

# 香港劇場年鑑2016

舞蹈・戲曲・戲劇

HONG  
KONG  
THEATRE  
YEARBOOK

2016

Dance

Xiqu

Drama



香港劇場年鑑2016 (舞蹈、戲曲、戲劇)

版次 2018年5月初版

資助: 香港藝術發展局

編輯及統籌: 陳國慧

執行編輯及資料統籌: 羅靖雯、巫書祺

專題論述編輯: 朱琮愛、黃進之、楊寶霖\*

專題論述校對: 葉懿雯

專題論述及資料統籌 (舞蹈): 林奕玲

專題論述及資料統籌 (戲曲): 盧敏樺

專題論述及資料統籌 (應用戲劇): 歐怡雯

資料搜集統籌 (神功戲): 張文珊

資料整理及校對 (神功戲): 張文珊、孫名慧

資料協作伙伴:

香港舞蹈界聯席會議－香港舞蹈年鑑編輯室、

香港戲劇協會、香港教育劇場論壇、

香港八和會館、八和粵劇學院、

香港中文大學音樂系 (戲曲資料中心)、art-mate.net

協作伙伴: 香港戲劇工程

封面、內文設計: TGIF

網頁設計及程式編寫: AlphaSoft Design Ltd.

© 國際演藝評論家協會 (香港分會) 有限公司  
版權所有，本書任何部分未經版權持有人許可，  
不得翻印、轉載或翻譯。

出版:

國際演藝評論家協會 (香港分會) 有限公司

香港灣仔港灣道2號香港藝術中心12樓1201-2室

電話: (852) 2974 0542 傳真: (852) 2974 0592

網址: <http://www.iatc.com.hk> 電郵: [iatc@iatc.com.hk](mailto:iatc@iatc.com.hk)

國際書號 ISBN: 978-988-13599-0-2

Hong Kong Theatre Yearbook 2016 (Dance, Xiqu, Drama)

First published in May 2018

Supported by: Hong Kong Arts Development Council

Editor and Coordinator: Bernice Chan Kwok-wai

Executive Editor and Research Coordinator: Queenie Law Ching-man, Mo Shu-ki

Feature Article Editors: Daisy Chu King-oi, Nicolette Wong Chun-chi, Yeung Po-lam\*

Feature Article Proofreader: Crystal Yip Yi-man

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Dance): Elaine Lam Yick-ling

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Xiqu): Jacqueline Lo Mun-wa

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Applied Drama): Au Yi-man

Research Coordinator (Ritual Performance): Milky Cheung Man-shan

Researchers (Ritual Performance): Milky Cheung Man-shan, Portia Suen Ming-wai

Research Partners:

Hong Kong Dance Sector Joint Conference - The Hong Kong Dance Yearbook

Editorial Board, Hong Kong Federation of Drama Societies,

Hong Kong Drama/Theatre and Education Forum,

The Chinese Artists Association of Hong Kong,

The Cantonese Opera Academy of Hong Kong,

Music Department, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Chinese Opera

Information Centre), art-mate.net

Partner: Hong Kong Theatre Works

Cover and Content Design: TGIF

Website Design and Software Development: AlphaSoft Design Ltd.

© International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong) Limited

All rights reserved; no part of this book may be reproduced, transmitted or translated  
without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Published by:

International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong) Limited

Rm 1201-2, 12/F, Hong Kong Arts Centre, 2 Harbour Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Tel: (852) 2974 0542

Fax: (852) 2974 0592

Website: <http://www.iatc.com.hk>

Email: [iatc@iatc.com.hk](mailto:iatc@iatc.com.hk)



International Association  
of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong)  
國際演藝評論家協會 (香港分會)



香港藝術發展局  
Hong Kong Arts Development Council

國際演藝評論家協會 (香港分會) 為藝發局資助團體  
IATC(HK) is financially supported by the HKADC

香港藝術發展局全力支持藝術表達自由，本計劃內容並不反映本局意見。

Hong Kong Arts Development Council fully supports freedom of artistic expression. The views and opinions expressed in this project do not represent the stand of the Council.

\*藝術行政人員實習計劃由香港藝術發展局資助。\*The Arts Administration Internship Scheme is supported by the Hong Kong Arts Development Council.

## 歷史文化視角下的「社區文化大使計劃」

羅婉芬

### （一）引言

「社區文化大使計劃」由康樂及文化事務署（康文署）轄下的觀眾拓展辦事處籌劃，<sup>1</sup> 每年公開邀請和甄選本地表演藝術家／藝團出任社區文化大使，為普羅市民或特定社群籌辦外展表演藝術活動。計劃預期能達致兩大目標：在社區層面推廣表演藝術，豐富大眾的藝術經驗和提高他們對藝術的欣賞能力；以及為本地表演藝術家／藝團提供外展機會接觸市民，培養新的觀眾。<sup>2</sup> 計劃自一九九九年推出，原名為「文化大使計劃」，由當時的臨時區域市政局轄下的文化藝術事務委員會策劃推行。<sup>3</sup> 二〇〇〇年香港議會架構重組，解散區域市政局和市政局兩個區域層級的議會，工作由新成立的康文署接替；<sup>4</sup> 該計劃隨後交由觀眾拓展辦事處策劃和推行，並改名為「社區文化大使計劃」。

計劃由籌劃、改名到跟觀眾拓展扣連在一起，整體上標著香港藝術文化界壓力團體與公共政策和議會政治發展的特有關係。一九九〇年代初，面臨香港政權回歸，當時的港英政府在各層級議會包括立法局、市政局、區域市政局（區局）增加民選議席，試圖加快議會民主化步伐。當時，關注香港藝術文化發展的藝評家、藝術家和藝團組成聯席會議成為壓力團體向政府施壓爭取檢討文化政策，或自行進行研究檢視香港藝術文化

發展的需要和文化政策的去向；<sup>5</sup> 具體促成香港回歸前至二〇〇〇年代初十數年間的藝術文化檢討工作。當中包括區局於一九九七年推出《區域市政局藝術發展計劃書：康樂文化事務委員會諮詢文件》，以及香港藝術發展局於一九九九年全面檢視香港的文化藝術生態和發展機遇。<sup>6</sup>

區局的諮詢文件就該局在表演藝術、視覺藝術及文學藝術方面所擔當的角色諮詢公眾；文件中建議加強藝術教育及培養觀眾，為區局轄區內（即新界）快將啟用的兩所文娛中心拓展觀眾層面和培育青少年對藝術的興趣。<sup>7</sup> 「文化大使計劃」在這歷史脈絡下落實推行，成為香港藝術文化政策一部分。

一九九九年首屆文化大使計劃有九個項目，其中有改編自民間故事《水滸傳》的戲劇巡迴表演、由兒童自己親手設計和製作的服飾的活動，亦有以「家事」為題由藝術家與十六個家庭聯合創作與家居有關的視藝作品，<sup>8</sup> 「家事」活動負責人表示該視藝活動試圖重新界定「藝術家」和「公眾」既有分野。<sup>9</sup> 這些文化大使項目的題材觸及社會文化及日常生活；項目整體編排上也帶有區局關注保存文化傳統的面向。<sup>10</sup> 社區文化大使計劃推行至今十八年，展現甚麼樣的特點？出任社區文化大使的本地表演藝術家／藝團如何看待社區層面的外展藝術活動，以及接觸市民和培

養新觀眾呢？他們參與其中，對計劃有何評價？

本文以「2016年社區文化大使計劃」的戲劇項目為起點，從歷史文化視角整理分析計劃的實施現況，試圖前瞻其發展，提出意見。文章所討論的內容重點來自國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）委託香港教育劇場論壇進行的「社區文化大使計劃」應用劇場研究項目的研究資料。<sup>11</sup> 二〇一七年，六月至十月期間，研究團

隊成功邀約執行計劃的康文署觀眾拓展辦事處人員、計劃的評審委員，以及部分出任二〇一六年社區文化大使戲劇類別的藝團和藝術家組合進行研究訪談，<sup>12</sup> 了解他們對計劃實施情況的見解。限於篇幅，本文會淺談社區文化大使計劃的觀眾拓展政策和受訪藝術家/藝團的戲劇藝術實踐所展現的觀眾觀念。至於研究項目所觸及有關文化政策的分析整理和建議等部分則留待研究報告內討論。

1. 社區文化大使計劃是觀眾拓展辦事處其中一個推廣藝術及教育活動的策略。有關其他策略，可瀏覽該處網頁：  
<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/tc/aboutus.php>
2. 參閱康樂及文化事務署觀眾拓展辦事處「社區文化大使計劃」網頁：<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/tc/ccas.php>
3. 區域市政局。1999。《區域市政局年報1998-99》，頁104，107-108。香港：區域市政總署。
4. 香港特別行政區政府。2001。《香港2000》，頁301。香港：政府新聞處。<https://www.yearbook.gov.hk/2000/b5/21/c21-00.htm>
5. 可參閱以下部分文獻：進念·二十面體、香港文化政策研究小組。1994。《尋找文化政策九三》。香港：進念·二十面體、香港中文大學。〈專題：香港官辦文化大檢閱〉，《明報月刊》，第31期，1996年11月號，頁68-79。陳雲。2008。《香港有文化：香港的文化政策（上卷）》。香港：花千樹出版有限公司。
6. 香港政策研究所、香港藝術發展局。1999。《香港文化藝術政策的釐定、推行與資源開拓：研究報告與綜合摘要結集》。香港：香港藝術發展局。
7. 區域市政局康樂文化事務委員會。1997。《區域市政局藝術發展計劃書》，頁29-33。香港：區域市政局。
8. 區域市政局。1999。《區域市政局年報1998-99》，頁107-108。香港：區域市政總署。
9. 參閱陳沛浩。1999。《家事》。[http://www.hkcmp.org/cmp/002\\_home.html](http://www.hkcmp.org/cmp/002_home.html)
10. 區局成立於一九八六年，為其轄區內（即新界）的居提供市政文娛康樂體育活動。有見新市鎮發展對鄉郊地區帶來破壞，區局自九十年代起以修葺古蹟、徵集新界文物/粵劇文物和興建博物館等方式，保育文化傳統和遺跡。參閱《區域市政局年報1990-91》、《區域市政局年報1993-94》及《區域市政局年報1995-96》。
11. 本研究採用文件分析和深度訪談的質性研究方法蒐集資料，把「社區文化大使計劃」放置在香港的歷史文化脈絡中，藉由不同人士對計劃推行的見解，以及劇團參與推廣社區文化發展和觀眾拓展擔當的角色，分析政策推行的現況，意圖提出意見以前瞻政策發展。研究報告將會於二〇一八年中出版。研究團隊成員包括羅婉芬博士（首席研究員），歐怡雯博士（副研究員）、韋淑敏小姐（研究助理）。
12. 二〇一六年共九個戲劇類別的社區文化大使項目，其中五個藝團/組合接受本研究邀請做受訪者，見文末的附錄。



## （二）只得一堆數字的觀眾拓展政策

觀眾是表演藝術不可或缺的重要部分。然而，社區文化大使計劃其中一個為藝術家／藝團詬病的地方是政府以數點在場人數的方式來衡量計劃的價值，所謂「有價值」往往是指最有效運用成本達到物有所值的意思。事實上，二〇一六年，政府審計署就康文署觀眾拓展辦事處二〇一五至一六年度推廣表演藝術而籌辦的觀眾拓展活動進行「衡工量值式」的審計工作。<sup>13</sup>審計報告指出康文署「計算參加人數有所不足……很多參加者似乎只是路過，或停留片刻便離開……有關藝團未必妥為計算參加人數」，建議署方「向藝團提供清晰指引，說明如何計算社區計劃下觀眾拓展活動的參加人數，並確保藝團遵從指引。」報告指康文署接納審計署的建議，並且表示會「定期出席有關活動，並安排突擊檢查，以監察活動和覆核參加人數」。<sup>14</sup>實在難怪當時報章報導亦只著眼藝團所舉辦的社區藝術活動報大觀眾人數的情況。<sup>15</sup>

社區文化大使計劃原意是讓藝術工作者或藝團透過外展的藝術活動「踏出細小的演出框框，走進社群，從而擴闊與觀眾的接觸面，發揮才能」。<sup>16</sup>然而，以「數人頭」作為單一標準和證據來做衡工量值，「觀眾」成為政府審計工作下一堆的數字和面目不明的物體；也把觀眾拓展辦事處和政策的焦點模糊到監察和核實藝團估計參加人數上。實在可惜。

政策制定者和執行者關心政策是否「有價值」是自然不過。但單憑點人頭所得的數字，對於具體了解社區文化大使計劃作為政策策略對社區、文化和觀眾素質的培育起了甚麼作用，和如何起作用等這些方面的價值，則不能提供具體和有用的資料。政策實施除了點人頭的做法之外，需要運用更有效的檢討和評量方法。下面會接續討論。

13. 衡工量值式的審計工作是指審計署「就受審核組織在履行職務時所達到的節省程度、效率和效益，進行審查」。參閱審計署網頁：

[http://www.aud.gov.hk/chi/aboutus/about\\_valm.htm](http://www.aud.gov.hk/chi/aboutus/about_valm.htm)

14. 審計署。〈為推廣表演藝術而籌辦的觀眾拓展活動〉，《審計署署長第六十七號報告書》，第10章，2016年10月28日，頁iv、vi、16、19、21。[http://www.aud.gov.hk/pdf\\_ca/c67ch10.pdf](http://www.aud.gov.hk/pdf_ca/c67ch10.pdf)

15. 嚴敏慧。〈康文署活動 藝團報大觀眾人數9倍〉，《蘋果日報》，2016年11月24日。<https://hk.news.appledaily.com/local/daily/article/20161124/19844098>

16. 區域市政局。1999。《區域市政局年報1998-99》，頁107。香港：區域市政總署。



《「縫補補」之「尋寶珠」》(2016)

照片提供：劇場空間



《稻米人家》(2016)

攝影：馮偉新



### （三）社區文化大使為誰工作為誰忙？

社區文化大使項目一般包括到社區中心、公園或商場等地方做巡迴演出、工作坊及展覽等外展活動，藝團俗稱之為「送外賣」。究竟，劇場人「送外賣」到社區所為何事？接受本研究項目訪問的五個「2016社區文化大使」藝團／組合均參加社區文化大使計劃多年，他們的活動各有特點，也各有期望。「麥秋·鄧安迪·陳鈞鍵」組合關心環境保育，過去數年分別用樹木、水、氣候和雀鳥為題，利用通俗劇、專題工作坊和講座分享珍惜和保護大自然的訊息，談綠色生活。「糊塗戲班」期望宣揚香港人的「can-do」精神，將共融平等兼容的訊息帶入社區。兩個藝團／組合均意圖以社區文化大使計劃作為教育公眾的平台。

受訪的另外三個劇團亦各有關懷。「劇場空間」的「縫補補」系列以五六十年代陪伴不少香港人生長的著名粵語片童星馮寶寶名字諧音取名。系列推行數年，主題圍繞長者、老舖、舊地與人情；舉辦編劇班、演技班和手工手偶製作工作坊等，回顧和重拾昔日「獅子山下」的香港情懷和價值觀。「一條褲製作」選用紀錄劇場、人種誌戲劇、論壇劇場和一人一故事等應用劇場<sup>17</sup>的形式來呈現社會事件；過去數年劇團走訪並演出包括受興建高鐵收地影響的菜園村、少數族裔和雨傘運動下的一個家庭等，述說當下的香港故事。「浪人劇場」同樣

以今日香港為題，運用戲劇重新演繹香港風俗、傳統手工藝，以及特色行業。工作坊帶著參加者去溜達落戶香港的水上人、潮州人、上海人、南洋人等所住的地方；光顧他們開的小店，學他們維生的手藝。

顯然，受訪藝團的文化大使項目關心香港本地風俗、今昔生活和人物地產景，當中不乏再現舊人、舊地和舊事。至於對過去的回味是純粹浪漫化地懷舊呢？或是在幫助我們把已有或沒有的記憶從主流媒體早已定型的看法中重新釋放，從更多不同的角度、層次去了解一些舊人舊事，重整記憶結連當下生活呢？要分析整理上述問題必須靠賴有效的文字和影像資料存檔，但現時受訪藝團和觀眾拓展辦事處雙方均未見妥善保存資料。而另一個受訪者亦指出，觀眾拓展辦事處表示計劃著重項目的持續和深化的可能性；實際上處方並沒有就藝團過往推行活動提供任何紀錄。資料欠妥善保存，除不利於文化大使項目的持續發展，更不利於展開有效的質性政策檢討和推展。

#### •劇場人作為社區文化的實踐者／開拓者的可能性

社區文化大使計劃送戲劇到社區的意義何在？受訪的劇場人和計劃甄選委員大致上認為「有好過無」，原因卻略有不同。受訪的藝團和組合觀察到參加工作坊／講座的朋友多為中年人士，部分是社區文化大使或其他康文署舉

辦的文娛康樂節目的擁躉。參加者善用活動各取所需，或藉機親子活動，或跟老友相聚，或享受退休後的消閒時光。計劃能否如預期目標誘發大眾對表演藝術的興趣，豐富他們的藝術經驗和提高他們對藝術的欣賞能力，促進社區藝術的發展呢？其中一位受訪者對此存疑。就他觀察送戲劇到社區的吸引力不一定來自藝術活動本身，更多可能來自活動把「人」和「關懷」帶到缺乏社會關注的邊緣社群如老人中，他有感現存公共政策對社群的關注不均。

上述受訪者的回應帶出一個有趣又重要的問題：社區藝術活動能拓展社區文化生活嗎？會怎樣拓展？若看工作坊活動，受訪的社區文化大使近年除了舉辦表演訓練、編劇等工作坊之外，還興起手藝創作；其中不乏手機攝影和Fotomo（攝影浮雕），參加者用相機鏡頭把平日尋常不過的大樹、老舖及周遭環境瞬間凝住，成為「凝視」對象。相機鏡頭的凝視同時建構攝影者自己的城市視覺經驗和記憶。這種視覺經驗大概跟康文署和香港旅遊發展局打造香港為「亞洲盛事之都」的視覺

經驗不一樣。<sup>18</sup>有機會為生活忙碌的香港人打開人與城市的另一種關係和方式去想像和論述香港。

#### （四）觀眾：誰在場，誰缺場？

受本研究訪問的藝團除了製作社區文化大使計劃的社區巡演，也有主劇場演出，其製作各有側重，有的追尋舞台美學上的創新、有的著重引發觀眾思辨、有的探索文本素材與劇場表演風格、有的矢志發展戲劇藝術與社會更緊密的關係。當藝團被問到計劃有否培養新觀眾，他們的看法卻十分相近。大部分受訪者認為巡演接觸到的社區觀眾大多不會成為他們主劇場的觀眾，因為給社區觀眾的演出「不可太深奧」，「故事要容易入口」，「要有開心的元素」因為「看演出應該是件賞心樂事」，所以其中一些受訪藝團會選用通俗劇形式演繹。換言之，受訪藝團眼中，社區觀眾似乎是一個模樣，需要大眾化口味、輕鬆、易明、看得愉快的演出，所以跟主劇場觀眾基本上不是一樣。

17. Tim Prentki和Sheila Preston（2009）在其著作《The Applied Theatre Reader》中解釋「應用劇場」一詞「泛指一系列廣泛的各種戲劇實踐和創作過程，把參與者和觀眾超越傳統的主流戲劇的範圍，進入普通人及其故事，當地環境和關心的優先事項的劇場中」（頁9）。

18. 康樂及文化事務署抱負和使命，<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/tc/aboutlcsd/mission.html>

香港旅遊發展局，<http://www.discoverhongkong.com/tc/see-do/events-festivals/index.jsp>

「香港品牌」，<https://www.brandhk.gov.hk/html/tc/OurHongKong/asiaseventscapital.html>

另外參閱Urry, J. 著，葉浩譯。2007。《觀光客的凝視》（The tourist gaze）。台北：書林。

藝團對「社區觀眾」的看法頗為一致，而這種觀眾觀念混和了香港經濟社會打造的娛樂觀。六七十年代，香港工業發達經濟騰飛，電視娛樂消遣強化打工仔工作與閒暇分明的生活，正所謂「日頭猛做，到依家輕鬆下。食過晚飯，要休息返一陣」。<sup>19</sup>另一邊廂，學校教導學生善用閒暇，培養良好嗜好應付緊張的工作和考試壓力，提高生產力或消耗過盛精力。<sup>20</sup>事實上，由七十年代起，香港整個康樂體育市政政策發展都是建基在工作／閒暇二分的城市生活上，康體設施為市民提供價錢低廉的消閒活動放鬆身心，不論是在劇院或商場看表演的人士都成為「消費者」。現時，藝團／藝術家需要跟電視、戲院、食肆、網絡／手機遊戲、網絡視頻等消閒活動競爭「顧客」。過去有批評說社區文化大使的社區演出質素欠佳，演出不為甚麼，爆發幾下笑料吸引觀眾了事，有「欺場」之嫌。<sup>21</sup>這個除了跟製作費有限或／和排練不足有關之外，也跟「戲劇是娛樂大眾」這種觀眾觀和娛樂觀有關係嗎？實在值得進一步探討。

時至今日，做工的往往「有返工，無放工」，做學生的情況也相若，長工時／學時在不斷蠶食市民的生活空間和樂趣。在這經濟社會脈絡下，社區文化大使計劃大概只能培育來自社區的觀眾作為消費者而非藝術愛好者。那麼，社區藝術的價值和作用何在？社區藝術如何介入這個生活節奏，令城市生活重新活潑起來？這

些問題來得更迫切。或許，藝團／藝術家其中一個具體推廣社區藝術的策略是爭取減少工時和學時，跟關注團體一同維護市民的作息時間和文化權益。無論如何，我們要問：藝術家／劇場人與來看演出的社區人士，除了是藝人與消費者的關係之外，還可以有哪些關係。

#### • 「關懷」社群：創建藝術家與觀眾的另類關係

事實上，受訪的劇場人當中已開始重新思考戲劇實踐與觀眾的關係。其中一位受訪者的劇團曾參加社區文化大使計劃多年，已嘗試運用不同的劇場說故事形式和表演風格，在演出過程中加強跟觀眾互動，讓他們不坐下來冷眼看戲，藉此豐富觀眾對主題的體驗與思考。另一位受訪藝團代表就運用應用劇場模式和理念<sup>22</sup>向特定的群體採集他們的生活故事，製作戲劇故事，其後這些參與者在巡演中變成自己和別人故事的觀眾。兩個藝團的戲劇實踐均意圖打破社區觀眾是被動受眾和消費者的固有做法，迸發出另一種觀眾觀念：「觀眾即參與者」。而應用劇場的戲劇實踐視社區／社群人士既是創作原材料，又是戲劇故事的主人翁，也是觀眾。

新西蘭戲劇教育學者Molly Mullen在一篇討論應用劇場的資助者與受資助者關係的文章中指出「應用劇場」中「應用」（apply）一詞跟英文「management」一詞皆蘊含「關顧／關

心」的意思。<sup>23</sup>英國劇場學者Nicola Shaughnessy解釋「apply」一字源自拉丁文applicāre，字面上有「把東西連繫一起」的意思，也比喻「投身於」和「加以注意」。<sup>24</sup>Shaughnessy指應用劇場工作者關心他們工作所及的社區或社群，有意識地運用表演的過程來帶動革變，創造新的東西。<sup>25</sup>換言之，從應用劇場角度看，發展社區藝術需要了解來自社區的觀眾特質和需要，必須創建另一種藝術家/藝團與社區觀眾的關係，建立另一種觀眾觀念。所以，坊間論者呼籲藝團在社區找定位，利用藝術駐足社區，耕耘社群關係，以營造社區感。<sup>26</sup>這方面，台灣和新加坡一些劇團的社區實踐經驗值得借鏡。<sup>27</sup>有關部分在研究報告內文再作討論。

### • 誰來關心：文化管理理念再定位

Mullen和Shaughnessy的提醒也適用於文化藝術界的管理理念。過去二十年，香港的大專院校陸續開辦藝術行政和文化管理學科訓練人才，回應早於九十年代中香港文化藝術界論者的倡議，藉以處理政府藝術政策行政主導甚至由外行領導內行的問題。<sup>28</sup>

現時，一些大型文化藝術機構/藝團、藝術行政人員專業組織，以至香港藝術發展局的觀眾拓展工作，主要從建立品牌的市場營銷角度或/和大數據分析的手法，務求改變觀眾文化消費行為模式。<sup>29</sup>某程度上，似乎在強化藝團與觀眾的藝術成品生產者和消費者的關係。讓觀眾拓展工作回歸到「關顧/關心」目標觀

19. 這是香港無線電視製作的長壽綜藝節目《歡樂今宵》的主題曲的歌詞，由一九六七年開始連續現場直播27年。

20. 香港課程發展委員會。1975。《社會教育科暫定課程綱要（中一至中三適用）》。香港：政府印務局。香港課程發展委員會。1980。《小學社會科課程綱要》。香港：政府印務局。

21. 余展豪。〈澳台演藝高人教路 「欺場」必失觀眾 學生或社區演出也要全力以赴〉，《星島日報》，2014年11月5日，觀眾拓展因局系列海外篇。

22. 有關「應用劇場」一詞意思，見註17。

23. Mullen, M. 2012. "Taking care and playing it safe: Tensions in the management of funding relationships". *Journal of Arts & Communities*, 4(3), pp.194.

24. Shaughnessy, N. 2012. *Applying performance: Live art, socially engaged theatre and affective practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.xiv.

25. 同上。

26. 鍾進怡、唐健朗。〈談政府的藝團觀眾拓展工作〉，《信報》，2017年6月5日，時事評論「文化論政」。鍾進怡、唐健朗。〈續談觀眾拓展 藝團該如何自救〉，《信報》，2017年7月24日，時事評論「文化論政」。

27. 關於台灣社區劇場的發展，可參閱《TEFOzine應用戲劇/劇場》2017年第18期的專題報導。

28. 黃清霞。〈文化政策五年計劃有感〉，《明報月刊》，第31期，1996年11月號，頁73-76。文樓。〈官辦文化的關鍵問題：為什麼會有外行領導內行？〉，《明報月刊》，第31期，1996年11月號，頁77-79。

29. 二〇〇四年，香港藝術發展局舉辦兩天「觀眾拓展工作坊」。另外，香港藝術行政人員協會於二〇一七年以「創建未來觀眾」為主題，舉辦兩天「二〇一七文化領袖論壇」，活動詳情可瀏覽協會網頁：<http://www.hkaaa.org.hk/doc/22798?tab=6>

眾身上，對於藝術文化行政人員而言也至關重要。這部分在研究報告內會作詳細討論。

### （五）小結與前瞻

社區文化大使計劃推展至今，一直以觀眾數字來看拓展觀眾和評量成效。但本研究的受訪者大致上告訴我們，外展戲劇活動多了並不自然而然成就更多藝術愛好者和劇場觀眾。所以，當局若依然以現時的方式推行政策計劃，我們估計於可見的將來也不會有效地提升社區藝術和培育藝術愛好者。故此，政策必須更新。

#### • 更新政策：重塑「關係」和「信任」

政策上，未來的關鍵工作在於善用社區文化大使計劃重構藝術與社區／社群和城市的關係，創建另一種觀眾觀念，以達致有效的觀眾拓展。本研究一位受訪者就針對該計劃令藝團走馬燈式地區巡演的做法，建議觀眾拓展辦事處修訂政策，容許甚至鼓勵藝團再次到訪已有初步接觸的地區或社群，深化彼此的關係，讓藝團藉由藝術媒介回應社區和社群的在地需要，同時拓展社區藝術的興趣和愛好。

另一位受訪者建議觀眾拓展辦事處建立資料庫和有效的儲存系統，妥善管理社區文化大使計劃的資料紀錄，支援甄選委員的評審工作和社區藝術的持續發展。他同時提議觀眾拓展辦事處招募「有能力、有水平」的觀察員與藝團緊

密接觸，認識藝團的外展計劃，到訪活動並給予有深度和全面的回饋。研究團隊贊同上述建議，認為此舉有助政府當局重新聚焦於項目的質素和推行實況，作為政策檢討和評估的具體依據，不單單依賴數點人數。藉著觀察員的工作，處方有機會加深了解藝團的特質和需要，重新建立信任，重塑與藝團之間的資助關係。

#### • 拓展觀眾拓展的「質性」面向

除上述建議，研究團隊認為政策上必須拓展觀眾拓展的質性面向，重構一個「有面目的觀眾」的文化藝術政策。就此，政策當局需要展開研究工作，從不同層面考察社區文化大使計劃在整體社會脈絡下的推行實況、公眾期望和參與等進行評估研究。除了檢討評量，蒐集證據更重要的作用是為政策制定者在新一輪政策決策過程中提供做決定的依據。<sup>30</sup>

嚴謹的政策研究工作必須吸納跨學科研究視野，善用混合研究模式。具體來說，除了採用慣常的問卷調查蒐集「定量」證據之外，公共政策制定者亦需要借用社會科學、文化研究以及人種誌等學術領域進行人與社會探究的「定性」研究方法，<sup>31</sup>更不能忽視應用劇場工作者和研究者運用的「表演研究範式」所能提供的證據。<sup>32</sup>政策當局若能如是者展開研究工作，對社區文化大使計劃以至於其他的藝術文化政策的制定、實施和檢討必定會帶來重要發展。

## （六）鳴謝

本文內容和相關研究計劃得以完成，承蒙康樂及文化事務署觀眾拓展辦事處人員、計劃甄選委員及各藝團／藝術組合抽空接受研究訪談，提供資料和分享寶貴經驗。特此鳴謝。

- 30. 參閱Parkhurst, J. 2017. *The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- 31. 參閱Stoker, G., & Evans, M. 2016. *Evidence-based policy making in the social sciences: Methods that matter*. Bristol, England; Chicago, Illinois: Policy Press.
- 32. 「表演研究範式」確認戲劇創作實踐本身就是研究，實踐研究過程中同樣衍生知識和建立理論，跟傳統的定性和定量學術研究同樣嚴謹。參閱Haseman, B. 2010. "Rupture and Recognition: Identifying the Performative Research Paradigm". In Barrett, E., & Bolt, B. (Eds.), *Practice as research: Approaches to creative arts enquiry*, pp. 147-157. London: I.B. Tauris.



### (七) 附錄：「2016社區文化大使計劃」戲劇藝術項目

劇團	節目
麥秋·鄧安迪·陳鈞鍵**	《「鳥」結生命 — 環境保育劇場》
郭志偉·黃婉萍·周佩韻·譚天樂	《戲·樂人生》
劇場空間**	《「縫補補」之「尋寶珠」》
浪人劇場**	《稻米人家》
演戲家族	《凌戲逼人》
糊塗戲班**	《人人有障礙·個個有才能》
一條褲製作**	《論盡一家人》
同流	《「竹」出過去·「築」出未來》
Arts' Options	《細味咸豐年：以前我哋玩呢乜》

資料來源：觀眾拓展辦事處網頁（截至2017年11月6日）

<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/tc/audience2016.php>

\*\*參與本研究的受訪劇團／組合。

---

#### 羅婉芬

羅婉芬博士從事戲劇和教育的教研工作。羅氏接受文化研究、批判教育學和戲劇教育的跨學科訓練，教研興趣包括：教育與文化研究；戲劇教育；英語的學與教和課程發展。羅氏現為《亞洲戲劇教育學刊》編輯之一。其學術論文散見於文化研究和戲劇教育領域內的學刊。近期學術著作有〈A Critical Analysis of Drama Curricular Practice as the Practice of Hope in Schools in Neoliberal Societies〉

（即將刊出，《Drama Research: international journal of drama in education》，第九期）；

〈分析觀眾反應：以《1894香港鼠疫》教育劇場為例〉（2016，《亞洲戲劇教育學刊》第六期）；

〈Education as an Aesthetic Exercise in Everyday School Performances〉（2015，刊於

《Paulo Freire: The Global Legacy》，Michael Peters和Tina Besley編）。近期研究報告有

《香港學校戲劇節中學組別劇本故事大綱內容分析，2008-2016》（2017，與歐怡雯、韋淑敏合撰）；

《香港小學戲劇活動統計報告2013》（2015，與陳自強、區家晞合撰）。

# A Historical-cultural Perspective on the Community Cultural Ambassador Scheme

Muriel Law Yuen-fun

## I. Introduction

The Community Cultural Ambassador Scheme (thereafter the CCAS or the Scheme) is organised by the Audience Building Office (AB Office) under the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).<sup>1</sup> Each year, the Scheme invites local performing artists/ arts groups through an open invitation exercise to act as community cultural ambassadors to conduct outreach performing arts activities for the general public or specific communities. The purpose of the Scheme is two-fold: to promote the performing arts at the community level, enriching the artistic experience of the general public and enhancing arts appreciation; and to encourage local performing arts practitioners/arts groups to broaden their audience base by reaching out to the community.<sup>2</sup> The Scheme, formerly known as the Cultural Ambassador Scheme, was launched in 1999 by the Culture and Arts Select Committee of the then Provisional Regional Council.<sup>3</sup> Following a review of the structure of district organisations in the HKSAR, the Provisional Regional Council and its urban counterpart the Provisional Urban Council were dissolved, and the provision of leisure and cultural services was taken up by the newly established LCSD in 2000.<sup>4</sup> The Scheme was renamed the "Community Cultural Ambassador Scheme", and its

planning and implementation has been overseen by the AB Office under the LCSD ever since.

From its planning, renaming to implementation under the AB Office, the Scheme as a whole indicates the specific relationship between local arts and cultural communities as pressure groups, public policy and the development of council politics in the Hong Kong context. In the early 1990s, with the transfer of sovereignty on the horizon, the then British Hong Kong Government increased the number of elected seats at all levels of councils including the Legislative Council, the Urban Council and the Regional Council (RegCo), in an attempt to speed up democratisation in Hong Kong. At the time, local arts critics and artists concerned about the development of arts and culture in Hong Kong formed joint associations to press the government to review its arts and cultural policy. Theatre groups also initiated research studies to examine the needs of Hong Kong's artistic and cultural development and possible directions for the city's cultural policy.<sup>5</sup> All these efforts facilitated reviews of arts and culture in the decade before and the one after the transfer of sovereignty. One of the outcomes was the consultation document on the arts development plan published by the RegCo in 1997; another was a comprehensive review of Hong Kong's cultural and artistic environment conducted

by the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (HKADC) in 1999.<sup>6</sup> The consultation document published by RegCo in 1997 reviewed its own role in promoting the performing arts, visual arts and literary arts. It proposed to step up arts education and to foster young people's interest in the arts, nurturing them as future audiences for the two civic centres set to open soon in the district (i.e. the New Territories).<sup>7</sup> The Cultural Ambassador Scheme was launched as part of Hong Kong's arts and cultural policy in this historical context.

The 1999 Cultural Ambassador Scheme had nine projects, including a dramatic rendition of the Chinese classic *Water Margin*; a programme with children making their own costumes and accessories; and a collaborative visual arts project where the artists worked with 16 household-participants on the theme of "Family Affairs".<sup>8</sup> With the "Family Affairs" collaborative project, the curators attempted to redefine the divide between "the artist" and "the public".<sup>9</sup> These cultural ambassador programmes touched upon the everyday life and popular culture, and the programming as a whole carried some of

1. The CCAS is one of the arts exposure and education programmes developed by the AB Office. For information about other programmes organised by the AB Office, visit the AB Office's website: <http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/en/aboutus.php>
2. For further details, visit the CCAS website: <http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/en/ccas.php>
3. Regional Council. 1999. *Regional Council annual report 1998-99*, pp. 104, 108-109. Hong Kong: Regional Services Department.
4. Hong Kong SAR Government. 2001. *Hong Kong 2000*, pp. 385. Hong Kong: Information Services Department. <https://www.yearbook.gov.hk/2000/eng/21/c21-00.htm>
5. See some of the references below: Zuni Icosahedron & Hong Kong Cultural Policy Study Group. 1994. *In Search of Cultural Policy '93*. Hong Kong: Zuni Icosahedron, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. "Special Topic: Hong Kong Government-run Official Culture", *Ming Pao Monthly*, 31(11), 1996, pp. 68-79. Chin, W. 2008. *Hong Kong's Got Culture: The Cultural Policy of Hong Kong, Volume 1*. Hong Kong: Arcadia Press Ltd.
6. Hong Kong Policy Research Institute & Hong Kong Arts Development Council. 1999. *Cultural and arts policy, its implementation and sustainable arts funding: A report for the Hong Kong Arts Development Council*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Arts Development Council.
7. The Recreation and Culture Select Committee of the Regional Council. 1997. *Regional Council Arts Development Plan Proposals*, pp. 29-33. Hong Kong: Regional Council.
8. Regional Council. 1999. *Regional Council annual report 1998-99*, pp. 108-109. Hong Kong: Regional Services Department.
9. See Chan, H. 1999. "Home Affairs" (In Chinese). [http://www.hkcmp.org/cmp/002\\_home.html](http://www.hkcmp.org/cmp/002_home.html)

RegCo's concern about heritage preservation.<sup>10</sup> The CCAS has been implemented for 18 years. What are the characteristics of the Scheme? How do local artists who have served as community cultural ambassadors view the outreach arts activities, the reaching out to the public and the nurturing of new audiences? What are their comments on the Scheme?

This article takes the theatre arts projects in the 2016 Community Culture Ambassador Scheme as its point of departure, and analyses the current implementation of the Scheme from the historical-cultural perspective in an attempt to put forth suggestions for its future directions. It draws data from the research study on the CCAS commissioned by the International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong) (IATC (HK)) and conducted by Hong Kong Drama/Theatre and Education Forum (TEFO).<sup>11</sup> Between June and October 2017, the research team successfully interviewed staff members at the AB Office, assessors of the Scheme, and some of the 2016 community cultural ambassadors for the theatre arts projects<sup>12</sup> for their views on the implementation of the Scheme. Because of limited space, the article focuses on the audience policy of the CCAS and the conception of audience revealed in the theatre makers' practice, while the analysis and discussion

related to cultural policy will be covered in the full research report.

## **2. Audience building policy that is just a bunch of numbers**

Audience is indispensable to the performing arts. However, the artists/arts groups who took part in the research study heavily criticised the CCAS for evaluating the "value" of the community arts programmes by counting audience numbers, where "value" is often equated with the most cost-effective way to achieve value for money. In fact, in 2016, the Audit Commission of the HKSAR Government carried out a value for money audit<sup>13</sup> on the audience building activities for performing arts organised by the AB Office in 2015/2016. The audit review reported that there were "[i]nadequacies in counting number of participants... Many participants appeared to be just passing by or only stayed at the activities briefly... the arts groups concerned might not have counted the number of participants properly". The audit report recommended that the LCSD "provide arts groups clear guidelines on counting the number of participants in audience building activities under community schemes, and ensure compliance with the guidelines". The LCSD generally accepted the audit recommendations, and would send officers to "attend the activities on a

regular basis and arrange surprise checks to monitor the activities and counter check the attendance”, as noted in the audit report.<sup>14</sup> It is no wonder that the press at the time focused on nothing but the attendance at community arts events organised by the arts groups under the AB Office.<sup>15</sup>

The CCAS is intended to enable artists “to move beyond their familiar working environment and reach out to the district community...widening

the audience base and developing the artists’ skills”.<sup>16</sup> However, with “headcount” being the single standard and evidence for value for money auditing, “audience” has become a bunch of numbers and faceless objects. It has also blurred the policy focus of the AB Office and shifted the management of audience building to monitoring and verifying participant numbers. It is a great pity.

- 10. Regional Council (RegCo) was established in 1986 to oversee the provision of municipal, recreational and cultural services for residents in the Council area (i.e. the New Territories districts). In view of the threat of the rapid development of new towns to the indigenous cultural heritage in the area, in the 1990s, RegCo adopted strategies like repairing historic buildings/sites, collecting relics from the New Territories and Cantonese opera, and building museums as means to preserve cultural heritage. See *Regional Council annual report 1990-91*; *Regional Council annual report 1993-94*; and *Regional Council annual report 1995-96*.
- 11. This research study adopts qualitative research methods of document analysis and in-depth face-to-face interview. It places the CCAS in the specific historical-cultural context of Hong Kong. Through analysing the views of people involved in the Scheme and the roles of theatre arts groups in promoting community culture and audience development, the study examines the ways in which the Scheme, as part of the government arts and cultural policy, is implemented. It attempts to draw implications for future policy development. The research report will be published in mid-2018. The research team consists of Dr Muriel Law Yuen-fun (Principal Investigator), Dr Au Yi-man (Co-investigator) and Ms Pauline Wai Shuk-man (Research Assistant).
- 12. There were nine theatre arts projects in the 2016 Community Culture Ambassador Scheme, and the research team interviewed five of the theatre groups for the research interviews. See the Appendix for further information.
- 13. Value for money audit is “an examination into the economy, efficiency and effectiveness with which the audited body has discharged its functions”. For further information, visit the Audit Commission website: [http://www.aud.gov.hk/eng/aboutus/about\\_valm.htm](http://www.aud.gov.hk/eng/aboutus/about_valm.htm)
- 14. Audit Committee. “Audience building activities for performing arts”, *Director of Audit’s Report No. 67*, Chapter 10, 28 October 2016, pp. vi, x, 18, 21 & 23. [http://www.aud.gov.hk/pdf\\_e/e67ch10.pdf](http://www.aud.gov.hk/pdf_e/e67ch10.pdf)
- 15. Yim, M.W. “Arts groups exaggerated audience attendance at LCSD-funded activities by 9 times”, *Apple Daily*, 24 November 2016. <https://hk.news.appledaily.com/local/daily/article/20161124/19844098>
- 16. Regional Council. 1999. *Regional Council annual report 1998-99*, pp.108. Hong Kong: Regional Council.

It is inevitable that policymakers and managers are concerned about whether a policy is “valuable”. However, participant numbers alone do not provide specific or useful information for understanding other values like how the CCAS as a policy strategy nurtures the community and its culture and the quality of audience, and how the Scheme may achieve that. Therefore, we need other more effective measures to evaluate policy implementation than doing the headcount, which will be discussed further below.

### **3. Who do community cultural ambassadors serve?**

The CCAS programmes generally include theatre activities in community halls, shopping centres and/or outdoor areas like parks, workshops/talks, and exhibitions. Theatre groups nickname the combination “theatre delivery”, meaning sending performances as “take-outs” to the community. Why do they do “theatre delivery” to the community? Five of the 2016 community cultural ambassadors interviewed for the research study shared their views. All of them have participated in the Scheme

for a number of years; their activities possess unique characteristics and reflect distinct expectations. The James Mark, Andy Tang, Freddie Chan ensemble is concerned about environmental protection. In the past few years, the group has worked on themes such as trees, water, climate and birds using melodrama, workshops and lectures to promote green living. The Nonsensemakers hopes to promote the “can-do” spirit of Hong Kong people and the notions of inclusiveness and equality, with a view to fostering social integration at the community level. Both groups intended to make use of the CCAS as a platform for educating the public.

The other three theatre groups interviewed also brought their specific concerns into the CCAS. Theatre Space has been running the Scraps of Life series for a few years, which revolves around themes such as the elderly, old shops, old places and the human touch. Their programmes have included playwriting workshops, acting classes and hand puppets workshops that evoke the “Spirit of Lion Rock”, the sentiments and values from the good old days of Hong Kong. Pants Theatre Production uses

17. In their book *The Applied Theatre Reader* (2009), Tim Prentki & Sheila Preston define “applied theatre” “as a term describing a board set of theatrical practices and creative processes that take participants and audiences beyond the scope of conventional, mainstream theatre into the realm of a theatre that is responsive to ordinary people and their stories, local settings and priorities.” (pp. 9).





*Scraps of Life – Family Treasures Hunt* (2016)  
Photo courtesy: Theatre Space



*Stories of Rice Family* (2016)  
Photo: Fung Wai-san



applied theatre<sup>17</sup> strategies including documentary theatre, ethnodrama, forum theatre and playback theatre to re-present social incidents. Over the past few years, they have presented in their CCAS programmes stories of Choi Yuen Tsuen villagers whose homes were demolished because of the construction of Express Rail Link, the lives of ethnic minorities in Hong Kong, and the experience of a family in the midst of the Umbrella Movement, where each of these tales reflects a larger story about Hong Kong. Theatre Ronin themed their CCAS programmes around local customs and traditional handicrafts and trades, and re-interpreted them using drama. Workshop participants strolled along the streets and areas inhabited by the boat dwellers who migrated to Hong Kong, as well as the peoples from Chaozhou, Shanghai, and Nanyang, to patronise their shops and learn their trades.

It is obvious that these community cultural ambassadors are concerned about local customs, and the social life and economic life in Hong Kong past and present, and their programmes inevitably re-present people, places and things from the past. Does this dramatic rendition or re-presentation simply romanticise the past, or is it a call to unpack and rework the nostalgia and memories that have been stereotyped by the mainstream media? To answer this question, we must have a reliable archive

of texts and images from the productions and performances. However, neither the art groups nor the AB Office have an effective archiving system at present that would enable further analysis of individual CCAS programmes or the programming of the Scheme as a whole. One other respondent also pointed out that the AB Office places heavy emphasis on the possibility of the continuation and sustainability of individual CCAS projects, but it has not kept any records of past activities conducted by the arts groups. Insufficient archiving is detrimental to the sustainable development of individual outreach arts programmes. Furthermore, it is not conducive to effective qualitative policy review and implementation.

### **Possibilities of theatre artists as practitioners/ pioneers of community culture**

What is the point of “sending take-outs” to the community? Generally speaking, the theatre makers and the assessors of the Scheme believe “[it is] better than nothing!”, though the reasons that underlie their sentiments vary. The theatre makers observed that most of the workshop/seminar participants were middle-aged people, with some of them being fans of the Scheme or other LCSD cultural and recreational programmes. They often made the most of the activities for engaging in parent-child activities, getting together with old friends, or enjoying their leisure time after retirement. Can the Scheme achieve its

goal in arousing public interest in the performing arts, enriching their artistic experience and enhancing arts appreciation, and promoting community arts development as it is intended to? One of the respondents was doubtful, saying that the attraction of drama or theatre activities does not necessarily stem from the activities. Rather, it lies in the power of these activities to bring “people” and “care” into marginalised communities that receive little social attention such as the elderly. The respondent observed that this reflects an uneven distribution of public policy focus.

The responses from the respondents point to an interesting and important question: Can community arts activities extend the community’s cultural life? If so, in what ways? When we look at the workshop activities conducted by the community cultural ambassadors in recent years, apart from acting or playwriting workshops, there has been an interest in running mobile phone photography workshops and 3D Fotomo workshops where models of real-world scenes are created from photo prints. Workshop participants can capture ordinary objects like trees,

street shops and the surroundings through the camera lens. Mundane everyday objects are turned into the objects of the “gaze”, through which the photographer’s visual experience and memory of the city are constructed. This visual experience is likely to differ from the visual experience that the LCSD and the Hong Kong Tourism Board work to create through branding Hong Kong as “Asia’s events capital”.<sup>18</sup> This workshop format may help open up a different relationship between Hong Kong people and their city, and present a new way for them to imagine and discuss Hong Kong.

#### **4. Audience: Who’s present and who’s absent?**

Besides community tours for the CCAS, the theatre groups we interviewed also produce main stage theatre productions with specific interests of their own — e.g. exploring scenography with literary materials, stimulating the thinking audience with translated plays, or exploring the relationships between theatrical arts and society. When asked if the Scheme helped nurture new audience, the arts

18. LCSD: <http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/en/aboutlcsd/mission.html>

Hong Kong Tourism Board: <http://www.discoverhongkong.com/uk/see-do/events-festivals/index.jsp>

Brand Hong Kong (BrandHK): <https://www.brandhk.gov.hk/html/en/OurHongKong/asiaseventscapital.html>

See also Urry, J. 2002. *The tourist gaze* (2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

groups gave surprisingly similar responses. Most of the respondents thought the audiences of their community tours would not turn into audiences of their main stage theatre productions. The reason is that performances for community audiences “cannot be too profound”, where “the story should be easy to understand” and it should “possess elements that delight the audience” because “watching a show should be a pleasurable experience”. That is why some of the theatre groups interviewed would choose to present some of their CCAS shows in the format of melodrama. In other words, in the eyes of the arts groups, community audiences are somewhat uniform: They look for theatre shows that cater to popular tastes, and which are accessible and entertaining. Fundamentally, community audiences differ from those audiences who would attend the arts groups’ main stage theatre productions.

The respondents’ views on “community audiences” are fairly consistent. This notion of audience is mingled with a notion of entertainment that can be traced back to Hong Kong’s economic development. In the 1960s to 1970s, Hong Kong’s economy took off thanks to the city’s industrial development. Television as a major form of entertainment strengthened the work-leisure divide for many wage earners, as reflected in the opening theme song of the popular variety show *Enjoy Yourself Tonight (EYT)*

which captures the essence of everyday life from the 1960s to 1980s.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, students were taught to use their leisure time to cultivate positive hobbies to cope with work stress and examination stress, increase productivity or release excess energy.<sup>20</sup> In fact, from the 1970s onwards, the development of Hong Kong’s recreational and sports municipal policy as a whole was based on this work-leisure divide, as it was centred around providing inexpensive leisure activities for the public. People who watched performances in theatres or shopping malls were all “consumers”. At present, arts groups/artists need to compete with leisure activities such as television, cinemas, restaurants, online/mobile games, and online video channels for customers. There have been criticisms about the quality of community performances being far from satisfactory, where some of the shows were peppered with random jokes just to entertain the viewers.<sup>21</sup> Apart from limited production budget and/or the lack of rehearsal, could this issue also be related to the notion of drama as “popular entertainment” and the ways in which audience and entertainment are understood? The question warrants further analysis.

Nowadays, many people work long hours, while students also face similar challenges. The issue of long working hours/school hours is starting to erode people’s everyday life and its pleasures. Under

this socio-economic context, the current way of implementing the CCAS will probably only foster community audiences as arts consumers rather than art lovers. In this case, what are the value and function of community arts? How can community theatre intervene in this social rhythm and enliven city life? These questions are becoming more pressing than ever. Perhaps one of the strategies that arts groups/artists may consider is to fight for reasonable working hours and school hours together with concerned groups as a way of promoting community arts through safeguarding the cultural rights of the public. In any case, we have to ask: Apart from the entertainer-consumer relationship, what are other possible relationships between the artists/theatre makers and the audiences of their community performances?

### **“Taking care”: building a different artist-audience relationship**

In fact, some of the theatre makers interviewed have started to rethink the relationship between their theatre practice and their community audiences. One of them whose company has joined the CCAS for several years has started experimenting with different modes of storytelling and performance styles to enhance interaction with the audience, for the purpose of enriching audience experience and stimulating their reflections on the subject. Another interviewee has used techniques and principles of applied theatre<sup>22</sup> to gather stories of specific groups, and turned those real-life stories into dramatic stories. Those who contributed their stories would become audiences of their own stories and others' when the performances are on tour. Both theatre groups seek to break the stereotypical understanding

19. *Enjoy Yourself Tonight (EYT)* is the longest-running variety show in the history of Hong Kong television; it premiered on TVB Jade in 1967 and had a 27-year run.

20. Hong Kong Curriculum Development Committee. 1975. *Provisional Syllabus for Social Studies (Forms 1 to 3)*. Hong Kong: Government Printer. Hong Kong Curriculum Development Committee. 1980. *Social Studies: Syllabuses for Primary Schools*. Hong Kong: Government Printer.

21. Yu, C. H. "Cheat your audience, and you lose them", *Sing Tao Daily*, 5 November 2014.

22. See footnote 17 for the meaning of the term "applied theatre".

and practices where community audiences are regarded as passive audiences and consumers, and to work with a different notion of audience – audience as participants. In the latter case, members of the community are people from whom the theatre makers sourced texts or pretexts for dramatic creation, the protagonists in the dramatic story to be staged, and the audience of the staged story.

In her article on the relationship between funders and applied theatre companies, Molly Mullen, a drama educator-scholar from New Zealand, points out that both the terms “management” and “apply” as in “applied theatre” imply the concept of “care”.<sup>23</sup> In the etymological context, Nicola Shaughnessy, a theatre scholar from the UK, explains that the notion “apply” is derived from the Latin word *applicāre* meaning “‘to bring things in contact with one another’ to ‘join’ to ‘connect’ and, figuratively to ‘devote (oneself) to’, ‘give attention to’”.<sup>24</sup> In this sense, she argues that applied theatre practitioners care for the community they work for and with, and consciously use the process of performance to bring together elements to create change and make new things.<sup>25</sup> In other words, from the perspective of applied theatre, the development of community arts development is grounded in the understanding of the attributes and needs of community audiences. It is essential to build a different kind of relationship between artists/

arts groups and community audiences, as well as a different notion of audience. In view of this, some critics have called on the arts groups to position themselves in the community and work with it to cultivate relationships and a sense community over a longer period of time.<sup>26</sup> In this respect, the experiences of some theatre companies from Taiwan and Singapore would be valuable references. Further discussion will be included in the research report.

### **Who cares: re-orientating cultural management**

The reminders from Mullen and Shaughnessy are also applicable to arts and cultural management. Over the past two decades, tertiary institutions in Hong Kong have been training talents in arts administration and cultural management, addressing the problem of executive-led or even lay-led public policymaking and implementation pinpointed by Hong Kong’s arts and cultural circles back in the 1990s.<sup>27</sup>

To date, large scale cultural and arts organisations/ arts groups, professional arts and administrative associations and the HKADC have orientated their audience development towards brand building marketing strategies and/or data analysis. The ultimate goal is to change the target audience’s

mode of cultural consumption.<sup>28</sup> To some extent, this seems to reinforce the producer-consumer relationship between theatre makers and their audiences. It is important that arts administrators turn their attention to “taking care” of their target audiences. This issue will be discussed in detail in the research report.

## **5. Concluding remarks and the way forward**

Since its launch, the effectiveness of CCAS's audience building and policy has been measured against audience numbers. However, as the respondents in our research study remarked, more outreach theatre activities do not necessarily contribute to an increase in the number of art lovers and theatre audiences. In view of this, if the authorities continue to implement

the Scheme in the present manner, we anticipate that the Scheme would not achieve these goals. Therefore, the policy must be renewed.

### **Renewing policy: reshaping "relationship" and "trust"**

Policy-wise, the key to effective audience development is to make good use of the CCAS to reconstruct the relationship between arts and the community and the relationship between arts and the city, and to develop different notions of audience. One respondent in the study suggested that the merry-go-round style of performance tour should be eliminated. Instead, the Scheme should allow, or, even better, encourage arts groups to revisit areas or communities with which they have had initial contact, and to understand and respond to the needs of the people in those areas or communities through arts.

23. Mullen, M. 2012. "Taking care and playing it safe: Tensions in the management of funding relationships." *Journal of Arts & Communities*, 4(3), pp. 194.
24. Shaughnessy, N. 2012. *Applying performance: Live art, socially engaged theatre and affective practice*, pp.xiv. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
25. Ibid.
26. Chung, C.Y. & Tong, K.L. "Let's talk about government initiated audience building", 5 June 2017, and "More on audience building in Hong Kong, and how arts groups should help themselves", 24 July 2017, *Hong Kong Economic Journal*.
27. Ooi, V. "Thoughts on the Dive-year Cultural Policy Plan", *Ming Pao Monthly*, 31(11), 1996, pp. 73-76. Van, L. "Key Issue of Government-run Official Culture: How Come Laymen Are Leading the Experts?", *Ming Pao Monthly*, 31(11), 1996, pp. 77-79.
28. In 2004, the HKADC organised a two-day audience building workshop. In 2017, the Hong Kong Arts Administrators Association held the two-day 2017 Cultural Leadership Summit with the theme "Building Our Future Audience". <http://www.hkaaa.org.hk/doc/22798?tab=6>

Audiences and art lovers would be nurtured along the way.

Another respondent suggested that the AB Office set up a database and an effective archiving system to properly manage the records of the CCAS, so as to support the selection of community cultural ambassadors and sustainable development of community arts. The respondent also proposed that the AB Office recruit “capable and competent” observers to be in contact with the arts groups to learn about their outreach programmes, and visit their events to give in-depth and comprehensive feedback. We, the research team, agree with the abovementioned suggestions, since we believe these initiatives would help public policy managers to refocus their efforts on the quality of the CCAS projects and the ways in which they are implemented.

This would further provide evidence for policy review and assessment beyond headcounts. The work of these observers would enable public policy administrators to deepen their understanding of the attributes of the arts groups as well as their needs, rebuild trust and reshape the funding relationship with the arts groups.

### **Building the qualitative dimension of “audience building”**

In addition to the abovementioned suggestions, the research team believed that there must be a qualitative dimension to audience building policies so that “the faces of audiences” could be constructed and examined in the context of public arts and cultural policy. In this regard, the authorities need to undertake research and evaluation to assess the implementation and impact of the CCAS in the broader Hong Kong social-cultural context to bring public expectations and participation to bear. Apart from evaluation and assessment, efforts must be made to gather evidence through rigorous policy research, which would allow policymakers to make informed decisions in the new round of the policymaking processes.<sup>29</sup>

Rigorous policy research must incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives and a good use of mixed methods research. To be specific, apart from the usual questionnaire survey that is used for collecting “quantitative” evidence, policymakers should also utilise the “qualitative” approach to the study of human and society that is practiced in the academic fields of social sciences, cultural studies and ethnography,<sup>30</sup> as well as the performative research paradigm adopted by theatre workers and researchers.<sup>31</sup> If policymakers can initiate research

using these approaches, it would benefit the planning, implementation and evaluation of the CCAS and bring about important developments to other policy strategies of the city's arts and cultural policy.

## 6. Acknowledgements

The author and her research team members would like to thank the staff members of AB Office, LCSD, the assessor of the Scheme and the theatre groups who took part in the research interviews for contributing their time, experience and ideas. Without their participation, the research study would not have been possible.

- 29. See Parkhurst, J. 2017. *The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- 30. See Stoker, G., & Evans, M. 2016. *Evidence-based policy making in the social sciences: Methods that matter*. Bristol, England; Chicago, Illinois: Policy Press.
- 31. The performative research paradigm recognises that creative artistic practice is itself research practice, or artistic practice as research. It acknowledges that the processes of arts practice produce knowledge and build theories equally rigorously as academic research in conventional qualitative and the quantitative research paradigm. For further insights, see Haseman, B. 2010. "Rupture and Recognition: Identifying the Performative Research Paradigm". In Barrett, E., & Bolt, B. (Eds.), *Practice as research: Approaches to creative arts enquiry*, pp. 147-157. London: I.B. Tauris.



## 7. Appendix: Theatre arts projects in the 2016 Community Cultural Ambassador Scheme

Theatre Group	The Programme
James Mark, Andy Tang and Freddie Chan**	<i>Bird and Life – An Environmental Conservation Theatre</i>
Ray Kwok, Estella Wong, Pewan Chow, Alex Tam	<i>Arts In Life</i>
Theatre Space**	<i>Scraps of Life – Family Treasures Hunt</i>
Theatre Ronin**	<i>Stories of Rice Family</i>
Actors' Family	<i>Detective Ling</i>
The Nonsensemakers**	<i>Nobody is Perfect but Everybody Can Do it!</i>
Pants Theatre Production**	<i>All About Family</i>
We Draman Group	<i>Building with Bamboo</i>
Arts' Options	<i>Those Were the Days: Let's PLAY</i>

Source: Audience Building Office Website (as at 6 November 2017)

<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/CE/CulturalService/ab/en/ccas2016.php>

\*\* Theatre groups that took part in the research interviews

---

.....

**Muriel Law Yuen-fun, PhD**

Law is an independent research scholar with interdisciplinary training in Cultural Studies, critical pedagogy and drama/theatre education. She has extensive research experience in leading drama-/ theatre-in-education research, and school curriculum and pedagogic action research studies. Currently, Law serves as the co-editor of *The Journal of Drama and Theatre Education in Asia* (DaTEAsia).

Her publications appear in both local and overseas cultural studies and drama education academic journals. Her recent academic publications include, "A Critical Analysis of Drama Curricular Practice as the Practice of Hope in Schools in Neoliberal Societies" (forthcoming, *Drama Research: international journal*

*of drama in education*, Vol 9); "Analyzing Audience Responses: The Case of 1894 Hong Kong Plague Theatre in Education Programme" (2016, *The Journal of Drama and Theatre Education in Asia*, 6, in Chinese); and "Education as an Aesthetic Exercise in Everyday School Performances" (2015, in *Paulo Freire: The Global Legacy*, edited by Michael Peters & Tina Besley). Her recent research publications include *Content Analysis of Hong Kong School Drama Festival Secondary School Play Synopses, 2008-2016* (2017, co-authored with Y.M. Au & Pauline Wai, in Chinese); *Drama activities in Hong Kong primary schools 2013: A statistical report* (2015, co-authored with Alex Chan & Brigit Au, in Chinese).

.....