WHOSE CLASSROOM IS IT ANYWAY?
IMPROVISATION AS A TEACHING TOOL

Ronald A. Berk
The Johns Hopkins University

Rosalind H. Trieber
Towson University

Whose Classroom Is It Anyway? Improvisation as a Teaching Tool

Abstract

Improvisational techniques derived from the experiences in improvisational theatre can be adapted for the college classroom to leverage the characteristics of the Net Generation, their multiple intelligences and learning styles, and the variety of collaborative learning activities already in place in a learner-centered environment. When improvisation is reformatted as small-group collaborative learning exercises, it can be a powerful teaching tool to promote deep learning. The key features of improvisation are described along with four generic, easy to execute exercises applied to real course content: (1) "One Word at a Time/One Sentence at a Time," (2) "Speech Tag," (3) "Freeze Tag," and (4) "Gibberish/Gibberish Expert Interview." An evaluation scale to measure the effectiveness of classroom applications is also included.

Whose Classroom Is It Anyway? Improvisation as a Teaching Tool

Introduction

"Are you kidding me? I'm no Wayne Brady! I can't do improvisation." Want to bet? Yes, you can! You improvise all of the time. You just may not be aware of it, but that's not the point. This article is not about you. Your students can do improvisation with your guidance and learn a lot from the activities you plan. After all, let's not lose sight of what's most important: *Effective teaching is all about the students, it's not about us*.

Traditional theatre uses a script to guide everything, from the sets, props, and costumes to the choice of actors for the various roles. The director controls the entire production with no input from the audience. This is strikingly similar to traditional instructor-centered college teaching, which is driven by the scripted lecture or PowerPoint® presentation and completely controlled by the instructor with little or no discussion involving the whole class. This model of teaching focuses primarily on the instructor.

In contrast, improvisational theatre has no script, sets, or costumes, possibly a few props, the actors play a variety of roles, and the audience participates by deciding the topic or story line. When improvisation is reformatted into small-group collaborative learning activities in a learner-centered environment, it can be a powerful teaching tool. Research evidence demonstrates that it can promote spontaneity, intuition, interactivity, inductive discovery, attentive listening, nonverbal communication, ad-libbing, role-playing, risk-taking, team building, creativity, and critical thinking (Crossan, 1998; Moshavi, 2001; Sawyer, 2004; Spolin, 1999). These features are all about the students.

"Improv is making the most of what you have and getting the most out of what you make" (Keefe, 2002, p. 6). Improvisation has been defined as intuition guiding action in a spontaneous way (Crossan & Sorrenti, 1997). It is a conversational skill that, like other social and interactive skills, can be taught. When improvisation is used in teaching, students provide different answers throughout the discussion and the instructor does not evaluate any given answer, but instead facilitates the improvisation among the students, with the goal of guiding them toward discovery of their own knowledge (Sawyer, 2003). Everyone gets to express themselves creatively, to play together, to have their ideas honored, and to have their mistakes forgiven (Koppett, 2001).

Improvisational techniques, sometimes referred to as activities, exercises, or games, are tools that can be added to any existing set of teaching strategies. It can increase students' awareness of problems and ideas fundamental to their intellectual development. Disciplined improvisation provides instructors with a way to conceptualize creative teaching within curricular structures (Sawyer, 2004).

"Is this for real?" Absolutely! Improvisation has already penetrated academe. One case example is The Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, which has been offering a course and intensive workshops on business/managerial improvisation for MBA students for several years. They were developed in 1999 by adjunct professor Robert Kulhan along with then-professor Craig Fox (now at UCLA). The course is designed to improve students' abilities to:

- build trust,
- foster teamwork and better brainstorming,
- improve communication and presentation skills,

- promote creative problem solving,

- respond quickly and decisively to unanticipated challenges,

- think on their feet and recognize opportunities as they arise,

- increase comfort with change and willingness to take risks, and

- manage change and promote a supportive, improvisational corporate culture.

In the world of business, the cliché metaphor of "swimming with the sharks" represents the need to learn how to adapt, adjust, listen, observe, agree, support, trust, and think fast. All of these skills are essential to manage a profitable business. The inclusion of improvisation as a teaching strategy provides an excellent opportunity to teach students these necessary skills, as they increase in their abilities to achieve academic and professional success. Instructors willing to use an innovative teaching strategy such as improvisation will stimulate emotions, attract attention, create meaning, and have lasting memories of lessons learned (Wildorf, 2000).

Before we go any further, a brief explanation of the basic principles of improvisation will be presented, after which the following will be given: (1) a list of four reasons why you should consider improvisation as a teaching strategy in your classroom, (2) how improvisation can be applied to teaching, and (3) step-by-step descriptions of four improvisational techniques with content from a mental health and stress management course.

Principles of Improvisation

The principles of improvisation consist of the following:

(1) *Trust.* In order for a group to be successful and productive, the members of the group, referred to as "players," must to be able to trust one another.

(2) *Acceptance.* This is the "Golden Rule" of improvisation (Gesell, 1997). Players must be willing to accept a new idea in order to explore its possibilities; not just saying "yes," but having an attitude of "yes, and…," meaning I accept the offer (i.e., idea, words, or movement) and must build on it. In other words, say yes, accept the offer, build on it, contribute, and discover new ideas. A person must make an offer of his or her own in response to a partner. It is this process that harnesses the power of collaboration. Each team member is responsible for contributing to and supporting the group's activity. The brainstorming that occurs can lead to innovative solutions (Koppett, 2001).

(3) *Attentive listening.* Players must be aware of the partners with whom they are co-creating in order to increase their understanding of each other and to be able to communicate effectively.

(4) *Spontaneity*. Players co-create *in the moment*, without the opportunity to revise. Each player is motivated by a positive purpose and desire to delight. Spontaneity allows players to initiate words and actions, building trust with the other players (Keefe, 2002). Players must suspend any critical judgment or spirit about what others say.

(5) *Storytelling*. Players develop the ability to create a collaborative narrative which connects their dialogue through a story. This process often results in memorable content.

(6) *Nonverbal communication.* Players use facial expressions and body language to help communicate attitude, character, and trustworthiness.

(7) *Warm-ups.* Warm-ups are structures that provide an opportunity to develop trust and safe environments, where the players can feel free to explore through "contentless" games and structures. It is similar to bantering with students to develop rapport. Warm-up activities focus on transitioning individuals into an improvisational mode to allow them to:

- improvise verbally and physically;

- be spontaneous;

- "listen" carefully to one another; and use a sense of humor (adapted from Koppett, 2001, p. 32)

Why Use Improvisation in the Classroom?

Improvisational performance is typically viewed as an alternative to scripted theatre, but over time it has also taken on a variety of creative genres, including storytelling, pantomime, music, poetry, and comedy (Atkins, 1993; Book, 2002; Diggles, 2004; Gwinn & Halpern, 2003; Lynn, 2004; Polsky, 1997; Spolin, 1999). However, the application of the numerous improvisational exercises and games developed over the past 30 years has extended far beyond the formal theatre setting to management and business training (Bergren, Cox, & Detmar, 2002; Crossan, 1998; Crossan & Sorrenti, 1997;

Keefe, 2002; Koppett, 2001; Leigh, 2004; Lowe, 2000; Moshavi, 2001) and everyday real-life challenges (Madson, 2005). A wide range of theatrical techniques and, most recently, improvisation, are also not new to teaching and they have been shown to be extremely effective in the live classroom (Berk, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2005; Diamond & Christensen, 2005; James & Williams, 1981; Millbower, 2003; Newton, 1998; Patterson, McKenna-Cook, & Swick, 2006; Spolin, 1986; Timpson, Burgoyne, Jones, & Jones, 1997).

Within that context, why should improvisation be considered as a potential teaching tool? There are four major instructional reasons: (1) it is *consistent with the Net Generation's characteristics*, especially their desire to learn by inductive discovery, experientially, their need for social interaction and collaboration, their emotional openness, and their limited attention span; (2) it *taps into students' multiple and emotional intelligences*, particularly verbal/linguistic, visual/spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal; (3) it *fosters collaborative learning* by helping to build trust, respect, and team spirit as well as listening, verbal and nonverbal communication, ad-libbing, role-playing, risk-taking, and storytelling skills; and (4) it *promotes deep learning* through the active engagement with new ideas, concepts, or problems; linking the activities or tasks to prior learning; applying the content to real-life applications; and evaluating the logic and evidence presented. A further explanation of each of these reasons follows.

Consistent with Net Generation's Characteristics

This generation of students grew up with the technology. They have been branded as "digital natives" (Prensky, 2006). "Digital" is their native language. They are

"native speakers" of the language of computers, video games, and the Internet. As you observe these students, you will notice wires coming out of every part of their body. Attached to those wires are MP3 players, iPods, iPhones or smart phones, PCs, and all the other tools of the digital age (Berk, 2008). Their experience with the technology has enabled them to master complex tasks and make decisions rapidly (Prensky, 2006). Classroom exercises need to extend these capabilities they already possess.

In contrast to these digital natives, instructors are referred to as *digital immigrants*. Many of us still have one foot in the past and "digital" is our second language, as we continue to learn and sometimes struggle with it on the fly. For example, immigrants may still print out an e-mail, print a document to edit it, or phone someone to see if he or she received their e-mail. Do you know any colleagues like that?

The *Net Geners* have certain characteristics that are consistent with the use of improvisation as a teaching tool. This *Net Generation* (Carlson, 2005; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2006a) (aka Millennials [Howe & Strauss, 2000], born between 1982 and 1994), possesses the following attributes:

1. *Learn by inductive discovery*, participating, by doing rather than being told what to do, experiential, hands-on, engaged, constantly connected with first-person learning, games, simulations, and role playing (Oblinger & Oblinger, 2006b; Tapscott, 1998); what Jenkins (2006) calls a *participatory culture*; they are not spectators;

2. *Intuitive visual communicators*, visually literate, comfortable in an image-rich rather than text-only environment, able to weave together images,

text, and sound easily, move between the real and the virtual instantaneously (Frand, 2000; Manuel, 2002);

3. *Crave social face-to face interaction* and gravitate toward activities that promote and reinforce conversation, collaboration, and teamwork (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Manuel, 2002; Ramaley & Zia, 2006; Windham, 2005);

4. *Emotionally open* to express their feelings, meet new people, and experience different cultures; openness to diversity, differences, and sharing personal information with others, whether online or in class (Lenhart, Rainie, & Lewis, 2001; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2006b);

5. *Respond quickly and expect rapid responses in return*, multitask, moving quickly from one activity or medium to another, such as using instant messaging (IM), the cell or smart phone or iPhone, and e-mail all at once, while surfing the Web and watching TV (Prensky, 2006; Roberts, 2006); and

6. *Shift attention rapidly from one task to another*, extremely short attention span, thrive on immediate gratification, accustomed to the twitch-speed, multitasking, random access, graphics-first, active, connected, fun, fantasy, quick pay-off world of video games, MTV, and Internet (Foreman, 2003; Prensky, 2006).

In summary, the most up-to-date surveys of the *Net Geners* indicate they are technology savvy and function at "twitch" speed thanks to their video game and MTV experiences. In school, they have the attention span of goat cheese, which is *their* choice; they can play video games for hours because of their strong interest in those games. They

want interactivity in the classroom with their peers, the instructor, tools, and concepts. Team experiences such as improvisation provide these students with the active, participatory, visual, collaborative, fast moving, quick thinking, rapid responding, emotionally freeing, spontaneous, combustible vehicle they so badly desire. As a teaching tool, improvisation is a natural fit for these students. The learning environment must be active, collaborative, social, and learner-centered for these students. Anything less, they will consider borrrrrrring.

Taps into Students' Multiple and Emotional Intelligences

Students possess 8.5 intelligences and each student has a unique intelligence profile (Gardner, 1983, 1993, 1999, 2005; Gardner & Hatch, 1989; Marks-Tarlow, 1995; White, 1998; Williams, Blythe, White, Li, Sternberg, & Gardner, 1996). Traditionally, the content faculty teach is usually verbal or quantitative in form. Most often instructors teach English literature verbally and statistics, quantitatively. That's natural and, perhaps, the easiest for the instructor. However, learning that content isn't as easy. Every student has strengths and weaknesses, and, for example, if Jerome isn't strong in quantitative ability, he will struggle in his statistics courses.

Fortunately, Jerome has other abilities or intelligences according to the latest research in cognitive psychology, up to 8.5 intelligences. In addition to the aforementioned verbal/linguistic and quantitative/analytical intelligences, he also possesses visual/spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, musical/rhythmic, interpersonal and intrapersonal (equivalent to Goleman's [1998] emotional intelligences), naturalistic, and environmental (.5) intelligences. Jerome's strengths may lie in visual/spatial and musical/rhythmic. Just imagine: If we could teach by drawing on these intelligences

AND quantitative ability, how much more effective we could be? In fact, if instructors could adopt this "pluralistic view of the mind" and teach so that four to six intelligences are tapped, probably every student could learn the material on most topics without struggling. Such strategies *build on students' strengths rather than their weaknesses*. Those strengths are translated into their learning styles (Conner & Hodgins, 2000; Felder & Soloman, 2000; Honey & Mumford, 1992; Kolb, 2005; Rose, 1985; Schroeder, 1997) with nearly a dozen different models suggested for higher education (Robotham, 1999).

Learning through improvisation can accomplish that goal. It requires active discovery, analysis, interpretation, problem-solving, memory, musical creation, physical activity, and emotions of self and others (Spolin, 1986). That covers six intelligences. Students learn best when they are engaged, thinking critically, solving problems, have choices to consider, and are making decisions (Matthews, 1996). Designing activities that systematically consider students' multiple intelligences and their different learning styles is essential for effective teaching of ALL students.

Fosters Collaborative Learning

With all that we know about *collaborative* learning (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2005; Dillenbourg, 1999a; Kaplan, 2002) and its super-structured counterpart, *cooperative* learning (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991, Kagan, 1992; Millis & Cottell, 1998), where does improvisation fit? Both collaborative and cooperative learning are instructional approaches in which groups of learners work together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product. They share the same philosophical framework with the following underpinnings: (1) learning is a naturally occurring social act and active and constructive process, (2) there must be respect for all students and their diversity of

backgrounds, intelligences, learning styles, experiences, and aspirations, and (3) the potential exists for all students to achieve academic success.

Johnson et al's. (1991) five elements characterize both collaborative and cooperative learning: (1) *positive interdependence;* (2) *individual accountability*; (3*) face-to-face interaction*; (4) *appropriate use of collaborative skills;* and (5) *group processing*. These elements intersect with most of the basic principles of improvisation listed previously.

Instructionally then, how do collaborative, cooperative, and improvisation learning differ? An analysis of the activities and exercises that fall into these three categories of learning strongly suggest that the differentiating factors are *structure* and *control.* Cooperative activities are structured and controlled by the instructor to accomplish a specific outcome. Collaborative activities vary in structure and control by degree from less-structured, consensus building, sharing of responsibility by the group's members to a highly-structured, cooperative system designed to create a product (Dillenbourg, 1999b; Panitz, 1996; Smith & McGregor, 1992). The selection, size, composition, task, and interaction of the group may vary considerably in any given application (Dillenbourg, 1999b; Roschelle & Teasley, 1995).

If you could visualize a continuum with cooperative learning at one extreme and improvisation at the other, as shown below, that continuum would represent the potential range of structure and control in a myriad of combinations in collaborative learning activities. Improvisation has the least structure and cooperative learning the most.

IMPROVISATION_____COOPERATIVE

LEARNING

The entire continuum contains fundamentally all possible and potential forms of collaborative learning. Improvisation involves unscripted, spontaneous, intuitive, interactive small-group exercises; cooperative learning is the instructor-scripted, meticulously planned small-group counterpart.

The trick is to determine how to get the maximum learning benefit from each as they are applied in the classroom. The benefits of the numerous cooperative learning exercises have been well documented (Felder & Brent, 2001; Goodsell, Maher, Tinto, Smith, & McGregor, 1992; Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1991; Kagan, 1992; Millis, 2002; Millis & Cottell, 1998; Springer, Stanne, & Donovan, 1999). At the other extreme end of the continuum is the less-structured spontaneity of improvisational activities, which may be more palatable introductory collaborative learning exercises for *Net Geners* than the more structured, formal cooperative learning methods. They can serve as the warm-up or segue to cooperative learning exercises.

In contrast to a cooperative learning exercise, when an improvisational approach is used in the classroom, the class facilitates the discussion and synthesizes the information. It is a process for exploring collaboration and cooperation at its most fundamental level, the co-creation of ideas, rather than an instructor-directed or scripted group activity. There is no concept of right or wrong answers, and actions and solutions are left to the students' judgments (Moshavi, 2001).

In fact, Barkley et al. (2005) describe many collaborative learning techniques that incorporate principles of improvisation, such as the *Three-Step Interview,* in which student pairs take turns interviewing each other and then report to another pair. The topic can be in the form of questions, attitudes, values, or comprehension of course content.

The interviewers must listen very carefully and pay attention to the interviewee's responses, and are not to impose their opinions or objections. The interviewee is the center of attention and is encouraged to elaborate on his or her thoughts regarding the topic. This exchange is not a discussion and, therefore, requires a personal level of commitment from interviewer and interviewee. The interviewers must understand and incorporate the information gathered from their interviewees' responses at a level deep enough to be able to summarize and synthesize the responses intuitively and effectively for other students. Partners then reverse roles and continue the process. This activity follows the basic principles of improvisation described previously. It is a technique for improving specific communication skills as well as "thinking on your feet," with or without criteria.

Promotes Deep Learning

All of the characteristics and outcomes of improvisational activities previously described and their relationships to collaborative and cooperative learning techniques strongly indicate that improvisation can promote deep learning (Campbell, 1998; Entwistle, 2004). More than 30 years of experience and previous research with improvisational exercises, particularly in the business and management training domain (e.g., Crossan, Cunha, Vera, & Cunha, 2005; Cunha, Cunha, & Kamoche, 1999, 2001; Kamoche, Cunha, & Cunha, 2002; Minor, Bassoff, & Moorman, 2001; Moorman & Minor, 1998; Vera & Crossan, 2004), demonstrate how they satisfy Rhem's (1995) four criteria for deep learning: (1) *motivational context*, the intrinsic desire to know, make choices, and take ownership and responsibility for seeking a solution or making the right decision quickly; (2) *learner activity,* the experiential, inductive discovery in

collaboration with other team members to synthesize, problem solve, or create knowledge; (3) *interaction with others*, with the spontaneity, intuition, quick thinking, brainstorming, trust-building, risk-taking, role-playing, and rapid decision making of improvisational dynamics; and (4) *well-structured knowledge base*, where content is reshaped, synthesized, critiqued, and even created to demonstrate understanding and comprehension as well as analytical and evaluative skills.

Not only does the actual interactive process of improvisational performance produce deep learning, but the *debrief questions* that follow every exercise penetrate even deeper. The series of questions and discussion involving the small group with the rest of the class can reach the highest levels of learning in the analysis and evaluation of the content and experience observed by all. Applications of the content to real-world situations can occur during this Q & A. In this context, research suggests that the type and level of questions asked are the keys to eliciting deep learning from students (Harrison, 2004).

<div align="center">Applications of Improvisation to the College Classroom</div>

Improvisation involves students creating a physical reality through individual action and emotion while, at the same time, developing a shared vision with the other students. Spolin (1999) stated that the goal of improvisation is to "solve a problem." The power of improvisation lies in being *in the moment* at all times. A major concept is that the point of concentration requires close attention to the problem rather than to the individuals who are addressing the problem (Spolin, 1999). For example, in a volleyball game, all players concentrate on the ball; each individual player, as a member of the team, must focus on the ball and act in collaboration with their teammates.

There are more than 200 improvisational games or activities described in the theatre literature (Spolin, 1999). Some are more appropriate than others as instructional strategies in the college classroom. This section will provide a sample of four generic activities that are easily adaptable to most all subject matter content. They are as follows: (1) "One Word at a Time/One Sentence at a Time," (2) "Speech Tag," (3) "Freeze Tag," and (4) "Gibberish/Gibberish Expert Interview." These activities are based on classical improvisational exercises (Gesell, 1997; Koppett, 2001; Spolin, 1986, 1999).

The purposes of the four activities are described first. Then each activity is applied to different content topics taught in an advanced undergraduate course, "Mental Health and Stress Management," with an average of 35 students per course over two years (2005–2007) at Towson University. The procedures for executing the activities are embedded in the examples. The first two are the least risky to students on first exposure and the last two are slightly more risky. Each activity will be presented in the following form: (1) topic, (2) purpose, (3) time, (4) step-by-step procedure, and (5) suggested debrief questions.

Purposes of Improv Activities

Any one of the activities may be used as a warm-up or energy builder. More important, however, as a teaching tool, the activity can be used to review, apply, synthesize, or evaluate any content to facilitate learning. They are particularly effective with problem-based material, as in problem-based learning (PBL). Students experience team identity by creating a unique story and/or unique answers, as each successive student volunteer contributes without hesitation. Students learn to listen to one another at all times and let go of the need to figure out the ending or direct the outcome. Each

exercise can serve as a warm-up for students so they may to begin to trust one another and practice the acceptance of unexpected ideas and information without objection, ridicule, and intimidation. It can also increase listening awareness as well as enhance creative and critical thinking through the debrief Q & A at the end. The examples that follow indicate the types of questions that can be used to tap deep learning of the content.

These four improv activities involve total engagement, visual-spatial skills, physical interaction, verbal exchange, and buckets of fun. They draw especially on the students' verbal/linguistic, visual/spatial, bodily/ kinesthetic, and interpersonal intelligences.

One Word at a Time/One Sentence at a Time

Topic: "Five Components of Wellness."

Purpose: The purpose is to review material for a quiz.

Time: Allow 5–10 minutes for this activity and 10 minutes for debrief questions and discussion.

Procedure:

1. The instructor says to the class: "Create 5 columns on a piece of paper identifying the five components of wellness (physical health, social health, mental health, emotional health, and spiritual health)."

2. Instructor then says: "List, under the appropriate column, as many words as possible that you can associate with each component."

    a. Physical health: fitness, nutrition, risk factors for disease, diet, body image, etc.

    b. Social health: fraternities, parties, beer, cigarettes, communication skills, interaction with others, friends, relationships, adapting to different social situations, etc.

    c. Mental health: acts impulsively, mood changes, depression, obsessive, impulsive, positive outlook, copes well, etc.

    d. Emotional health: anger control, self-esteem, self-confidence, trust, love, adjusts to change, sad, happy, laughs, etc.

    e. Spiritual health: feelings of oneness with nature, deep faith, belief in a supreme being, respect all living things, express one's purpose, etc.

3. The students need to create the story focusing on the five components of wellness and create sentences, *one word at a time*, which emphasizes key words associated with each component.

4. Speed and eye contact should be encouraged by the instructor. The instructor tells the volunteers: "Small words such as 'a' and 'the' are acceptable and necessary to the sense of the sentence. Use complete sentences. Making mistakes should not be viewed as a sign of failure."

5. The class selects the theme of the story; in this case "Stressed College Students." The instructor's objective is to see how well the class identifies the specific details associated with each component of wellness and how it will apply behavior change concepts to negative and positive wellness situations by telling a spontaneous story one word at a time. The goal of the volunteers is to create a story with a beginning, middle, and end that focuses on the theme picked by the class using one word at a time and possibly acting them out as well.

6. Five diverse, heterogeneous student volunteers are identified and asked to stand in line (or in a circle) in the front of the class.

7. A self-selecting student begins a sentence with "My."

8. The second student says: "roommate."

9. The third student says "complains."

10. The fourth student says "constantly."

11. The fifth student says "She."

12. The students begin again with their spontaneous responses in turn such as: "says, she, had, too, much, work, and, drinks, beer, and, eats, pizza, every, day."

13. The story could possibly end by the team coming up with solutions one word at a time to a plausible end: "Your, roommate, needs, a, support, group, exercise, and, diet, program." "Talk, to, your, roommate, and, offer, her, your, help." "No, no, she, needs, to, stop, blaming, everyone, else, for, her, problems." "She, has, to, take, responsibility, for, changing, her, diet, and, getting, help." "She, needs, to, make, an, appointment, with, a, counselor, or, gecko, and, focus, on, her, strengths." All of this would have been said one word at a time rapidly, or one sentence at a time, with each member of the team focusing on the context of the story and pushing the team to succeed in telling all that could be told.

This exercise tends to begin slowly as students are a little hesitant at first. They are not sure what's going to happen. After the first few sentences are completed and they get the hang of it, they become more relaxed, spontaneous, intuitive, and funny.

Suggested debrief questions:

1. What new information did you learn from this activity?

2. What insights did you learn about letting go of the result?

3. How did you handle information that seemed questionable?

4. Why are you encouraged to go quickly?

5. How is this like teamwork on a job or in class?

6. Do you have any clarification questions that you would like to ask in order to understand the behaviors that contribute to wellness?

At this point, the students answer the questions, while the rest of the class listens intently, observes the correctness of the answers and how the group worked together to make the story successful by spontaneously incorporating the content on the categories of wellness. A lively discussion usually ensues. *It is during this debriefing Q & A that the instructor and students become aware of the benefits of the improvisational activity as well as their abilities to synthesize the content at hand.*

Small-group format variation. This variation can be played with two or three students facing each other, each one offering a sentence, one word or two words at a time. This is an effective strategy to use with large classes where the room and space configuration doesn't permit a lot of movement. It's an improvisational spin on *Think-Pair-Share*. Let's call it *One Word at a Time-Don't Think-Pair-Share*. Each pair or triad can have the same title and/or questions or make up their own based on content. New ideas can then be shared from each group about their content.

Speech Tag

Topic: "Preventing Coronary Heart Disease."

Purpose: The purpose is to assess student knowledge, attitude, and skills needed to prevent coronary heart disease following a reading assignment.

Time: Allow 10–15 minutes for this activity and 10 minutes for debrief questions and discussion.

Procedure:

Three to five diverse, heterogeneous student volunteers are identified to come to the front of the class. One student stands in front with the others behind him or her in a horseshoe shape. The instructor picked the topic.

Student 1:	Begins the story by saying: "Physical exercise needs to be part of a healthy lifestyle. People who are sedentary are at high risk for developing coronary vascular disease. When a person participates in 30–60 minutes per day of a combination of aerobic exercises and resistance training, blood pressure and cholesterol are usually lowered. Physical exercise also reduces the risk of heart attack and heart diseases. You need to get medical approval before you start any kind of exercise program. Weight reduction…"
Student 2:	Tags student 1 on the shoulder and continues the story, picking up where the first student stopped: "Yes, and it is enhanced when exercise is part of the daily plan. Obesity is a major risk factor for heart disease. But it's so much fun to supersize with Big Macs® and milkshakes."
Student 3:	Tags student 2 on the shoulder and says: "Yes, and forget about supersizing, pass the McDonalds® and head for the shrink! You've got to know the difference between good nutrition and

emotional eating. It might not be what you are eating; it might be what's eating you! Nutrition plays an important role in reducing the risk of heart disease."

Student 2:   Tags student 3 on the shoulder and says: "Yes, and smoking doesn't help either. When life is full of stress, there's another reason coronary vascular disease has a chance to develop. Here's a plan that…"

Student 1:   Tags student 2 on the shoulder and begins with "Yes, and any student could follow even living on campus…eat fruits, vegetables, whole grains, lean sources of protein and move into the gym!!"

Spontaneity increases as the students randomly self-select and tag each other, adding information about stress management. (*Warning:* Make sure students are told to tag shoulder only. Tagging other parts of the anatomy is illegal.) They accept the ideas of the previous player (not necessarily agree) and continue to add more information and bring out their most significant understanding and comprehension about preventing coronary heart disease.

Students respond intuitively and cover each other's back so that everyone will be successful. Students listen intently to each other as the entire class listens to them. They are listening for accuracy and the ability to be spontaneously creative. The instructor coaches students to tag in, even if they do not know what they are going to say. They are also encouraged to tag in if they see that their partner needs relief. It is during the spontaneous responses that humor usually emerges.

Suggested debrief questions:

1. Did the information presented fit the content on coronary heart disease previously taught?

2. How could this information be used to create a coronary heart disease prevention program for your family or in your place of work?

3. When did you choose to jump in?

4. When did you hesitate?

5. What is the value of creating collaboratively?

6. What values or beliefs underpin the behaviors captured in this activity?

Discussion follows to assess the ability of the group to work as a team and to help each other to be successful in creating a cohesive story, building upon each student's contribution, adding new information, and having the confidence to "jump in" spontaneously.

This type of exercise was originally used in introductory drama classes (Spolin, 1999) as an extension of *One Word at a Time*. Instead of speaking one word at a time, students speak in sentences, giving them an opportunity to loosen up and feel safe. This experience gives them the ability to improvise verbally and physically, to be spontaneous, to listen to themselves and to others, and to exhibit a natural sense of humor.

Freeze Tag

Topic: "Fight or Flight Stress Management Theory."

Purpose: To assess student's knowledge of the multiple physiological and psychological effects of perceived stressful situations following a lecture and reading assignment on the topic.

Time: Allow 3–5 minutes for this activity and 10 minutes for debrief questions and discussion.

Procedure:

1. Instructor explains to the class that they are going to explore the physiological and psychological effects of the "Fight or Flight" stress response theory as they create reality using information from their body and emotions rather than from their mind. Students will focus on intuition rather than fact.

2. Instructor asks the class for a place where a stressful situation may occur. Someone in the class responds with "health clinic." (Other answers include "restaurants," "offices," "stores," "hospital," "doctor's and dentist's offices," and "school.")

3. Instructor asks the class: "What would be a relationship between two people in that stressful situation?"

4. Another student responds with "irate patient" and "receptionist." (Other responses in other venues include "server-customer," "salesperson-client," "supervisor-employee," "doctor-patient," "siblings," and "school work/social life.")

> Student 1: Irate patient (student 1) has hand on her hips and is yelling at the receptionist saying: "I can't believe you can treat a patient like this!"
>
> Student 2: Receptionist (student 2) responds: "Yes, and Miss Jones you are being treated with respect and calmness even though your appointment was at 1:00 PM today and it's now 3:00 PM."

Student 1:   "Yes, and my stomach hurts, my head hurts and

my insurance has lapsed!"

Student 2:   "Yes, and this is a Bummer!"

Student 3:   FREEZE! (*Note*: This is cryogenic version of

Speech Tag.) (Student 3 taps Student 1 on the

shoulder and replaces her.) Putting her hand

around the patient's shoulder, she says, "I'd feel

the same way if I were in your situation. Sit

down here and let's talk."

Student 2:   "Thank goodness you are here, my blood

pressure is now sky high!"

Student 3:   "Yes, and my company has got just the thing to

help patients coming in here with a lot of

anger."

Student 2:   Hands waving all around, she says, "Are you

kidding?"

Student 3:   "I've got an automatic massage bed; it calms

the mind and body!"

Student 4:   FREEZE! (Student 4 taps Student 2 on the

shoulder and replaces her.)

Student 4:   "What we need is some music to listen to and

a comedy video to watch."

(And the scene continues…)

In Freeze Tag, a student cannot enter a scene with a prepared solution, but can get ideas from the position or emotions of the frozen student (aka "freezee"); he or she must listen and accept the other participant's input positively or cause a scene to falter. The student can jump in at any time and tag the freezee. When he or she sees other students faltering, the best thing to do is help them. Each student hopes the other students will do the same for him or her. The student takes risks by jumping in and not being certain of what to say as they try to remember to begin with "yes…and" to accept the offer.

This version of Freeze Tag does not follow exactly the classical theatrical approach because instructors cannot allow students to touch each other in areas of the anatomy that are inappropriate. When a student pops up and shouts FREEZE!, he or she may tag the freezee on the shoulder. That student becomes the replacement freezee and assumes the exact physical position of the tagged freezee. The position and the emotion of the tagged freezee may trigger ideas for the replacement freezee. The replacement picks up on the last words said by that tagged freezee. Then the replacement can assume different physical positions, such as hands in the air, hands on their hips, bent over, legs crossed, or jumping up and down. His or her facial expressions can convey emotions, such as anger, fear, or joy

Suggested debrief questions:

1. What were the key points of the stress response theory presented in this activity?

2. What were your biggest fears?

3. How did you censor yourself?

4. How can this experience change the way you relate to others in different life situations?

5. How did it feel to have your ideas or offers accepted?

The instructor then reviews the key points of the stress response theory presented in the exercise and leads a brief discussion of its application to health improvement in daily living situations. She asks the students to compare and contrast how the theory was (and could be) applied to the two different situations highlighted and probes the implications of the different relationships (e.g., coworkers, supervisor-patient-customer, etc.) presented in the exercise. Student responses to these questions can lead to greater understanding of the various psychological and physiological effects of stress. This debriefing exercise is where deep learning occurs.

In the classroom, variations on Freeze Tag can be particularly useful for reinforcing and applying different theories in basic science and health courses and a specific organizational behavior concept, such as leadership, motivation, power, and politics. Moshavi (2001) utilized a variation of this exercise multiple times in his business management classroom at Montana State University. It resulted in enhanced class discussion and role play, teamwork, risk taking, and creativity. This approach to class discussion involves everyone in the class.

Gibberish/Gibberish Expert Interview

Topic: "Preventing Sexually Transmitted Diseases (STDs)

Purpose: This activity was used to determine how many key points about preventing sexually transmitted diseases were understood by the class.

Time: Allow 3–5 minutes for this activity and 10 minutes for debrief questions and discussion.

Procedure: Random members of the class ask the designated health expert, from a foreign country, (student volunteer) specific questions about preventing sexually transmitted diseases.

Student 1:	Asks (in English) expert from Chutzpahsenstein: "How does your country achieve such a low rate of sexually transmitted diseases and how do they prevent them?"
Student 2:	The interviewer/interpreter in gibberish says: "Gweeb! Neeb nop nork fop fob la proo?"
Student 3:	Expert replies, "mookulu ladi, or blah de blah. La gee grab nabble lip quip scrunge la quack. Zar zar far quar mar nar shellac. Frem oogle oop fing fang. Shlop looble la ling lang." As the expert is saying these nonsense words, her arms and hands are moving in different directions, her hands put up fingers as if to identify a number of points. She stomps her feet three times and uses facial expressions that express the non-acceptance of multiple sex partners.
Student 2:	The interpreter replies: "Yes, and anyone who is sexually active can get a STD. Men and women of all ages, regions, ethnic backgrounds, and economic levels can get them. Most STDs are only spread through direct sexual contact with an infected person. The best way to prevent getting a STD is to not have sex. If you do decide to have sex, you

should have sex with only one partner who only has sex

with you and who has never injected drugs."

The health expert answers in nonsense language using serious and exaggerated sounds and body movements. In this particular class, the expert spoke in such a way that other class members wanted to know where she learned "that language." Her body language also demonstrated her answers. The student volunteers conversed as if they were making perfect sense. Following each nonsense answer, the interpreter explained in English what the health expert said. During this process, the entire class was paying attention to the players, laughing, and listening for the correct answers. This activity provides an opportunity for all members of the class to ask questions, obtain clarity, and increase communication skills without fear of intimidation.

Suggested debrief questions:

1. What communication cues do we have without words?

2. Observers, did the translation match the interpretations you made in your head?

3. Was fluency or continuity ever achieved? If so, under what conditions? If not, why
   not?

4. How do people understand each other if they don't speak the same language?

5. How did people contribute to the success?

 6. What can this activity teach us about how we view the unfamiliar?

Gibberish expert interview. One student volunteer speaks in a nonsense language as an expert on the chosen topic. Another student volunteer translates the "gibberish*"* into English or English into "gibberish." Class discussion follows with debrief questions of clarity and accuracy of the information and translations through voice and body language

Variation. There can be teams of four or five players where four of the participants speak different languages (*gibberish)*. The conversation between the *gibberish* speakers flows through the interpreter(s). The instructor can call "change" and one of the *gibberish* speakers becomes the interpreter. The interpreter goes back and forth between English and nonsense language. This exchange is continued until everyone has had an opportunity to be the interpreter. This can also be conducted simultaneously with multiple teams in the class. Each team debriefs itself and then shares its insights with the entire class.

<div align="center">Conclusions</div>

More than a thousand journal articles and 119 studies on the effectiveness of learner-centered teaching and student success (Cornelius-White, 2007) suggest that college instructors need to leverage all that they know about the characteristics of the Net Generation, their multiple intelligences and learning styles, collaborative learning activities, and theatrical approaches to teaching to create learning environments where every student can succeed. Four generic, easily adaptable improvisational exercises were described in the context of different course content applications: (1) "One Word at a Time/One Sentence at a Time," (2) "Speech Tag," (3) "Freeze Tag," and (4) "Gibberish/Gibberish Expert Interview." The value and potential outcomes of these exercises focused on promoting deeper learning through the suggested debriefing questions.

Unfortunately, at present the bulk of the research and college level practice with improvisational techniques have been primarily only in the business and management

training domain. Despite the documented effectiveness in that domain, their potential for application to virtually all other disciplines has not been realized.

Now that the improvisational activities have been outlined in the preceding pages, the next step is to conduct research on those activities in all fields to justify the contributions improvisation can make to learner-centered teaching. A scale to evaluate the effectiveness of various improvisational exercises is provided to facilitate data-gathering in any classroom application (see Appendix A). We strongly encourage faculty to not only test these activities with their students, but to collect evidence of their instructional efficacy.

As a form of collaborative learning, it is hoped that improvisation will gain popularity among those faculty already employing cooperative learning exercises as well as newbies to these activities who want to break their teaching mold. It is just another collection of tools to put in their teaching tool belts that the *Net Geners* will love and Tim "The Toolman" Taylor will applaud.

The best way to close this article is to ask for your answer to the title. Do you remember the title? We don't either. We got bogged down with boxes of articles on cooperative learning. Here it is: *Whose classroom is it anyway?* Although the original intent was to parody the title of the amazing British and American improvisational television shows, "Whose Line Is It Anyway?," there was an unanticipated instructional legitimacy that emerged. From the first paragraph of the introduction to this article with the teaching mantra in italics through the four arguments justifying the use of improvisation as a college teaching tool, there is only one possible answer: Ellen DeGeneres. OOPS! Wrong answer. It has to be: the STUDENTS!

Appendix A

IMPROVISATION EVALUATION SCALE

Improv Exercise (Circle one):   Date:_____
    Freeze Tag
    Speech Tag
    One Word/Sentence
    Gibberish

Directions: Please respond to each of the outcomes below to evaluate the improv exercise you just experienced. Your feedback will help me improve the quality and application of future exercises for specific course content.
      Please indicate the *extent to which you experienced each outcome* below in this improv exercise . There are no right or wrong answers. Just respond truthfully by *circling* the letters of your choice from among the following. (*NOTE:* All responses are anonymous and will remain confidential.):

Strongly Agree = **SA**
Agree = **A**
Disagree = **D**
Strongly Disagree = **SD**

1. Built trust among students in my group.   .   **SA   A   D   SD**

2. Built mutual respect among the group members.   **SA   A   D   SD**

3. Fostered a spirit of teamwork and collaboration among
    the members of my group.   **SA   A   D   SD**

4. Encouraged the acceptance of each other's ideas**.**   **SA   A   D   SD**

5. Improved my brainstorming skills.   **SA   A   D   SD**

6. Increased my willingness to take risks.   **SA   A   D   SD**

7. Improved my verbal communication skills.   **SA   A   D   SD**

8. Improved my nonverbal (e.g., facial, body language) skills. **SA   A   D   SD**

9. Improved my listening skills.   **SA   A   D   SD**

10. Applied the content to real-life situations.   **SA   A   D   SD**

11. Linked activities to my prior knowledge and experiences. **SA   A   D   SD**

12. Promoted my creative problem solving.　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

13. Actively engaged me with new ideas and concepts.　　**SA　A　D　SD**

14. Increased my ability to ad-lib and think quickly on my feet.　**SA　A　D　SD**

15. Promoted a true hands-on learning experience.　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

16. Encouraged me to be spontaneous**.**　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

17. Encouraged me to be intuitive in my responses**.**　　**SA　A　D　SD**

18. Encouraged me to assess the credibility of the information presented**.**　**SA　A　D　SD**

19. Increased my ability to respond quickly and decisively in different situations.　**SA　A　D　SD**

20. Facilitated my

　　a. comprehension of the content.　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

　　b. reshaping of the content.　　　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

　　c. synthesizing the content.　　　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

　　d. analyzing the content.　　　　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

　　e. evaluation of the content.　　　　　　　　　**SA　A　D　SD**

WHAT DID YOU LIKE *BEST* ABOUT THIS EXERCISE?

WHAT DID YOU LIKE *LEAST* ABOUT THIS EXERCISE?

HOW COULD THIS EXERCISE BE *IMPROVED*?

References

Atkins, G. (1993). *Improv! A handbook for the actor.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

    Drama.

Barkley, E. F., Cross, K. P., & Major, C. H. (2005). *Collaborative learning techniques: A*

    handbook for college faculty. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bergren, M., Cox, M., & Detmar, J. (2002). *Improvise this! How to think on your feet so*

    you don't fall on your face. NY: Hyperion.

Berk, R. A. (2001). Using music with demonstrations to trigger laughter and facilitate

    learning in multiple intelligences. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*,

    12(1), 97–107.

Berk, R. A. (2002). *Humor as an instructional defibrillator: Evidence-based techniques*

    in teaching and assessment. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Berk, R. A. (2003). *Professors are from Mars$^{®}$, Students are from Snickers$^{®}$*. Sterling,

    VA: Stylus Publishing.

Berk, R. A. (2005). Laughterpiece theatre: Humor as a systematic teaching tool. *Teaching*

    Excellence, *17*(2). (Available from www.ronberk.com)

Berk, R. A. (2008). Star tech: The net generation. In C. C. Craig & L. F. Deretchin (Eds.),

    Teacher education yearbook XVI: Imagining a renaissance in teacher education.

    Lanham, MD: R & L Education.

Book, S. (2002). *Book on acting: Improvisation technique for the professional actor in*

    film, theater, and television. Los Angeles, CA: Silman-James Press.

Campbell, E. (1998). *Teaching strategies to foster deep versus surface learning*. Ottawa,

    Canada: University of Ottawa, Center for University Teaching. (Available from

http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/cut/options/Nov_98/TeachingStrategies.)

Carlson, S. (2005). The net generation goes to college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *52*(7), A34.

Conner, M., & Hodgins, W. (2000). Learning styles. Retrieved November 9, 2006, from www.learnactivity.com/learningstyles.html.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*, 113–143.

Crossan, M. M. (1998). Improvisation in action. *Organization Science*, *9*(5), 593–599.

Crossan, M. M., Cunha, M. P., Vera, D., & Cunha, O. (2005). Time and organizational improvisation. *The Academy of Management Review*, *30*(1), 129–145.

Crossan, M. M., & Sorrenti, M. (1997). Making sense of improvisation. *Advances in Strategic Management, 14*, 155-180.

Cunha, M. P., Cunha, J. V., & Kamoche, K. (1999). Organizational improvisation: What, when, how, and why. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *1*, 299–341.

Cunha, M. P., Cunha, J. V., & Kamoche, K. (2001). Organizational improvisation: An empirically-based exploration of an innovative management concept. Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&lr=&q=cache:lOTEF39xrhQJ:www.fieldsofflow.c.

Diamond, M. R., & Christensen, M. H. (2005). Bravo! Do acting games promote learning in the college classroom? *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, *16,* 55–67.

Diggles, D. (2004). *Improv for actors*. NY: Allworth Press.

Dillenbourg, P. (Ed.). (1999a). *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational*

approaches. Oxford, England: Elsevier Science.

Dillenbourg, P. (1999b). What do you mean by 'collaborative learning'? In P.

Dillenbourg, (Ed.), *Collaborative learning: Cognitive and computational*

approaches (pp. 1–19). Oxford, England: Elsevier Science.

Entwistle, N. (2004, June). *Teaching-learning environment to support deep learning in*

contrasting subject areas. Paper presented at Staffordshire University, Stafford,

UK.

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (2001). Effective strategies for cooperative learning. *Journal*

of Cooperation & Collaboration in College Teaching, *10*(2), 69–75.

Felder, R. M., & Soloman, B. A. (2000). Learning styles and strategies. Retrieved July

14, 2006, from www.ncsu.edu/felder-public/ilsdir/styles.html.

Foreman, J. (2003, July/August). Next generation: Technology versus the lecture.

Retrieved April 10, 2007, from www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0340.pdf.

Frand, J. (2000). The information-age mindset: Changes in students and implications for

higher education. *EDUCAUSE Review, 35*(5), 15–24.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. NY:

Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.*

NY: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (2005, May). *Multiple lenses on the mind.* Paper presented at the

ExpoGestion Conference, Bogota, Columbia.

Gardner, H., & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational

implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. *Educational Researcher, 18*(8), 4–9.

Gesell, I. (1997). *Playing along 37 group learning activities*. Duluth, MN: Whole Person Associates.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* NY: Bantam Books.

Goodsell, A., Maher, M., Tinto, V., Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. (1992).*Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education*. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Pennsylvania State University.

Gwinn, P., & Halpern, C. (2003). *Group improvisation: The manual of ensemble improve games*. Colorado Springs, CO: Meriwether Publishing.

Harrison, P. (2004, September). *Unleashing deep learning through questioning*. Paper presented at the Education in a Changing Environment Conference, University of Salford, UK.

Hay, D. B. (2007). Using concept maps to measure deep, surface, and non-learning outcomes. *Studies in Higher Education*, *32*(1), 39–57.

Honey, P., & Mumford, A. (1992). *The manual of learning styles* (2nd ed.). (Available from Peter Honey, Ardingly House, 10 Linden Ave., Maidenhead, Berks, SL6 6HB, UK.)

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. NY: Vintage Books.

James, R., & Williams, P. (1981). *A guide to improvisation: A handbook for teachers.* Oxon, England: Kemble Press.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. NY:

New York University Press.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). *Cooperative learning: Increasing*

college faculty instructional productivity (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report

No. 4). Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of

Education and Human Development.

Kagan, S. (1992). *Cooperative learning*. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Resources for

Teachers, Inc.

Kamoche, K. N., Cunha, M. P., & Cunha, J. V. (2002). *Organizational improvisation:*

What, when, how, and why. London, England: Routledge.

Kaplan, S. (2002). Building communities—Strategies for collaborative learning.

Learning Circuits. Retrieved December 1, 2006, from

www.learningcircuits.org/2002/aug2002/kaplan.html.

Keefe, J. A. (2002). *Improv yourself: Business spontaneity at the speed of thought.*

Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Kolb, D. A. (2005). *The Kolb Learning Style Inventory—version 3.1: Self-scoring and*

interpretation booklet. Boston: Hay Resources Direct.

Koppett, K. (2001). *Training to imagine: Practical improvisational theatre techniques to*

enhance creativity, teamwork, leadership, and learning. Sterling, VA: Stylus

Publishing.

Leigh, A. (2004). *Dramatic success at work: Using theatre skills to improve your*

performance and transform your business life. London, England: Nicholas

Brealey Publishing.

Lenhart, A., Rainie, L., & Lewis, O. (2001). *Teenage life online: The rise of instant-message generation and the Internet's impact on friendships and family relationships*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project. (Also available from www.pewinternet.org/pdfs/PIP_Teens_Report.pdf.)

Lowe, R. (2000). *Improvisation, inc.: Harnessing spontaneity to engage people and groups*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lynn, B. (2004). *Improvisation for actors and writers: A guidebook for improv lessons in comedy*. Colorado Springs, CO: Meriwether Publishing.

Madson, P. R. (2005). *Improv wisdom: Don't prepare, just show up*. NY: Harmony/Bell Tower.

Manuel, K. (2002). *Teaching information literacy to generation Y*. NY: Haworth Press.

Marks-Tarlow, T. (1995). *Creativity inside out: Learning through multiple intelligences.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Matthews, R. S. (1996). Collaborative learning: Creating knowledge with students. In R. J. Menges, M. E. Weimer, & Associates (Eds.), *Teaching on solid ground: Using scholarship to improve practice* (pp.101–124)*.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millbower, L. (2003). *Show biz training*. NY: American Management Association (AMACOM).

Millis, B. J. (2002). *Enhancing learning—and more!—Through cooperative learning* (IDEA paper # 38). Manhattan, KS: IDEA Center.

Millis, B. J., & Cottell, P. G., Jr. (1998). *Cooperative learning for higher education faculty*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

Minor, A., Bassoff, P., & Moorman, C. (2001). Organizational improvisation and

learning: A field study. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *46,* 304–337.

Moorman, C., & Minor, A. (1998). Organizational improvisation and organizational

memory. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(4), 698–723.

Moshavi, D. (2001). Yes and …: Introducing improvisational theatre techniques to the

management classroom. *Journal of Management Education*, *25*(4), 437–449.

Newton, B. (1998). *Improvisation: Use what you know--make up what you don't!:*

Improvisation activities for the classroom. Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology

Press.

Oblinger, D., & Oblinger, J. (2006a). Is it age or IT: First steps toward understanding

the net generation. In D. C. Oblinger & J .L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the net*

generation. EDUCAUSE. Retrieved November 14, 2006, from

www.educause.edu.

Oblinger, D. C. & Oblinger, J. L. (Eds.). (2006b). *Educating the net generation*.

EDUCAUSE. Retrieved November 14, 2006, from www.educause.edu.

Panitz, T. (1996). A definition of collaborative vs cooperative learning. Retrieved

December 1, 2006, from

www.city.londonmet.ac.uk/deliberations/collab.learning/panitz2.html.

Patterson, J., McKenna-Cook, D., & Swick, M. (2006). *Theatre in the secondary school*

classroom: Methods and strategies for the beginning teacher. Portsmouth, NH:

Heinemann Drama.

Polsky, M. E. (1997). *Let's improvise: Becoming creative, expressive and spontaneous*

through drama (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Prensky, M. (2006). *"Don't bother me mom—I'm learning."* St. Paul, MN: Paragon

House.

Ramaley, J., & Zia, L. (2006). The real versus the possible: Closing the gaps in
engagement and learning. In D. C. Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating
the net generation*. EDUCAUSE. Retrieved November 14, 2006, from
www.educause.edu.

Rhem, J. (1995). Close-up: Going deep. *The National Teaching & Learning Forum*, *5*(1),
4.

Roberts, G. R. (2006). Technology and learning experiences of the net generation. In D.
Oblinger & J. L. Oblinger (Eds.), *Educating the net generation*. EDUCAUSE.
Retrieved November 14, 2006, from www.educause.edu.

Robotham, D. (1999). The application of learning style theory in higher education.
Retrieved March 4, 2007, from http://www2.glos.ac.uk/GDN/discuss/kolb2.htm.

Roschelle, J., & Teasley, S. D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in
Collaborative problem solving. In C. E. O'Malley (Ed.), *Computer-supported
collaborative learning* (pp. 69–197). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Rose, C. (1985). *Accelerated learning*. NY: Dell.

Sawyer, R. K. (2003). *Improvised dialogues: Emergence and creativity in conversation.*
Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined
improvisation. *Educational Researcher*, *33*(2), 12–20.

Schroeder, C. C. (1997). New students – New learning styles. Retrieved October 5, 2006,
from www.virtualschool.edu/mon/academia/kierseylearningstyles.html.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J. T. (1992). What is collaborative learning? In A. Goodsell,

M. Maher, V. Tinto, B. L. Smith, & J. MacGregor, *Collaborative learning: A sourcebook for higher education*. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Pennsylvania State University.

Spolin, V. (1986). *Theatre games for the classroom: A teacher's handbook*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Spolin, V. (1999). *Improvisation for the theatre: A handbook of teaching and directing techniques* (3rd ed.). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Springer, L., Stanne, M. E., & Donovan, S. S. (1999). Effects of small-group learning on undergraduates in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *69*, 21–51.

Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Timpson, W. M., Burgoyne, S., Jones, C. S., & Jones, W. (1997). *Teaching and performing*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Vera, D., & Crossan, M. M. (2004). Theatrical improvisation: Lessons for organizations. *Organizational Studies*, *25*(5), 727–749.

White, J. (1998). *Do Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences add up?* London, England: Institute of Education, University of London.

Willdorf, N. (2000). Masters of improvisation. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 46*(37), A12.

Williams, W. M., Blythe, T., White, N., Li, J., Sternberg, R. J., & Gardner, H. (1996). *Practical intelligence for school*. NY: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Windham, C. (2005). Father Google and Mother IM: Confessions of a net gen learner.

  EDUCAUSE Review, 40(5), 45–59.