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Abstract

Research into talk and learning in the primary years has focused mainly on reasoning in mathematics and science and far less on creative learning contexts, such as process drama. Moreover, despite the predominance of talk within process drama, scant attention has been paid to the nature of this talk. The current study examines this gap in understanding about teacher and pupil talk in primary process drama.

The participants were two primary school teachers, who frequently used process drama in their practice, and with their two classes of pupils aged nine to eleven. The data were collected and analysed within a constructionist, interpretivist, case-study methodology. Talk within process drama was explored through audio and visual recordings of process drama lessons and analysed through thematic coding and multimodal analysis. Secondary data was explored through teacher and pupil interviews.

Findings indicate three types of talk were prevalent in primary process drama, questioning, co-constructed narratives, and empathetic talk. Talk was not shaped or guaranteed by the drama conventions, but it was influenced by the nature of teacher questioning or whether pupils were invited to pose questions. Additionally, the status of teacher-in-role (TiR) played a pivotal role in determining whether teacher and pupil talk was dialogic or monologic in nature. Creative, co-constructed narratives were associated with an equal-status TiR, and a high-status TiR was associated with monologic talk. By contrast, when teachers adopted low-status TiR, they used monologic talk, which in this instance was productive, eliciting empathetic responses. It is argued that process drama creates a dialogic space in which creative interthinking is possible.

These findings raise questions about the need to examine the nature of talk in other empathetic or creative contexts, and when using diverse drama conventions. They also underline the importance of process drama, for talk, thinking and learning.
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1 Introduction

This study focuses on exploring the nature of talk and communication in primary process drama. In this chapter I begin by outlining the fields of process drama and talk before explaining how my interest in drama and talk developed through experiences on my PGCE, my MA in English in Education, my work as a primary school teacher and now a HE lecturer in education. I go onto to explain how the impetus for my study’s focus grew out of increasing concerns about the apparent limited use of process drama in primary classrooms and the diminished status of talk in the National Curriculum (NC) in England (DfE, 2014). I outline the key findings from the pilot study, before establishing the key theoretical frameworks underpinning my study. I conclude by setting out the aims and objectives of this study, the research questions, and an explanation of the structure of the thesis.

1.1 The field of process drama

Drama includes a range of practices including informal role play, puppetry and storytelling, more formal, scripted performances, and improvisational classroom drama. It is therefore important to establish the nature of the type of drama being used in this study, which focuses on drama with 10 and 11-year-old pupils.

Classroom drama, the focus here, has been defined as text-edged drama (Wolf, Edmiston and Enciso, 1997). Dramatizing at the edges of texts does not rely on a script or an audience, although the classroom participants are the informal audience of the on-going work. A story is often used as a prop, which acts as a context around which different situations can be enacted (Wolf, Edmiston and Enciso, 1997) and ‘multiple implied events, characters, and conversations can be imagined, represented, and interpreted’ (Edmiston and Enciso, 2002). Text-edged-drama is a social and collaborative process, which requires participants to use imagination, to create fictional worlds and to use dialogue constantly in order to negotiate and interpret issues, dilemmas, characters and events in role (O’Neill, 1995; Neelands, 2011; Edmiston, 2014; 1994; Edmiston and Enciso, 2002).

Such drama is also referred to as story drama (Booth, 1995) and process drama (O’Neill, 1995) since it is ongoing, as opposed to a product or finished object such as a theatre production. More recently, Edmiston (2014; 2016) developed the terms dramatic inquiry and drama pedagogy. In this study, I use the term process drama. Process drama involves using a range of drama strategies and conventions and it was initially pioneered by Dorothy Heathcote and developed by other drama scholars such as Neelands (1987) and O’Neill (1995).
1.2 The field of talk

The field of talk has developed out of concerns in the 1960s about teacher dominated talk in classrooms, which tested pupils’ thinking and understanding, rather than developing it. Underpinned by Vygotsky’s (1978; 1986) theories about the role of talk in thinking and Bakhtin’s (1981; 1984; 1986) concept of monologic and dialogic thinking, many scholars have researched ways of developing teacher pupil talk. In the UK this is mainly associated with the research into dialogic teaching of Robin Alexander (2008; 2020), and in America with Michaels, O’Connor and Resnick (2008) and Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur and Prendergas (1997). Research into independent small group talk also revealed that much of the pupil talk was unconstructive and did not support thinking and learning. This led Mercer and colleagues to develop pedagogies and strategies to foster constructive, small group talk (Mercer, Wegerif and Dawes, 1999; Mercer, 2000; Mercer and Littleton, 2007). The research into talk has predominantly focused on developing reasoning and there is much less research into talk which fosters speculative, creative thinking in open-ended contexts such as process drama. Research into the relational and cultural nature of constructive talk has led some scholars to focus on the concept of dialogic space (Wegerif, 2011; 2013; 2020).

Talk in drama takes place between teachers and pupils and between pupils talking in small groups and could encourage reasoning or creative thinking. Therefore, research into whole class talk, small group talk, reasoning and creative thinking are all examined in the literature review.

1.3 My interest in process drama and talk

My interest in process drama developed whilst writing my MA dissertation, which focused on powerful visual and written texts and their impact on the quality of children’s writing. I was particularly influenced by the theories of Vygotsky (1978; 1986) and a seminal study on the impact of reading quality texts on children’s writing (Barra and Cork, 2001). This study included examples of process drama, which I began to introduce into my literacy practice. Since I had had no training in drama as a student teacher, on completion of my MA, I continued to develop my understanding of how to use it. I began to find process drama particularly useful for supporting pupils’ understanding of stories and for fostering highly imagined writing.

My interest in drama developed further once working as an HE lecturer in Initial Teacher Education (ITE) through introducing student teachers to process drama. I also had the
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opportunity to work with student teachers in India during seven visits over two years and introduced some elements of process drama to students and lecturers there, within the frame of a social constructivist approach to pedagogy. Changing the prevailing pedagogy in schools to a social constructivist approach was a focus of the Indian government at the time. However, in the context of very large classes in Indian state schools, it proved very difficult for the student teachers to implement process drama successfully.

My interest in talk and its relationship to thinking and learning began on my PGCE at Roehampton, where I was introduced to Vygotsky’s theories on the role of talk in thinking and learning. This developed further on my MA at the Institute of Education, where Vygotsky’s (1978; 1986) sociocultural theories were central as were Bakhtin’s (1981; 1986) ideas. As an ITE lecturer, I introduced students to some of the ideas from the research of Alexander and Mercer. The combination of the research in India, my own experiences of using process drama as a primary school teacher and ITE lecturer and increased interest in talk, learning and sociocultural theories has subsequently developed into an interest in exploring talk within process drama itself.

1.4 Impetus for this study

As a classroom teacher, I noticed that few of my teaching colleagues used process drama and was aware that teachers outside of my school rarely did so either. Likewise, as a lecturer in ITE, I find that student teachers report that they see very little process drama in school and therefore get few opportunities to develop their practice. Moreover, those students who do observe process drama mainly see role-play and hot-seating and do not experience the potential offered by the wide range of drama strategies. Student teachers are introduced to some drama conventions in seminars which they find engaging, but there is limited time to develop their understanding and use of this tool for learning. Therefore, the pattern of few teachers using process drama in schools is likely to continue.

This concern is exacerbated by the revised (NC) in England (DfE, 2014), where drama in the English NC (2014) has been slimmed down considerably. There are only two references to drama or role play which relates to all age ranges in the primary years, the most comprehensive of which is,

All pupils should be enabled to participate in and gain knowledge, skills and understanding associated with the artistic practice of drama. Pupils should be able to adopt, create and sustain a range of roles, responding appropriately to others in role. They should have opportunities to improvise, devise and script drama for one
another and a range of audiences, as well as to rehearse, refine, share and respond thoughtfully to drama and theatre performance (DfE, 2014: 4)

Other than this, there is one example of non-statutory guidance for year one, which relates to how role-play can support reading comprehension. There is also brief non-statutory guidance on how drama and role-play can support reading comprehension and writing composition in year two. In years 3 and 4 there is reference to drama supporting pupils to use language with a variety of audiences and purposes and one non-statutory guidance on how drama can support pupils to perform plays and poems. There is no guidance that is specific to years 5 and 6 on drama or role-taking.

The guidance is therefore brief, lacks detail and is mainly linked to how drama can support spoken language, reading comprehension and writing composition. Although these are important benefits of drama, the NC (2014) does not recognise the importance of process drama for child development such as develop critical and creative thinking, collaboration, reflection, or empathy.

Furthermore, the ITT Core Content framework (DfE, 2019) (CCF) views learning mainly as memory and recall. This is evident in ‘How Pupils Learn’ (Standard 2), which focuses on prior knowledge and its relationship with short and long-term memory and Cognitive Load Theory. Moreover, it is mainly underpinned by well-known academics in the field of Cognitive Science such as, Baddeley (2003), Kirschner et al., (2018), Rosenshine (2012) and Willingham (2000), whilst there is no reference to theorists associated with Constructivism, or Social Cultural Theory, such as Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner, Bakhtin or Rogoff. The ‘How Pupils Learn’ section includes ten key points which student teachers are expected to know about learning, and six of them are about memory including:

‘2. Prior Knowledge plays an important role in how pupils learn: committing some key facts to their long-term memory is likely to help pupils learn more complex ideas

3. An important factor in learning is memory, which can be thought of as comprising two elements: working memory and long-term memory

4. Working memory is where information that is being actively processed is held, but its capacity is limited and can be overloaded

5. Long-term memory can be considered as a store of knowledge that changes as pupils learn by integrating new ideas with existing knowledge’ (DfE, 2019: 11)
In Classroom Practice ‘Plan and teach well-structured lessons’ (Standard 4) there are some references to modelling and scaffolding, without any reference to Bandura or Vygotsky. Instead, this section is again underpinned by scholars in the field of Cognitive Science. Questioning is only referenced in terms of teachers checking pupils’ prior knowledge and understanding, but not in relation to developing pupils thinking, nor pupils asking questions. There is a brief reference to enabling critical thinking and problem solving but it is claimed that pupils first need the foundational content knowledge to be able to do this. Furthermore, there is only one reference to how high-quality classroom talk can support pupils’ understanding and vocabulary. However, there is no guidance on how teachers can develop critical thinking nor high-quality talk. Instead, most of the guidance relates to supporting working and long-term memory. Additionally, there is no reference at all to creativity in the CCF. Yet, in my study, as I will show, the creative nature of process drama influenced the nature of the pupil talk.

In relation to talk, I find that many student teachers commence their courses with the assumption that a silent classroom is a learning classroom. Moreover, references to and the valuing of the role of talk in learning has also diminished in the NC (DfE, 2014). There are some references to the value of talk for learning in the CCF (DFE, 2019), but this is minimal compared to the focus on memory. This contrasts with the recent All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG, April 2021) inquiry and report into the value of talk in learning, and the work carried out with teachers by organisations such as Voice21 (2015) and Oracy Cambridge (2022). However, these are not statutory reports or guidance and are not as impactful therefore on the teaching profession.

Alongside these concerns, there appears to be little research into the role of talk in process drama, which is surprising since talk is such an important aspect of it and because of its potential as a tool for developing understanding. Furthermore, drama scholars such as Neelands, Franks and Edmiston take a theoretical or philosophical inquiry approach to researching process drama. They are in turn greatly influenced by the pioneering work and concepts of Dorothy Heathcote (1977; 1978; 1980; 2010). However, much of the discussions of drama by these scholars are descriptions of what happened within drama lessons, rather than providing evidence from empirical data. Moreover, a lengthy search of the Research in Drama Education (RiDE) journal for example, revealed few empirical studies of drama. Many papers were narratives about commercial theatre performances and focused more on theatre studies than process drama. This study therefore examines the gap in knowledge and understanding of teacher and pupil talk in primary process drama. It also responds to
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the methodological gap in drama research, by the approach taken to analyse the findings. This is explored next, beginning with considering the findings from my pilot study and how this informed the methodology of this study.

1.5 The Pilot Study

My pilot study took place in a Hertfordshire school, observing a teacher of nine-year-olds, who used process drama strategies in her literacy teaching. Although there was evidence of constructive talk in this pilot study, it raised some issues, which informed the selection of participants for the main study. It was clear from early discussions with the teacher that she used drama strategies, which invite children to pose questions, imagine, improvise, and empathise, in her practice. But these were not the sort of drama strategies observed during data collection. Process drama only played a small part in the lessons. The strategies observed consisted of improvisation, followed by talk afterwards to develop ideas, but this was not talk within the drama itself. The children also wrote play scripts in groups, which were subsequently performed. The co-written narratives involved lots of collaborative, creative talk, but it was talk related to writing, rather than talk within drama. Additionally, the subsequent performance of the playscripts consisted of presentational talk.

This pilot study taught me to ensure that I found teachers who spent more of the lesson time on process drama, which perhaps led into a separate English lesson. Therefore, with support from my supervisor I approached a well-known drama practitioner, Patrice Baldwin, who identified two primary teachers who were highly experienced in regularly utilising a wide range of process drama strategies in their practice.

Another issue with the pilot study was that the teacher only recorded herself introducing aspects of lessons, rather than working with the pupils. This had been discussed in the preparatory discussions but may have been forgotten in a busy lesson. Therefore, in the main study, I also ensured that I had several voice recorders for both teachers and pupils to use, so that the teachers recorded themselves when talking and working with the pupils. I initially found it difficult to record a lot of the talk in the main study, because of the noise from other groups. Although I continued to explore ways of recording the small group talk in my main study, much of the drama was whole class, involving teachers and pupils in role, which overcame this issue. I also explored using more sophisticated camera equipment for the main study.

In the pilot study, the analysis of the data was deductive and influenced by the codes and approach of Maine’s (2015) study. By contrast my analysis for the main study combined
both deductive and inductive approaches by to create my own codes. Although the amount of talk within process drama was more limited than had been hoped in the initial study, some of the findings resonate with the main study’s findings, such as the cumulative nature of talk in open-ended, creative activities.

1.6 Theoretical frame and analytical frameworks

The main study was framed by sociocultural theory, since this aligns with the collaborative, co-constructed and socially situated nature of both process drama and classroom talk. Since the creative nature of process drama is likely to influence the talk fostered through process drama, creativity, and creative pedagogy were also explored. I adopted a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm and a case study research design. Most data were analysed using thematic analysis, but some were also analysed through multimodal analysis, which is apposite for analysing meaning-making created through gesture, movement, and facial expressions in process drama.

1.7 Aims of the study

I aimed to respond to the current gap in understanding of the nature of talk and communication in process drama. The second aim was to examine what can be revealed through analysing multimodal communication in process drama, which developed in response to the embodied and multimodal nature of such drama. Since research into talk has mainly focused on understanding talk in relation to reasoning in mathematics and science, this study also aimed to further develop the currently more limited research into talk in open-ended creative contexts, such as process drama. Moreover, qualitative research into process drama has been criticised for lacking transparency and rigour. The third aim of this study was therefore to respond to this by carrying out qualitative research into talk and drama in a credible manner, strengthening the claims and contributions of the study.

1.8 The research questions

My main research question developed out of my interest in the gap in the literature on talk within process drama. I was interested in examining whether claims made by drama scholars about the empathetic, co-constructed, creative, and reflective nature of process drama and its potential for meaning making are evident in empirical, qualitative research. I therefore asked:

RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama?
My second research question responds to the embodied and multimodal nature of process drama. I wanted to examine what can be understood about communication in process drama by focusing on movement, gesture, and facial expression, as well as talk. I therefore asked:

RQ2  What does a multimodal lens reveal about the nature of teacher and pupil talk and communication in primary process drama?

1.9 The structure of the thesis

In the following chapter, I present my literature review. I explore more details of the sociocultural frame and the significance of this for talk in the classroom and in primary process drama. I examine the literature on dialogic talk, small group talk, talk in creative contexts and dialogic space. I go onto to explore the literature on process drama, including collaboration, role-taking, dialogism, empathy, and reflection. The aim of examining the literature on talk and process drama was to understand the research evidence of these areas. I also examine the literature on creativity and creative pedagogy in relation to process drama. I conclude this chapter by investigating the research methodologies of studies into process drama.

In chapter three, which focuses on my chosen methodology, I outline my choice of paradigm, my research design, which is a qualitative case study approach, and I examine my methods of data collection. I also explore the two approaches taken to analyse the data, thematic coding, and multimodal interaction analysis. In chapter four, I present the analysis of my data. Vignettes from selected episodes from three drama lessons and interview data are analysed and this analysis addresses my two research questions. Through this analysis I refined the codes and themes that emerged.

In chapter five, I discuss the findings of my analysis of talk in drama and secondary teacher and pupil interview data. I also return to the literature to examine the main types of talk identified in the study and to situate this talk conceptually. Finally in chapter six, I draw my main conclusions, discuss contributions to knowledge and introduce my conceptual framework of talk in process drama. I consider the limitations of the study and propose implications for practice and policy, concluding with recommendations for further research. I turn now to the literature, reviewing research on classroom talk, process drama and creativity.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I examine different aspects of classroom talk and process drama. I begin by exploring sociocultural theory, which underpins this study. Sociocultural theory emphasises the social and cultural nature of learning and interactions, valuing the importance of talk for the development of thinking. It is highly relevant to examining both talk and process drama and underpins much of the research into both fields. So, in section 2.2, I explore the basic tenets of sociocultural theory, focusing on some of the concepts of Vygotsky and Bakhtin.

In section 2.3, I consider some historical problems with teacher pupil talk, examining why talk is important for thinking, and how it can be developed. I focus on dialogic and small group talk, creative contexts for talk and dialogic space. In 2.4, I consider the nature of process drama and how it relates to sociocultural theory. I also examine how being in role fosters perspective taking, empathy, reflection and meaning making. The creative nature of process drama is also explored, since this may influence both the adult and pupil talk.

Finally, I examine the strengths and weakness of the methodologies of studies into process drama, process drama and talk, and process drama and creativity. There are a limited number of studies into these areas and my thesis seeks to respond to this gap. I begin by exploring sociocultural theory.

2.2 A sociocultural view of teaching and learning

The focus of this doctoral study is to explore the nature of talk and communication in primary process drama. Since process drama is socially and culturally situated, involving talk, interaction and imagination, a sociocultural approach has been taken. It is argued that sociocultural theory has developed out of the theories of Vygotsky (Lewis, Enciso and Moje, 2007). Applying his theoretical frame to drama is apt because before moving into psychology, he was involved with and influenced by the arts and drama (Franks, 2014). It is also suggested that the development of sociocultural theory has been influenced by the theories of Bakhtin (Wertsch, 1991). Like Vygotsky, Bakhtin was influenced by literature, writing extensively about dialogue in relation to it. In the following sections I introduce Vygotsky’s concepts of social and cultural tools, talk and learning and the role of ZPD and play in learning. I then consider Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism because his theories underpin
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concepts related to both talk and process drama. I return to the concepts and theories of Vygotsky and Bakhtin when I explore talk in 2.3 and process drama in 2.4.

2.2.1 Tools and signs socially mediate thinking and learning and the importance of talk

Vygotsky's theory of the role of tools and signs in learning are important in sociocultural theory, since he argued that higher mental functioning and action are mediated by tools (Wertsch, 1991). These physical tools or objects can mediate memory and our understanding (Vygotsky, 1978). For Vygotsky, tools for mediating human learning, development and thought were signs (Razfar and Gutierrez, 2013). These signs included, ‘language; various systems for counting; mnemonic techniques; algebraic symbol systems; works of art; writing; schemes; diagrams; maps, and mechanical drawings; all sorts of conventional signs’ (Vygotsky, 1981: 137).

The concept of mediation through cultural tools is further developed by Rogoff (2008) with her notion of distributed cognition. According to this, when humans work together and collaborate, using cultural and social tools to solve a problem socially, the thinking and cognition is shared and distributed. This view of human development is seen as a process of change or transformation, whilst participating in sociocultural activities. It does not see all thinking and cognition taking place within individuals, but as ‘cognition beyond the skull’ (Rogoff, 2008: 64). This is appropriate for process drama where learning takes place socially through talk and involves the co-construction of knowledge and understanding through shared thinking.

Children learn to use these tools and signs in culturally appropriate ways through interacting with more expert members of a group (Razfar & Gutierrez, 2013). It is argued therefore that development or change is culturally and historically situated and appears socially before it appears individually; an interpersonal process is changed into an intrapersonal process. Understanding and meaning making develop through interaction with others, as Vygotsky explains:

Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: First, on the social level, and later, on the individual level; first between people (interpsychological), and then inside the child (intrapsychological).

(Vygotsky, 1978: 57)

Additionally, this, it is suggested, applies to the whole of human life and not just childhood (John-Steiner and Souberman, 1978). This links to Vygotsky’s argument that of all the signs
and tools that mediate learning and cognition, language is the pre-eminent sign; the ‘tool of tools’ (Enciso and Ryan, 2011). They argue, moreover, that development is not additional to learning, but a critical part of learning and is key to engaging with problems which arise when encountering new situations. Similarly, in play children use language to develop their imagination and to create, exchange and rehearse their ideas through talk in play and drama.

The view that talk is the most important tool for learning is relevant for this study’s focus on the nature of talk within process drama. As well as talk, process drama also utilises other tools and signs, such as props and different drama conventions, and these are explored later in 2.4.2.

2.2.2 The concept of ZPD and the role of play

The dialectical ideas and philosophy of Engels and his focus on change influenced Vygotsky and was evident in his (1978) concept of development (Cole and Scribner, 1978; John-Steiner and Souberman, 1978; Wertsch, 1991). It relates to the concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), which sees learning preceding development and is not dependent on biological stages of development (Vygotsky, 1978). By working with a more able-other such as an adult, using a range of tools, such as language, a learner and teacher can solve problems together, which are beyond the child’s current capability when working alone (Enciso and Ryan, 2011). Essentially learning is focused on the potential of learners to develop through social interaction (Enciso and Ryan, 2011; Razfar and Gutierrez, 2013). As Vygotsky explains, ‘…what is in the zone of proximal development today will be the actual development level tomorrow – that is, what a child can do with assistance today she will be able to do by herself tomorrow.’ (1978: 87).

However, Daniels (2001) argues that it can be inferred that this assistance or scaffolding is a hierarchical, one-way process, rather than being created through negotiation. Vygotsky was not clear what form scaffolding would take since he merely suggested that teachers,

‘…… offer leading questions or show how the problem is to be solved……or if the teacher initiates the solution and the child completes it or solves it in collaboration with other children.’ (Vygotsky, 1978: 85)

This one-sided, adult directed view of scaffolding has been developed and adapted by Rogoff (1990) into the more inclusive terms of ‘guided participation’ and ‘apprenticeship’, which recognise the role the child plays in their development. ZPD and scaffolding have a
role to play in both talk and process drama and I return to this concept later in this chapter when discussing small group talk, dialogic space, and process drama.

Vygotsky’s (1978) work on play also relates directly to my study since drama is about learning playfully. Indeed, play is seen by some as early drama (Barrs, Baron and Booth, 2012). Vygotsky, it is argued, developed some of his ideas about the concept of ZPD by focusing on imaginative play in young children (Enciso and Ryan, 2011). He suggested that ‘play contains all developmental tendencies in a condensed form and is in itself a major source of development’ (Vygotsky, 1978: 102). It is suggested that play creates opportunities for novice and expert peers to work together, thus supporting them to cross their ZPD socially, and through imaginative play, children can go beyond daily routines and behaviours, assuming roles that they cannot do in real life (Razfar and Gutierrez, 2013).

Imaginative play is also creative; children use their imagination to become a pirate, king, or doctor. Play, it is argued, is more than a reproduction of what a child has experienced, but a reworking and combining of impressions to create something (Vygotsky, 2004). Moreover, this process of combining experiences, and using the imagination are also needed for role-taking in process drama. So, Vygotsky’s theories on play, imagination and creativity are invaluable for my study.

The concepts and ideas of Bakhtin, alongside those of Vygotsky, are also seen as important in the development of sociocultural theory, Wertsch (1991) posits, and these are examined next.

2.2.3. Dialogism

Dialogism is germane for my study, since it relates to both talk and drama and is a key concept underlying theories about talk in the classroom (Wegerif, 2005; Alexander, 2008). It can, Edmiston argues, also deepen understanding of process drama (Edmiston and Enciso, 2002, Edmiston, 2014; 2016). These theories are returned to in later sections on talk and drama and have helped to conceptualise the nature of some of the talk in my study. Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism is viewed as sociocultural because all utterances and dialogue are socially, culturally, and historically situated (Wertsch, 1991). The words that we use express our social, cultural, and ideological positions (Edmiston & Enciso, 2002).

Dialogue is seen as more than talking, ‘but rather back-and-forth substantive meaning-making between two or more people whose intended action may involve non-verbal as well as verbal communication.’ (Edmiston, 2014: 7). Meaning is seen to be made between people
in dialogism because like Rogoff’s (2008) concept of distributed cognition, Bakhtin argues that ‘truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction’ (1984: 110). All meanings are therefore seen as dialogic, since meanings are dynamic, provisional, and open to change, rather than being fixed.

Monologic interactions by contrast are where both the ideas and the talk are dominated by one person (Bakhtin, 1984). In a monologic view of learning and talking, ideas and meanings are seen as fixed which cannot be changed and tend to consist of dogmatic, uncontested truth (Depalma, 2010). This is like authoritative discourse, which is associated with politicians, religious leaders, adults, parents and sometimes teachers (Bakhtin, 1981). Authoritative teacher-dominated interactions in the classroom and more constructive forms of classroom talk are explored in the next section on talk.

2.3 Classroom talk

2.3.1 Introduction

Process drama includes both pupil teacher talk, in whole class contexts, and small group talk. Both types of talk could potentially be monologic and dialogic in nature. Consequently, in this section, I begin with an overview of the early 1960s and 1970s research and explore the problem of teacher dominated talk. I then examine different strategies that have been devised to develop teacher pupil talk by researchers such as (Michaels, O’Connor and Resnick, 2008), Nystrand et al., (1997) and Alexander (2020) for example. I also explore small group pupil talk and the concepts of interthinking and exploratory talk (Mercer, 2000; Mercer and Littleton, 2007; Mercer and Dawes, 2008). I conclude by investigating talk in creative contexts and the concept of dialogic space (Wegerif, 2013).

2.3.2 Monologic or IRF talk

Research into the important role that talk plays in thinking and learning was initially undertaken in the late 1960s e.g. (Barnes, Britton and Rosen, 1969). These researchers were surprised at the extent to which teachers dominated the talk and how passive and unengaged the pupils were in the question-and-answer routine. This routine was identified as a pattern of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) in the UK (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975). It is also known as recitation and in the USA is referred to as Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) (Mehan, 1979). This pattern of discourse is often compared to a game, where the teacher asks a question, they know the answer to (Alexander, 2020; Mehan and Cazden,
2015). IRF is a persistent pattern of talk within classrooms, which has been identified in classrooms around the world. Establishing what it is and why it can be problematic is necessary to appreciate the value of strategies developed by scholars to foster more constructive and democratic talk in classrooms.

IRF has been identified by many scholars as having a range of characteristics, including brief exchanges between the teacher and the pupils, as the teacher focuses on pace and recall and moves quickly from pupil to pupil. Pupils focus on getting the correct answer and teachers tend to brush over incorrect answers, rather than using them as a means of developing understanding (Nystrand et al., 2003; Michaels and O’Connor, 2015; Alexander, 2020). There is little focus on speculative thinking or thinking aloud because the questions tend to be closed ‘test’ questions (Nystrand et al., 1997). Recitation or IRF resonate with the concept of the authoritative voice, associated with fixed ideas and meanings, and the uncontested truth of monologic talk (Bakhtin, 1981). The teacher asks the questions and pupils have little or no opportunity to do so (Alexander, 2020).

There were a few examples of this sort of talk in my study and to understand why this happened and why on other occasions the talk was more dialogic, I briefly outline the nature of more constructive classroom talk.

2.3.3 Constructive classroom talk

Instead of testing and sorting pupils, it is argued, schools should develop intelligence and one of the best ways to do this is through structured dialogue and reasoning, where ‘All students are positioned as intellectual agents in the discussion – they are expected to use their minds’ (Resnick and Schantz, 2015a: 344). This is like dialogic teaching, where developing thinking, rather than testing thinking is valued (Alexander, 2020). Alexander’s framework of dialogic teaching has been influential in understanding some, although not all aspects of the nature of the talk in my study.

Comparing Alexander’s conception of dialogic teaching to many other researchers in this area has led some scholars to argue that his concept of dialogic teaching is the most influential and the most comprehensive in terms of the types of talk teachers use and its exploration of the conditions which encourage constructive pupil talk (Kim and Wilkinson, 2019). So, this approach is explored in the next section, alongside concepts and findings by other researchers such as Resnick and Nystrand for example, since they have shaped aspects of Alexander’s framework.
2.3.4 Alexander’s dialogic teaching framework

Dialogic talk is pertinent to process drama since it can consist of teacher pupil talk, particularly if teachers are in role as well as the pupils. Influenced by the ideas of Bakhtin, Vygotsky and Dewey, and the importance of seeing learning as a combination of cognition and learning socially, dialogic teaching appears to be congruent with the sociocultural underpinning of this study.

Several recent empirical studies suggest dialogic teaching can have a positive impact on talk thinking and learning in schools. One study found that teachers in intervention groups used a much better balance of closed and open questions and a much wider repertoire of follow up moves than those in control groups (Hardman, 2019). This supported the pupils to engage in extended answers and share, analyse, explain, argue and challenge, justify their thinking and build on the ideas of other students. By contrast, the teachers in the control groups tended to use recitation and closed questions, encouraging brief student answers (Hardman, 2019). A large-scale study into dialogic talk, found ‘pockets of excellence’ in terms of dialogic talk, but in this case, teachers were given no input on dialogic teaching (Vrikki et al., 2019). Additionally, a large-scale research project led by the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) into the impact of Alexander’s dialogic teaching on pupil progress found that pupils who engaged in 20 weeks of using a dialogic teaching pedagogy made two months more progress in English, maths, and science tests, than pupils not involved in dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2018). So, there is empirical evidence of the impact of dialogic teaching on pupil talk and learning.

Alexander’s (2020) dialogic framework is guided by six principles, which relate to the classroom culture and type of talk associated with a dialogic pedagogy. The emphasis on an appropriate culture is evident in the first three principles: collective, supportive, and reciprocal. These emphasise the importance of talk being co-constructed and the development of a classroom culture where pupils feel free to contribute ideas and to take risks, without worrying about being judged as being wrong. Relationships are seen by Alexander (2020) as critical for dialogic teaching, arguing that culture should be, ‘towards student engagement, empowerment and metacognition, or ensuring that students have a significant stake in the manner of their learning’ (Alexander, 2020: 114). It is also argued that pupils’ conceptions of themselves as learner are reinforced by their perceptions of how the teacher or their peers judge them, and this too contributes towards a positive classroom culture (Resnick and Schantz, 2015b). All three principles are pertinent for process drama, since drama is collective and co-constructed and pupils need to feel able to talk in role to
imagine what characters might think, feel, or say, and create characters and narratives without feeling embarrassed to do so.

Three other principles, deliberative, cumulative, and purposeful, focus on the nature of talk itself. The deliberative principle relates to the weighing up of arguments and ideas, deciding the best course of action and as Alexander (2020) maintains, is important for supporting pupils to build arguments and they know how to, ‘listen to each other, share ideas, ask questions, and consider alternative viewpoints’ (Alexander, 2020: 131). Cumulative talk refers to participants building on contributions by themselves and others and chaining, ‘them into coherent lines of thinking and understanding’ (Alexander, 2020: 131). His research suggests however, that teachers find cumulative talk difficult to develop since it, ‘makes demands simultaneously on teacher’s professional skill, subject knowledge and insight into capacities and understanding of each of his/her students’ (Alexander, 2020: 132). Purposeful, the final principle, refers to the need for talk to have a learning goal, including in open-ended activities, such as process drama.

2.3.4.1 Repertoires

Central to Alexander’s (2020) framework is the notion of repertoire, which he argues is important because teaching is complex and different practices have value. The framework includes a repertoire of learning talk for pupils and includes talk such as transactional, expository, interrogatory, exploratory, deliberative, imaginative, expressive, and evaluative. Imaginative and expressive talk may be particularly pertinent in process drama. The importance of language which narrates, speculates, creates, and articulates feelings and responses are also emphasised and these too are apposite for language in process drama.

The teaching talk repertoire first emerged from Alexander’s research and comparison of teaching and learning in Britain, America, France, Russia, and India (Alexander, 2001). The (2020) revised version of his framework includes eight types of teacher talk. The first four consist of rote, recitation, instruction, and exposition. Recitation allows teachers to use ‘test questions’ to control the direction of the talk and the lesson, which is high risk for pupils. The inclusion of teacher talk, associated more with monologic than dialogic talk, seems surprising. However, Alexander justifies this by explaining that ‘…exposition, recitation and even rote have a place in teaching, for facts need to be imparted, information needs to be memorised and explanations need to be provided’ (2001: 527). Indeed, there are criticisms of the research into dialogic teaching, which tends to create a binary between dialogic and monologic talk, ‘where direct instruction or unidirectional transmission of knowledge is often
pitted against open-ended, student-centred inquiry, and the two are viewed as mutually
exclusive.’ (O’Connor and Michaels, 2007: 276). These scholars argue both monologic and
dialogic talk are needed in learning, and this was also a finding in a large-scale study into
dialogic talk in classrooms (Vrikki et al., 2019).

The remaining four types of teacher-talk in Alexander’s (2020) framework are associated
with dialogic talk and include discussion, deliberation, argumentation, and dialogue. Dialogic
teaching, arguably, requires the teacher to be able to reason and argue, alongside the pupils
and it is for this reason that Alexander states:

…it is mainly through and in response to the teacher’s talk that the child’s own talk is
facilitated, prompted, inspired, probed or otherwise orchestrated; or indeed inhibited,
restricted, ignored, prematurely terminated or persistently channelled along the
narrow tramlines of recitation and factual recall.’ Alexander (2020: 26)

The nature of questioning is critical in dialogic teaching, and there was evidence in my study,
that how the teachers spoke, and the nature of their questions impacted on the pupils’ talk in
the process drama. As well as open and closed questions, authentic questions, developed
by Nystrand et al., (2003), are an important feature of Alexander’s (2020) dialogic teaching
framework and defined as,

‘…one for which the asker has no prespecified answer……As such, an authentic
question allows a range of responses unlike more frequently occurring recitation
questions, in which the teacher asks a question with a prescribed answer in mind.’
(Nystrand et al., 2003: 145).

Authentic questions differ from questions associated with IRF and monologic talk, where the
teacher dominates and controls the talk and, ‘someone who knows and possesses the truth
instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error’ (Bakhtin, 1984: 81). Alexander’s (2020)
framework is also influenced by the concept of uptake, also devised by Nystrand, which
refers to teachers probing and questioning pupils’ responses to their questions, to
understand and develop pupil thinking (Nystrand et al., 2003). This extends the third turn of
the IRF sequence, and both teachers and students can use uptake to follow up students’
responses. The extension of the third turn of the IRF pattern through probing and
questioning pupils’ responses is seen as an essential aspect of dialogic talk, ‘For it is the
third turn that makes talk dialogic rather than monologic, or fails to do so’ (Alexander,
2020:118). Parallels are drawn by Alexander between extending the third turn in dialogic
discourse and Bakhtin’s argument that, ‘if an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue’ (Bakhtin, 1986: 168).

Alexander has also been influenced by Michaels and O’Connor’s (2015) research into teacher talk moves as a way of supporting teachers to develop the third turn of the IRF sequence. The aim of talk moves is to provide teachers with the linguistic means to extend pupils’ responses with further questioning, or uptake, such as, ‘can you say more?’, ‘why do you think that?’ These talk moves relate to four talk goals of: getting pupils to share and clarify their thinking; to listen to each other; to deepen their reasoning and getting students to think with others (Michaels and O’Connor, 2015). Talk moves are based, ‘on the sociocultural and sociohistorical work on tools as mediational means’ (Michaels and O’Connor, 2015: 350). They thereby fit with the sociocultural underpinning of this study.

Dialogic talk can also be developed through allowing pupils as well as the teacher to ask questions and that one way to do this is for the teacher to step back and let pupils take over the talk (Alexander, 2020). This is a way of developing pupil voice, engagement and empowerment and may be achieved in process drama conventions as my study examines. Small group talk is seen as a way of ceding control of the dialogue and questioning by Alexander (2020) and talking independently in small groups is an aspect of process drama. It has also been the focus of Mercer’s research into talk, and I consider this aspect of classroom talk in 2.3.5.

Alexander has also considered the role of imagination in learning, which is apt for process drama and is considered next.

2.3.4.2 Imagination and dialogic talk

Alexander proposes that exciting the imagination should be one of twelve aims for education because it can support children to,

‘…… advance beyond present understanding, extend the boundaries of their lives, contemplate worlds possible as well as actual, understand cause and consequences, develop the capacity for empathy, and reflect on and regulate their behaviour; to explore and test language, ideas and arguments in every activity and form of thought.’ (Alexander, 2010: 199).

He argues that exciting children’s imagination is important because, ‘to experience the delights – and pains – of imagining, and of entering into the imaginative worlds of others, is to become a more rounded person’ (Alexander, 2010: 199). The arts, including drama, are
highlighted by Alexander as being particularly powerful in developing the imagination and creativity. Given this, it is surprising that his (2020) dialogic teaching framework only focuses on reason and argumentation. It provides little examination of the nature of talk in imaginative, open-ended, creative contexts and provides no guidance at all on how teachers can develop talk in such settings. So, although Alexander’s (2020) dialogic framework may pertain to talk in process drama, it is likely that other talk frameworks are needed to enable understanding of the nature of talk in process drama.

Pupils often talk in small groups in process drama, using strategies such as hot-seating, improvisation in role or jointly created freeze frames. So, I turn now to examine the research into small group talk.

2.3.5 Small group talk

Mercer along with colleagues, such as Dawes, Littleton and Wegerif, have researched talk in small groups over many years, underpinned by Vygotskian concepts such as ZPD. As such, this approach aligns with the sociocultural underpinning of this study.

One of the key concepts, *exploratory talk*, was first proposed by Douglas Barnes in the 1970s and is defined as tentative and hesitant, and includes assertions, questions, changes of ideas, self-monitoring and reflexive, hypothetical, and speculative talk (Barnes and Todd, 1995). It is seen as an important means by which pupils can try out and make sense of new ideas, provided they are not ridiculed or contradicted in an aggressive and unconstructive way (Barnes, 1992). Although these definitions of exploratory talk relate to talk in small groups, they are also congruent with the sort of pupil talk developed through dialogic teaching and may be congruent with talk in process drama. The concept of presentational talk, by contrast, is defined as a ‘final draft’ for public display and evaluation in larger groups. It tends to occur often after teacher questioning, which is testing pupils’ understanding of topics which have already been taught and where there is a focus on getting an answer right, rather than exploring ideas (Barnes, 1992).

Reflecting on his research into small group talk in the 1980s, Mercer noted his surprise at the unconstructive nature of much of this talk (Littleton and Mercer, 2013). Despite this, some of this talk revealed children jointly thinking and Douglas Barnes’ term exploratory talk was used to describe it, although it was developed to specifically refer to reasoning:

‘*Exploratory talk* is that in which partners engage critically but constructively with each other’s ideas. Relevant information is offered for joint consideration. Proposals
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may be challenged and counter-challenged, but if so, reasons are given and alternatives are offered. Agreement is sought as a basis for joint progress. Knowledge is made publicly accountable and reasoning is visible in the talk’ (Mercer, 2000: 98)

Building on Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of ZPD, Mercer (2000) developed the concept of the intermental development zone (IDZ), which refers to symmetrical talk between more equal participants, such as pupils talking in small groups. This in turn has led to the concept of interthinking, which refers to higher order thinking, developed through collaboration, where talk is used as a tool to solve problems, using explicit reasoning for convergent tasks (Mercer, 2000). His research indicates that pupils can be taught to talk together more effectively through several strategies, termed Thinking Together. The creation of jointly constructed talk rules, it is argued, support children in interacting effectively together (Mercer, 2000). Talk prompts support pupils to use the language of reasoning, whilst talking points, defined as provocative statements, which can be agreed or disagreed with or be a means of stimulating discussion; invite a focus on reasoning (Dawes, 2012).

These strategies have parallels with accountable talk and the need to develop talk norms (Michaels, O’Connor and Resnick, 2008). These scholars argue talk needs to be accountable to reasoning, knowledge, and the community. So, students need to know how to use the language of reasoning and to get their facts right and develop knowledge through talk. They also need to learn to take turns, listen to each other, and build on each other’s ideas, which as Alexander (2020) notes, also has parallels with the cumulative principle in his dialogic teaching framework. Despite the rigorous and extensive research into talk by Mercer, Alexander, Resnick, Nystrand, O’Connor, Michaels, and other scholars, they have all focused predominantly on fostering reasoning through talk, and primarily in subjects such as maths, science, and technology. This sort of talk is not so appropriate for open-ended creative contexts such as process drama. However, some further research by Mercer and others has examined the nature of talk in open ended, creative contexts, congruent with the imaginative and creative nature of process drama. This is considered next.

2.3.6 Group talk in open-ended, creative contexts

When Mercer and colleagues were researching exploratory talk three other sorts of talk were identified but seen as less useful. Disputational talk, they posit, is when pupils argue unconstructively and cumulative talk, they suggest, is characterised as uncritical agreement and neither foster reasoning (Mercer, 2000). Another type of talk, playful talk was identified
but not recognised as important at the time, but was subsequently revisited by Wegerif, who acknowledged the role it played in creative contexts (Wegerif, 2005). Further research found that explicit reasoning was not so useful for open-ended, more overtly creative tasks, such as creative writing. The term 'co-constructed talk' was suggested as an overarching term, rather than exploratory talk, which was defined as just one type of constructive classroom talk (Rojas-Drummond et al., 2006).

Later research by Littleton and Mercer (2013) focused on talk and creativity, rather than reasoning, adapting the IDZ to create the concept of the *intermental creativity zone* (ICZ). This refers to the notion that creativity can be collaborative and developed through talk and the term *creative interthinking* replaces *interthinking* in open-ended creative contexts. This research revealed the value of cumulative talk in creative contexts and recognised its value for open-ended tasks involving divergent thinking, although reasoning is also needed in collective thinking, to ensure that issues such as group think do not arise (Littleton and Mercer, 2013). This assertion is supported by research into pupils talking in pairs and making meaning of paintings, where the language of creative thinking, such as speculation and possibility was often used together with the language of reasoning by the children (Maine, 2014; 2015). This aligns with the suggestion that divergent and convergent thinking are seen as two sides of the same coin, where the generation of new and original ideas are critiqued and evaluated almost simultaneously (Nickerson, 1999).

The concept of *background common knowledge* is considered important in group creativity and refers to common technical knowledge needed for co-creation, such as specific musical knowledge (Littleton and Mercer, 2013). This is pertinent to process drama, where both teachers and pupils need background common knowledge of a range of drama conventions to talk and create in process drama. Ground rules, important in reasoning, are also considered important for talk in creative contexts. Tension, created through the consideration of multiple perspectives is essential, it is suggested, otherwise creativity can be suppressed (Littleton and Mercer, 2013). This too has salience for process drama, where both tension and the taking of multiple perspectives through role taking are important features of it.

Yet, despite the apparent relevance of Littleton and Mercer’s (2013) research into talk in creative contexts to process drama, it focused on pupils talking in groups with technology, such as interactive white boards and talk in adult, work-based teams, or professional musicians. The research in their book does not examine talk in the humanities nor arts-based school subjects. Consequently, there is less guidance and fewer strategies to support
teachers to develop pupil talk in creative contexts compared to Mercer’s work on reason and talk. Additionally, despite his (2013) research into talk and creativity, Mercer has not developed this further, returning instead to research into talk and reasoning in subjects such as science, mathematics, and technology.

Karen Littleton, however, has continued to explore talk in open-ended, creative contexts, with other colleagues, focusing particularly on talk in collaborative creative writing. In this research, it was found that reasoning and argumentation are less useful in understanding talk in group creativity such as joint creative writing and the concept of creative interthinking was further developed (Vass et al., 2014). The findings from their research were partly influenced by comparisons made between a well-formed argument and a good story, where narrative is seen as being concerned with the human condition, emotions, and endowing experience with meaning, whereas logic and reason is focused on knowing the truth (Bruner, 1986). This is pertinent for my study since process drama is often based around or creates narratives.

The Vass et al. (2014) study also revealed the important role that emotion plays in cognition and group creativity. They argue that during the Enlightenment, conscious, rational thinking, and logic were separated from emotion; associated with being out of control and leading to the undervaluing of the role of emotion in cognition, which persists today. Recent affective and social neuroscience science research, however, suggests that emotions play a central role in perception, learning and understanding. It is argued that our rational decision making is informed by a consideration of the emotional consequences of our decisions, within social and cultural settings and is associated with ethical and moral thinking (Immordino-Yang and Damasio, 2007). This is pertinent to process drama, which involves pupils in role having to make decisions at moments of high tension, and to consider the moral and ethical implications of characters’ behaviour and decision making. It is also affective in nature, since empathy is seen to be at its heart, as I will discuss in sections 2.4.4.4. The combination of emotion and reason is therefore likely to be evident in talk in process drama.

It is argued that ethical decision making, combining reason and emotion in response to complex situations is the basis of creativity (Immordino-Yang and Damasio, 2007). This is supported by Vass et al. (2014), who maintain that low focus thinking, or stream of consciousness is the basis of creativity, where emotion supports the combination of different thoughts, generating creative associations and metaphors, whilst unconscious thought replaces more conscious analytic thought. There was evidence of a flow of ideas, associated with affect, unconscious thought and creative thought, in the Vass et al. (2014)
findings, which they claim is similar to conceptualising group creativity as group flow (Sawyer, 2008). Rather than challenging each other’s ideas through exploratory talk, the talk in the creative writing context examined was cumulative in nature, demonstrating shared emotional resonances, such as smiles and excitement. It was this, the researchers suggest, which provided the cohesion, rather than reasoning (Vass et al., 2014).

The concept of creative interthinking and the role of emotions in group creativity seems fitting for my study, since process drama takes place in open-ended, group creativity contexts, and involves talking in role to imagine the thoughts and feelings of characters. The role of emotion and cumulative talk in creative interthinking also has similarities with dialogic space and this concept is discussed next.

2.3.7 Dialogic Space

Despite his research with Mercer and colleagues, Wegerif (2013) has since rejected Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theories of ZPD and the role of language as cultural tool to develop thinking, reasoning, and collaborative construction of knowledge,

‘I no longer think that the metaphor of learning to use cultural tools that the sociocultural approach relies on can understand the creative kind of thinking we learn through engaging in dialogue.’ (Wegerif, 2010: 308)

He became convinced that what he was seeing in groups who talked successfully together, was not explicit reasoning or exploratory talk, but group relationships (Wegerif, 2010). This led him to focus on the concept of dialogic space, which may have salience with the nature of talk and interaction in process drama. Dialogic space, developed from Buber’s concept of ‘das zwischen’, or ‘the space of the inbetween’, and it is argued that this is where dialogue takes place (Wegerif and Major, 2019). Wegerif posits it builds on Bakhtin’s (1986) concept of ‘Great Time’, ‘the ’space’ of dialogue between all times and places’ (2011: 180). He also argues that it is the difference or gap between perspectives and voices which fosters dialogue and without it meaning will not take place (Wegerif, 2013). The relational nature of Dialogic Space, where people engage constructively with each other’s ideas, is also seen to align with Alexander’s (2020) collective, reciprocal, and supportive principles of talk (Kim and Wilkinson, 2019).

Wegerif has therefore moved from an epistemological perspective, which sees language as a tool for reasoning to an ontological perspective. He is influenced more by Bakhtin, than Vygotsky, because an ontological perspective is not just about knowledge, but about ‘the
very nature of our existence and identity’ (Wegerif, Mercer and Major, 2020:3). Defining
dialogic space as ontological, it is argued, emphasises that dialogue is not just a means to
deepen thinking and knowledge, but important for its own sake (Wegerif, 2013).

Wegerif (2013) offers a pedagogical framework to develop dialogic space, which he
suggests consists of three moves, opening, widening, and deepening dialogic space. He
suggests that dialogic space can be opened by a relationship, such as a teacher pupil,
where attention is gained through a challenge, a question or by preparing pupils to talk
effectively, such as the use of talk rules (Wegerif, 2013). Others add that well designed
group tasks and talk prompts are also needed (Palmgren-Neuvonen, Littleton and Hirvonen,
2021).

Dialogic space can be widened, Wegerif (2010; 2013) suggests, by bringing in other
perspectives and voices. He has achieved this by focusing on the use of the internet
(Wegerif, 2020). In other research into collaboration in open-ended tasks, it was found that
multiple perspectives could also be introduced through having heterogenous groups of
mixed genders, and by using multiple information resources, including web-based resources
(Palmgren et al., 2021). Dialogic space, it is proposed, can be deepened by inviting pupils to
reflect on assumptions they may have brought to the dialogue, which may have changed
through meeting different perspectives (Wegerif, 2020). It is possible that process drama
can open, widen, and deepen dialogic space, since it invites perspective taking and
reflection. This will be explored in section 2.4 on process drama.

Yet Wegerif’s (2021) rejection of Vygotsky’s theories in relation to dialogic space can be
questioned. He maintains that Vygotsky’s (1978) concept of ZPD is one-way, hierarchical
and inappropriate for dialogic talk. However, others argue that although ZPD could be
interpreted as one-way, Vygotsky intended it to be more about negotiation (Daniels, 2001;
Mercer and Littleton, 2007; Razfar and Gutierrez, 2013). Moreover, Vygotsky emphasised
the relationship between affect and thought, arguing that, ‘Thought is not begotten by
thought; it is engendered by motivations i.e., by our desires and needs, our interests and
emotions’ (Vygotsky, 1986: 252). Additionally, others argue that ZPD, usually
conceptualised as the co-construction of knowledge through cultural tools and interaction,
can be viewed through an emotional lens (Mann and John-Steiner, 2002). They combined
ZPD with Vygotsky’s concept of perezhivanie; defined as a lived or emotional experience,
arguing that perezhivanie is, ‘the affective processes through which interactions in the ZPD
are individually perceived, appropriated, and represented by participants’ (Mann and John-
Steiner, 2002: 49). So, despite Wegerif’s (2020) arguments against ZPD and the
sociocultural approach, these concepts could be seen as compatible with creative thinking and the relational and ontological nature of interactions in dialogic space, particularly when combined with the affective aspect of Vygotsky’s theories. I return to the concept of perezhivanie in relation to drama in section 2.4.4.4.

Furthermore, despite Wegerif’s interest in talk in creative contexts and the revisiting of playful talk, he has not developed this research, focusing instead on developing dialogic space through the internet and technology. Further research into talk and dialogic space in open-ended divergent tasks and creative contexts is needed, since there is little research into talk in these contexts, nor in arts subjects such as process drama. Yet dialogic space is germane for collaboration and interaction in process drama, which involves dialogue, reflection, the taking of multiple roles and perspective taking. Process drama is relational and a way of experiencing and making meaning of issues that arise in the real world, but through the safe space of the imagination. Finally, the wide range of drama strategies and a culture of trusting relationships can open dialogic spaces. Process drama is therefore examined next.

2.4 Process Drama

In this section I introduce the key features of process drama, considering the links between Vygotsky’s theories on play and mediational tools and drama, before looking at the collaborative nature of process drama. I examine the importance of role, the potential of teacher-in-role (TiR) and how these are informed by Bakhtin’s theories on dialogism. I also consider how role-taking can foster empathy and examine the importance of reflection and evaluation in process drama.

The principles and models of drama explored in the following sections have been developed by a range of practitioners and theorists, such as Dorothy Heathcote, who has been highly influential in the development of the drama pedagogy of scholars such as Jonathon Neelands, Cecily O’Neill, and Brian Edmiston. Nevertheless, despite being developed from years of practice, her drama pedagogy has little theoretical underpinning.

The research approach taken by Neelands and Edmiston is underpinned by theory and seems to correspond with drama research as conceptual, theoretical, or philosophical enquiry (Omasta and Synder-Young, 2014). Occasional explicit examples of their practice are referred to, supporting their framework and pedagogy of process drama. The drama pedagogy developed by these scholars has not however been analysed through an empirical research frame, such as case study. Empirical data has not been collected, rather
they reflect on their own practice with teachers and children through various theoretical lenses.

By contrast as discussed in the previous section, the pedagogy that has emerged over years of research and studies around dialogic teaching has used a mixture of qualitative and quantitative empirical research to develop dialogic teaching. There are some empirical studies of process drama which, whilst more limited in number than in the field of talk research, are examined in section 2.6.

2.4.1 Features of process drama

Drama has been defined as,

‘The imagined, embodied and active semiotic representation of social relations located in time and place. Drama requires the involvement of the whole person – the active and integrated engagement of mind and body, involving imagination, intellect, emotion and physical action.’ (Franks, 2010: 242)

In process drama, the focus of this study, participants use their imagination to co-create an imagined world, which takes place at the same time as the real, everyday world of the classroom (Edmiston, 2003). It could be argued that process drama has a double reality, consisting of the ‘what if’ world of the drama and the ‘what is’ world of the classroom (Edmiston, 2003). These two worlds interact and impact on each other, as there is constant oscillation between the imagined drama world and reflection on the events and themes of the drama in the real world.

Process drama is often seen as beginning with a pre-text stimulus for the drama. However, O’Neill (1995) posits that a pre-text does more than this:

‘The function of the pre-text is to activate the weaving of the text of the process drama……..The pre-text operates, first of all to define the nature and limits of the dramatic world, and second, to imply roles for participants. Next it switches on expectation and binds the group together in expectation.’ (O’Neill, 1995: 20).

Stories are often used as starting points for process drama, providing a context, rather than a script, hence it is sometimes also referred to as text-edged drama (Wolf, Edmiston and Enciso, 1997). Scenarios or objects could also be the pre-text including a missing person or object, a problem to be solved or a letter to be read, which act as a source for the story world that is co-created in process drama (O’Neill, 1995). This is explored through a range of
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process drama strategies and in addition, props and costumes can mediate the imagination in drama, which I explore next.

2.4.2 Vygotsky’s theories of mediational tools, signs and ZPD in process drama

Vygotsky’s (1978) theories on mediational tools and learning can be applied to play and process drama, since action can mediate learning in the same way as tools, by acting as a kind of pivot, such as stamping on the ground, which can support the child’s imagination, helping them imagine they are riding a horse for instance. In process drama, pupils use tools, symbols, and social interaction to mediate meaning making and imagination, to take on roles that they cannot yet take in real life. As well as talk, movement, gesture, costumes, and props are significant tools and signs, which mediate meaning in process drama. Moreover, according to Edmiston, ‘each of the dramatic modes can thus be considered tools that when used over time with students can collectively become a sign system for mediating, and thus authoring, understanding through dialogue’ (Edmiston, 2014: 25).

The social encounters of drama, it is argued, are full of signs, such as pauses, silences, space, movement, and voice which create meaning between participants (Heathcote, 1980/2014). The many drama conventions themselves can also be considered as signs or tools, which mediate meaning, particularly TiR,

‘When teacher in role is used it can set the frame very quickly because the very fact that someone has entered into a full signing system, in drama time, automatically places the rest of the people present into roles themselves, for they must be addressed as if they are those roles’ (Heathcote, 1980/2014: 72)

When children use these tools, in role, moving, gesturing, and using language with teachers, (who may also be in role) the teachers may be scaffolding the children’s meaning making, beyond what they could do alone and thus supporting pupils to cross Vygotsky’s (1978) ZPD. Collaboration and co-construction between teachers and pupils are important features of both dialogic teaching and process drama and I therefore explore collaboration in process drama next.

2.4.3 Collaboration in process drama

Process drama is created jointly between the teacher and groups of children or the whole class, as well as between children working independently. This community or ensemble can be supported by the development and negotiation of a contract of how everyone will work together (Neelands, 2009). The use of collaborative warm up games at the beginning of
process drama sessions also fosters an enabling community. Pupils and teachers collaborate to solve problems and co-construct meaning and they must trust each other and feel secure enough to take risks such as taking roles (Neelands, 2011; Edmiston, 2014; Lehtonen et al., 2016).

In process drama, it is suggested that ‘there is often a ‘dethroning’ of the power of teacher, leader or director and an expectation that learning or rehearsal, will be negotiated and co-constructed’, where meaning is socially created (Neelands, 2009: 168). Moreover, it is suggested that student agency and ownership of learning is supported by the teachers, ‘giving up the normal social roles, but concentrating totally on and participating in the interaction of drama class (Lehtonen et al., 2016: 561). Like dialogic pedagogy, this encourages pupil engagement, agency, and empowerment, particularly when pupils in role are joined by the TiR, and this will be explored in more depth later in this chapter.

This section and the previous section have touched on role-taking and TiR, which are important aspects of process drama and are examined in more detail next.

2.4.4 Role-taking

Adopting roles is central to process drama and has its roots in imaginative, role play in the early years (Booth, 1995; Franks, 2010; Neelands, 2011; Heathcote, 2010/2014). When pupils are in role, it is as if they are in the situation for real, and it is this ability to imagine themselves differently that Neelands (2011) argues is distinctive about learning in drama. In role, pupils can imagine being the other, an adult, with very different characteristics to themselves. They can create imagined worlds and events and think not just ‘as if’ but also ‘what if’ (Booth, 1995).

Being in role is also associated with perspective taking, metaxis, dialogism, TiR and empathy, and can be linked to Vygotksy’s (2004) notion of perezhivanie. These concepts and aspects of role are explored in the next four subsections.

2.4.4.1 Role-taking, position, and dialogism

Role-taking, it is argued, tends to lead to participants experiencing a single perspective and the term role can suggest that the voice of the role does not change its views or values in dialogue with others, or itself (Edmiston and Enciso, 2002; Edmiston, 2016). This is arguably a monologic approach to drama, which only allows students to take one position and perspective. If a dialogic approach to drama is taken, the focus is on conflicts between discourses, rather than conflict between people or characters (Edmiston and Enciso, 2002).
One way to develop a more dialogic approach to drama is to position students so that they experience multiple viewpoints. These multiple viewpoints can be created by taking on different roles and dialoguing from these different positions. This, scholars argue, allows one discourse to be placed against another, which helps pupils unpick the underlying assumptions and values of different discourses (Edmistone, 2000; Edmistone and Enciso, 2002). Through this, pupils are allowed to, ‘enter more fully into the consciousness of others and dialogue from those positions through their use of embodied dialogic imagination’ (Edmistone, 2016: 336). This, he asserts, is both dialogic and inquiry and for this reason, the term dramatic inquiry is used by Edmistone (2014; 2016) rather than process drama.

Perspective taking links to dramatic tension which is viewed as being an essential part of drama (Heathcote, 2010/2014). When pupils can imagine differing viewpoints and perspectives of characters, Edmistone (2014) posits it can lead to conflicted feelings and discomfort as pupils try to make sense of competing values and perspectives. Similarly, tension and conflict in discourse is seen by Bakhtin (1981) as a meaning-making struggle between people and within people.

Edmistone (2014) also posits that tension in drama is informed by Bakhtin’s concept of polyphonic novels, which Depalma defines as, ‘a discursive space where characters take dialogic positions with respect to each other and the author, where different ideas embodied by different voices collide with each other’ (2010: 437). This is similar to Bakhtin’s (1984) proposal that ideas are not born inside the heads of individuals but are born between people. Moreover polyphonic conversations consist of multiple voices rather than two, whilst a polyphonic classroom is described as, ‘a dialogic space into which multiple voices are invited….to engage each other in dialogue’ (Depalma, 2010: 437). It is suggested that a polyphonic classroom can be encouraged through using a range of drama conventions and in the careful selecting of texts to use as starting points (Edmistone, 2014). These conventions would seem to have the potential to open and widen dialogic space since Wegerif (2020) maintains that it is the difference between perspectives and voices that supports meaning making, which widens dialogic spaces.

Like Wegerif’s dialogic space, the concepts and theories of Bakhtin underpin much of Edmistone’s framework of drama pedagogy. He takes a theoretical and philosophical enquiry approach to researching process drama. Although he reflects on examples of his practice, working with teachers to illustrate the connections he makes between Bakhtin, dialogism and drama, there are no examples of empirical data and no analysis of the talk in drama.

Notwithstanding that I concur with much of what Edmistone claims for drama but perceive his
arguments would be strengthened by empirical data. My study seeks to research drama empirically, to develop new understandings about the nature of talk within process drama.

So far, this review has explored the importance of collaboration and taking different perspective and positions in role. Role is also associated with the concept of metaxis and this is examined next.

2.4.4.2 Role-taking, metaxis and dialogism

In role teachers and pupils are between worlds, simultaneously thinking as themselves and as the imagined other. This is referred to as metaxis. Originally Greek in origin, metaxis relates to the state of in-betweenness Davis (2015) explains since it is defined as, ‘the state of belonging completely and simultaneously to two different, autonomous worlds: the image of reality and the reality of the image’ (Boal, 1995: 53). Parallels can be drawn between metaxis and dialogic space, since both are associated with a space of meaning making and the state of in-betweenness. This further supports the possibility that dialogic space is germane for understanding interaction in process drama.

Similarly, it has been argued that role is informed by Bakhtin’s concept of double-voiced discourse (Edmiston and Enciso, 2002; Edmiston, 2014). Bakhtin posits that, ‘in such discourse there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions’ (1981: 324). When children and teachers take up roles, Edmiston (2014) argues the language can be viewed as double voiced. In role, teachers and children speak and make meaning as themselves in the real world and as if they were someone else and there is constant oscillation between these two realities and voices (Edmiston, 2003).

The importance of TiR in process drama has been emphasised by many drama scholars and this aspect of role is explored next.

2.4.4.3 Teacher in role (TiR)

TiR, a key feature of process drama, was utilised extensively in my study by the two participating teachers. TiR is seen by Edmiston (2014) as an inherently dialogic tool. Arguably, the purpose of TiR is to put the pupils into the position of being the ones who do the thinking, talking, responding, decision making and problem-solving. Using TiR is claimed to be a safe way that pupils can oppose and disagree with the teacher, who replies as the role, not the teacher, ‘thus holding it in the ‘no penalty zone’ – in this way good relations are built.’ (Heathcote, 1980/2014: 74). The TiR does not act in the same way as actors do, since
they have a different purpose. Instead, the TiR can be the ‘gateway’ into exploring the issues in depth that arise out of the drama (Heathcote, 1980/2014).

TiR is seen by O’Neill (2014) to be an effective way to develop collaboration in a class and to begin to share power with the class. She emphasises that this is different to exchanging or transferring power to the children. The status of the character that teachers use in role is seen as critical in sharing this power. A high-status character who leads, such as a king, can result in the teacher behaving and talking in role just as they would as a teacher, which could inhibit the behaviour, attitude of the pupils and their interaction with the teacher and the resulting talk (Neelands, 1987; Booth, 1995; Baldwin, 2012). Scholars suggest that it can be more effective to get pupils to engage in the imaginary as if world and take on a role if the teacher uses a lower status role, such as a slave, or someone who is a victim who needs help. Using a lower status teacher-in-role places the pupils in a more powerful position than the teacher, which can impact on the normal power relations and interactions between the teacher and the pupils (Neelands, 1987; Baldwin, 2012). Within an equal or lower status role, the teacher can be inside the drama, alongside the group (Neelands and Goode, 2000). From a Bakhtinian perspective, when a high-status TiR is adopted, the teacher has an authoritative voice, but when using a lower-status role they use a persuasive voice. I will return to the effect of a low-status and high-status TiR on the interactions in my study in chapters four, five and six.

Empirical research into process drama with Norwegian teachers, found that when TiR was used, the talk was far less IRF in nature and instead seemed to be more what people were genuinely interested in (Saebo, 2009). Furthermore, the findings indicated that when TiR was used, the students’ ideas tended to be included more in the learning process, ‘which the teacher can challenge during the interaction. This in turn can stimulate student engagement and help create a learning community’ (Saebo, 2009: 289). However, this study can be criticised for its anecdotal nature and lack of transparency about methodology, making these findings less credible.

The development of empathy, emotion and the imagination through role taking, are also considered important features of drama, which is likely to affect the nature of the talk. I therefore turn now to the role of empathy, emotion and perezhivanie in process drama.

2.4.4.4 Role, empathy and perezhivanie

Emotion is seen as being at the heart of drama, Heathcote maintains. She used role to develop empathy in children since, ‘talking about emotion is no substitute for feeling it’
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(Heathcote, 1977/2014: 54). Although influenced by the work of Heathcote, a concern with emotion and empathy is largely absent from Edmiston’s model of drama however, perhaps because he focuses more on dramatic inquiry. By contrast, (Neelands, 2010; 2011) argues that creativity and art should be placed at the heart of learning and that drama and role-taking develop the empathetic imagination, since it is essentially about imagining oneself as the other. As Neelands maintains, ‘imagining what it is like to be someone other than yourself is at the core of our humanity. It is the essence of humanity and it is the beginning of morality’ (Neelands, 2010: 44). This resonates with Immordino-Yang and Damasio’s (2007) assertion that emotion, as well as reason are essential for cognition, and moral and ethical decision making. Process drama is a tool which could develop this sort of thinking, since pupils in role can question the moral and ethical behaviour and motives of characters, examine the consequences of their actions, and thereby engage with the issues and themes of the drama.

Role-taking is also seen by Holland (2009) as important for enabling pupils to explore feelings, motivations, and perspectives, but careful sequencing of the drama conventions is considered necessary. For example, in their research, a drama warm-up was followed by a hot-seating activity, where pupils asked questions of the teacher or other pupils in role. Without the drama warm-up it is argued that the students would not have felt safe enough to take emotional risks in the sorts of questions that they asked (Holland, 2009). Another element needed in developing empathy seemed to be the respect and empathy the teachers had for the pupils, alongside sensitive questioning to support students to express themselves (Holland, 2009). Just like dialogic teaching, the teacher pupil relationships and the classroom climate appear to be important for process drama.

Since empathy is seen as an essential element in drama, it is useful to define what it means. Two types of empathy, cognitive and affective, have been identified by Kidd and Castano (2013). They define cognitive empathy as the ability to infer what others’ beliefs and intentions might be and to understand what people are thinking, also referred to as Theory of Mind (Zunshine, 2004; Djikic, Oatley and Moldoveanu, 2013). This is pertinent for process drama since role-taking supports pupils to imagine what a character might be thinking or saying through strategies such as freeze frame and thought tracking. Furthermore, they argue that cognitive empathy is about perspective taking; being able to see different viewpoints and to understand those viewpoints.

Affective empathy relates to the ability to notice and understand the emotions of others (Kidd and Castano, 2013). This is developed further by Djikic et al., (2013), who argue that
empathy is not just imagining the emotions of the characters, but also feeling those same emotions ourselves. Likewise, Vygotsky proposes that:

> every construct of the imagination has an effect on our feelings, and if this construct does not in itself correspond to reality, nonetheless the feelings it evokes are real feelings, feelings a person truly experiences. (Vygotsky, 2004: 19)

Applying this to literature, Vygotsky reminds us that we are moved by the fates of imaginary characters from literature and theatre. They affect us emotionally, even though we know they are not real, because the emotions are, ‘completely real and we experience them truly, seriously and deeply’ (Vygotsky, 2004: 20). This would also seem to be the case for process drama, where teachers and pupils can imagine the thoughts, and experience the feelings of characters, through taking roles.

Additionally, empathetic responses to the predicaments of characters within process drama attune with the concept of perezhivanie, which relates to strong emotional experiences; briefly introduced in 2.3.7. Associated with Vygotsky, this concept is attracting growing interest from researchers, including from research into drama (Davis, 2015). It roughly translates from Russian to mean a significant, emotional, lived experience. This is apposite for process drama, for as Davis argues, ‘within drama education, human experience and emotions are at the very core of learning’ (2015: 64). It is also seen by some as ontological in nature, since it is experiential (Veresov and Fleer, 2016). This has parallels with dialogic space; also described as ontological and experiential. My own experience of using process drama as a teacher and particularly in my study, indicates the potential power of process drama to foster emotion and empathy in role, which I will discuss in later chapters. Perezhivanie also relates to Boal’s concept of metaxis because both concepts open up, ‘a problem space and gap which requires cognitive and emotional engagement, tensions, possible resolution and new understandings’ (Davis, 2015: 69). This seems comparable to the relational, meaning making nature of dialogic space. Process drama is also seen as a reflective practice and is briefly explored next.

2.4.5 Reflection and evaluation in drama

Reflection is seen as essential within drama and is regarded as a central part of the reviewing process Heathcote (1977/2014). Moreover, since drama encompasses emotion and tension, it is argued it needs to be reflected on:
Drama is about filling the spaces between people with meaningful experiences. This means that emotion is at the heart of the drama experience, but it is tempered with thought and planning. The first is experienced through tension, the second through the reviewing process. (Heathcote, 1978/2014: 53)

Reflection is also viewed by O'Neill as a key aesthetic element where ‘…contemplation and interpretation become possible’ (2014: 39). Moreover, Bakhtin posits that the concept of ‘outsideness’ is important for meaning making in reflection since, ‘in order to understand, it is immensely important to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding in time, in space, in culture’ (1986: 7). Additionally, the arts are seen by Edmiston (2014) as particularly good at fostering reflection and meaning making. In process drama this reflection can be encouraged through pausing the drama to step back out of role and let pupils discuss their thoughts and feelings in response to events or issues raised in role.

Reflection can also take place within the drama Edmiston (2014) argues. He describes this as reflective dialogue or being in dramatic reflection mode because he views reflection, whilst engaged in the drama, as a way of supporting pupils to actively make meaning. Like Boal’s (1995) concept of metaxis, when participants are in role, they think and reflect as themselves and as the role they have taken; thereby belonging to two worlds at the same time.

The imaginative, empathetic, and reflective nature of process drama is associated with creativity and is likely to influence the nature of talk fostered through process drama. The following section therefore considers some aspects of creativity and creative practice which are pertinent to process drama.

2.5 Process drama as creative practice

Research into the nature of creativity and creative practice goes back at least 40 years and it is beyond the scope of this thesis to explore all the theories and models. Instead, this section will examine Possibility Thinking (PT) and Sawyer’s view of creativity as improvisation and a problem-solving process. These two major arguments, based on substantial bodies of work within the field, link most closely to the nature of process drama.

2.5.1 Group creativity, improvisation, and process drama

Improvisation is seen as important in group creativity and creative teaching and is based on research into improvisational jazz music and theatre, where groups improvise and create in
the moment (Sawyer, 2006). Group creativity also consists of collaboration, since all members contribute, but it has an unpredictable nature and outcome, since the words or actions of the group are contingent on the words or actions of the previous participants (Sawyer and DeZutter, 2009). Consequently, process drama is recognised as a form of group creativity, since the creative community is seen as important in drama (McCammon et al., 2010). Moreover Neelands (2009) compares the group dynamics in drama to the ensemble of the Royal Shakespeare Company (RSC).

Teachers need to change plans and adapt in process drama, having to respond to what children say and do in role, as they improvise and create the words, thoughts, and feelings of characters, particularly when TiR is utilised. Process drama distributes the power of the teacher, and the negotiated, co-constructed learning that this encourages is creative because the teacher needs to tolerate the unpredictable situations that would arise from this (Neelands, 2011; Lehtonen et al., 2016). The pupils, as well as the teacher improvise in role, in imaginary worlds, responding to others and thinking on their feet to make spontaneous decisions and respond to the unexpected. This is also congruent with dialogic pedagogy where ceding some of the control of the talk to pupils is seen as a way of developing dialogic talk. Moving away from IRF and scripted lessons is risky for teachers since they lose control of the direction of the talk Sawyer (2004b; 2011) argues. Moreover this kind of risk-taking, it is argued, is associated with a creative pedagogy (Burnard, et al., 2006; Sawyer, 2012).

Creative teaching is seen as a balance between structures such as curriculum and planning and improvisation in the moment (Sawyer, 2004a). This resonates with a drama study by Saebo (2009), which found that when the process drama lessons were teacher-structured, more creative ways of learning were fostered. By contrast, when teachers stood back too much and provided little structure, the pupils tended to be less productive, and less creativity was fostered.

Process drama is arguably therefore a form of group creativity, which requires teachers and pupils to improvise and make constant in-the-moment judgements, and there needs to be a balance between structure such as planning appropriate drama strategies, and improvisation.

2.5.2 Creativity as a problem-solving process

Creativity is often seen as a problem-finding and problem-solving process, which Sawyer (2012) argues consists of different stages such as problem finding; gathering new knowledge and information, incubation of ideas; generating ideas; combining ideas and
selecting and evaluating these ideas. Narratives are full of problems and dilemmas to solve and since process drama is often based on stories, it invites learners to solve problems or dilemmas in role. Problem-solving is also linked to tension in drama by Lin, who suggests that ‘……there is always a tension which enables drama teachers to trigger children’s curiosity to explore the problems and solutions with real imagination.’ (2010: 108)

Generating ideas through problem-solving, or imagining possibilities are also seen as important aspects of creativity (Burnard et al., 2006). Idea generation is often associated with divergent thinking, but creative thinking is more complex than this according to Sawyer, who asserts that, ‘Creative achievement requires a complex combination of divergent thinking, convergent thinking, critical evaluation, and other abilities, and creative people are good at switching back and forth at different points in the creative process’ (2012: 51). Since creative thinking is complex and drama involves problem-solving, as well as co-constructed imagined worlds and narratives, talk in process drama is likely to be a mixture of divergent, convergent, and evaluative thinking.

Sawyer (2012) posits that the stages he identifies in the problem-solving process are not linear and can be seen as habits of mind or disciplines, which he argues, align with aspects of possibility thinking (PT), which I consider next.

2.5.3 Possibility thinking and process drama

Every day, problem-solving is often referred to as little c creativity and it is this type of creativity that is perhaps most pertinent to creative teaching and learning in process drama. Possibility Thinking (PT) is seen as the engine of little c creativity (Craft, 2000; 2014). Research into possibility thinking, suggests it consists of the habits of posing questions; immersion; play; being imaginative; self-determination; risk-taking and innovation (Burnard et al., 2006). How these creative habits of mind relate to process drama are examined next.

Developing ideas and possibilities encourages curiosity in children through questioning and posing questions is seen as an important feature of PT (Burnard et al., 2006; Cremin, Chappell and Craft, 2012). This is congruent with process drama since question posing is a feature of many drama strategies, such as hot-seating and TiR. Teachers asking possibility broad questions, is also seen to encourage creativity, given that they invite pupils to speculate and image multiple possibilities (Chappell et al., 2008).

Inhabiting the imaginary world is an important aspect of creativity (Burnard et al., 2006; Craft, 2014), which is developed through supporting children to use speculative what if
thinking or engaging in *as if* perspective taking behaviour (Craft, 2014). This is comparable with imaginative perspective taking, developed in role in process drama. Process drama invites participants to imagine themselves differently, to develop their empathetic imagination and to create imaginary worlds, improvising in role to imagine what characters might be thinking, feeling, saying, or doing. Imagination is central to process drama and therefore a creative pedagogy, aligning with PT.

Another feature of PT, *self-determination* is seen as creative, since developing agentive learners is associated with a creative pedagogy, through giving ownership and control to pupils (Jeffrey and Craft, 2004; Burnard *et al.*, 2006; Craft, 2014; Cremin, 2014; Craft *et al.*, 2014). Process drama situates the teacher in the role of facilitator, Lin (2010) argues, and maintains that it fosters autonomy and possibility thinking through the principle of standing back and giving pupils space to talk and think together. This resonates with findings in a PT study which suggested that when teachers stand back from the pupils PT is fostered by encouraging autonomy and freedom to play (Cremin, Burnard and Craft, 2006). Further research into PT proposed that it is also fostered when teachers step forward at times, into pupils’ play space, co-imagining and co-authoring stories as TiR (Craft, McConnon and Matthews, 2012).

Both stepping back and stepping into pupil’s activities, have parallels with TiR in process drama, where teachers oscillate between stepping into the drama in role, and then stepping back to encourage autonomy. This is analogous with the view of the creative teacher as *meddler-in-the-middle* (McWilliam, 2008). In this concept of creative pedagogy, the teacher goes beyond the guide-on-the side, where the focus moves from the teacher to the learner, to the teacher experimenting and risk-taking with the pupils spending, ‘less time giving instructions and more time spent being a usefully ignorant co-worker in the thick of the action.’ (McWilliam, 2008: 265). The concept of meddler-in-the-middle is particularly germane to an equal status TiR, in the thick of the action, engaged creatively with the pupils. However, despite the convincing nature of the *meddler-in-the-middle* metaphor, it lacks the theoretical underpinning of PT, or the concepts of improvisation and distributed creativity developed by Sawyer (2004a; 2008).

Innovation is another feature of PT, and this too is germane for process drama, since pupils do not follow a script, but imagine and co-create characters, plots, and narratives, as well as the thoughts, words, and actions of characters within process drama. Pupils also need to take risks to step into role to imagine and create the narrative, thoughts, and feelings of characters. This fosters creativity, since it is argued that risk taking is an aspect of creativity
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(Burnard et al., 2006). This is comparable with the view that seeing failure as positive is an important habit of mind in a creative pedagogy (Sternberg, 2010; Sawyer, 2012). Neelands (2011) maintains that risk-taking within drama means that pupils need to choose to engage with drama and without this willingness and intrinsic motivation to participate, drama cannot take place. This aligns with the PT habit of immersion, defined as pupils deeply involved in a benevolent environment, where emotional support and high cognitive challenge are present (Craft, 2014). Play is also associated with PT (Bernard et al., 2006). This is applicable to the emotional connectivity of creative interthinking, role-play in early years and the playful nature of learning in process drama.

Overall, the creative pedagogy of PT is summarised by Craft (2014) as encouraging dialogue between pupils and between teachers and pupils. It also values children’s experiences and ideas and encourages an ethos of respect, ownership, control, and innovation. Similar conceptions of a creative pedagogy have been identified in a recent systematic review of creative pedagogies (Cremin and Chappell, 2021). These creative pedagogies include a culture of openness which supports autonomy and agency, playfulness, problem-solving, risk-taking, co-construction and collaboration and teacher creativity. Teacher creativity is also a feature of process drama through TiR, which involves risk-taking, playfulness, co-construction and talking in role with pupils. Therefore, process drama is a creative pedagogy and corresponds particularly with the pedagogy of both Sawyer and PT researchers; the creative context is seen to influence the nature of the talk.

In the final section of this chapter, I consider some of the criticisms of research into process drama and examine the methodology of some studies into it.

2.6 Criticisms of research into process drama

Concerns have been raised about the nature of research into drama by Omasta and Synder-Young (2014). In their analysis of over 400 peer-reviewed journal articles, they found a bias towards philosophical enquiry and theoretical approaches to researching process drama, where theorists reflect on their own practice, rather than empirically gathering data. The latter is true of some of the drama scholars who have underpinned my analysis of process drama in this literature review, such as Edmiston, Neelands, and O’Neill. As touched on earlier, Edmiston’s (2003; 2014; 2016) concept of process drama is very influenced by Bakhtinian concepts of dialogism and is largely theoretical. He does draw on his own practice, but this tends to be rather anecdotal, reflecting on examples of working with teachers and their pupils, rather than collecting data and analysing it.
The work of Neelands (1987; 2009; 2010; 2011) has also underpinned much of the discussion of drama within this chapter. Although his arguments about drama make sense to me based on my own experiences as a teacher and my observations of others, he does not support these arguments with any specific examples from his own practice, nor any empirical data. Whilst his claims of the links between drama and creativity align with creative pedagogies, such as improvisation, this is not underpinned by many of the theorists and writers on creativity. By contrast, Lehtonen et al.’s (2016) study is underpinned by contemporary theories into creative pedagogy, but this too is theoretical, rather than empirical in nature. This lack of empirical data and research by key scholars who have influenced the development of drama pedagogy, makes it harder to convince teachers and policy makers to value process drama.

Many of these drama scholars have been influenced by the ideas developed of Dorothy Heathcote. Although highly experienced, reflective, and influential on later drama scholars and practitioners, Dorothy Heathcote’s work is largely anecdotal since there are few explicit examples from her practice and there is little reference to theory. Therefore, it could be argued that her work attunes with the definition of drama research as documentation of practice, where practitioners share knowledge which is not analysed through a theoretical lens, which is seen to weaken arguments and claims (Omasta and Snyder-Young, 2014). To convince policy makers of the value of her practice and influence, there is a need for contemporary scholars to provide empirical data to support her claims and important work.

Omasta and Snyder-Young (2014) also found that empirical studies into drama are predominantly qualitative and are not often methodologically transparent. Holland’s (2009) study, explored earlier in this chapter for example, was a synthesis of some process drama sessions carried out in some schools over a period of a few months. There was no discussion of research design, methods, or ethics; raising questions about the methodological and credibility of the claims made. Similarly, the Saebo (2009) study, also explored earlier, is anecdotal in nature, telling the story of two different teachers’ drama lessons. Interviews and questionnaires are mentioned, but no details of data are presented, and the methodology deployed is not evident.

In the following section I examine studies into process drama, which take a theoretical, qualitative, or quantitative approach to research, so that I can examine their methodology. I begin with two theoretical approaches to researching process drama.
2.6.1 Theoretical studies into process drama

One theoretical study focused on the role of process drama in developing the imagination and the impact this might have on narrative comprehension and production (Mages, 2006). If literature provides instructions for the imagination, Mages (2006) argues, then process drama provides the training to develop this imagination for young children, who may have difficulty understanding the de-contextualised language of books. Through movement and talk, it is argued that drama can develop the ability to imagine tastes, sounds, smells, and textures, as well as the situations that characters face and how characters feel (Mages, 2006). If this is a regular feature of their learning, it is suggested that this can support a link between a text, comprehension, and the imagination. Eventually the link between the text and imagination could become so strong, it is posited, that students may not need drama to support comprehension. If this is correct, ‘it is possible that drama fosters the developmental trajectory – from make-believe play in childhood to absorption while reading in adulthood’ (Mages, 2006).

Engaging with stories through process drama can also support narrative production, it is suggested, because through re-telling or co-constructing narratives in role, students begin to understand narrative structures. However, the links that are proposed by Mages (2006) are based on the theories and ideas of others, rather than empirical data, but she suggests this model could form the basis of future empirical work, which could provide evidence to support the use of process drama in school. My study provides some of this evidence.

Similar findings emerged from a large-scale meta-analysis examining how drama develops verbal skills. In this second study, seven meta-analyses were undertaken to statistically examine the effect of classroom drama on different verbal outcomes (Podlozny, 2000). This study found that engaging in drama supported students’ understanding of story and furthermore suggested that drama develops generic comprehension skills, which can be transferable to other texts. These findings endorse Edmiston’s (2014) argument that reflection and taking roles in process drama can support meaning making. Moreover, the metanalysis also found that meaning making within drama was further enabled by teachers using TiR, working inside the drama, alongside the pupils.

Podlozny’s (2000) meta-analysis also found a link between process drama and reading achievement and reading readiness. Oral language development was supported by engagement with drama, particularly when it was unstructured, rather than following a script. This is significant for my study since process drama involves pupils creating their own words
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in role as characters, rather than following a script. By contrast though, no link was found between drama and vocabulary development, which seems surprising, given the central nature of talk in process drama. However, although some of the findings from this study resonate with other literature examined in this chapter, this study did not examine the nature of talk itself. The following three studies all explore talk within process drama.

2.6.2 Qualitative studies into process drama

In one partly empirical study, the role of speaking and listening was explored in relation to social capital; it focused on grammatical aspects of speech such as ellipsis, clauses, discourse markers, modality, deixis and vague language such as ‘you know’ (Kempe, 2010). However, this study exemplifies some of the criticisms made by Omasta and Synder-Yong (2014), since there is little detail of research design, nor evidence of data to support these claims. The same is true of the next two studies which, like my study, compare process drama to dialogic pedagogy.

The first of these studies, claims that the drama classroom is a dialogic classroom (Stinson, 2015). However, this claim is made by comparing Alexander’s principles of dialogic teaching; collective, reciprocal, supportive, cumulative, and purposeful with some examples of drama. Other important aspects of Alexander’s framework were not used to analyse the data, such as the importance of extending the third turn of the IRF sequence and asking authentic questions. The details of the methodology, interviews and video recording in the Stinson study are somewhat opaque and there is limited data to justify claims made.

A study by Marjanovic-Shane (2016) argues the opposite to the Stinson (2015) study, claiming that the differences between drama pedagogy and dialogic pedagogy are irreconcilable because drama is characterised by co-ordination, collaboration, and agreement, to jointly create an imagined world. This, it is suggested, is underpinned by the Vygotskian view that cognition, meaning making and development happen through play and imagination. Dialogic pedagogy, she argues, is instead underpinned by Bakhtin and not seen to be congruent with process drama pedagogy (Marjanovic-Shane, 2016). However, drama theorists such as Edmiston, underpin their conception of process drama with many concepts from Bakhtin, as well as Vygotsky, whilst Alexander’s (2020) framework of dialogic is influenced by both these significant scholars. Moreover, the Marjanovic-Shane (2016) study is not underpinned by the work of key theorists or scholars in dialogic teaching or process drama. It also exemplifies some of the criticisms of the methodology of process drama research. Drama pedagogy was examined by analysing some of the talk from a well-
known, but old documentary on Dorothy Heathcote, (recorded in 1971), rather than observing drama and collecting empirical data for example. This documentary was then compared with discussions with university students about aspects of learning, which did not relate to drama, but were seen as examples of dialogic pedagogy.

The literature base and the methodology of both these qualitative studies into dialogic pedagogy and process drama have gaps and weaknesses, which diminish their claims. This could explain why they have drawn such opposing conclusions about whether process drama has a dialogic pedagogy.

Although these qualitative studies have methodological weaknesses, quantitative studies of process drama can also have limitations, as I discuss next.

2.6.3 Quantitative studies into process drama

Three quantitative studies are considered, all of which used intervention groups of pupils who were engaged with drama pedagogy lessons and control groups of pupils who did different lessons, (such as PE) to compare creative outcomes from the lessons. In some of these studies, the drama lessons were given by visiting drama experts, rather than the teachers themselves. However, this approach is criticised by some, since it is argued that naturalistic approaches are authentic because they, ‘address existing practices rather than practices as artificially and possibly temporarily imposed’ (Howe et al., 2019: 468).

Batteries of tests of creativity were given to the intervention groups after the drama training, in all three studies. The tests utilised in two of these studies were purely tests of divergent thinking (Hui and Lau, 2006; Karakelle, 2009). A third study used tests of both divergent and convergent thinking and is therefore more akin to the current definitions of creative thinking (Celume, Besancon and Zenasni, 2019). However, creativity and creative pedagogies are complex and other aspects of creativity previously examined in this chapter, did not inform these studies. Although these studies claim that drama does develop creativity, their quantitative methodologies raise questions about the appropriateness of using control groups and tests of creativity alone. No observations of how the teachers taught process drama were made in addition, which could have been compared with theories about creativity and creative pedagogies to analyse whether the practice of process drama fosters creativity. This suggests that process drama should be researched with qualitative or mixed methods approaches, and that purely quantitative methods may appear less suitable.
2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the nature of IRF and constructive classroom talk, focusing on dialogic pedagogy, group talk and dialogic space. The landscape of process drama pedagogy was also investigated, including role-taking, imagination, empathy, and the collaborative and creative nature of primary process drama. Sociocultural theory was additionally explored since this underpins both pedagogical approaches.

The review confirmed that the research into talk and dialogic pedagogy is extensive and rigorously researched, using a wide range of research approaches, both qualitative and quantitative. The focus of most research into constructive talk in classrooms, however, has been on reasoning; there are fewer studies into talk in open-ended, creative contexts or arts subjects such as process drama. This literature review also established the significance of role-taking in relation to perspective taking, dialogism and empathy. It also revealed the importance of providing opportunities for reflection in process drama. The links between process drama and creative pedagogies suggested that some of the talk within drama is likely to foster creative thinking as well as reasoning.

This literature review also revealed that most influential theorists of process drama either share their practice in an anecdotal way, with little underpinning of theory, or conversely take a highly theoretical and philosophical enquiry, rather than empirical approach to their research and writing. Moreover, the qualitative studies of process drama, which I have examined in this chapter support the criticisms made by Omasta and Snyder-Young (2014), since they lack transparency about their methodology, data collection and analysis. The few quantitative studies into process drama examined also have limitations, since they relied solely on pre and post-tests of creativity and did not include other forms of data collection such as interviews or observations of drama, which would have revealed a deeper view of process drama. My study is a qualitative study which seeks to respond to these weaknesses in the research into process drama. I seek to utilise empirical research and to be transparent about my research design, methods of data collection and analysis and I have carried out a rigorous, qualitative, empirical study of the nature of talk in process drama. My study is also underpinned by a range of research and models of process drama, dialogic teaching, and creativity. Accordingly, in the next chapter, I examine my choice of methodology, research design and methods of data analysis.
3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

Having reviewed the literature, this chapter explores and justifies the methodological approach taken to examine the nature of talk in primary process drama. As explained in chapter one the main research question in this doctoral study is ‘What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama?’ An additional question reflected the possibility that many ways of communicating might be evident, due to the embodied nature of process drama: ‘What does a multimodal lens reveal about the nature of teacher and pupil talk and communication in primary process drama?’

My search of the literature revealed the extensive and rigorous nature of the research into talk pedagogy but found that it has focused on reasoning. There is little research into talk in open-ended, creative or arts contexts, including process drama. The search also revealed that research into process drama predominantly takes a philosophical enquiry approach, and moreover there are weaknesses in both qualitative and quantitative research in process drama.

In the previous chapter I examined sociocultural theory, and in this chapter, I argue that this is congruent with the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm which underpins my methodology. I will argue that the naturalistic, in-depth, and focused nature of case study is apposite for this study and that although it is difficult to generalise from case study research, it is possible to transfer my findings to other teachers who are skilled in process drama. I will also explore how I aimed to carry out credible research through triangulation and how I was reflexive in my approach through being as transparent as possible about myself and methods of data collection and analysis. I finish this chapter by exploring my methods of data analysis, thematic analysis, and multimodal interaction analysis. I begin by considering the theoretical frame of my thesis.

3.2 Theoretical framing

It is suggested that here are five main interpretive paradigms (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). This study aligns with a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, and here I examine the nature of this paradigm and explore why it is congruent with understanding the nature of talk in process drama. To justify the approach of the paradigm taken, I need to be clear about three key elements, to be sure that my approach is indeed a constructionist-interpretivist
paradigm. The first of these elements, ontology, is the study of the nature of reality, of being and existence (Schwandt, 2001; Silverman, 2014). It is argued that ontology consists of the worldviews and assumptions that researchers hold and bring to their research (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). The second element, epistemology, is defined by Schwandt (2001) as the study of the nature of knowledge and by Lincoln, Lynham and Guba as the process of thinking and ‘the truths that we seek and believe as researchers’ (2018: 15). The methodological element considers the overall approach the researcher takes to find out what they think can be known.

The constructionist-interpretivist paradigm adopts a relativist ontology, where truth and meaning making are created in a cultural and historical context; the research is situated and multiple realities and perspectives exist, such as those of the researcher and the participants (Charmaz, 2014; Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). The realities are local and specific to the situation and include what the participants bring and do within these realities, which are co-constructed between the researcher and the participants (Charmaz, 2014; Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). My study is ontologically congruent with a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm because I was embedded in the research reality of the classroom, filming the drama lessons, having informally met the teachers before the research and throughout the research process.

The epistemology of an interpretivist-constructivist approach is defined as transactional and subjectivist (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). In this paradigm, knowledge is created as an interaction between researchers and participants (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). This is appropriate for my study, since it was a naturalistic, classroom-based study observing the teachers’ existing process drama practice, rather than an intervention implemented by external experts or researchers. By contrast, a positivist paradigm, it is argued, views the researcher as neutral and objective, where there is one reality or truth, which can be studied and measured and where the aim of the research is to explain, predict and control (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). This paradigm is also congruent with the sociocultural framework underpinning this study, which views learning as being co-constructed and negotiated, rather than a top-down view of learning from the teacher to the learner.

The constructivist-interpretivist methodology is defined as hermeneutical and dialectical (Guba and Lincoln, 1994: Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). Hermeneutics refers to the interpretation of the meaning of an object, such as a text, work of art, social action, or utterance of a speaker (Schwandt, 2001). Dialectics, concerned with the logical discussion of opposing ideas, is congruent with Vygotsky’s (1978) theories, which he viewed as
dialectical in nature. It is also argued that the overarching aim of the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm is meaning making (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). Whilst Charmaz (2014) posits that a constructivist approach is the study of how and sometimes why participants create meanings and behaviour in different situations. This paradigm is therefore consistent with the sociocultural underpinning of this study and my aim to understand the nature of talk in process drama.

My research design is a single case study, which I explore and justify next. I will also discuss other aspects of research, such as generalisability, trustworthiness and taking a reflexive stance, and how these affected my research design and process.

3.3 Case Study

How case study is defined and understood is disputed (Schwandt and Gates, 2018). It is seen as a self-contained entity, which is bounded and interesting; a particularity (Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier, 2013; Stake, 1995). Some argue that a case can be an organisation such as a school, a class, or an individual, such as a teacher, but it cannot be teaching nor a relationship, since they are not specific enough to have a boundary (Stake, 1995). However, others argue that a case can be anything such as a decision, a service, programmes, relationships, roles, or events (de Vaus, 2013; Robson and McCartan, 2016). It is also defined as a strategy for carrying out research through investigating a particular phenomenon in context, through a wide range of data collection methods (Yin, 2009). My case study is not limited to individuals or groups, since it consisted of two primary teachers and their classes; the phenomenon that I investigated was the nature of talk within their practice of process drama.

Case study can be researched through naturalistic, holistic, ethnographic, phenomenological, or biographic means and utilises a qualitative research methodology, focusing on the case itself (Bassey, 1999; Stake, 1995). This supports, complex detailed research, which looks at the context of the case and a range of factors (Tight, 2016). My study is small-scale, qualitative, naturalistic, real-world research; data was collected from teachers and pupils in a school and focused on the nature of talk in process drama, through observing existing drama practice, rather than conducting research in a laboratory or implementing an intervention. This allowed me to collect and analyse qualitative data in an in-depth, detailed way, and therefore the choice of case study is appropriate for my research. It should be noted however, that in addition to observing process drama,
secondary data was collected through interviews, which are not naturalistic, but a form of intervention.

Others assert that case study methods can consist of both qualitative and quantitative data and do not always consist of the thick description associated with qualitative research (Yin, 2014). This reflects his quantitative background, and Hamilton and Corbett-Whittier (2013) posit that he tries to make case study fit a quantitative model of research, whilst others suggest that Yin’s approach focuses more on general patterns, than on the case itself (Abma and Stake, 2014). This methodology is not appropriate to the specific, detailed nature of my study. Moreover, qualitative case study has developed along two paths, a critical realist orientation and an interpretative orientation (Schwandt and Gates, 2018). They posit that an interpretative orientation is defined as historically situated, sees the world as socially made and is particularly focused on language and other cultural symbolic systems. The interpretative-constructivist paradigm underpinning this study is therefore congruent with an interpretative case study orientation.

A theoretical dimension is seen as essential to case study, and this takes a theory testing, or a theory building approach (Bassey, 1999; de Vaus, 2013; Schwandt and Gates, 2018). Theory, and hypothesis testing case studies, or explanatory case studies (Yin, 2014) begin with theories related to a phenomenon, which are used to test and predict the characteristics of a case (de Vaus, 2001; Schwandt and Gates, 2018). Whereas, a theory building approach, sometimes referred to as exploratory (Yin, 2014) begins with a question or proposition. Case selection is connected to theoretical ideas or propositions of interest and looks at real cases to develop a more specific theory or set of propositions (de Vaus, 2001; Schwandt and Gates, 2018).

Stake (1995) defines case study in a different way. An intrinsic case study is a case studied for its own sake, rather than something studied to learn more about a general problem or phenomenon (Stake, 1995). Schwandt and Gates (2018) suggest this is like a descriptive or holistic case study, which paints a complete picture and whose purpose is to ‘describe a phenomenon in a real-world context’ (Yin, 2014: 238). Whereas an instrumental case study is defined as studying a case to learn about something else (Stake, 1995). Considering these different aspects of case, my case study can be described as theory building and instrumental because I studied two primary teachers, who were highly skilled in process drama, to learn about something else. I examined the phenomenon of talk in process drama, through observing these teachers and their classes, and by doing so I was developing some theory about it. Moreover, when selecting case studies, focusing on
something unusual, unique, or critical, rather than typical is advised, since the unusual case can maximise what we can learn (Stake, 1995; Schwandt and Gates, 2018). I selected two primary school teachers, who were unusual because they were highly skilled in process drama and used it frequently in their practice.

Making generalisations from case study research is seen as difficult, since it is the study of the particular; considered by some as one of the weaknesses of case study research (Tight, 2016). This is explored next.

3.3.1 Making generalisations from case study

Generalization is usually associated with large amounts of data and statistical analysis, which is not possible for a small-scale qualitative doctoral research project. Because qualitative research is smaller in scale and utilises different methods, it is difficult to generalise findings and therefore the term *transferability* is suggested instead (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Transferability is defined by Denscombe (2017) as the researcher using information from an incident or case and using their judgement to decide if it could be applied to another, comparable incident. Similarly, the concept of fuzzy generalizations is offered as a solution for case study research by Bassey (1999), where researchers use their judgement to decide how likely findings will be found in similar situations. Moreover, these do not make absolute claims, but are tentative about contributions to knowledge. Correspondingly, Denscombe (2017) maintains that findings from case studies can be transferable if they are viewed as a single example of a broader range of phenomenon and the extent to which they can be generalisable to other similar examples.

Stake (1995) asserts that case studies can be studied at length and that the repeated patterns which emerge in a particular case study are still generalisations; referred to as *petite generalisations*. He also argues that other research methods are better for generalisation because case study is about the particular as opposed to the general. However, he also maintains that learnings from one case study can be added to others, which will build into generalisations. Since the teachers in my study were examples of teachers with a lot of knowledge and experience of using process drama, my findings could be applied to case studies of other teachers who habitually use process drama as part of their practice, but not so much to primary school teachers who do not regularly practice process drama.

The role of analytic generalization rather than numerical generalisation is suggested as a way to generalize from case studies (Yin, 2013; 2018). This refers to abstract ideas or
concepts, which are extracted from case study findings and these analytic generalizations could be applied to other similar situations, which may contribute to abstract theory building. It is argued though, that although theory building starts with one or two case studies, the findings may provoke the researcher to examine the same phenomenon in other case studies and that it is through several case studies that theory is developed (Dooley, 2002; Ravenswood, 2011). However, the in-depth and contextual nature of case studies and their association with *thick description* (Geertz, 1973) makes it difficult to apply the findings to large numbers of case studies and therefore it is argued that it is only possible to develop theory with a small number of case studies (Yin, 2013). Therefore, although I argue in my conclusion, that I am making theoretical contributions to knowledge about talk and process drama, a small number of further case study research in this area will be needed to develop this theoretical contribution further and to be able to generalise from my findings.

Case study has also been criticised for lacking reliability and validity and ways that case study can address this are explored next, alongside how these relate to alternative terms in qualitative research, such as *trustworthiness, credibility, and dependability*.

### 3.3.2 Validity, rigour, and trustworthiness in case study research

The notions of reliability, validity, and objectivity, associated with positivism and quantitative research, is replaced in a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm with the notion of *trustworthiness* and *authenticity* (Guba and Lincoln, 1994; Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). These concepts focus on a concern with morals, ethics, and fairness in relation to the participants (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018; Morse, 2018). For qualitative researchers, including those working within a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, it is difficult to prove the accuracy, quality or truthfulness of their findings which makes it difficult to prove the *validity* of their results. Therefore, the criterion of *credibility* is used instead of *validity* and a significant way that researchers try to overcome this is using *triangulation* (Denscombe, 2017). Triangulation was suggested by Denzin in the 1970s to validate findings in qualitative research Flick (2017) explains. It is apposite for case study since as Yin (2013; 2018) asserts, an important way to strengthen the validity of case study research is through triangulation.

Triangulation is about considering aspects of the research from different perspectives. To achieve this, Denzin suggests four ways that data could be triangulated; *theoretical triangulation; investigator triangulation; data triangulation and methodological triangulation* (Flick, 2017; Yin, 2013). *Investigator triangulation* refers to having more than one
researcher, which was not appropriate in my research. Methodological triangulation is evident however in the use of film and audio recordings of talk in drama, alongside an interview with both teachers and some small group interviews with the pupils.

Data triangulation refers to the use of a range of data sources, of which there were many in my research. There was team teaching between two teachers, with one leading, in the first phase of data collection and just one teacher in the second phase, with a different class of pupils. Three separate drama lessons were recorded in the first phase, with different examples of children’s literature used as a starting point. The three lessons observed in the second phase were based around one book. The different nature of the books used pre-texts for the different drama affected the nature of the drama and talk and therefore also contributed towards triangulation. A range of different drama conventions were used in the different lessons, encouraging different sorts of talk and interactions. Some of these drama strategies were used in different lessons, but in slightly different ways, which also affected the talk. These factors are examined in subsequent chapters.

Theoretical triangulation refers to interpreting the data from several different theoretical viewpoints. My study is informed by concepts and theories about process drama, classroom talk, and creativity and is underpinned by sociocultural theory and these theories impacted on how I interpreted and analysed the data. Additionally, the transcripts of the talk were analysed using thematic coding but a second method; multimodal interaction analysis was also used for two drama vignettes, which I explore later in this chapter. Triangulation has therefore been used in multiple forms in my research, thus contributing towards credible findings.

Flick (2017) posits that conceptualising triangulation purely as way of validating data has developed to seeing the combining of methods and theories as also adding breadth, since triangulation has been defined as, ‘best understood as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness and depth to any inquiry’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 5). This definition supports the range of triangulation used in my study and with the choice of case study, because case study research can enable in-depth, holistic, focused, and naturalistic research.

A second criteria used in quantitative research is reliability, which refers to the extent to which research can be replicated by another researcher and achieve similar results (de Vaus, 2013; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). This is possible with positivist research and the use of statistical tests, but more difficult to achieve with qualitative research. Instead of reliability, the term dependability has been developed in qualitative research and
particularlly within a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). In case study research, Yin (2014) suggests a way to achieve this is through transparency about the research approach, such as using a case study protocol. This consists of the aims, questions, theoretical frame, and details of the data collection. In my study, these details have been discussed in previous chapters, and in this chapter.

To achieve dependability, researchers need to provide fully explicit, transparent, and reflexive accounts of all the methods, analysis and decision making utilised in the research process (Denscombe 2017; Silverman, 2014). This provides rigor in qualitative inquiry Morse (2018) argues. Similarly, objectivity, refers to the extent to which the findings are free from the influence of the researcher, although some qualitative researchers argue that the notion of objectivity in research is in fact a chimera, which is impossible to fully achieve, even in positivist paradigms (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). In qualitative research, the term **confirmability** is used rather than objectivity (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Like dependability, confirmability also relates to how transparent researchers are about their own backgrounds, values, culture and experiences, and how these factors may influence how they interpret findings (Cresswell and Cresswell, 2018). A way to address this is through reflexivity according to Denscombe (2017), which refers to the researcher’s scrutiny of the decisions and interpretations of their research process and how they carried out the research (Charmaz, 2014; Cresswell and Cresswell, 2018). Reflexivity also relates to positionality according to Punch and Oancea (2014) and these two concepts are discussed next.

### 3.4 Positionality and reflexivity

In the constructivist-interpretivist paradigm, which underpins my study, Charmaz (2014) argues that researchers need to take a reflexive stance and examine how their preconceptions and position may influence the research process and analysis, because they are embedded in and share the same social world as the participants. This, it is argued, is ‘a rejection of the idea that social research is, or can be, carried out in some autonomous realm that is insulated from the wider society and from the biography of the researcher,’ (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007:15). Arguably, the researcher’s lens is shaped by their own biographical history, their values, interests, attitudes, feelings, and relationship with the field of research (Greene and Hill, 2005; Emond, 2005; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). The different background and views held by the researcher may conflict with those of the participants. Moreover, making background information about their values, beliefs, and
identity clear to the reader, it is suggested, supports understanding of the connection between the researcher and the study (Denscombe, 2017; Cresswell and Cresswell, 2018). Reflexivity therefore involves ‘the process of reflecting critically on the self as researcher’ (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018: 143). It is argued that it is not a method, but a way of thinking (May and Perry, 2013).

My values aligned with those of the teachers, in that I valued process drama as an art form and as a way of supporting learning. This could be seen as positive, since it helped develop my working relationship with the teachers; they were aware that I had some insight into their drama practice and its potential influence on learning, since I had used process drama in my own practice as a primary school teacher and later as a Higher Education tutor working with student teachers. This could also have caused some bias however, since I already had a positive view of process drama. Despite this, I witnessed many drama strategies and ways of working in process drama that I had not used in my practice, extending, and deepening my understanding. Moreover, I was keen to work with teachers who used TiR because of what I had read about its potential in the literature. I had not actually experienced TiR in my own practice, so I believe I was not biased about how it might influence the interactions and talk. Moreover, my experience of process drama had always been through my own practice, as a teacher or university lecturer. Observing others’ practice provided distance, which enabled me to understand and evaluate process drama in a different way.

In addition, I have been reflexive in the introduction since I have discussed my background interest in process drama and constructive talk through my experience as a primary school teacher and lecturer in ITE. This prior interest could have prejudiced my interpretation of the data. I was already aware of the amount of teacher and pupil talk in process drama, through my own practice. However, I did not know the nature or value of this talk as a teacher since I was fully engaged in the moment and did record or research it. I had also found little evidence of the nature of talk in process drama when reviewing the literature on process drama, so I did not have pre-conceptions about the nature of talk in process drama.

As well as being open and aware of ones’ own perspectives and possible biases towards the findings, Denscombe (2017) also recommends being open to what the findings suggest rather than neglecting data which does not fit in with the rest of the analysis. The grounds on which claims about research are made need to be examined and understood, rather than the researcher trying to control what arises through naturalistic research (May and Perry, 2013). This iterative process, where the researcher reads, re-reads and reflects on data to interpret it is seen as a feature of qualitative data analysis (Cohen, Manion and Morrison,
In my research, although much of the talk in my data was dialogic in nature, it was sometimes also monologic, and this difference was examined rather than ignored. I revisited the examples of monologic talk, comparing it with the dialogic talk, and triangulated this with the teachers’ comments made in the interview. In addition, I returned to the literature on talk, drama, and creative pedagogies, considering different explanations, which gradually helped me to understand what was causing the differences in the nature of the talk. This will be discussed further in the findings and discussion chapters.

It is suggested that another way to be reflexive is for the researcher to consider where they are on the insider-outsider continuum (Hellawell, 2006). In my study, I was an outsider, since I was not working in the school, which may have helped me to be more objective about the findings, fostering confirmability. However, Hellawell (2006) asserts that you do not have to be part of a community to have insider knowledge. My experience of being a primary school teacher prior to being an ITE lecturer, meant that I had insider knowledge of how primary schools work and how teachers and pupils interact. Moreover, although not as expert in utilising process drama in my practice as the teachers I filmed, I was familiar with process drama and its impact on the pupils and the classroom culture. This therefore aligns with the suggestion that the insider-outsider concept is a continuum, and I concur with Hellawell’s (2006) contention that ideally the researcher should be both inside and outside the research.

I had a different perspective of the process drama to the teachers, since I was not actively part of the process drama, but outside of the drama. I was filming the practice of others; pupils and teachers working together in process drama, from a distance, at the back of the classroom. I believe this helped to reduce the potential for bias and for my presence to affect the behaviour of the teachers and pupils. A problem with this could be that I did not have an existing relationship with the school, teachers, and children and this could have impacted on how they behaved in the drama lessons that I observed. They may have made a special effort for a visitor. However, the teachers informed me at the first meeting, that the pupils and teachers were used to visitors watching lessons, so my presence may have affected their normal practice less than in a school where outsiders did not come in often to observe school practices. It was also clear from the observations that the pupils were very familiar with the wide range of drama strategies they were asked to engage in. The filmed observations were also triangulated with teacher and pupil interviews, both of which revealed how comfortable and familiar the pupils and teachers were with process drama and that it was something with which they engaged regularly.
Despite this, the second drama lesson seemed to be affected by a willingness to show me what the teachers thought I wanted to see as a researcher. The teacher changed the lesson from her normal practice because she knew I was researching talk in process drama. She used far more improvisation than normal and fewer drama strategies to encourage talk. This combined with the lesson taking place late on a Friday afternoon, a day before the class were going on a week’s residential trip, influenced the quality of the talk and drama. My presence and role as a researcher appeared to affect this lesson, and in future I would make it clearer to participants not to change their normal practice.

Other ways that I could have affected the participants and resulting data, was the extent to which I differed from the sort of teachers the pupils were used to. The pupils and teachers in this Cambridgeshire, village school, were predominantly white. Being white myself, I was not different to the sort of teachers the children were used to, so I may not have affected their behaviour towards me too much. However, some of the pupils were immigrants from various European countries, who spoke fluent English. My different nationality could have impacted on them.

Another way of being transparent and taking a reflexive approach is to discuss the methods of data collection. Accordingly, in section 3.6, I discuss my data collection methods and the process and timeline of how and when data was collected. I also discuss why I chose to analyse my data utilising both thematic analysis and multimodal interaction analysis.

Ethical considerations are another important aspect of research and there are links with reflexivity since, alongside aesthetics and religion, ethics is categorised under the heading of axiology in philosophy and, it is argued in research relates to researchers’ values and beliefs (Lincoln, Lynham and Guba, 2018). Like positionality and reflexivity, for ethical reasons researchers need to be transparent about the possible impact their identity and values have on the participants, data collection and analysis, rather than ignoring it (Greene and Hill, 2005; Emond, 2005).

How I have considered other aspects of ethical issues in my research design are examined next and revisited in subsequent sections on data collection, where appropriate.

### 3.5 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are informed by ideas about behaving in moral and virtuous ways, by considering duties and obligations when carrying out research (Punch and Oancea, 2014). The ethical approach I took to the research design was informed by the British Educational
Research Association ethical guidelines (BERA, 2018). These guidelines are underpinned by five key principles of respect, justice, beneficence, nonmaleficence and fidelity (Farrimond, 2016). These inform the way a researcher collects and analyses data to help them do good rather than harm, ensure respect is shown to participants and present truthful, rather than distorted data (Punch and Oancea, 2014).

Respect for participants can be shown by offering them the choice to take part in the research. This needs to be through informed consent, making it clear to participants the aims of the study and what it involves (Hill, 2005; Farrimond, 2016; BERA, 2018). I therefore met the teachers to explain the research, to find out how they worked in general terms and to give them an opportunity to ask any questions. Ethical approval was sought from the Ethics Committee to carry out my study, which is evidenced in the HREC form (appendix one). An information sheet (appendix two) was given to both teachers, explaining the aims of the research, that cameras and voice recorders would be used to capture the drama and talk and that I wished to interview both the teachers and the pupils. Building trust between the researcher and participants also demonstrates respect for participants and a means to achieve this is to ensure privacy of data storage (Hill, 2005; (BERA), 2018). The storage of the data followed OU and BERA (2018) ethical guidelines and it was made clear to all participants and carers, that no images from the films or recordings would be made public, or used in my doctoral work, apart from helping me to analyse my data.

Trust is also gained by ensuring the anonymity of the setting and participants (Farrimond, 2016). Therefore, it was also made clear that the names of the school, children and teachers would be anonymous since pseudonyms would be used. I explained that I wished to record interviews with the teachers and with the pupils who had parental permission to take part in the drama. As gatekeeper for the school, the head teacher was also given a participant information sheet (appendix three), which included the same information as the teachers’ participant information sheets.

I returned to the school to meet with both classes of pupils to explain my research, so that they, and their parents or carers, were informed and could decide whether they wished to participate. Pupils were able to ask me any questions about the research at this point. A participation information sheet for the pupils and a separate one for the parents were sent home with the children. The parents’ participation information sheet (appendix four) included the same information given to the teachers and the head teachers. The pupils’ information sheet (appendix five) had similar information but was based on a proforma from the Open University. The pupils and parents were asked to jointly sign a consent form to take part in
the drama and interviews, which is a requirement from the Open University. The teachers, parents and pupils were all informed that I would keep the audio and video recordings of the process drama for two years after I had completed my doctorate, when it would be destroyed.

Despite meeting with the teachers and pupils and complying with the ethical requirements of The Open University, I was observing the lessons, not planning them and had no control over how they were conducted, nor the stories chosen by the teachers as pre-texts for their drama lessons. However, as a researcher, I still needed to be aware of my responsibilities. A model of ethical thinking devised by Stutchbury and Fox (2009), which combines the ethical frameworks of Seedhouse (1998) and Flinders (1992) has supported me in this. It is argued that this model can provide a comprehensive framework to support researchers’ ethical thinking (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). Their model consists of four aspects of ethical thinking: deontological; relational/individual; external/ecological and consequent/utilitarian. One example of how this informed my thinking relates to the external/ecological aspect, which suggests that neither participant, nor researcher have full control over ethical issues or events which may arise. As a researcher I need to be aware of this and be prepared to respond in the moment if necessary.

There was an example of this during the second drama lesson, which was based on the story of *The Arrival* (Tan, 2007). This book has the potential to raise difficult issues for some children such as migration, poverty, and family separation. This relates to the consequential/utilitarian aspect of the Stutchbury and Fox (2009) ethical thinking model, specifically the avoidance of harms, such as being aware of ‘any sensitive issues or aspects of the study likely to cause discomfort or distress’ (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009: 495).

Although I did not discuss sensitive issues in interviews with the teachers nor the pupils, the teachers discussed the potentially sensitive issue of migration within one drama lesson. One EAL child remarked in a discussion outside of the drama in vignette 4.7.1 that she felt sorry for the boy in the story, because she had also been without her dad for a year, and that the boy might be without his dad for much longer. However, she didn't appear to be distressed but was making connections between the themes of the story and her own personal experience. This was a teacher led discussion and it would have been appropriate for them to deal with this child if she had been upset. However, if she had spoken to me about this, ethically, I would have needed to inform the teachers immediately, in case she needed support. It was, however, unlikely that a child would have disclosed to me, since I was filming from a distance, at the back of the room and did not engage directly or closely with
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the pupils, apart from occasionally handing them a voice recorder when they worked in groups.

Another example of an unexpected ethical issue occurring related to all participants needing to return signed forms before taking part in the research. These forms clarified that participants could withdraw from the research at any time, without any negative consequences. This is a way of being honest with participants, which relates to a deontological framework of ethics (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). Moreover, making it clear to participants that participation is voluntary respects their autonomy by not putting pressure on them to participate if they do not give assent to take part on the day of data collection. This is congruent with a relational/individual framework of ethics (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). In my study during one day of filming a drama lesson, one of the pupils became upset and told her teacher that they no longer wished to be involved in the lesson which was being filmed. The teacher tried to persuade her to still take part and ordinarily, when there are visitors to schools, teachers try to persuade reluctant pupils to take part. However, I intervened and reassured the pupil it was fine to change her mind and separately explained to the teacher, that for ethical reasons, I had to respect the pupil's decision to change her mind on the day. Instead, she joined the children who had not given their consent to take part in the filmed drama. They were taught a different lesson by a third teacher. They then swapped with the children who had taken part in the recorded drama and the teachers repeated the drama lesson with this second group of children, without it being recorded. This ensured that all the children, including the child who had changed her mind on the day, had a chance to partake in the drama at some point during the day.

Ethical principles linked to virtuous behaviour also relate to reflexivity and researchers scrutinising their own conduct during the research process, to ensure they embody dispositions such as impartiality, benevolence, and fidelity (Punch and Oancea, 2014; Guillemin and Gillam, 2004; Farrimond). Fidelity relates to researchers being truthful about the findings by not inventing data nor ignoring findings which do not align with results a researcher may be hoping for. Therefore, in my research, as discussed in 3.4, there was evidence of both monologic and dialogic talk, which was examined rather than ignored. Ethically, it was important not to hide these findings, which appeared to show some talk in drama was less constructive than other teacher pupil talk. However, the monologic talk seemed to be associated with one teacher more than another, which raised concerns about causing harm to one of the participants, since avoidance of harms or distress (nonmaleficence) is another important ethical principle to consider. However, as will be
discussed in the findings and discussion chapters, revisiting this data in the light of the literature revealed why there were sometimes differences in the talk used by the two teachers.

Behaving ethically also applies to not offering incentives and is another way of avoiding harms, since incentives could encourage participants to take part in research for a reward, rather than because they are intrinsically interested in being involved. No incentives were therefore offered to the school nor the children because I wanted to ensure they were all genuinely happy and interested in taking part in the research. However, stationery was given to the children and high-quality children’s literature to the teachers, as a thank you, after the research was completed.

It is also possible to cause harm to the children in group pupil interviews and therefore, the measures taken to avoid this are considered in 3.6.3. In the following sections, I continue to discuss my choice of research methods and analysis and consider how I endeavoured to collect data in an ethical, reflexive, and transparent way.

3.6 Research Methods and Tools

A range of data collection methods were used to triangulate the data and included audio and video recordings of the process drama, which was the main data collected for my study. Audio recordings of teacher and pupil interviews were also made as secondary data and these methods are examined next.

3.6.1 Audio and video recordings

Audio and video recordings of the drama were made in a variety of ways. I gave the teachers voice recorders to provide evidence of their talk with pupils in drama. Voice recorders were also given to pupils working in small groups to record themselves talking in drama. I used a video-recorder, which captures both audio and visual data; seen as one of its advantages (Flick, 2018). This was appropriate for my study since the talk needed to be analysed in the context of the action of the drama and because the data were being analysed in the broader sense of interaction and communication, which includes action, gesture, facial expressions and so on, as well as talk. These would otherwise have been missed. It is also argued that these aspects of communication and interaction are particularly useful for detailed case studies of children interacting and playing together (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). The combination of audio and video recording equipment are therefore suitable for collecting data in process drama.
The variety of recording equipment consequently helped me to triangulate the data. Since the data was recorded, rather than using field notes, I was able to capture different things happening simultaneously. At the same time, I also had a permanent record, which I could re-listen to and re-watch many times for transcription and analysis purposes, and for hearing anything that I had difficulty hearing. Furthermore, because there were several recording devices being used at the same time, some of them recorded the talk better than others, at different points in the lesson. Therefore, when it was difficult to hear odd sentences on one device, I could listen to other devices, to get as accurate a transcription of the data as possible.

A potential problem with this approach is the presence of the technical equipment influencing and changing the normal interactions (Flick, 2018). Another problem is the focus of the camera lens, which could provide very good quality and detail, but lose the context of the situation, or alternatively a wider angle, could lose the detail of the facial expressions (Flick, 2018). This means that the data are selective since the researcher decides what to focus on. When recording the drama with the camera, I mainly had the camera on a tripod, situated slightly outside the drama, giving me a wide-angle view, helping me affect the drama as little as possible. As there was a great deal of teacher pupil interaction, I was also able to focus the camera angle and lens on where the drama was taking place, without being too close. I did not video record the pupils working in small groups, because it was impossible to capture all the children close-up, since some had their backs to me. This would also have been very intrusive and could have affected their normal behaviour in the drama. Instead, all the independent group talk was captured with voice recorders, aligning with Flick’s (2018) assertion that video recordings need to be triangulated with other kinds of data. For this reason, secondary interview data was also collected. This is examined next.

3.6.2 Group semi-structured teacher interview

Both the teachers were interviewed together in a semi-structured, small group interview, to triangulate drama data and examine their perspectives on using process drama in their practice. It was not possible to interview the teachers after every lesson because I had to fit the interviewing in with other teaching commitments that they had on the days that I was collecting data. Consequently, the questions related to their on-going practice, as well as aspects of the lessons that I observed and recorded that day (appendix six). Group interviews like this are seen as suitable for when people have been working together for a while or have a common purpose, gathering a range of responses (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). Thus, a small group interview was apposite for interviewing these teachers.
since they normally combined two classes together and team-taught process drama. Group interviews are also seen as saving time compared to individual interviews, which was an important consideration when the teachers had other work commitments. Group interviews can be inappropriate when investigating personal matters according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2017). However, this was not an issue since the teachers were only discussing their practice of team-teaching process drama.

The interview began with generic questions about the sort of drama strategies they used and how often they used drama in their practice before moving onto more specific questions such as whether they behaved differently in drama in role or whether the way they talked in drama impacted on the pupils. There were also specific questions about the drama around The Arrival lesson, which had taken place that day. These included questions about how much it engaged the pupils, whether they were using their imagination, taking risks, what they had learned from that lesson and about pupil talk in drama. Since this was a semi-structured interview and there were two participants, the discussion that followed some of the questions were extended, and further questions were asked in response to their comments.

Children were also interviewed in small groups to explore their perspectives on process drama and their thoughts on how it supported them with talking and learning, which I explore next.

3.6.3 Group semi-structured pupil interviews

As an outsider to the school and not someone the children knew, other than being a visitor who was filming their drama lesson, I wanted the pupils to trust me and feel comfortable talking to me. MacDougall and Darbyshire (2016) posit that group interviews offer safety in number and that one pupil’s response may encourage another, whilst Hennessy and Heary (2005) suggest that hearing what another pupil says may jog pupils’ memories, supporting them to contribute to discussions. Small group interviews were therefore a relevant choice. There was a maximum of eight pupils in each group interview, since it is argued that larger numbers can make it difficult for the discussion to remain focused (Hennessy and Heary, 2005).

Having the same seating arrangements is seen as a way of setting the interviewer apart from other authority figures and putting pupils at their ease (Hennessy and Heary, 2005). I organised this by sitting on the floor in a small circle with the pupils, rather than above them on a chair. In addition, I asked the pupils to talk in pairs first, allowing them to share, test
and develop ideas before expressing ideas with me and the whole group, and this ensured that all pupils had an opportunity to contribute. This corresponds with the suggestion that group interviews encourage interaction between the pupils, rather than just responding to questions (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). This also replicated the way that pupils talk in pairs and in small groups with teachers on a regular basis, and it is suggested that this familiarity can redress the adult pupil power imbalances that can occur in individual interviews with children (Hennessy and Heary, 2005). The pupil interviews were semi-structured and, when necessary, I followed up pupil responses with further questions. Having followed the suggestions in the literature on how to carry out group pupil interviews I found that the pupils I interviewed talked readily in small groups.

Many of the steps I took to make pupils feel at ease also relate to ethical considerations, such as not inhibiting children, nor encouraging them to say what they think will please the researcher (Hill, 2005). He suggests this is because children are not necessarily used to being asked their opinion and I aimed to address this through the measures described in the previous paragraph to support pupils to feel comfortable. Hennessy and Heary (2005) maintain that participants are disclosing to the whole group, not just the researcher and intense group discussion could give rise to distress in some pupils. This relates to the ethical principle of beneficence; the avoidance of harm and the protection of the vulnerable, such as children (Hill, 2005). I aimed to address this, by all of us sitting on the floor together and allowing paired talk before talking as a group. The questions did not seem to cause distress to the pupils; rather they were engaged and seemed keen to talk about their learning in process drama. This could be because the children enjoyed engaging in drama. Additionally, the questions asked invited them to reflect on their talk and that of their teachers in process drama, rather than the disclosure of emotions or recall of difficult memories.

The questions were open questions, which are a commonly utilised question-type when interviewing children because they encourage much longer, more detailed responses from pupils (Westcott and Littleton, 2005). Closed questions by contrast can lead to yes/no answers and response bias, since children may answer questions without thinking about their answer (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2017). I started my questioning with a general question about whether they enjoyed drama, and if so why, before asking more specific questions. These included questions about what they enjoyed about a specific drama lesson, whether they thought their teachers talked differently in drama and if it supported their learning. I also asked them whether they thought they used their imagination in drama,
if they talked differently, and whether they solved problems together in drama (appendix seven).

Each of these questions provoked a great deal of discussion between the pairs of pupils before each pair was given an opportunity to share what they had been saying. The paired talk encouraged further dialogue between me and the pupils, without the need to prompt pairs to contribute. Since this was a semi-structured interview, I asked questions to extend the pupils’ responses further, which differed slightly between the separate groups of pupils.

In the next section, I outline the context of the research.

3.7 Research context and participants

Bishop’s Rise CE Primary School is based in the East of England. Located in a small rural town, it is two form entry and has a nursery. The intake is socioeconomically mixed, and predominantly white. In the classes I observed there were some EAL children, fluent in English, who were immigrants from parts of Eastern Europe. During the first phase of data collection, the data were collected from pupils aged 10 to 11 years old. This took place a few weeks before the end of the school year and the pupils were about to leave primary school and move onto secondary schools. During the second phase of data collection, I collected the data two thirds of the way through the school year, and these pupils were aged 9 to 10 years old.

During the first phase of the data collection, I collaborated with both teachers, who team taught the drama lessons, although one of them led the drama. During the second phase of the data collection, there was only one teacher, because one of the teachers had since become the deputy head teacher and was not teaching in class. Details of how the teachers worked together with both classes will be explored in the next section on data collection.

3.8 Data collection

3.8.1 Data collected and selected for analysis

The data collection occurred in two phases. I collected the first set of data in July 2016 and the second set in March 2017. Both sets of data collection consisted of three visits, observing a lesson each time. I stayed between four and six hours on each visit. I made an
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initial visit in May 2016 to talk through the proposed research. I returned in June 2016 to meet the children and explain my research to them and the need for them to give their consent to take part, which I discussed in section 3.5 on ethics.

During the first phase of data collection, there were two classes, but not all the children from the classes had given consent. Therefore, the children who had given consent were put together to make one class. The pupils were used to this, since the teachers normally team taught the drama with both classes together, using the hall space for the larger number of children. Observing the two classes like this did not therefore impact on how they normally worked in drama, which is important for a naturalistic study. The pupils who were not involved with the drama worked with a third teacher, who also normally taught the pupils and they engaged with the drama separately. I therefore did not select the pupils to focus on for my data collection, since they were self-selecting, by agreeing to take part. The drama moved quickly between short periods of small group work and whole class work. Additionally, when pupils were working in small groups, the teachers usually moved between groups, in role, talking with pupils and recording these exchanges with voice recorders. I also recorded other groups who were working independently. Consequently, I could not focus on one group of pupils, since there was much movement in the classroom. I conducted small group interviews with three groups of children on the second visit in July. These lasted about twenty minutes each. On the last visit in July, I conducted a semi-structured group interview with both the teachers.

During the second phase of the data collection, as in the first phase of data collection, there were two classes and the children who had given consent from each class worked together as one class, whilst the children who had not given consent stayed with the teacher of the second class. I conducted one group interview of about 15 minutes with one group of children.

The drama lessons during the first phase were based on three different stories and took place on three days during July 2016. The drama lessons in March 2017 were based around one book and took place on three separate days. A summary of how I collected the data and which data was selected for analysis is illustrated in table 3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and time</th>
<th>Method and data source</th>
<th>Analysed?</th>
<th>Link to research questions</th>
<th>Comment on why analysed or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase one of data collection July 2016</td>
<td>Observed drama lesson Digital filming by researcher Digital voice recorder by both teachers Digital recording of pupils in groups</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? The lesson was transcribed, interpreted, and analysed. Examples of all the different types of talk identified were included in the thesis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 Day 1 Lesson 1 One hour</td>
<td>Observed drama lesson Researcher digital filming Teacher digital voice recorder</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? The drama lesson took place late in the day on a Friday afternoon, prior to a residential trip. The pupils were excited, which affected their concentration, resulting in high noise levels, making it difficult to hear much of the drama. The teacher also revealed she had changed her normal practice, to try to support my research. She used more improvisation and fewer drama conventions than normal, which also increased the noise levels. The lesson therefore differed from her normal practice, and I had specifically chosen these teachers because of the way they planned and taught process drama. Therefore, to preserve the integrity of the data, it was not included for analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 Day 2 Lesson 2 One hour</td>
<td>Three group pupil interviews Researcher digital voice recorder</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? Interviews analysed to triangulate the drama data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 Day 3 Lesson 3 One hour</td>
<td>Observed drama lesson Digital filming by researcher Digital voice recorder by both teachers</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? RQ2: What does a multimodal lens reveal about the nature of teacher and pupil talk and communication in primary process drama? Lesson transcribed, interpreted, and analysed. Some data was included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and time</td>
<td>Method and data source</td>
<td>Analysed?</td>
<td>Comment on why analysed or not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016 Day 3 One hour</td>
<td>Group teacher interview Researcher digital voice recorder</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>because it addressed RQ2 through multimodal analysis. Other data was included because the talk differed in nature to talk identified in the first drama lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase two of data collection March 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017 Day 1 Lesson 1 One hour</td>
<td>Observed drama lesson Digital filming by researcher Digital voice recorder by teacher Digital recording of pupils in groups</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed and analysed data not selected for inclusion in the data set because much of the lesson was mime so did not relate to the RQs. Data which did include talk was transcribed and examined, but it was repetitious from the first phase of data collection in July 2016 and was therefore not included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017 Day 2 Lesson 2 One hour</td>
<td>Observed drama lesson Digital filming by researcher Digital voice recorder by teacher Digital recording of pupils in groups</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? Some data was transcribed and analysed because it consisted of different drama conventions, which fostered types of talk which differed to that already identified in the data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2017 Day 3 Lesson 3 One hour</td>
<td>Observed writing lesson Digital filming by researcher Digital recording of pupils in groups</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Video recording of lesson of children writing in groups based on the drama and presenting their group writing at the end of the lesson. Data not transcribed nor analysed, since this was not a drama lesson, so it did not relate to the RQs. This lesson seemed to be a misunderstanding on the part of teacher about what I wanted to observe. I had asked at the beginning of the unit of work, if there would be any writing following on from the drama. The teacher appeared to assume that I wanted to observe a writing lesson. I did not discover that she had planned a writing lesson for me to observe, until after observing the second drama lesson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date and time | Method and data source | Analysed? | Comment on why analysed or not
--- | --- | --- | ---
March 2017 Day 3 15 mins | One group pupil interview Researcher digital voice recorder | ✓ | Ethically, I did not wish to cause harm by offending the teacher, since she had spent time planning the lesson for me. In future research I would ensure plans agreed for what will be observed are clear and not open to misunderstandings by participants who are trying to be very helpful.

RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? Data transcribed and analysed to triangulate the drama data

| March 2017 Day 3 15 mins | One group pupil interview Researcher digital voice recorder | ✓ | RQ1: What is the nature of pupil and teacher talk in primary process drama? Data transcribed and analysed to triangulate the drama data |

Table 3.1 Data collection timeframe, methods, data type and reason for selection for analysis

To summarise, research ethics is about care for the participants and the integrity of the research (Stutchbury and Fox, 2009). One lesson was not analysed because it did not provide data for the research questions; one was transcribed and examined but provided no extra evidence; and one observation of writing at the end of the phase two data collection did not provide evidence relevant to the research question. There was a misunderstanding by the teacher, who thought I had wanted to watch a writing lesson and to avoid offence, I observed the lesson. Moreover, it was interesting to observe how drama from the previous lesson influenced collaborative writing and suggests focusing on writing outcomes from process drama may be valuable for future research.

3.8.2 Drama episodes selected for analysis

Additionally, the three lessons selected for transcription and analysis consisted of many drama episodes. Not all could be included in the final thesis because each lesson was an hour long, producing extensive amounts of drama data. So, for reasons of word count it was not possible to include all the episodes. There was also repetition of talk data in some of the vignettes within and between the three drama lessons. The reasons why each transcribed episode from the three drama lessons was selected or not for inclusion in the final thesis are explained in three tables for each lesson in appendix eight.

Having explored my methods of data collection, I now consider my two methods of data analysis.
3.9 Data analysis

Two approaches to data analysis have been used. I employed coding and thematic analysis to analyse the talk within the process drama and to develop themes. Since process drama is such an interactive, multimodal, and multisensory activity, a multimodal approach to analysing the data has also been used for some of the drama episodes. This approach captures the gestures, facial expressions and action involved in communication, as well as speech. The interview data is secondary to the audio and video recorded drama data and triangulates the drama data. Appropriate extracts from the pupil and teacher group interviews are woven into sections from the process drama, where they support or illuminate further the process drama in the findings chapter. I examine thematic analysis next.

3.10 Thematic analysis

For some time, I thought that I was looking for themes and codes within a form of discourse analysis. I explored discourse analysis but realised that the focus is on how meaning is situated in different sociocultural groups, creating unique social languages, with different grammars, depending on which social groups a person belongs to (Gee, 1999; Blommaert, 2005). I decided therefore that this approach to analysis is not suitable for analysing the nature of talk within process drama. I also explored sociocultural discourse analysis (Mercer, 2000; Mercer, 2004). This seemed congruent with the sociocultural theoretical frame, underpinning my study. However, as well as taking extracts from the transcripts and providing a commentary, it uses concordant software, to quantify examples of language which is indicative of reasoning. Since this is a mixed method approach, focused on identifying evidence of reasoning, I decided it was inappropriate for analysing the nature of talk within process drama, which has a creative and dialogic pedagogy and is analysed qualitatively.

Other studies I explored included one which looked at classroom talk through various lenses, including discourse moves, logical processes, social and cognitive skills and reflexivity (Kumpulainen and Wray, 2002). I also examined a study, which had researched pupils talking about paintings through thematic coding (Maine, 2014; 2015). Another framework of classroom talk considered, was developed from the research of scholars such as Michaels and O'Connor, Nystrand, Alexander, Mercer, Dawes and Wegerif, and Maine. It devised a comprehensive coding scheme in response to a lack of an analytical frame for analysing
peer and pupil-teacher dialogic interactions and consists of eight clusters of codes (Hennessy et al., 2016).

These different coding frameworks have been useful in developing my understanding of coding talk. There is an overlap with some of my codes from the framework devised by Hennessy and colleagues, which I explore in 4.4.1. However, most of the talk in my study is in role, and therefore differs from much of the talk analysed to develop these frameworks. Therefore, I decided to use qualitative thematic coding to inductively identify my own codes. I begin by explaining how I transcribed the data.

3.10.1 Transcription

Being familiar with the data, reading and re-reading it and getting fully immersed in it is seen as vital by Braun and Clarke (2006). Transcription is regarded as time consuming, but an essential way of fully engaging with the data, ensuring effective coding (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Kawulich, 2016). Consequently, when transcribing my own data, hearing it over and over, did enable me to become completely engrossed in it. Moreover, as Kawulich (2016) suggests, I also found that when I read some of the drama data back, I could hear the tone of voice of some of the teachers and pupils in my head.

Since the transcription needed to make sense to me, I only used dotted lines to note pauses and put in brackets where the talk was unclear, rather than using complex conventions of transcription. I did not know all the pupils’ names, so for this and ethical reasons pseudonyms or numbers were used. Moreover, when the talk was collected through audio alone, such as in group talk, it was difficult to know which pupils were talking, so pupils were not identified at all. It was generally not necessary for the analysis to know individual children’s identities when they were speaking in role in the drama, since I was focused on group talk in drama. I used pseudonyms for the teachers and was able to identify their different voices, when transcribing purely audio data, such as when they spoke with small groups of children.

Transcription is seen as part of the process of starting to identify possible themes or codes (Braun and Clarke, 2006). In my research this process began earlier at the stage of collecting data. Because I filmed lessons, I noticed possible patterns and themes emerging at this stage, which developed further as I transcribed the data. The transcription process in my study was also complex and time consuming since it involved listening and watching recordings from different devices. There were video and audio recordings from the camera I was using, and audio recordings from the teachers’ voice recorders, which captured whole
class talk and teachers talking with small groups. There were also some voice recordings from pupils talking in small groups. I began by transcribing the filmed recordings. Then I listened to the two teachers’ audio recordings and the recordings of the pupils talking in groups. At times there were things I couldn’t hear on some devices, so having recordings from different devices helped me fill any gaps. The transcription of data from multiple types of recordings was therefore layered and provided a means of ensuring that I could hear and see as much of the data from a busy drama lesson as possible.

In the next section I examine coding and the process of how I developed my own codes.

3.10.2 The process of coding

Thematic coding was used to determine categories and themes in the recordings of the drama lessons. Coding is associated with grounded theory and thematic coding and in this section, I examine the approach to thematic coding taken by Braun and Clark (2006, 2022) and Kawulich (2016), as well as touching on a version of grounded theory developed by Charmaz (2006; 2014). Braun and Clarke (2006) assert that this version of grounded theory is not solely focused on developing theory from the ground up and has similarities with thematic analysis. Unlike grounded theory, it is argued that thematic analysis is more akin to a method than a theoretically informed methodological framework (Braun and Clark, 2022).

Coding is a process of labelling and categorising data to identify patterns in the data and is regarded as the first step of analysis (Kawulich, 2016; Flick, 2018; Miles, Huberman & Saldana, 2020). Qualitative coding has been defined as, ‘naming segments of data with a label that simultaneously categorizes, summarizes and accounts for each piece of data’ (Charmaz, 2014: 111). A code is usually a word or phrase which, ‘symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data’ (Saldana, 2009: 14).

Coding can be approached inductively or deductively. Inductive coding involves researchers making meaning from the data, without influence from preconceived ideas, biases, existing coding frameworks or literature on the focus area of research. It is a data driven, bottom-up approach to coding and is similar to grounded theory (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Kawulich, 2016). However, it is argued that it is impossible not to be influenced by prior theoretical, epistemological beliefs or biases in some way (Braun and Clarke, 2006). A deductive approach, by contrast, uses codes derived from other studies according to Kawulich (2016) and is defined as theoretical analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006), since it tends to be driven
by theoretical and analytic interests but can be seen as providing less rich description of the data. Kawulich (2016) also argues that the theoretical underpinning of the study influences how we interpret the data, since this affects the choices we make, in terms of data collection and the research questions. This can influence the coding process, since some codes may map onto the research questions themselves (Braun and Clarke, 2006). They also assert that the interpretation of the data can be influenced by the theoretical underpinning and concepts examined in the literature review and this appears to be the case with some of my own interpretation and coding. For example, my codes of speculative or possibility broad questions were influenced by reading about possibility thinking (Craft, 2014). However, other codes such as empathetic questioning and responding, and codes related to narration, such as scene setting, time shifting and building tension were evident in my data, rather than from my reading.

It is argued that coding is not a process of discovering and identifying code in the data but is instead a process of interpreting the data (Braun and Clarke, 2022). Kawulich (2016) posits that interpretation of the data may be enhanced by moving between induction and deduction, whilst Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) maintain that researchers often start with a few codes or themes in mind, which are then developed, adjusted, and added to when analysing the data. This is true for how I approached my interpretation and analysis. I started deductively, since it was impossible not to notice similarities in the data and types of talk identified in the literature on talk, process drama and creative pedagogy. Additionally, some of my codes were generated before I found similar codes later in my reading. For example, one of my codes, extending questions; questions which extend and probe, is similar to Alexander’s (2020) dialogic teaching framework which emphasises extending the third turn of the IRF sequence to develop dialogic talk. Another one of my codes, speculative or possibility broad questions; questions which invite speculation, exploration and imagination, is almost identical to a code in the coding scheme devised by (Hennessy et al., 2016), Invite possibility thinking based on another’s contribution; invite speculation/imagining, hypothesis, conjecture, or question posing based on another’s contribution.

Coding takes place in stages, beginning with initial coding Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest. After initial coding, the most frequent or significant codes become clearer in the next stage, referred to as focused coding by Thornberg and Charmaz (2013) and categorising by Soldana (2009). This stage is about condensing large amounts of codes which have similar characteristics into categories or concepts (Soldana, 2009; Miles et al., 2020). The codes
generated at this stage of the thematic coding are seen as identifying a semantic meaning and are identified from the surface meanings in the data and are different to the themes, which Braun and Clarke (2006) suggest are the units of analysis.

My process of coding began with the transcription phase. As I listened to different recording sources this helped me begin to interpret the data. I rewatched and relistened to these recordings many times, returned to the literature and read new literature, which deepened, changed, and developed my interpretation and understanding of the data and the developing codes. This process aligns with the description of coding as being a reflexive, creative process, where researchers need time and space for reflection, insight, and inspiration to develop (Braun and Clarke, 2022).

As I interpreted the data, I noticed that some codes had similar characteristics or patterns. It is suggested that a label is given to a set of codes that have a similar meaning, creating a hierarchy, where some codes are subsumed by others (Kawulich, 2016). Others argue that high quality coding is achieved through prolonged engagement with the data, where codes evolve and change as codes collapse together, split into two codes, or expand (Braun and Clarke, 2022). These higher levels of codes are referred to as axial codes by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2017), whilst Hennessy and colleagues use the term clusters, which I chose to use, since, like them, I was also coding classroom talk.

The clusters and codes generated in my data have been set out in table 3.2. The column on the left represents the clusters. The next column consists of the codes that are associated with that cluster. For example, the first cluster is questioning, and I found five question codes which relate to that cluster. These codes are defined in the next column and there is an example of each of the codes from the data in the final column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td><strong>Metacognitive questions</strong></td>
<td>Questions that invite reflection and metacognition</td>
<td>T: “Have you got any thoughts, responses, anything you want to say about…from today..today’s drama? Has it made you think any more about anything? Do you think differently about anything?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Narrow/possibility narrow questions</strong></td>
<td>Questions that narrow the range of possibilities or lead</td>
<td>T: “What the wires you put in last week?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speculative or possibility broad questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions that invite speculation, exploration and imagination</td>
<td>T: “Was he going mad? Was the family? Did they believe him? Did they not believe him?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathetic questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions that invite an empathetic response</td>
<td>T: “Can you share any of your feelings about Anna and the family?” P: “Does your child know what is going on?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extending questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Questions that extend and probe</td>
<td>T: “So...um...what are we seeing here? What are the reasons, which cause people to leave their countries and seek a new life elsewhere?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to ideas, comments or questions</td>
<td><strong>Empathetic responses</strong></td>
<td>Responses that suggest emotions and empathy have been evoked</td>
<td>P: “I felt sorry for her, but she is trying to do the best for her family, so she is doing the right thing. I'm hoping that they'll be together again soon.” T: “No, no, no! But you know what it's like. You want to protect your children. He doesn't need to see this. He's at school right now. And when he comes back, we'll, you know, put on a bright face...pretend everything's ok...And it will be...I hope!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Speculative responses</strong></td>
<td>Responses that speculate and suggest possibility thinking</td>
<td>P: “I wonder if something sad happens, because they look sad.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reasoning responses</strong></td>
<td>Responses that justify, argue or reason</td>
<td>P: “My idea is that at night because he normally comes at night. I'm thinking, using some old screws and cogs we can throw them around, like a bit of new machinery. It if clangs off, we know where it is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Extending responses</strong></td>
<td>Responses that extend others’ contributions</td>
<td>P: “So, this is going to be our plan. We leave loads of stuff on the floor, so he can't walk, and we know where he is. Then once we've seen where he is.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: “Activate the Iron man.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: “Yeah and if that doesn’t work, if he manages to fight him off…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: “We cover him with water!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating</td>
<td>responses</td>
<td>Responses that repeating others’ contributions</td>
<td>T: “Well what have you noticed has gone?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P: “The tiles have gone missing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P “The tiles have gone missing!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responses that are closed</td>
<td>T: “Have you heard anything about Harry?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“No”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>responses</td>
<td>Responses that suggest metacognitive engagement with the drama</td>
<td>C: “It’s made me think about how lucky, about how lucky we are and the um, how lucky I am for my dad’s job, because he doesn’t have to go off and I get to see him. But some people don’t have that opportunity.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrating</td>
<td>Scene setting</td>
<td>Narrating that sets the scene and helps create the what if’ story world</td>
<td>T: “It’s an ordinary street……. ordinary people living there, going about ordinary lives. Well….in this street……. there’s……. an empty house. And you’ve just noticed that this house might not be empty for very much longer.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time shifting</td>
<td>Narrating that indicates a temporal shift in the drama</td>
<td>T: “So! The next morning the family got together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building tension</td>
<td>Narrating that creates tension</td>
<td>T: “Nobody knew what had happened. It seemed like he’d just disappeared.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td>Explaining</td>
<td>Talk that explains a task or an idea</td>
<td>T: “So, we’re going to be those objects in the room. Just join in and say what, where why and how and all sorts of things that those things might be thinking and feeling. Over to you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C: “Our main idea is to get our best tractor, put it in somewhere really metal and stuff. Then the Iron Man will go in there and we can trap him.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.2 Clusters and codes identified in the data

The process of developing codes and axial codes or clusters, shapes the data and supports the process of identifying and developing themes. How my themes developed from my codes is discussed next.

3.10.3 The process of developing the themes

Themes develop from the axial codes or clusters, and it is suggested, capture something important about the data, which is not necessarily quantifiable (Braun and Clarke (2006). They define this analytic process as a latent level which identifies the underlying ideas, conceptual meanings or ideologies and leads to the development of the themes, through interpretation and analysis. Others call this stage Pattern Coding, which consists of four interrelated summaries, categories, or themes; causes or explanations; relationships amongst people, and concepts or theoretical constructs (Miles et al., 2020). It is argued that themes are not waiting to be discovered by the researcher in the data but are produced and generated by the researcher from the codes, which interact with the researcher’s experience and their theoretical and conceptual lens (Braun and Clarke, 2022).

This approach to thematic analysis aligns with my analytical process as my clusters of questioning, responding to ideas, comments, or questions, narrating, and explaining, developed into my themes. This occurred through iteratively examining and revisiting the data, which interacted with my conceptual and theoretical understanding. This continued to develop as I explored new literature or re-read existing literature. For example, the cluster of narrating developed into the theme of narration and co-constructed narrative, whilst questioning developed into the theme of teacher and pupil questioning since there were many examples of these types of talk in the data.

The empathetic talk codes developed into the theme of empathetic talk. However, at the coding stage illustrated in Table 3.2, the empathetic codes are categorised under different clusters. There is an empathetic questions code under the Questioning cluster and empathetic responses under the Responses to ideas, comments, and questions cluster. The theme of empathetic talk and communication was only generated once I utilised multimodal interaction analysis of the movement, gestures, and facial expressions in vignettes thirteen and fourteen. Without this second approach to analysis, the empathetic codes may not have developed into the important theme of empathetic talk.
The reflective talk theme developed from the examples of reflection both within and outside the drama and like empathetic talk, initially consisted of codes which were categorised under the two clusters of **Questioning** and **Responses to ideas, comments or questions**. Some of the codes under the cluster of **Responses to ideas, comments or questions** included reflective talk codes, such as **empathetic responses**. Other reflective talk was more dialogic and reasoned in nature and codes such as **metacognitive responses or extending questions** from the questioning cluster. Through constantly revisiting the codes, the data and the literature, the theme of **reflective talk outside drama** was generated.

The titles of the themes also changed in the analytic process. There was initially a theme of monologic and dialogic talk. However, I realised that the monologic and dialogic talk was created by the nature of teacher questioning and the extent to which pupils were invited to question alongside the teachers. So, this theme collapsed under the theme of **teacher and pupil questioning**. Another initial theme, reasoning and creative talk was renamed small group talk, which mainly consisted of problem solving, combining exploratory talk and creative interthinking.

Although the focus in this study was to find out the nature of talk and communication in process drama, the interpretation of my drama and interview data also generated a sixth theme, the **culture of talk in process drama**. This is because the supportive culture of process drama was evident in the recordings of the drama lessons and the comments made by pupils and teachers in the interviews. This culture seemed to encourage different sorts of teacher and pupil relationships and talk in my study.

To summarise, the process of developing my initial codes and clusters into themes, aligns with Braun and Clarke’s (2006, 2022) suggestion that to develop themes from codes researchers need time and space to reflect, revisit and develop the themes. My experience concurs with Braun and Clarke’s (2022) argument that this process goes beyond the semantic, surface level of what can be described in the data and that themes are not passively discovered in the data by the researcher. Instead, I generated my themes at a latent level through interpreting the data and codes through the lens of my theoretical understanding, in an iterative manner, by constantly revisiting my data, codes and the concepts and theories met in my reading.

The themes generated through this process consisted of the following types of talk; **narration and co-constructed narrative; teacher and pupil questioning; empathetic talk and communication; reflective talk outside drama, small group talk and the culture of talk in process drama**. These themes are examined in the following chapters.
Although most of the focus of analysis is on spoken language, a multimodal approach to analysis has also been taken, because of the multisensory, active nature of process drama, which utilises movement, gesture, facial expression, and body language as well as talk. So, the nature of multimodal analysis is explored next.

## 3.11 Multimodal analysis

The term multimodality is not a unified field and has emerged out of several disciplines, such as linguistics, social linguistics, semiotics, discourse analysis and social semiotics (Bezemer and Jewitt, 2018; Jewitt, Bezemer and O’Halloran, 2016). In multimodality, different ways of making meaning are viewed as going together, not separately, such as image with writing and speech with gesture. This became more noticeable in the late 1990s with the wider use of digital technologies, which is when the term multimodality was adopted by scholars Bezemer and Jewitt (2018) explain. A multimodal approach also challenges the assertion by both Saussure and Vygotsky that language is the most powerful tool or sign system for communication and the development of complex thinking. Instead, other semiotic resources, or modes, are also viewed as important for meaning making and communication (Jewitt, Bezemer and O’Halloran, 2016; Bezemer and Jewitt, 2018). Speech and writing are viewed like any other mode in multimodality. It is argued that they do not have more potential than other modes for meaning making, such as gesture, movement, gaze, or image. Instead, speech and writing are viewed as having a different potential to other modes (Bezemer and Jewitt, 2018).

A social semiotic approach to multimodality not only values different modes but also sees meaning as socially situated between a sign maker and sign interpreter, such as audience and performer. This, it is argued, is appropriate for drama, where the body is seen as a sign and meaning is made through gesture, the face, movement, and position, in conjunction with the use of objects as props (Franks, 2014). The multimodal approach which seems most apt for analysing these different modes in process drama is multimodal interaction analysis, devised by Sigrid Norris and is explored next.

### 3.11.1 Multimodal interaction analysis

This approach sets out a methodology for dealing with and analysing the complex data associated with a multimodal analysis of interaction. It is argued it combines concepts from different theoretical backgrounds, including Kress and van Leeuwen’s *social semiotic* approach to analysing texts and *interactional sociolinguistics* (Jewitt, Bezemer and
Multimodal interaction tries to understand and describe what happens in different human interactions and focuses on how individuals express their perceptions, thoughts, and feelings (Norris, 2004). It considers different semiotic modes as well as language because all interaction is seen as multimodal by Norris (2004), who explores nine modes: language, proxemics, posture, gesture, head movement, gaze, music, print and layout. She explains that there are other possible modes, such as facial expression which are equally valid to use. I have used facial expression as part of my analysis, in drama episodes where affect and empathy are expressed through facial expressions and other modes. Taylor (2012) has developed multimodal interaction analysis by adding the mode of haptics (touch) to her analytical frame. I have also included this mode when analysing some of my vignette. I have also adapted Norris’ (2004) approach, which uses photographs of interactions and superimposes language on top. Instead, following Taylor (2012) and Cremin and Baker (2014), I have put the modes in a grid and have not used the music or layout modes. This seems to be a more transparent way of analysing the multimodal interactions in process drama.

For the multimodal analysis of pupils hot seating a low status TiR (vignette thirteen) I have adapted Norris’ (2004) use of nine modes: language, proxemics, posture, gesture, head movement, gaze, music, print and layout. I have not used the music or layout modes since these were not evident in my data. I used the headings from Taylor’s grid (table 3.3) as a helpful starting point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of turns</th>
<th>Vocalisation speech</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Gesture facial expression</th>
<th>Posture, proxemics, haptics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3.3 grid headings use by Taylor (2012)

I have adapted both Norris (2004) and Taylor (2012) and this is illustrated in table (3.4). Like Taylor (2012) I have changed Language to speech vocalisation but have also added intonation because this was noticeable and apposite for the emotional and empathetic nature of the language and communication in process drama in vignette thirteen, where pupils hot seated a low-status TiR. Unlike Taylor (2012) I have put Proxemics in a column on its own, since this did not change, because everyone was seated in the first example of
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O’Halloran, 2016). Others suggest it is also influenced by mediated discourse, which focuses on how interaction is mediated by social semiotic resources and on how links between discourse and action take place in complex social situations (Wong-Scallon and de Saint-George, 2012).
multimodal interaction analysis. The modes of posture and gesture have been put in one column along with Taylor’s (2012) mode of action because these interacted with each other and often occurred concurrently. This also seems appropriate for process drama, where there is a lot of bodily gesture and action within open spaces. I have also adapted gesture to bodily gesture since there were many examples of the teacher expressing emotion through her bodily gestures. I have kept Gaze in a column of its own because the pupils’ gaze at the teacher was a noticeable aspect of vignette thirteen. I have also added facial expression, as this was an important aspect of communication in this vignette as well as facial gesture since the teacher sometimes used her eyebrows to gesture to some children to speak.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3.4 Grid headings used for multimodal analysis of pupils hotseating a low-status TiR

The headings were slightly changed for the second example of multimodal interaction analysis in the findings chapter from another drama episode, 10-second drama (vignette fourteen) since the nature of this drama episode differed slightly to vignette thirteen and are evident in the headings used for the second example of multimodal analysis in the grid in table (3.5). An extra column for sound has been added for slow drumbeats, which accompanied the drama. Posture and proxemics go together for a freeze frame and are in one column because compared to the first example of multimodal analysis of hot seating the TiR, where the pupils were sitting statically on the carpet, in the second example the pupils were moving in role. Haptics has been added to gesture and action since there was some use of touch in this vignette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/Vocalisation/Intonation</th>
<th>Posture and proxemics</th>
<th>Bodily gesture, action and haptics</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression facial gesture</th>
<th>Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3.5 Grid headings used for pupils’ empathetic talk and gestures in 10-second dramas

There are some vignettes from drama episodes in my data where both the teacher and the pupils appear to feel great empathy for a character and this is expressed as much through their facial expressions, tone of voice and actions as through the language used. What they thought, and felt however, only became apparent when they were asked to reflect on their thoughts and feelings after the drama episode in a class discussion. These discussions were analysed using thematic analysis instead and illustrates that for my study two ways of
analysing the data were necessary to reveal the complexity of the data and to deepen my understanding of it.

3.12 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined the constructionist-interpretivist paradigm which underpins the case study research design of this study. Whilst examining my choice of case study, I examined how I addressed trustworthiness and triangulation. I discussed how reflexivity and positionality had been considered to enable me to carry out my research in as a transparent and unbiased way as possible. How ethical considerations influenced my research design and data collection were also discussed. I also explored my choice of audio and visual recordings of the drama, and why I chose group pupil interviews and a small group teacher interview. The research context and data collection were also considered, and I discussed how data were analysed though thematic analysis and to a lesser extent multimodal analysis.

Having examined the methodology for my research, I present the analysis and findings from my data in the next chapter.
4 Presentation of Data: Analysis and Findings

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I present the analysis and findings. Initially I offer an overview of the three lessons. These have been broken down into drama episodes and all the episodes from the three drama lessons have been set out in a table to provide some context (appendix ten). Short vignettes from some of these drama episodes have been selected for analysis.

The themes are introduced next and consist of the five types of talk identified, before exploring them in more detail. Twenty vignettes were analysed altogether, integrating recorded data from the drama lessons and the teacher and pupil interviews. These vignettes are not organised by lesson, but by the nature of the talk, which was sometimes evident in more than one lesson. For each of the five types of talk, I respond to the research question about the nature of teacher and pupil talk in process drama. In section 4.6, where I examine empathetic talk, I also respond to the research question about what can be revealed by exploring the data through a multimodal lens. Throughout this chapter I also explore how the different types of talk interact with other factors such as the status of the TiR or whether talk occurred in role or outside drama.

4.2 Overview of analysed lessons

To give a context for the vignettes selected for analysis, a brief overview of the lessons is given in the following subsections, 4.2.1., 4.2.2 and 4.2.3. The first two lessons were based around The Mysteries of Harris Burdick (Van Allsburg, 2011) and The Arrival (Tan, 2007). These took place with 10 – 11-year-old pupils. The third lesson, based around The Iron Man (Hughes, 2005), took place with 9 – 10-year-old pupils. There was extensive teacher and pupil talk throughout the lessons.

4.2.1 Lesson one based on The Mysteries of Harris Burdick

This lesson centred on one illustration of a man standing holding a chair in the air above a large lump on the carpet from The Mysteries of Harris Burdick (Van Allsburg, 2011). The pupils had previously been asked to pose questions about illustrations from the book and in the lesson itself, the teachers created a narrative based loosely on the following illustration, which acted as a pre-text (O’Neill, 1995).
**The Mysteries of Harris Burdick**

The mysterious and surreal illustrations in this book simply have captions and invite readers to speculate and create their own stories. The pupils had to work out which illustration the lesson had been based on, by the end of the drama lesson. The lesson was characterised by drama conventions such as narration, co-constructed narrative, rumours, TiR and objects-in-the-room. There were multiple examples of the teachers introducing drama conventions by oscillating between narrating, explaining the next drama episode, and asking strings of *possibility broad* questions (Chappell et al., 2008). The pupils were invited to take different perspectives by being in role as a family moving into a new house, and as the neighbours.

Mystery emerged through the drama; a previous owner of the house, Harry, had disappeared, and the pupils were invited to speculate about what had happened to him through co-constructed narratives, combined with TiR. Pupils in role as objects and furniture owned by the family were questioned. A mysterious lump was discovered by the TiR as the dad, whilst the family cat mysteriously disappeared at the same time. This led to the pupils speculating and questioning in role to try to solve this problem.

**4.2.2 Lesson based on The Arrival**

This lesson was created around the beginning of the wordless graphic novel, *The Arrival*. It focused on several illustrations from the beginning of the book. A range of drama conventions were used, including hot-seating, TiR, freeze fame, ten second dramas and objects-in-the-room. Issues around migration and what causes people to migrate emerged through the drama. The pupils’ emotional responses to the family’s predicament and their thoughts about migration were explored through reflective class discussions, outside the drama.

**4.2.3 Lesson three based on The Iron Man**

Three lessons were recorded in this second phase of data collection, which all built on *The Iron Man*. Like *The Harris Burdick* lesson, there were several occasions when the teacher introduced drama episodes with a mixture of narrating, TiR and explanation. Since it was a novel and there were no pictures, extracts were read from *The Iron Man* throughout lessons one and two, which led into the drama.

In the first lesson the pupils took the perspective of the Iron Man, looking out to sea. The teacher read the beginning of the story, whilst walking between the pupils who were
standing, swaying in role as the Iron Man. This use of drama appeared to support their understanding and meaning making through visualising and embodying the character in a silent, but multimodal way. Pupils were invited to ask ‘I wonder’ questions about the sea, which he had just seen for the first time. After crashing onto the beach, the pupils mimed being parts of the Iron Man crawling back together again and then took the role of seagulls looking at the broken pieces. Although this was an interesting lesson, which set the scene for the rest of the drama, most of the it consisted of mime, so little analysis of talk was possible from this lesson.

In the second lesson, the pupils were asked to change their perspective by being in role as farmers at a town council meeting, discussing the damage caused by the Iron Man to their homes and machinery. TiR as the council leader, a high-status character, was used several times along with rumours and pupils talking in small groups, in role as farmers, trying to solve the problem of what to do about the Iron Man. The third lesson was based around group writing, rather than drama. Therefore, only the data from the second lesson on *The Iron Man* was analysed.

### 4.3 The five types of talk

It is difficult to analyse talk by the three lessons since themes developed across the three lessons. Therefore, to analyse the talk in detail the different types of talk are examined in separate sections. The first type of talk explored is narration and co-constructed narrative, followed by a section on teacher and pupil questioning. I also examine talk which is indicative of empathy and affective thinking before considering examples of reflective discussions outside of process drama. The final section analyses the nature of pupils talking independently in groups, solving a problem together. Questioning was evident throughout and so is also discussed in relation to other talk types. There were examples of monologic and dialogic talk in all the sections and are analysed throughout to examine what factors encourage them. There was also evidence of the creative nature of process drama, influencing some of the talk, and is considered throughout, where appropriate. According to Alexander (2020), a positive classroom culture is needed to encourage talk and pupil voice, and comments made in interviews suggest that process drama can create such a culture. This is investigated in the final section.

I begin by examining narration and co-constructed narrative.
4.4 Narration and co-constructed narrative

Teacher narration was a feature of the *Harris Burdick* lesson and was used to introduce some of the drama episodes. This book invites pupils to imagine and create their own stories and consequently this lesson was structured as a co-constructed narrative. These narratives took place between pupils, and between teachers and pupils, in small groups and as a whole class. Within these, an equal-status TiR was sometimes used. At other times, the teachers were out of role and used more closed questioning, which impacted the nature of the talk. Some of the teacher narrations were mixed up with brief explanations and strings of possibility broad questions, or a few possibility-medium questions. The nature of the subsequent talk varied in the following vignettes from the *Harris Burdick* lesson.

4.4.1 Narration: Vignette one

This introduction involved the teacher oscillating between narration, explanation and asking possibility broad questions (Chappell *et al.*, 2008). The pupils were all sitting in a big circle and Hannah walked around the circle as she narrated the next part of the story.

*Hannah:* *So! The next morning……The family got together. They had more unpacking to do after all didn’t they? So much more unpacking to do. They had a lot of things to get on with and the cat needed feeding. The cat was nowhere to be found! Dad had noticed nothing in the night. The cat was definitely there. During the night he’d shut the cat in. And yet, the cat had disappeared. He’d seen this lump that nobody else had seen.*

This was followed by several speculative, possibility broad questions:

*Was he going mad? Was the family? Did they believe him? Did they not believe him?*

These possibility broad questions were coded as, ‘*speculative or possibility broad questions,* which invite speculation, exploration or the imagination’. Although I had not read the coding devised by Hennessy et al. (2016) when I coded my data, this code is almost identical to one of their codes, ‘*Invite possibility thinking based on another’s contribution*; invites speculation, imagining, hypothesis, conjecture or question posing’ (Hennessy *et al.*, 2016: 23). Both codes have been influenced by PT, which could explain why I have developed such a similar code. This illustrates how prior reading can influence inductive coding. These questions were followed by the explanation of the next drama convention:
You can imagine what those discussions would have been like during the evening…. sorry, during the morning and then trying to get on with their new life, in their new home.

So! What I want you to do is to get into groups, with two people, three people, four people. It doesn’t matter. You are the family in the house. Whatever that family looks like to you guys. But one of you is dad. Dad is trying to……I don’t want to give you too many clues, but he’s going to be trying to recall what happened in the night. The others though. How do they react? Let’s get into groups and have a go.

The pupils moved into groups and talked independently. The teachers wandered around and knelt or sat with groups, recording this talk. Despite Hannah’s use of imagination to create the narrative, the nature of this subsequent talk varied, depending on how the teachers talked with and questioned the pupils. If the teachers worked with a group, but asked minimal questions, or if the pupils talked independently, the talk tended to be imagined, co-constructed narrative and dialogic in nature. However, if the teachers became involved in lots of questioning the talk became more teacher dominated, asymmetrical and monologic, following the IRF pattern of very short turns, with little to no extension of the third turn of the IRF sequence, seen by Alexander (2020) as critical in encouraging dialogic talk.

The evidence in the following vignette appears to support his argument:

4.4.2 Monologic talk – narration - group: Vignette two

1. Alison So, who’s dad? What did they say when you told them what you’d seen in the night?
2. Child 1: Well, they were like really shocked
3. Alison Did they believe you?
4. Child 1: Unclear
5. Alison What did you say when she told you about the lump?
6. Child 2: I didn’t know whether to believe him
7. Alison: Ah! Does dad often make up silly stories?
8. Child 2: Yes!
9. Alison: Ah!
10. Child 3: No!
11. Alison: Oh! You said yes too. Does dad make up silly stories?

12. Child 4: Yes because…… once, we lived in this house. We heard banging noises under the table, but all along it was him.

13. Alison: Oh dad! What about this one then?

14. Child 4: This one was true (unclear – lots of noise)

15. Alison: And what happened to Tiddles?

16. Child 4: I'm not sure. I saw her and locked her in. I didn’t……My theory is that there are spirits (unclear) Maybe (unclear) ghosts (unclear)

17. Alison: Mmmm

Although Alison was trying to extend the narrative, the questions were closed, possibility narrow and encouraged simple one-word answers from the pupils such as turn 3, whilst leading questions were asked in turns 7 and 11. Other questions were more open (e.g., turns 1, 5, 13 and 15) but the pupils’ responses were not extended, or the exchanges were short and other pupils were not invited to join the discussion and develop the story world. The pupils were in role, but Alison was not; she was outside of the drama, asking the pupils what they had said. She could be seen as a spect-actor Boal (1995) asking the pupils questions as if they were the family. However, since the pupils’ responses were not extended by Alison and despite the creative teacher narration which introduced this vignette, the teacher talk tended to inhibit the pupils’ talk, fostering monologic talk.

This vignette illustrates that creative teaching does not automatically foster creative learning or dialogic talk. However, there is a need to assess the learning that is taking place in process drama, and this appears to be what Alison was doing here. This type of talk has a place in a drama lesson, alongside more creative talk and I return to this point when discussing the interview data later in this section.

After the group talk, the class came together to share some of this talk in role as the family. This talk included examples of co-constructed narrative and provided evidence of how the teacher narration, combined with possibility broad questions can lead to imagined, dialogic and co-constructed narratives. Two of these vignettes are explored next.
4.4.3 Dialogic talk - co-constructed narrative - group: Vignette three

In this vignette Hannah moved to a group, who spoke in role independently, in front of the class, with no questioning or involvement from the teacher.

Hannah: And freeze! We’re going to dip into those conversations between the family in their house that morning, after the night before. Yeah. Go! (Moves over to one group and stands nearby).

1: Child 1: *Tiddles has gone! I don’t know what it was, but I saw that the window was open, so I went downstairs, but then I forgot to shut the window. So maybe a person broke in and stole Tiddles, because there’s a bit of red on his cage bars. But I think it’s just paint when we painted the other houses……the other house……red.*

2: Child 2: *The floors are all dusty and I can’t see any footprints, so he must have been wearing something special.*

3: Child 1: *Yeah, it must have got took in a bag because it looks like it’s a huge track! But I’m not quite sure if he got kidnapped or it was just like the rug moved by itself or something like that.*

4: Child 3: *Did you realise that it was 5cms from its normal place? Like moved?*

5: Child 1: *No! I didn’t notice that!*

6: Child 3: *It’s like there’s a massive slice in the floor, or something, like something was moving round like…..um on the floor.*

7: Child 1: *Because in the middle of the night there was a huge bump inside of it and I checked, there’s nothing inside of it. But now it’s moved, it’s like someone must have been in here, or somehow, it’s still alive.*

8: Child 4: *(unclear) playing tricks on you.*

9: Child 1: *No, I went down to get some coffee, so obviously my eyes were fine. But…….. I must have been seeing things.*

Here the pupils were talking independently, cumulatively building on each other’s ideas, questioning each other, and using their imagination to co-construct a narrative. Hannah stepped back and let them lead the talk, watching and listening, rather than talking. This is one way to develop dialogic talk argues Alexander (2020) and this example supports that
Standing back and giving pupils space is also seen as creative, developing *possibility thinking* (Cremin, Burnard and Craft, 2006). This is also an example of how group creativity can be mediated through talk within process drama.

In the next vignette, within the same drama episode, Hannah joined a group, but instead of standing back, she joined in with the drama, as an equal-status TiR, as one of the family, fostering teacher pupil co-constructed narrative:

4.4.4 Dialogic talk – co-constructed narrative - group: Vignette four

1. Hannah *(Moves over to the next group, sits on a chair yawning) Morning!*
2. Child 1: *Morning! Did you see that thing glowing downstairs?*
3. Hannah: *No! What thing!*
4. Child 1: *It was coming from the living room. It was underneath the rug.*
5. Child 2: *You must have been dreaming.*
6. Child 1: *I couldn’t have because I drank some milk from the carton.*
7. Hannah: *Oh! That’s why we haven’t got any milk this morning. I don’t even know where the local shop is to get some milk. It’s you that had it during the night, was it?*
8. Child 1: *Yeah*
9. Child 2: *The milk was probably off and it probably did something to your brain, and you were imagining it. That can’t be happening.*
10. Child 1: *Yeah, but we bought it on the way to this house though, so it couldn’t have been off.*
11. Child 2: *Well maybe you were just dreaming because I very much doubt there was something moving.*
12. Child 3: *Yeah!*
13. Child 2: *Because there’s no such thing as ghosts (unclear)*
14. Hannah: *Have you seen Tiddles?*
15. Child 1: *No! We thought she’d just gone out, into the back garden*
Hannah’s use of an equal status TiR affected the talk in several ways. In turn one she pretended to yawn, which modelled how people tend to behave first thing in the morning. It also signalled that she was part of the family, and as an equal, mediated the pupils’ ability to step into the imagined world. This seemed to encourage the pupil in turn two to respond in role and to have the confidence to ask the teacher a question, which is significant because teachers usually ask most of the questions in classrooms. It is an example of co-constructed narrative and group creativity, where both pupils and the teacher use their imagination and improvise to create characters and a story line. Hannah did ask some questions in role in turns 14 and 16, but they did not dominate the talk, as in vignette one. Instead, her questions seemed to extend the pupils’ ideas and the co-constructed narrative. This could be because she asked authentic questions in role, as an equal-status TiR, as a member of the family.

Hannah oscillated between being in role and stepping back to let the pupils take over the talk in turns 4 - 6 and 8 - 13. Knowing when to step into the activity, as well as knowing when to step back is also seen as a creative pedagogy, developing possibility thinking (Craft, McConnon and Matthews, 2012). Moreover, ceding control of the talk like this, is a way to foster dialogic talk, because it changes the normal classroom relationships to one where pupils have some ownership over the language and content of the lesson (Alexander, 2020). This was further encouraged by both the teacher and pupils being in role, which seemed to foster more equal talk between teacher and pupils.

In summary, the use of an equal-status TiR, combined with the teacher knowing when to step back, encouraging the pupils to lead the talk, and knowing when to step in and join the talk, as an equal-status TiR, encouraged cumulative, dialogic talk and a creative pedagogy. The following vignette is also from the *Harris Burdick* lesson and is another example of teacher narration and equal-status TiR, but with the whole class, rather than a group.

4.4.5 Narrated introduction: Vignette five

This vignette began with teacher narration, which set the scene and supported the pupils’ imagination by introducing and creating the character of Harry and the mystery of his disappearance.
Hannah: So! It caused a bit of chaos on the street. The new family arriving. Because that house had been left unoccupied for quite some time. There had been no one living there. Before that though, there had been a lovely man, called Harry. Harry was in his late 60s, but he was still full of life. A very vibrant man. He kept that house immaculate, and he had the best garden on the street. He grew all his own vegetables, and he would always go out of his way to help anybody else on the street. He was such as nice man! And then….one day….they hadn’t seen him for a while. Nobody knew what had happened. It seemed like he’d just disappeared. Nobody knew anything of what had happened. But as we know…. when nobody knows anything…they make up all sorts. And that’s when the rumours started.

This narration ended with a brief lead into the next vignette from a drama episode of rumours. Combining this drama strategy with teacher narration and the creation of an imaginary world should support pupils to use their imagination and creative thinking to speculate and wonder what had happened to the character of Harry. However, unlike vignette 1, this example of teacher narration did not include strings of possibility broad questions. This may have constrained the dialogue and pupil imagination, up to turn 12, where there is a change in the nature of the talk:

4.4.6 Monologic talk - narration whole class: Vignette six

1. Hannah: Have you heard anything about Harry?
2. Pupil: No
3. Hannah: No…Nothing….Nothing? You haven’t seen him for a while, have you?
4. Pupil: No
5. Hannah: Um......um. Have you heard anything about Harry?
6. Pupil: No…. The last time I saw him, he was (unclear). He invited us round for dinner
7. Alison: Was that before he disappeared? And did you notice anything odd?
8. Pupil: It was about a week before he disappeared.
9. Alison: A week before he disappeared. And did you notice anything odd?
10. Pupil: No
The talk in turns 1 – 11 is dominated by both teachers, which appears to close-down the pupils’ talk and ability to imagine what could have happened to Harry. This is despite the teachers asking authentic questions and trying to extend the third turn of the IRF sequence, with further authentic questions such as turn 9 for example. However, asking if they had noticed anything odd, could be seen as a leading question. This seems to be further compounded by the lack of possibility broad questions within the initial teacher narration, which means there was less support for the pupils to speculate, imagine and think creatively. As a result, this talk is initially monologic in nature.

However, in turn 12 there is a change when Hannah stopped asking questions and stepped into an equal-status TiR, as one of the neighbours. Hannah’s improvisation and use of her own imagination to suggest that she heard loud noises appeared to scaffold and mediate the pupils’ capacity to speculate and imagine what could possibly have happened to Harry. The power relationship changed from being a teacher asking questions to a more equal relationship, where the questions she asked in role, in turn 12, encouraged talk and pupil imagination, rather than inhibit it. The pupil in turn 13 built on Hannah’s idea and suggested that they had heard a scream and the length of this exchange was much longer than preceding exchanges.

The drama strategies of teacher narration, followed by rumours alone do not guarantee the encouragement of speculative, creative thinking it seems. Moreover, the use of authentic questions did not foster dialogic talk either. However, once an equal-status TiR was combined with rumours, the pupils were able to build on the scenario created by the teacher.
and the authentic questions began to encourage dialogic talk, imagination, speculation, and co-constructed narrative.

The nature of the talk in the rest of this episode continued to develop after this point, becoming more dialogic and imagined, developing into co-constructed narrative. It also became led more by the pupils than the teachers, who stepped back, relinquishing control of the talk and drama to the pupils. This is illustrated in the following vignette.

### 4.4.7 Dialogic talk - co-constructed narrative – whole class: Vignette Seven

21. Pupil:  *I don’t know what you heard, but according to my best friend’s friend, there was this plant he grew that was really dangerous. So, I dunno what that was about but....*

22. Pupil:  *But don’t you remember when Alannah said there was that big bang, and she came running into your room?*

23. Pupil:  *Oh yes*

24. Pupil:  *And then we phoned 999 and they didn’t do anything about it.*

25. Pupil:  *They just said it might be a truck*

26. Pupil:  *Yeah, so, we think he might have been taken by a truck*

27. Teachers:  *(gasping) Oh!*

28. Pupil:  *With someone in the truck (unclear)*

29. Hannah:  *Well, I’ve heard that he’d got a new girlfriend*

30. Pupils:  *(gasping) Oh!*

31. Hannah:  *And he ran off with her in the middle of the night and she took all of his money and then, and then she put the house on the market.*

32. Pupils:  *Gasping*

33. Hannah:  *I know, I know. But that was my brother’s uncle’s…friend who works at a bank. So, I don’t know if it’s true or not.*

34. Pupil:  *The one you’re related to, the one who had twins?*

35. Hannah  *No, that’s a different side of the family.*
From turns 21 to 28, the pupils took over the discussion, in role as neighbours, cumulatively building on each other’s ideas and co-constructing the narrative through their imagination, creating dialogic talk. Findings from Vass et al. (2014) suggested that the role of emotion and creative thinking can be more important in open-ended, co-constructed written narratives than explicit reasoning. This was apparent in their study in the improvised flow of ideas, like a stream of consciousness. This also appears to be the case with co-constructed narratives. The pupils were not judging each other’s ideas through reasoning. Instead, they were improvising together, in role, to create a possible scenario about a missing character, which could also be seen as an example of group flow (Sawyer, 2008).

In Vass and colleagues’ study into co-constructed narratives, affect was visible in the emotional connections of the pupils created through existing friendships, which supported talk and creative thinking. In a similar way, through being in role as friends and neighbours, emotional connectivity was evident in the pupils and teachers, as they co-constructed the narrative together, as equals, and without the use of reasoning.

Humour and playfulness, also an emotional way of connecting, was apparent in this vignette in turns 29 and 31, where the TiR suggest that Harry had a new girlfriend. This shocked and amused the pupils, as their joint gasp in response to this humorous gossip illustrates. This emphasises the potential of TiR to support positive, symmetrical relationships and talk between teachers and pupils. This playfulness on the part of the equal-status TiR provided the stimulus for much more talk and collaborative creativity and group flow between the pupils, as the teachers stepped back more and more, and handed over the talk to the pupils as they co-created the narrative. Moreover, it is argued that humour is important for developing creative thinking because creativity lies between convention and nonsense (Vass et al., 2014). Humour and playfulness, like this example, can test boundaries to break rules and create unexpected or shocking ideas.

Improvising like this, knowing when to step in and out of role, allowed the pupils to lead the talk and the narration. Moreover, the occasional contributions in role by the teachers, in Vygotskian terms, mediated the pupils’ imagination. As in the previous examples of teacher pupil, co-constructed narrative, the teachers oscillated between stepping in and out of the drama, using an equal-status TiR, which encouraged PT and dialogic talk by allowing the pupils to lead the talk and the questioning (Alexander, 2020).

A focus on the more macro elements of movement is useful by considering how the use of space could also have impacted on the nature of the talk. In this vignette the pupils were seated on the floor in small groups, whilst the teachers moved informally around the room to
different groups. This use of space seemed to give the pupils the confidence to build on the ideas of other groups, across the drama space and exchanges took place between the groups, whilst the teachers stepped back and let the pupils lead the talk. Therefore, as the pupils took more control of the narrative, it began to be co-constructed between the different groups of children and not just within the individual groups and the talk became increasingly dynamic and imaginative in nature.

In summary, the use of the physical space, the teachers wandering around between the seated groups of pupils in a relaxed way, in addition to the use of an equal-status TiR combined to support pupil-led, co-constructed narrative, creative thinking and cumulative, dialogic talk.

4.4.8 Interview data

The interview data revealed both teachers and pupils believed that process drama supported their imagination and creativity, and there were some examples of this in the co-constructed narratives. Some also discussed how talking in groups, as they were in this vignette, supported their thinking, whilst others commented on how the teachers talked in role, supported their understanding. Teacher interviews clarified the reasons why the teachers differed in the way that they talked in small groups, and these points are discussed next.

4.4.8.1 Imagination and group creativity

The talk in the teacher narration and the co-constructed narrative could be seen as being indicative of creative thinking, particularly the use of the imagination. This is reflected in some of the comments made by the pupils in the group interviews. One pupil noted how they liked talking in role in drama, because they were able to listen to other people’s imagination and ideas,

“It was fun to, like, play the family and have the get together. Because it was listening to what other people’s imagination thought of how Harry disappeared. So, it was, like, nice to hear what other people thought.”

The importance of listening to others’ ideas and opinions was commented on by other pupils, who also understood the critical role that the imagination plays in supporting thinking and talking. They both observed how they like hearing other people’s ideas and that this supported their imagination:
“This might sound weird, but I think that imagination is a key to drama because I like seeing people think their opinions and seeing what they’re going to do and being, just taking part in it.”

“I think that erm, opinions and imagination’s quite a big part of drama……But like, on Wednesday when we got to, like come up with ideas, that’s our own opinion. So, it’s like fun to, like see other people’s opinion. Because like it’s really imaginative.”

Both pupils emphasise the importance of the imagination supporting them to express their thoughts and opinions in process drama. Listening to and respecting others’ opinions is associated with dialogic talk, particularly pupil voice, which Alexander defines as, ‘the right of students to express their ideas, opinions, and concerns, and to the obligations of teachers and fellow students to listen to them and treat them with due seriousness’ (Alexander, 2020: 53).

Another pupil commented on the importance of the imagination in drama, but noted how effective this is when working collaboratively in groups:

“I think we use our imagination quite a lot in drama. Like, if we work in groups, when we’re doing drama, erm, like everyone’s imagination goes into, like it bundles up and it becomes one big thing.”

Their description of pupils combining and building on each other’s ideas and imagination seems dialogic in nature and an example of distributed, group creativity (Sawyer and DeZutter, 2009). An example of this is the co-constructed narrative where teachers and pupils tried to solve the problem about the disappearance of Harry. Some children made specific links between talking in groups in process drama and how this helps them to invent narratives:

“So, you’re doing drama and the teacher says something that puts you into, like a situation. Well, you can like, talk in your group and whatever you do in that situation would alter the story completely and it would be different.”

“My favourite part was probably when we went into groups of four and we chatted about, like the new family……and the old man, who used to be in that house. Because you can completely like, make something up about the old man, which can also, like, change the story and the way people think about the old man.”

These pupil comments suggest they understand that drama provides opportunities for them to talk, use their imagination to create and change stories.
The teachers commented on how the creative nature of process drama conventions such as TiR affects the pupils’ imagination and creativity, but this also depends on how they behave when in role.

Hannah: “We get into role and I’m very aware that I’m not, I really try to be the facilitator in the drama, rather than the instructor…..Drama, sometimes is about imparting knowledge and information, but that is secondary to the exploration that the children are doing.”

This again implies that drama conventions do not ensure dialogic talk or a democratic classroom. It depends on how the teacher behaves and talks. Furthermore, encouraging equal power relations, where the pupils contribute to the direction of the lesson is a characteristic of process drama, possibility thinking and dialogic teaching (Neelands, 2011; Craft, 2014; Alexander 2020).

The co-constructed narratives were also creative in nature, since they were unscripted, which could produce surprises and encourage improvisation, as Hannah observed:

Hannah: “It’s more of a path you’re following. And sometimes it might go off in a different direction. Erm and I think they like the fact that it’s unexpected and they don’t know what they’re going to do next.”

*The Harris Burdick* lesson was a co-constructed narrative and reminiscent of a path going off in different directions at times, as described by Hannah. The pupils did not know what would happen next. Moreover, the teachers also had to improvise to react to the pupils’ responses, which, it is argued, is a creative pedagogy (Sawyer, 2004a; Sawyer, 2004b; Neelands, 2011; Lehtonen et al., 2016).

These examples suggest that process drama offers ways of developing creative thinking and the imagination through talk. Imagination also seemed to support pupil understanding and examples of this are explored next.

4.4.8.2 TiR talk supporting the imagination and understanding

An equal-status TiR was a key element of the co-constructed narratives. The following comments by pupils illuminate how supportive they find the way the teachers talk, when they are in role.

Several pupils remarked that when teachers are in role and using different voices, it helps them to picture and imagine the scene and the character:
“You can picture it. They help you picture it.”

“I think as they do it, they make the character come alive. Like, you have a picture in your head...... it gives you a better image, what sort of person they are.”

Several pupils commented on how the teachers changed their voices and supported pupil understanding:

“She raises her voice to, like, get into character and she moves around a lot, so that everyone can see her, and everyone knows what she is doing.”

“I find it easier, because when they say it in a different voice, it like helps me picture it. Like when something’s really happy, they say it in that voice. But when it’s not happy, they like say it in a really deep and dark voice.”

Another pupil suggested that when the teachers spoke slowly in role, this also supported their understanding.

“When it’s slower, your mind has more time to process it...... Because when there’s like gaps between them speaking, you can think about it, and you get it a lot easier.”

These comments imply that their understanding is supported by the TiR using different modes, such as volume, speed, and tone of voice, and how the teachers move, which reinforces the embodied, multimodal nature of process drama and the value of using multimodal interaction analysis to analyse some of the talk in process drama. It also corresponds with claims made by both Mages (2006) and Podlozy (2000) that process drama supports understanding.

4.4.8.3 Co-constructed narratives and freedom to talk

The Harris Burdick lesson was characterised by a lot of equal-status TiR, working with the whole class, or small groups of children, which encouraged creative and dialogic talk. This claim is supported by one pupil, who remarked how she enjoyed the talk with the teachers, when everyone was in role:

“I liked it when they first moved in and we went up to them, when the teachers were being the people who were moving in. Because we were talking and then they added onto it. And it just flowed really nicely.”

She is describing symmetrical, dialogic talk, which is neither dominated by the teachers nor the pupils and exemplifies how the control of the talk is shared between pupils and teachers,
when an equal-status TiR is adopted (O’Neill, 2014; Edmiston, 2014). This is also cumulative talk, where ‘participants build on their own and each other’s contributions and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and understanding’ (Alexander, 2020: 131).

Several children also commented on how they are encouraged to talk much more in process drama compared to other lessons, inferring they enjoyed this level of freedom to talk, imagine and think:

“The teachers just say, “off you go” and then you get your own picture, which is quite cool.”

“She says, “just talk”, like when we’re in a group. The teachers normally say, “hush! No more talking now”, but she says, “just talk”.”

These comments reveal that the pupils believe they are encouraged to talk much more freely in process drama than in other lesson, suggesting process drama is inherently dialogic and creates a supportive culture where pupils feel free to talk. How the teachers questioned pupils in process drama affected the nature of pupil talk and is considered next.

4.4.8.4 Teachers questioning pupils

In 4.4.2 it was noted that when Alison talked to a group, it was dominated by her questioning, encouraging monologic talk. By contrast in 4.4.3, Hannah stood back and just listened to the pupils talking in a group and in 4.4.4 she joined in with the pupils as an equal status TiR, fostering dialogic talk. However, in the interview with the teachers it emerged that it was a deliberate strategy that Alison asked more of the questions than Hannah, as the following comments illustrate:

Alison “It is when you pop round to different groups, again, it’s about questioning. I think you do that in order to draw out”

Later in the interview Hannah commented:

Hannah: “I’m much better at the directing, than I am at facilitating their questioning

Libby: “In lessons?”

Hannah: “Yeah. In lessons you’re (looking at Alison) much better at working in smaller groups”

This reveals the teachers deliberately talked and questioned differently from each other when team teaching. Although Alison’s group talk is more monologic, it does have value.
Having a repertoire of different sorts of teacher talk is a key tenet of dialogic talk and as Alexander (2020) explains, IRF is needed to support memorisation and to assess pupils’ learning. When Alison joined the group, she was questioning them to find out what they had been talking about and how they were getting on, an important part of teaching.

In order to be ethical and to carry out credible research, I needed to be transparent about how Alison’s talk sometimes differed from Hannah’s, rather than ignore it. However, this could potentially have portrayed one teacher’s practice as less positive than the other, which ethically could have caused harm. Triangulating the data, by comparing what the teachers said in interviews with my lesson observations, helped me understand what was happening in the data in a more nuanced way.

Questioning was evident throughout the drama lessons and therefore I turn now to focus on some specific examples of where monologic or dialogic talk developed, depending on the nature of teacher and pupil questioning.

4.5 Teacher and pupil questioning

Questioning was briefly discussed in the previous section. Here, it is the focus of the analysis of all the vignettes, looking particularly at how the same drama strategy can foster very different talk, depending on the nature of the questioning. In this section I consider how a high-status TiR influenced the nature of teacher questioning, compared to the equal-status TiR with co-constructed narrative, examined in the previous section. I then compare two different examples of objects-in-the-room, where differences in how the teachers talked, asked questions and the extent to which pupils were encouraged to lead the questioning, determined whether the talk was dialogic or monologic in nature.

In the following vignette from *The Iron Man* lesson a high-status TiR was used. This example of TiR contrasted with the previous example of an equal-status TiR in terms of the use of space and the nature of the teacher questioning, impacting on teacher and pupil talk.

4.5.1 Monologic talk – high-status TiR: Vignette eight

Here, Alison used a high-status TiR as the leader of the local council, who was running a meeting about the problems being caused by the Iron Man. Teacher narration was used to introduce this vignette and to set up the problem:
Now this is our problem villagers and towns people. This is our problem. This……disappearing of stuff seems to be linked to this Iron Man, that Hogarth’s been talking about. And I wondered if you’d heard any rumours about this Iron Man.

Like the examples of teacher narration in the *Mysteries of Harris Burdick* lesson, the teacher narrative led into a brief explanation of the subsequent activity:

So, I want you to talk to your neighbour and tell them what you’ve heard about this Iron Man.

The explanation was followed by a mixture of possibility broad and possibility moderate questions. These could also be defined as authentic, open questions and have the potential to encourage speculation, *possibility thinking* and the imagination:

What have you heard about this Iron Man? What does he look like? What sound does he make? Where does he come from?

The pupils had a few minutes to talk in pairs before reporting to the whole class what their partner had said. The following is an extract from this town council meeting.

1. Alison: OK, right! What I’d like to do now is you are going to report to us, what your partner has just said……. It’s really fast, otherwise we won’t have time for the next partner. OK? We’ll start over here. What did your partner say?

2. Pupil 1: He didn’t say anything to me. I said something to him.

3. Alison: Oh! OK (points to the other child) What did your partner say?

4. Pupil 2: Erm…Someone crazy might have built this.

5. Alison: You’ve heard that someone crazy built this. A crazy person might have built this Iron Man. (Points to the next pair of children) What did your partner say?

6. Pupil 3: Erm…that he looked really tall, like iron and he had bolts.

7. Alison: Bolts! All the way through. (Points to partner) What did you partner say?

8. Pupil 4: She said he looked like he was as tall as (unclear)

9. Alison: Really?! What did your partner say?

10. Pupil 5: That his eyes changed colour
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11. Alison: *That his eyes changed colour!* What did your partner say?

12. Pupil 6: *That he has these like things on his hands* (gestures one hand against the palm of the other) *and like* (pushes both palms faced up in front of him) *raise water in front of him.*

13. Alison: *Really!* What did your partner say?

14. Pupil 7: *He said that he was as big as a house, and he had some sort of dustbin head.*

15. Alison: *Really!* What did your partner say?

16. Pupil 8: *That he heard a couple of children talking about this massive silhouette.*

17. Alison: *(Gasps in role)* Some children talking about a silhouette.

Using TiR in a high-status role, as the leader of the council running a meeting appeared, as this transcript shows, to produce predominantly asymmetrical, teacher-dominated talk. The talk turns were very short, consisting of a very repetitive teacher question, ‘What did your partner say?’ This was followed by a short reply by a pupil and very brief teacher feedback such as ‘really!’ or ‘wow!’ or repeating what the pupil had just said. Just a few of the pupils’ responses were extended. Although the pupils were encouraged to invent rumours which they had heard about the Iron Man, by asking pupils to report back on what their partner said made it difficult for the teacher to develop the pupils’ ideas, thinking and talk, since the pupils were not talking about their own ideas.

Furthermore, compared with the example of rumours with an equal-status TiR, explored in vignette seven, the use of space was very static; everyone was sitting down and rather than ideas bouncing from different groups, the same question was asked of each pupil in turn, around the circle. Moreover, as the high-status leader of the council, Alison was sitting on a chair overlooking the circle of pupils. Compared to the dialogic, co-constructed narrative with equal-status TiR and rumours, examined in vignettes three to five, the high-status TiR with rumours here, encouraged test like questions and monologic talk. This corresponds with the suggestion that a high-status TiR can inhibit pupil talk (Neelands, 1987; Baldwin, 2012).

4.5.2 Interview data

As discussed in the previous section, the talk in the town meeting was monologic in nature. However, the teachers told me that they used lots of town meetings in their drama, but the
meeting that they described from a previous unit of drama, based on *The Hobbit* (Tolkien, 2013) seemed to have been set up differently to one that I observed:

Hannah: “Town meetings”

Alison: “Yes! Lots of town meetings”

Libby: Town meetings?

Hannah: “Yeah, so you know, with er…Lake Town on fire. We all gather together to decide what we would do about this…about the imminent arrival of Smaug.”

Both meetings were based around the problem caused by a character, but the reference to the meeting from *The Hobbit* appeared to involve discussion and problem-solving as a whole group and was possibly more dialogic. The strategy of town meetings therefore would seem to have the potential to be dialogic, inviting problem-solving and creative thinking, but it can equally invite IRF, monologic talk, as illustrated in vignette eight from *The Iron Man*.

4.5.3 Objects in the room

I turn now to compare the different nature of talk produced by the same drama convention, objects-in-the-room, in two different lessons. In both examples, the children were sitting in a large circle. Those that took part as objects moved into the circle, then froze into a shape to imitate their object, and explain what object they had become in role. This was quite static but took place in a large space.

Teacher narration was used again in the first example of objects-in-the-room.

**Hannah:** Now! They’ve come out into the living room. It’s completely empty and bare. It might have a luxurious carpet in your imagination, or it might have just floorboards. You know, nice, oak planks. It might be… but it’s bare! The room is bare. But, as the removal van comes and brings their furniture and their most precious possessions into the room, it soon starts to fill. Just join in and say what, where, why, how and all sorts of things that those things might be thinking and feeling.

This introduction invites speculation, imagination and *possibility thinking*, but the following talk which follows directly after the teacher narration is monologic in nature.
4.5.4 **Monologic talk – teacher questioning**: Vignette nine

1. Pete: *I’m a (unclear)*
2. Hannah: *Pardon?*
3. Pete: *A bear skin*
4. Hannah: *A bear skin! Are you a rug?*
5. Pete: *Yeah*
6. Hannah: *That’s interesting. So, they have a bear skin rug. Where are you from?*
7. Pete: *Er…..Antarctica*
8. Hannah: *And where did they buy you?*
9. Pete: *(unclear)*
10. Hannah: *Did they buy you in Antarctica?*
11. Pete: *Er…. Yeah. I’m a great white polar bear*
12. Hannah: *And they bought you back?*
13. Pete: *Yeah*
14. Hannah: *OK*
15. April: *I’m a cat, which is wondering why we’re here and knows that there is something mysterious about this house.*
16. George: *I am a bed made of the finest wool from er cloth*
17. Hannah: *Are you a sofa bed?*
18. George: *Yes*

Here, the talk was dominated by teacher questioning and the turns are very brief. Pupils’ responses were not extended much in this question, answer, IRF sequence. Although the pupils were using their imagination to create the objects, the backstories to the objects and therefore the pupils’ imaginations were not developed further by the teachers’ questions. Some of the questions are authentic questions, but some are quite leading; ‘Are you a rug?’ or ‘Did they buy you in Antarctica?’ for example. The teachers were arguably working harder than the pupils who seemed to be distant and outside of their characters. Although there
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was imaginative thinking, this talk is monologic in nature. One of the reasons could be the drama strategy itself, which involves pupils freezing to represent an inanimate object. However, this same drama strategy was used in the lesson based on *The Arrival* and the talk was very different, as the following vignettes illustrate.

4.5.5 Dialogic talk – pupil questioning: Vignette ten

In this lesson, the pupils had looked at an illustration of objects from the family’s house. The introduction is included in the following extract to illustrate how Hannah invites the pupils to use their imagination, to speculate what might be in the room. She also asked them to consider what memories the objects held; a question which impacted on the nature of the subsequent talk:

Hannah: *Now, I want you to have a think. You could either be one of those objects that you’ve already seen in those pictures, or you might be another object. Something that we haven’t seen, but that would add to the scene. So, if you’ve got that picture and if you were to turn and bring it out a bit and see the rest of the room. You only see a little bit, don’t you? What else might be in there and what memories would those things hold? So, when you’re ready, you can go into the circle and be one of those. Off you go.*

1. Elaine: *(unclear) The father and the son read every night.*

2. Hannah: *OK and what memories do you hold?*

3. Elaine: *That the father, erm, told his son that he would be gone for a while. They read the book three times before he went to bed.*

4. Hannah: *So, is it a memory of….?*

5. Elaine: *A memory of sadness.*

6. Hannah: *Sadness?…… Or was it……in what way?*

7. Elaine: *Because the child (unclear) memory of the father to the child.*

8. Hannah: *Oh! OK. Interesting.*

9. Ruby: *I’m the origami bird, which was the first piece of origami that the child made with his father.*
10. Hannah: *You can all ask questions and not just me. I was just asking Faith there. Other things and you can also do the same.*

11. Alison: *Have you got any questions for Heather, or for the bird?*

12. Hannah: *Just take your time.*

13. Alison: *What’s your question for the bird?*

14. Child: *How many years have you been made?*

15. Ruby: *Five*

16. Alison: *What’s your question for the bird?*

17. Ann: *Why were, why were you made?*

18. Ruby: *Because of happy memories that I can cherish forever*

19. Child: *Did the child have any help making you?*

20. Ruby: *Yes, from the father*

Turns 1 – 9 are an extended exchange between the teacher and one child, which is a characteristic of dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020). Hannah prompted and asked questions to extend the pupil’s responses, which seemed to develop the pupil’s thinking and the pupil here said more about the object, unprompted, compared to the pupil, who was the bear rug in vignette nine. In turn 6 Hannah nearly asked a closed question, but stopped herself and instead asked an authentic question, “In what way?” extending the pupil’s response; a significant way to develop dialogic talk. In turn 10, Hannah invited the pupils to ask the questions and from turn 17 the pupils began to lead the talk and the questioning; another way of fostering dialogic talk (Alexander, 2020).

There are differences in the teacher questioning in the introductions to the two examples of objects-in-the-room, which could explain why the talk is also more dialogic in this second example. In vignette nine, Hannah asked the pupils to think about the thoughts and feelings of the objects. This had the potential to encourage dialogic talk, but the pupils did not subsequently talk about thoughts and feelings, and this was not pursued by the teachers. In vignette ten, by contrast, the pupils were asked to consider what memories the objects held, and this question was asked again by the teacher, in response to the pupils’ suggestions in turns 2 and 4. Not only did this extend the pupils’ responses, developing the teacher pupil exchange into more dialogic talk, but the focus on memories seemed to encourage more
emotional investment and empathy for the family compared to the first example of objects-in-the-room. In turn 1, 3 and 5, the object was a book that the father and son read together every night and when this response was extended by asking what memories it held, the pupil responded that it held memories of sadness.

Multimodal interaction analysis was also utilised for this vignette because I wondered if the empathetic nature of the pupils’ questions and responses would also be evident in their movements, gestures, and facial expressions. However, I decided that in this instance, the multimodal analysis did reveal anything new, since it appeared to be the teacher question about what memories the objects held, which evoked empathy most powerfully. I have therefore not included this data analysis in chapter itself but have instead put this multimodal analysis into Appendix Eleven.

Another reason why the pupils engaged more emotionally and imaginatively in this example of objects-in-the-room, could be because *The Arrival* has been used as a pre-text for this lesson. It is a book with powerful themes around migration. Two illustrations were used from this book for this whole lesson, and they seemed to evoke a wide range of imaginative and emotive responses from both the children and the teachers.

The rest of this episode consisted of a mixture of the teachers and pupils asking questions of those in role as the objects, as illustrated from the following vignette from later in the episode.

4.5.6 Dialogic talk: Vignette eleven

39. Pete: *I’m the child’s bed, where the boy was crying when he heard about his father leaving the house, and I hold lots of memories of the things in the child’s (unclear).*

40. Hannah: *Does he sleep well at night?*

41. Pete: *(unclear) because he’s worried about his dad.*

42. Sophie: *I am the jewellery box the mother had*

43. Child: *What memories do you hold?*

44. Sophie: *When the child gave her a necklace for Mother’s Day.*

45. Elaine: *Do you hold a lot of jewellery, or is it just a little?*

46. Sophie: *I hold many parts of jewellery*
47: Child: What kind of jewellery?

48: Sophie: I hold the marriage ring from the father.

The talk in this vignette mainly involves pupils asking each other questions. This is cumulative in nature and supported character development. Although the exchange in turns 39 to 41 is quite short, it is emotionally powerful because the pupil suggested that the bed held the memories of the child crying, the night he heard that his father would be leaving. This pupil demonstrated their ability to imagine how the characters in this story could be feeling at that moment of tension, and to empathise with them. Turns 41 to 48 are longer, and all the questions were asked by the pupils. These are authentic questions, which extend the responses of child 11 in role. The question in turn 43, ‘what memories do you hold?’ illustrates how the teacher asking this question had acted as a model and helped to scaffold pupil questioning. Repeating the teacher’s question about what memories the objects held helped the pupils to bring the objects alive, to imagine what stories they told about the family and to build more empathy for this family, fostering pupil-led dialogic talk.

4.5.7 Interview data

In the second example of objects-in-the-room; vignettes ten and eleven, the talk became more dialogic when the teachers stepped back and invited the pupils to ask questions. In the interview the teachers also commented that allowing pupils to raise questions facilitates independent thinking:

Alison: There’s an awful lot of independence in the thought processes. We’re very careful…. you saw it today “I don’t want to lead you anywhere” and it is that facilitating. Allowing them to come up with decisions, come up with questions and come up with….

Hannah: Observations

Encouraging independence and inviting pupils to raise questions is consistent with a creative pedagogy, possibility thinking and dialogic talk. The pupils were interviewed after the Harris Burdick lesson, but before the Arrival lesson, so they did not comment specifically on the Arrival lesson. Despite the talk in objects in the room in the Harris Burdick lesson being less dialogic compared to The Arrival lesson, many pupils remarked on how they liked using their imagination to be in role, such as being an object in the room. The children were not asked specifically about this, so it is interesting how many of them referred to it, although they did not discuss how it supported them to talk:
“Another good thing about drama is that you don’t just act as the characters, but you act as the objects in the room…. you can like picture what’s in the room and what type of room it is”

“What I enjoyed about it, was when we got to be something in the room. Because…. erm, you got to use your imagination……..just to think of what’s in the room, or what’s going to happen.”

“I liked it when we got to be objects because we actually got to be an object.”

These comments illustrate how the pupils believe this drama convention can foster their imagination. The very different sorts of talk encouraged from the same drama strategy exemplify however, that both the nature of teacher questioning and the extent to which pupils are encouraged to question can determine if the talk is dialogic or monologic. Like TiR, this is also another example of how the drama strategy alone does not guarantee constructive talk takes place, since a range of factors are involved.

Empathy was a feature of the example of objects-in-the-room, based around *The Arrival*, which was discussed in vignettes ten and eleven. There were other emotionally powerful episodes in this lesson, and I therefore turn now to explore three of them.

### 4.6 Empathetic talk and communication

The vignettes in this section all come from *The Arrival* lesson and are again influenced by questioning and TiR. The lesson began with the pupils being asked to pose questions about an illustration of the mother and father shutting a suitcase on a table from *The Arrival* (Tan, 2006) This activity was carried out without first showing the pupils the front cover of the book.

They were invited to speculate and predict what might be happening in this illustration, who the people might be and what might happen next. Although the focus of this section is on the subsequent hot-seating, a few examples of the questions raised by the pupils are presented in the following vignette, because they supported the hot-seating section which followed:

#### 4.6.1 Pupil questioning: Vignette twelve

The pupils were given the ‘I wonder…’ stem to encourage speculative questions and engagement with the characters in the picture.
I wonder:

…………... if there’s something precious in the case?
…………... if the paper bird has anything to do with the story?
…………... if something sad happens? Because they look sad.
…………... if they are expecting it to arrive?
…………... who they are?
…………... if they lost their child? Because there is a picture right there, with a person inside the picture.
…………... if a child drew some pictures in the top right-hand corner?
…………... if the hat belongs to the man or the woman?

The ‘I wonder’ stem, combined with the illustration, mediated the pupils’ imaginations and curiosity, sparking interest in the possible time, place, and predicaments of the characters. They also denote the beginnings of empathy. Posing questions in pairs enabled the pupils to go onto hot-seat a low-status TiR as the mother. The impact on the pupils of her responses to their questions, through words, gesture, and movement, helped to develop their understanding and empathy and is discussed next.

4.6.2 Empathetic Talk – hot seating a low-status TiR: Vignette thirteen

This episode began with Alison introducing Hannah as the mother, Anna. She spoke in a very quiet tone of voice and was in role herself introducing Hannah as if she were the mother, Anna:

-Alison: OK, are we ready with some questions? OK, so you need to be very sensitive towards, sensitive towards Anna. This is Anna. And we need to think very carefully about the questions we’re asking. We haven’t got a lot of time, so you will need to think really carefully about the questions that you’re asking. (unclear) You had your hand up.-

Alison’s hushed tone of voice and emphasis on sensitivity appeared to support the creation of the mother’s character and situation, which further scaffolded the pupils’ developing empathy for the character. Whilst Alison was talking, Hannah was taking on the role of Anna in the way she was sitting on the chair, with a downcast, forlorn expression on her face and
hunched up shoulders. A sense of tension was also created through this introduction, by telling the pupils that there was not much time. Both teachers working together like this possibly supported the pupils to believe that their teacher had become someone else.

Because of the focus on gesture, expression and use of the body and movement noted here, this vignette has been analysed using multimodal interactional analysis (Norris, 2004) to explore the value of this approach. The interaction is set out first as dialogue

**Child:** What's inside the box?

**Hannah:** (in a slow, sad, hesitant voice) Well…. the case is… the case that we took out of our wardrobe…and…. we've packed it…with….all the things that my husband might need. So, he has a change of clothes in there…. his toiletries. I think it would have been good for him to have had another warm coat. But, at this point…. we can't.

What Hannah said began to create a picture of the difficulties of the family. However, Alison’s introduction and this dialogue are set out again in the table 4.1. in order to analyse it using multimodal interaction analysis. *Table 4.1* reveals how the teacher portrays empathy for the characters, through her gestures, tone of voice and facial expressions. Without using multimodal interactional analysis, I might not have appreciated the complexity of this interaction. As explained in the methodology chapter, Norris’ (2004) approach of putting language onto photographs of interactions, has been adapted to setting out the modes of communication in the table. Norris (2004) used nine modes: *language, proxemics, posture, gesture, head movement, gaze, music, print and layout*. I have not used music or layout since these were not pertinent. *Language* has been changed to *speech, vocalisation, and intonation*, because these were noticeable and apposite for the emotional and empathetic nature of the language and communication. *Proxemics* is in a column on its own because the teachers and pupils were seated throughout, and this did not change very much. However, but *posture and gesture* have been put in one column along with *action*. The latter is a new mode that I have added, as it seems appropriate for process drama, where there is a lot of movement and action within open spaces. *Gaze* remains because the pupils’ gaze at the teacher was a noticeable aspect of the following vignette. I’ve also added *facial expression*, as this was an important aspect of communication of this emotionally powerful vignette.

The child who asks the question has been called Sally and a second girl, who particularly expressed empathy has been called Kate, both pseudonyms. Alison and Hannah’s
movements and speech are in bold, and the pupils’ movements and speech are in italics to differentiate them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alison: OK, are we ready with some questions? OK. So, you need to be very sensitive towards, very sensitive towards Anna. This is Anna. And we need to think very carefully about the questions we’re asking. So, you will need to think really carefully about the questions that you’re asking. (In role as someone introducing the class to TiR as ‘Anna’, the mother). A much quieter voice in role</td>
<td>No film of Alison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>TiR is sitting on the large chair.</td>
<td>Legs crossed, shoulders hunched up, arms wrapped around her, leaning slightly forward</td>
<td>Looks around at the children sitting in a semi-circle.</td>
<td>Drawn, weary, resigned, worried look on her face, half trying to smile for her audience (almost a fixed smile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 girls seated next to the teacher on the floor</td>
<td>One girl rests her chin on her hand. Some hands are up to ask a question from children behind the girls seated closest to TiR</td>
<td>Most girls stare at the teacher. Kate in particular stares intently at the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alison: Sally, you had your hand up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TiR, seated on chair and leans towards Sally</td>
<td>Turns around</td>
<td>Looks at Sally</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raises eyebrows to gesture that she should speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sally: What’s inside the box?</td>
<td>Sat three rows away from TiR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some of the girls seated close to the teacher turn around to look at Sally, including Kate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Two boys seated on chairs on the right between the teacher and Sally</td>
<td>One boy has his hand over his mouth</td>
<td>Staring at Sally</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking very worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The girls seated on the floor close to the teacher, including Kate</td>
<td>Crossed legged on the floor, leaning towards the teacher</td>
<td>Staring straight at the teacher</td>
<td>Staring straight up at the teacher without looking away</td>
<td>Kate - Eyes look fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: (in a slow, sad, hesitant, flat voice) Well… the case is… the case that we took out of our wardrobe… and…. we’ve packed it… with… all the things that my husband might need. (pauses) So he has a change of clothes in there…. his toiletries…… (pauses)</td>
<td>Hand fiddles, almost nervously, whilst talking</td>
<td>Looks down at the floor</td>
<td>Lifts head and looks at the pupil who asked the question. Looks up, then looks down as though thinking.</td>
<td>Continues to look drawn and weary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it would have been good for him to have had another warm coat……(pause) But, at this point…. we can’t</td>
<td>Leans back slightly, shrugs, and shakes her head (suggesting there is nothing they can do about it). Shrugs again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1 Multimodal interactional analysis of TiR as mother in a low status**

Many examples of empathy and emotion were visible in Hannah’s facial expressions, the pauses, gestures, actions, tone of voice and the way that the pupils responded to her. In
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turn 2 for example, Hannah created a real sense of the emotional distress of the mother, before any child asked a question and before she spoke, through her facial expressions and body language: *Drawn, weary, resigned, worried look on her face, half trying to smile for her audience (almost a fixed smile)* and through the way that she hunched her shoulders up and wrapped her arms around herself.

In turns 3, 7 and 9, a group of girls were seated on the floor, nearest to Hannah. One of them, Kate, stared intently at Hannah almost continually throughout this whole episode, looking very worried. In turn 9 they all leaned towards Hannah, just as she was about to speak, which suggested concern and empathy for her character. At the same time, two boys seated on chairs to the right of Hannah, also stared intently at her throughout this vignette as shown in turn 8. The pupil’s question in turn 6 is a relatively simple question: "*What’s inside the box*". Hannah’s response implied hardship because the family could not afford a winter coat. Additionally, the emotional difficulty of the mother could be inferred from her flat and hesitant voice, the pauses in her speech, and her actions of wrapping her arms tightly around herself and nervously fiddling her hands.

As the dialogue continued, the later questions asked by the pupils varied and influenced the depth of Hannah’s responses. Some questions seemed more literal and factual as the pupils tried to find out who the family were and where and when events took place:

‘Do you have any children?’

‘What does your husband do?’

‘Where’s he going?’

‘How old is your child?’

‘What year is your husband leaving?’

As the questioning developed, some questions suggested the pupils were trying to dig a little deeper and were trying to make sense of the situation that the family were in. The use of *why* rather than *what or how is indicative of this deeper thinking and engagement:

‘Why are you leaving?’

‘Why is your husband leaving and not your husband, yourself, and your child?’

Other later questions appeared to reveal the pupils’ empathy for the family, since they showed concern for the whereabouts and wellbeing of their child:
‘Is your child missing?’

‘Does your child know what’s going on?’

Hannah had to improvise and empathise with the mother to be able to imagine what she might have felt and thought. She was working alongside the children to co-create this family, whilst simultaneously being narrator and story creator. This is consistent with the argument that process drama is a creative pedagogy; the teacher had to be flexible and take risks, there was less hierarchy. This also resonates with the definition of learning in process drama as, ‘negotiated and co-constructed’ (Neelands, 2011: 168). It could be argued that Hannah was being more inventive than the pupils because she was taking risks by being in a highly emotive role and she had to improvise to answer the questions posed to her by the pupils. This created a backstory and context for the family, engaging the pupils’ empathetic imaginations. However, by allowing the pupils to ask questions she invited them to be creative too, since posing questions and responding to questions is seen as being at the heart of possibility thinking (Chappell et al., 2008). The hot seating was also a form of problem-solving, as the pupils tried to find out more about the character and to make sense of their predicament through raising questions. Problem-solving too is seen as a key feature of creativity (Burnard et al., 2006; Cremin, Burnard and Craft, 2006; Sawyer, 2012).

Employing a low-status TiR evoked strong, empathetic responses in the pupils and moreover, Hannah’s own empathy for the mother was very clear and this supported meaning making and understanding of the family’s predicament and the complex moral and ethical decisions they were having to make. As Immordino-Yang and Damasio (2007) argue, these sorts of ethical or moral decisions combine both reason and emotion. They argue that teachers should not just teach knowledge and skills in isolation but relate them to real world decision making. This vignette illustrates how process drama can support pupils to do this; through questioning the TiR, the pupils imagined and experienced the kinds of decisions people must make in real life, but in the safe space of process drama.

Pupil questioning, a dialogic pedagogy, was an important aspect of this vignette. Despite this, it was Hannah who did most of the talking as the TiR, as the mother. Normally seen as fostering monologic talk, here she was not asking test questions; a key indicator of monologic talk (Nystrand et al., 2003). The imagination, empathy and meaning making fostered through this example of TiR, therefore raise questions about whether monologic teacher talk is always antithetical to creative, emotive talk and if it has value beyond pupil assessment. The full transcript of the multimodal analysis of the whole of this episode can be found in Appendix Twelve.
The empathy evoked in this vignette was subsequently developed further when the pupils were invited to work independently to imagine a highly emotional moment in the narrative and is examined next.

4.6.3 Pupil empathetic gestures and talk: Vignette fourteen

Multimodal analysis was employed to analyse a second drama episode where the pupils created freeze frames in groups, which then came to life through speech and action, in ten-second dramas. They were asked to capture the moment when the dad left to go abroad to find work; a moment of high tension, which had the potential to foster empathy. The pupils had a few minutes to create and practice their scene in their groups before each group performed to the rest of the class. They were given ten slow beats on a drum to perform their scene, followed by 3 loud beats to indicate that the next group should get itself into position. One group’s performance has been analysed using multimodal interactional analysis. As explained in the methodology chapter, the headings for the analysis grid have been slightly changed for this drama episode in table 4.2. An extra column for sound has been added for the slow drumbeats, which accompany the drama. Posture and proxemics go together for the freeze frame and are in one column because compared to the multimodal analysis of the hot-seating vignette, where the pupils were sitting statically on the carpet, here the pupils were moving in role. Haptics has been added to gesture and action since there was some use of touch in this vignette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/Vocalisation/Intonation</th>
<th>Posture and proxemics</th>
<th>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
<th>Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 girls crouched on the floor. The ‘mother’ is hunched up with her head in her hands. Her ‘son’ is sitting more upright on his knees to the left</td>
<td>One boy (the ‘father’) stands up and walks away and up some stairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 loud drum-beats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 Multimodal analysis of pupils working independently in a small group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/Vocalisation/Intonation</th>
<th>Posture and proxemics</th>
<th>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
<th>Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans over and rubs &quot;mother&quot; on the back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow drum beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s alright mummy. It’s the right thing to do, you know that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>'Mother'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head in hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why does he have to leave?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Uses a tone of voice to mimic crying and despair. Sounds of sobbing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Son' puts hand on 'mother's' shoulder and pats it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Mother' lifts head turns towards 'son'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks at 'son'</td>
<td>Looks genuinely upset and smiles towards 'son' in an appreciative way (perhaps for his attempts to comfort her). Looks as though she has been crying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, the slow beat of the drum in the background added a theatricality to the performed short episodes. Multimodal analysis reveals the pupils, expressing empathy, such as in turn 1 where ‘the mother’ was crouched with her head in her hands, and in turn 3 where she pretended to cry. Empathy was also visible in the ‘son’s’ concern for his mother, expressed through rubbing her back in turn 2 and patting her on the shoulder in turn 4. The sequence of the drama strategies, with the pupils raising questions about the illustration of the family, followed by the TiR as the mother being hot seated, before the pupils worked independently in groups, at another moment of tension in this vignette appears to be very important in
developing their empathy and understanding. This corroborates Holland’s (2009) findings which suggest how the drama strategies are ordered influences whether empathy is encouraged or not. Arguably, it is the low-status TiR as the mother early in the drama lesson that mediated their empathetic response, and this strengthens Edmiston’s (2014) argument that TiR is critical in developing pupil talk and meaning-making. The multimodal analysis of all the children’s ten-second drama can be found in Appendix Thirteen.

In the interview, both the teachers and the pupils talked about empathy or being able to imagine how characters were feeling, which supports the findings discussed in this section, and this is explored next.

4.6.4 Interview data

In the teacher interviews, Alison remarked on the pupils’ engagement with TiR, which was shown on their faces and the way their questioning developed:

“They loved Hannah being in role. Because I was watching those faces and they were, they were absolutely hooked. And that was interesting how the level of questioning changed. They started with ‘what’s in the suitcase?’ and they moved up to much deeper questions. Much, tried to, you know dig a little bit deeper and ask more open-ended questions I suppose, but more probing questions. And they were utterly hooked.”

Alison’s comments are congruent with the evidence revealed by multimodal analysis that a low-status TiR can encourage pupils to respond empathetically to characters. She also observed how their questioning deepened, and the pupils became increasingly engaged, as the hot seating progressed. This corresponds with my observations and was discussed in vignette thirteen.

Empathy also emerged as a theme within the pupil interviews, without them being prompted to talk about it. However, they did not discuss these vignettes from The Arrival because the interviews took place before this lesson. Several pupils mentioned generally that drama helped them to understand and empathise with the characters that they were playing in the drama. The following are a few typical examples:

“I like drama because it’s an easy way of understanding how the character would feel and you get to like experience......You’re in their shoes and you get to like, you know how they’re feeling because you have to go through it.”

“You can feel how the characters are feeling.”
The empathy evident in these comments is reaffirm claims that empathy can be viewed as more than imagining what characters feel, but experiencing the same emotions for real (Vygotsky, 2004; Djikic, Oatley and Moldoveanu, 2013).

The TiR as the mother in vignette twelve, revealed the empathy of the teacher for the mother and how this evoked an empathetic response in the pupils. Her tone of voice was an important element of this, and several pupils commented on how the teachers use different voices and how emotionally engaged they are, when they are in role in drama:

“It’s quite funny when they do it in some ways because they always put themselves through the situation”

“It’s different because they like talk in character.”

“They’re changing their voices and they’re getting into roles.”

Empathy was also briefly mentioned in the interview with the teachers. They observed how much the drama they had done all year had impacted on the pupils’ writing and how empathy can develop through experiencing different viewpoints in role:

Hannah: But I think, in terms of their narratives. Much, much more powerful. That empathy, being able to empathise as well. You can see that in their writing.

Alison: ‘And again, it’s come from…that’s come from seeing different points of view as well.’

These comments reiterate Edmiston’s (2014; 2016) argument that process drama helps pupils experience and understand multiple viewpoints and perspectives, and that TiR, pupil role-taking and imagining oneself as the other support the development of children’s empathy (Neelands, 2010; Holland, 2009). Hannah’s suggestion that empathy developed in process drama impacts on the pupils’ writing was also commented on by several pupils. For example, in commenting on TiR, one noted:

“I think, when they talk a bit more and they put the emotions in it, it’s easier if you were doing like a diary entry and it helps you reflect on the writing. So, you get more of what they’re doing as a character. It just reflects in your writing.”

Another pupil focused on the emotion and empathy that is encouraged through being in role and how this can impact directly on their writing:
“Erm, yes, so the emotion that happens in the drama comes through in your writing. So, a lot of what happens in the…so it’s when you’re acting, you suddenly like feel what they’re feeling. And then when you’re writing that you can put it into the exact words you want.”

This last comment reiterates again, the belief of some scholars that empathy is feeling others’ emotion, rather than just imagining it. Although my research is not focusing on process drama and writing, the perceived links between the development of empathy and writing are interesting and are an area that has the potential for future exploration and research.

There were opportunities for reflective discussion in The Arrival lesson, some of which was also empathetic in nature, and this is examined next.

4.7 Reflective talk outside drama

In The Arrival lesson, there were several spaces to step out of the drama to allow pupils to express their thoughts and feelings about the emotive events in the drama and the wider issues raised about migration, poverty, and separation. The first of these vignettes is an example of the pupils reflecting empathetically on the events in the drama.

4.7.1 Reflective and empathetic talk: Vignette fifteen

This discussion took place immediately after the emotionally potent low-status teacher-in-role as the mother explored in vignette thirteen:

1. Alison: Your faces changed. It was really interesting to watch. Can you share any of your feelings about Anna and the family? Has anybody got any thoughts or feelings, or anything you just want to share about what you’ve discovered? What you’ve found out?

2. Child 1: I felt sorry for her, but she is trying to do the best for her family, so she is doing the right thing. I’m hoping that they’ll together again soon.

3. Child 2: I felt quite bad, quite sad for her because obviously I think (unclear) husband going away and I just thought what happens? Why’s he going away?

4. Alison: Yes?

5. Child 3: (unclear) however painful it was for her.
6. Alison: You could see the pain, couldn’t you? A very, very difficult decision to make. Yes?

7. Child 4: I felt quite bad for the family, especially the boy, because he’s only just (unclear) and he has to deal with…. Because he doesn’t even know what’s going to happen, or anything in the end.

8. Child 3: I felt bad for the boy because I was without my dad for a year, and he might be without his dad for way longer than I was.

9. Alison: So, you could empathise. Empathise means that you can understand how another person is feeling. And your empathy, you can see you understand and feel the same way about this story. Really interesting.

Alison began this discussion with a string of possibility medium, authentic questions which invited the pupils to reflect on and share their feelings. Empathy was manifest in the responses and demeanour of the pupils, such as turns 2, 3, 5 and 7. In turn 6 Alison commented that you could see the mother’s pain because she had a very difficult decision to make, reiterating the multimodal nature of process drama and how meaning is communicated in multiple ways and not just through talk. In turn 7 child 4, an immigrant child connected this to their own experience of being without their dad for some time.

Alison allowed the pupils to respond to her questions uninterrupted until turn 6, which encouraged cumulative and empathetic talk. Additionally, some of the pupils combined expressing their thoughts and emotions with the language of reasoning and justification, by explaining why they felt this way; revealed through ‘because’ (turns 3, 7 and 8) or ‘so’ (turn 2). This aligns with Wolf, Edmiston and Enciso’s (1997) assertion that drama weaves mind and emotion together.

Questioning the low-status TiR, explored in 4.6.2, followed immediately by stepping out of the drama to discuss their thoughts and feelings seemed to help the pupils make sense of their feelings experienced in the drama and to develop their understanding of the family’s predicament. Other reflective talk encouraged more reasoned, dialogic talk, as the next vignette illustrates.

4.7.2 Reflective and dialogic talk: Vignette sixteen

This example of discussion outside drama allowed the pupils to reflect on their understanding of the issues raised in this story and comes from episode 6 in The Arrival.
lesson. Here, the pupils were asked to think about migration and what causes people to leave their countries

1. Hannah: **Right! So...erm...What are we seeing here? What are the reasons, which cause people to leave their countries and seek a new life elsewhere?**

2. Pupil 1: **Some countries have war.**

3. Pupil 2: **Bankrupt**

4. Hannah: **Bankrupt?**

5. Pupil 2: (unclear) because the family isn’t working. So, they’re not getting any money.

6. Hannah: **Mm Yes?**

7. Pupil 3. **It would be education and like, work**

8. Hannah: **When you say education, what do you mean by that?**

9. Pupil 3: **If someone’s in a country, well a poor country and it doesn’t have any schools in it. And they don’t......they don’t have a job, because they can’t get a job (unclear)**

10. Hannah: **And get a better education. OK**

By asking authentic, **possibility broad** questions, followed by the probing of pupils’ responses to extend the third turn of the IRF sequence, Hannah encouraged speculation and dialogic talk. Although the exchanges between Hannah and each pupil are not long, this is not a ‘classic’ IRF sequence and her questions do not dominate the talk or lead the pupils’ thinking and answers, since she was prompting them to talk more. In turn 4, for example, Hannah repeated the pupils’ suggestion of “bankrupt”, with an upward intonation, as if asking a question. This type of re-voicing was found in research into dialogic teaching practices and is seen to develop dialogic talk (Bignall, 2019).

Turn 8 is an example of extending the third turn of the teacher pupil exchange by asking an authentic question “What do you mean by that?” By asking this question, she is supporting them to develop their thinking further, a key strategy of Alexander’s (2020) dialogic teaching and informed by Michael’s and O’Connor’s (2012) work on teacher talk moves. Reasoning in turn 9 is noticeable in the language of *if*, and use of *and*, to build their argument and
because, to justify their argument. There were however few examples of extending the third turn of the teacher pupil exchange within the process drama lessons I observed. It occurred more in discussion outside drama, where pupils reflected on and tried to make sense of the themes emerging.

The final example of reflection and discussion outside the imagined world, comes from the conclusion of *The Arrival* lesson.

### 4.7.3 Reflective and empathetic talk: Vignette seventeen

Here, pupils were asked to reflect on the whole lesson and to talk about their thoughts and feelings:

> “How do you feel? Have you got any thoughts, responses, anything you want to say about it? From today……today’s drama. Has it made you think any more about anything? Do you think differently about anything?”

This string of authentic questions is possibility broad and the combination of asking the pupils to reflect on their feelings and thoughts at the same time seemed to invite them to use reasoning, to justify these:

> “It’s made me think about how lucky, about how lucky we are, and the um, how lucky I am for my dad’s job, because he doesn’t have to go off and I get to see him. But some people don’t have that opportunity.”

Hannah’s questions enabled the pupil to reflect on and connect to the themes of the drama. She appeared to appreciate her own circumstances more because of this and used reasoning to justify her thinking using *because*, to justify. Another pupil’s response also demonstrated that they were reflecting on the ‘what if’ reality of the drama world and how this also exists in the reality of our world:

> “It’s made me think about people who have to leave their family, so that they can have a better life. So, in a way it’s kind of good, but it’s really sad and it’s upsetting” (unclear)

Her empathy for the family and understanding of their predicament, reflected in the final comment, “it’s really sad and it’s upsetting”, support Edmiston’s (2014) argument that process drama can be a safe way of experiencing and understanding difficult issues in the real world and that reflection in process drama is a meaning-making process.
The relationship between the imagination and reality was commented on by one pupil in group interviews and is explored next.

4.7.4 Interview data

The pupils did not discuss the examples of reflection discussed in this section because they were interviewed before *The Arrival* lesson. However, some of them commented on how drama can impact on their behaviour in the real world:

“You get to experience it yourself and it can help you in life situations anyway, and you know what happens, doesn’t affect you in anyway….because when you’re acting, you see these things that the characters go through, and the way they react to it, so say they react to it really badly, you know that if that had happened to you, you should react to it in a different way.”

This reiterates again that process drama can be a safe place to explore difficult emotions and real-life experiences, because it is explored in role, through the imagination. Moreover, situations experienced in role can be applied to and help them deal with challenging situations outside the drama in the real world.

These vignettes underline the importance of planning time into drama sessions for pupils to step back from the ‘what if’ of the drama to reflect on the issues raised through the drama and their thoughts and feelings about this. A feature of these vignettes was the use of reasoning by the pupils to justify their thoughts and feelings about the characters and themes of the story. When asked to reflect on feelings the talk was cumulative and emotive in nature. When they reflected on their views about the themes, the talk was more reasoned, visible in the extension of the third turn of the teacher pupil exchange.

The final type of talk, small group talk, is examined next.

4.8 Small group talk

In this section I explore an example of problem-solving in small groups. Small group talk has been the focus of research by Mercer and colleagues (Mercer, 2000; Wegerif *et al.*, 2004; Mercer and Littleton, 2007) and is arguably a way of developing dialogic talk, since it is the pupils who ask the questions and lead the talk and thinking (Alexander, 2020). This example comes from the second *Iron Man* lesson. Alison introduced this drama episode as high-status TiR as the town council leader, running the meeting. Through this introduction she used positive language to encourage the pupils to use their imaginations and creativity:
Alison: (In role as the chairman of the meeting) Well! I think we are all agreed that we cannot let this Iron Man run rampage around our town any longer! If he gets out, if he gets out into our farms again and starts ruining all of our, (points straight ahead towards child) we’ll all have the same problem as Andrew. We won’t be able to do our jobs. So! We need a plan. So, I’m going to task you lot. Because you are all incredibly inventive farmers. You created a lot of your farms from scratch and worked very hard on them. And I am certain that you have brilliant ideas. We need to rid ourselves of this Iron Man.

The pupils talked independently in small groups to solve the problem. The nature of the talk evolved and changed as the pupils’ ideas developed and this is discussed in the next three vignettes taken from this small group talk.

4.8.1 Reasoning: Vignette eighteen

The first vignette is early in the discussion and began with different pupils suggesting a range of ideas.

1. Pupil: My idea is that at night, because he normally comes at night, I’m thinking, using some old screws and cogs we can throw them around, like a bit of new machinery. If it clangs off, we know where it is!

2. Pupil: Oh Yeah!

3. Pupil: We can like. Because we can’t see it, we can throw it.

4. Pupil: I, I’ve also got another idea. You could collect loads of buckets of water and like a towel. Cover it in everything and knock him over, rust his feet and he won’t be able to move.

5. Pupil: No, we make a replica of him, and that replica can stand (unclear) everywhere.

This talk appears to have aspects of exploratory talk (Mercer and Littleton, 2007). They all seem to be suggesting ideas in turns 1 – 5 including language such as “my idea is….”, “We can like….” and “I’ve also got another idea”. According to exploratory talk research, this language is indicative of speculation and reasoning (Wegerif et al., 2004; Littleton et al., 2010). Language such as if, used in turn 1, “If it clangs off, we know where it is!” is seen as reasoning, because if can be used to justify and elaborate ideas (Wegerif et al., 2004; Littleton et al., 2010). Reasoning and divergent thinking were also being used together,
since some of the pupils justified their ideas, with language such as *because* in turns 1 and 3. This could also be seen as creative thinking associated with problem solving, which Sawyer (2012) maintains consists of participants constantly switching back and forth between divergent, convergent, and critical thinking.

This talk continued until the pupil in turn 5 disagreed with the previous ideas and made a different suggestion of their own. However, they did not clarify why they disagreed with the previous idea or why they thought their idea was better. There was then a slight change in the talk, which is explored in the next vignette.

### 4.8.2: Cumulative talk and reasoning: Vignette nineteen

6. **Pupil:** I’m thinking. *Get some new machinery. Leave it, just like*…

7. **Pupil:** *We get his ear.*

8. **Pupil:** Yeah! *Get his ear! Put his ear right in so that it looks like he can just walk off*…

9. **Pupil:** *You know those food things that spin around* (Unclear. All talking at once)

10. **Pupil:** *So, he kind of spins over it.*

11. **Pupil:** *It could be a bucket of water that* (unclear)

12. **Pupil:** *I think we should like cover everything with metal machinery and then we’d know where he is, and we can like cover him in water.*

13. **Pupil:** *Yeah!*

There were a few more examples of pupils proposing ideas including “I'm thinking…”, “I think….”. However, in this vignette the pupils were developing the idea proposed in turn 6, with examples of agreement; “yeah!” rather than challenging ideas as they cumulatively built on each other’s ideas. This talk is cumulatively building and is consistent with the finding that cumulative talk can be useful for divergent tasks, although reasoning is still needed to ensure that ‘group think’ does not arise (Littleton and Mercer, 2013). There is an example of this in turn 12 which combines a introducing a new idea, “I think we should like cover everything with metal machinery”. However, this was not justified, although with any of the language associated with of reasoning in research into exploratory talk (Mercer, 2000; Wegerif *et al.*, 2004). Instead, the words, “and then we'd know” and, “we can like” seemed
to be acting as a way of reasoning and justifying the ideas. This suggests that using concordance software, used in the research into exploratory talk to measure the occurrence of words indicative of reasoning, can miss words, which are not obviously associated with reasoning. More examples of divergent thinking mixed with reasoning were apparent in the final vignette, where the talk became increasingly indicative of creative thinking.

4.8.3: Creative interthinking: Vignette twenty

14. Pupil: *So, this is going to be our plan. We leave loads of stuff on the floor, so he can't walk, and we know where he is. Then we, once we've seen exactly where he is......*

15. Pupil: *Activate the anti-Iron Man!*

16. Pupil: *Yeah, and if that doesn't work...... if he manages to fight him off....*

17. Pupil: *We try to cover him with a water!*

18. Pupils: *Yeah!*

19. Pupil: *We drown him!*

20. Pupil: *Yeah! Try and drown him in the cliffs. So, get loads of water (unclear)*

21. Pupil: *Ah no! We should get loads of white (unclear) and pin him to the floor.*

22. Pupil: *Yeah!*

23. Pupil: *Like in monsters versus aliens!*

24. Pupil: *And then we throw ropes*

25. Pupil: *Soak him! We absolutely soak him!*

26. Pupil: *Yeah*

27. Pupil: *In fresh water though because salt water (unclear). No, water, no, because iron rusts.*

28. Pupil: *So, what we do is, is to make a robot to go and put a load of stuff on the floor and trap him. OK! Right! That's going to be our plan, so put stuff on the floor......*

29. Alison: *(In the background calling the children to come back)*
This final vignette began with the pupil in turn 14 beginning to use convergent thinking to decide on their plan. However, the other pupils continued to propose ideas from turn 15 to 27, developing and cumulatively building on the idea proposed in turn 14. Reasoning was again combined with divergent thinking such as, “so he can't walk’, to justify the ideas generated. The talk in this vignette is like the low focus thinking or stream of consciousness, where ideas are shared and jointly created, which were identified in joint written narratives (Vass et al., 2014). This is also an example of group creativity, where ideas are cumulatively built on in group flow. The pupil in turn 17 for example, finished the sentence and idea of the pupil in turn 16.

Vass and colleagues also found that emotions were an important part of creative interthinking of their (2014) study, where pupils became excited about their ideas and accepted each other’s ideas, without the use of reasoning. They concluded that it was this sharing of emotions which provided the cohesion in the talk, rather than reasoning and argumentation, which they suggested would hinder the group flow. This is also the case in this vignette, particularly as it progressed, and the ideas developed in turns 14 to 28. It is noticeable in the excited tones of voice, as pupils made suggestions and cumulatively built on each other’s ideas; indicated here by the exclamation marks, endorsing the suggestion, that emotion plays a role in fostering talk and idea generation in creative contexts. In their study, the pupils’ emotions were also captured through their glances and smiles as they generated new ideas (Vass et al., 2014). However, in my study, the small group talk was only captured through audio recordings, so the role this may have played in my study cannot be commented on. Despite this, the talk in this third vignette can be described as creative interthinking. The vignette concluded with the pupil in turn 28 seeming to take the lead again to pull the thinking of the group together, using convergent thinking to decide on their solution to the problem of the Iron Man.

To summarise, the talk in these vignettes of problem solving in small groups, began with reasoning and exploratory talk. As the thinking became more creative, the talk became more characteristic of cumulative talk, although there was still some evidence of reasoning. Eventually, as the pupils became more animated and excited about their ideas, the talk revealed that creative interthinking rather than reasoning was apparent in their talk.

The use of talk rules, talk prompts, talk lessons and talking points is seen as crucial in developing thinking through constructive talk (Mercer, 2000; Mercer and Littleton, 2007; Dawes, 2012). However, the pupils tried to solve an imaginary problem, in role, using constructive talk, without the need for these strategies. Additionally, the process drama itself
provided the engaging and naturally occurring talking point. This is also true of all the vignettes which have been explored throughout this chapter. These strategies to foster talk are perhaps more necessary when the focus is on reasoning, but there appears to be less need for them in open-ended, creative contexts, such as process drama.

Some of the pupils talked about problem-solving in the group interviews, which is examined next.

4.8.4 Interview data

Some pupils interviewed in the first phase of data collection understood that stories contain tension and mysteries, which must be solved whilst engaged in process drama, as the following comments illustrate,

“I think we do solve problems in a way, because we have a lot of mystery in our drama. As, like I think they choose, like, the stories, which can build up tension. So, you’re like, what’s going to happen?”

“Maybe it’s like a mystery and you have to solve the problem. Making ideas are like solving problems.”

Indeed, previous vignettes such as speculating about why Harry had disappeared, questioning the objects in the room to find out about the family or hot seating the TiR as the mother to find out why the father was leaving, are examples of problem-solving. Their comments also support the argument that tension is critical in process drama (Heathcote, 2010/2014; Edmiston, 2014). Other pupils in the first phase of data collection linked problem-solving with using their imagination, which reinforces the idea that problem-solving is a creative process.

“So, I think you are using your imagination because you’re solving problems. When you’re solving problems, because it isn’t a real-life situation that you’re facing, you’re using your imagination to solve it.”

“Erm, I think we do use our imagination, a lot, because if you’re in a small group, erm, you all have different ideas. They all have different imaginations. And like, how to solve the problem, if it’s a problem, or if you’re making a story.”

Interviews with pupils from the second phase of data collection also revealed that they recognised that they had been involved in problem-solving when they were planning how to get rid of the Iron Man:
“It was about the Iron Man and how we could destroy him and stuff.”

“We had this thing in our group. A load of plans to come up with. And we chose our best ones, for getting rid of the Iron Man.”

This pupil recognises that working in a small group supports them to have different ideas, which was reflected in the talk in vignettes eighteen to twenty. Hannah also observed that small group work encouraged pupil talk:

Hannah: “It’s when they break into their groups, where they really have that opportunity to talk themselves.”

These comments endorse Mercer’s (2000) argument that it is important to support children to talk constructively in small groups and Alexander’s (2020) suggestion that small group talk is dialogic in nature.

There were examples of the culture of drama supporting pupils’ confidence to talk in the data and this is examined in the final section of this chapter.

4.9 The culture of talk in process drama

Some of the comments made in interviews imply that the culture of process drama is important for constructive talk to flourish. Several pupils remarked that they talk differently in drama compared to other lessons because process drama gives them the confidence to talk more for example:

“I speak differently, because in class I’m usually really quiet, but while I’m in drama I feel more like…not, not… and because it’s not me, as the person, I feel like I can be a bit louder.”

Being in role appeared to give this quiet pupil the confidence to speak more than they normally do, and this was a point echoed by Alison:

“There are a lot of quiet children generally and there are a lot of loud ones. But they listen to each other, and they’ll listen to the quite ones and they’ll allow them to share their ideas, as valid as the loudest child in the class.”

Not having to follow a script is fundamental to process drama and encourages pupils to have the freedom to say what they want, as one pupil noted:

“I liked the drama the other day because I could just make it up. There wasn’t a script in front of you, so you didn’t have to follow the script.”
Another pupil made similar comments about being free to make it up and there being no issue with making mistakes,

“I liked it because you can, like, it doesn’t matter what you’re going to say because you’re just making it up and on you go, so it doesn’t matter what you say and if you go wrong.”

The comments about confidence and freedom to make things up seem to relate to empowering children to speak, which is also seen by Alexander (2020) as an underlying principle of dialogic talk. Teachers foster pupil risk-taking through supporting them to be in role and to create the thoughts and words of characters, rather than performing a script. As the pupil commented, it doesn’t matter what they say or if they go wrong. The focus on the freedom to make mistakes and to not be wrong in process drama was also commented on by the teachers,

Alison. “It’s that freedom, isn’t it? That we’re giving them……. to not be wrong. And when we had Smaug flying over, we had a whole ‘I’ve heard….‘ ‘I’ve heard he’s the size of a….’ ‘He’s got claws that can snatch a cow out of a field!’ or whatever, you know? Those kind of level of description and……”

Hannah “I hear he drops blood as he flies overhead”

Alison “I hear he steals children from their beds’. All of those, they can’t be wrong.”

Additionally, there was evidence in the pupil interviews that the culture of process drama also changes the normal teacher pupil hierarchy and relationships when both teachers and pupils are in role together. One child noted how in role, they had more authority and could talk to their teachers in ways that would not be possible in a normal lesson, which appears to be empowering for them:

“It doesn’t matter because you’re making it up, so it doesn’t matter. So, you actually say things like that to them, being mean and arguing at them because, you don’t normally do that to teachers.”

This comment supports the claim that TiR is a safe way to oppose the teacher, since they are in role which is seen as a way of building good relations between teachers and pupils (Heathcote, 1980/2014). Moreover, sharing power like this is also characteristic of process drama since as Neelands (2011) asserts, the teacher is temporarily de-crowned. Arguably, this is also pertinent to dialogic space, which Wegerif (2010) argues is more about relationships than the talk itself.
Having examined drama vignettes and interview data, I now conclude this chapter.

4.10 Conclusion

In this chapter I have examined the data in relation to the two research questions. In response to the first question about the nature of talk in process drama, five types of talk emerged as important. These included, narration and co-constructed narrative, teacher and pupil questioning, empathetic talk, reflective talk outside drama and problem-solving through small group talk. The data also revealed that whether the talk was monologic or dialogic was dependent on several factors, such as the status of the TiR, the creative nature of process drama, teacher questioning and the extent to which pupils were encouraged to pose questions or lead the talk. Moreover, comments made in the pupil and teacher interviews confirmed themes which emerged from analysing the drama data. Additionally, the interview data suggested that process drama encourages the sort of classroom culture which encourages pupils to talk, take risks and changes the normal teacher pupil relationships and talk.

The second research question, which asked what can be revealed through a multimodal lens, was particularly useful for discovering the empathetic nature of talk in process drama. Ascertained through multimodal interaction analysis, the empathy of the teacher in a low-status TiR, was evident through a focus on gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice, as well as her words, which engendered a powerful emotional response in the pupils. This talk was monologic, rather than dialogic in nature, however, suggesting that a re-evaluation of the value of monologic talk in creative contexts may be necessary. Empathy in the pupils was also apparent in the multimodal analysis of a subsequent freeze frame and 10 second drama. Moreover, interview data revealed that both teachers and pupils also thought process drama supported the development of empathy.

Having presented and explored the findings, I discuss them in greater depth in the next chapter, in the light of related literature.
5 Discussion of Findings

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter the five types of talk identified in the research, narration and co-constructed narrative, questioning, empathetic talk, reflective talk outside drama and small group talk are discussed in turn. Throughout I make connections to the research literature to consider each talk type in more depth and explore how they might interact with dialogic and monologic talk, questioning, TiR and the creative nature of drama. I also examine the significance of dialogic space in process drama. I begin by discussing narration and co-constructed narrative.

5.2 Narration and co-constructed narrative

Two types of narration were evident in the data, teacher narration and co-constructed narrative between teachers and pupils, and between pupils. I briefly explore teacher narration before focusing on co-constructed narratives.

5.2.1 Teacher narrations

Teacher narrations were central to the Harris Burdick lesson; they helped set the scene, move the narrative on, and support the pupils to imagine the setting, the characters, and their situations. The teachers voiced the next part of the story and sometimes they included explanations of the next drama episode. Three of these teacher narrations were followed by strings of possibility broad (PB) questions, which are associated with encouraging creativity and possibility thinking (Chappell et al., 2008). These strings of questions seemed to be consistent with the definition of PB questions as,

‘The broadest kind of questioning, ......like viewing a situation through the 360-degree lens of a fly’s compound eye, a whole variety of possibilities exist; none of them is clearly in focus or well defined but the lens applied to the questioning is 360 degrees’ (Chappell et al., 2008: 276).

Alongside the teacher narrations, these PB questions seemed to encourage speculation, imagination, and engagement with the developing narrative, fostering possibility thinking. However, this was not always the case and the reasons for this were related to TiR and are discussed next.
5.2.2 TiR and co-constructed narrative

An equal-status TiR was used alongside co-constructed narratives throughout the drama based on Harris Burdick. Analysis revealed different factors influenced the nature of this talk, including teacher questioning in role. Teachers constantly oscillated in and out of role, fostering a creative pedagogy and influencing the talk. There was evidence of teachers sharing control of the talk and questioning with the pupils. Humour and emotional connectivity also provided cohesion in co-constructed narratives. Overall, the talk aligned with the cumulative aspect of Alexander’s dialogic framework, rather than extension of the third turn in the IRF sequence. It also seemed to take place within a dialogic space and there was also evidence of creative interthinking. However, at other times the talk was more monologic in nature. The reasons why the talk differed in nature is discussed in the following subsections, beginning with questioning and equal-status TiR.

5.2.2.1 Equal-status TiR and questioning

Initially the co-constructed narratives with rumours were dominated by teacher talk and questioning, since the teacher was not in role. This stifled the talk, fostering monologic talk, but once the teacher stepped into role as an equal, working alongside the pupils and joining in with the co-constructed narratives, the talk quickly changed to being dialogic, cumulative, and creative in nature. The questions asked in role as an equal-status TiR tended to be authentic in nature; associated with dialogic teaching (Nystrand et al., 2003; Alexander, 2020). Additionally, when the teachers stepped back from the talk and just listened to the pupil talk, pupil-led, co-constructed narratives were fostered. This included pupils posing questions of each other; seen as an aspect of possibility thinking (Cremin, Burnard and Craft, 2006). Moreover, ceding control of the talk to pupils like this is empowering and encourages pupil voice; a key tenet of dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020).

Another factor influencing the talk was the different nature of questioning used by the two teachers engaged in co-constructed narratives with small groups of pupils. One teacher joined small groups of pupils as an equal-status TiR, co-constructing narratives alongside the pupils, which fostered dialogic talk. Conversely, the other teacher tended to join small groups and ask questions about the drama but was outside of it. This tended to inhibit pupil talk and imagination, encouraging IRF. This is congruent with Alexander’s (2020) assertion that how teachers talk influences how pupils talk and determines whether dialogic talk is fostered or hindered. The teacher asking constant questions could be symptomatic of the pressure teachers are under to assess pupil progress in lessons in a performativity culture.
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(Ball, 2003). However, interview data indicated that this was a deliberate strategy of the teachers to take different roles, since questioning was perceived as a strength of one of them. Therefore, it could be argued that the teachers were team teaching well together by balancing their different teaching strengths. Additionally, assessing pupils’ learning is an important aspect of teaching and learning, and moreover having a repertoire of different teaching talk, which includes judicious use of IRF, is seen as essential in dialogic teaching (Alexander, 2020).

My study also revealed that an equal-status TiR was associated with creativity; explored next.

5.2.2 Equal-status TiR and creativity

Creativity was a strong feature of the co-constructed narratives. For example, the teachers improvised by stepping in and out of role and improvisation is seen as a characteristic of creativity pedagogy (Sawyer, 2004a). This is also consistent with possibility thinking, where teachers need to know when to step back and when to step into the action (Burnard et al., 2006; Craft, McConnon and Matthews, 2012). Parallels can be drawn between teachers stepping in and out of role and effective classroom talk, which it is argued, can also be seen as improvisational and creative,

‘……because its effectiveness derives from the fact that it is not scripted. Instead, the flow of the class is unpredictable, and emerges from the actions of both teachers and students’ (Sawyer, 2004b: 189).

The equal-status TiR is regarded by Edmiston (2014) as a flexible tool for fostering meaning-making between teachers and pupils through dialogue. My study provides empirical evidence to support this claim.

Building on Wegerif’s (2005) assertion that playful talk is evidence of verbal creativity and interconnectedness, Vass et al. (2014) identified emotion and shared emotional resonance, as important for developing creative thinking. They argued humour and playful exchanges support the testing of boundaries, moving away from conventional ideas, and supporting novel connections to occur. Likewise, there was evidence in my study that an equal-status TiR, co-creating alongside pupils in role, can foster such creative thinking through talk, humour, and emotional resonance. The suggestion by the equal-status TiR that a character had a new girlfriend shocked and amused the pupils, for example, and this sparked more ideas and a long chain of pupil-led co-constructed narrative. Reasoning and argumentation were not evident in these exchanges, and the free flow of ideas resonated more with the
concept of creative interthinking (Littleton and Mercer, 2013; Vass et al., 2014). It was also found that existing friendships and shared interests contributed to the emotional connectivity in their study of pupils’ co-constructed written narratives (Vass et al., 2014). Similarly, in my study, both the pupils and teachers were in role as family or friends in the co-constructed narratives and perhaps their in-role friendships supported the connectivity and shared emotional resonance. Additionally, they were very familiar with process drama, which appeared to have created a supportive community of practice.

This sort of group creativity corresponds with the sociocultural concept of distributed cognition, where humans work together and collaborate, using social tools to solve problems (Rogoff, 2008). Developing Rogoff, Sawyer and DeZutter (2009) refer to this as distributed creativity. In this view of cognition, not all the thinking takes place within individual’s heads, but through talk, thinking and creativity are developed and distributed between minds. The social tools used in process drama consist of talk and the different drama conventions; there was evidence these supported distributed cognition and creativity in the drama and interview data, presented in the previous chapter.

In the co-constructed narratives, power was shared between the pupils and the equal-status TiR and the talk was cumulative in nature. These aspects are discussed next.

5.2.2.3 Equal-status TiR, power sharing and cumulative talk

Power sharing between teachers and pupils was a feature of the co-constructed narratives, which supports claims made by drama scholars that TiR can help distribute power between teachers and pupils (Neelands, 1987; Saebo, 2009; O’Neill, 2014). Although their reflections on theory provide invaluable insights into the potential of process drama and create frameworks for practitioners to put into practice, they are underpinned with little empirical data from research. However, my study supports and corroborates their frameworks and models of process drama by providing empirical data, which also allows me to contribute new knowledge to the field. For example, my study provides evidence that co-constructed narratives can be associated with cumulative talk, where teachers and pupils build on each other’s contributions to co-create characters and plots together. Moreover, my findings also suggest that co-constructed narratives with equal-status TiR can be a way to foster pupil-voice and comments made by pupils in group interviews illustrated that the pupils enjoyed using their imaginations and being free to make things up when talking in role in groups and with their teachers.
The findings also suggested that an equal status TiR and co-constructed narratives are associated with dialogic space. This is examined next.

5.2.2.4 Equal-status TiR, and dialogic space

The concept of dialogic space is seen to support the emergence of meaning through ‘opening up a shared space so different perspectives can interact, and new learning can occur’ (Wegerif and Major, 2019: 113). This is germane for the playful, humorous nature of the co-constructed narratives, where children cumulatively built ideas upon each other’s, in a meaningful way. It is also apt for the relational stance of an equal-status TiR, creating narratives alongside the pupils, where the normal classroom hierarchies alter, pupils have the confidence to risk talking to their teacher as an equal, and learning is negotiated and co-constructed (Neelands, 2011).

Dialogic space is seen by Wegerif (2011) as being ontological in nature; also pertinent to process drama in general, since process drama is embodied, improvisational and immerses pupils in other worlds through their imagination and social encounters in role. Opening, widening and deepening is suggested as a pedagogy for developing dialogic space (Wegerif, 2013: 2020). In this instance the dialogic space was opened through the co-constructed narratives with equal-status TiR and widened through hearing the ideas and perspectives of the pupils, in role as the family and neighbours.

Teachers working creatively alongside pupils in role, using cumulative talk within a dialogic space leads me to suggest the notion of the TiR as co-creator in process drama, which I discuss next.

5.2.2.5 TiR as co-creator

In the co-constructed narratives, the equal-status TiR modelled imagining, speculating, and creating narratives and characters. The teachers were working alongside the pupils, within the imagined drama world improvising and solving problems together. Parallels can be drawn between an equal-status TiR with co-constructed narrative, and the notion of *Teachers as Readers*: teachers who read and readers who teach (Commeyras, Bisplinghoff and Olson, 2003). In practice this relates to teachers sharing with pupils their reading preferences, how they prefer to read and their identity as a reader to support children’s reading for pleasure (Cremin *et al.*, 2014). Teacher readers may read alongside their pupils, during silent reading, or join in with informal book talk and recommendations, modelling what being a reader involves (Cremin *et al.*, 2014). Arguably, in a not dissimilar manner, an...
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equal-status TiR, steps into role alongside the pupils and imagines, experiences, co-creates and expresses emotion through movement, gesture, tone of voice and facial expression. This also attunes with the concept of the teacher as a meddler-in-the-middle, who is a risk-taker and ‘ignorant co-worker in the thick of the action’ (McWilliam, 2008: 263). Teachers as actors is not an appropriate title for this since it suggests performance and speaking given lines. Perhaps, in process drama teachers are better entitled co-creators as they improvise, imagine, empathise, and create alongside pupils, in and out of role. This leads me to suggest the concept of TiR as co-creator in this context.

Having discussed evidence of narration and co-constructed narrative in relation to equal-status TiR, I now examine the influence of teacher and pupil questioning on the nature of talk in process drama.

5.3 Teacher and pupil questioning

In this section, I discuss findings which indicate that a high status TiR, influenced the nature of the questioning, fostering monologic talk. I also consider an example of the same drama strategy encouraging monologic talk in one lesson and dialogic talk in another, depending on the nature of the teacher questioning and whether pupils were encouraged to ask questions.

5.3.1 High-status TiR and questioning

In the previous section, I considered how the use of an equal-status TiR and the drama convention rumours, fostered co-constructed narrative and dialogic talk. By contrast, a high status TiR, drama scholars assume, will frustrate dialogic interaction. In my study, a high-status TiR as the town council leader with rumours, did indeed encourage monologic talk, hindering the development of pupil talk, thinking and creativity. Here the high-status TiR repeated the same question to all the pupils. There was little or no uptake or extending of the pupils’ responses; one of the key pedagogies for fostering dialogic talk (Alexander, 2020; Nystrand et al., 2003). Consequently, the turns were very short and undeveloped, and pupils were not encouraged to use their imagination, or lead the talk, rendering them somewhat voiceless.

The authority and distance of the high-status TiR was also emphasised by the teacher, who was sitting on a chair above the pupils on the floor, seeming to contribute towards the monologic talk. This contrasted sharply with the freer and apparently more democratic use of space in the equal-status TiR and co-constructed narratives. The claims made by drama scholars and practitioners such as Neelands (1987), Booth (1995) and Baldwin (2012) about
the negative impact of a high-status TiR on teacher pupil interactions are not empirically evidenced. The evidence in my study responds to these research gaps and strengthens their argument that the status of the TiR is critical for determining whether talk in process drama is teacher dominated or not.

There were two examples of a different drama strategy, objects-in-the-room, which also fostered very different sorts of talk, depending on the nature of the questioning and these are explored next.

5.3.2 Objects-in-the-room – teacher and pupil questioning

The talk in two examples objects-in-the-room in different lessons differed greatly. In the first example of objects-in-the-room, from the Harris Burdick lesson, the questioning and talk was led by the teachers. Although some authentic questions were used, leading questions were also asked and this seemed to stifle the pupils’ imaginations, talk and thinking, fostering monologic talk. Part of the introduction to this vignette asked the pupils to think about what thoughts and feelings the objects might have. This could have evoked imagination and empathy; supporting them to inhabit the objects in role. However, the pupils did not respond to this, and the teachers did not prompt them to consider the thoughts and feelings of their objects, which perhaps contributed towards the short turns and teacher dominated questioning and monologic talk.

The second example of objects-in-the-room, by contrast, was based around a moment of tension in The Arrival lesson, when the father was about to leave the family to look for work abroad. The teachers initially began asking the pupils in role as objects, “what memories do you hold?”, which was repeated in the initial teacher and pupil exchanges. This seemed to mediate an imagined, empathetic response by the pupils to the family’s predicament at a moment of high emotion. The pupils were emotionally invested and the turns between teacher and pupils were longer, as the teachers extended pupils’ responses.

Moreover, the pupils were invited to ask questions of each other, encouraging them to lead the talk and questioning; some pupils repeating the teacher question about memories. The teacher question thereby acted as a model for the pupils to use with each other, sparking their empathetic imagination and fostering dialogic talk. In addition, this relates to Neelands’ (2010) suggestion that imagining yourself as the other, in role, is at the heart of developing humanity and morality. The pupils’ empathy and concern for the family, was apparent in both the questions that pupils asked those in role as objects, and the replies given. This encouraged meaning-making, engagement, and by stepping back to let the pupils lead the
talk and questioning, there was a shift from the unequal power relations of the IRF sequence.

Arguably, the tension in the second example of objects in the room supported a more powerful response from the pupils because of the emotionally powerful nature of the teachers’ question and the use of *The Arrival* as the pre-text for this example of objects-in-the-room.

5.3.3 Summary

The contrasting talk fostered by two different examples of TiR with rumours and two examples of objects-in-the-room exemplify that drama strategies alone do not ensure constructive talk is fostered. The high-status TiR encouraged the pupils to be, ‘channelled along the narrow tramlines of recitation……. What the teacher says partly conditions what the child says’ (Alexander, 2020: 27). This contrasted with the equal-status TiR in co-constructed narrative, where the teachers inspired and facilitated the pupils to join in and take over the narrative in role, supporting pupil voice. Likewise, in the two contrasting examples of objects-in-the-room, teacher dominated questioning encouraged monologic talk in one example, whilst teachers modelling emotive questions and encouraging pupil led questioning fostered dialogic talk in the other. In the next section I discuss how a low-status TiR can foster empathetic talk.

5.4 Empathetic talk and multimodal interaction analysis

My second research question, examining, what a multimodal lens can reveal about talk in primary process drama, is considered in this section. Multimodal analysis revealed empathy was evoked in the pupils in the *Arrival* lesson when pupils hot seated the low-status TiR. Empathy was also evident when pupils worked in groups to create a freeze frame and ten second drama to explore the moment the father left to find work abroad. Multimodal interaction analysis was adopted to analyse these vignettes because there was much more evidence of movement, gesture and facial expressions compared to other vignettes. Without utilising multimodal analysis, insights into the nature of the talk and interaction could have been overlooked.

5.4.1 Multimodal analysis of a low-status TiR

Findings indicate that the low-status TiR influenced the nature of the talk in this drama episode. It was characterised by pupils leading the direction of the talk, to an extent, since
they questioned the TiR, although Hannah did most of the talking in response. The low-status TiR enabled Hannah to imagine and develop the mother’s character; helping the pupils to understand the predicament and difficulties that her fictional family were experiencing.

Through focusing separately on the speech, proxemics, posture, gesture, gaze, facial expression and tone of voice, it was clearly noticeable that a powerful, empathetic, and imaginative response had been engendered in the pupils. Analysing the talk alone would not have revealed this. Crucially, it was the multimodal analysis which revealed the potential of the low-status TiR to encourage empathy in the pupils. For example, this analysis enabled the Hannah’s expressive facial expressions, tone of voice and gestures to be fully captured, alongside the empathetic response of the pupils, who stared transfixed, hushed, fully engaged, and lost in the as if world of the drama. Their facial expressions and looks in their eyes also revealed their concern for the low-status TiR. This observation was also supported by Alison observing in the interviews that the pupils were ‘utterly hooked’. This example provides empirical evidence to corroborates the assertion that through process drama participants can understand what others other thinking and ‘dialogue from those positions through their use of embodied dialogic imagination’ Edmiston (2016: 336).

These findings support Neelands’ suggestion that TiR can develop the empathetic imagination and put pupils into a position of responsibility, since the power of asking questions was temporarily given to the pupils, through the hot seating (Neelands, 2010; 2011). Holland (2009) argues in her study that the questions the pupils asked in hot seating revealed their identification with the characters and that they took emotional risks with their questions. This also happened here, where the pupils’ questions revealed that they were identifying and empathising with the low-status TiR. Wider real-life issues and themes emerged through the pupils’ questioning, and these became deeper as their understanding of the situation developed through Hannah’s empathetic responses. Holland (2009) maintains that teachers need to understand and feel empathy to build pupils’ own empathy, and this is what Hannah managed to do through a low-status TiR. She had to empathise with the mother to imagine and evoke her feelings and frame of mind at that point in the story. Moreover, as Vygotsky (2004) reminds us there is a link between the imagination and the effect on our feelings:

The passions and fates of imaginary characters, their joys and sorrows move, disturb and excite us, despite the fact that we know these are not real events, but the products of fantasy (Vygotsky, 2004: 20)
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Characters created through the imagination of authors such as Shaun Tan, can have strong emotional effects on us and process drama can develop empathy further. Empathy was revealed not just in the demeanour of the low-status TiR and the pupils’ responses to her but was also supported by comments made by pupils in the interviews. Some pupils observed how being in role helped them imagine what the characters were feeling. They also noticed how the teachers also imagine and experience the characters’ emotions when adopting TiR, which was affirmed in the hot seating of the low-status TiR.

The powerful empathetic response to the TiR also influenced the talk. Despite the pupils leading the questions, which is a feature of dialogic talk, the low-status TiR did most of the talking. Asymmetrical, teacher-led talk is usually seen as monologic and associated with the IRF sequence. Instead, here she engendered empathy in the pupils. She was also being creative herself in role, but by inviting the pupils to pose questions, she was encouraging the pupils to be creative too. Therefore, in the context of arts subjects, using low-status TiR to evoke empathy and creativity, monologic talk can have a positive impact on the pupils and offer more than simple knowledge recall.

There was a noticeable change in the mood of the teacher and the pupils in the intense emotional response engendered by this instance of a low-status TiR, which supports the suggestion that the arts offer special experiences where humans can feel and express emotion (Vygotsky, 1925/1971). Multimodal analysis revealed that this continued to affect the pupils in a subsequent vignette, where the pupils worked independently in group freeze frames at the moment the father left the family. These came alive through speech, gesture, facial expressions, and movement in their ten second dramas. The previous emotive experience of hot seating the low-status TiR had arguably supported the pupils’ understanding of the characters’ situation and their ability to empathise with them. This indicates the potential of a low-status TiR to continue to evoke empathy and develop understanding in pupils throughout the drama lesson, even when pupils are working together independently in role.

I have already argued that dialogic space is an important way of conceptualising, creative, co-constructed narratives in process drama. In the next section I also contend that dialogic space is germane to empathetic responses and talk.

5.4.2 Empathetic talk in process drama and dialogic space

The ontological and relational nature of dialogic space is pertinent to the pupils’ empathetic questioning of the equal-status TiR as the mother since the normal teacher pupil
relationships changed. The teacher became more of a victim than a leader. In addition, dialogic space is seen to encourage continuously emerging meaning-making since, as Wegerif posits, ‘meaning does not exist in a vacuum but is always in response to a question’ (2011: 181). This was apparent when the pupils questioned the low-status TiR, since they were trying to make sense of, and inquire into, the family’s predicament through continual questioning. This arguably took place within a dialogic space, since Wegerif (2013, 2020) posits that pedagogically, dialogic spaces are opened through positive relationships and supportive tools and strategies. In this context the low-status TiR was a supportive tool, which also fostered positive relationships, opening the dialogic space in drama. Additionally, Wegerif (2020) argues that dialogic spaces are widened by hearing different perspectives. Here through evoking empathy in the pupils, they were able to understand the predicaments and perspectives of the family, widening the dialogic space. It is also argued that dialogic space is about ‘changing ourselves and to change our reality’ (Wegerif, Mercer and Major, 2020). This seems to be true for the low-status TiR, since through this potent experience, the pupils’ understanding of the characters’ predicament was shaped, which was reflected in their change of mood and behaviour.

The empathetic response of the pupils to the low-status TiR could also be an example of Vygotsky’s concept of perezhivanie, which Davis (2015) argues is like metaxis, since both concepts open problem spaces and gaps, in which cognition and emotion are used to develop new understandings. The pupils’ meaning making of the family’s dilemma through their empathetic response to the low-status TiR is an example of just such a problem space and seems similar to dialogic space. Therefore, it could be argued that the concept of perezhivanie is a way of characterising the empathetic responses and meaning-making, fostered through pupils hot-seating a low-status TiR within a dialogic space.

Through questioning the TiR and making sense of the TiR’s responses, the pupils were also reflecting in the moment. The relationship between pupils interacting with those who perform like this is seen by Edmiston (2014) as an example of Boal’s (1995) concept of “spect-actor”. He argues this is a useful concept to understand the relationship between those performing and those watching and making meaning. The pupils asked questions of the TiR as if their teacher was the mother. Through interaction and observation, they were reflecting whilst engaged in drama helping them to make sense of the family’s dilemma. Edmiston (2014) refers to as dramatic reflection mode. Reflection is therefore another way of conceptualising process drama as a dialogic space, which Wegerif (2013, 2020) posits can be deepened through pupils reflecting on initial assumptions. So, this example of
empathy evoked through a low-status TiR appears to have opened, widened, and deepened the dialogic space.

Reflection was also noticeable in discussions outside the drama, which occurred several times in the *Arrival* lesson. Some of this talk also took place within a dialogic space, which I turn to discuss now.

5.5 Reflective talk outside of the drama

There were three examples of teachers and pupils stepping out of the drama, to discuss and reflect on *The Arrival* lesson. According to Heathcote (1977/2014) emotion, experienced through tension, is at the heart of drama and this is tempered by planning and thought, experienced through reviewing the drama. Moreover, the distance and sense of being outside of one’s creation through reflection is viewed by Bakhtin (1986) as being essential for meaning making, whilst Edmiston (2014) argues that the arts are particularly good at creating something to reflect on.

In one example of reflection outside drama, the teacher asked the pupils how they felt immediately after the low-status TiR. The talk was cumulative in nature, since Alison allowed them to respond and encouraged them to freely express their emotions and feelings, without questioning them. Through reflecting on and reasoning about their emotional response to the mother, the pupils were responding both emotionally and cognitively to events and characters in the drama. Additionally, without the prior emotional experience of hot seating the low-status TiR, it is likely that the pupils’ empathetic responses and understanding of the family’s dilemma would not have been so profound. This finding substantiates the assertion that, ‘Appropriate sequencing helps identification with characters and their circumstances, and in the development of empathy’ (Holland, 2009: 534).

Pupils were also asked later to reflect on the whole drama lesson and to consider if they thought any differently. This fostered further reflective, empathetic talk which indicated they had understood the family’s dilemma, verifying the argument that drama fosters comprehension (Podlozny, 2000; Mages, 2006). Moreover, pupils justified their feelings about the lesson, supporting the argument that there is an interrelationship between emotion and cognition when we interpret experiences (Immordino-Yang and Damasio, 2007; Smagorinsky, 2011; Vass et al., 2014). Through responding empathetically, the pupils were also engaged with the moral and ethical issues of this story, which resonates with Neelands’s (2010) assertion that empathetic imagination is the beginning of morality. This reflective talk also affirms Holland’s (2009) suggestion, that process drama can provide a
safe space where pupils feel able to express their affective identification with characters. Both discussions took place in a dialogic space, since they appeared to change and deepen the pupils’ understanding of the family’s predicament and what it must be like to be a migrant in real life. The teacher’s questions supported perspective taking and fostered a trusting environment, thereby opening and widening a dialogic space. They were also reflecting on their assumptions by talking about how their thinking and understanding may have changed through the drama lesson, thus deepening the dialogic space.

Pupils were also asked to think about why people leave their homes. Thinking and talking about the themes and issues raised in the process drama and focusing on why things happen in real life invited reasoning. This encouraged the teacher to focus on asking authentic questions and to extend the third turn of the teacher pupil exchange, by asking the pupils to clarify what they meant. Overall, however, there were few examples of teachers extending the third turn of IRF in the process drama itself. In my study this was most obvious in reflective discussions about the themes and issues of the drama.

This third discussion, reflecting on the whole drama lesson, could also be regarded as an example of dialogic space, since it helped pupils encounter different views and perspectives, thereby widening the dialogic space. It also invited the pupils to reflect on assumptions they may have held, which is another example of reflection deepening the dialogic space.

Having discussed four types of talk most found in process drama, in the penultimate section I explore the talk generated in small groups.

5.6 Small group talk

Pupils talked in small groups to solve the problem of the Iron Man. Initially the group talk contained elements of reasoning, since pupils justified their ideas, built on and sometimes challenged each other’s ideas and the talk was not dominated by one pupil; characteristics of exploratory talk (Mercer 2000; Mercer and Littleton 2007. This talk also supported some speculative and hypothetical thinking, as pupils suggested and justified ideas, associated with possibility thinking (Craft, 2014) group creativity and problem solving (Sawyer, 2006; 2012).

As the problem solving developed the pupils continued to justify their ideas, but also began cumulatively building on each other’s ideas, without challenging them. This is seen as mutually supportive, but uncritical talk by Mercer (2000), whilst others maintain this talk is useful for open-ended, more creative tasks, where explicit reasoning is less useful (Rojas-
Drummond et al., 2006; Littleton and Mercer, 2013; Vass et al., 2014). The talk developed further as their thinking became more creative. There was a flow of consciousness, free association, and low focus thinking, which, it is argued, is essential for creative thinking (Vass et al., 2014). The pupils also became excited about each other’s ideas, and this sort of emotional resonance, it is argued, provides the cohesion in open-ended tasks, rather than reasoning in creative interthinking (Vass et al., 2014). At the end of the discussion the group used convergent thinking to decide on the solution to their problem. The emotional resonance of this talk fits with the relational nature of dialogic space. Moreover, through problem solving in small groups, pupils shared and built on each other’s ideas, enabling pupils to hear different views and perspectives; widening dialogic space. So, this example of small group talk, arguably also took place within a dialogic space.

Mercer and Littleton (2007) and Dawes (2012) argue pupils need to be explicitly taught how to talk in specific talk lessons, where talk rules need to be agreed and language prompts and talking points provided. However, process drama is not a talk lesson and yet the pupils were talking and thinking together. No language was ‘on display’ in their small groups nor were there talk rules to remind them how to engage. There was no need to provide a talking point, since process drama can intrinsically create authentic talking points through the themes, issues and emotions encountered in role. These included the discussions outside drama and the small group problem-solving. The talk that emerges from these foci differ from those devised by Dawes (2012). They are not necessarily provocative, nor do they need to be agreed or disagreed with. Talk in process drama can invite reasoning, but my research suggests it tends to be more empathetic, imaginative, creative and cumulative in nature. There is little research into such small group talk, prompted by aesthetic, artist approaches to learning and my research, albeit small scale, responds to this gap. In the final section, I return to dialogic space in relation to process drama.

5.7 Dialogic space

As this study has suggested, process drama can take place in a dialogic space, supporting the pedagogy of opening, widening, and deepening dialogic spaces (Wegerif, 2020). There was evidence of this within co-constructed narratives with an equal-status TiR, empathetic talk with a low-status TiR, reflective talk outside of drama and in small group talk.

Dialogic space, it is argued, is relational where reflection, creativity and discovery are fostered through talk with others (Kim and Wilkinson, 2019). They also maintain that dialogic space attunes with Alexander’s (2020) dialogic principles; collective, reciprocal, and
supportive, which create a positive classroom culture, where constructive talk can flourish. Moreover, Alexander (2020) posits that the nature of the relationships and culture of a dialogic classroom should focus on pupils’ agency, engagement, empowerment, and metacognition to develop pupil voice. This is very similar to the classroom culture needed for process drama since it is posited that the sharing of power and talk in process drama, is important for fostering negotiated meaning-making, student agency and ownership of learning (Neelands, 2009; Lehtonen et al., 2016). This can open a dialogic space through developing a culture of trust and developing positive relationships through utilising appropriate tools and strategies (Wegerif, 2013; 2020).

This culture was characteristic of much of the process drama in my study. The trust shown between the teachers and pupils as they worked together in role, strengthens claims that trust is important in collaboration in process drama, to enable pupils and teachers to take risks with each other and to take on different roles (Edmiston, 2014; Lehtonen et al., 2016). The range of drama strategies utilised by the teachers fostered a culture, where the teachers and pupils felt free to express ideas, thoughts, and feelings in role. The equal-status TiR co-constructing narratives with pupils, for example, took place in a trusting supportive, risk-taking culture, as the teachers worked alongside the pupils as equals or stepped back to cede control of the talk to the pupils, thereby changing the normal classroom hierarchies and creating a dialogic classroom. Furthermore, creative interthinking, evident in the co-constructed narratives and small group talk consisted of emotional resonance, humour, the free flow of ideas and cumulative talk more than reasoning. All these characteristics are apposite to the relational nature of dialogic space. Thus, the culture of these drama strategies opened dialogic spaces.

A culture of trust was also essential for the low-status TiR to evoke empathetic responses in the pupils, which also opened a dialogic space. This episode was based on an emotionally powerful book, the wordless and complex The Arrival. Potentially, in addition to the drama conventions, the culture of dialogic space in process drama can also be encouraged through using such picture books as a pre-text. Examining illustrations from this book before questioning the low-status TiR was influential in engaging and evoking empathy in the pupils. The double page illustrations in this wordless picture book convey strong emotions, whilst different moods are conveyed by different colours. It is suggested that sepia brown, grey and black illustrations, such as those in The Arrival, tend to be associated with distress (Nikolajeva, 2013). She explains that through mirror neurons in the brain, the brain responds to images such as illustrations as though they are real. Therefore, the sadness
and mystery in the illustration may have already evoked curiosity and empathy in the pupils, which was further encouraged through posing questions about the illustration. When this was combined with the embodied, and affective low-status TiR, strong empathetic responses were evoked in the pupils, opening a dialogic space. The emotionally powerful nature of this pre-text also contributed towards to the empathetic questioning and responses between the pupils in the second example of objects-in-the-room.

Evidence of the culture of process drama fostering pupil engagement and empathy in the drama, is substantiated by comments made in interviews. Some pupils noted how process drama supports both teachers and pupils to empathise with characters. Others felt it encourages quieter pupils to speak more and that all pupils listen to each other and share ideas. Pupils also noted how not having a script and being able to make it up, a cornerstone of process drama, was enjoyable and that this encouraged them to not worry about making mistakes. The idea that the freedom of not being wrong in process drama encourages thinking and talk, was also remarked on by the teachers. It was also noted that being in role alongside the teachers empowers the pupils to challenge and speak to their teachers in ways that would not be possible in a normal classroom situation. The nature and culture of process drama can alter the normal teacher pupil hierarchies, which is dialogic, relational, and further supports the proposition that process drama can take place in a dialogic space.

It is suggested that dialogic space can also be widened through encountering different voices and perspectives Wegerif (2013; 2020). Additionally, Depalma (2010) defines the different voices and perspectives that are heard in a dialogic space as a polyphonic classroom. My research suggests that drama strategies are ways to foster a polyphonic classroom, where teachers and pupils encounter different perspectives, which widen dialogic space. This included being in role in the co-constructed narratives, the pupils’ empathetic responses to the equal-status TiR as the mother, reflective talk outside drama and solving the problem of the Iron Man in small groups. The reflective discussions outside drama also deepened dialogic space, since pupils were invited pupils to reflect on their assumptions and to think about how they might have changed.

It could therefore be argued that dialogic space characterises the culture and the nature of much of the talk in process drama. Whilst the extension of the third turn of the teacher pupil exchange, a significant aspect of Alexander’s (2020) framework of dialogic talk was characteristic of talk in some discussions outside of drama, there were few examples of it within the drama itself. Instead, the talk fostered through the drama strategies was mainly cumulative, sometimes empathetic and reflective in nature and creative interthinking was
often a feature. This relates to the importance Alexander (2020) places on the supportive classroom culture needed for dialogic talk, which is similar to the relational nature of dialogic space.

In this section I have discussed how the culture of process drama creates a dialogic space, through a culture of trust and empathy and less hierarchical classroom relationships, which affect the nature of talk fostered in process drama. This can open, widen, and deepen dialogic spaces and the term *Drama’s Dialogic Space* is offered as a way of capturing the nature of dialogic space in process drama.

### 5.8 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have considered the main findings in relation to the research questions about the nature of talk in process drama and the value of a multimodal lens. I have discussed the five types of talk identified in the findings; narration and co-constructed narrative; questioning; empathetic talk; reflective talk outside drama and small group talk.

I have argued that the status of the TiR plays a pivotal role in shaping the sort of talk which is fostered. An equal-status TiR was associated with a creative, improvisational pedagogy, fostering co-constructed narratives, leading to the concept of teacher as co-creator. The co-constructed narratives took place in a dialogic space, and I also contended that the nature of teacher questioning and the extent to which pupils are ceded some control of the talk and questioning, influences the nature of the talk. Additionally, I argued that the drama strategy itself does not guarantee a particular type of talk.

A multimodal lens revealed that a low-status TiR was potent in evoking empathetic responses in pupils, although the talk was monologic in nature since the teacher talked more than the pupils. This led me to question whether monologic talk is always negative and has a role beyond the recall of knowledge, since this talk also took place within a dialogic space. I demonstrated that small group problem-solving was associated with creative interthinking and both this and the co-constructed narratives were also examples of Alexander’s (2020) concept of cumulative talk. Cohesion was maintained in both sorts of talk through emotional connectivity more than reasoning.

Overall, Alexander’s argument that the extension of the third turn of the IRF sequence is critical for determining if talk is monologic or dialogic does not always seem to be the case in open-ended, creative activities such as process drama, where cumulative talk and creative interthinking were more prevalent. Cumulative talk and the dialogic principles related to the
culture are the most appropriate aspect of Alexander's (2020) dialogic framework for process drama. Extending the third turn of the IRF sequence was associated more with reflective discussions outside of drama, when pupils were asked their opinions about the issues raised in the drama.

Finally, I argued that process drama can take place within a dialogic space, since there was evidence of process drama opening, widening, and deepening dialogic spaces. This was supported by the positive culture created by the drama conventions, which invite pupils to take different perspectives and to reflect on assumptions, thoughts, and feelings and change the normal classroom hierarchies and relationships. This has led to the concept of process drama's dialogic space.

Having discussed the findings, I now turn to the conclude my study.
6 Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Introduction

In this final chapter, I synthesise the main findings and contributions of the study, consider the limitations of the research, and explore the implications for practitioners and my own practice as a Higher Education lecturer in primary education. Finally, I consider the implications for policy and pedagogy and conclude with recommendations for further research.

The focus of this doctoral research was to explore the nature of talk and communication within primary process drama. A secondary focus was to consider the contribution of using a multimodal lens to explore teacher and pupil talk in this context. Most research into talk has focused on reasoning in science, maths, and technology (Michaels and O’Connor, 2015; Mercer, Hennessy and Warwick, 2019; Wegerif, 2020). Less attention has been paid to talk in creative contexts which develops creative thinking. A review of the literature revealed that there is also very little research into talk and creativity in arts subjects, such as process drama. Furthermore, a methodological gap also exists in the research into process drama, which is predominantly theoretical or philosophical in nature, whilst the qualitative drama research tends to lack transparency and methodological rigour. In sum, although drama scholars have developed process drama theory and pedagogy over the past 50 years, very little of this is underpinned by robust empirical research.

My study aimed to respond to the gap in understanding of the nature of talk within process drama, and investigate the many scholarly claims made about process drama. It also aimed to understand what can be learned by examining the embodied and multimodal nature of communication in process drama. A third aim was to extend and develop the understanding of talk in open-ended creative contexts such as process drama. I sought to contribute to knowledge about drama pedagogy and methodology and respond to the gap in credible qualitative research into process drama.

6.2 Main Findings

The main findings were discussed in the previous chapters, so here, I offer a summary. Five types of talk were identified and discussed in the previous chapter: co-constructed narrative, questioning, empathetic talk, reflective talk inside and outside drama and small group talk. These talk types interact with each other and have been reduced further to three
significant forms of talk. Since the reflective talk was characterised by empathetic talk and questioning it can be subsumed within these, whilst the small group talk consisted of some questioning and creative interthinking and can arguably be placed within questioning. So, overall, this thesis study revealed the three most significant forms of talk in primary process drama were: co-constructed narratives, teacher and pupil questioning and empathetic talk. These served to encourage cumulative, dialogic talk and creative interthinking, which often took place within a dialogic space. Another key finding was the pivotal role that the status of the TiR plays in determining the sort of talk which is fostered within process drama. The key findings are summarised next under the three main talk types identified. How they interacted with and were influenced by the status of the TiR is also discussed.

6.2.1 Co-constructed narratives

An equal-status TiR was associated with a creative pedagogy, that fostered co-constructed narratives between teachers and pupils. When an equal-status TiR was used, the teachers tended to ask authentic questions in role or improvised by constantly stepping in and out of role and temporarily ceding control of the talk and thinking to the pupils. Additionally, the teachers took risks by taking roles and co-creating alongside the pupils, leading to the concept of TiR-as-co-creator. In these co-constructed narratives pupils and teachers built on each other’s ideas in role, fostering cumulative talk and possibility thinking, and power was shared between teachers and pupils, encouraging pupil voice.

The playful and humorous talk in the co-constructed narratives encouraged possibility thinking, creative interthinking and interconnectivity through shared emotional resonance. This supported joint meaning-making and was seen to take place within a dialogic space, typified by supportive relationships between pupils and teachers which attunes with Alexander’s (2020) collective, reciprocal, and supportive talk principles. This space encourages a culture which supports the risk-taking, imagination, perspective-taking and co-creation associated with process drama.

6.2.2 Questioning

How teachers talked and questioned and the extent to which pupils were encouraged to ask questions influenced the nature of the talk. Teacher narration, which was often used to introduce drama episodes, was commonly followed by strings of possibility broad questions. When the teachers remained outside of the drama and asked the pupils lots of questions, their imaginations tended to be stifled, prompting monologic talk. By contrast, when teachers stepped back from the drama and invited the pupils to lead the talk and the
questioning, pupil-led, cumulative, dialogic talk was fostered, encouraging pupil voice and autonomy. Pupil autonomy was also developed when pupils were invited to ask questions in other drama strategies, such as objects-in-the-room. Moreover, the affective question, initially asked by the teachers, modelled effective questioning for the pupils, influencing the nature of the subsequent pupil questioning and talk. Independent small group talk also encouraged pupils to lead the talk and questioning. Like the co-constructed narratives, this talk was largely uncritical and cumulative in nature, and a free flow of ideas and emotion was noticeable in the excited tones of voice as the young people built on each other’s ideas within the dialogic space.

Reflective discussions outside of drama assisted meaning-making. When pupils were asked to think about the themes of the drama and why things happen in real life, the talk was dialogic and closer to reasoning in nature, since their responses were extended by the teacher. This type of talk occurred mainly in discussions outside of drama and rarely when teachers and pupils were in role. Some of these reflective discussions were also empathetic in nature and are examined in the next section.

Questioning in process drama also interacted with the status of the TiR and influenced the nature of the talk. As discussed in the previous section, an equal-status TiR fostered co-constructed narratives, cumulative talk and creative interthinking. A high-status TiR on the other hand, fostered teacher dominated IRF sequences, where closed, ‘test’ questions were asked by the teacher and pupils’ responses were neither probed, nor extended. Consequently, pupil imagination and talk were hindered, fostering monologic talk. Questioning overlaps with empathetic talk which is discussed next.

6.2.3 Empathetic talk

Empathetic talk, associated with a low-status TiR, relates to the second research question about what can be revealed through a multimodal lens. Evidence of powerful empathetic responses were discovered through multimodal analysis of the communication between the teacher and pupils. By focusing on gesture, movement, and facial expression as well as talk, the potential of a low-status TiR to develop strong empathetic responses and meaning-making in pupils became clear. This evidence supports the previously unsubstantiated claims by Neelands (2010; 2011) that process drama develops the empathetic imagination and that we enter more fully into the consciousness of others through the embodied nature of process drama (Edmiston, 2016).
Despite the pupils asking the low-status TiR questions, the talk was monologic in nature since the teacher did most of the talking in response. However, in this context the monologic talk was positive. This suggests that the traditionally negative view of monologic talk needs to be reassessed in arts subjects, where evoking empathy may be an aim of an activity, since monologic talk can have a broader purpose than the recall of knowledge. The impact of the low-status TiR on pupil empathy was found in two subsequent drama episodes, revealing the potency of a low-status TiR to continue fostering pupil empathy throughout drama lessons.

In discussions outside of the drama, when pupils were asked how they felt, empathetic, reflective talk was invited. This talk was cumulative in nature, although the language of reason was evident in justifications of thoughts and feelings about issues raised in the drama.

Both the empathy evoked through the low-status TiR and reflections outside drama took place within a dialogic space. The prevalence of examples of drama taking place within a dialogic space has led to the concept of process drama’s dialogic space and this is discussed next.

6.2.4 Process drama’s dialogic space

Much of the drama was characterised by continual joint meaning-making, typical of dialogic space. The potent, affective responses engendered through a low-status TiR, took place within a dialogic space, as did the talk reflecting on feelings and affective responses outside of the drama. The co-constructed narratives were examples of group creativity, joint meaning-making and continual change taking place within a dialogic space, as was the small group talk. The co-constructed narratives and small group talk were also described as creative-interthinking, which was often present within the dialogic space. Dialogic space also characterises the supportive, trusting culture needed in process drama for pupils and teachers to feel safe to take risks in role and to express their thoughts, feelings, and imagination. This space is thus relational, experiential, and ontological; it encourages pupil autonomy and creates an empowering culture.

My study strengthens claims by Depalma (2010) that dialogic space takes place in polyphonic classrooms, where multiple perspectives and voices are invited to participate. It is argued that a polyphonic classroom can be encouraged through using a range of drama strategies and through the careful selection of texts to use as starting points (Edmiston, 2014). This was visible in my study in the high quality of the pre-texts, and the way that the
voices of all the pupils and the teachers were encouraged and heard through a wide variety of drama strategies.

Process drama is also a means by which dialogic space can be opened through its relational, interactive nature and the talk fostered through different drama conventions. Dialogic spaces can be widened in process drama through encountering different perspectives in role and discussing and negotiating from these perspectives. Additionally, dialogic spaces can be deepened through discussions outside drama, which offer a space to reflect on assumptions brought to the drama. I therefore argue that much of the talk took place within drama’s dialogic space.

I now turn to summarise the contribution of this study.

6.3 Contribution of the study

In offering an understanding of teacher and pupil talk in process drama, my study makes a new contribution to the field in three ways; conceptually, methodologically, and practically.

Conceptually, my research identified three main types of talk associated with process drama. These were co-constructed narrative, empathetic talk, and questioning and were seen both to shape the drama and be shaped by it. The work also highlighted the role of reflective talk that was linked to the fictional drama world but was voiced outside of it. I found that both teachers and pupils improvised and constructed narratives together and stepped in and out of role within a dialogic space of continual meaning making within and beyond the imagined world of process drama. Theoretically, my study suggests that creative interthinking is an appropriate way to conceptualise much of the talk in process drama and it particularly highlights the potential of process drama to foster a dialogic space where teachers and pupils talk freely together. Thus, the study contributes a new understanding of dialogic space and reveals that this can exist both in and out of role in process drama.

Methodologically my study contributes to understanding the potential of process drama by providing transparent empirical research into process drama. I carefully tracked, moment by moment, data and evidence from process drama lessons, which were analysed through a combination of thematic coding and multimodal interaction analysis. This contrasts with eminent scholars in the field who have contributed richly to our understanding of the role of process drama in children’s development and learning but have done so in a theoretical or anecdotal way. Moreover, the few empirically researched qualitative studies of process
drama tend to rely on interview data, and the research process often lacks rigour and transparency.

Practically, my study reveals much about TiR, particularly its status, and the salience of this in shaping the nature of teacher and pupil talk. An equal-status TiR was an essential feature of co-constructed narratives. The teachers' use of authentic and possibility broad questions opened-up spaces for children to think and imagine, creating stories that children could think through, fostering cumulative talk. An equal-status TiR was also associated with a creative pedagogy, as teachers worked alongside the pupils in role, fostering possibility thinking, creative interthinking and cumulative talk. This has connections to the concept of Reading Teachers, where teachers read alongside pupils and share their reading preferences. In the context of process drama, I have adapted this and re-named it TiR-as-co-creator.

Another new finding was that the status of the TiR interacted with the teacher questioning, influencing the nature of the talk fostered. Whilst an equal-status TiR employed authentic and possibility broad questions within co-constructed narratives, a high-status TiR utilised closed questions, inhibiting pupil talk and fostering monologic talk. A low-status TiR was seen to evoke powerful empathetic responses, contributing towards children's meaning-making, and understanding of emotions and issues raised. The role of multimodal interaction analysis was valuable in revealing the potential of a low status TiR to evoke empathy in pupils, revealed in the tone of voice, gestures, facial expressions, and movement of all involved. Although I recognise the need to be tentative in my claims, based on my data, I argue TiR is a valuable tool in fostering teacher and pupil talk in process drama.

A model summarising the key contributions of this study offered in figure 6.1.
In this model, the three main talk types: co-constructed narrative, questioning and empathetic talk and are shown as interrelated; they interact and influence each other. These three categories of talk are also influenced by other factors such as the status of the TiR and this is illustrated in the model, by the equal-status and low-status TiR-as-co-creator. Co-constructed narrative is characterised by cumulative talk, emotional connectivity, group creativity, creative interthinking and is developed in dialogic space. Empathetic talk and communication are also associated with dialogic space. Questioning developed a dialogic space, through pupil led questioning in drama strategies and small group talk, and teacher questioning in reflective talk outside of drama. Since high-status TiR is associated with monologic talk it is represented by being placed in a separate circle outside the main model.

My study indicates that process drama predominantly takes place within a dialogic space. This is cultivated through the teacher’s words and use of voice, gestures and movement, the embodied nature of drama and the use of space. Dialogic space is therefore more than words in process drama. This is indicated by the outer circle. Dialogic space encapsulates how the talk in process drama in this study was characterised by co-constructed narratives, meaning-making, empathy, reflection, emotional connectivity, cumulative talk and creative interthinking, more than reasoning.
This empirically derived evidence tends to support existing claims about the potential of process drama to support children’s imaginative thinking, empathy, and their ability to reflect, which have largely, until now, been based on scholarly, yet unsubstantiated assertions.

6.4 Limitations of the study

Whilst this was a robust, carefully documented and meticulously analysed study, I recognise it was small-scale in nature; I worked with two teachers, a class of 11-year-olds and a class of 10-year-olds. A range of drama strategies were observed and recorded, although there are other drama strategies, which might serve to shape teacher and pupils talk differently. Another limitation I recognise is that because of noise level, it was often hard to record the pupils talking in small groups, so it was not initially possible to capture all the talk. But by asking one pupil in the group to use the recorder as a microphone, I resolved this in a non-intrusive manner. If I were to record small group talk in process drama again, I would use this technique from the beginning. It was also difficult to film the small group talk without potentially influencing the pupils’ talk and behaviour, and hard to capture all their facial expressions since they were sitting in small circles. It would have been valuable to have captured their gestures also, alongside the physical excitement evident in their bodies and voices as they developed their ideas together. This would have enabled a more extensive multimodal analysis.

Additionally, although my study has revealed some new findings about talk within process drama, the teachers were arguably atypical in relation to their expertise. Both had specialised in drama as student teachers, and one had trained with Jonathon Neelands, Joe Winston, and Ken Robinson. They were unusually well trained and confident in using a range of drama strategies, particularly TiR and therefore, the insights cannot necessarily be transferred to all primary school settings with ease. Nonetheless, I argue that my findings indicate that process drama has the potential to foster a wide range of talk. Drama strategies, such as conscience alley for example, have the potential to be extended into debates and arguments across the curriculum. But more education in process drama in Initial Teacher Education and in schools is likely to be needed to develop practice further.

6.5 Implications for practice

There are implications for my practice and that of teachers and student teachers. With the new attention on oracy, some schools and teachers are developing dialogic practice across the curriculum. Findings from my study indicate that process drama can foster different
aspects of dialogic talk in whole class and small groups, including co-constructed narrative, creative interthinking, empathy, meaning making and some reasoning. Hence, schools that wish to develop dialogic teaching could usefully turn to process drama. Many would benefit from developing talk in creative, open contexts, going beyond the focus on reasoning in most research into talk by scholars such as Mercer, Mannion and Warwick (2020), Alexander (2020) and Wegerif (2020).

In relation to my own practice, as a lecturer in primary English, I intend to use this new knowledge to help the next generation of teachers develop greater skill and confidence in dialogic teaching and process drama pedagogies. I can also seek to influence my colleagues and ensure that they understand the importance and significance of these areas. Whilst I have taught aspects of talk and dialogic teaching for some time, my understanding has deepened greatly because of this doctoral research, and I plan to develop my teaching with undergraduate and postgraduate students in this regard. Process drama has always been taught to student teachers in my university, but I now realise more emphasis needs to be paid to the potential of low and equal-status TiR in developing empathetic responses, meaning making and group creativity. The findings also suggest there would be value in encouraging the use of process drama across curriculum subjects beyond English.

However, the difficulty that I encountered initially locating primary teachers who regularly use process drama suggests this work is likely to have limited impact on the profession currently. Not only do there appear to be constraints in terms of primary teacher knowledge of process drama and dialogic pedagogy, but there are also constraints on student teachers’ time because of curricular demands in ITE. Moreover, anecdotally, many students in my university comment that they observe little process drama in schools. Therefore, for it to fulfil its potential to be a powerful tool to develop dialogic teaching, schools and teachers need more training, to develop the knowledge, skills, and confidence to use process drama in the sophisticated way that I observed in my research. Developing student teachers’ and teachers’ understanding of the value of oracy and how to foster talk in schools is also needed.

There are also implications for the inclusion of all children, such as mute, EAL or neurodiverse children. In my study, I worked with two teachers and two classes of children. Although there were EAL children in the class, they spoke English fluently and there were no children who were neurodiverse, so I did not observe any adaptation that might be needed for such children. Nevertheless, teachers may need to adapt their drama lessons to support such children. The autism spectrum, for example, consists of a range of conditions, which
would seem to preclude them from engaging successfully in drama. These include restricted repetitive behaviour, impairments in social relationships, a lack of flexibility, difficulties with imagining what others might be thinking or feeling and the need for structure (Fein, 2015). These conditions do not seem compatible with the improvisational, imaginative, empathetic, and collaborative nature of process drama. Drama requires participants to walk in someone else’s shoes, to put aside their own thoughts and feelings, to think, decide, behave, and talk as that character, in collaboration with others to co-create an imaginary world (Fein, 2015).

Moreover, it is suggested that autistic children are most successful in social situations characterised by stable social order, such as rules, schemata and structures, and cultural practices, which include explicit conventions (Ochs et al., 2004). However, it is also argued that drama can create just such a stable social order, since role play supports children in social situations, because the different types of characters have a different status, creating rules of behaviour, ways of talking and hierarchies:

Social interactions in game are therefore structured by a top-down, explicitly articulated, systematic, and shared set of behavioural norms and obligation—the very kind of system that Ochs et al. suggested is most productive of interactive success among individuals on the spectrum (Fein, 2015: 308)

This is evident in my study, where the broad range of drama conventions, provided a familiar structure for all the children. They seemed to be familiar with the different drama conventions, and this could be supportive for neurodiverse children. Fein (2015) also posits that in her study of drama with autistic students, the relationships between students and adults, created a culture of mutual trust and acceptance, and emotional risk-taking, where both adults and students took roles together. It was this culture, she argues, which supported the autistic students. Similarly, the culture of the process drama evident in the observations and interviews in my study, supported different sorts of relationships between the teachers and pupils and was partly fostered by the frequent adoption of a low or equal status TiR. It is possible therefore to speculate that the culture of the process drama I observed in my study, may also be supportive for autistic children.

There are still further adjustments that teachers could make, however. Careful selection of the genre of literature used as a pre-text could also be supportive for neurodiverse children for example. Fantasy stories were the basis of the drama games in the Fein (2015) study, which consist of specific tropes, character types and narrative structures, often already familiar to the children, through stories and games. Familiarity with these narratives provided a supportive scaffold and structure for the neurodiverse children. Therefore,
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knowing the sorts of stories autistic children enjoy is important, so that teachers can chose to plan some of the drama around these stories, encouraging a more meaningful and supportive drama environment for them. Moreover, selecting stories with autistic characters could also be supportive, as well as supporting their peers to understand neurodiverse children better. Another characteristic of autism is sensory overload, which can cause meltdowns and challenging behaviour and could be sparked by a noisy, drama lesson. However, it is suggested that establishing an agreement between the teacher and pupils that autistic children may need a short time out from the drama, if they find it challenging, could be a way to support them (Fein, 2015).

Including non-verbal children in process drama, where collaboration and dialogue are central would seem to present a bigger challenge. One way that such children could be included is through planning some mime into the process drama. There were several examples of this in the first lesson based around The Iron Man in my study. On one occasion the teacher read from the book and the children simultaneously mimed being The Iron Man. In another episode, the pupils mimed being parts of The Iron man moving and coming back together, after he had fallen off the cliff and broken into pieces. Greater use of mime through a drama lesson, could support and encourage non-verbal children to take part in process drama lessons.

6.6 Implications for policy and challenges

At present both process drama and talk in schools play a small part in the National Curriculum (NC) (DfE, 2014). However, there is growing interest outside of government in the role that oracy plays in teaching and learning, such as the All-party Parliamentary Group report into oracy and learning, which included recommendations for the DfE, Ofsted, teacher education and schools (APPG, April 2021). There are also organisations such as Oracy21 and Oracy Cambridge (2022), which work to support teachers in developing pupil talk. Researchers and scholars continue to argue that as classroom talk is important, it should be considered a subject, and have equal status alongside the 3Rs of reading, writing and maths (Mercer, Mannion and Warwick, 2020; Alexander, 2020). Moreover, since the nature and quality of the language teachers use is critical in ensuring the successful implementation of dialogic teaching and learning, training, and guidance on how teachers can use talk effectively is needed. As Alexander (2020) explains, teacher talk is pedagogical, and therefore official guidance beyond the NC is needed for teachers to implement effective talk practices. I would concur with these suggestions but would add that policy makers also
need to be convinced of the value of more creative subjects such as process drama and the role of talk in these. The current policy focus reifies STEM (science, technology, and maths) subjects, at the expense of SHAPE (social sciences, humanities and the arts for people and the economy) subjects and the aesthetic, creative aspects of the curriculum.

A further barrier to encouraging dialogic teaching and the creative pedagogy of process drama includes the ITT Core Content Framework (CCF) (DfE, 2019). The section on how pupils learn in this framework is defined purely in terms of acquiring knowledge, by focusing on memory and recall, which is likely to reinforce the IRF pattern of talk in classrooms. The role of creativity in teaching and learning is absent and drama is not mentioned at all. Moreover, there is only a brief reference in this document to the role of questions and high-quality classroom talk to extend and challenge pupils' thinking and learning and there is no reference to developing autonomous learners.

The strong emphasis on knowledge acquisition and memory in the CCF has been criticised for not focusing enough on the social contexts of learning, and its definition of memory is also seen as simplistic, focusing on recall or semantic memory, and ignoring episodic and procedural memory and the metacognitive, social, and emotional aspects of memory (Turvey et al., 2019). Defining learning as a narrow aspect of memory is a major concern for the future of a sociocultural view of learning, dialogic teaching, creativity and emotion in learning, all characteristics of process drama. Yet the nature of process drama and its potential to develop group creativity and problem-solving, empathetic, and divergent thinking is of considerable value in the future lives of pupils growing up in an ever-complex world. Moreover, there is a need for educators to develop agreed definitions of creativity and a range of creative pedagogies to use in their practice (Cremin and Chappell, 2021), including I would argue process drama.

Immordino-Yang and Damasio posit that real or imagined events can induce emotion, which can make changes in the body and mind such as the ‘focusing of attention, calling up of relevant memories and learning the associations between events and their outcomes’ (2007; 7). Imagining events is central to process drama, which as this study has shown, can induce powerful emotions, and support meaning making in a memorable manner. Furthermore, current neuroscience research underscores that rather than emotion interfering with complex cognition, emotion in relation to abstract thinking may motivate deep and hard thinking (Gottlieb, Yang and Immordino-Yang, 2022).

Neuroscience suggests there are three core networks in the brain which interact with each other, and support thinking and learning through social, cultural, and emotional contexts
In essence, the Executive Control Network relates to in-the-moment thinking such as goal-focused learning, paying attention, persistence, and empathy. The Default Mode Network relates more to emotional reflection, daydreaming, deep abstract and conceptual meaning-making, creativity, imagination, intrinsic motivation, and complex social emotions (Immordino-Yang, Darling-Hammond and Krone, 2019). The Salience Network acts as a pivot between the other two networks since it is not possible ‘to attend to the outer world and to inner reflections simultaneously’ (Immordino-Yang, Darling-Hammond, and Krone, 2019: 189). Additionally, theories developed by significant scholars including Vygotsky (1978), Bruner (1986) and Rogoff (2003), which underpin sociocultural theory and this study, are seen as consistent with developing brain growth and deep learning (Immordino-Yang, Darling-Hammond and Krone, 2019; Gotlieb, Yang and Immordino-Yang, 2022).

As this study has shown, process drama provides opportunities to think in the moment, imagining, creating, empathising, questioning, and to reflect on thoughts and feelings, thereby developing growth in all three brain networks and encouraging different types of memory. Whereas the CCF (DfE, 2019) just emphasises recall through a focus on cognitive science, cognitive load theory and goal directed tasks such as retrieval practice. In this, knowledge is seen as more important than imagination (Willingham, 2009). This individual view of learning seems monologic and similar to Bakhtin’s (1981) authoritative talk and the banking model of education, where students memorise information, teachers teach and pupils are taught, teachers talk and are experts, whilst pupils are ignorant novices (Friere, 1996). This portends that teachers in England will need considerable support to value process drama and appreciate how thinking and memory could be fostered through it. Nevertheless, drama is based on and often creates narratives and as Hardy (1977) asserts, not only do we daydream, hope, despair, believe, construct, gossip, learn, hate, and love by narrative, we also remember by narrative. Narratives within process drama offer a way of developing memory beyond cognitive load theory.

The stance taken towards learning in England contrasts noticeably with the 2022 Curriculum for Wales (Government, 2021). This emphasises developing critical and creative thinkers, who can solve problems, be curious and inquisitive, express emotions, discuss, and debate. Moreover, the Oracy element of the Welsh curriculum has been developed in collaboration with significant English researchers in this field (Mercer and Mannion, 2018). Skills are emphasised in addition to subjects, which are organised into six areas of learning. One of these, the expressive arts, includes drama. Cross-curricular teaching is encouraged, apt for
fostering creativity, and lifelong learning is valued, rather than memorising knowledge in the short term for exams. With such a curriculum, oracy, creativity, and arts subjects such as process drama, are more likely to flourish in Wales than in England.

Furthermore, the culture of performativity, high-stakes assessment and the standards agenda identified by Ball (2003) is seen to be in tension with encouraging creativity in schools (Cremin, 2017). It tends to produce a narrowing of the curriculum and is associated with the current focus on memorising knowledge in the CCF (DfE, 2019), which often results in creative activities or arts subjects such as process drama being deemed as unimportant and squeezed out, since they are not assessed (Berliner, 2011). Until this high-stakes culture and policy change, the potential of process drama to develop agentive, creative, thinking pupils, who can empathise and talk freely is unlikely to be realised. An important implication for policy makers, therefore, is a reconsideration of the current very narrow view of how pupils learn, what is valuable to learn and a deeper understanding of the role of talk and arts subjects, such as process drama in learning. Some agreement on what constitutes effective teaching and learning between the four UK governments, informed by wider current research would seem to be a necessary way forward.

### 6.7 Recommendations for further research

Several areas for further research have arisen from my study’s findings. Firstly, some of the talk in this study, such as the co-constructed narratives and small group problem-solving aligns with findings from Vass et al. (2014) that creative, open-ended activities, rely more on emotional connectivity, humour and creative interthinking for cohesion than on reasoning. The study also indicated that process drama does not need the talk rules, prompts or discussion points to develop talk and reasoning, as Mercer, Hennessy and Warwick (2019) assert. The imaginative world of drama and its many conventions, such as TiR mediate and scaffold children’s talk in less formulaic ways. Since most of the research into talk has focused on reasoning, further research is needed into the nature of talk in other open-ended creative contexts, which may also offer such talk scaffolds.

My small-scale findings support claims made by drama scholars such as Neelands (2011) about the creative nature of process drama and its ability to develop teachers and children’s creativity. This could be a powerful way for schools to develop more creative teaching and learning. Therefore, research into the link between process drama and its potential to develop creative thinking and learning could be usefully explored.
Process drama involves the imagination through the creation of characters, narratives and the development of affect and empathy. This study did not have the scope to examine imagination and so research into the nature and role of imagination in pupils' learning in process drama would also be valuable. Moreover, empathy was revealed to be important in process drama through multimodal analysis. More extensive research into process drama using this method of analysis is needed, as well as the role of empathy in process drama and how monologic talk may contribute to learning in other arts contexts.

The methodology used to research process drama has been criticised for being mainly theoretical or qualitative in nature and lacking transparency and rigour (Omasta and Synder-Young, 2014). I affirmed this criticism, through my literature review, noting that even the quantitative studies had limitations. There is still therefore scope for both more rigorous and more transparent quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods studies of process drama. Finally for the findings to be generalisable to other school settings, further small-scale studies of talk in primary process drama would be of value, potentially strengthening or nuancing the claims made in this study.

6.8 Conclusion

I aimed to explore and examine the nature of talk in primary process drama. My study revealed that process drama has the potential to develop a range of talk, which in turn can develop different types of thinking, foster meaning making and evoke emotional responses. Process drama supports problem-solving, collaboration and co-creation between pupils and teachers and pupils. It is also a way of developing teachers as creative practitioners, who co-create alongside pupils. I found that the key forms of talk fostered within process drama are co-constructed narrative, questioning and empathetic talk. I also found that the status of the TiR plays a critical role in determining whether the talk is dialogic or monologic in nature. Theoretically, I argue that talk in process drama takes place within a dialogic space.

To conclude, my study reveals that process drama’s dialogic space can develop a range of ways of talking and thinking on the part of teachers and pupils. It has the potential to develop empathy, a creative, dialogic pedagogy, and more democratic classrooms. The value of process drama deserves to be more widely recognised.
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Dear ………

Participant Information Sheet

The nature and value of talk in primary process drama

I am writing to give you some information about some research into talk and classroom drama, which I am hoping to carry out in your classroom, involving you and the children in your class. My name is Elisabeth Lee, and I am a lecturer in primary education at a university in South-East England. I am carrying out this research to inform the main study for my doctorate. My main supervisor in this study is Professor Teresa Cremin.

The aim of my research is to explore the nature and value of the talk used by both children and teachers when involved in process drama. In order to carry out this research I will need to record the talk and drama, using a flip camera. Although the intention is to video record sessions, this is purely as an aid for analysis. Using video will help me with transcription of the data and will also give some context for the talk within the drama. Only you and I will watch the video and the video will be destroyed after analysis has been carried out. You can of course share the videos with the children in your class, if you think this would be useful to you and interesting to the children. I will also make written notes whilst observing the drama.

No images of children will be used in any of the reports, or in my final theses. Selected extracts from the video will be transcribed for analysis, but any names of children used will be pseudonyms. The school, the teacher and any children who are filmed, will remain anonymous and pseudonyms will be used instead of real names, both when analysing the data and in writing my final thesis.

I will also use a Dictaphone to record your talk during some of the drama sessions, because I am looking at the sort of teacher talk as well as pupil talk that takes place in process drama. I am also planning to carry out a few semi-structured interviews with you after some of the drama sessions to ask about your thoughts and views on the drama that has taken place in that session.
In addition to this, I am hoping to talk to a few children in two group interviews, with another adult present to try to find out what they think about the two drama sessions. Only children and parents who consent to take part in these group talks, in addition to agreeing to being filmed involved within the drama, will take part in this extra data collection. These will be short and will not take up very much of the children’s time and will only take place after selected drama sessions.

Please be aware that the children can withdraw from taking part in this research at any time, without any negative consequences. They can do this by letting you know and I will also check each time that I work with a group of children that they are still happy to work with me.

The children and parents will be asked to sign a consent form if they are willing to let the child in their care take part in being filmed in the drama, and a separate consent form to take part in the group talks.

Please could you sign the consent form, if you agree to take part in this research and to confirm that you are happy to be recorded during drama sessions and semi-structured interviews.

Thank you for your time.

Elisabeth Lee
Senior Lecturer University xxxxxxxx
EdD student Open University
01707 285646
e.c.lee@herts.ac.uk
Dear ..........

Participant Information Sheet

The nature and value of talk in primary process drama

I am writing to give you some information about some research into talk and classroom drama, which I am hoping to carry out in your school with the year 6 teachers, xxxxxxxxxx and xxxxxxxxxx. My name is Elisabeth Lee, and I am a lecturer in primary education at a university in South-East England. I am carrying out this research to inform the main study for my doctorate. My main supervisor in this study is Professor Teresa Cremin.

The aim of my research is to explore the nature and value of the talk used by both children and teachers when involved in process drama. In order to carry out this research I will need to record the talk of the children using a digital recorder. I may also need to record some of the drama using a video recorder. Although the intention is to video record sessions, this is purely as an aid for analysis. Using video will help me with transcription of the data and will also give some context for the talk within the drama. Only the teachers and I will watch the video and the video will be destroyed after analysis has been carried out. It can of course be shared with the children if the teachers would like to. No images of children will be used in any of the reports. Selected extracts from the video will be transcribed for analysis, but any names of children used will be pseudonyms. The school, the teacher and any children who are filmed, will remain anonymous and pseudonyms will be used instead of real names, both when analysing the data and in writing my final thesis.

I also use a Dictaphone to record the teachers’ talk during some of the drama sessions, because I am looking at the sort of teacher as well as pupil talk that takes place in process drama. I am also planning to carry out a few semi-structured interviews with them after some of the drama sessions to ask about your thoughts and views on the drama that has taken place in that session.

In addition to this, I am hoping to talk to a few children in two group interviews, with another adult present to find out what they think about two drama sessions. Only children and parents who consent to take part in these group talks, in addition to agreeing to being filmed within the drama, will take part in this extra data collection. These group interviews will be
short and will not take up very much of the children’s time and will only take place after selected drama sessions. I will also make written notes, whilst observing the drama, all names will again be pseudonyms.

Please be aware that the children can withdraw from taking part in this research at any time. They can do this by letting the class teacher or myself know and I will also check each time that I work with a group of children that they are still happy to work with me.

The children and parents will be asked to sign a consent form if they are willing to let the child in their care take part in being filmed in the drama, and a separate consent form to take part in the group talks.

Please could you sign the consent form, if you agree to this research taking place in your school?

Thank you for your time.

Elisabeth Lee

Senior Lecturer University xxxxxxxxxx

EdD student Open University

01707 285646

e.c.lee@herts.ac.uk
Dear parents or carers

Participant Information Sheet

The nature and value of talk in primary process drama

My name is Elisabeth Lee, and I am a lecturer in primary education at a University in South-East England. I am also currently studying for a doctorate at the Open University. As part of this doctorate, I am hoping to come into xxxxxxx class for several sessions when the children are engaged in drama, so that I can collect some data on the sort of talk that is taking place during drama.

In order to carry out this research I will need to record the talk of both the teachers and the children during the drama, using a digital recorder. I may also record some of the drama using a video camera, in order to help me to write up the recorded talk and to give some context for the talk within the drama. Only xxxxxxxx and I will watch the video, although xxxxxxxxxx can of course share the video with children at a later date. In addition to this, I am hoping to be able to talk to a few children in a group after two of the drama sessions. I am hoping to find out what they think about two selected drama sessions. These will be short and will not take up very much of the children’s time.

Only the children and their parents or carers, who have given written consent will be recorded in the drama or the group talks.

I should complete my doctorate in two years’ time but will need to keep the information collected for up to two years after I complete my doctorate in case I need it for any writing which is published afterwards. After this the video will be destroyed. The children can of course watch the videos if they are interested. I will also be making notes, whilst I am observing the drama.

No images of children will be used in any of the reports or the final thesis for my doctorate. Selected extracts from the recorded talk will be written up and analysed, but the real names of the children will not be used. The name of the school will also
not appear in any of the reports for my doctorate, or any writing that I may do after completing my doctorate.

Please be aware that the child in your care can withdraw from taking part in this research, at any time, without any negative consequences. You can do this by either letting me or xxxxxxxx know. If you are willing to let the child in your care to take part in being recorded in the drama, please could you sign and return the attached consent form to xxxxxxxx. If you are also happy for the child in your care to be involved in the group interview, please also return the consent form for this to xxxxxxxx.

Thank you for your time.

Elisabeth Lee
Senior Lecturer University xxxxxxxxxx
EdD Student Open University
01707 285646 e.c.lee@herts.ac.uk

Open University EdD supervisor:
Professor Teresa Cremin: teresa.cremin@open.ac.uk
7.5 Appendix Five: Pupil participation sheet

Participant information sheet for children

The nature and value of talk in primary process drama

What is this research about?
This research is about the sort of talk that takes place in process drama sessions in classrooms. I would like to find out about what sort of talk takes place when children are engaged in creative activities, such as process drama. I would also like to know how your teachers might talk differently during classroom drama. Most schools and teachers do not use much process drama in their teaching, and I would like to help other teachers understand the benefits of this approach.

Who is doing the research and who is it for?
The research project is being carried out by me, Elisabeth Lee. I am an ex-primary school teacher and currently work as a lecturer at the University of xxxxxxxxxx, teaching student teachers. I am also studying for a doctorate at the Open University. The research is part of my doctorate.

If I take part in this research, what will be involved?
I will be observing lessons at the end of June and into July 2016. The exact dates will be finalised with your teacher. I am hoping to interview in a small group with children of your class, if you agree to this. You can decide if you want to or not. If you agree to take part,
you can change your mind at any time. You can ask me to throw away any information that I have collected about you by the end of July 2016. You can ask me to do this or talk to your teacher of parents about this.

**What will the interview be like?**

I would like to ask you questions about your views on process drama. I would like to know how you think you and the teacher might talk differently in drama. I’d also like to know how you behave in drama and what you find enjoyable about drama sessions. I will record what is being said instead of writing it down but I won’t film or your take any pictures.

**What will you be observing?**

When I observe lessons in your classroom I will write down what the children and teacher are doing in the drama sessions. I would also like to record what children are saying in drama with a digital recorder. Sometimes I might use a video recorder to record how groups of children are behaving together in drama.

**What will happen to the data?**

The interviews and observations will be written up and studied by me. All children’s and teachers’ real names will be taken out and the information will be stored safely at The University of Hertfordshire. The video will be given to your teachers, who may want to share the video with you, but my version of any video used will be destroyed after the data has been analysed. I will then meet with your teachers to talk through the findings from the drama. I will not tell teachers what any individual child has said in interviews. I will write a report for my doctorate. No real names of children, teachers or schools will be used and no pictures of children will be used in the report.

**What if I have any other questions?**

If you have any other questions about the study, you can ask your parent/guardian or teacher. They have my contact details. You can also ask me when I am at your school – I am happy to answer your questions.

Elisabeth Lee

EdD student The Open University
7.6 Appendix Six: Teacher semi-structured interview schedule

Teacher Interview Questions

1. What do you base your drama lessons on?

2. What sort of drama techniques do you use?

3. How often do you use drama?

4. How well did the children work together at the beginning of the year compared to now?

5. What about today’s drama? How well did that go do you think?

6. Do you think you behave differently in drama compared to other lessons? Such as using role.

7. Thinking about today’s session, when do you think the children were most engaged?

8. What about the pupils using their imagination today or in previous sessions; are there any examples?
9. Were there any examples of risk-taking or creativity today, or in previous drama sessions?

10. Overall, what do you think they've learned from today's session?

11. What about the way you're using talk? Do you think you are talking differently in drama?

12. Do you think there were any parts of the lesson where the way that you were talking supported the children to engage?

13. What sort of ways were the children talking today do you think? How did the session encourage them to talk? Did they talk differently to how they do in class?

14. Do you think they were having to use reasoning at all in today's lesson?
7.7 Appendix Seven: Pupil semi-structured interview schedule

- Do you enjoy drama and if so, why?
- How does it compare to other ways of learning?
- How did you find the drama that you did the other day? Was there anything you particularly enjoyed?
- Do you notice anything about the way the teachers talk? Is it different to how they talk in other lessons?
- Do you think the way your teachers talk in drama supports your learning?
- Do you use your imagination when you work together in drama?
- Do you think you talk differently, in drama, compared to other lessons?
- Do you think you were having to solve problems the other day in drama or in other drama lessons?
7.8 Appendix Eight: Vignettes selected for inclusion in the final thesis

The reasons for including vignettes or not from the transcribed data have been set out in a table for each of the three lessons.

Table One: The Mysteries of Harris Burdick

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode and Drama convention</th>
<th>In thesis</th>
<th>Why included in the thesis or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Warm up game, rather than drama, so not transcribed nor analysed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sun always shines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode One</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Teacher introduction to lesson and review of previous week’s lesson. Not drama, so not analysed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminding children of the pictures they looked at the previous week form <em>The Mysteries of Harris Burdick</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Two</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed and explored early in the analysis process. The speculative language was similar to episode one from <em>The Arrival</em> lesson. Therefore not finally included because of the repetitious nature of the data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil group talk - who could be moving into the house on the street, in role as neighbours?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Three</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed and explored early in the analysis process. TiR and pupils in role together, co-constructing the narrative. Not included to avoid repetition, because episode five and episode nine are also equal status TiR with co-constructed narrative. Vignettes from these two episodes have been included in the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal status TiR and co-constructed narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils in role as the neighbours and teachers in role as the new family who ask the pupils what the neighbourhood is like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Four</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>There were several examples of teacher narration, introducing the next drama episode in this lesson. This example is included because it is an example of when the teacher followed the narration with a series of possibility broad questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vignette Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher narration introduces <em>rumours</em> about the disappearance of Harry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Five - Vignettes Six and Seven</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This example of equal status TiR co-constructing the narrative with the whole class was included because initially the teacher asked questions, which closed the pupil talk down. When she suddenly went into role, this opened up the talk for the pupils and she eventually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode and Drama convention</td>
<td>In thesis</td>
<td>Why included in the thesis or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Six</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stepped back to let the pupils take control of the talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion, picturing and imagining what kind of street Harry lived on</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A brief discussion asking pupils to imagine, picture and speculate what they thought Harry’s house might be like. It was not included because it is similar talk to the pupils speculating who the people are in the illustration from Episode One, Vignette Twelve from <em>The Arrival</em> lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Seven</strong> - <strong>Vignette Nine</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>There were several examples of teacher narration, but their influence on the subsequent talk differed, depending on the nature of the teacher questioning which followed. This teacher narration led into the first example of objects in the room. This is included as well as a second example of this drama convention from <em>The Arrival Lesson</em>, because the nature of the talk in both examples differed greatly because of the difference in the teacher questioning and the extent to which pupils were invited to ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher narration</strong>, introducing <strong>Objects in the room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some pupils in role as the family’s furniture, who are questioned by the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Eight</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed and explored early in the analysis process. This was very short and led into pupils working in groups together in role. So, this was explained in the final thesis, rather than included as data, to provide a context for to explore some of the group talk, which is included in the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIR, narration and improvisation</strong> - Dad wakes up in the night, drinks milk from the fridge and sees a lump in the carpet as he talks to the cat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Nine</strong> - <strong>Vignettes Two, Three and Four</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Teacher narration included because it is short and another example of the teacher creating mystery and inviting pupils to speculate through creating a mystery, followed by more strings of possibility broad questions, a feature of this lesson. Different examples of the pupils talking with teachers were included since the talk differed in nature, depending on whether the teachers asked the pupils lots of questions, joined a group or just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher narration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting the scene for the next morning when the cat has disappeared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal status TIR with pupils in role and independent Pupil group talk in role</strong> questioning dad about the night before.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode and Drama convention</td>
<td>In Thesis</td>
<td>Why included in the thesis or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>listened, or joined a group and joined in as an equal status TiR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Ten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TiR, Rumours and co-constructed narrative</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed and analysed, but episode four was also an example of <em>rumours</em>, so not included because of repetition of data type. Also, the equal status of the TiR used with rumours, in episode four contrasted starkly with an example of a high status TiR in episode six of The Iron Man lesson. So, these two examples were selected, since they corroborate much of the literature on Process drama, which argues that the status of the TiR influences the nature of teacher pupil relationships and interactions in role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Eleven</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher briefly narrates in role to conclude the story and the lesson.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Transcribed early in analysis process. Not analysed since this concluded the lesson and did not involve drama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table Two: The Arrival Lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode and Drama convention</th>
<th>In Thesis</th>
<th>Why included in the thesis or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warm Up</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not included because it was a warm-up, and it involved the teacher doing most of the talking. However, it is set out here because the questions relate to the themes in the story of <em>The Arrival</em>, which became developed as the pupils engaged with the drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils in a circle an asked to move across the circle. Move if you’ve ever…. had to move house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been to a country where you don’t understand the writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been to a country where you don’t understand the language, ever felt like an outsider ever felt like you’ve been treated with suspicion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode One - Vignette Twelve</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Looking at picture from 'The Arrival' and asked to talk in pairs about what they wonder about the picture using the stem ‘I wonder….’ It wasn’t possible to record the paired talk, but the suggestions from the paired talk were shared as a class in this vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘I wonders’ shared as a whole class fed into the questions the pupils asked the Low-Status TiR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Two – Vignette Thirteen</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This is the only example of a low-status TiR in the data set. It is included for this reason and because it illustrates the potential of a low-status TiR to foster empathy in pupils. This vignette was analysed with multimodal interaction analysis, which is another reason why this was included in the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low status TiR hot seated by pupils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Three – Vignette Fifteen</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This was one of several examples of teachers and pupils stepping out of the drama to discuss thoughts and feelings. They were all in this lesson and all differed slightly and so all are in included in the thesis. This discussion indicates that the empathy generated in the previous episode continued to be evident in this discussion outside of the drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole class discussion reflecting on how the previous episode had made them think and feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode and Drama convention</td>
<td>In Thesis</td>
<td>Why included in the thesis or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Four</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Freeze Frame, Thought Tracking</em></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>This was not included because most of the recorded talk consisted of both the teachers talking separately to different groups about what the family could be doing as part of daily life. Each pupil was tapped on the shoulder and asked to say what they were thinking. This wasn’t included, because some pupils were confused and said what their characters were doing, rather than thinking. This could have been because freeze frame, thought tracking is usually used at a moment of high tension or dilemma in a story, rather than a mundane moment in the family’s daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Five – Vignette Sixteen</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>This second example of discussion outside drama differed from the first example in episode three. Here, the pupils were thinking about the themes of the drama and to consider why things happen in real life, inviting dialogic talk such as the teacher extending the pupils’ responses and ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Six</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at a different illustration of the objects, which also appear in the first picture. Children shown illustrations of objects in the story and asked to suggest what could be happening in the story, what clues the objects give, and what questions they invite the pupils to ask.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>This was not included, because this was a discussion about the role of the illustrations in storytelling more than a discussion about the drama itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Seven – Vignettes Ten and Eleven</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Although this is the second example of <em>Objects in the Room</em> the nature of the teacher questioning created very different talk to the first example in the Harris Burdick lesson, Episode Seven, Vignette Nine. Therefore, both examples of the same drama convention have been included in the thesis. This episode was also analysed using multi-modal interaction analysis, but was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode and Drama convention</td>
<td>In Thesis</td>
<td>Why included in the thesis or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Eight – Discussion outside drama</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>This was not included since it repeated other examples of speculation and therefore repetitious. The discussions prepared and supported the pupils to move into the next drama episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Nine – Vignette Fourteen</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This was included, since it was a different example of empathetic talk, but it was the pupils working in groups independently and then performing to the whole class rather than the empathy being evoked by the TiR. Multimodal Interaction Analysis was used, since the use of movement, space and sound differentiated this from the earlier use of this method to analyse Episode Two, Vignette Thirteen of this lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Ten – Vignette Seventeen</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>This discussion was included since although it is like episode five, vignette sixteen, which was dialogic talk, it focused on their thoughts and feelings towards the whole drama lesson, rather than considering why things happen in real life, such as people moving to different countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table Three: The Iron Man Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode and Drama convention</th>
<th>In Thesis</th>
<th>Why included in the thesis or not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode One</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not analysed since most pupils mimed. The episode supported the pupils to change to the farmers' viewpoints. In the previous lesson, they had been in role as The Iron Man or seagulls, mainly through mime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups in role as farmers, creating an everyday scene of their lives. Each performed and most were mimed. mime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Two</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not analysed because it was very short and repetitious of episodes one and six from The Arrival. It led into the next longer episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In groups pupils discuss what an emergency town meeting could be about, and to consider if anything strange has happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Three</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not included in thesis because although the TiR is running the meeting, she was also co-constructing a narrative with pupils and increasingly behaved like an equal status TiR. The talk is very similar to episode five in The Harris Burdick lesson and therefore repetitious of data already analysed in the thesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town meeting, high status/equal status TiR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher sat on chair and said something drastic had happened the previous night. The pupils were invited to suggest what it might be in role. The TiR joined in, improvising and building on pupils' suggestions with further ideas or questions in role.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Four</strong></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not included, because short extracts from the novel were read throughout the two drama lessons, leading the pupils into the next part of the narrative and drama. It therefore did not involve dialogue nor drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher read more of the story – the Iron Man walking off into the sea. Read chapter two, Hogarth seeing the Iron Man on the top of the cliff and running home to tell his family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Five – Vignette Eight</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Analysed and included because this example of TiR running a meeting is very high status. It differs greatly from examples of an equal status TiR and co-constructed narrative from The Harris Burdick lesson and episode three from this lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High status TiR as town leader asked pupils to talk in pairs about what rumours they’ve heard about the Iron Man. TiR invited pupils to report on what their partner had said about the Iron Man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Six – Vignette Eighteen</strong></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>Included as another example of teacher narration, which also provides context to the subsequent pupil group activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiR as town council leader saying the community of farmers cannot let the Iron Man carry on destroying property – introduction to pupils working in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode and Drama convention</td>
<td>In Thesis</td>
<td>Why included in the thesis or not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups to solve the problem of the Iron Man leading into pupil group talk.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysed and included because it was the only example of pupils talking in groups problem solving together from the three lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupils talked together in groups to solve the problem of the Iron Man – different groups recorded, most working without the teacher</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Analysed and included because it was the only example of pupils talking in groups problem solving together from the three lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Episode Seven</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person from each group stood up and presented their group’s idea for how they would get rid of the Iron Man</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Not analysed, because this was not drama and was presentational talk, as each group explained to the whole class how they were going to solve the problem of the Iron Man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.9 Appendix Nine: Example of coded talk

This vignette is an example of the pupils talking together with the teacher:

1. Child: (unclear) to play with maybe
2. Child: Yeah, me too. I’d really like someone my age, because everyone is either older or younger.
3. Alison: Whereabouts do you think they’re coming from these people?
4. Child: Maybe another planet. Maybe another planet
5. Alison: A different planet! It’s possible, but unlikely! So where do you think, where do you think….what do you want to find out about them?
6. Unclear
7. Alison: Ah! Why do you think they might have moved?
8. Unclear
9. Alison: You’re a bit suspicious. What do you think?
10. Child: They could be criminals, so you don’t know
11. Alison: Oh you’re highly suspicious, you lot! Is everyone who lives on this street, a little bit dodgy then?
12. Child: Yeah (others agree)

The next vignette is of pupils talking independently together:

1. Child 1: I hope the people that move in are people to play with. That would be really cool. They better be good at gaming because…
2. Child 2: I wonder if they have, I wonder if they have daughters
3. Child 3: So we can play with them?
4. Child 1: I hope the person is an American so that we have like….
5. Child 4: Maybe he’s an alien!

6. Child 1: No! I don’t think it would be an alien. I hope he’s an American because he could tell us what’s in the other countries.

Child 2: I hope they have a dog because our dog could interact with their dog.
7.10 Appendix Ten: Lesson structures

The analysed episodes which have been included in the thesis have been highlighted

**The Mysteries of Harris Burdick**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Drama Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up and introduction to lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode One</td>
<td>Reminding children of the pictures they looked at the previous week form ‘The Mysteries of Harris Burdick’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Two</td>
<td><strong>Pupil group talk</strong> - who could be moving into the house on the street, in role as neighbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Three</td>
<td><strong>TiR and narration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pupils in role</em> - as the new family talk to the neighbours to find out about the new neighbourhood, in groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Four</td>
<td><strong>Teacher narration</strong> introduces <strong>rumours</strong> about the disappearance of Harry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rumours - Pupil group talk</strong> and some <strong>TiR</strong> speculating what could have happened to Harry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Five</td>
<td>Discussion, picturing and Imagining what kind of street Harry lived on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Six</td>
<td><strong>Teacher narration, introducing Objects in the room.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some pupils in role as the furniture, teachers question the pupils in role as furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode seven</td>
<td><strong>TiR, narration and improvisation</strong> - Dad wake up in the night, drinks milk from the fridge and sees a lump in the carpet as he talks to the cat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Episode eight

**Teacher narration**

*Improvisation* and TiR – Pupil group talk in role questioning dad about the night before.

### Episode nine

*Rumours* - The neighbours are invited around for a party. The teachers are in role questioning the pupils and the pupils answer the questions in role.

### Episode Ten

Nothing happens for two weeks, the cat never turned up and then it happened again. The teachers narrate in role and the lesson concludes.

---

### The Arrival Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warm up</td>
<td>Move if….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode One</td>
<td>Whole class Looking at picture from ‘The Arrival’ and asked to talk about what they wonder about the picture using the stem ‘I wonder….’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Two</td>
<td>Pupils hot seat the mother, with teacher in role (TiR) as the mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Three</td>
<td>Whole class response to the drama, talking about how it made them think and feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Four</td>
<td>Pupils in groups, preparing and creating a still image of the man in ordinary life, talking to each other and explaining their ideas to the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Five</td>
<td>Each group in turn shares their scene with the rest of the group. Half the class presents, whilst the other half watches. Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Six</td>
<td>Whole class discussion about what is going on. What causes people to leave their countries and seek a new life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Seven</td>
<td>Looking at a different illustration of the objects, which also appear in the first picture. Children shown pictures of objects in the story to work out what is happening in the story and what clues the objects give. The teacher prompts them to work out what the word symbol means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Eight</td>
<td>Some pupils in role as one of the objects in the illustration. The other children ask the ‘objects’ in role questions to build a picture of the family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Nine</td>
<td>Pupils talking about the family leaving in small groups and then as a whole class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Ten</td>
<td>Freeze frame at the end of the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode Eleven</td>
<td>Review of the lesson - Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Iron Man Lesson**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Changing viewpoint to the farmers Groups in role as farmers working. Pupils in groups come to life as groups of farmers – most mime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Town meeting – TiR as leader (more like a messenger, inviting them to a town meeting). Out of role, discuss what they think the town meeting could be about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Episode</td>
<td>In groups for a few minutes, speculating what the town meeting could be about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>Town meeting TiR – going round in a circle, each pupil in town saying what has been damaged or gone missing on their farm - Concludes meeting TiR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Alison reads more of the story – the Iron Man walking off into the sea. Reads chapter 2, Hogarth seeing the Iron Man on the top of the cliff and running home to tell his family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Reading leads into pupils talking for about a minute and then reporting on what rumours they’ve heard about the Iron Man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>TiR as town council leader saying the community of farmers cannot let the Iron Man carry on destroying property – introduction to pupils working in groups to solve the problem of the Iron Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>Pupils talk together in groups to solve the problem of the Iron Man – different groups recorded, most working without the teacher –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>One person from each group stands up and presents their group’s idea for how they will get rid of the Iron Man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 7.11 Appendix Eleven: Multimodal analysis of Objects in the Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Posture, bodily gesture and action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elisabeth Lee is the book that the father and the son read every night</td>
<td>On the left side of the circle</td>
<td>Moves forward slightly into the space in the circle, kneeling on the floor</td>
<td>Looks at Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hannah asks what memories does he hold?</td>
<td>Sat on throne chair, leaning forward in chair towards child, lower legs crossed</td>
<td>Looking at Elisabeth Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elisabeth Lee mentions that the father, um, told his son that he would be gone for a while. They read the book three times, before he went to bed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hannah asks if it is a memory of…?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elisabeth Lee explains that it is a memory of sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hannah asks if it is sadness or in what way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elisabeth Lee says that it is a memory of sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hannah asks her questions of the origami bird</td>
<td>Turns towards child with hand up</td>
<td>Looks at child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ruby lifts up her head as Hannah speaks</td>
<td>Opposite the teacher in the circle</td>
<td>Moves forwards into the circle a few feet on her knees. Stretches arms out to mimic a bird</td>
<td>Looks towards the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hannah asks if they can ask questions for the origami bird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ruby asks if they can ask questions for the origami bird</td>
<td>Lifts head up as Hannah speaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alison asks if they have any questions for Elisabeth Lee, or for the bird?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hannah asks if they just take their time</td>
<td>Uses hand towards Ruby as the bird to indicate that they should ask her questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Alison asks if they have any questions for the bird?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Child asks how many years have they been made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Ruby</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>To the right of child who has asked the question</td>
<td>Looks up, pauses and then gives answer</td>
<td>Turns towards child on her left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Alison</td>
<td>Ann, what’s your question for the bird?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ann</td>
<td>Why were, why were you made?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Ruby</td>
<td>Because of happy memories that I can cherish forever</td>
<td>To the left of Ann on her right who has asked the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Child</td>
<td>Did the child have any help making you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Ruby</td>
<td>Yes, from the father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Alison</td>
<td>Ok is anyone else ready to come in? (Noise of children moving)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Alan and Tom</td>
<td>I am the cage of the bird (only Alan speaks)</td>
<td>Alan's cage shape is a few inches above Tim</td>
<td>Tom and Alan move into the circle, just in front of the teacher. Tom kneels crouched on the ground, with arms out bent, which hover to mimic a bird. Alan makes an arch with his body a over Tom to mimic a cage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Alison</td>
<td>(After a pause) What memories…. What have you seen in your time in this room? What do you remember?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Alan</td>
<td>Me seeing the child and the dad playing games and knocking over a vase. (Alan and Alison laugh)</td>
<td>Still arched over Tom</td>
<td>Looking to the floor and then turning to his right</td>
<td>Looks at Alison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Elaine</td>
<td>Were you found or bought? Were you found or bought?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Alan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Tom</td>
<td>Um…. after a while I was found</td>
<td>Opposite Elaine</td>
<td>Stays in kneeling position of bird and looks towards the ground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 John</td>
<td>I am the suitcase that holds my clothes…. His clothes and precious belongings.</td>
<td>In between Alan and Tom and Ruby</td>
<td>Moves into the circle on his knees, with his hands on his knees and his head facing the floor as he speaks. Once he has finished speaking, he puts his head down to the floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Ruby</td>
<td>What memories do you hold? About a foot away from John</td>
<td>Looking down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 John</td>
<td>I hold a picture of my family, a picture of my family and precious things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Have you been used before?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>Yes, by the mother when she went to work and had to bring other belongings with her.</td>
<td>Lifts head slightly</td>
<td>still faces the floor as he speaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ruby</td>
<td>A foot to the left of Ruby</td>
<td>Moves into the circle to the left of Ruby and lies on his front with his elbows on the ground and his head up</td>
<td>Looks towards the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifts one arm up off the ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Have you been used in happy times or sad times?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>I've been used in happy times and sad times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>What happy times were there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Er…. That was when we went, as a family we went to, er on holiday to, I think it was a beach place? But, then I wasn't really used anymore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moves off his arms and sits back on his knees and puts his arms out straight over Tom to indicate cage still</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Shakes his arms which have been held out to indicate wings of the bird flapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks round and up at Alan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>A long time ago. Was that when the child was little or even before that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>That was when he was about four years old.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Oh! Thank you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>I'm the child’s bed, where the boy was crying when he heard about his father leaving the house and I hold lots of memories of the things in the child’s (unclear)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks up towards Hannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Does he sleep well at night?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pete</td>
<td>(unclear) because he’s worried about his dad</td>
<td>Puts his head and arms down on floor, once he has finished speaking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td>I am the jewellery box the mother had</td>
<td>On the left of the circle, halfway</td>
<td>Moves forward into the circle, kneeling on the floor facing the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>What memories do you hold?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>When the child gave her a necklace for Mother’s Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Do you hold a lot of jewellery, or is it just a little?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I hold many parts of jewellery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>What kind jewellery?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I hold the marriage ring from the father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>I am the pot that sits on the stove, with which they shared their last meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>(After a pause) What was their last meal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Um…. they made home-made soup. That they had found …… the ingredients which they collected together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Where did they find the ingredients?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>They were out and they were exploring, and they thought it would be great to bring ingredients home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>How….?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>How long have you been in the house for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Um….several years, it will be six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I’m the grandfather clock that sits on top of the cabinet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>What Memories do you hold?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I hold the memories of when the child was born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Where was he born?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Um......um....... He was born in the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>To the left of Mike and to the left and behind John who is further inside the circle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whilst Mike is talking moves forward on her knees whilst Mike is answering the last question. Clasps her hands together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Nods towards Amy to gesture that she should speak.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>To the left of Mike and to the left and behind John who is further inside the circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sitting outside the circle looking towards Abbie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Still kneeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>To the right of the teacher, in between Sophie and Pete.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moves slightly into the circle. Sits up on Knees with arms above her head, with elbows bent and hands touching (to suggest a picture frame?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>What kind of picture? What did they do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>They drew all their family together, in one picture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>To the right of Rose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns her head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>He used all his crayons. All the colours of the rainbow he used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>(Whispering) Ok. And relax. Do you want to move forwards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.12 Appendix Twelve: Multimodal analysis of hot seating of low-status TiR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Posture, bodily gesture and action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hannah: Now! OK. So I’m going to do a quick explanation. So the father, oh the mother...and I’m going to be the mother, are about to leave the family home. OK? So I’m going to come in, in role, about to leave the family home. OK? And I want you to ask some questions to me as the mother and see what comes out about what we can find out about the mother from the questioning. Does that make sense?</td>
<td>Sat on throne like chair, with children sat on the floor around the teacher</td>
<td>Stands up and walks through the circle of children</td>
<td>Looks down at notes and up at the children, whilst explaining the task.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>So, I’ll help you organise yourselves. So talk to each other for a second about what sort of questions you want to find out from the mother. (sound of children talking to each other). You can ask any questions (sound of children talking for a few minutes).</td>
<td>No film of A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alison: OK, are we ready with some questions? OK, so you need to be very sensitive towards, very sensitive towards Anna. This is Anna. And we need to think very carefully about the questions we’re asking. We haven’t got a lot of time, so you will need to think really carefully about the questions that you’re asking. (in role as someone introducing the class to TH in role as ‘Anna’, the mother). A much quieter voice in role Sally, you had your hand up</td>
<td>No film of A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TiR Hannah</td>
<td>The teacher is sat back down on large throne like chair</td>
<td>Legs crossed, shoulders hunched up, arms wrapped around her, leaning slightly forward</td>
<td>Nods to child who has her hand up to ask a question. Drawn, weary, resigned, worried look on her face, half trying smile for her audience (almost a fixed smile)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sally: What’s inside the box?</td>
<td>Sat four or five feet away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Two boys</td>
<td>Sat a few feet away on chairs</td>
<td>Leaning towards the teacher</td>
<td>Staring straight at</td>
<td>One has hand over their mouth. The other has their hand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

225
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Proxemics</th>
<th>Posture, bodily gesture and action</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Two girls sat on the floor near the teacher</td>
<td>Close to the teacher</td>
<td>Crossed legged on the floor, leaning towards the teacher</td>
<td>Staring straight up at the teacher without looking away</td>
<td>Eyes look fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: (in a slow, sad, hesitant, flat voice) Well… the case is… the case that we took out of our wardrobe… and… we’ve packed it… with… all the things that my husband might need. (pauses) So he has a change of clothes in there… his toiletries……..(pause) I think it would have been good for him to have had another warm coat. But, at this point…. we can’t.</td>
<td>Leans back slightly and shrugs and shakes her head (saying there is nothing they can do about it). Shrugs again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pupil 2: Do you have any children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: Yes we do……… Yes…… We have a little boy (Blank, weary, resigned tone of voice)</td>
<td>Close to the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Same 2 girls</td>
<td>Close to the teacher</td>
<td>Sat on the floor</td>
<td>Staring up at the teacher intently</td>
<td>Eyes look intently at the teacher, looking fearful and worried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TiR Hannah</td>
<td>Leans back, turns head and looks towards a pupil asking the next question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pupil 2: Why are you leaving?</td>
<td>A few feet from the teacher</td>
<td>Sat on a chair</td>
<td>Looks at the teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: I’m not leaving. No, I, I, I… I can’t! My husband’s leaving. He has to go. Er…. He has to go…… we need… (loud sigh) …… we need some future……….</td>
<td>Pulls one hand up towards chin. Shakes head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frowns and grimaces (indicating having no alternative?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Elisabeth Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>It’s not here!</td>
<td></td>
<td>fear or nervousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shakes head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>(Speaks quietly, with a tone of despair and desperation)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stares at child who has asked the question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Alison: Have you got any more questions you want to raise in your head, that haven’t been asked before?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: We just can’t afford it. We don’t know what’s out there. It’s hard…. at the moment. You know it yourself…. and so….we’ve got to go….. he’s got to go……. It’s the only way. And hopefully…. once things are better…. hopefully we can connect, we can come back together again.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moves hands into lap and leans forward, then leans back. Leans forward and twists hand up and then down. moves hand up and leans forward. Clenches fist. Moves fist forward and back.</td>
<td>Looks at the pupil who has spoken.</td>
<td>Looking down at the ground, then at the pupil again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pupil 4: What does your husband do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: Well! He’ll do anything. He really will. He’ll do anything; it’s been so hard around here these last few years. Er, he hasn’t been able to afford the luxury of having one job. It’s just whatever he can find, out on the streets and in the fields (emphatic, listing). But even that now. There’s nothing left. Yeah?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans forwards. Puts lower arm out, palm up and shrugs. Shrugs with both lower arms out. Pulls cardigan together with hand. Pulls on cardigan with one hand and leans forwards and backwards continually. Shrugs and leans back, then forward arm still pulling cardigan together.</td>
<td>Looks at pupil.</td>
<td>Looks up and then back at pupil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pupil 5: Where’s he going?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: Well.......</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans back and then towards child. Holds cardigan together with</td>
<td>Looks at pupil. Leans back looks up. Looks at pupil</td>
<td>Pulls a resigned face with mouth (grimaces)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He’s going to keep going, until he’s found somewhere that we can settle....... He’s going to go west...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or, or north...........</td>
<td></td>
<td>one hand throughout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We’ve heard it’s better there.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shakes head and shrugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>TiR Hannah</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns head towards children who are sat to her left (same boys who had hands over mouths at the beginning)</td>
<td>Looks at child who has hand up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pupil 6: Is your child missing?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat on chair to the left of the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: No, no, no! But you know what it's like. You want to protect your children. He doesn’t need to see this. He’s at school right now. And when he comes back.....we’ll, you know, put on a bright face...Pretend everything’s ok...</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crosses arms in front. Legs crossed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans forward, sits upright, puts hand up to her face. Moves slightly to the right and turns to face the child more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns back to face the whole class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks at child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shakes head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grimaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Half smiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moves up and down in front of face and changes expression from worry to a smile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiles broadly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worried face, then grimaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pupil 4: Does your child know what’s going on?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: As much as children do, I think. (Speaking quietly) I mean, he knows daddy’s got to go.........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>But (louder and more positive tone of voice, rising) ..... we’ve got to look to a positive future. That’s what we’re trying to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans back and pulls cardigan up to mouth and pulls arms and shoulders in to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hvordan gaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Proxemics</td>
<td>Posture, bodily gesture, and action</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pupil 7: How old is your child?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: He’s nine……He’s nine.</td>
<td></td>
<td>He’s got a brilliant future ahead of him……(Brighter and louder tone of voice)I hope (quieter and flatter tone of voice)I hope</td>
<td>Leaning back hand at pulling cardigan across at the top Shrugs</td>
<td>Looks up. Looks at pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pupil 2: What year is your husband leaving?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>TiR Hannah: The…well…now! He’s leaving today. Thank you (quietly)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns head to one side and then turns back Stands up out of seat</td>
<td>Looks at child. Looks down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.13 Appendix Thirteen: Multimodal analysis of ten-second drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</th>
<th>Posture, proxemics</th>
<th>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</th>
<th>Gaze</th>
<th>Facial expression and facial gesture</th>
<th>sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 boys stand up</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow drum beats through out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mimes picking up a suitcase and walking away from the group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 “son”</td>
<td>Bye dad (Flat tone)</td>
<td>Standing behind “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 “dad”</td>
<td>Bye (Flat tone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns around and hugs his “son”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 “son”</td>
<td>Bye (Flat tone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hugs “dad” back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 “mother”</td>
<td>Standing to the side of her “son”</td>
<td>Arm outstretched waiting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bye (Flat tone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bye (tone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steps forward to “wife” and they hug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 “son”</td>
<td>Please don’t go (pleading tone of voice)</td>
<td>Looking up at “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns around and puts arm around “son”.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Head down looking towards “son”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 “son”</td>
<td>Steps back from his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head bent down facing his son</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 “son”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks up towards “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Big “sad” eyes, stares pleadingly at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td>Slow drum beats throughout out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>“dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans head in towards “dad’s” chest</td>
<td></td>
<td>“dad”. Eyebrows down, slightly frowning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>“son”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulls a face as if he is about to cry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Don’t cry (flat tone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leans towards “son”, puts left arm around the shoulder of his “son” and rubs his “sons” upper arm with his right hand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>“son” And “dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bye (both speaking at the same time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>“dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walks away from son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>“son”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stares at dad as he leaves Waves to dad and looks sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>“mother” bye</td>
<td></td>
<td>Waves to dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>“dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turns around to face family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>All four boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sit down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4 girls</td>
<td></td>
<td>All three girls get into position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>“father” I’ll miss you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow drum beats throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>“mother” Bye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Father” pulls away from the “mother” and turns to his left to face his son and puts his hand out towards his son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>“son” Bye daddy!</td>
<td>Son crouching down</td>
<td>Looking up to “father”, “father” looks down at “son”. “Mother” to the right also</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>looks at the “son”.</td>
<td></td>
<td>All are smiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2:35 “father” Bye Jimmy</td>
<td>Bends down towards “son” and hugs “son” and pats his back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Leans forward towards “son” and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“mother”</td>
<td></td>
<td>then bends down towards the origami bird</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow drum beats through out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Teachers</td>
<td>Shush</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 “father”</td>
<td>Bye, I’ll miss you</td>
<td>Bends down towards “son” and pats him on his arm with his right hand and turns to walk away</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 “son”</td>
<td>Daddy! Wait!</td>
<td>Rushes over to “father” and grabs him. “father” hugs him back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 “father”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pats “son”’s back and then turns to walk out of the house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 New group</td>
<td>2 girls crouched on the floor. The “mother” is hunched up with her head in her hands. Her “son” is sat more upright on his knees to the left</td>
<td>One boy (the “father”) stands up and walks away and up stairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 loud drum beats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Son</td>
<td>It’s alright mummy. It’s the right thing to do, you know that.</td>
<td>Leans over and rubs “mother” on the back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 “mother”</td>
<td>Why does he have to leave? (Uses a tone of voice to mimic crying and despair. Sounds of sobbing)</td>
<td>Head in hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 “son”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puts hand on “mother”’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoulder and pats it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifts head and turns towards &quot;son&quot;. This child had experienced exactly this experience and had been separated from her father when he came to England</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks genuinely upset and smiles towards &quot;son&quot; in an appreciative way (for his attempts to comfort her?) Almost looks as though she has been crying for real, slightly red in the face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>&quot;mother&quot; and &quot;son&quot;</td>
<td>All three are standing together. The &quot;mother&quot; is on the left, the &quot;son&quot; in the middle and the &quot;father&quot; to the right.</td>
<td>Turn around to watch the new group (3 girls), who are in position. All three are standing together.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 loud drums to signal new group to start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>&quot;son&quot;</td>
<td>Please don't go</td>
<td>Puts arms around &quot;father&quot; and leans head on his shoulder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slow drum beats throughout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>&quot;mother&quot;</td>
<td>It's for the best (unclear)</td>
<td>Leans across and puts hand on &quot;Son's&quot; arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“father” turns and walks off to the right. “mother” and “son” walk off towards the right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Mother” and &quot;son&quot; sat on chairs. “Mother” puts head on one hand</td>
<td>“Son” has head down</td>
<td>“Son” and “mother” look despondent</td>
<td>3 loud drum beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td>Slow drum beats through out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 girls stand up and get into position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>“mother” a foot from camera, with back to camera. “Son” to the right of the “mother”. “father” facing both the “mother” and the “son”.</td>
<td>“mother” with back to camera.</td>
<td>“father” and “son” face each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Please don’t go</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking down towards “father”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I have to. It will be for the best</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking up towards “son”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moves to his left towards the “mother” and puts his hand on her upper arm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I’ll miss you</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looks down towards dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>You’ll always be in my heart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Looking up towards mum, staring into her eyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Laughs (embarrassed ?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Bye bye</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Speech/vocalisation/intonation</td>
<td>Posture, proxemics</td>
<td>Bodily gesture, action, and haptics</td>
<td>Gaze</td>
<td>Facial expression and facial gesture</td>
<td>Slow drum beats through out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>“dad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Dad” pulls away and walks off to the left and waves at “mother” and “son”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“mother” and “son” hug each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>