

TOUR 01.08 REPORT 2008

A] PROJECT TOUR REPORT

1. TOUR DATA

Networking with 23 other organisations, 22 of which we have worked with before, Tour 1 travelled 5172 kilometres of the Gauteng and Kwa Zulu Natal and Western Cape (Mainly Cape Town) provinces as planned. **48 get Real and 50 Replay** shows were performed in 36 schools, 20 of which we have performed at before over 41 (GP 14, KZN 15 and WC 12) performance days. This is 2.4 shows per day, 10 shows more than anticipated and 22 less than booked because 4 shows had to be cancelled because of the absence of one team member 10 by the school and 8 combined shows by the school. 77 were in category A, 10 in B, and 11 in C schools reaching some 15 465 English, Afrikaans, Isi Zulu and isi Xhosa speaking 13-18 year old youth, 2135 less than anticipated. 51 life-orientation curriculum support workbooks were distributed. 50 educator and 97 learner evaluations were returned. The tour received R41 326.00, R 11 181 less than according to policy. 4 Schools still expected to deposit money.

2. PRODUCTION REPORT

Western Cape:

This tour was the first High School tour for the project manager. Identifying and contacting schools was not difficult at all. The project manager found that there were very few high schools in comparison to primary schools and that some of these schools were technical schools and not interested in having the show at all. A conscious effort was also made to book schools which have drama as a subject and these showed great interest. Most of the schools had huge numbers of learners and on most days the whole day would be spent at a school. Two schools were visited two consecutive days because not all learners could be accommodated within one visit.

The actual booking of the schools started in October and went very well. By the 14th of December the first term of the Western Cape tour was fully booked and almost half of the second term. The project manager had particular difficulty in booking Category C schools in Cape Town. Most of their motivation for declining was a lack of budget for programmes of this nature. They stressed the fact that parents already pay such a lot of school fees and that they are not allowed to charge for any activities. Some also mentioned that they cover the same topics and issues in class as in the play and could not see the need for having the play.

The project manager's initial fear for this leg of the tour was that the team would be so tired by the time they get to Cape Town and the energy and focus would be lost. This was however not the case. The level of enthusiasm was very high and there were no problems with call times and logistics. Team members from Johannesburg were very satisfied with their accommodation and getting to the office was not a problem.

Booking the last two days was very problematic though because of schools closing. This was explained in a production meeting and it was decided that these days would be used for capturing, logistics and preparing for the next leg of the tour.

The CWCI also requested a visit to a Cape Town school on 12 March. The project manager made arrangements with the relevant schools and prepared the team for their visit. The visit went very well and very positive feedback was received from both the CWCI reps and the team.

This leg of the tour managed to bring in R12 489.00. This amount is R1689.00 more than anticipated during planning and R 3922.50 less than agreed with schools. The main reasons for the huge difference is the fact that one school cancelled (Ocean View, promised R1170), Westridge High did not pay R 195.00, Luhlaza High did not pay (promised R 2490.00). It should also be noted that when making bookings, most of the educators estimate the number of learners and when the team collects the money learner numbers are far less.

Gauteng and Kwa Zulu Natal:

Booking of Tour 1 was relatively easy and stress free. Starting in August 2007, without the disturbances of educator strikes and teams to manage allowed for contacting schools to operate efficiently and uninterrupted.

Getting hold of the relevant educator tends to be a problem and on the 3rd/4th time of trying the secretary requests that any information we have be faxed and she will place it in the relevant educator's pigeon hole. Educators don't respond and the only way to get hold of them is during their break time. This often resulted in me frantically phoning as many educators during a specific and limited time.

The interest for our shows in Gauteng (GP) schools was relatively low. I felt that this could have been a result of offering the show to schools free of charge the previous term. I tried to explain that the previous term was a special dispensation due to the educator's strike, but they were still reluctant to book shows. There were also category C schools who just felt that R12 per learner was too much and trying to get the money out of the learners too much of an effort. However, within category A schools in both GP and Kwa-Zulu Natal (KZN), whether, we had previously performed at their school before or not, they were often more than eager to book us again.

KZN category B and C schools showed a lot of interest. I contacted twice as many category B and C schools in GP but only 2 booked compared to 5 category B and C schools booking in KZN. All the category B and C in GP and KZN schools we performed at for the first time and the shows and the team were exceptionally well received.

Through out the entire tour we only had one incident with the team, whereby, one of the actors did not arrive at the Johannesburg office on the morning of the opening day of the tour. After much worrying and searching the actor was contacted and picked up. A letter of warning was given to the actor and a meeting to discuss his ill discipline held with the entire team, myself and Brigid. This was the last indiscretion by any actor in the team and they carried on together, growing immensely and bonding together to become very close.

Other than the one day lost due to the team, all other shows cancelled or combined were a result of the school. At the beginning of the tour, 3 schools who had booked 2 days each, cancelled at the last minute. Fortunately, I was able to fill 4 of the 6 days, but still lost a fair number of shows.

Compared to previous tours last year, this tour managed to bring in more than the minimum amount reflected in the recovery policy. However, when comparing the total amount banked to the expected it still indicates that schools do not always pay what they agree to. The main reasons are:

1. Fewer learners than booked were present on the day. This happened particularly in category C schools, whereby, if for example 10 learners were absent on the day of the performance the team received R120 less.
2. Very poor schools. Some schools are situated in very underprivileged areas and can not simply afford the shows. In these cases educators do their best to collect as much money as possible, but it has a propensity to be very difficult.

3. Learners refuse to pay. Learners from some schools refuse to pay and the shows are combined on the day at the request of the educators.

Overall the running of the tour was very successful and the team were fantastic.

3. ENVIRONMENT REPORT

Western Cape:

For all except one of the team members, working in Cape Town schools was a totally new experience. They expected maybe a little bit more order and discipline and anticipated that language (Afrikaans) might be a problem. This was not the case though. The team was very disappointed in the poor discipline in some schools and reported that doing four shows at such a school was very difficult. They did not enjoy performing at schools in township areas as educators were not interested at all and it was very difficult to maintain discipline and perform a good quality show at the same time. This made facilitation very difficult as well. The team made a point of not handing out Educator Worksheets at schools where there were no educators present, hence only 6 Get Real and 8 Replay workbooks were handed out.

Show no 33- *"It was a very difficult audience. About half the audience wanted to listen but the other half didn't and constantly disrupted the performance. Often throughout the play the actors couldn't be heard. Those listening didn't respond that much."*

At a Department of Education workshop in November 2007, presentations were made by various organisations which work in schools and focus on substance abuse. The presented showed that substance abuse is very prevalent in Cape Town High schools and in compiling profiles for schools it seems that educators report differently on the issue or are not very aware of the prevalence within their schools. No questions were asked in terms of this topic and many more on relationships and sexuality. During a conversation with an educator the PM noted a comment that the learners had a "know it all, seen it all attitude" towards substance abuse.

An interesting issue to note is that learners were very keen on asking questions concerning performing and the actors' personal lives, career history etc. This fact can be attributed to the fact that most of the learners are now at an age where they are thinking about their careers and the future.

In terms of Teenage pregnancy ratings, the PM noted that educators are not really keeping track of this issue and some even said that they do not know if this is happening in their schools or not. Most of these girls return to school and at most schools girls comment and debated this issue more than boys.

The team performed comfortably at most of the schools. An interesting fact to note is that educators expect them to perform "on stage". Team members also commented on the poor theatre etiquette of learners and educators and found it very disturbing in some instances that the art is not appreciated. Educators expected or assumed that a portable stage would be used or that the performance would be done on the stage in halls.

At some schools the team struggled to start conversation / debate on the issues or the play and had to provoke debate.

Show 36 - *"The learners weren't confident to ask questions. The learners that did ask questions were laughed at by the audience. Not much valuable discussion was possible"*

No disclosures were reported by the team and in general they had a "smooth" tour.

Gauteng and Kwa-Zulu Natal

When I went through the presentation arrangement forms with the liaison officer nothing interesting/unusual/worthwhile arose from the discussion. However, there were a few issues that surfaced regarding some of the learners/educators and venues.

As with previous tours, the team are still experiencing problems with educators not being present during some of the shows. At a total of 6 schools, 3 in Gauteng (6 shows) and 3 in Kwa-Zulu Natal (7 shows), the educators either left at the beginning of the show or half way through. The learners become restless and the learners who do want to watch the show struggle to concentrate. The facilitation is also effected and the team struggled to control the learners. When educators were present during both the show and the facilitation the team made comments like the one from KwaNtsikana Secondary.

“Kids really listened and there were educators present in both shows, which really helped to control the behaviour of the kids”

At the schools where educators were not present the Life Orientation Worksheet was not handed to any educators. If the educators are not in attendance at the shows it is not possible for them to do a follow-up lesson. Consequently, the team have been instructed insist on there being an educator, especially the LO educator, available and as a last resort to threaten to not perform their show. I have also made it a priority to emphasise to either the principal or the LO educator that the LO educator be present during all the shows.

Regarding the venue, the team didn't experience any problems except on a few occasions the venue was too wide. The team felt that they were unable to maintain the attention of the learners sitting on the sides. This happened at three schools, namely Eldorado Park, Holy Family College and Dick Ndlovu. I have instructed the team to try and recognise if the venue is broad and ensure that the learners are seated more narrowly.

There were no changes to the learner's profiles. Substance abuse (2.77) was the highest average and often an area of concern when on the phone to the principal or LO educator. Peer abuse (2.70) also featured highly and so did pregnancy (2.57). Two schools, Durban Girl's Secondary and Trenance Park, wanted the team to mention more about teenage pregnancy. Pregnancy was the only issue that the Durban Girls Secondary LO educator, Jayshree Govender, marked as there being “lots” of.

Generally, the team remarked that the majority of principals, educators and learners were great. The team were incredibly well received by both educators and learners. The shows went very well and the team had many fruitful discussions in the facilitations.

B] TEAM TOUR REPORT

1. TEAM EXPERIENCE

Larissa:

I've never worked with such amazing and talented people before (professionally). That is not to say that we did not have any arguments, but problems and small conflicts were dealt with immediately and forgotten about the next day. Overall there were no major problems within the team. Hayley, Sandile, Anele and I have good chemistry and our personalities compliment each other. I'm glad that they did not get too annoyed with me, as I tend to get very edgy at times and at one point Anele confronted me which was unnecessary in my opinion but also very surprising at the same time.

Where acting is concerned I feel that I've grown. I managed to get out of my two year 'rusty' stage. I had the freedom to enhance my characters and acting techniques and found new ways of keeping my characters interesting. This, in turn, also helped me to stay focused and not get bored with the plays. I did not really enjoy the first leg of the tour (Gauteng) because we did not really get a chance to bond as a team as everyone went their own separate ways

after work. Durban proved just how well this team was cast, we were responsible for the production and everything worked out well.

Where schools were concerned, overall it was a blessing for me to be part of a project that cares about the youth in our country. The only downside was the fact that there were a few teenagers that did not appreciate our work or our reasons for the production. It was hard trying to come to terms that there were times when it felt like work was wasted on a corrupt teenage mind. I personally don't have any problems with accommodation. Apart from Orange Grove being extremely dry and dreary thus forcing me to travel far for some recreational activities...

In conclusion I'm grateful to be part of a company that takes care of their employees and is part of a good cause of building a resilient youth.

Hayley:

I feel this was a successful tour in all provinces. Learners from all backgrounds engaged in the performances. The multiracial team, credible script and high standard of performance allowed the learners to relate to the characters and learn from their actions. Emotional engagement from the audience was a definite achievement.

The organisation of the tour generally ran smoothly. It was irritating however that on certain occasions schools would tell us to arrive too early before the learners or teachers had got to school. I enjoyed how in each province we visited a range of schools - from the rural ones to private schools.

The accommodation provided in Durban and Cape Town was well positioned however no access to company transport in Cape Town was frustrating. I appreciated the general standard of our accommodation on our tour yet the kitchen and bathrooms in Durban were problematic.

The relations amongst the team were positive. An effective and friendly working relationship was established. Team members taking on others' roles and being defensive caused tension on occasion however this was defused quickly due to the level of openness amongst the team.

I really enjoyed this experience. I feel fortunate to have visited such a range of schools and witnessed so many different living environments in South Africa. I appreciated being able to travel and work at the same time. Although the shows did get monotonous, the learner's positive response to our work was motivating.

Anele:

Once again working for *Arepp: Theatre for Life* has been a worthwhile experience in terms of personal, professional, creative and career growth. It is good to work for a company that enables the actor to work as an entity, within a collective. Furthermore, being in such a dynamic group of people was an eye opening experience.

It has been a really fulfilling experience to be part of a collective that helps society to be more socially conscious, of the social ills. Inspiring through creativity, in my opinion, is by far the most successful tool to impact on people.

The biggest problem I encountered was having to adapt to working in Joburg for the first time and be accused of being a thief. After using a company ball, I believe, and end up being labelled as a thief.

The tour, so far, has been good and all our requirements have been met. Thanx once again! Ningabi satyhafa, qhubekani ngalo msebenzi umhle niwenzayo. Ndithi halala kuwe *AREPP: THEATRE FOR LIFE* halala!

Sandile:

It's been a fruitful tour, filled with lots of fun and work at the same time. Seeing more of my own country was a privilege I never had before and it's taught me a lot about the different types of people around me. Nothing surprising when it came to the shows itself though, kids still ask if I'm gay, due to one of my characters. No problems faced except for the different weather changes around the country and trying to adapt to them. We work well together as a team and we understand each other, so from that side of things I couldn't complain. What has been an eye opener is the amount of racism that I found is still out there especially in my home town KZN, which is quite sad. Having learners come up to me from all over the country complimenting my performance has also pushed me to another level to try and be all I can be as an actor.

2. OVERALL ENGAGEMENT RATING 3.03

Look Before You Leap: *Get Real* 2.84

The overall impression of the audience is that they were captivated and involved in our performances. Representatives from the CWCI came to watch a performance at Alexander Sinton Secondary, Cape Town and were very impressed with the "dynamic performance" and audience response. They recognised the value and importance of the facilitated discussion and felt it was handled in a professional manner. We were surprised with the reach of the script. Irrespective of the schools' location or the learners' background, the learners engaged in what they were watching. All learners seemed to identify with at least one aspect of the script, no learner was unaffected by the experience. In most schools the learners' engagement was either 'exceptional' or 'well'. We feel this emotional engagement is due to the humour in the script and the recognisable characters.

There were some lines that had a guaranteed laugh, while the subtle humour depended on the size of the audience and their efficiency in English. For example lines like, 1) "Breasts! Breasts!!...no daughter of mine is going to have breasts!... 2) Hi, I've checked you out...I mean running, I've seen you running...hi". All the grades appreciated the characters in drag, the camp characters and the crude characters.

The learners also loved the device of the remote control. They enjoyed how 'Roxy' made 'Loyiso' kiss her over and over again. They also found it humorous when an actor was 'paused' mid-sentence. Many learners however found the phrase, "Don't you sometimes wish that life had a remote" very monotonous. In discussion some learners asked why we used the remote. When we asked them what they would do if they had a remote some responses were, "erase school," "erase bad things."

The audience often got very involved with the characters on stage. They would sigh, 'Aah shame' for Roxy when she was trying to impress Loyiso and they would call out comments to try and build her confidence.

Cognitive engagement varied. Large rowdy audiences without any educator supervision created a recreational atmosphere rather than educational. We battled to get educators to monitor the behaviour of the learners during the production, due to some teachers attending workshops or just no interest at all.

The majority of the learners who watched the shows were shocked at the amount of kissing onstage between 'Carmen' and 'Jay Jay'. Some learners were also embarrassed at how sex

and masturbation were spoken about so openly. Learners would cover their eyes, laugh and point during these scenes.

Look Before You Leap: *Replay* 3.01

The audience was very emotionally engaged. They found the play very humorous and connected with the characters. They particularly liked the characters; Johnny, Candy, Jo's dad, Jaques and Tsepho. They often cheered Johnny on with "Vat haar vas, my broe" and sighed, "Ag shame" for 'Candy'. With regards to 'Michael', some empathised with his character while others shouted, "Cause you're gay!"

The largest reactions were in response to the kissing onstage. For each kiss there was a guaranteed response whether it be negative or positive. In only one school the learners commented on the interracial couples. We were surprised at the extreme reactions we always got from the gay kiss. Boys would often shout or pretend to walk out. In one case two boys walked out after the kiss (Livingstone High, Cape Town). The girls just laughed with their friends or shook their heads. We found it interesting at some schools that the learners got frustrated at the amount of kissing. Often we heard comments like, "not again", "here they go again" or "just get a room".

The audience reaction to the paedophile scene was unexpected and learners often laughed as a reaction to the serious matter of molestation. This could be due to the learners feeling uncomfortable or not recognising a shift in mood from the previous humorous scenes.

3. MAIN TOPICS

Look Before You Leap: *Get Real*

Relationships: (learners asked 69 questions)

As the show focused on young people and relationships, dating was often discussed with the learners. Girls often wanted to know, "Why do boys go for girls like Carmen?" This question always led to a discussion around "what to do when you really like someone". Hearing other learners' suggestions like "send an sms", "go on mxit" or "write a letter" sparked awareness among shy learners and encouraged them to make choices. The new law about kissing in public and the age of consent for sex, was an enjoyable in depth discussion. In general, the learners were against this new law, they thought it was 'unfair' and 'unnecessary'. They were concerned about why their generation has to have this law. They questioned this law in comparison to the age of consent for sex (16 years) and abortion (12 years). For example, "Why is it legal to have an abortion at 12 years old and its only legal to have sex at 16 years old?"

The other topic that was also discussed was relationships between adults and children. The main concern for them was that their parents do not understand them and that parents do not understand what they go through as young people. Many of them commented that their parents do not allow them to date. They discussed conflict between themselves and their parents for example, "How do you explain the new fashion to your parents without causing a fight?" (Danville Girls High, Durban, 27 Feb 2008).

The learners were intrigued by the kissing. The most popular question on the tour was, "Are you kissing for real?" They wanted to know how we kissed on stage, if we had romantic feelings for one another and whether it was awkward, they also asked if we were dating other people and how we felt about the kissing in the play.

Look Before You Leap: *Replay*

Sex and sexuality: (learners asked 52 questions)

Homosexuality was a regular topic of discussion. During discussion learners immediately wanted to know about the actors' experience of the gay kiss. They wanted to know how it felt, if the actor portraying 'Michael', was gay. Sandile would always explain what our roles are as actors, he would prompt them for further discussion by throwing the question back at them. For example, we would ask the audience how they would respond if their friend of the same sex suddenly kissed them. The common response from some of the boys was, 'punch him' while the girls suggested 'walk away' or 'talk to the person'. By discussing the issue of homosexuality and the reason for "Michael" kissing "Nthando", the learners were able to reassess their reactions and judgement.

The learners' fascination with homosexuality allowed us to make reference to the constitution of South Africa. We were able to talk about Human Rights in various situations. It was interesting to note that learners were aware that 'everyone is equal' according to the law, yet the majority still looked down upon gay people.

Relationships: (learners asked 55 questions)

The roles that girls and boys play in relationships were also addressed. This discussion often turned into a gender debate. Questions like, 'Why does the play make guys look like dogs?' and "Why can't boys say no?" were raised occasionally. Learners would also discuss who should make the first move in relationships and why. Discussing this theme reinforced understanding. Guys would hear reasons like, 'Girls are too self conscience' or 'afraid of rejection' to ask them out. Girls would hear comments like, 'we like confidence in a girl' from the boys.

Performing: (learners asked 38 questions)

The learners wanted to know about our work as actors and who we are as people. Often in discussion, learners wanted to know how to get into our line of work. They would ask questions like, "How do I become an actor?" and "What subjects do I need to have at school in order to study drama?" It felt good answering these questions but we tried to steer them away from these queries and rather steer them towards asking questions about the characters and themes of the play. We gave them the opportunity to ask career choice questions after the discussion, while we were packing up.

C] EDUCATORS & LEARNERS ASSESSMENT REPORT

(All quotes are transcribed as written, the appellation (sic) is not used as this will detract from the intention of the comments).

Look Before You Leap: *Get Real*

1. EDUCATORS

Presentation Rating: 3.63

Engagement Rating: 3.32

Seen Before: 22

The educators really enjoyed the play, finding the characters and issues real and relevant to the learners, and complimenting their life orientation sessions. "Very well presented. Characters brought out everyday youth life concerns. Relevant issues discussed. Learners engaged in questioning etc. Very informative" (Educator, show 30). "Everything that has been said is about Life Orientation. That's what I expected. Well Done." (Educator, show 11). "Well executed. Good interaction with learners. Good reflection. Excellent integration of the (life orientation) outcomes. Discussion relevant to the (life orientation) outcomes & assessment standards" (Educator, show 45). "I think L.O teachers will have a fantastic opportunity to refer to this production when working through these issues" (Educator, show 35). The educators were pleased with the learners' engagement, feeling that they had benefited positively from the presentations. "Learners were fully involved in the presentation of the play as one could see that they were emotionally attached. They could relate to the events that took place in the play" (Educator, show 45). "A very positive impact on learners. Learners are more aware of the negative impact substance abuse and HIV/AIDS have on society and young people in

particular” (Educator, show 14). “I think that what they have seen and heard in the play made them realise that these issues and situations does not happen to them alone and that they can make different decisions and take responsibility for their actions” (Educator, show 37). Many requested that arepp:Theatre for Life perform at their schools more frequently but at least once a year, “the show must be held once a week or a month because learners benefit more from these shows” (Educator, show 5). Once educator how has experienced arepp:Theatre for Life presentations before at her school commented on the long term impact of the presentations: “Theatre for Life helps our learners big time, as most of them are from bad family backgrounds. Please come again, you are developing them in many different ways. Keep it up” (Educator, show 11).

2. LEARNERS

Presentation Rating: 3.62

Engagement Rating: 3.13

The learners really enjoyed the presentation. “The scenes were realistic. Funny” (Grade 8 male learner, show 19). “Great actors! Script was well-written! Questions and answers were good!” (Grade 9 female learner, show 26) “The play was like real life” (Grade 8 female learner, show 4). “It was enjoyable. Answered our questions well” (Grade 8 male learner, show 18). The learners identified with the characters and situations, feeling that the presentations and the actors had helped them in dealing with those issues, their relationships and the stresses of being an adolescent. “I felt very relieved because some of the things that were presented I normally see them in reality in my school and in the streets and they were talking about things which are real” (Grade 9 female learner, show 9). “It was good to see people in the same situation we face at high school” (grade 9 male learner, show 21). “Because me and my friends are a bit overweight we learnt to appreciate ourselves for who we are, and not let people to intimidate us about our looks and body. We are now proud to be us!!!” (Grade 9 female, show 3). “I felt like something has change my life. I liked the play very much” (Grade 8 male learner, show 32).

“I think I learnt more about being a teenager and I heard some stuff I’ve never heard about. This play made changes to me like things I saw before in my life I saw different things. This play taught me about a choices I have already made about these things I learn about. And I am so proud about this play. It was so good and excellent play I have ever known before” (Grade 8 female, show 24).

Look Before You Leap: *Replay*

1. EDUCATORS

Presentation Rating: 3.54

Engagement Rating: 3.31

Seen Before: 8

The educators felt that the presentations were excellent on the whole, complimenting arepp:Theatre for Life for the standard and quality of the show, the handling of the discussions, and the suitability to and alignment with the Life Orientation Curriculum syllabus and the situation and circumstances of the learners. There was some concern expressed regarding the audibility of the performers during the facilitations because of the level of discussions generated after the shows. “(The play) was exceptionally good and informative. It was relevant to their daily lives” (Educator, show 4). “Graphic, realistic, bold. Well Done. Thanks for the resource.” (Educator, show 12). “Covered various issues in a short time, condensed play. Relevant to our L.O Curriculum. Realistic, open (discussion) and our learners could relate” (Educator, show 36). They felt the audiences engaged well and were positively affected by they interaction with the presentations and the opportunity to engage with the issues. “They identified well with the characters when it came to relationship issues. They also asked some very pertinent questions” (educator, show 17). “The play raised relevant issues in an honest manner, the humour allowed for difficult issues to be touched on and accepted. The discussion was well managed and dealt with relevant issues. Students appear to have engaged fully and enjoyed it” (Educator, show 26). “Gender issues relevant to

school situation, so good to cover. Discussion is encouraged well by actors. Play covers wide range of issues with different types of people, genders, colours, cultures” (Educator, show 2).

2. LEARNERS

Presentation Rating: 3.44

Engagement Rating: 3.02

The learners really enjoyed and appreciated the play, and often rated it as ‘exceptional’ and “brilliant”. “It was fantastic” (Grade 10 female learner, show 28). “The characters were cool!” (Grade 11 male learner, show 46). “It’s an eye-opener. The actors were brilliant” (Grade 12 female learner, show 24). “I felt good about the play and emotional about the discussion. It reminds me about thing I have done” (Grade 10 male learner, show 36). The learners felt that the play “felt like real life” to them, expressing that it was relevant, taught them something, and that the issues were issues that they dealt with daily. They felt that the experience had further equipped them to deal with the issues in terms of building confidence and making choices and decisions. “It gave me a lot of self esteem. It not always right to go after friend and you should not be pressurised from friends” (Grade 10 female learner, show 4). “The show was great cause it has taught a lot of us about status and self respect cause at the end it’s your responsibility alone” (Grade 11 female learner, show 7). “It showed me that I must be patient and think before I open my pants” (Grade 12 male learner, show 16).

“It meant a lot, I at first thought its probably just about the girls because of the way it started, I also felt in a way of “do they ever think of a guys perspective way” but in the middle they brought up the guys perspective, it’s a lot of info of the world today and I think of what I go threw, now I can share it with the actors. THANK YOU” (Grade 12 male learner, show 37)