

**From Practice-based to Practice-led Research:  
Dapo Adelugba's Work on *Kiriji* and *Langbodo*  
as Inspiration**

Chris Dunton

*Department of English, National University of Lesotho, Lesotho*

---

Let me begin by outlining the structure of this paper. I start by trying to define practice-based and practice-led research, then move on to some critical observations from Pierre Bourdieu on standard research practice. Following that I turn to comments made by Dapo Adelugba on the principles that he maintains should inform theatre research and then I focus on his essays on producing *Kiriji* and *Langbodo* as exemplars of this (both of which essays contain within their titles the phrase 'The Concept of Theatre as Exploration' – a pointer to the concerns of this paper). Finally I make a tentative suggestion as to how the kind of research Adelugba addresses in his essays might be extended in the future. Thus, this somewhat meandering paper takes quite a while to reach its point.

Lelia Green has noted that 'practice-led research is notoriously difficult to define'. She goes on to suggest that this difficulty may be exacerbated in the case of research in the creative arts, because of the tendency of this field 'to celebrate the novel, the original, the unusual, and to subvert the expected'. Green's observation on the difficulties involved in definition is nicely supported by the following definition (from a website article titled 'Differences between Practice-based and Practice-led Research'), which seems to me somewhat unhelpful: 'If a creative artefact [such as a theatrical production] is the *basis* of the contribution to knowledge, the research is *practice-based*. If the research *leads* primarily to new understandings about practice, it is *practice-led*'. The problem being (unless I'm missing something here) that this definition seems to point to a distinction between research findings that are largely descriptive and those that are more analytical, and no more than this.

Lelia Green has the following to say about the kind of research that I would think of as being practice-led: 'The definition and process of [such] research implies a prolonged engagement with a specific research question, or a suite of inter-connected questions. Typically, the question might arise first and then the progress of the research project—and the art work—would be dictated thereafter by the refinement and exploration of the question and its related issues *through practice*' (my emphasis).

Research of this kind implies a close symbiotic relationship between the creators of an art work (such as a theatrical production) and researchers (it may indeed be that these individuals are one and the same). Such a symbiosis represents the kind of relationship Pierre Bourdieu (1977) advocates in his *Outline of a Theory of Practice*.

Richard Nice, Bourdieu's English translator, comments aptly on Bourdieu's concern with 'the *separation* which is the hidden condition of all academic activity' and he goes on to also point out Bourdieu's wish that this separation be 'grasped scientifically in the course of inquiry into the social functions of scholarship and the mechanisms of cultural and social reproduction.' (Bourdieu, vii) Bourdieu admits (and these are now his own words) that generally 'Science [let us specify, research] has a time which is not that of practice' (Bourdieu, 9: 'time', I take it, in the sense both of 'moment' and of 'time scale'. I shall come back to this when I return to the nature of practice-led research). Too often, however, even acknowledging this constraint, the researcher is 'an observer, excluded from the real play of social activities by the fact that he has no place in the system observed' (Bourdieu, 1).

Later in his study Bourdieu has this to say (and before the quotation I should indicate that when Bourdieu refers to 'anthropologists' here — and he himself began work as one such — he may be taken to be referring to any researcher in the human and social sciences; when he refers to the 'native world' he is referring to the world of production the researcher addresses, in his case that of farmers in Kabylia, Algeria): 'anthropologists often forget the distance between learned reconstruction of the native world and the native experience of that world, an experience which finds expression only in the silences, ellipses and lacunae of the language of familiarity' [as distinct from the far-from-silent and fully fleshed-out language of the researcher's report] (Bourdieu, 18).

Dapo Adelugba is a scholar whose thinking can be thought of as being suffused by the concerns raised by Bourdieu. During his monumental interview with Ademola Dasylva, Adelugba notes that when he began work as a lecturer there was 'a dearth of material in the African theatre sector' (Dasylva, 61). Hence — whatever his reservations about that book—his decision to translate Bakary Traoré's *Le Théâtre Nègro-Africain*.

(His reservations have to do with different levels of research practice: describing Traoré's work as lacking a thesis, he hints at a species of research that is largely descriptive and that lacks hypotheses and in-depth analysis; see Dasylyva, 61-3).

The interview begins with Adelugba partially contesting Dasylyva's suggestion that at the outset the pursuit of theatre as an academic practice in Nigeria was seen by colleagues and peers as a 'Yèyé' ('unserious') programme (Dasylyva, 37). Adelugba insists that 'profound absorption in theatre practice need not be seen as inimical to theatre scholarship' (Dasylyva, 42). Later in the interview he states: 'my focus area is theatre arts praxis. I embrace the indissoluble unity of theatre arts theory and practice' and, later again, with reference to Soyinka, 'I see the theatre critique as, in its own right, a creative work... I am stressing the *artist in the critic*' (Dasylyva 159).

I shall now turn to Adelugba's essays on *Kiriji* and *Langbodo* (the first of which he describes, somewhat mysteriously, as a review), discussing how these exemplify the principles he sets out in the Dasylyva interview.

The *Kiriji* paper appeared in print less than a year after Adelugba's December 1971 production of that play (if the date borne by the journal issue is reliable), suggesting a close relationship between the thinking-through of, and thinking about, that production.

The first four paragraphs of the essay focus on the conceptualisation of the production. Adelugba notes that in the script there are indications that its author, Wale Ogunyemi, had a proscenium staging in mind; Adelugba and his team opted, however, for thrust staging in an open space, the rationale for which choice is then explained (Adelugba 1971-2, 107). Adelugba goes on to refer to the epic qualities of the script, with its succession of short scenes and a certain lack of 'depth' in characterisation (a contentious point, *vide* discussions of the nature of Brecht's approach to characterisation). This suggested to Adelugba and his team that they should pursue a 'presentational' rather than 'representational' approach (Adelugba 1971-2, 107: terms that are explored in the Dasylyva interview; see Dasylyva 121).

The production opened up new areas of cooperation between the University of Ibadan's Department of Theatre Arts and its Institute of African Studies, staff from the latter being involved in the writing and early production stages. For the very first time, all students from the department took part in a single production, which also involved the Oluyole Theatre Group. This emphasis on maximising collaboration will be an important factor when it comes to advocating practice-led research. (Despite its foregrounding of the initiatives of various kinds and chiefs, *Kiriji* is a play that explores the strengths and pitfalls of collective

leadership during a period of profoundly damaging internecine conflict. *Kiriji* is, of course, a historical drama, the planning of which required Ogunyemi to undertake research [see Ogunyemi, 5] and to problematise the relationship between nineteenth-century history and the just concluded Civil War of 1967-70 [for a discussion of whether through this play 'the examples of yesterday can help illuminate today and tomorrow', see Olaniyan 1987]. One imagines that as Adelugba's team workshopped their production, this must have been a constant concern; the play-text generated from research becomes the subject of critical scrutiny and the distinction between creative work and critical inquiry becomes quite fluid).

'Our approach', records Adelugba, 'was to use the script of *Kiriji* as the basis for creative responses, to 'poke up into activity' the players' and production staff's minds and bodies. The very inadequacies of parts of the script [were] an additional stimulus'. (Adelugba 1971-2, 109)

What we have here, then, is an account of a number of aspects of the rationale behind a specific production (which the author of the essay headed), an account put together either during or very shortly after the production was staged. It has the virtues of intimacy (an 'inside job') and of immediacy. What it lacks is an external viewpoint and (beyond a point) contextualisation.

The slipperiness of definition once again acknowledged, the *Kiriji* essay strikes one as being more an example of practice-based than of practice-led research and that on *Langbodo* moves substantially further in the direction of the latter.

Here Adelugba sketches the history of the FESTAC commission behind the production he headed in 1977, focusing on the idea that it should be a 'national cooperative enterprise' (Adelugba 1986, 4), with its hundreds of participants involved as far as possible in multiple tasks, dissolving the conventional division of skills.

Consultative sessions were regularly held after rehearsals, during which sessions artistic and administrative issues were discussed. When Adelugba notes that 'some members of the troupe inevitably felt that this was either too democratic or too academic, or both', he is pointing to the extent to which the role of theatre practitioner and the role of researcher (the inquirer, the analyst, he or she who addresses data) coalesced through a highly organised, systematic model of collaborative work.

For the subsequent productions (1984 and '85) the actors kept diaries. That of Ayo Akinwale is quoted, as he explores and critiques various possible means of producing the guttural sounds his character needed to make. Here the actor problematises his own procedures with a high degree of self-reflexivity – and doubtless that is true of any responsible

actor, the difference here being that processes and findings are recorded in a diary that functions as an informal research report (Adelugba 1986, 8).

Adelugba, finally, sees the process of production as 'a ritual of national self-recognition for the performing/production troupe' (Adelugba 1986, 7) and for its various audiences, and—and here we are talking about one of the fundamental outcomes of practice-led research – as a practicum in which (at least for the more experienced members) the dramaturge, actor, critic and researcher are 'rolled into one personage' (Adelugba 1986, 7).

What Adelugba has clearly been working hard to avoid is what has been termed 'objectivism'. As Bourdieu points out, with objectivism 'a practical succession becomes a represented succession' (one might say 'merely a represented succession'). 'Objectivism constitutes the social world [for example, the micro-world of the theatrical production] as a spectacle presented to an observer who takes up a 'point of view' on the action, who *stands back* [my emphasis] so as to observe it.' But from the Marxist view (and Bourdieu is referring here to Marx's *Theses on Feuerbach*) 'the theory of practice as practice insists... that the objects of knowledge are *constructed*, and... that the principle of this construction is practical activity oriented towards practical functions.' For the researcher, accordingly, the challenge arises to situate oneself within 'real activity as such' (Bourdieu, 96).

I very much wish not to suggest that collaboration, the breakdown of the division of skills, self-reflexivity and accountability, are ideas strange to theatre practitioners, nor that researchers who study theatre would be amazed if they were ever asked to block a scene or to tread the boards.

On the contrary, even if this does not necessarily constitute extensive, hypothesis-based research, there is an extensive and impressive history of theatrical production being generated through reflection, inquiry and debate and in turn generating this (especially in cases where the process of theatrical production moves away from authoritarian approaches to the director's control).

There is, for example, the practice of diarising production. A fine example of this would be the book, *Woza Shakespeare!*, in which Antony Sher and Gregory Doran are seen to account for, puzzle out and critique the process of producing *Titus Andronicus* in South Africa, a book that is especially significant because it is so multi-faceted, addressing the rationale behind the project, the production conceptualisation, working procedures in rehearsals, and reception (with special reference to white South African audiences' extreme conservatism regarding what they expect from Shakespeare).

Workshop productions involve by their very nature a constant to-and-fro between production and its evaluation in which primary activity and inquiry can become close to indivisible. An example would be the processes that lay behind the production of Brecht's *Lehrstücke* (Learning Plays). Another, the kind of workshopping, evaluation and monitoring involved in Theatre for Development (TfD), especially in respect of its outcome within the community and perhaps especially when TfD takes the form of forum theatre (Adelugba speaks at length on the processes involved in evaluation and monitoring in the Dasylya interview and also on the documentation that informs this: workshop reports, how-to-do manuals and theoretical assessment; see Dasylya, 209-13).

Bearing initiatives of this kind in mind, this paper goes a step further in suggesting that Adelugba's work be taken as a stimulus for projects in practice-led research, with problem statements and hypotheses being tested and refined through production. A research question can, after all, be regarded as a problem: we construct research questions in order to problematise a situation we cannot read sufficiently clearly, in order — in one sense or another — to move forward. Practice-led research enables a tangible concretisation of that process, *experienced* by researchers and those involved in production (personnel who should preferably not be wholly categorisable into those two distinct groups).

Let us remind ourselves of two comments cited above, by Bourdieu and Green respectively. First, that '[research] has a time which is not that of practice' (Bourdieu, 9), to which insight we might now add the rejoinder 'it ain't necessarily so'. Second, that in practice-led research '[t]ypically, the question might arise first and then the progress of the research project — and the art-work — would be dictated thereafter by the refinement and exploration of the question and its related issues through practice' (Green). Let me very tentatively suggest one example of how such a process might be constructed.

In 1977, while rehearsals for the FESTAC production of *Langbodo* were under way, an alternative script was produced by a team comprising Biodun Jeyifo, Femi Osofisan and Seinde Arigbede. In his interview with Adelugba, Dasylya refers to this script as adopting a 'Marxist posture'; Adelugba recalls that he respected the script and adds 'I was in favour of Marxist works... and I still am.' The relationship between the working script and the alternative script was perhaps not sufficiently problematised at the time for reasons that are understandable (rehearsals had already begun).

What if a team could be put together to mount productions of both scripts, or perhaps two teams, one for each script. The team(s) would debate the relative values of each script, a process that would entail an

exploration of the possibilities of theatre, and especially the question to what extent theatre can do service to the radical perceptions of Marxism. Then let the productions be performed to separate audiences (each audience attending only one production or the other) and then for both productions to be performed before a third audience. Following this, for the production teams – constituting themselves both as theatre practitioners and as researchers – to discuss with the three audiences their responses to the productions they have attended, those theatre audiences that, as Nicholas Abercrombie and Brian Longhurst have pointed out, are more *attentive* than the audience for the mass media, '[concentrating] their energies, emotions and thoughts on the performance and [trying] to distil from that performance a meaning of one kind or another' (Abercrombie and Longhurst, 43).

In a process such as this the principle that Adelugba has so eloquently articulated – that of welding theatre practice and research together – might reach a further stage in fruition.

### Works cited

- Abercrombie, Nicholas and Brian Longhurst, 1998, *Audiences*, London: Sage Publications.
- Adelugba, Dapo. 1971-2. 'Kiriji': The Concept of Theatre as Exploration.' *African Notes*. 7: 1, 107-11
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986, 'Langbodo: The Concept of Theatre as Exploration.' *Nigeria Magazine*, 54: 2, 3-9.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977 (French original 1972). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dasylva, Ademola. 2003. *Dapo Adelugba on Theatre Practice in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Ibadan Cultural Studies Group.
- 'Differences between Practice-based and Practice-led Research', <http://www.creativityandcognition.com/content/view/124/131/>
- Green, Lelia. 'Practice-Led / Action Research' [http://www.pica.org.au/downloads/97/L\\_Green.pdf](http://www.pica.org.au/downloads/97/L_Green.pdf)
- Ogunyemi, Wale. 1989. 'Six Plays by Wale Ogunyemi: notes for the M.A. African Theatre class, University of Leeds.' School of English, Workshop Theatre, University of Leeds.

Olaniyan, Tejumola. 1987. 'History and the Dramatists: the Example of Wale Ogunyemi's *Kirijj*' in *Theatre Forum*. 1.

Sher, Antony and Gregory Doran, 1996, *Woza Shakespeare!: Titus Andronicus in South Africa*. London: Methuen.

### **Author's Note**

This paper was to have been presented at the Professor Dapo Adelugba International Conference on Contemporary Theatre and Literature, at the University of Lagos, Nov-Dec 2009. I am very grateful to Professor Duro Oni and Dr. Sola Adeyemi for making arrangements to facilitate my participation at this conference. In the event I was unable to attend, as the Nigerian High Commission in Pretoria (the nearest NHC to Lesotho, where I am based) was unable to issue a visa, having run out of stickers to insert in my passport. Professor Patrick Ebewo tried valiantly to resolve this issue, but to no avail. Surely in this sticker saga there is the germ of a satirical sketch? Meanwhile, my heartfelt thanks to all involved, if not to the High Commission.

## Issues and Development in Contemporary Nigerian Drama and Theatre Practice

Ahmed Yerima  
*Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria*

---

The development of theatre in any country takes a certain pattern. It is up to historians to falsify or report truthfully on the various threads that make up this pattern. The Nigerian theatre stands in a lucky position because it has the benefit of the written histories of other theatres. In this sense the political development stands in very close analogy to the theatrical. For Nigeria has had the benefit in politics of the established democracies of the world, and also of examining the ideologies of countries with political systems other than democratic. In evolving a national theatre we hope the same breath of perspective, which has been manifested on the political sphere, would be brought to bear on the artistic.

– Dapo Adelugba, 1964.

The quotation above is the total content of the ‘Abstract’ of the 1964 Master of Art in Theatre Arts thesis of the University of California, Los Angeles, titled *Nationalism and the Awakening National Theatre of Nigeria*, of Adedapo Abayomi Olorunfemi Adelugba. In his abstract, Adelugba sets the tone for the theatre he desired in 1964 and still dreams for Nigeria today. The type that, because of its closeness to other theatre practices all over the world, will be relevant to its immediate audience; be ideologically meaningful to those who would practice it and those who would watch it; and finally, a theatre that would document the history of his people, while at the same time pointing towards a better socio-political alternative for his people’s future. Adelugba has adopted this philosophy to motivate him in his teaching, ministering, inspiring, leading, and mentoring students throughout his career.

The questions that form the thematic preoccupation of this paper are: how well have Nigerian dramatists and theatre practitioners measured up to this vision/philosophy? How can one measure the stages of development of contemporary Nigerian theatre? Where do we fuse the line between theatre and the political reality of a developing country? Have we failed in our attempts at creating a theatre practice that will survive generations to come, or have we lost the focus of our theatre history, and the theatrical traditions and the performative, theoretical and practical achievements which the early practitioners, writers and scholars such as Hubert Ogunde, Duro Ladipo, Kola Ogunmola, James Ene-Henshaw, J. P. Clark-Bekederemo, Wole Soyinka, Oyin Ogunba, Joel Adedeji, Ola Rotimi, Wale Ogunyemi, Bayo Oduneye, Tunji Oyelana, and Dapo Adelugba handed down to us?

Nigeria is the largest post-colonial country in West Africa. It has through the accident of history, size and number found itself adorned with the vestige of leadership in both the historical, political and economic spheres of the lives of the African peoples. Yet the historical reality of Nigeria is often shaded with the abuse of the opportunity which fate presents her to be the leader of Africa. Sometimes, it too grapples with the loss of ideological perception such as which characters should inhabit our literature and what they should say. Why they should say it and what the resultant effect of what they say to the Nigerian society continue to task the minds of writers and the reading public.

Before embarking on the argument of this paper, one must examine the relationship between theatre and politics, because Adelugba hinged the future of the development of Nigerian theatre on the political development in Nigeria. Adelugba, in the earlier quotation, states that:

The Nigerian theatre stands in a lucky position because it has the benefit of the written histories of other theatres. In this sense the political development stands in very close analogy to the theatrical.

The closeness in the analogy between theatre and society which Adelugba mentions, allows and endows theatre with the functions of mirroring society's actions while critically examining the challenges of existence and co-existence, and while also purging, and suggesting a better alternative or resolution to the problems of society. In contemporary terms, the relationship which theatre has with politics steps slightly beyond being in 'close analogy'; it has moved to becoming a relationship of interdependency. Politics and the people who live it remain the providers of materials for drama and theatre to feed on. Drama selects content from the materials provided and fuses it with the story, the characters, the language, the

symbols and the images, and finally, theatre practice turns the story into action, into movement, into a reflection... into visual art in transient movement.

'Event in Literature is experienced according to the scale of its treatment' (Soyinka 2005: 43), the scale upon which a society's truthfulness and readiness is set to confront and resolve its social developmental problems, so that it can become a peaceful, fruitful and prosperous society. The perfection of the creator of literature in the treatment of a societal event is how well the subject matter is presented so that members of the society do not see it as an abstract work, but instead find the thematic message of the work of art relevant to their collective reality. This is why in contemporary society, the art it gives birth to could not be for art's sake, it must speak to society while at the same time point to an alternative solution to society's problem.

Apart from the relationship theatre has with the politics of the period, Adelugba believes that a good polity must grow along with its art. Femi Osofisan (2001: 110) believes that the relationship between art and politics in contemporary times must go beyond this when he states that:

Drama in particular, no doubt because it is the most social of the arts, provides the site in which this inherent menace is most strident. In whatever country in black Africa that you open the curtain, you will find that in the absence of genuine democracy, the life of drama is lived on the edge of the cliff... The stark reality impresses itself upon us; all dramatists with a conscience know that when they play, they play dangerously.

'They play dangerously' because it is often difficult for society or even an individual within society to face the critical analysis theatre presents. This is why it is important to note that the criticism theatre makes of society is sometimes too bitter for society to accept, yet it is important that they co-exist in order to stabilize society against its own excesses, and in order for drama and theatre to grow. Adelugba's observation of theatre and politics being in close analogy, especially for a developing country like Nigeria, therefore is correct. Man is paired with culture, for culture is the totality of his life. Politics is the art of man finding a suitable way to inter-relate or co-exist with other peoples and their cultures. And theatre is the arbiter of reflection, correction, and presentation of alternative ways towards solving issues and problems that will emerge during the period of societal cohesion.

One major point to note is that contemporary Nigeria since 1964 has outgrown the country that Adelugba refers to in the opening quotation; it

has gone through the process of historical development. It has had a civil war; it has had several years of military rule; it has passed through a cultural hegemonic process of cultural fusion and interacted with other cultural consciousness of the world. The performance culture has moved from the traditional story-telling practices to professional dramatic performances. It has moved from pre-colonial and nationalist experiences, from the original traditional serious, sacred concepts and practices of ritual and social entertainment forms to postcolonial thoughts of dramatic and creative processes. Nigeria has since lost its age of innocence; indeed, the country has become a mature country, constantly demanding its own form and type of politics and more importantly its own type of drama and theatre practice.

Because of changes in socio-economic and political development, new demands have been made on the type of drama and theatrical practices that must emerge to satisfy contemporary audience. The demand goes beyond the basic functions of the theatre, which are to entertain, educate and inform; it goes beyond a representation of a particular culture and political history; beyond even chants, poetry, acrobatic displays, dances and songs and all such creative embellishments which often raise the aesthetic level of performances. It has given drama and theatre a more critical stance towards confronting contemporary challenges of existence and humanity.

This is why the first major challenge for drama and theatre development in Nigeria is its dramaturgy; this has to do with the functionality, the composition and structure of plays in performances. This also refers to the type of old and new theatre writing and performances that exist. Historically, despite the very important early efforts of James Ene-Henshaw, J.P. Clark-Bekederemo, Browson Dede, Frank Aig Imoukuede, Mac Akpoyoware, Demas Nwoko and Yetunde Esan, it was the introduction from England of the two plays of Wole Soyinka, *The Swamp Dwellers* and *The Lion and the Jewel* in 1959, that served as the catalyst for the emergence of serious dramatic works in the English language in Nigeria. These plays and the ones that were to follow started to confront the people and the politics of the society that was giving birth to it. They started to recreate the characters that inhabit our physical reality; to question the social reality of our cultural environment, the issue of power and greed, the domestic issues of ethnicity, cultural diversity and survival became the dominating themes. The playwrights started to recognize the ethos of the ancestral gods, erstwhile used just as character-links in traditional stories and playmaking into figures of humanity within the very contradictions of our modern reality. The second generation playwrights – including Wale Ogunyemi, Ola Rotimi, Zulu Sofola, Bode

Sowande, Kole Omotoso, Femi Osofisan, Olu Obafemi, Tunde Fatunde – had to feel the new anger and fire which forced them to tell their stories with an analytical zest propelled by an inner drive to be relevant to their immediate society.

Irrespective of Nigeria's adaptations to Eurocentric priorities, influences and dominant culture, new and contemporary demands on Nigerian drama continue to force the playwrights to go beyond ancestral memory, from individual messages, communal issues of ethnic reaffirmation, to assessment of Nigeria within the new global reality and the domestic issues of existence and humanity. Because of this demand on contemporary playwrights, there have also been shifts in the structure and themes of new plays. Secular and sacred mythologies now question new symbols and drama and theatre dislocate old beliefs and fixations which hinder societal development. It must be noted that experience is not monolithic, but must take its roots in the cultural diversity of the Nigerian nation and weave it into a collective consciousness that strives binding of the people's consciousness. It is important to note that dramaturgy is an integral part of the development of a people's drama and theatre; it grows with the consciousness of a people, while taking into cognizance, developments in other countries and societies. So in the case of Nigeria, we see the development of a people from traditional entertainment forms, to the Greek theatre which we meet in the works of J. P. Clark-Bekeredemo and Ola Rotimi, from Shakespeare to Brecht's epic theatre and its influences in the works of Soyinka and Osofisan. It must be noted that contemporary theatre is hybrid, because it draws influences from different schools of thought to constantly shift 'between the dramatic, the epic and the lyric, the high and the low, tragic and comic, theatrical and extra-theatrical a dynamic montage' (Turner & Behrmdt 2008:190). It is important to pay special attention to the dramaturgy of a developing theatre experience because the theatrical works that emerge are brought closer in meaning to the audience. The playwrights themselves are able to find the type of style and structure, even to the use of modern technologies in the process of play writing.

Other challenges include the belief and negative attitude to drama and theatre practitioners by the society that the bohemian attitude of most actors and theatre practitioners was a sign that the profession was not a good one and children and youths should not be encouraged to go into it. This has led to the dearth in the number of practitioners and also hindered the development of theatre in Nigeria. Although over twenty universities offer drama and theatre courses at degree level, most of theatre arts graduates go into other professions like law and banking.

Another challenge is training. At the secondary school level, theatre and drama are not included in the curriculum for Ordinary and Advanced level qualifications in Nigeria. There is also no government funding for the performing arts or to maintain existing infrastructure. There are also inadequate forums such as seminars, conferences, workshops, residences, internships, festivals and networking amongst drama and theatre professionals and practitioners. This has also led to the shortage of fresh research, experiments, writings and scholarly publications on drama and theatre studies.

No legal framework was given for the implementation of the 1988 Cultural Policy for Arts, and no proper implementation statute was set for the National Endowment for the Arts. These two aspects of government policies would have helped to assist the development of drama and theatre in contemporary Nigeria. This has also led to the lull in local and international collaborations and exchanges in training. The non-articulation of Nigerian policy towards the arts has also contributed to the way sponsors such as multi-nationals and banks in the private sector view the arts.

But the greatest challenge in the development of drama and theatre is in the preference for trans-national media, electronic media and the internet over live theatre practice. Nollywood, which is the product of new technology to Nigeria entertainment practice, is the major concern here. The glamour, money, fame, and the short time within which trained and untrained actors become successful lure theatre practitioners from the stage; the ease and security through which audiences can sit in the comfort of their homes lures the society from the theatres. Contemporary Nigerian society is not as safe as the society of 1964. Amidst instances of armed robberies, car-jacking, pick pockets and even police harassment, live theatre has lost most of its audience.

We also need to define a new role for the National Theatre and National Troupe of Nigeria in the development of drama and theatre practice in Nigeria. The National Theatre is an architectural masterpiece copied and shaped like a horse's saddle from Bulgaria in 1975 by the Federal military government, for Nigeria's hosting of the Second World Black and African Festival of Black Arts and Civilization (FESTAC '77). Auditions for the Nigerian troupe that would represent Nigeria at the 1977 festival and also honour numerous invitations to Nigeria to attend other festivals all over the world led to the decision to form a cultural troupe of dancers, actors, musicians from the whole country which will celebrate the rich cultural heritage of Nigeria, and also show-case the unity in our cultural diversity through representative dances from the different ethnic groups of Nigeria. The major problem has been that most

scholars see the National Theatre as a place that should evolve a national culture for a culturally diversified country like Nigeria. Adelugba sees both the National theatre and the National culture playing complementary roles. In a recent interview, he says that, 'the theatre and the culture, should see each other as partners. The theatre is going to be based on an understanding of and a profound response to the national culture' (Dasylva 2003: 67). But the more disconcerting issue is that practitioners see the National theatre as their 'home' – the place for art, and should be part of the programming and administrative considerations, but government sees it differently. Both the National Theatre and the National Troupe are organs of government set up by decree 47 of 1991 to carry out the objectives of government and conform to the rules of government. Consequently, there is bound to be friction between the owners and those who feel the organs were set up for them. The relationship has to be properly streamlined in order to allow the National Theatre and the National Troupe to contribute more to the growth and development of drama and theatre practice in Nigeria. Perhaps there is a need for the artistes to look beyond these two government agencies, and set up private troupes, and build private theatre halls, which will provide avenues for more development.

It is right then to make suggestions and recommendations for the further development of drama and theatre practice in Nigeria: Nigeria should have a focused and stable polity which will provide appropriate government policies, infrastructure, and institutions for drama and theatre development. And the dramaturgy must appeal to the commonality and communality of emotions, feelings, and realisation of the shared values and interests of the peoples of a country even when they live in a culturally diversified society like Nigeria. Additionally, theatre should be allowed to diversify in form and in practice. It should also take development trends all over the world into consideration in order to be in tune with global developments. This will increase the interest of the audience, and increase audience attendance. Furthermore, the private sector should be encouraged by both government and theatre practitioners to invest in the arts and professional theatre bodies should intervene to regulate, profile, and offer continuing training and advocacy in the industry. Finally, Drama and Theatre curriculum should be improved upon to provide educational focus for proper professional training.

In conclusion, the pattern of development of theatre of Nigeria and the *knitting threads*, which have evolved into what is referred to as Nigerian theatre continues to grow, and must adjust generation to generation as society demands. And despite the challenges of development ahead, it is comforting to note that theatres all over the world have gone through

these stages of development. Nigerian theatre practitioners can therefore be said to be on the right path.

## **References**

- Adedeji, Adeyinka. 1980. *The Theatre in an African University: Appearances and Reality*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Adedeji, Joel A and Hyginus Ekwuazi, 1998, *Nigerian Theatre: Dynamics of a Movement*. Ibadan: Caltop Publications Nig. Ltd.
- Adelugba, Dapo. 1964. 'Nationalism and the Awakening National Theatre in Nigeria' M.A thesis for the University of California. Los Angeles.
- Adolphe, Jean-Marc, 1998, 'Dramaturg of Movement: A Plea for a Dramaturgy of Perception', *Ballet International*, No. 6, 27-29.
- Amali, Samson. 1985. *Ancient Nigeria Drama*. Verlag: Stuttgart, Franz Steiner.
- Bhabha, Homi. 2002. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge
- Borecca, Art. 1993. 'Political Dramaturgy. A Dramaturg's Review', in *The Drama Review*, Vol. 37, 56-79
- Dasylva, Ademola. 2003. *Dapo Adelugba on Theatre Practice in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Ibadan Cultural Studies Group.
- Dugga, Victor. 2002. *Creolisations in Nigerian Theatre*. Bayreuth: Bayreuth African Studies 61.
- Gbilekaa, Saint. 1997. *Radical Theatre in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Caltop Publicatiopns Nig. Ltd.
- Harrison, Carter Paul, Leo Victor Walker and Gus Edwards (eds). 2002. *Black Theatre: Ritual Performance in the Diaspora*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jeyifo, Biodun (ed). 2001. *Modern African Drama*. New York: Norton & Company.
- Malomo, Jide and Saint Gbilekaa, 1993 *Theatre and Politics in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Caltop Publications Nig. Ltd.

Ahmed Yerima/APR Vol. 5, No. 1 (2011), pp. 36-44

Obafemi, Olu. 1996. *Contemporary Nigeria Theatre: Cultural Heritage and Social Vision*. Lagos: CBAAC.

Obafemi, Olu and Ahmed Yerima, 2004, *Ideology and Stage-Craft*, Lagos: Bookplus Nigeria Ltd.

Ogunbiyi, Yemi (ed). 1981. *Drama and Theatre in Nigeria: A Critical Sourcebook*. Lagos: Nigeria Magazine.

Rotimi, Ola (ed). 2001. *Issues in African Theatre*. Ibadan: Humanities Publishers.

Oni, Duro and Ahmed Yerima, 2008, *Trends in the Theory & Practice of Theatre in Nigeria*, Lagos: Society of Nigerian Theatre Artistes (SONTA)

Osofisan, Femi. 2001. *Literature and the Pressures of Freedom*. Ibadan: Opon Ifa Readers.

Ogunba, Oyin and Abiola Irele, 1978, *Theatre in Africa*, Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Sarrazac, Jean-Pierre, 1998, *L'Avenir du Drame*, Belfort: Circe

Soyinka, Wole. 2005. *Myth, Literature and the African World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Traore, Bakary (trans. Dapo Adelugba). 1972. *The Black African Theatre and its Social Functions*. Ibadan: University Press.

Turner, Cathy and Synne Behrndt, 2008, *Dramaturgy and Performance*, Palgrave: Macmillan.

Yerima, Ahmed. 2005. *Modern Nigerian Theatre: The Geoffrey Axworthy Years, 1956-1967*. Ibadan: Kraft Books.

Yerima, Ahmed and Ayo Akinwale (eds). 2002. *Theatre and Democracy in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Kraft Books.