls "the grain of the voice," which exceeds meaning and establishes an affective relationship between the body of the one who vocalises and the listener. In short, the grain is the "body" in the voice. Thus, the touch of the other body can be felt even without concrete, immediate contact because it can be mediated through the vibro-tactile qualities of the voice. (Gorman, Syrjä, and Kanninen 2019, 220-221)

Indicators

Indicators have been identified in each of the three key elements of the CoI framework. Reviewing these indicators for each subcategory can support educators pivoting to online contexts with strategic directions for digitized pedagogy:

The examples of indicators for cognitive presence corresponding to each of the four phases of critical educational inquiry include:

- triggering event—recognizing the problem, a sense of puzzlement
- exploration—information exchange, discussion of ambiguities;
- integration—connecting ideas, create solutions;
- resolution—vicariously apply new ideas, critically assess solutions.[5] (Garrison, Anderson and Archer 2000, 102)

The findings from a study by Garrison and Cleveland-Innes also offer some guidance on specific strategies for effective implementation of successful activities that promote cognitive presence in online learning:

From a design and organizational perspective, our findings suggest defining clear expectations and selecting manageable content, structuring appropriate activities (collaborative and individual), and conducting assessment congruent with intended goals: the fostering of a deep approach to learning. In terms of facilitating discourse, it is important to first provide clear participation requirements in terms of length, content expectations, and timeliness. Next, it is important to provide engaging questions, focus discussion, challenge and test ideas, model appropriate contributions, and ensure that the discourse is progressive. The central focus must be on students creating meaning and confirming understanding. Sustained teaching presence that encourages participation, but is not teacher centered, is crucial.[6] (Garrison and Cleveland-Innes 2005, 145)

Further to these investigations, Lewis and Abdul-Hamid (2006) employed a study to identify how exemplary online instructors implemented effective pedagogical practices. Their

research revealed themes of constructive feedback, organization, fostering interaction and involvement, and teacher presence. In summarizing their findings on effective online teaching practices, they highlight the importance of structured and deliberate planning:

> One of the expectations for effective online instruction is for structured pedagogical approaches, which evolve around interactivity and the deliberate actions of faculty willing to provide careful attention to student needs. Evident from this study is that this type of environment is not one that emerges naturally or unwittingly in online courses. Faculty must carefully plan, maintain organization, and creatively engage students with the course content and with each other. (Lewis and Abdul-Hamid 2006, 95-96)

The literature also reveals the impact that the instructor has as facilitator in the online learning environment and highlights the efficacy of primarily instructor-student oriented instruction, as well as the successful learning outcomes of peer-to-peer learning activities. Martin and Bolliger (2018) surveyed students in their study and found that instructor facilitated engagement strategies seemed to be valued over peer facilitation, with the most beneficial strategies identified as regular announcements, email reminders, and grading rubrics for all assignments. This was also supported in earlier complementary research where similar findings showed instructor-facilitated online courses had a stronger sense of community than peer-facilitated online courses (Phirangee, Denmans Epp, and Hewitt 2016). A smaller study investigating effective online teaching highlighted that "the path to student engagement, based on this data, is not about the type of activity/assignment but about multiple ways of creating meaningful communication between students and with their instructor – it's all about connections" (Dixson 2010, 8).

Social Presence

Student engagement is critical for learning to occur in online courses (Martin and Bolliger 2018; Dixson 2010). The literature suggests that students in online courses may struggle with social isolation, which can impact student engagement and learning (Martin and Bolliger 2018; Phirangee, Denmans Epp, and Hewitt 2016; Dixson 2010; Lewis and Abdul-Hamid 2006; Thurston 2005; Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000).

The second key element identified in the CoI framework is social presence. In defining social presence, Garrison, Anderson, and Archer (2000) suggest that social presence may also mitigate attrition in a program of study, which may be of interest for theatre educators and administrators in this unprecedented digital context:

> The second core element of the model, social presence, is defined as the ability of participants in the Community of Inquiry to project their personal characteristics into the community, thereby presenting themselves to the other participants as "real people." The primary importance of this element is its function as a support for cognitive presence, indirectly facilitating the process of critical thinking carried on by the community of learners. However, when there are affective goals for the educational process, as well as purely cognitive ones, (i.e., where it is important that participants find the interaction in the group enjoyable and personally fulfilling so that they will remain in the cohort of

learners for the duration of the program), then social presence is a direct contributor to the success of the educational experience. (89)

In their subsequent research, Garrison and Anderson (2003) further contextualize social presence, inadvertently supporting equity minded course design and facilitation:

Education is socially situated. The need for social presence is derivative of this fact. Social presence is essential to creating a community of inquiry that, in turn, is central to a higher-education learning experience. Education is more than transmitting and assimilating content. It is about reflection, questioning, critical analysis, and collaboratively testing ideas. These basic activities do not thrive in a group without personal affiliation or where expression is not open and risk free. (84)

Mindfully designing and facilitating online course content to support social presence can promote a sense of community, as well as student engagement, learning and success (Raygoza, León, and Norris 2020; Berry 2019; Martin and Bolliger 2018; Phirangee, Denmans Epp, and Hewitt 2016; Tanner 2013; Woods and Ebersole 2010; Slagter van Tryon and Bishop 2009; Lewis and Abdul-Hussein 2006; Thurston 2005; Garrison and Anderson 2003, Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000). Dixson's (2010) study findings suggest that active learning that involves discussion forums and websites may also help develop social presence. The use of additional technology that promotes peer interaction online can help students feel more connected and enjoy higher successful academic completion rates (Thurston 2005). Darby and Lang (2019) recommend encouraging social interaction at the outset of the course:

One of the most common ways to harness the power of social interactions in online classes, especially student-to-student interactions, is to include online discussions as a central element in course design. A tried-and-true method to create community from the beginning is to have students post an introduction in the first week of class. These introductions can be in the form of text or video. Be sure to incentivize students' replies to each other as well. (82)

The idea of an introductory welcome message from the instructor as a means of breaking the ice and increasing social and teaching presence was also highlighted in some of the other literature in this review (Berry 2019; Buffington-Adams, Honaker, and Wilde 2017).

Modelling appropriate messages and responses can be crucial in making students feel welcome and in giving them a sense of belonging. These messages and responses should set the tone and draw reluctant participants into the discussion. For these reasons, the teacher or moderator must be particularly sensitive and responsive at the start of an e-learning experience. We must keep in mind that the purpose of establishing a secure environment is to facilitate critical thinking and inquiry. (Garrison and Anderson 2003, 54)

Indicators

The indicators for social presence in an online class are identified by Garrison, Anderson, and Archer (2000):

> Social presence indicators include:
>
> - emotional expression—emoticons, autobiographical narratives;
> - open communication—risk-free expression, acknowledging others, being encouraging;
> - group cohesion—encouraging collaboration, helping, and supporting.7 (102)

These indicators can help instructors anecdotally identify the level of social presence and connectedness in their online courses, which may support responsiveness and the ability to recalibrate towards these indicators throughout the academic year to support social presence online. It is helpful to recognize that these indicators (emoticons) were reflective of a time before video conferencing enhanced computer-mediated communication and allowed virtual face-to-face opportunities for social engagement as well. Dixson (2010) offers similar suggestions based on study findings

> Instructors should consider learning assignments that engage students with the content and with each other. Across many types of courses when students readily identified multiple ways of interacting with other students as well as of communicating with instructors, they reported higher engagement in the course. (8)

Darby and Lang (2019) reiterate the connection between social presence and teaching presence by encouraging educators to consider the impact they have on supporting a vibrant social presence through educational leadership:

> The importance of the social and teaching presences in the community of inquiry framework suggests that you have the potential to impact the sense of community in your online class in a way that no one else has. You set the tone and the example, both at the very beginning of the class and throughout the semester. Although you may feel yourself present in class just through your role as instructor, you have to make your presence *known* to students. This can be a simple practice to implement, but it can produce significant results in keeping the attention and engagement of your students. (86)

Jamie Buffington-Adams, Denice Honaker, and Jerry Wilde (2017) offer up these conclusions on connection and community:

> Unsurprisingly, what fosters the interpersonal connections or community […] is the human connection which the teacher him/herself creates and then continues to facilitate via his/her own presence. While we tend to be familiar with what this looks like in a face-to-face classroom, reimagining the building of learning communities in online spaces has challenged educators to rethink how connections are built and maintained and to create and sustain strong teacher presence. What we find is that the work is not, as some might believe, impossible but strangely remains the same while looking different. (245-246)

Teaching Presence

Teaching presence is widely considered another critical aspect for the success of online course delivery and learning, and includes the design of the course as well as its facilitation (Vuuren and Freisleben 2020; Phirangee, Denmans Epp, and Hewitt 2016; Dixson 2010; Lewis and Abdul-Hamid 2006; Garrison and Archer 2003; Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000). Teaching presence can also include instructor-student relationships, rapport, and opportunities for collaboration and connection, which lead to student success (Martin and Bolliger 2018).

> The third element of the model, teaching presence, consists of two general functions, which may be performed by any one participant in a Community of Inquiry; however, in an educational environment, these functions are likely to be the primary responsibility of the teacher. The first of these functions is the design of the educational experience. This includes the selection, organization, and primary presentation of course content, as well as the design and development of learning activities and assessment. A teacher or instructor typically performs this function. The second function, facilitation, is a responsibility that may be shared among the teacher and some or all of the other participants or students. This sharing of the facilitation function is appropriate in higher education and common in computer conferencing. (Garrison, Anderson and Archer 2000, 89-90)

In their subsequent research, Garrison and Anderson (2003) further contextualize teaching presence, and how it intersects with cognitive and social presence:

> Teaching presence is what the teacher does to create a community of inquiry that includes both cognitive and social presence. Therefore, we do not focus specifically on the social and cognitive elements themselves but on the roles of a teacher or the actual functions that a teacher must perform to create and maintain a dynamic learning environment. (66)

Indicators

Garrison, Anderson and Archer (2000) offer examples of teaching presence indicators in their study, which may serve theatre educators engaging in online course design with clear strategies to support pedagogy:

- Instructional management—structuring content, setting discussion topics, establishing discussion groups;
- building understanding—sharing personal meaning/values, expressing agreement, seeking consensus;
- direct instruction—focusing and pacing discussion, answering questions, diagnosing misconceptions, summarizing learning outcomes or issues.[8] (103)

Buffington-Adams, Honaker, and Wilde (2017) offer further insights into instructional leadership in online courses:

Instructional leadership requires one to be a keen and critical observer who can transform observations into action. Planning and implementing a well-suited curriculum is at the heart of effective instructional leadership. Doing so well always requires knowing one's students […] To know one's students does not mean to merely know their latest standardized test scores but to know their learning styles and intelligences, their strengths and weaknesses, their backgrounds and communities and to respond to this knowledge by creating a learning environment which capitalizes on what is rich while addressing those areas in which students demonstrate the greatest need. In short, it means to recognize students as whole and complex learners coming from specific cultural contexts and to use that knowledge to design learning experiences in which that knowledge is not a deficit but an asset. (237)

These same researchers later offer a strong argument for investing in structured and organized design.

Actions speak louder than words, or so the old adage goes. In virtual spaces, strong organization of course content communicates volumes to students about the instructor behind the scenes before the instructor him/herself offers official communication. A lack of clear or strong organization can leave students questioning not only what is required of them but whether the instructor knows what he/she is doing or, perhaps worse, whether they care about the course they are teaching. Conversely, a clearly organized course is evidence that an instructor has invested time in presenting course materials, activities, and spaces in logical and accessible fashions. (238)

The literature offers further suggestions on how to structure and facilitate online pedagogy successfully. Woods and Ebersole's study (2010) found the use of personal discussion folders in online courses contributed to building positive faculty-student relationships. Faculty self-disclosure was cited as a component of successful online community building in a number of publications (Berry 2019; Buffington-Adams, Honaker, and Wilde; 2017; Cayanus 2004; Garrison, Anderson, and Archer 2000).

One of the simplest ways to make your presence known is by posting frequent text or video announcements. This serves two purposes. Frequent communication helps to keep your students focused and progressing. Plus, you can use announcements to accomplish important teaching goals: clarifying misunderstandings, summarizing the week's highlights, helping students to prepare for an upcoming exam. (Darby and Lang 2019, 87)

Implications for Digitized Theatre Voice Pedagogy

Having considered the research on effective online teaching practices, the literature also offers insights into creative developments, innovation and observations of technology and online teaching in the discipline-specific areas of voice, speech, and text.

Voice

For the purposes of consolidating the information here, I have grouped voice pedagogy with approaches to movement training and public speaking education.

Some investigation into the perceptions of both instructors and students toward voice teaching technology have been shared in the literature (Preeshl 2014; Barnes-Burroughs, et al. 2008; Sansom 2016; Guichard 2007). There are also a number of articles that offer approaches to teaching digitized public speaking (Butler 2017; Ward 2016; Lind 2012; Linardopoulos 2010).

Allain (2019) speaks to the lack of precedence in digital physical actor training approaches and offers suggestions based on his research and creative work. Camilleri's (2015) investigation into actor training in the age of globalized digital technology offers reflections on the paradigm shift from studio to digitized pedagogy. Within his reflections, he identifies a model of online physical actor training that originated in 2014 and is currently accessible online:

> Jonathan Pitches' University of Leeds MOOC on *Acting Training Theatre Biomechanics* in An Introduction to Physical Actor Training is among the first – if not the first – to explore the possibility of teaching some aspects of actor training via this medium. It was marketed as a three-week, four-hours-per-week course and as an introduction to physical actor training that focuses on "world-renowned Russian director Meyerhold's technique of biomechanics, inviting you to experience first-hand his revolutionary approach to acting – the biomechanical étude."[9] (as cited in Camilleri 2015, 25)

Speech

While the literature review identified few articles revealing insights into teaching speech online (Riha et al. 2010; Battenburg and Lant 2003), it is worth noting that there are many resources that support the successful facilitation of teaching speech, phonetics, accents, and dialects to theatre students online.[10] Of special note is Knight-Thompson Speechwork (KTS).[11] This organization has already successfully facilitated many webinars and speech courses online and are currently pivoting all planned 2020 workshops to the online format.

Text (Shakespeare)

"Canonical decision is one of the ways an institution makes sociopolitical choices" (Mihyang Ginther 2015, 48). In this literature review, I do not discount the important global conversation and movement toward decolonizing theatre training and curriculum, nor do I mean to support an uncritical Eurocentric perspective as the default in the theatre voice studio. The choice to focus on Shakespearean text in this literature review is due to its ubiquity in theatre training programs, and I hope that a multiplicity of texts will be explored by students.

A number of publications highlighting the digitization of Shakespeare pedagogy were very recently published. Co-editors Bell and Borsuk (2020) introduce a themed journal with the aim "to create space for more in-depth exploration of how digital practices are received and applied in a pedagogical environment, and how they are framed and applied as pedagogical processes" (2).

Bell (2020) provides an overview of the many Shakespeare resources and digital databases available online to support pedagogy. Marlatt's (2020) research supports interdisciplinary teaching and learning with "justice-oriented looks at canonised works" (107). Lior (2020) highlights digital innovations and applications that use emerging technologies and can supplement learning with additional resources. Lan and Yip (2020) offer an overview of the Asian Shakespeare Intercultural Archive and its support of intercultural pedagogy.

Considerations and Suggestions

Manternach and Manternach (2019) reported interesting results in their study on the nature of performance training; they highlighted that while most performance students initially felt best served pedagogically by having more opportunities to engage in practical work in their training (performing songs), these same students later reported greater value in engaging in the scholarship-based activities of vocal pedagogy and music theory as a foundation for success in their future professional performance pursuits. The pivot to online teaching, then, may inadvertently support an increase in scholarly activities (readings, writing assignments) due to the nature and constraints of theatre course design and implementation in the new digital context. These findings support practice-based instructors by highlighting that scholarship can support performance students and encourages educators to consider how curriculum change can prepare students for future careers in the performing arts.

> Identifying which elements of that training are the most useful should be an ongoing exploration. As industry demands change, so should our curriculum change in order to best help students meet those demands. When making these changes, the students and graduates who are using that training to build their acting careers can provide valuable input (Manternach and Manternach 2019, 319).

It is my hope that this literature review supports theatre educators in delivering well designed and facilitated courses online that offer both scholarly and practical pedagogical approaches during this unprecedented pivot to online and digitized pedagogy.[12] I look forward to when classes and rehearsals resume "IRL."[13]

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

Allain, Paul. 2019. "Physical actor training 2.0: new digital horizons." *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 10 (2): 169-186. doi:10.1080/19443927.2019.1609074.

Battenburg, John D. 2003. "Teaching Linguistics and Lexicography with Online Resources." *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 14 (2): 3-20. doi:10.1007/BF02940936.

Barnes-Burroughs, Kathryn, William Y. Lan, Elizabeth Edwards, and Noel Archambeault. 2008. "Current Attitudes Toward Voice Studio Teaching Technology: A Bicoastal Survey of

Classical Singing Pedagogues." *Journal of Voice* 22 (5): 590-602.
doi:10.1016/j.jvoice.2006.12.004.

Barthes, R., 1992 [1981]. *The Grain of the Voice. Interviews 1962–1980*. California: University of California Press.

Bell, Henry. 2020. "Digital processes: enabling the teaching of Shakespeare(s): an interview with, and response to, Tom Bird (former executive producer of Shakespeare's Globe)." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (1): 68-76. doi:10.1080/13569783.2019.1704239.

Bell, Henry and Amy Borsuk. 2020. "Teaching Shakespeare: digital processes." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (1): 1-7. doi:10.1080/13569783.2019.1704241.

Bensimon, Estela Maria, Alicia C. Dowd and Keith Witham. 2016. "Five Principles for Enacting Equity by Design." *Diversity and Democracy* 19(1): 1-8.

Berry, Sharla. 2019. "Teaching to Connect: Community-Building Strategies for the Virtual Classroom." *Online Learning* 23 (1): 164-183. doi:10.24059/olj.v23i1.1425.

Buffington-Adams, Jamie, Denice Honaker, and Jerry Wilde. 2017. "Education: Building Online Learning Communities on the Foundation of Teacher Presence." In *Best Practices in Online Teaching and Learning Across Academic Disciplines*, edited by Alexander C. Ross, 231-247. Virginia: George Mason University Press.

Butler, Nicholas D. 2017. "Learning to speak in the digital age: an examination of instructional conditions for teaching public speaking online." *Voice and Speech Review* 11 (1): 40-54. doi:10.1080/23268263.2017.1370805

Camilleri, Frank. 2015. "Towards the study of actor training in an age of globalised digital technology." *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 6 (1): 16-29. doi:10.1080/19443927.2014.985334.

Cayanus, Jacob L. 2004. "Effective Instructional Practice: Using teacher self-disclosure as an instructional tool." *Communication Teacher* 18 (1): 6-9. doi:10.1080/1740462032000142095.

Darby, Flower and James M. Lang. 2019. *Small Teaching Online: Applying Learning Science in Online Classes.* San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass

Dell, Cindy A., Thomas F. Dell, and Terry L. Blackwell. 2015. "Applying Universal Design for Learning in Online Courses: Pedagogical and Practical Considerations." *The Journal of Educators Online-JEO* 13 (2): 166-192.

Dixson, Marcia D. 2010. Creating effective student engagement in online courses: What do students find engaging?" *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 10 (2): 1-13.

Garrison, D. Randy, and Martha Cleveland-Innes. 2005. "Facilitating Cognitive Presence in Online Learning: Interaction Is Not Enough". *The American Journal of Distance Education* 19 (3): 133-148. doi:10.1207/s15389286ajde1903_2.

Garrison, D.R., and Terry Anderson. 2003. *E-Learning in the 21st Century.* London: Routledge.

Garrison, D. R., Terry Anderson, and Walter Archer. 2001 "Critical thinking, cognitive presence and computer conferencing in distance education." *American Journal of Distance Education* 15 (1): 7–23. doi:10.1080/08923640109527071.

Garrison, D. Randy, Terry Anderson, and Walter Archer. 2000. "Critical Inquiry in a Text-Based Environment: Computer Conferencing in Higher Education." *The Internet and Higher Education* 2 (2-3): 87-105. doi:10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00016-6.

Gorman, Tom, Tiina Syrjä, and Mikko Kanninen. 2019. "There is a world elsewhere: rehearsing and training through immersive telepresence." *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 10 (2): 208-226. doi:10.1080/19443927.2019.1610491.

Guichard, Julia. 2007. "Peer Reviewed Article To Tech or Not to Tech: Revising an Undergraduate Voice & Speech Course." *Voice and Speech Review* 5 (1): 94-103. doi:10.1080/23268263.2007.10769745.

Knight-Thompson Speechwork. 2020. https://ktspeechwork.org

Lewis, Cassandra C., and Husein Abdul-Hamid. 2006. "Implementing Effective Online Teaching Practices: Voices of Exemplary Faculty." *Innovative Higher Education* 31 (2): 83-98. doi:10.1007/s10755-006-9010-z.

Li Lan, Yong, and Roweena Yip. 2020. "Teaching with the Asian Shakespeare Intercultural Archive (A|S|I|A)." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (1): 8-25. doi:10.1080/13569783.2019.1687291.

Linardopoulos, Nick. 2010. "Teaching and Learning Public Speaking Online." *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching: Long Beach* 6 (1): 198-200.

Lind, Stephen J. 2012. "Teaching Digital Oratory: Public Speaking 2.0." *Communication Teacher* 26 (3): 163-169. doi: 10.1080/17404622.2012.659193.

Lior, Noam. 2020. "Multimedia Shakespeare editions: Making Shakespeare accessible/making an accessible Shakespeare." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (1): 125-142. doi:10.1080/13569783.2019.1704237.

Lorenzo, Albert L. 2010. "Teaching the world to sing: Planning for the future of online learning." *New Directions for Community Colleges,* no. 150: 95-102. doi:10.1002/cc.409.

Manternach, Brian and Jeremy N. Manternach. 2019. "Survey of University of Acting Major regarding the Most Useful Elements of Singing Training." *Voice and Speech Review* 13 (3): 312-321.

Marlatt, Rick. 2020. "Connected learning and Shakespeare: engaging students in drama teacher education." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (1): 103-108. Doi:10.1080/13569783.2019.1687289.

Martin, Florence and Doris Bolliger. 2018. "Engagement Matters: Student Perceptions on the Importance of Engagement Strategies in the Online Learning Environment." *Online Learning* 22 (1): 205-222. doi:10.24059/olj.v22i1.1092.

Massengale, Lindsay R. and Eleazar Vasquez III. 2016. "Assessing Accessibility: How Accessible are Online Courses for Students with Disabilities?" *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 16 (1): 69-79. doi:10.14434/josotl.v16i1.19101.

McAllister-Viel, Tara. 2016. "The role of presence in training actors voices." *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training* 7 (3): 438-452. doi:10.1080/19443927.2016.1217265.

Mihyang Ginther, Amy. 2015. "Dysconscious racism in mainstream British voice pedagogy and its potential effects on students from pluralistic backgrounds in UK Drama Conservatoires." *Voice and Speech Review* 9 (1): 41-60. doi:10.1080/23268263.2015.1079773.

Oram, Darren. 2020. "Developing Equitable On-line Actor Training for Neurodivergent Students." https://medium.com/@daronoram72/developing-equitable-on-line-actor-training-for-neurodivergent-students-ebf18292134e

Oram, Darren. 2019. "De-colonizing Listening: Toward an Equitable Approach to Speech Training for the Actor." *Voice and Speech Review* 13 (3): doi:10.1080/23268263.2019.1627745.

Oram, Darren. 2018. "Losing sight of the land: tales of dyslexia and dyspraxia in psychophysical actor training." *Voice and Speech Review* 9 (1): 53-67. doi:10.1080/19443927.2017.1415955.

Pawan, Faridah, Trena M. Paulus, Senom Yalcin, and Ching-Fen Chang. 2003. "Online Learning: Patterns of Engagement and Interaction among In-Service Teachers." *Language Learning & Technology* 7 (3): 119–40.

Phirangee, Krystle, Carrie Denmans Epp, and Jim Hewitt. 2016. "Exploring the Relationships between Facilitation Methods, Students' Sense of Community, and Their Online Behaviours." *Online Learning* 20 (2).

Pitches, J. 2014. "Physical Theatre: Exploring the Slap." https://www.futurelearn.com/courses/physical-theatre-exploring-the-slap

Preeshl, Artemis. 2014. "The virtual voice: teaching modalities in voice and speech in online and traditional learning environments." *Voice and Speech Review* 8 (2): 169-178. doi:10.1080/23268263.2014.906958.

Raygoza, Mary, Raina León, and Aaminah Norris. 2020. "Humanizing Online Teaching." http://works.bepress.com/mary-candace-raygoza/28/

Riha, Helena, Dikka Berven, Brian D. Joseph, and Don Winford. 2010. "Forums With Experts As A Way To Teach Sociolinguistics Online." *American Speech* 85 (2): 238-250. doi:10.1215/00031283-2010-013.

Sansom, Rockford. 2016. "The Unspoken Voice and Speech Debate [or] The Sacred Cow in the Conservatory." *Voice and Speech Review* 10 (3): 157-168. doi: 10.1080/23268263.2016.1318814

Slagter van Tryon, Patricia J., and M.J. Bishop. 2009. "Theoretical foundations for enhancing social connectedness in online learning environments." *Distance Education* 30 (3): 291-315. doi:10.1080/01587910903236312.

Sujo de Montes, L.E., Sally M. Oran and Elizabeth M. Willis. 2002. "Power, language, and identity: Voices from an online course." *Computer and Composition* 19 (3): 251-271. doi:10.1016/S8755-4615(02)00127-5.

Tanner, Kimberly D. 2013. "Structure Matters: Twenty-One Teaching Strategies to Promote Student Engagement and Cultivate Classroom Equity." *CBE—Life Sciences Education* no. 12: 322-331. doi:10.1187/cbe.13-06-0115.

Thurston, Allen. 2005. "Building Online Learning Communities." *Technology, Pedagogy and Education* 14 (3): 353-370. doi:10.1080/14759390500200211.

Tobin, T.J. and K. Behling. 2018. *Reach everyone, teach everyone: Universal design for learning in higher education.* Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press.

Vuuren, Petro Janse van, and Christian F. Freisleben. 2020. "How to catch a flying pig: facilitating embodiment work in online rooms." *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance* 25 (2): 268-285. doi:10.1080/13569783.2020.1730169.

Ward, Susan. 2016. "It's not the same thing: considering a path forward for teaching public speaking online." *Review of Communication* 16 (2-3): 222-235. doi:10.1080/15358593.2016.1187458.

Woods, Robert and Samuel Ebersole. 2003. "Using Non-Subject-Matter-Specific Discussion Boards to Build Connectedness in Online Learning." *The American Journal of Distance Education* 17 (2): 99-118. doi:10.1207/S15389286AJDE1702_3.

Notes

1 In this quotation, Darby and Lang quote Tobin and Behling (2018) on pages 1 and 130. See Tobin and Behling (2018) for the primary source.

2 Computer-Mediated Communication.

3 For further information on the primary source, see Garrison, Anderson, and Archer (2001, 11).

4 See Barthes (1985, 184) for the primary source.

5 The original quote was reformatted to include bullet points for clarity.

6 See Pawan et al. (2003) for the primary source.

7 The original quote was reformatted to include bullet points for clarity.

8 The original quote was reformatted to include bullet points for clarity.

9 For more information see Pitches (2014).

10 A curated list of online resources, VASTA Links, is a member benefit of Voice and Speech Trainers Association. It offers up to date online resources for Accents and Dialects, Anatomy, Audio Software, IPA Fonts and Input Helpers, Languages and Linguistics, Phonetics and Phonetic Notation, Pronunciation Guides, etc. Please see vasta.org for more information on the resources available to members.

11 I am affiliated with this organization and methodology, and I am a Certified Teacher of KTS.

12 See Sansom (2016) for a discussion of learning theories in voice pedagogy.

13 "In real life." IRL is a common abbreviation in online forums.