



Kent Academic Repository

**Lewis, Tyronne Antoin (2017) *Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting*.
Master of Arts by Research (MAREs) thesis, University of Kent,.**

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/67456/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

This document version

UNSPECIFIED

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Exploring, Sharing, Connecting, Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond): a practice-as-research study into the refinement of my self-directed learning model for key stage 3 Drama students

Tyrone Lewis

Submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Master of Arts by Practice as Research in Drama

School of Arts

University of Kent

Submission date: 22nd September 2017

Word count: 37,692

Tyronne Lewis MA Drama by Practice as Research:

Exploring, Sharing, Connecting, Affecting and (E.S.C.A and
beyond)

Part 1:

Abstract	4
Chapter 1 introduction	6
Chapter 2 The Sequential Learning Model (influences and refinement)	7
Chapter 3 Review in context	10
Chapter 4 literature review	14
Chapter 5 Methodology	38
Chapter 6 Thesis structure	50

Part 2

Chapter 7 Skills for Drama experiment	51
Chapter 8 Empathy for Drama experiment	80
Chapter 9 Knowledge for Drama experiment	94
Chapter 10 Conclusion	115
Bibliography	125

List of Appendices

		Page
Appendix A	Making use of E.S.C.A and Beyond	129
Appendix B	Participant information sheet	130
Appendix C	Consent forms	133
Appendix D	E.S.C.A and beyond curriculum overview	134

Abstract:

As a new Secondary school teacher of Drama, I created The Sequential Learning Model in September of 2014. It was a Drama curriculum that introduced key stage 3 students to the study of Drama; the model was a reaction to the disappointing GCSE results our centre received in 2013, which I felt this was partly due to an ineffective key stage 3 Drama Curriculum that was created long before I joined the school.

Whilst the Sequential Learning Model went some way to promote consistency and cohesion in my department, and contributed to the rapid increase in the GCSE results: 97% A*-C for the July 2015 cohort (a 34% gain on the 2014 results), it was clear that the model would require extensive refining in order to prepare students for the demands of the reformed GCSE examinations in Drama, grades 9-1 (first teaching September 2016). One of the changes to the Devising exam was for students to work without direction from their teachers.

This study examines the extent to which the revised version of The Sequential Learning Model entitled 'Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting' (E.S.C.A and beyond), promotes progress for eight students as they embark on their study of Drama. Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting are essentially the core values that underpinned my existing teaching practice and curriculum, and will be examined in part 2 of the Literature review and forms part of the Methodology.

This study will address the following question: **to what extent have the Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond) scaffolds that I have created promoted the skills, progress, and self-directed readiness that is required for success in the new GCSE Drama examination for devising?**

Since 'progress' is rather a broad term, and could present itself in a myriad of ways within a classroom setting, this study will focus solely on progress specific to the devising aspect of Component One from the Edexcel GCSE Drama (9-1). Moreover, this study will only report on the progress of the aforementioned eight case study students. These case studies represent a broad

spectrum of students and follows their journey as they learn using the Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting model; details about the case study selection process will be explained in chapter 5 (Methodology).

Chapter 1: Introduction: Drama's position

Drama encapsulates a range of skills necessary for secondary school success in the twenty-first century: it can foster excellent communication skills through its collaborative nature, and also nurture dynamic and creative problem solvers since it focuses more on one's interpretation, and problem solving with non-standard solutions. It is imperative, therefore, that all students have access to a rich and balanced Drama education.

Teachers of drama are faced with a profound challenge: they have to prepare students for an increasingly rigorous and linear exam system without a formal structure or curriculum in place to support them (Drama is not formally recognised by the national curriculum at Key stage 3). In times of budget cuts, reduced funding for the arts and increased focus on English Baccalaureate courses, Drama's place in mainstreams schools is beginning to look uncertain. Some might argue that the aforementioned issues are the cause of falling numbers at GCSE: the Cultural Learning Alliance reports that approximately 65,000 students started the course in September 2015 which was a 13% drop from September 2014.

Many students across the country experience success in Drama at GCSE level, but are standards in Drama likely to rise without the key stage 3 pedagogical guidance afforded to core subjects like English and Maths? Javier Espinosa, the education editor for The Telegraph, states that, 'humanities students are more likely to be affected by the changes where marking is more open to interpretation' (Espinosa, 2016) when discussing the issues surrounding the more rigorous appeals process for GCSE examinations. This could potentially affect the number of students studying Drama beyond GCSE if they feel their results are less secure, or their achievements are 'open to interpretation'.

Chapter 2: The Sequential Learning Model (influences and the need for refinement)

As a newly appointed Head of Drama in 2015, I felt it was necessary to create a learning model to address the fact that whilst there was not a formal curriculum in place, learning at Key stage 3 needed to be as effective as possible in order to prepare students for success in the subject (at GCSE). My work as a cover supervisor, freelance drama facilitator in a range of schools across London, and as a trainee preparing for Qualified Teacher Status (Q.T.S) opened my eyes to the effect Drama's diminishing identity had at classroom and department level.

The most common and notable issues occurred when students had to tackle complex themes and events like The Holocaust in Drama. In most cases skill acquisition was a problem and teachers spent a large portion of the lesson asking students to 'speak up', 'stay in role' and 'use gestures to convey emotions'. This feedback was rather didactic and immediately shifted the focus from the issue being explored to 'skills'; subsequently, students struggled to re-engage with the issues being explored. As a result, some delicate and thought provoking stimuli were belittled and students often failed to engage with the cathartic and explorative aspect of Drama. I felt this issue arose because students were not being given the opportunity to first develop the skills of a performer and the ways in which vocal and movement skills can be used to communicate a character. I also witnessed very few instances where students were introduced to theatrical genres or the work of practitioners. Many subject leaders in the schools I worked in cited the poor engagement with the issues explored, and underdeveloped performance skills as their reason for only introducing theatre studies (engagement with different theatre genres and the works of practitioners such as Brecht for example) when it was a formal requirement for A Level Drama and Theatre studies.

I observed greater levels of consistency in Drama when it came to the teaching of key stage 4; I felt this was owing to fact that students were preparing for 'actual exams'. I wanted to ensure that students began working towards examination success earlier on in their secondary school journey

and I felt a curriculum that followed a prescribed sequence that separated skills, issues and theatre studies would be the best way of promoting progress specific to Drama.

The Sequential Learning Model introduced Year 7 students to Drama through three key modules and was taught across approximately forty-five hours of learning time.

- **‘Skills for Drama’** – introduces students to a range of explorative approaches and provides them with opportunities to develop their use of voice and movement. This unit is essentially designed to help students develop the skills of a performer, and also creates opportunities for them to apply these skills when introduced to explorative strategies such as mime, choral speaking, still images (and physical theatre and thought-tracking during year 8).
- **‘Empathy for Drama’** – provides students with the opportunity to develop their use of performance skills when exploring a range of issues that affect children from around the world. This unit’s primary focus is to help students empathize with different people through the medium of Drama; students look at ‘identity’ in year 7 and use their pre-existing performance skills to explore their own identity and that of a tribe in North America.
- **‘Knowledge for Drama’** – introduces students to different theatrical styles and genres from a range of epochs, and gives them the opportunity to use this knowledge to enhance and develop their work. The main objective for this unit is to help students set their performances in different historical contexts, making use of the conventions of the time to aid their exploration. Year 7 students study Ancient Greek Theatre.

The need for refinement:

Whilst the aforementioned structuring of the Sequential Learning Model was a success (91% A*- C at GCSE is the average for the past four years – since the introduction of the Sequential Learning Model), the recent 2016 GCSE reform has rendered many of the model's approaches redundant: a substantial portion of the activities in the original model were 'teacher-led'; pupil progress was primarily promoted through the use of formative and summative assessment that provided students with explicit guidance on what they needed to improve (and how). The new Edexcel specification states '...(teachers are) not allowed to offer coaching, direct students, undertake an artistic/creative role or give solutions to artistic/creative problems' (Pearson Edexcel Level 1/ Level 2 Specification for Drama 9-1: 21). These changes require higher levels of independence from students during the learning and development process leading up to examinations; this is important if they are to be prepared for the new demands by the time they reach 14+. This inspired me to examine the extent to which elements of my pre-existing model – chiefly its capacity to promote Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting throughout the curriculum – could be developed to promote the independence that is required for the new examinations. The review that follows sets this study in context in terms of the reformed examinations, its impact on the assessment of Devising at GCSE, the literature that is available in the realm of Drama education and the many elements that make up the new exam.

Chapter 3 Review in context: literature pertaining to the examination reform

The Conservative Government continued to develop the GCSE (and A level) reforms that were introduced under the Coalition Government; the principle aim was to, 'increase the rigour of qualifications, with an increased focus on examinations' (Long, 2017:3). There was also a desire to move away from the modular approach to GCSE examinations by introducing, 'a fully liner structure with all assessments at the end of the course' (Long, 2017:7). The Secretary of state for Education stated that plans for changes were, 'designed to address the grade inflation, dumbing down and loss of rigour' (Long, 2017: 6 [speech given on 7th February 2013]), and to, 'avoid learning through repeated assessment'. This was the intention for all subjects, including Drama, which was initially marginalised in favour of English Baccalaureate (EBAC) courses and caused uncertainty in many schools and 'concern about the treatment of creative subjects' (Long, 2017:5). Organisations such as The Cultural Learning Alliance (who help to ensure an access to culture is available through arts education) stated that 'the arts have the power to shape young people's lives' and highlighted the need to encourage young people to 'explore other cultures, past and present and...contribute to the arts and culture of the future' (Cultural Learning Alliance handbook, 2017:5). Support of this nature contributed to the eventual scrapping of the EBAC system that would marginalise subjects such as Drama in schools.

Review in context part 2: literature specific to the assessment of Drama

The reform has generated a standardised assessment of Drama. For the Pearson Edexcel Level 1/Level 2 GCSE in Drama, devising is '40% of the qualification' (Pearson, 2016: 4) which is exactly the same devising exam weighting as the AQA and WJEC examination boards (who also offer Drama). It would appear that 'rigour' has been interpreted to mean abolishing the teacher-directed aspect of the devising unit with Pearson stating that, 'when in a facilitating role, teachers are not allowed to offer coaching' (Specification, 2016:12). I believe this necessitates literature that focuses on the role of a facilitator during the devising process and is the first aim of the literature review that follows.

Virtually identical wording is used in AQA's new 9-1 Drama specification which states, 'teachers may not direct the performance under any circumstances' (AQA GCSE Drama Specification, 2017: 26). On the one hand, it could be argued that the new requirement for students to approach the devising unit independently actually highlights the academic demands associated with the subject, further cementing its place in the examination system.

The aforementioned similarity where the devising unit is concerned appears to be in accordance with the exam reform's objective: 'to allow standards to be set fairly and consistently' (Long, 2017:7), and would suggest that the marks awarded for devising are perhaps less likely to be determined by the exam board students are doing their exams with. For example, the pre-reform GCSE Drama specifications contained some discernible differences where the assessment of written work was concerned. The lack of written examination for the Edexcel board – students had to 'produce a documentary response to the (practical) work conducted' (Edexcel Drama, 2012: 11) – took the need for memorisation of drama terminology out of the equation. Students taking the AQA exam, however, completed a written examination paper that was comprised of three sections and had a focus on most of, 'the practical work completed during the course' (AQA Drama specification, 2014: 2) which was significantly more demanding.

Edexcel's somewhat 'easier' written examination had ramifications in terms of how the pre-reform devised unit was marked. Edexcel stated that the 'minimum uniform mark for grade D is 45 marks' (Pearson, 2012: 42); this figure roughly translates to students been awarded in the middle of the 'good band' for each assessment focus ('good' equates to a grade D) which many would not consider a 'good' grade or a strong pass; this highlights the 'grade inflation' Michael Gove spoke of as a reason for the reformed GCSE examinations. One could argue that this grade inflation may have inspired teachers of Drama to adopt behaviourist approaches in lesson that call for students to 'respond in the desired way' (Gregson and Hilier, 2015:40) if only to keep them 'out of the good band'. The removal of teacher-directed devising is arguably the removal of behaviourist approaches

and grade inflation where GCSE Drama (devising) is concerned, but is expecting students to be entirely self-directed too big a transformation?

The Cultural Learning Alliance recently published research findings that revealed, 'participation in structured arts activities can increase cognitive abilities by 17%' (The Cultural Learning Alliance, 2017:1) thereby highlighting Drama's potential to foster skills that are conducive to the twenty-first century learning the Government want to move towards; this is evident through their removal of modular examination which now places greater cognitive demands on students. These demands must be met with literature that supports teachers of Drama to promote the cognitive abilities required of students as they devise and refine without direction.

Review in context part 2: literature specific to the new assessment of Devising

In terms of the reformed GCSE's, Edexcel stated that they 'used the opportunity to re-design a qualification that will engage students through encouraging creativity, focusing on practical work which reflects twenty-first century practice' (Pearson, 2016:9). Edexcel also argued the case for devising stating that it is, 'essential for the development of new theatre and performance' and that 'it allows for personal development and exploration' (Pearson, 2016: 9). The new devising assessment also contains additional challenges for pupils in that they must also 'deliver a group performance of the devised piece' and 'perform for the rest of the class' (Drama spec, 2016: 9) but 'teachers are not allowed to offer coaching; direct students; undertake an artistic creative role (or) give students solutions to artistic/creative problems' (2016: 16).

Whilst the intricacies of one's practice at key stage 3 teaching practice does not appear to be a priority for exam boards, it is clear that teaching practices specific to devising will need to change to prepare students for the demands ahead. The purpose of the literature review that follows is to examine the available literature specific to Drama education and the demands of the new exam.

Chapter 4: Literature review

Edexcel recognises GCSE to A- Level progression and the fact that taking the course helps students to develop, 'an understanding of how to amend and refine work in order to make a smooth transition to the next level of study' (Pearson, 2016:2). There isn't, however, any reference to the key stage 3 to 4 transition. In fact, the specification states, 'there are no prior learning or other requirements for this qualification' (Pearson, Edexcel: 53). Literature that focuses on the way in which students can be prepared for the demands at GCSE is vitally important if students are to have a chance of success.

This review focuses on literature that is pertinent to secondary school Drama education and will examine what has been written about Drama curriculums, the pedagogy that underpins it and current practices related to devising and the promotion of self-directed learning.

Curriculum

Michael Anderson's book on Drama education touches on many aspects of Drama curriculums in schools. I would argue that his view that 'Drama sits in a unique place in the curriculum at the intersection between intellectual, creative and embodied education' (Anderson, 2012: 10) is an apt one and the higher attainment band criteria provided by Edexcel which states students must, 'offer comprehensive explanations of the creative intentions' (Person Edexcel, 2016: 21) appears to echo this notion. This assessment criterion suggests that students will need to demonstrate embodied practices and communicate intellectual and creative ideas through performance thereby requiring them to synthesise and engage in high level thinking, but in a self-directed way. Both Anderson's statement and Edexcel's criterion appears to highlight Drama's multi-faceted and complex nature compared to the reformed 'intellectual' subjects, but they do not offer any guidance on how best to promote these embodied practices that point to a dynamic learner and are recognised on an academic level (by the exam board).

It could, of course, be argued that the lack of guidance students are allowed to receive is to reflect the rigorous and challenging curriculum in which not every child can experience 'success' where Devising is concerned. In terms of 'success', there is a substantial amount of information pertaining to the expected standard and demands of the course, 'students must select stimuli and then be able to demonstrate how they have used it to create and develop a performance piece, this should include how they have rehearsed and refined their work with clear intent' (Pearson Edexcel specification, 2016: 10). Intent suggests purposeful devising and students 'arriving' with the knowledge that needs to be demonstrated throughout the course of the exam. I would argue that the above over-arching assessment objective would be hard for the majority of students to meet without having experienced a rich key stage 3 programme/curriculum. Students are expected to complete this diverse component in addition to component 2 which is 'externally assessed by a visiting examiner' where students perform 'two key extracts from a performance text' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016:5); this is in addition to a written examination on the 'practical exploration and study of one complete performance text' and a 'live theatre evaluation'. This leaves teachers with very little time to 'teach' and prepare students before the examination of the devising work begins, thereby necessitating better pedagogical guidance. Granted, the Edexcel GCSE Drama 9-1 Teacher pack does offer worksheets for students to use during the rehearsal process with instructions, 'use this worksheet to record discussions that you have as a group' and includes focuses for the meeting like, 'share initial research after first response to stimulus' (Pearson Education, 2016:39). There are even some useful questions like, 'how do you want people to act to your performance?' These provide teachers with some guidance with regards to the content, but this generic approach suggests that individual outcomes determine the marks awarded (some students may not 'sustain' their ideas for example). Teachers of Drama need pre-GCSE curriculum guidance to prepare students for this eventuality, especially if this is the level of support they can expect during preparatory stages. Once again, the structure of these supportive worksheets does promote self-

direction to some degree, but better guidance is required when it comes to the balance between theoretical 'planning' and the promotion of engagement during the actual rehearsal process.

Whilst I agree Anderson's view that, 'Drama teachers have at their disposal an enormously powerful pedagogy that has the potential of transforming young people', it clusters all students together and does not show any real recognition of the different learning abilities and dispositions that exist in schools across the country. These differences place a very unique set of demands on students who may experience barrier to learning such learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) or have behavioural needs such as Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. Examples of Pedagogy that demonstrates engagement with these diverse needs is important if we are to provide teachers of Drama with a better insight into what it can offer the students in their classroom in light of the curriculum changes. Throughout the course of my study, I will engage with literature specific to different learning needs like students learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) and use these findings to inform the curriculum design.

Neelands clearly outlines the purpose of 'child centred' approaches in Drama: 'the purpose of a child-centred curriculum is to respond to the child's present and developmental needs' (Neelands, 2010: 73). This serves as a better starting point in terms of the emphasis he places on the specific learning needs of individual students and its influence on curriculum choices. Neelands does not, however, present examples of what such a curriculum might look like in practice. There is the mention of a, 'feasible curriculum framework which is adaptable to individual need', but the planning examples at the start of this publication do not go beyond mentioning the age groups of students, 'seventeen mixed nine and ten year olds' the location of the school (Neelands, 2010: 9). These lesson outlines also lack engagement with the individual needs that he pinpointed; there is no mentions of students with specific learning needs, nor is there engagement with dispositions and backgrounds or those from higher or lower income households. Engagement of this kind is necessary

if teachers of Drama are to develop their pedagogy in a manner that promotes inclusion and allows students to develop as a self-directed learner irrespective of the aforementioned circumstances.

The new GCSE Devising exam has very specific self-directed aims. For example, students must show they can communicate meaning through 'rehearsing, refining and amending works in progress' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016:11). These demands appears to have been somewhat pre-empted by

Anderson who recognised the importance of 'providing a scaffolded learning framework' (Anderson, 2012: 68) in his book *MasterClass in Drama Education* that was published in 2012. His reference to a 'scaffolded learning framework' suggests support as opposed to explicit direction which is needed since, 'teachers are not allowed to make artistic/creative decisions' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 12).

Anderson does not, however, offer any insight into what a learning 'scaffold' in Drama looks like in practice; I would argue that this is essential as only then can teachers ascertain whether such approaches are effective and appropriate given the examination guidelines. His statement that 'the teacher must have knowledge of the students and a deep knowledge of the activities of theatre and drama pedagogy' (Anderson, 20112: 68) highlights some engagement with individual pupils and the importance of this when securing progress, but once again, Anderson does not offer any explicit guidance as to what this pedagogy might look like in practice. Gregson and Hillier refer to pedagogy as the 'artful judgement about what to do for the educational good of the students' (Gregson and Hillier, 2015: 248) which implies one's 'actions' in the classroom and the use of 'strategies' teachers put in place to secure progress. I would argue that the reference to pedagogy without actions and strategies isn't as useful a starting point.

Edexcel also offer little in terms of a 'starting point' when it comes to the devising stimulus and the subsequent assessment of the process, 'centres have free choice of stimuli, but the stimuli must ensure students can work collaboratively to create and develop the performance; and analyse and evaluate both the process and the performance' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 9). Here, the exam board appears to group practical and theoretical aspects, which appears to be another attempt at

introducing 'rigour' into the examination process. What appears to be missing, however, is pedagogical guidance that embeds both practical and theoretical elements. I would argue that the sheer volume of the assessment and multi-faceted nature of the course necessitates more explicit guidance. Neelands recognises the importance of, 'bridging the rehearsal and classroom (Neelands, 2010:139), but there do not appear to be any examples of how such practices might be introduced to students earlier on in their Drama education (so as to better support teachers who must plan for these demands).

Planning:

One could argue that engaging with the demands of the reformed examination is reminiscent of the Newly Qualified Teacher's experience in a department of very few, and starting from scratch where resources are concerned. Mike Fleming's, 'Starting Drama Teaching' devotes a chapter to planning. He shares case studies that articulate the devising activities undertaken by students of Drama, 'one simple activity involved the pupils in pairs at a supermarket or other modern contexts, gradually discovering that they have rats' (Flemings, 2003: 94); devising scenarios such as these offer teachers a starting point in terms of using stimuli to promote creatively and some independence of thought. It is not clear how challenge has been built into such tasks to allow for the higher level outcomes that are required at GCSE. There is a requirement for teachers to plan activities in such a way that these specific outcomes are indeed achievable during the process of devising; guidance in this area is crucial. Fleming does, however, pose questions about objectivity, 'what is the purpose of an activity of that kind' (Flemings, 2003: 94) following activity descriptors; this does reveal some engagement with outcomes, but Fleming doesn't offer any direction beyond these questions. Practical examples expounded by analysis of how activities have promoted achievement specific to the demands at GCSE are needed in order to shed light on how best to nurture students who are preparing for the devising.

Flemings does touch upon dilemmas surrounding the degree in which teachers of drama should plan their lessons; this is an important area of focus given the pendulum shift towards the teacher 'doing' less in the classroom. When exploring planning, Flemings considers '...whether to operate with a highly structured lesson plan which leaves little room for pupils to determine the shape and content of the lesson, or to go for more flexibility' (Fleming, 2003: 44). This statement suggests that in-depth planning restricts creativity and alludes to a freedom that is hard to fathom given the increasing demands placed upon Drama students today: 'when in a facilitating role, teachers are not allowed to offer coaching, direct students or undertake an artistic/creative role' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 12). Surely teachers need a more concrete guide on how progress could be fostered when working towards very specific outcomes? Also, Fleming's reference to 'flexibility' is not developed beyond this, thereby offering little guidance as to what this looks like in practice.

Surprisingly, very similar comments about planning are made in study guides that have been written for students; when discussing devising, the Edexcel study guide states, 'your teacher may have set structures for each lesson, or you may not be given any structure' (Elsden et al, 2016: 14). This is unhelpful without research that examines student outcomes in response to both tightly and loosely structured rehearsals approaches; only then can such claims offer a useful starting point for students and teachers alike. This openness raises questions about whether students are placed at a disadvantage creatively if their teacher imposes strict structures, or if not giving them any structure could result in under-performance. Such questions need to be addressed in response to practice that has taken place in preparation for these exams.

Fleming does state that, 'effective planning for drama needs to balance theoretical and pragmatic considerations' (Flemings, 2003: 44) which, in the case of the reformed GCSE Drama devising unit, might suggest a blend of research into the demands of examination specifications and teachers reflecting on their own experience of teaching Drama and their pupils needs in general. The main challenge for Drama teachers is likely to be working towards very specific self-directed GCSE

outcomes that are not part of their repertoire – arguably, pragmatism then becomes a challenge in itself if teachers cannot rely on their previous experiences teaching Drama in school. This issue of very new, specific and challenging assessment objectives does not appear to have been considered by the exam board who state ‘there are no prior learning or other requirements for this qualification’ (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 53). There is an absence of literature that focuses on the crucial key stage 3 to 4 transition and the planning that is needed to address the very challenging learning requirements of the new exam; in my context, for example, the emphasis on practice based and teacher-led Devising would have to change, but in the absence of explicit guidance.

Fleming goes on to state that, ‘Drama, perhaps more than any other subject, can easily lend itself to an emphasis on practical activity’ and, ‘theory without practice can easily become vacuous and irrelevant’. Fleming puts this into practice and provides a section of strategies/practical activities that could be used to offer teachers of Key Stage 3 Drama guidance. His task inspired by ‘Mantle of the Expert’ is linked to the theories associated with Heathcote and his engagement with teaching practice is evident when he refers to the fact that, ‘curriculum learning takes place through the expert role’ (Fleming, 2013: 62). Fleming’s writing does not, however, shed light on the very specific self-directed aims: the strategies identified, whilst useful, will most certainly need to be modified so as to make the execution of them less reliant on teacher delivery for example. Worked examples with an explicit focus on the course demands are necessary. This prompted further engagement with the exam board to ascertain whether they provide guidance in this area.

Edexcel suggest some strategies, ‘centres may practically explore stimuli using a variety of methods such as: whole class exploration, small group improvisations, creating tableaux’ (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 11). These approaches are logical given the explorative nature of the devising exam, but what is missing is the consideration of assessment and recognition of the fact that students are assessed on the extent to which they use these strategies to create, ‘refine and communicate meaning’. The middle achievement band states that students will need to have demonstrated, ‘effective and

sustained practical creation, development and refinement of ideas' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 20).

There is a need for pedagogical guidance in terms of how teachers can create opportunities for students to demonstrate an 'effective' use of strategies. Literature such as this is needed to support the planning process and enable teachers to successfully, 'undertake a management role in relation to managing time, space, resources' and indeed, 'help students with interpreting information' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 12) – two things the exam board does allow teachers to do during the examination, rehearsal and refinement process.

Self-direction:

The literature aimed at students goes some way in offering guidance on how to excel during the rehearsal process and the strategies that could be used. The text book states, 'creating a schedule could help you with organisation' and students are offered some explorative suggestions like, 'swap roles – seeing someone else do your role might give you a new perspective' (Elsden et al, 2016: 33). These strategies clearly point students in the right direction in terms of refinement and appear to have value for teachers: they are something that students could be guided toward so as to encourage self-direction and collaboration. The main issue with this exam board-issued student guidance is that they suggest pre-existing interpersonal skills and the ability to both reflect after each activity and use practical outcomes to move forward with rehearsal. The aforementioned student guidance implies students are self-directed; there isn't any guidance on how best to promote this self-direction. With this in mind, it is even more crucial that teachers have access to literature and lesson plans that provides learning scaffold guidance to support them with facilitation during the reflective process that follows such strategies (after roles have been swapped for example); this is necessary to help students see the significance of the process, thereby preparing them for higher levels of independence by the time they begin GCSE Drama.

Elsden et al also give student direct instructions like 'seek motivation in others' and 'come to rehearsal with energy' (Elsden et al, 2016:33). The literature does not appear to recognise that these

behaviours can hinge on the classroom environment, pupil relationships and the individual developmental needs of students. Once again, these outcomes point to a self-directed learner but there is no guidance from the exam board regarding how one might go about structuring the devising process to enable students to reach such heights; whilst they may be useful starting points, an extensive amount of synthesising is required if they are to truly be of use.

Van de Water et al offer guidance on how to, 'execute linear Drama lesson plans' that are designed to, 'be employed by teachers and teaching artists in a number of ways to facilitate student learning' (Van de Water et al, 2015: 32). This suggests a multi-faceted approach which is needed if teachers are to accommodate the diverse range of learning needs and self-directed learning style. This writing shows clearer engagement with fostering interpersonal learning behaviour; the tasks are fairly detailed and comments like, 'we usually demonstrate this activity with a volunteer' (Van de Water et al, 2015: 38) create a stronger sense of practical knowledge being used to inform the tasks. Each activity is followed by a section entitled, 'procedure' which includes instructions and learning aims, 'divide the group into pairs and ask them to delegate themselves as partner A and B'. Each task also comes with a set of 'side-coaching' prompts, 'make your movement clear and distinct so we can figure out exactly what you are doing' (Van de Water et al, 2015: 38) to help students execute the activity. This clearly has value in terms of presenting teachers with success criteria and providing an indication of the intended outcome. Teachers preparing students for the Edexcel Devising assessment, however, require a set of resources that are not reliant on such 'side-prompts' to promote achievement, and rather embed coaching through the activities themselves (to promote self-directed learning). Arguably, the exam board's criteria offers teachers a 'side prompt' by indicating the standard that is expected of students as they move through the bands; engagement with research into the ways in which activities can help to prepare students for higher band achievement could support teachers during the Key Stage 3 curriculum design process. There are some instances where the 'side-coaching' is phrased as a set of questions for example, 'can you find more than one way to...' (Van de Water et al, 2015: 42) which are more appropriate given the

demands of the new specification. I would argue that such prompts should serve as inquiry questions that inform any activity choices identified in the exam-specific research and that the analysis of these findings should be made available to teachers.

The above findings inspired me to engage more closely with literature containing pedagogy specific to devising to examine whether an existing model and example of teaching approaches was available to help teachers address the issues at hand and promote progress specific to devising (and self-directed learning earlier down the school).

Pedagogy (specific to devising):

Fleming points new teachers of Drama towards examples of lesson structures and schemes; one such activity on UFOs is outlined and stimulus details are provided for example, 'a newspaper headline article is shown to the class' (Fleming, 2003: 132). Fleming then goes on to state how this activity is developed, 'they question teacher in role' which, which offering some explanation about the direction the task, doesn't provide much detail about the developmental process which is clearly a large part of the new devising requirements. This comment also points to high levels of involvement from the teacher. He does, however, refer to 'the difficulties involved in translating ideas on paper into practical activities in the classroom' (Fleming, 2003: 2) thereby drawing attention to the fact there is a need for teacher support for Drama to be visual, allowing for them to see exactly how tasks are executed in practice. This would provide them with the opportunity to interpret the overall effectiveness in terms of pupil outcomes against the assessment criteria.

Also, there is this issue of the changing role of the teacher to consider. Fleming states, 'as pupils gain experience in the subject, they should be able to use dramatic forms to create meaning independent of the teacher' (Fleming, 2003: 127). Whilst this is ideal, there is still the issue of 'experience'; guidance is needed in terms of how best to promote the right kind of experience early on in the

students' educational journey so that they may be able to exude confidence and demonstrate this level of autonomy, but in a collaborative way.

Anderson highlights the importance of, 'moving students from the introduction of a topic to the process of making an idea into theatre' (Anderson, 2012: 106) in stage one of his model 'Devising theatre: collaborative play building' which appears to be a set of pedagogic steps that underpin his work. He highlights the importance of the stimulus and rejects the 'anything goes' approach to the developmental process. He also explores the idea of students using a range of dramatic approaches stating, 'it may be that students decide to use Brechtian techniques in their devised work' when discussing the refining process.

Stage two of Anderson's 'collaborative play building' manual introduces more challenging elements which appears to mirror the criterion steps provided by the exam board. For example, using Brechtian conventions independently during the refining process (stage 2) could enable students to demonstrate the high levels of confidence implied with top band, Edexcel criteria like, 'comprehensive engagement with the process of collaboration' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016:20); Brechtian theatre is associated with a number of conventions including placards and banners and the use of multi-role thereby challenging the students to use a wide range of approaches when devising ('wide ranging' is a synonym for 'comprehensive').

Anderson develops his devising argument in stage 3 and states, 'manipulation of these elements allows the drama to be changed to enhance the student's aesthetic control' (Anderson, 2012: 106) which suggests that students will need to manipulate the conventions employed to meet their demands. The issue here is that this points to high levels of creativity that will most certainly require some scaffolding from teachers, and it is here that guidance on the promotion of self-directed learning is needed. He continues with 'If students are able to respond using their understanding of the elements, they are beginning the process of manipulating, altering and refining'. Here, Anderson clearly offers some guidance in terms of what constitutes refining, but there appears to be a

considerable gap between Stages two and three; guidance is needed in terms of what learning could take place between stimuli and rehearsal, and refinement of rehearsal ideas using the conventions associated with practitioners such as Brecht. Without this, Anderson offers what could be interpreted as a curriculum outline that will require a substantial amount of development.

Pedagogy specific to collaborative learning:

In the absence of Edexcel GCSE Drama exemplar material (first examinations for 9-1 are in July 2018), I decide to re-engage with Anderson's writing to examine the collaborative learning pedagogical guidance he offers. He states, 'devising Drama means students must actively engage with each other for creation to work' and also shares that teachers and students 'have mutual responsibility to achieve a common goal in learning' (Anderson, 2012: 69). Statements such as this offer a guide in terms of the purpose and meaning of devising, but they appear to fall under what Anderson categorises as the 'theoretical knowledge' that teachers need to acquire/develop. He refers to this type of knowledge as being, 'specific to teaching drama in schools (books like this one for instance)' (Anderson, 2012: 60 – his brackets). There is not enough emphasis on what he calls 'practical knowledge' and 'the management of personal and interpersonal behaviour' in a Drama classroom. One would think the main purpose of engagement with the theories of Drama teaching would be to inform/promote changes to one's practice; the theoretical, technical, historical and cultural knowledge that Anderson refers to is helpful, but there is a need for explicit pedagogical guidance on how to distil these types of knowledge and use it to underpin the methods and practices we put in place to help students access the curriculum.

Anderson notes that, 'pedagogically in the classroom, drama learning involves students in group collaborative learning, coming together as shared participant creators of Drama. They do this by negotiating and exchanging ideas and roles to create, explore, challenge and solve' (Anderson, 2012: 60). This suggests that students will most certainly need to manage their own personal and interpersonal behaviour, thereby creating an even greater need for literature and pedagogy that

examines how the methods and practices that have been underpinned by theories can make use of key personal and interpersonal behaviour findings to enhance curriculum delivery.

Neelands' work on ensemble-based learning is also useful. He states, 'nothing can happen unless young people take action, initially through their social participation in making decisions, taking on roles and interacting with each other' (Neelands, 2010:138). Here, he has placed students at the centre of the learning and recognises both the social dimension and need for students to have their own role during the devising process. This is important given the exam board's stipulation that students must provide evidence of their, 'contribution to the creation, development and realisation' (Pearson Edexcel GCSE 9-1 in Drama, 2016: 15). Neelands does not offer any guidance beyond this in terms of what 'taking on a role' might entail, or how best to promote this pedagogically in the classroom/ rehearsal space. There is a need for literature that both offers guidance on, and promotes ensemble learning and independent contributions concurrently.

Pedagogy specific to self-directed learning

In terms of students as self-directed learners, Van de Water et al focus on 'assessment' in their book and the extent to which activities test for, and promote self-direction. They state, 'students develop self-awareness while embodying and sharing characters' (Van de Water et al, 2015: 160). This definitely highlights the potential of the 'performing' strand of Drama, but what isn't addressed, however, is the pedagogy and the way in which activities are crafted to promote the 'embodiment of characters' since presumably this isn't something that students simply arrive with. Once again, there is further evidence of a gap in Drama curriculum guidance to promote development at Key Stage 3.

One could argue that education is such that not all students will achieve such feats and be able to refine with success by the time they reach Year 10, but more research into strategies that have been put in place to allow students to make progress in this way would be more useful. A number of practical outcomes are mentioned in this chapter of Van de Water et al writing, 'they produce social awareness and relationships when making artistic decisions with their peers'; this in-keeping with

the collaborative learning that is required when embarking on the new GCSE Drama exam, but more is needed when it comes to examining how such outcomes can be promoted in order for students to demonstrate what could be interpreted as 'coherent', 'effective' and 'comprehensive' outcomes as they progress through rehearsal.

Progression:

Fleming recognises that, 'describing progression in drama is not straightforward yet it is important' (Fleming, 2003: 123). He continues with, 'nor is it possible to plan in a coherent and balanced way without some sense of how work can be made increasingly challenging'. When delving further into assessment, he adds, 'statements which seek to describe progress in a subject are likely to involve some degree of reduction and simplification' (Fleming, 2012: 124) which appears to be the case for the examination board's assessment criterion, 'demonstrate secure engagement with the process of collaboration' (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 20). The word 'secure' is an example of the simplification that Fleming discusses and the exam board offers no indicative content for teachers of Drama to refer to when marking the outcomes of collaborative work. There appears to be a demand for materials that indicate ways in which students respond to activities in order to help teachers prepare students during Key stage 3. Fleming's writing does pinpoint some of the fundamental concerns, but does not appear to offer any solutions/ideas about how best to address these concerns.

Literature review conclusion

Whilst the literature does provide lots of insights regarding principles of teaching drama and some guidance on activities that can be used in the class, synthesis of theory and practice to promote self-directed progress specific to devising is clearly lacking. Moreover, the literature makes explicit links to the ways in which students can develop through devising, but with little engagement with a spectrum of learners.

In the absence of literature and pedagogy specific to devising and self-directed learning within educational contexts (there also appear to be an absence of articles published in the Research in Drama Educational 'RIDE' since the GCSE reform), I conducted an additional review to delve more deeply into devising and self-directed learning practices. This was done in conjunction with the exam specification to establish a greater understanding of what how findings specific to Devising and self-directed learning could promote effective pedagogy and support teachers with the very specific demands of this GCSE examination.

Review of contemporary devising and self-directed learning practices (in conjunction with the Edexcel examination specification)

My main inquiry question is as follows: to what extent have the Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond) scaffolds that I have created promoted the skills, progress and self-directed readiness that is required for success in the new GCSE Drama examination for devising? The purpose of this additional review is to engage with literature that focuses on learning theories that are associated with self-directed learning (more specifically scaffolding an approach that underpins this enquiry) and contemporary devising practice to establish any links to the demands of the revised GCSE devising examination; the aim is to use findings to support curriculum development and provide teachers of Drama with a useful model to promote success at Key Stage 3.

Whilst my proposed E.S.C.A and Beyond pedagogy has its origins in the educational strengths of my pre-reform Sequential Learning Model, the review of the literature that follows has revealed some parity between my core values (Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting) and influenced the sub-inquiry questions that I aim to address as part of this study.

A closer look at Edexcel's reaction in terms of 'devising':

In terms of the reformed GCSEs, Edexcel stated that they 'used the opportunity to re-design a qualification that will engage students through encouraging creativity, focusing on practical work which reflects twenty-first century practice' (Pearson, 2016:9). Edexcel also argued the case for devising stating that it is, 'essential for the development of new theatre and performance' and that 'it allows for personal development and exploration' (Pearson, 2016: 9). The new devising assessment also contains additional challenges for pupils in that they must also 'deliver a group performance of the devised piece' and 'perform for the rest of the class' (Drama spec, 2016: 9) but without teacher-direction (and over a significantly longer period of time than the pre-reform assessment).

Implications – teaching practice and self-directed learning

This assessment shift in Drama (devised unit) places an emphasis on teachers in a facilitating and non-artistic role, clearly seeks to reward the self-directed learner which Lucy Madsen Guglielmino describes as ‘one who accepts responsibility for his or her own learning’ and ‘one who has a strong desire to learn or change and is self-confident’ (Guglielmino, 2013). Students will need to accept responsibility for their learning; the specification clearly states that, ‘all students must document the practical creation and development of ideas’ (Pearson, 2016:15) which also implies that students will have the self-confidence to be able to do this.

Edexcel does state that teachers in a facilitating role are allowed to support by, ‘explaining assessment criteria and the requirements of the component’ and, ‘undertake management in relation to managing time’ (Pearson, 2016: 12), but students are going to be the ones that must take responsibility for gathering their ‘portfolio of evidence’ demonstrating a, ‘successful communication of intentions’ (Pearson, 2016: 15). This, once again, highlights the need for self-directed qualities such as students being able to ‘think for themselves...learn in their own way, choose their own goals’ (Gibbons, 2002: 3). These desired qualities appear to suggest a move towards the Piaget-inspired constructivism educational theory; Cohen states that key conventions include ‘learning is self-directed’ and ‘self-regulated’ (Cohen et al, 2010:182).

Examining where self-directed learning sits in terms of educational theory

The collaborative nature of the devising unit, however, arguably points to a paradigm shift in the direction of social constructivism which Cohen et al states is, ‘differentiated by references to the social basis of much learning’ and ‘retains constructivist concern with learner activity but also recognise the significance of the social process’ (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 48). The social process has long since been an integral part of Drama education; the new specification is no exception. Students are asked ‘what work did your group do in order to explore the stimulus and start to create ideas for

the performance?’ (Pearson, 2016:24) – ‘your group’ suggests that social context could in fact play a significant part in the success students may or may not enjoy.

‘A weakness of social constructivism is that students may need preparing for these activities’ (Gregson and Hilier, 2016: 51); one could argue that structured social constructivism-inspired support at key stage 3 is a potential strategy. One such strategy/mechanism that exists in the social constructivism domain is known as a ‘scaffold’ (Gregson and Hilier, 2016: 51).

A closer look at scaffolding

Long examines ‘scaffolding’ in his book *The Psychology of Education* and traces its origins, ‘Vgotsky particularly believed that children’s early understanding came from the support that they were given by interacting with knowledgeable adults’ and explains that supporting students to manage tasks with a level of independence is as, ‘similar to the process of ‘scaffolding’ in building’ (Long, 2000: 36).

Cohen et al also clearly state that, ‘David wood coined the term ‘scaffolding’ in his research on the teaching techniques that mothers used with their 3-4 year old children’ (Cohen et al, 184). Its place within the social constructivist domain has been articulated as ‘inducting less competent learners’, and ‘scaffolding and extending their understanding’ (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 48). One could argue that all students begin the study of Drama ‘less competent’ but to varying degrees: factors such as low prior attainment; previous exposure to behaviourist approaches when taking part in other Drama-related activities such as school plays (being instructed how to deliver lines for example), or the challenges associated with getting acclimated to the secondary environment could denote ‘less competent’. This highlights scaffolding as a necessary tool to promote an extension of their understanding, and the need to place emphasis on them managing tasks with a level of independence; I would argue that this could better prepare them for the self-directed demands of the new examinations. Providing ‘scaffolds in the learning process’ is also referred to as an

‘instructional strategy’ (Cohen et al, 2016:184). This appears to offer teachers a way forward: exam board stipulations prevent teachers from giving explicit direction/instruction where devising is concerned, so this would appear to be an approach that could be used to support Key Stage 3 Drama students but in a manner that is conducive to the reformed examinations.

Scaffolding – validity and testability

The above literature on scaffolding is useful in terms of its purpose and the functions of learning scaffolds in general. The absence of any devising-specific guidance from the exam board, however, prompted me to engage with both contemporary devising practice, and the devising-specific criterion from the specification. The suggestion that scaffolding ‘should provide activities, cultures and structures of intellectual social and emotional support to help learners move forward in their learning’ (Cohen et al, 2016: 189) is perhaps a useful starting point in uncovering what scaffolding might look like in the context of devising at GCSE.

Activities

‘Activities’ in the context of devising might suggest the promotion of actual practice and a requirement for group work. Davis Robinson refers to devising as ‘the process of inventing material for performance together, including scene and script work, choreography, narrative structures and design elements’ (Robinson, 2015: 9). ‘Activities’ here appears to encompass a range of components that may need to be explored within scaffolds; the suggestion of ‘script work’ and ‘inventing’ suggests that the ‘structures’ within some scaffolds may need to change in light of the diverse skill being promoted. The specification’s reference to the use of explorative strategies ‘centres may practically explore stimuli using a variety of methods such as: whole class exploration, small group improvisations, creating tableaux role on the wall, hot seating, etc.’ (Pearson, 2016: 11) could potentially serve as structures to support progress within diverse ‘activities’. For example, creating

tableaux as a starting point for 'inventiveness', or the use of 'hot seating' as a strategy to promote engagement with text and character.

Structures

'Structures', when referring to devising, is explored in some detail in the literary works of Frantic Assembly; they state, 'all of our devising is broken down into tasks', 'they can be bite sized and self-contained' and 'like building blocks they are simple and robust; they are not the house' (Graham and Hoggett, 2014: 15). This suggests that devising-specific scaffolds may benefit from a design that promotes 'stand-alone' activities. This 'self-contained' approach could potentially support the GCSE assessment process: the devising unit is made up of four different assessment aims that range from the 'engagement with the process of collaboration' to 'explanations of creative intentions (Pearson, 2016: 21), so a structure that promotes some separation of the different skills could potentially secure progress that is specific to each aim. Arguably, this reference to 'building blocks' necessitates engagement with what 'building' looks like in the 'devised theatre' learning context. This is where an underpinning pedagogy could perhaps be most useful and prove a vital tool in ensuring students are continuously moving forward both in terms of competency and the meeting of assessment aims. Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond) is the underpinning pedagogy that will be used to address this aim; activities that promote 'exploration' will be followed with one that promotes the 'sharing' of ideas and findings for example.

Culture

A 'culture' of support where scaffolding is concerned suggests a set of behaviours and classroom traditions that could be developed; the nature of 'Devising' and its origins could potentially influence the 'culture' of support that is created. Heddon and Milling refer to devising as a 'practical expression', 'a means of taking control and operating autonomously' and 'spontaneous; experimental; non-literary' (Heddon and Milling, 2016:4) which accentuates the multi-faceted

nature of devising and could suggest that scaffolds should seek to promote a culture of active learning, independence and have an experimental slant. It appears the exam board also wish to reward student who embrace an active learning and progressive culture; the GCSE criteria assesses 'practical creation, development and refinement of ideas from the stimuli to communicate meaning' (Pearson, 2016: 20). This also suggests a demand for scaffolds with 'built in' progression through each stage (creation, development and refining). In addition, the incorporation of some 'open' tasks may be necessary to promote 'experimentation' and allow for spontaneity (and not take shape in way that is too rigid). A culture of 'experimentation' also appears to be desired by the exam board. The guidance for students includes, 'Your original devised piece can be developed from any stimuli; visual e.g. paintings, photographs, film or artefacts' (Elsden et al, 2016: 15).

Intellectual support

'Intellectual support' can be interpreted in a number of ways. In terms of scaffolding per se, it is said that, 'teachers need to draw on both their subject knowledge and their understanding of people in general and of their pupils in general' (Gregson and Hilier: 49). This suggests the designs of scaffolds should take into consideration prior knowledge, the knowledge and skills students must acquire and develop the performance of pupils in previous lessons and be flexible enough to address any emergent issues that may present themselves. This seems pertinent given the fact that the 'scaffold approach' places emphasis on students moving themselves along; misconceptions will almost certainly need to be addressed through the intricate planning of activities.

Davis Robinson, however, places more emphasis on skills than the intellectual demands of ensemble devising, 'no matter what type of work you make, skills are needed to give your ideas power and clarity; art involves making choices' (Robinson, 2015: 16). These sentiments are echoed in the GCSE Drama study guide: 'unlike GCSE subjects such as History and Maths, there aren't many simple facts for you to revise in Drama – instead you are developing skills' (Elsden et al, 2016: 7). This would

suggest that creating scaffolds to promote skills that can be applied in a range of devising contexts could be a useful form of 'intellectual support'.

In terms of 'intellectual' challenges, the exam board states that students must 'communicate meaning through research' (Pearson, 2016: 11). Gil Lamden also emphasised the importance of research during the devising process in his 'Devising handbook for Drama and Theatre Studies students' stating that, 'research develops devisers' depth of understanding of issues and topics' and 'what a wasted opportunity not to research the time place and the period' (Lamden, 2000: 10). This suggests that some engagement with research should form part of the overall design (both in terms of the teachers theoretical research into drama teaching practices and research specific to the stimulus or theatrical styles being employed). Arguably, scaffolds could be modified to promote synthesis: research-focused tasks could be followed by activities that support students to communicate their findings artistically for example. The exam board's reference to students understanding, 'characteristics of dramatic work including genre, structure, character, form and style' (Pearson, 2016: 11) offers a potential scaffolding 'outlets' for students to communicate their research outcomes.

Social support

There is also the reference to 'social support' to consider. Devising is referred to as, 'a social expression of non-hierarchical possibilities' (Heddon and Milling, 2016:4). On the one hand, this would appear to suggest that devising scaffolds be created with social interaction in mind alongside the development of social expression; this requirement is also made explicit in the guide to students, 'the key is to communicate with your group and seek ways forward together' (Elsden et al, 2016: 14). However, there is the issue of 'non-hierarchical possibilities' and whilst this points to an inherent freedom and move towards social constructivism, the need for scaffolding here is clear: when devising is placed in an educational context where students are in fact being assessed on their ability to 'explore the processes by which devised performance is developed' (Pearson, 2016: 11) there

needs to be some form of social support to help them achieve against criteria that is hierarchical. Edexcel use 'assured, effective and coherent' as adjectives to define the hierarchical outcomes where the top, second and middle achievement bands are concerned; what could offer a potential starting point in terms of tailoring activities to allow for students to access these levels. Examples of how promoting social yet hierarchical development specific to the exam board can be seen at stage 3 of the methodology (my self-created E.S.C.A and Beyond/Edexcel GCSE Drama comparison grid).

One could argue that examining how 'emotional support' can be interwoven into scaffolds will be supported by forensic engagement with the individual needs of learners. Literature pertaining to the very specific needs of students in the study can be seen in the main body of the thesis along with the ways in which activities have supported their needs.

Summary

Below is a summary of the literature explored in this chapter with direct links to the sub inquiry questions that I aim to address with this study.

Exploring (the core 'value' from my pre-reform 'Sequential Learning Model' that was promoted through activities that promoted the exploration of a range of stimuli, cultures and styles):

The exam board's statement that, 'devising allows for personal development and exploration' (Pearson, 2016: 9) and students must 'explore stimuli in the process of devising' place an emphasis on exploration as a 'starting point'. This has both inspired and lent credence to my sub inquiry question for 'exploring-focused' activities: *to what extent does starting lessons with exploration focused scaffolds promote active learning, engagement and the enthusiasm necessary for personal development (and help prepare students for the 'practical expression' necessary to access 'sharing-focused' activities)?*

Sharing (the core 'value' that promoted collaboration and sharing of devised/scripted work throughout the exploration and development process):

The literature on social constructivism refers to 'learning as a social process' (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 48) and most of the literature on devising made explicit references to collaboration. Both of these elements are incumbent in my sub inquiry question for sharing-focused activities: *to what extent do activities with a 'sharing focus' promote the non-assisted exchange and development of ideas, skills and knowledge during the devising process (and support students in establishing a greater connection and 'desire for change' when refining their work)?*

Connecting (which focused on the refinement process and encouraged students to make connections between stimuli and their creative choices):

In terms of self-directed learners, there is an emphasis on students having a 'strong desire to change' (Guglielmino, 2013), and 'problem solving' is referenced as a key component of social constructivism. Both of these components underpin my sub inquiry question for connecting-focused activities: *to what extent do activities with a 'connecting' focus promote a deeper connection with stimuli and independent refinement to communicate ideas (and prepare students to 'operate autonomously', demonstrating a wide-ranging use of styles to communicate their deeper understanding)?*

Affecting (the core 'value' that was promoted through activities that encouraged stronger engagement with 'purpose' as part of final refinement process and the use of diverse theatrical approaches to evoke responses from audience members and group members alike).

In terms of devising, the ability to, 'communicate with the audience on a number of levels' (Lamden, 2000:10) is referenced as an outcome of research. This also points to 'autonomy' that is spoken of where self-directed learners are concerned. These ideas are addressed explicitly in my sub inquiry question for affecting-focused activities: *to what extent do activities with an 'affecting focus'*

promote greater consideration of audience and how theatrical styles and approaches can be used to promote desired outcomes?

Chapter 5: Methodology

Practice as Research (PAR) is a 'research project in which practice is a key method of inquiry' (Nelson, 2013:9). This study is focused on my Drama teaching practice within the mainstream secondary school education system; the refinement of my practice and pre-existing curriculum will be an integral part of my project. Nelson states that P.A.R concerns itself with, 'practical knowledge that might primarily be demonstrated in practice' (Nelson, 2013:9). Practice as research was the most appropriate form of research for this study because the outcomes of the refinement process will need to be evident in the practice itself. I believed the best way to examine whether my practice was 'fit for purpose' is to actually deliver the curriculum, teach lesson from it and use the student outcomes as my guide in terms of effectiveness. This study focuses on 'knowledge which is a matter of doing rather abstractly conceived'. Adopting methods that are solely traditional and theoretical cannot possibly yield meaningful knowledge regarding the effectiveness of my model: the classroom setting and study of an art-form such as drama is not neat and tidy. An inquiry such as this requires me to 'practice to a resolution' and not merely, 'think (my) way through a solution' (Nelson, 2013:10).

Nelson also states that 'Practice as Research methodology draws upon approaches such as hermeneutics' (Nelson, 2013:98) which in itself suggests that practice research, whilst lacking an established methodology of its own, draws upon other more established methodologies.

Hermeneutic/interpretive methods lends itself to my study in that the majority of knowledge claims will be the result of my interpretation of the GCSE exam specification, existing practice and student behaviour in response to my refined learning model. Nelson states, 'each project is different and there is no single approach' (2013: 92). This hint at practice as research being eclectic is indeed well-matched with my multi-faceted study which focuses on a practice-based area, Drama, but within an educational context and encompassing students a range of learning needs. I felt it important to

ground the study in an established method that is often associated with both practice-based enquiries and educational research to ensure cohesion. Action research is such a methodology.

Ian Bryant states that, 'the action research process has been compared to a spiral where action is followed by reflection and a greater understanding then by more action and reflection (Bryant, 1995: 115). This spiral epitomizes my initial approach when creating the Sequential Learning Model where teaching a lesson was followed by a set of reflections that inspired me to 'act' and then refine.

Nixon states, 'action research must be designed in a way as to be implemented within the pattern of constraints existing with the school' (Nelson, 2013:52). Whilst the action research spiral definitely encapsulates the reflective nature of my teaching practice, it still requires a significant amount of adapting to address the demands of my study. In reference to PAR, Nelson states that these inquiries, '...require more labour and a broader range of skills to engage with the multi-mode research inquiry than more traditional processes' (Nelson, 2013:9). For this inquiry to work, I had to draw on a number of qualitative methods and engage with a number of epistemological processes; the likes of which I will tease out later in this chapter.

Whilst the above methods will be built into the hermeneutic spiral, the range of methods employed could lead one to believe such a project could be chaotic with too many factors when compared with traditional methods. But as Melissa Trimmingham states, 'there is no need to pretend that the process is more orderly than it really is, only to demonstrate that the planning is orderly' (Trimingham, 2002: 54-60). Being that my inquiry is focused on the refinement of my curriculum in light of the new specification, meticulous planning is needed to ensure that methods are used effectively and efficiently. The outline of my plan can be simplified into five spiral stages: interpreting (stage 1), reflecting (stage 2), creating (stage 3), action (stage 4), and re-engaging (stage 5).

Nelson states, 'the methodology is the study of methods' (2013:98). The remainder of this chapter is essentially the study and unpicking of the methods employed at each stage of my action research spiral.

Stage 1: interpreting

David Usher refers to the fact that hermeneutic/interpretive epistemology 'assumes that all human action is meaningful and hence has to be interpreted and understood within the context of social research' (Usher, 1996: 18). Being that my research project is focused on the extent to which my practice promotes success towards the new Edexcel GCSE Drama specification, I decided to employ hermeneutic/interpretive methodology as part of the 'entry point' of the spiral.

Whilst the process of interpreting this mark scheme doesn't necessary involve the 'human action' that Usher refers to when explaining hermeneutics, the Edexcel GCSE Drama criterion for component one does refer to a set of actions/behaviours that students need to demonstrate in order to achieve. For example, the assessment criteria states that student will need to demonstrate '...engagement with the process of collaboration' (Pearson Edexcel Level 1/ Level 2 Specification for Drama 9-1: 21). This assessment focus comes up throughout the criterion which is broken up into five incremental bands; the only thing that separates the achievement bands from each other is an adjective that suggests the standard of 'engagement' students must reach. Examples of this include the word 'effective' being used in the second band and 'assured' in the highest band. This prompted me to interpret these adjectives in the context of each assessment focus (collaboration, refinement etc.) to produce knowledge pertaining to what these adjectives could look like behaviourally in the context of my curriculum. Bryant refers to the 'informal theory' which practitioners, unlike outsider researchers 'who are not in and of the situation', often possess (1995:115). It is here that I drew on my experience preparing students for GCSE drama exams ('informal theory') coupled with visual

evidence of devised work that has been externally moderated to support me with articulating these 'behaviours'.

Hermeneutics involves 'interpretation of the interpretation' (Usher, 1995: 20). Interpreting my findings after engaging with the mark scheme revealed a series of trends; chief amongst those was the fact that personal development was implicit in the mark scheme. Criterion such as 'competent practical creation' (Pearson Edexcel Level 1/ Level 2 Specification for Drama 9-1: 21) suggests that students will need to feel comfortable collaborating and interacting with the students they work with. This stage generated a slight problem since the term 'personal development' is in itself rather broad and I wanted to avoid generalising and, 'speaking for others.....in the name of doing good by them' (Usher: 49) – this couldn't possibly produce meaningful and fruitful practical knowledge that relates to my refined model. This 'interpretation of the interpretation' spiralled into further research on students with different behavioural or learning needs.

Nelson states, 'a programme of reading of all relevant kinds should be undertaken simultaneously with the commencement of the practical inquiry to mobilize an inter-play between practical doing-thinking' (Nelson, 2013: 29). The more I read about the personal development, the clearer it became that it looks very different from student to student; this was inspired by my engagement with the student data which I referred to in the hopes of better understanding what 'personal development' might look like. Scott states that, 'hermeneutic/interpretive researchers argue that data collection is a social activity' (1995:68). Whilst some of the data collated on my pupils has been done so following observations of them in social classroom situations, this stage involved me extrapolating this data to establish knowledge about potential social limitations that may prevent students from achieving. I selected eight case study students who have very different behavioural and learning needs and began reading up on them; these findings, coupled with the knowledge produced after my engagement with the mark scheme would go on to inform my activity choices during the actual lessons.

Stage 2: reflecting

For this stage of the spiral, I felt it was important to re-engage with my existing year 7 teaching practice.

Nixon Produced action research guidance for teachers; he points to its suitability, 'when a new approach is grafted on an existing system' (1981: 212) thus necessitating an engagement with one's old practice. I interpreted my original year 7 teaching practice (videos, lesson plans and examined work for cohorts over the years) and my classroom mannerisms to identify what would need to change in order to create learning situations that could promote some of the 'behaviours' that I pinpointed as a result of my interpretive research into the mark scheme (stage 1). This stage generated the following knowledge:

- The standard of work during summative assessments was very high, but my modelling, verbal instructions and personalised feedback played a big part in the success students enjoyed.
- Subject-specific 'achievement' was the sole focus when arriving at the devising assessment judgements. Students were given a mark in one of the following bands: attempted, satisfactory, good, excellent and exceptional performance. Marks awarded did not encompass personal development in any way.

Whilst the assessment processes for my original model did not explicitly reward/recognise personal development, further interpretation of my practice as a whole did reveal some useful findings. There appeared to be a set of underpinning values (exploring, sharing, connecting, affecting, innovating) being visibly nurtured throughout the curriculum resulting in some very positive outcomes: over a term of lessons students had become great **explorers** of themes, styles and performance as a whole; they **shared** their knowledge and interpretations of role with each other; there was also clear evidence of them **connecting** with stimuli and considering ways in which to convey their

interpretations to **affect** others, showing some **innovation**. I felt that focusing on these values (exploring, sharing, connecting, affecting), had greater potential to promote 'personal development' in a way that my original Edexcel-inspired assessment bands (satisfactory, good and excellent) did not.

Nelson explains that, 'the creative process involves a number of aspects' and 'involves gestation, allowing time for the spark of an idea to be fired' (2013: 28). It is at this stage of the spiral that my model's limitations were used as a creative starting point. This included creating assessment approaches and self-directed learning activities based on my analysis of my old teaching practice; this was in conjunction with the new GCSE criterion. When these creative activities and assessment strategies are placed in the context of a lesson, they essentially become, 'experimental situations in which variables are manipulated...' (Cohen, 2000:16). The outcomes of my self-created 'experiments' could potentially produce knowledge relating to the effectiveness of the new drama assessment methods and preparatory activities that I create, and the extent to which they promote achievement in line with the GCSE criterion.

Stage 3: creating

Having interpreted both the new specification and my existing practice, I felt it was important to synthesise my findings into what would become the underpinning pedagogy and my model's assessment criterion. This stage became a logical next step in light of my interpretive approaches during stage 1 and 2 of the spiral which highlighted how broad the existing criteria was and the fact that personal development was implicit throughout. Moreover, in terms of assessment and measurement, the GCSE criterion is more summative in nature and, 'designed to measure achievement, outcomes or mastery'. This study is focused on formative assessment, 'to monitor students' progress and to diagnose strengths and weaknesses' (Cohen et al, 2000:322), so re-focusing the criteria onto progress became crucial.

I recognised that personal development and assessment were equally important and they could both be reduced to a series of 'behaviours'. I wanted to examine the extent focusing on exploring, sharing, connecting and affecting could promote progress when placed on an incremental scale. I wanted to find out whether they could also serve as a formative assessment tool to measure the extent to which students are progressing towards GCSE success (assessment).

Whilst I felt happy the core values encapsulated everything I wanted students to achieve/experience in Drama, I knew that further hermeneutic engagement with the GCSE Specification was important in order to establish greater parity between the demands of the new specification and potential outcomes at all levels for the 'E.S.C.A and beyond' taxonomy and assessment. This stage of the spiral was about testing the effectiveness of my model.

In terms of positivist/empirical epistemology, Usher discusses the questions surrounding validity of knowledge and states that, 'the answer was to ground the validity of knowledge in scientific method in the form of measurement, testability and the right use of reason'(Usher, 1996: 11).

In terms of 'measurement' and 'reason', the first thing I did was engage with my old practice in an attempt to measure what success looked like at different levels. I recognised that the qualities that 'attempted band' students demonstrated during the old assessment footage only measured up to the second to lowest GCSE band when it was combined with the qualities demonstrated during the old 'person development-focused' 'exploring' footage. This led to decision to use the key values to encapsulate both achievement and personal development. I then aligned this with the exam specification achievement bands to help measure success and establish parity. The result was as follows:

Exploring – level 2 'adequate', **Sharing** – level 3, 'clear', **Connecting** – level 4 'secure', **Affecting** – level 5 'assured'

Once I had decided that exploring would be aligned with the second lowest achievement band, I engaged with the learning behaviours that I associate with the lowest band, and created a series of

exploration focused activities to examine whether they could promote these behaviours without teacher-intervention. This is to address the demands of the new GCSE specification, where, as stated, students are not allowed to be directed; it is my aim to create a similar learning environment through my refined model, 'E.S.C.A and Beyond', to prepare them for success at key stage 4.

Testability:

In terms of the assessment focus one 'engagement during the process of collaboration' aspect of the new Component One criteria (Pearson Edexcel, 2016: 21) the incremental scale used to measure success' is, 'adequate', 'clear', 'secure', assured' ('adequate' engagement for the lower band and 'assured' for the top).

The small table below illustrates my consideration of measurement and testability when creating self-directed learning experiments (scaffolds) and the development of my 'E.S.C.A and beyond' pedagogy (based on stage 1 of the research process). This stage could potentially produce knowledge pertaining to the personal development and achievement of pupils through my self-directed learning methods.

<p style="text-align: center;">EXPLORING</p> <p>To what extent could activities that promote exploration of.....</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SHARING</p> <p>To what extent could activities that promote the sharing of.....</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new and unfamiliar stimuli • how performance skills can be used when experimenting with explorative strategies • new information about theatre practices • the process of collaboration and listening to the ideas • opinions on issues and events • new theatrical approaches • mediums and how to use them within the rehearsal process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge that has been acquired • opinions on the rehearsal works-in-progress • an interpretation of role (during rehearsal) • performance skills during preparatory activities • personal views on the issues explored during rehearsal/discussion • ideas during the rehearsal process
<p>.....promote at least 'adequate', self-directed engagement?</p>	<p>.....move students towards 'clear' self-directed engagement?</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">CONNECTING</p> <p>To what extent could activities that promote connecting to the.....</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">AFFECTING (others)</p> <p>To what extent could activities that promote greater engagement with others by.....</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wider themes associated with stimuli when contributing ideas • circumstances surrounding the world of their devised pieces • explorative strategies being employed and how drama elements can support this • experiences the student has had • pre-existing skills being used to meet the needs of different stimuli • style explored when creating theatre 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting peer to peer questioning to elicit ideas • exploring potential target audiences and modifying performances accordingly • promoting peer to peer feedback on how best to refine work • allowing students to explore social, cultural and historical circumstances through their devised work • providing opportunities for students to respond imaginatively to ideas contributed by others.
<p style="text-align: center;">...move students towards 'secure' self-directed engagement?</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">...move students towards 'secure' self-directed engagement?</p>

Stage 4: the actual practice (action and epistemology)

In reference to practice research, Nelson states, 'the practice, whatever it may be, is at the heart of the methodology' (2013:26). The 'heart' – in the context of this study – is the spiral stage that involves the actual application of my practice in light of my interpretations, surmising and planning/creating of lesson activities. The action-research spiral accommodates practice within its spiral, 'acting (implementing plans), observing (systematically), reflecting....and the re-planning, further implementation' (Cohen and Manion et al, 2000:229). My reflections of experiment outcomes resulted in re-planning, and informed my practice when engaging with the next experiment thereby exemplifying the circular nature of the spiral which allows me to return to this stage (to generate more knowledge).

In Practice-as-research 'a practice is submitted as a substantial evidence of a research inquiry' (2013:9); it is through my practice that the essential data will be generated. Cohen and Manion state that, 'action research relies chiefly on observational and behavioural data' (1985:215). I opted to film each experiment by way of capturing the data and supporting the observational process for both

myself and those that view this study; this actually replicates the GCSE devising examination conditions where students are filmed and the footage is sent off to the examiner. Cohen and Manion state, 'the purpose of such observations is to probe deeply and analyse intently' (1985:215). To support this process and promote knowledge findings that probe deeply, my documentary evidence will be accompanied by written commentary that hones in on the behaviours of case study participants only.

In terms of case studies, Cohen explains that they, 'provide a unique example of real people in real situations' and that the case studies themselves, 'will have temporal characteristics which help to define their nature' (200:181). Each case study represents students with different learning backgrounds and dispositions to (a) support my departmental ethos of inclusion and (b) to highlight the model's potential to promote achievement and personal development irrespective of ability and background. This documentation also marries with practice-as-research which places an emphasis on, 'accompanying writing to articulate and evidence the research inquiry' (Nelson, 2013: 58). Whilst the visual evidence along with written analysis could denote secure evidence of a practice-based inquiry having taken place, the issue of epistemology and the 'question of how any given knowledge can be considered valid or how indeed is it possible to 'know' anything' (1995: 11) was something I had to take into consideration. In addition to stage 1,2 and 3 of my spiral, the following 'measure' was put in place to support knowledge claims during this stage of the inquiry: I carefully scripted my interjections and guidance to students to ensure that all directive language was removed from the lesson plan and my speak during the lesson. This was to ensure that all findings are a result of self-directed learning and accurately depict progress against the new criterion (which assesses students on their ability to devise without guidance).

Stage 5: hermeneutic circle (re-engaging)

David Usher suggests that, 'interpretations are always circular' and 'the interpretation of part of something depends on the interpretation of the whole' (Usher, 1996: 18) when explaining the process of hermeneutic-circulatory.

My study is broken up into three lessons; each one consists of several experiments that happen linearly.

- a. The outcomes of experiment/scaffold one, for example, impacts the way students respond to experiment two thus highlighting the circular nature of my practice and interpretations.
- b. The outcomes of each individual experiment/scaffold are dependent on the entire sequence of activities – the 'whole' of the lesson.
- c. Each lesson represents a unit from the learning module (Skills, Empathy and Knowledge); the experiments created in each lesson are based on findings from the lesson prior (unit) thereby enabling me to generate interpretations that are reflective of the 'whole' model.

In order to accurately share knowledge findings that focus on the amount of progress students make from task to task, I engaged with experimental methods such as the 'single group pre-test and post-test design' (Scott, 1996: 52). I ensured some of the classroom activities were completely un-aided to enable me to clearly see the standard of work before and after the independent variable (scaffold) had been introduced. The 'pre' and 'post' testing also refers to the examination of student progress from one lesson to another. For example a lack of progress for case study student 1 during lesson one, informed my choices for lesson two; in this regard, lesson two becomes the 'post-test' since the aim of the activities created for this lesson will be to improve outcomes, and this will be done by

adapting variables that were not present in lesson one. Once again, supporting me in articulating how students' progress at activity, lesson and module level.'

Chapter 6: Thesis structure

Whilst my practice research is on-going and informs my approach to all lessons, for the sake of word count and succinctness, I have chosen to present findings from three lessons; one lesson per unit (see below). Each unit focuses on separate areas of the GCSE assessment criteria and tracks the progress of the eight case study students.

- The **Skills for Drama** lesson/scaffolds focus on Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond's') potential to 'promote engagement with the process of rehearsal', and support the personal development of students with behavioural and emotional difficulties.
- **Empathy for Drama** hones in on E.S.C.A and Beyond's potential to 'promote engagement with the process of refinement', and supporting students learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L).
- **Knowledge for Drama** experiment explores 'E.S.C.A and beyond's' potential to 'develop explanations of creative intent' and genre-specific knowledge. It focuses on supporting Gifted and talented students and the extent to which all incremental stages can be interwoven into activities.

The documentation of my practice research consists of a three components:

- rationale (a section that explains my activity choices),
- the activity students partook in; these have a label to indicate which aspect of the taxonomy the task addresses 'E' for exploring for example
- the findings.

Chapter 7: Skills for Drama

Topic: **Non-verbal communication** Lesson: **4 of 10**

Task 1 Rationale

Lesson 1 from the Skills for Drama unit introduced students to the principles of improvisation. I began the lesson with 'The colours game'. This involved me scattering red, yellow and blue coloured card around the room and telling students that each colour represented a primary emotion (red represented anger, blue – sadness, and yellow represented happiness). I then called out a series of make-believe scenarios that students had to act out ('you are being chased by a horse' for example); I wanted to examine whether encouraging reticent students to explore 'accepting' in a practical way promoted at least 'adequate engagement with the process of rehearsal' since introducing this concept in a theoretical way made some students learning from my old model self-conscious about whether they were 'hitting the criteria'. This often resulted in me instructing students to 'just go with it'; I would not be able to give direction in this way moving forward.

Whilst the vigorous nature of 'The colours game' activity appeared to have reduced the inhibition levels of reticent students, a number of students learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) struggled to articulate what 'accepting' meant in the context of the activity and they had to be prompted to use technical drama language.

For activity one (the colours game), I chose to combine a physical activity that included discussion to see if this supported these students in sharing their reflections with greater clarity.

1. Warm up (E) 03:00. I instructed students to get with a partner and stand facing them.

Students were instructed to stand leaning toward their partner with slightly hunched over posture. I explained that the objective of the game was to try and tap their partner's calves as many times as they could, but without being hit by their partner. I gave them the additional challenge of discussing what their understanding of mime was as they engaged in game play. After the game-play was complete, I asked students to share their ideas about what mime is and annotated the objective to include their thoughts.

Task 1 observations

The Primary National Strategy, Supporting Children Learning English as an Additional Language document refers to the fact that, for students engaging with, 'the meta-cognitive processes of 'thinking out loud' by sharing their reasoning with their peers are more likely to understand' (National Strategy, 2002: 14). Whilst the open and explorative nature of this physical warm-up provided Student F, a less able student learning English as an additional language, with the opportunity to think out loud and share his ideas about mime, it seems his enhanced understanding is primarily due to the active and reflective learning scaffold that he remembered from the lesson before (students explored the principles of improvisation by taking part in the colour game, and this was followed by questions that elicited the key performance skills used over the course of the game). Student F's actual contributions suggest a number of self-directive qualities have been promoted through his recent exposure to the model.

'Self-directed learners draw from their past experiences' and 'they call upon their store of knowledge and experiences as a source of data to support theories to explain' (Costa and Kallick, 2004: 25). In terms of developing 'theory', his concerted effort to explain what mime is using the subject specific language he was introduced to during lesson one appeared to be his 'source of data' thus highlighting the model's potential to promote a

basic 'store of knowledge' very early on in the curriculum. At 05:12, he contributed 'it's where you can't speak...you have to use facial expression...you have to use drama skills and your imagination' and 'you have to accept things that are not there'. It seems the structure of the curriculum thus far and sequencing of activities from one lesson to another has supported this student to recognise how skills and improvisation fundamentals like 'accepting' also fit into the context of this lesson; this understanding is demonstrated without the use of probative questioning thereby suggesting increasing fluency where this student is concerned.

In terms of the Skills, Empathy then Knowledge structure of the model, it appears focusing primarily on 'skills' to begin with supports the cognitive development of this less able E.A.L student. His self-directed desire to make connections appears to have also developed his spoken language and resulted in a 'coherent use of drama terminology' (middle band criterion from the Component One specification) without any prompting or coaching which is in keeping with new specification requirements.

Further evidence of the model's ability to develop competency and skills related to the GCSE Component One specification was seen at 06:58. Student C, a gifted and talented student of drama, shared a link between mime and the children's television genre, 'I see mime on 'Tom and Jerry'...like...they don't talk...' He then went on to make a connection by provide a narrative example, 'Jerry steals his milk'. Student C then referred to the 'angry' facial expressions used by Tom before modelling the facial expressions witnessed in the cartoon episode. David Fontana refers to the fact that when verbal testing, 'the tester can become an important variable in the exercise' (Fontana, 1995: 102) which in some respects lends credence to the GCSE Component ones specification guideline that teachers must not ask 'leading questions'. In this case, however, Student C was able to expand on his answer without any additional prompting from me and his reference to the

skills of drama, and how they were used follows the sequential questioning approach that I employed during Lesson 1 on improvisation: my questions encouraged students to first share their knowledge/ideas, communicate the 'connection' to the stimulus and provide details so that it is clear and accessible to others (affecting). The memorable quality of the 'colours game' coupled with this 'exploring-focused' (and active learning) scaffold clearly has an impact where this more able student is concerned. Moreover, the underpinning pedagogy, whilst not made explicit to students at this point, appears to be filtering into these students' own responses.

Task 2 Rationale:

For task 2 I employed a charades-inspired warm up activity which resulted in strong outcomes for less able performers in the past, particularly when I modelled a mime performance for these students. Whilst my experience told me that mixed ability groupings did not constitute 'differentiation', I opted to pair less able 'performers' with more able ones to examine whether this would promote peer modelling which isn't against the new specification rules (demonstrating exactly what miming should look like would be going against the rules). I wanted to see if this would encourage students to move each other up the incremental learning scale and result in stronger levels of 'connecting'.

- 2. Mime phrase (E/S) 08:50.** I told students that we were going to be given the chance to apply the rules that students contributed ('no talking' and 'using only your body') during the first activity. I placed students with a partner and asked them to form two parallel lines at opposite ends of the room. I showed side 'A' a simple phrase 'your dog is dead'. These students had to run to their partner and deliver this message non-verbally. The process was then reversed; 'B' students had to communicate 'your house is on fire!' to their partner. I played circus music throughout the warm up activity.

Task 2 observations:

Student A, a less able student learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) made a considerable amount of progress during the course of this activity. R.F Rakos observes that 'effective assertion depends on behavioural factors such as eye contact....latency and gesture' (R.F Rakos quoted in Harry Ayers and Cesia Ayers, 1991: 25). Student A demonstrated increasing levels of assertion during this activity. At 10:03 her engagement with the task was evident through a consistent use of eye contact with her partner and clear focus on his hand gestures and body language throughout the guessing process. In terms of 'latency', she demonstrated great decorum and allowed her partner to modify his use of gesture before intervening with her 'guesses'.

Student A was completely immersed in the activity and she seemed quite comfortable with the demands of the task; her facial expressions communicated enjoyment even when she was not taking on a character (and just guessing).

Developing problem-solving skills is considered to be an important part of self-directed learning, and where teaching students is concerned, the following suggestion is made: '...when students confront problems, teach them to use problem solving approaches themselves' (Gibbons, 2002:83). The design of this particular scaffold has promoted problem-solving skills through embedding instructions within the activity (students having to decipher a key message from their partner) rather than this skill being explicitly 'taught' as the quote from Gibbon's book suggests. This student has not been given a formula or set of rules to support her through the problem-solving process; she has been placed in an accessible learning situation that promotes the use of this quality, followed by reflections that encourage her to examine how she solved the problem (studying her partner's careful use of gestures). The non-complex spatial configuration (that had students facing their partners rather than other members of the class) and the use of music revealed implicit social constructivist-inspired ideologies that requires the teacher

to 'recognize the significance of the social processes' (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 48). Further evidence of the impact of such spatial configuration when facilitating social learning activities is demonstrated through Student A's wonderful reserve – she guessed incorrectly several times before eventually deciphering the mimed message, and became more animated as she tried to decipher the message; there was a clear sense of urgency and she remained engaged with the activity throughout. Further social competence was revealed when it was her turn to 'share' and communicate the short message: she was able to use the non-verbal communication skills and as a result her partner deciphered the message. This also revealed growing levels of perseverance which is also implicit in the mark scheme – there is a wide reference to 'refining' performance work which would require patience, collaboration, perseverance and a level of enthusiasm. She also demonstrated growing confidence in terms of 'sharing' her guesses with her partner which was seen to a lesser degree during the introductory lessons where she was hesitant to do so. This highlights another emerging strength of the scaffolds: the use of collaborative preparatory activities appears to promote increased confidence levels where this reticent student is concerned. As time progressed she was clearly 'connecting' with her partner's body language and interpreting non-verbal communication. This level of attentiveness also introduced a new dimension to the taxonomy: this activity actually promotes 'sharing' by way of creating opportunities for students to exercise the skill of being comfortable with 'not speaking' and essentially 'sharing' the rehearsal process so that others also get to communicate – a quality that could potentially support her during a longer rehearsal process.

Task 3 Rationale:

The new GCSE specification refers to the fact that students achieving in the middle band must offer 'coherent explanations of the creative intentions' (Pearson, 2016, 21). Whilst this isn't entirely new (the old specification contained a retrospective writing assessment that addressed creative intentions), it was clear that my practice would need to be refined in order to encourage students to communicate their performance choices verbally. Moreover, their spoken responses need to be more developed since teasing out answers through lots of questions could be construed as 'coaching'.

Robin Nelson explores the issue of 'Knowing-doing' in his book *Practice as Research in the Arts* and provides the example 'knowing how to ride a bike is knowing-doing largely beyond verbal explanation' (Nelson, 2013: 40). I noticed that some of the more able boys were very intuitive during the lesson on improvisation and experimented with a range of performance skills with energy and creativity; they did, however, struggle to articulate what they did when it came to reflecting on the practical activities in the written form. This prompted me to examine whether 'knowing-doing', where practically able students are concerned, was a result of a cognitive barrier, and to what extent questioning them immediately after practical activities would elicit unconscious knowledge in a verbal way. To achieve this, I also incorporated a connecting-focused 'how exactly were skills used?' dimension to my questioning to see if this promoted a more detailed response.

- 3. Questioning (S) 10:50 and 14:00 .** After the first round, I questioned the group of more able creating/performing students: which skills did your partner use to communicate the message? Answers included facial expressions, gestures, levels, posture, sign and mimicry. I then challenged students to develop these responses when I asked: did you receive the message quickly and clearly – *is there a way these skills should be used?*

Task 3 observations:

This scaffold makes clear use of, 'games to assist the social development' (Heddon and Milling: 2016: 34), whilst developing qualities that are specific to performing and the devising process per se. Evidence to support this can be seen at 10:23, where Student B experimented with a range of skills and approaches when miming his message as part of the preparatory game; this was done in an instinctive manner that grew increasingly energetic and also revealed growing levels of confidence and his willingness to work as a team.

The design also seems to promote 'coherent refinement' (the second bullet point descriptor on the middle band, Component One assessment criterion), and qualities synonymous with self-directed learners. An example of this can be seen when he experimented with different levels and a change of physicality which enabled his partner to guess the message correctly; he did not require prompting and showed a strong sense of determination. Whilst he is not formally recognised as being a student with A.D.H.D, he clearly reveals some 'difficulty sustaining attention' and 'reluctance to engage' (Metcalf, 2001: 2) which are traits that have come to be associated with A.D.H.D. This was in sharp contrast to his behaviour during the practical 'sharing' of the message: Student B demonstrated a confident and energetic use of mime during the activity (10:23). This suggests that he excels when there is a stronger sense of purpose and 'doing' which he may find harder to recognise in theory-based or reflective tasks (as observed later in the lesson).

Costa and Kallick refer to Marzano's theoretical model that explores the ways in which people confront tasks. It states that, 'self-directed people would choose to engage in a task based on how important the task is to them' (Costa and Kallick, 2004: 26). On the one hand, it is clear that the first part of this scaffold (a miming activity to promote the use of non-verbal skills) appeals to Student B and the demands and content of the task helps Student B to perceive 'getting the message across' as important. However, the introduction of theorising and reflection immediately after the ardour and excitement inspired by the game

points to a potential structural issue where the design is concerned and this is evident through Student B's change in behaviour – one which is less conducive to the devising process.

Student B is on the inclusion register for emotional and behavioural needs. His behaviour is by no means poor when responding to questions like 'which skills did you use and how did you use them?', but he seemed less than enthused to 'share' his answer. His body language was quite tense when answering; his shoulders were both raised and he leaned back onto the stool behind him. When questioned immediately afterwards, he still wasn't quite able to articulate how he actually communicated this message other than to refer to 'body language'. Student B's vocal volume was also very quiet, his tone was quite defensive and at times his use of language was very 'matter of fact'. When asked 'were you successful?' he quietly responded with 'of course'. It appears that the mere timing of these questions isn't a major contributing factor in terms of the standard of verbal response; although his brisk change in demeanour is perhaps better explained by the fact that he was so engrossed in the active learning, but uninterested in theorising and articulating his response in front of the entire class.

Whilst most literature highlights self-directed learning as a strength, this scaffold in particular highlights a potential weakness of such learners (or at least identifies a potential pitfall in using dynamic and playful learning activities): the shift away from playful active learning appears to exemplify disengagement when the interest is not there. It could be argued that the student does not perceive explaining the skills used as 'important'.

The practical activity did place a significant amount of emphasis on 'performing'; using the skills of Drama appears to be what this student enjoys most. The lean towards theory here echoes that of the reformed examination which places great emphasis on theory; students are reminded in help books that, 'you may enjoy working on a piece as a performer...most of all, but remember the portfolio is worth 45 marks and the performance is only 15' (Elsden et

al, 2016: 13). Interestingly, the length of time being spent asking him to theorise and articulate his ideas far outweighs how long he actual got to spend performing as a mime. The exam board's justification of why devising is important is, 'it allows both performers and designers the opportunity to stretch the limits of their creativity' (Edexcel, 2016: 9). This mirrors the explanations contemporary companies Frantic Assembly offers; they suggest that tasks should 'allow your performer to offer much creative input' (Graham and Hoggett, 2014: 15), but contemporary companies such as these place little emphasis on the 'theoretical' aspects of devising. The quality of his actual miming ability was dynamic; arguably giving this student greater recognition for his efforts where performing was concerned may have sustained his enthusiasm. Another useful strategy might include highlighting the fact that he was being given the opportunity to verbalise his understanding rather than writing it down (and breaking up the flow of the lesson).

Whilst the range of learning approaches that were embedded into this activity did not allow for maximum progress in Student B's case, E.S.C.A and Beyond's promotion of inclusion and the clear differentiation that is embedded in each incremental learning band is showcased. For example, the sat down approach to the 'sharing' of key skills is perhaps similar to the 'seated' learning environments that students such as Student B are more frequently exposed to. When given a task that promotes 'active learning' and 'sharing', he excels and exhibits a 'clear engagement throughout the process of rehearsal' (Pearson, 2016, 12) this is from the middle attainment band.

Whilst this experiment did not promote 'knowing-doing' in an explicit way for more able pupils, it did elicit strong verbal and practical responses from more able but reticent students.

In terms of teacher modelling, it is said that, 'you can start by paying attention to your language' (Costa, 2004: 114). The design of this activity promoted modelling through the use

of language and mime skills, but in a manner that exploited the student-to-student dynamic thereby fostering the strong levels of independence and un-assisted work that took place. These outcomes also appear to have been promoted through the use of 'high with lower ability' partnerships.

Including a 'dog' as part of the message prompted more able Student C to change his physicality (11:28); this supported Student H, his partner (and reticent but gifted and talented student), in making more acute observations: she was able to refer to her partner's 'use of space' when he mimed and how it communicated meaning. She used the technical term 'proxemics' thus showing further evidence of the 'skills' focus of this unit supporting students in making links and 'connecting' learning from previous lessons to new contexts. The breakthrough happened when I challenged further and asked 'how exactly did he communicate this?'

The 'sharing' focus of this activity clearly inspired Student H to re-enact his movements whilst vocalising what he did; this was done in a more exuberant fashion than has previously been seen by her just two lessons prior (Improvisation lesson 47:22). She was not instructed, nor asked to do this, but it could be argued the socially motivated activities that were planned earlier in the lesson helped her to feel at ease. Whilst behaviourist approaches have less of a place when preparing students for the new devising GCSE assessment, the outcomes of this activity emphasises the potential for the structuring and sequencing scaffolds to promote learning that is, 'evidenced in observable behaviour' (Cohen et al, 2010: 191); the main difference being these outcomes were elicited through practice-based and collaborative learning activities that allow for self-direction and creativity. One could argue that this is essential – devising students are in fact awarded marks are awarded for the learning 'behaviours' they show.

Fontana affirms that 'the social outgoing and active teaching environments of the normal Primary school suits the habits of the extravert' (Fontana, 1995: 196). Student H's response during this activity reveals E.S.C.A and Beyond's potential to promote the personality development of reticent students – she presented herself as increasingly outgoing and extraverted in response to the stimuli and questions that are underpinned by E.S.C.A and Beyond taxonomy.

Student H's increased confidence levels and interpersonal skills were evident and these qualities are very much implicit in the 'accomplished' and 'assured' band of attainment where offering 'comprehensive explanations of the creative intentions' (Pearson, 2016, 13) will very certainly require high levels of confidence.

Barrett and Bolt suggest 'double articulation between theory and practice whereby theory emerges from a reflexive practice at the same time as practice is informed by theory' (2010, 29). Through this 'sharing-focused' activity, she was able to develop a greater connection with theory and practical elements of the course and this also highlights the model's alternative promotion of 'praxis': Student H's understanding of theory supported her in recognising the practice of others which in turn influenced her own practice.

Task 4 rationale:

Brown, Roediger, and McDaniel state that 'effortful retrieval makes for stronger learning' (Brown, 2014: 43). In lesson 1 (on improvisation) I noticed that some of the students struggled to justify their creative choices in relation to the 'alien abduction' stimulus. I felt this was because I encouraged one student per group to read the contextual information out loud whilst the remaining group member listened. These students didn't have to work hard enough to make sense of the contextual information, so when asked 'why did you choose to use scared facial expressions?' students seldom 'connected' and did not link their responses

to the stimulus. I wanted to examine whether employing a 'student-teacher' approach that encouraged them to 'explore' a new topic by retrieving information and 'sharing' it in a performed manner could help to foster 'clear engagement' and greater 'connecting' to the stimuli throughout the rehearsal process.

4. Context/reciprocal teaching (S) 25:00. For this part of the lesson, I asked students to get with a partner and to stand facing them somewhere in the room. I modelled this and reiterated that one person must have their back to the board during this activity. I then put up a slide that contained three facts about children in developing countries. I gave the students who could see the board thirty seconds to read the information and take it in. I told them they'd have to teach their partner as much as they could remember from the board. Furthermore, I asked students how they could 'check' if their teaching was strong. Moreover, I told students they could talk when passing the information on, but should also try to use accompanying gestures.

Task 4 observations:

When asked 'why might the use of your mime skills be helpful when communicating the information?' Student G, a more able student, referred to 'clarity' and explained that 'not every student will understand the words so you can show them with your body language' (the 'sharing-focused' nature of this activity revealed some meta-cognitive understanding where this student was concerned).

The outcomes of this scaffold suggests reciprocal teaching that promotes the introduction of new knowledge, 'can be a fast and effective way to learn' (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 51) as with tradition behaviourist approaches, but also promote self-directed learning in the process. The educational outcomes are supported by very explicit teacher-modelling of the structure of the activity, and understanding is developed largely through questioning the recipient of knowledge immediately after they have been 'taught' by their partner. This aspect of the activity appears to 'raise the stakes' for learners and also serves as a strategy to clear up misconceptions – this is evident where an incorrect recount of knowledge is addressed by the questioning of a different student.

At 27:44 Student G opted to mime the entire message instead of using his voice. He also followed through with his decision to test his partner who was able to recall the information from the board precisely. This could be considered an 'effective' use of performance skills where Student G is concerned; his approach affected his partner cognitively in that he was able to decipher the non-verbal message and recall the facts. The element of choice during this part of the activity results in Student G developing as both a, 'creative contributor' and 'interpreter of text' (Heddon and Milling, 2016:7) but outside of the context in Heddon and Milling's scripted versus devising argument. This pinpoints the models potential to encompass both creative and interpretive qualities that could potentially be exploited through the teaching of other subjects – the task here is to impart knowledge (which could

take place in any lesson), but the activity choices that have proceeded appears to have inspired this student to embrace creative ways to interpret and pass on this knowledge.

The structure of the model appears to promote very seamless transitions from 'sharing' to 'connecting' and these fundamentals seem to complement each other: placing emphasis on 'sharing' information resulted in Student G clearly connecting with the role of 'student-teacher' and how key drama skills can also be used for different purposes – in this case, to educate his partner.

Whilst training students to become 'teachers' is not the aim of this task, the removal of teacher input during the new GCSE component one could result in students taking on a directorial role to enhance their groups' work; Student G's growing understanding of how to promote the learning of others shows potential in terms of meeting the Pearson examination assessment criterion that refers to a 'secure engagement with the process of collaboration' (2016: 9).

In terms of personal development, Student H, continued to excel. She also opted to use non-verbal communication throughout the 'student-teacher' process even though this approach was optional. The model's focus on 'sharing' also promotes cognitive challenges; her facial expressions clearly reveal that she is trying to remember the information that was posted on the board moments before, and her levels of concentration when passing on this knowledge were high.

Further progression was evident after Student H shared the knowledge she acquired with the class. The 'connecting-focused' question clearly moved her up the assessment scale. When asked to 'share' her views, thoughts and opinions, she engaged more closely with the issues at hand and her answers were increasingly coherent. When asked, 'How might hunger affect their performance at school?' Student H referred to 'tiredness' and 'they might not be able to answer questions...and they get low grades'. Whilst this part of the unit focuses more on 'skills', the slight cross over to 'empathy' moves the learning forward in a more

explicit way thus communicating the potential and validity of the sequential 'skills' before 'empathy' structure.

Task 5 rationale:

In the original version of the Sequential Learning Model I let students devise their own mime performance based on the stimuli; this was in an attempt to develop their creativity. This went well on the whole, but lots of the students' creative ideas were self-penalising and didn't enable them to demonstrate the skills explored. An example of this was a pair who adopted a quadrupedal stance throughout their scene thereby preventing them from using hand gestures or different levels/posture. I wanted to examine whether a straightforward scripted template that included non-adverbial structural guidance ('Mime A and B walk through a swamp in search of water' for example) could promote free expression whilst also encouraging students to experiment with the skills and techniques necessary to meet the requirements. I also left certain stages of the template blank to see if this would further promote creativity and reaffirm this notion of stimulus as opposed to 'script'. This activity also became the 'pre-test'; I wanted to see how students performed instinctively and with basic contextual knowledge. Later in the lesson, I planned to introduce an activity to promote greater 'connecting' with the stimulus.

- 4. Main task- scripted mime(S/C) 35:45.** I told students they would now have the opportunity to bring a scene to life where two characters, **Mime A** and **Mime B**, who are from the same deprived milieu, are looking for food. I told them they would have ten minutes to rehearse the short scene and they'd need to be able to perform without the script by the end of the lesson and using the skills explored during the lesson.

Task 5 observations:

The design and sequencing of activity 5 contributes to the learning behaviours outlined below. Firstly, the inclusion of instructional elements appears to promote a journey towards the 'self-directed readiness' that Gugliemino refers to as being the focus 'in the 21st century educational institutions' (Gugliemino, 2: 2013). This scaffold consisted of a stimulus in the form of a story which students were essentially 'instructed' to act out; the specification clearly advocates the use of stimulus as a necessary and appropriate part of the devising process stating, 'your teacher will give you something to start generating ideas from' and 'you may be given a very loose structure on how to work with the stimuli' (Elsden et al, 2016: 14). This activity resulted in significantly improved work from Student J, a student who was recently placed on the inclusion register for a communication needs. Student J showed signs of hyperactivity, which Fontana categorises as 'almost constant physical activity' (Fontana, 1995: 176), earlier in the lesson. An example of this can be seen during activity two from 11:20; Student J fidgeted throughout the questioning-focused activity that took place immediately after a physical activity. His behaviour was similar during other activities that required stillness and auditory skills. Fontana also explains that 'limited attention spans and high distractibility are not dealt with easily', but it appears the E.S.C.A and beyond underpinning taxonomy (exploring – sharing – connecting – affecting) goes some way in addressing this. At 35:56, Student J received his script and his behaviour changed immediately: he began reading it whilst I called out the instructions, thereby managing distractions in a manner that had not been seen up until this moment.

The broad nature of the stimulus creates the opportunity for students to interpret what are basic instructions 'mime A and B walk through the mud' – this demonstrates the scaffolds ability to promote freedom and structure concurrently. Student J's responses suggest that the removal of all adjectives allows him to decide how he will explore each stage thereby

encapsulating the idea of self-direction, and the ability to be self-regulated during the development process.

One minute into the rehearsal process (at 37:00) he could be seen engaging with the resource again and immediately interpreting one of the stages through the use of body language; he altered his posture so that his back was slightly arched and faced the ground, then he adopted a hesitant gait before demonstrating a brief use of body tension. This revealed his character's fear at the sight of a lion. He demonstrated strong communication skills; he read the information out loud, engaged with his partner using direct eye contact and initiated a rehearsal order. This choice of activity clearly promoted the independence and autonomy that Component One insists upon. The scripted nature of the activity clearly supported him with 'connecting' to the stimulus in a manner that was not as 'tentative' as it was during earlier preparatory activities. At 40:16 he began leading the rehearsal process. In his book 'Understanding and Supporting Children with Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, Paul Cooper explains that 'there is increasing evidence that for many children social reinforcement and approval or disapproval is more powerful than material gain' (Cooper, 1988: 125). Student J's behaviour change seemed to be a result of the model's differentiated learning approach and introduction of structural guidance during the devising process. This results in him being more sociable: he consistently uses the text to generate discussion with his partner, who despite being a more able performer, clearly benefits from working with him. This is further evidence that the E.S.C.A and Beyond resources help to foster levels of self-belief: Student J initiates the majority of the ideas, many of which are aptly chosen and his partner is accepting of this; 'acceptance from peers' is also cited as playing a part in behavioural improvement (Cooper, 1988: 125). The removal of the script later on in the lesson did not affect his ability to go on communicating and there was no sign

of the attention seeking behaviour that was displayed earlier on in the lesson. Student J remained focused and worked independently for over eight minutes.

It is suggested by Fontana, that students with learning difficulties attention span can 'gradually increase as they grow older' (Fontana, 1995: 196) – the sequencing of activities resulted in growth throughout the lesson. This appears to be largely due to the fact that each assessment focus (exploring, sharing, connecting and affecting) from the E.S.C.A and beyond Taxonomy promotes very different approaches to learning thereby differentiating the learning environment in an explicit way; this supported Student J in accessing the higher attainment bands. At 41:12 Student J stopped using the script but remained completely focused. This suggests the model's ability to develop longer term memory which has clearly been achieved, in Student J's case, through the 'refinement' process.

Task 6 Rationale:

During previous teaching of the unit I waited until the end of the lesson to watch the mime scenes that students had produced and provided them with feedback on how to improve their work. The areas that most commonly required addressing were related to the use of body language to convey their character's state of mind and surroundings. I chose to incorporate the use of 'connecting-focused' questions because I wanted to examine whether students would be able to externalise their insights, draw on their pre-existing knowledge from the reciprocal teaching task and modify their work without my intervention. I wanted see what impact paired discussion had on students' ability to refine their work.

- 5. Textual analysis (C) 44:10.** Seven minutes into the rehearsal I asked students to look at the back of the script which contained five questions (How long might they have been searching for? How will you communicate this? How do they feel when they notice the tiger? What might cause their itching? What do you think they would want most in life?). I told students

they had to discuss the answers with their partners and consider how they could alter their use of the key mime skills to communicate emotions and ideas to an audience.

Task 6 observations:

It is here that the scaffold design's evolution from stimulus interpretation to targeted questioning supports Student J to continue to make strong levels of progress with considerably less support.

Student J engaged with this activity purposefully. He clearly responded to all of the questions. At 44:58, he referred to the fact that seeing the tiger will evoke feelings of fear in mime A. At 45:36 he altered his hand gestures to convey this panic; he thrust his left arm up and down in rapid succession and pointed towards the 'tiger's' position. This is a clear example of him further refining his ideas in response to targeted questioning. At 45:50 there is further engagement with his script and he articulated that the itching may be 'because they are not able to bath in clean water often and ants crawl on them at night and bite them'. He was also able to communicate these insights through performance. The model's activity choices sustained his interests and significantly enhanced his confidence levels to the point where he actually leads the rehearsal process. At 46:23 there is further evidence of improved focus whilst others are talking and contributing answers – Student J looks at his script and also listens to the responses given by other students. At 47:42, Student J raised his hand slightly and his facial expressions revealed confusion in response to my question – 'what do you think these children want most in life?' thereby revealing some uncertainty about the answer. He turned around some four seconds later and contributed his inference, 'maybe they find some food' and began to rehearse the scene with this in mind.

Student B approached the earlier part of the rehearsal process with ardour; at 51:10 he can be seen using body language in a rather histrionic manner. At 43:02 he also alters his body language to communicate hunger. He remained on task throughout the rehearsal process

and was clearly 'sharing' his ideas and interpretation throughout the rehearsal, but the engagement was somewhat superficial; there didn't really appear to be any emotional connection to the characters and the fact they were from a different part of the world and starving. Soon after answering the questions (50:50 and 51:18), Student B could be seen using body language with a sense of urgency and his facial expressions began to reveal different emotions throughout the rehearsal process. The timing was better and he had clearly developed a stronger rapport with his partner.

Task 7 Rationale:

The changes to Component One (previously 'unit 1') require students to 'refine' their work independently and receive no guidance from teachers, but there isn't any reference to creative input from their peers. I wanted to examine the extent to which participatory theatre approaches mid-way through the rehearsal would support the 'refinement' process. I was also keen to find out whether placing students in the role of an examiner/director would promote progress up the E.S.C.A and beyond incremental scale: the sharing of feedback, connection to the stimulus and the development of creativity when supporting the work of others (influencing the work of their peers - affecting).

- 6. Peer-assessment (S/C/A) 50:00.** I divided the class into two large groups (students were not separated from their partners – for example, Student J and H were in the same 'large group'). I labelled one group 'student directors' and the other, 'performers'. I asked the student directors to remain seated and asked the 'performers' to stand outside of the room with their partner (they would soon re-enter and perform their scene in front of one of the 'student director' pairs). This process was later reversed.

Task 7 findings:

It is said of devising that there is, 'no one model for collaboration' (Heddon and Milling, 2016: 223). The student-friendly criterion that is given to learners to support the peer-assessment activity promotes a fairly confident and focused student-to-student collaboration as evident feedback that is outlined below. Moreover, the structure of this activity (additional rehearsal following receipt of feedback) provides learners with the opportunity to refine their work in light of peer feedback. Student D is learning E.A.L and is a prime example of a student who is experiencing a 'temporary language barrier as a result of insufficient exposure to English' (Hall, 1995: 7), but by no means 'less able'. Student D made very clear references to her peer's use of key performance skills when giving feedback. At 00:18 she stated, 'they did very good because they had some body language and eye contact'; the actual body language is not explained but her response reveals that she is growing increasingly comfortable using technical terms and interweaving them into her feedback only three lessons into the curriculum. In response to the 'satisfactory' band question – 'has the performer established a connection to the character and their feelings?', Student D went on to develop her answer and referred to the fact that the group were unsuccessful in communicating contextual aspects of the performance, 'Student J was smiling; he should kind of change that...because he should be, like hungry scared...or sick or something'. Her reference to 'hunger' and 'fear' revealed a clear engagement with the 'connecting-focused' questions that she responded to midway through the rehearsal (task 3). This activity appears to have helped her to develop greater interpretive skills; she was able to identify that smiling indicates a lack of connection to the stimuli. The middle band achievement descriptors mention that students must reveal a 'coherent explanation'. Whilst she is still working towards this, the 'connecting-focused' activity has supported her in engaging with the potential emotions and physical state of the characters, revealing 'clear engagement throughout the process

of rehearsal' (2016: 21). The spatial configuration (that is clearly planned for) also play a part – students 'directors' are facing outward in the direction of the pair they have been asked to watch perform; this appears to manage distractions. Hall suggests, 'It takes from five to seven years (for students learning E.A.L) to acquire the full range of literacy skills needed to cope with the literacy demands of GCSE' (Hall, 1995: 6). The varied activities from this lesson – the reading and subsequent performed interpretation of a short script and verbal responses to a range of contextual questions – has encouraged a significant amount of progress within a single lesson making chances of success for Student D likely if she continues to learn using from the E.S.C.A and beyond model.

When exploring the aims of self-directed learning, Costa and Kallick states, 'we want them to have methods of self-evaluation and know how turn to external critique for self-improvement' (Costa and Kallick, 2004: 3). The design and structuring of this peer assessment activity clearly supports Student J to use the feedback he receives to improve his performance and overall work ethic. It is clear that the rehearsal, feedback and refining loop that has been established promotes self-improvement. A few minutes after receiving feedback from Student D (at 03:06), Student J's facial expressions were considerably more serious and he adopted a somewhat clumsy and erratic gait that revealed hunger and exhaustion. Student D's response during this peer-directing activity clearly affected the way in which students continued to rehearse which could actually be interpreted as 'effective practical engagement' since two members of the class were able to communicate meaning in a more obvious fashion due to her involvement. This is also a success for Student J in terms of personal development. He demonstrated resilience and perseverance; he took on advice and implemented it without fuss therefore showing increasing social competence and continued behavioural improvement.

The above outcomes accentuate the design's ability to promote what could be interpreted as 'student-in-role' activities; this activity advocates 'instruction' and 'explicit guidance and advice' but among pupils. It appears to promote the independence and drive necessary for students to, 'create and develop a devised piece from a stimulus' (Elsden et al, 2016: 12), while allowing for instructional peer-assessment feedback to support their transition from the 'create' to 'develop' stage which is part of the GCSE assessment.

Student I has moderate learning difficulties. Paul Cooper suggests that this can 'prevent the child from 'catching on' and when others do so this can lead to feelings of failure and fear of learning situations' (Cooper, 1988:166). In response to this participatory and practical activity, Student I excelled. She was able to switch from being a performer and receiving feedback, to engaging with a performance herself, and with ease. At 53:50 she watched a group share their work; her eyes narrowed whilst watching a group perform and she even shared a brief but quiet exchange with her partner about the way in which a part of the scene was communicated. Her engagement with the process of collaboration is 'sustained', and this activity supports her to, 'devise in a way that fulfils potential' (Lamden, 2000:2).

'In self-regulated learning, students use their repertoire of strategies to guide and enhance their learning process' (Carol S Dweck and Allison Master, 2008:31). This comment suggests the 'outcomes' where self-regulated learning is concerned. The E.S.C.A and Beyond scaffold design very clearly helps to develop this repertoire by interweaving a range of learning approaches in rapid succession of each other. She is able to provide her peers with useful feedback immediately after; this also resulted in her using terminology in a 'secure and consistent way' (Pearson, 2016:21). She does more than 'catch on'; she actually reveals high levels of competency in what is a very dynamic and rapidly changing

learning environment. Whilst performing, Student I was confident and completely absorbed in the task; she used an increasing range of non-verbal communication. The model shows that casting students in the role of an 'audience member/assessor' can result in stronger participation; this can, in turn, enhance their work when it's time for them to switch role and become the 'performer'. At 53:54, immediately after giving feedback, Student I engaged with the success criteria before proceeding to refine her own performance work. Having her comment on a scene that she is also working on results in her being even more invested in the process; being part of the other group's action helped Student I to progress.

Mime – Part 2

Activity 8 Rationale:

I chose to re-visit the issue of 'Knowing Doing' during the second lesson on mime. Whilst I was fairly happy with Student B's progress during the first part of the mime unit (lesson 4 of 10), I felt that the model's potential to support development in this area had not been fully realised.

Augusto Boal created a series of exercises that were designed to 'undo the muscular structures of the participants...to disjoint one's own muscle structure' (Boal, 2008: 104); these formed part of the 'spectator-to-actor transformation'. Having viewed the footage from the first mime session, I realised how difficult Student B had found elaborating and using the language of drama to articulate his performance choices. My initial experiment sought to find out whether reducing the amount of time that passed between the activity and the articulation of skills used was creating a boundary for more able boys (performance). Since his response to questioning immediately after the activity revealed very little change, I started to wonder whether his impulsive but effective miming hindered his overall ability to overcome the 'knowing-doing' barrier (the students who were able to articulate what they did most clearly tended to be those that worked slower). I wanted to see if employing the slow-motion strategy and applying it to miming could promote cognition and support students like him in recalling their choices following a slower rehearsal/performance process. Moreover, I experimented with a wider use of imperatives for the less able mime phrase; I wanted to see whether miming an instruction as opposed to message would help less able performers mime with more energy thus demonstrate stronger levels of 'engagement'.

7. Preparatory activity (E/S) 00:30– I instructed all more able students to incorporate characterisation into the mimed message, ‘the old man is behind you’ and later they had to mime the phrase ‘your tummy will explode; lay down’. Less able students were given the phrase, ‘I fly and breathe fire’. I asked them to stand in a circle but facing outwardly; firstly, students got to rehearse at full speed. I then gave them the challenge of miming that activity in slow motion.

Activity 8 findings:

The TLRP study into pedagogy revealed, ‘effective pedagogy requires learning to be scaffolded’ (Cohen et al, 2015:189). The individualised approach of this learning activity – the incorporation of characterisation into the miming process to support verbalization of an enacted sequence – clearly supports this student of Drama to make gradual progress. At 04:20, shortly after the slow-motion mime activity, I questioned Student B (a more able ‘performer’ who struggles to articulate and justify practical choices) again to see if he was able to articulate his movements and actions using technical language. He was able to comment, ‘I used body language’ and once again re-enacted what he did to communicate the old man. It’s clear that the characterisation difference to this mime phrase (playing an elderly man) went some way to support him in remembering as he quickly referred to his hunched posture. The specifics of this activity appeared to make the student feel more comfortable and resulted in less persistent questioning when compared with task 7 where it seemed more ‘obvious’ in terms of the teacher’s desire for student progress (and perhaps made this student feel under-pressure to deliver the ‘desired’ answer).

Student B still required, however, a significant amount of questions to illicit responses which goes against the specification rules for Component One.

Activity 9 Rationale:

Whilst this study is focused on 'creating' and the rehearsal process, I wanted to examine the extent to which employing strategies that are designed to move students towards 'affecting' in terms of their written work – getting student to focus on putting a picture in the examiners mind when explaining the rehearsal process – would support Student B in communicating what he did during performance.

- 8. Intervention (C/A)** – I gave the students another phrase to mime and then asked Student B if he could have another go at articulating what he did.

After Student B had finished a second mime activity, I asked him to explain what he did the 'as if I was a blind student...' I then proceeded to close my eyes to support him with this. At 14:33, he was able to articulate himself in a coherent and sustained manner, 'I pointed my fingers at my tummy and then wriggled my hand'. I responded with 'thank you' and tried to move on. Student B clearly wanted to continue his answer; '...and then, I pointed at him with my fingers and I told him to lay down – so I moved both hands down and he lay down'. He seemed a lot happier sharing his responses and did so with great pride. Student B is on the inclusion for emotional and behavioural needs as well as mental health. This response exemplifies the role that reflection has played in the planning of scaffolds; the incorporation of the 'blind' listener went some way in addressing the issue of 'perceived importance' that was evident the first time he was asked to articulate the mime skills used (activity 3), and arguably this change in attitude and more developed answer could suggest this student views helping the blind as 'important'.

He exuded very positive emotions during this interaction which points to the model's ability to promote an interlink between personal and academic development: the 'affecting' achievement band clearly encapsulates 'empathy' which, in Student B's case, resulted in a positive outcome in terms of achievement and his overall communication and self-esteem. The empathy-focused approach to questioning supported him in revealing higher levels of emotional intelligence; he clearly empathised with my blind 'character' and this clearly motivated him to develop his answer in a clear and precise manner.

Chapter 8: Empathy for Drama

Topic: **Identity**

Lesson: **4 of 10**

Task 1 Rationale:

My original approach to task 1 (in this lesson) involved pairing students up, giving them a picture of Ishi and instructing them to discuss what they learn about him using sentence prompts. This tended to result in tentative engagement where students learning English as an Additional Language were concerned: in many cases their eyes wandered from the picture and they focused more on what other students were doing. This initially prompted me to deploy support staff more strategically so that they could reiterate my explanation and provide guidance to support language development. The new GCSE Edexcel Drama (9-1) Component One assessment criteria, however, focuses on 'independent engagement in the process of collaboration and devising', thus rendering the aforementioned approach and task counter-productive and obsolete. The new specification makes it explicit that students can only be given support through questioning that does not 'lead them' in too obvious a fashion. In preparation for the planning adjustments that would need to take place, I engaged with the Primary National Strategy which suggests that one of the features of supportive learning is to ensure that there are 'planned opportunities for oral rehearsal in pairs' (2002: 3). Through the activity below, I wanted to examine the extent to which an explorative and active learning activity would reduce passivity among students learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) and promote greater exploration of the stimulus and 'sharing' with peers (E.S.C.A and Beyond stage 1 and 2). Previously, I used a picture that contained the whole tribe holding a bow and arrow, but this appeared to lead students too much and most of their feedback became observational. I wanted to see whether opting for a black and white picture of Ishi would promote greater engagement with countenance, posture

and to also highlight this idea of minimalism which in many ways links into the life of the tribe.

1. **Interpreting a photograph (E) 01:42.** I asked students to get with a partner of their choice, take a stool and then sit back-to-back. I told students to decide who would be **Person A** and **Person B**. Once the students had decided, I instructed **Person A** to stand at the door and **Person B** to remain seated. I then walked around the room and placed a picture of 'Ishi' face down in front of the seat where **Person A** was sitting.

I told students that they must run towards their seat and take on the role of a person who has just seen 'Ishi' as soon as I made the sound of a phone ringing. **Person B** (who had remained seated with their back to person A) was told they'd be playing call-centre anthropologists.

I then modelled the following conversation with a student in the class: (a) 'Hello, I've just seen Ishi' (b) 'What does he look like?' I explained that person A should then pick up the photograph in front of them, turn it over and describe exactly what they see (I told person B to remain with their back to person A and listen to the descriptions given).

Task 1 observations

Student A, a participant who is learning English as an Additional Language, engaged with this role play activity in a focused way: her eyes remained fixed on the photograph for the majority of the activity, and the 'character' she was given went some way in minimising distractions – she seemed less aware of the discussions taking place just a few yards from her and in either direction. Also, the spatial configuration of this activity appeared to promote better social interaction with her partner and a more attentive response to the stimulus overall: Student A was able to share observations about Ishi's appearance and make basic inferences about his emotions ('he looks scared').

It is said that scaffolding, 'should enable students to develop their own understanding' (Long, 2000:37). In terms of design, the use of photographic stimuli seems to promote students developing their own understanding; this is supported by the teacher enacting the structure of the activity (running over to a partner, picking up the photograph and engaging in a dialogue), but without leading students in terms of how they will respond to the photograph.

I encouraged Student A to take on the 'Person A' role first to reduce the chances of 'parroting'. This served to tease out her pre-existing vocabulary which included correct pronunciation and naming of clothing items, 'his coat makes him look cold' and 'maybe he is going to get some food' – the latter revealed a basic yet correct use of tenses. Despite this additional challenge of going first, Student A approached the activity with ardour; 'going first' actually prompted her partner to probe deeper and not duplicate answers Student A gave. As a result, Student A was introduced to some new vocabulary – this was evident through slight changes in her facial expressions in response to her partner's use of the word, 'homeless' and 'malnourished'. The explorative nature of the task enables her to access it instantly and puts her on an even-keel with the rest of the class (many of whom might explore at a deeper level) thus promoting confidence in a way that the traditional 'knowledge-focused' approach often excludes students learning English as an additional language because they first need to 'develop their understanding of the English Language' before they can make sense of the knowledge given (Supporting Children Learning English as an Additional Language' National strategy, 2002: 2). Student A smiled throughout the activity and demonstrated growing listening skills: she slightly turned her head towards her partner when taking on the role of person B. The National strategy document also highlights the importance of modelling 'speaker/listener roles to pupils' (2002: 11). My modelling of the task appeared to promote a better understanding

of the task's demands: I did not have to reiterate the explanation and support Student A further thus revealing E.S.C.A and Beyond's exploration-focused, role-play activities' ability to foster greater levels of independence. Whilst this activity went some way in encouraging Student A to articulate her ideas to her partner, she did not raise her hands to share these ideas with the class as a whole (there would however, be a very visible difference in her response less than fifteen minutes after this activity).

Whilst the extent to which the scaffold supported the student is clear, it is not clear if the student is able to recognise how the design of this particular activity has promoted her own engagement. Questioning of a metacognitive nature may support this student later in the devising stage – an example of this might be when students are required to choose their own stimulus.

Task 2 Rationale:

My initial approach to activity 2 also involved placing students in ability partnerships, questioning them to illicit inferences and the subsequent placing of correct answers onto the board after the discussion. This was to address any misconceptions in relation to the tribe – the original photograph led to inference like he lives in India, is a warrior and land owner, so that students could then go on to portray them in an 'accurate' manner. In light of the GCSE changes, this could be interpreted as 'too leading'; the specification states that top band students will need to embark on the rehearsal process in an 'assured' and 'accomplished' manner (2016:21) – both adjectives imply a high confidence levels, enthusiasm and social skills since students will need to communicate ideas in front of the entire class. This would involve collaborating with students of all abilities, ethnicities and backgrounds. I wanted to see if adopting a more explorative approach would promote the non-subject specific development in addition to inferences and subsequent synthesising.

2. Questioning and Feedback (E/S) 02:48. I asked students to feedback their observations regarding Ishi and his identity, and I used this information to annotate the board; I wrote a question mark after each adjective that students contributed. I began with an open question: **what can you tell me about Ishi?** And then focused on an inference-based one: **What does the fact he isn't wearing any shoes tell us?** I also challenged lower ability pupils: he is wearing a long coat – **where might he live, and how could you use body language to communicate this?** A more able student referred to his bare-feet, so I followed this with: **how might this affect his gait?**

Task 2 observations:

These 'connecting-focused' questions appear to have resulted in inquiring approaches from Student C, a more able student of Drama. At 04:05 after contributing an answer and listening to the answers of others, he re-engaged with the picture in a rather forensic way. He squinted, paused momentarily and put his hands up to contribute further. In many ways, the sequential nature of this activity elicits an interrogative response from him in that he examines, plans his answer and then acts/responds in a loop not to dissimilar to that of an action researcher. In terms of vocal tone and pitch, his upward inflection reveals an underpinning rhetoric quality which could be both associated with uncertainty or indeed someone who is approaching their work in a rather reflexive manner. This also resulted in positive outcomes for Student C during the lesson on mime where he contributed to a class discussion, sharing his ideas, making connections, and developing examples clearly motivated by 'affecting' others and helping them to visualize what happened in the cartoon. Student C showed a willingness to 'share' his creative ideas with the rest of the class – he provided a very clear example of how body language could be used to communicate one of his classmate's inferences ('Ishi might be homeless). He contributed '...Ishi might be limping because there might be like stones on

the floor and things like that'; this was clear evidence of him 'connecting' to the stimuli. The study guide written for students clearly instructs students to do the following, 'always try to get up on your feet and work practically as early as possible: it's easy to get caught up in discussion, but you're here to devise' (Elsden et al, 2016:16). The design of this scaffold, which includes probative questioning that focuses on articulating how inferences will be performed, clearly prepares students in terms of formulating their creative ideas, but in a manner that has students thinking 'actively'. The responses from less able students also prompted him to share further and build upon their answers – at 05:59 he modelled how the climate could be conveyed through performance by raising both arms, wrapping them around himself whilst lifting his shoulder slightly and leaning his head toward it, 'you could wrap your hands around your body and shiver'.

When prompted further, and asked which skill he just made use of, he contributed 'body language' thus demonstrating a 'coherent use of drama terminology' and 'clear engagement with the process of collaboration' aspects of the Pearson Edexcel assessment criteria (2016: 21). This also revealed Student C's cognitive development in that he is able to recall subject specific terminology accurately, without hesitation; this is pleasing given the fact he is eleven years old and only eight weeks into his Year 7 study of Drama. He exudes positive emotions throughout the course of the activity.

Ken Robinson makes the distinction between creativity and imagination in his book 'Out of Our Mind – Learning to be Creative'. He refers to creativity as 'applied imagination' (Robinson, 2005: 115). Within a very short space of time, Student C is able to move from sharing his 'creative' ideas in response to the stimuli, to actually putting them into practice and ensuring they are 'realised' in a successful manner. An example of this can be seen at 03:12 when his hands raised before I got the chance to ask 'what does this tell us?', and he is able to build upon his partner's inferences.

Task 3 Rationale:

I decided to inject an impromptu whole class preliminary activity to examine the extent to which Student C would be able to 'apply' his imagination without any guidance and the impact this might have on his groups' performance during task 4.

3. **Group activity (E/S) 08:45.** I instructed students to get into the groups I selected, and create a unique walk as if they were the Yahi tribe.

Task 3 observations:

Frantic assembly refer to the fact that their devising is, 'broken down into tasks. These remain as simple as can be. They are bite sized and self-contained' (Graham and Hoggett, 2014: 15). It appears that this contemporary approach to devising is also promoted through the sequencing and length of each E.S.C.A and Beyond lesson. Complexity, however, is interwoven in a manner that is controlled and targeted, and whilst this particular set of scaffolds are 'self-contained' in terms of how they are planned, they appears to have supported students in building on their pre-understandings beyond the confounds of the task at hand.

Student C immediately began to experiment with abstract body language; at 09:05 he arranged his group members and encouraged them to manoeuvre around the space in a histrionic manner. His suggestion of the circular spatial configurations revealed connection to the context; this idea of family, togetherness, shared values and behaviour came across when the group followed his suggestion. There was a clear 'call-and-response' nature to their rehearsal process and Student C quickly immersed as the 'tribal leader'. At 09:21, his approach had inspired others: a member of his group contributed a tribal gesture. Student C's work quite clearly reveals a 'secure engagement with the process of refinement'. He is clearly the driving force behind this activity and able to put

ambitious ideas into practice; this is done without any intervention from me, the subject teacher, thereby in-keeping with specification stipulations. It seems that the design has provided evidence that moves beyond the notion that, 'improvisation of some form is part of the devising process' (Heddon and Milling, 2016:8); this improvisation activity has given him the opportunity to demonstrate a range of self-directed qualities that are arguably harder to elicit through written activities which may or may not result in an improved performance. It is also said that, 'learning from adults does not always involve the tight structure and interactivity of scaffolding' (Long, 2000:37). This activity, however, reveals that tightly structured and openness can co-exist: the sequencing of activities promotes a focused engagement where this student is concerned and the rest of the class who are able to work independently.

Task 4 Rationale:

Ian Bryant refers to Carr and Kemmis' affirmation that the 'purpose of action research is not to prove or disprove theory, but to improve practice' (Carr and Kemmis, 1986: 202). Previously, the outcomes of this activity told me whether students could use skills to communicate the knowledge I had shared with them and if they were ready to move on. But I wanted to examine whether setting up a pre and post testing learning activities would encourage students to both engage with, and improve their practice since the word 'refinement' features so heavily on the Component One mark scheme. I wanted to see whether encouraging students to view the activity as an 'experiment' not too dissimilar to the experimental research I am doing would promote greater connection with one's own performance and higher levels of reflection. I omitted the use of any adverbs during the course of the activity since this could be interpreted as 'directing'.

4. Whole class improvisation (pre-test where students respond instinctively and without any concrete knowledge of the tribe) 12:18(E/S)

I asked the class to stand in a space and to manoeuvre around the room when the music started. I told them they'd get the chance to live as Ishi for a few minutes. I called out the following instructions 'Ishi is walking **barefoot** towards a cave', 'Ishi hears a noise and takes out his bow and arrow' and 'Ishi notices a chicken'. I adopted a matter-of-fact tone of voice when delivering each instruction to avoid 'directing' students towards a particular way of responding.

Task 4 observations:

In many ways the critic's view of creativity, '...children running wild and knocking down furniture....being spontaneous and uninhibited rather than with serious academic work', as cited by Ken Robinson is challenged (Robinson, 1995: 113). This activity actually supported Student A in communicating her pre-existing knowledge of what a tribe is through its promotion of non-verbal communication, thus transcending language barriers. Student A quickly demonstrated her understanding of improvisation principles 'accepting' and 'spontaneity'; she was able to put herself in the character's shoes during this whole class exploration. She altered her body language to convey the bow and arrow when following my 'the tribe are being attacked' instruction; this suggested some pre-understanding of the primitive connotations the word 'tribe' has. She manoeuvred around the room with her 'tribe' and displayed stock emotions when responding to the 'gun-shot'. The sequencing of this activity clearly allows students learning English as an Additional Language to be expressive, and enables Student A's progress to be tracked through her use of non-verbal communication. This scaffold has promoted embodiment in a very explicit way and one could argue that the aforementioned physical responses from Student A support Piaget's view that students construct their own meaning 'mainly through their ability to internalise experiences' (Long, 2000:

35). This scaffold has not allowed for Student A to verbalise her ideas about how best to communicate the feelings and experiences of the tribe. This appears to encourage her to internalise the emotions the tribe may have felt and communicate them spontaneously and in-keeping with self-directed learning which, 'demands new skills from students' (Gibbons, 2002: 3). Anderson states, 'mostly the body is ignored in education' and presents the following argument: 'to achieve aesthetic understanding of any play....reading over it or even watching the play will not give the depth of understanding required for the characterisation and dramatic action' (Anderson, 2012: 86). This scaffold clearly embraces the importance of body when it comes to the devising process and allows students to experience the stimulus in the absence of elaborate power points and visuals. Moreover, Edexcel has not provided teachers with any indicative content where devising is concerned; arguably, the sheer volume of embodiment-specific insights that have be drawn from this activity (and others) highlights the potential such scaffolds have in terms of providing teachers with the opportunity to interpret devising 'outcomes' (in the absence of indicative content bands).

Whilst this study is focused on the devising aspect of the exam, this less scaffolded pre and post-test activity also promoted stronger performance skills than observed earlier in the course which suggests a potential for over-lapping the assessment of performance outcomes. One of the performance criterion states, 'physical skills are sound demonstrating an adequate understanding of how creative choices communicate meaning to an audience' (Pearson Drama specification, 2016: 37); arguably, the embodiment and performance focus of this activity is helping students to develop their own acting abilities and levels of refinement concurrently. There is also the view that, 'limitations create freedoms and breed creativity' (Graham and Hoggett, 2014:16) this is incumbent in the scaffold's promotion of instructions during the pre and post-test ('the tribe hear a bang' etc.) which allows for creativity (and the use of gesture and proxemics detailed above), but the narrative is pre-decided. Moreover, less development opportunity is allowed for thereby requiring her to deliver performed interpretations in a limited period of time. The pre and post testing also creates the opportunity for Student A to reflect on her progress.

Task 5 Rationale:

The Skills for Drama 'student teacher' experiment on mime was successful (the students had to share information about the Rio slums with each other), but this approach involved only the sharing of factual information. When students shared the factual information they had retained, I followed them up with question like 'how do you think they would have felt?' The responses were monosyllabic ('sad' for example, 28:44 mime lesson) and students found it hard to elaborate even when I tried to probe further. I wanted to examine the effect building this empathetic line of questioning into the reciprocal teaching activity would have on the quality of student responses.

5. Context-focused activity (C/A) 14:00:

I put students in pairs – each pair consisted of a more and less able student in terms of their key stage 2 examination data and achievement in Drama thus far. I asked the students to stand facing their partners; the less able students were instructed to stand so that they could see the board and the more able were told to have their back to it. I then shared some factual information with the less able students (including who the Yahi tribe were, what their life was like, and some of the issues they faced). I gave the students thirty seconds to read the information and take it in before passing it on to their partners. The more able students (with their back to the board) were given a question that they had to answer; this question was put up on the wall in front of them and read 'how do you think they would have felt?' Students were instructed to answer this question in response to the information they had received from their partner.

Task 5 observations:

The design of this activity clearly promotes non-assisted peer-to-peer teaching and the sharing of ideas; it had a tremendous impact on Student D, a Gifted and Talented student learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L). This was partially due to the embedded sub-questions like 'how do you think this would make them feel?' This added a more complex dimension to this reciprocal teaching activity. After the sharing of information has taken place, she demonstrated fairly high levels of inference (at 18:02) in response to the fact her partner shared about the Yahi tribe lived far away from civilization. She referred to the 'happiness' they might experience and touched upon the idea that the tribe could comfort each other in times of sadness. Student D demonstrated secure levels of social competency during this activity and her tone of voice revealed engagement with the emotions felt by the tribe; this is evident in her subtle use of elongation to communicate emotional experiences (most noticeably during the word 'happy') the tribe may encounter. Student D's vocabulary is far more developed and her 'explanations' were 'sustained'. The sequencing of this activity supports her in moving from 'connecting' to the stimuli to having affected others in a positive way – this was evident when two students contributed insightful answers in response to her ideas. One student began with 'following on from what Student D said' and he went on to further explore this idea of 'family'. Moreover, Student E (a learner with a physical disability), opened her argument with 'I agree and disagree with what Student D says'; she referred to 'safety in numbers' and immediately went on to talk about the 'down side'.

Student D's contributions inspired a fruitful debate and students shared their answers in a very respectful manner. GCSE Component One criteria uses words like 'effective' in the second highest achievement band – one could argue that ideas that significantly impact the thoughts and ideas of others could constitute 'effective'.

Post-test observations:

At 25:48 Student A's use of proxemics and body language revealed a 'clear engagement (during) the process of rehearsal'; Student A held her imaginary bow and arrow and pivoted her entire body to the left and right in a fairly quick but tense fashion revealing the tribe's panic during the 'gun-shot' moment. Student A's overall performance is vastly different to her somewhat superficial engagement during the first attempt at this activity – Student A initially smiled during this part of the activity, demonstrating an ability to 'share' an interpretation, but without the connection evident in *this* performance. It is clear from this activity that the action-research approach to learning helps her to develop her confidence as well as vocabulary. At 27:08 she volunteered to share her experience with the class without prompting. Her facial expressions reveal happiness and enjoyment following her meaningful contribution.

At 26:06 Student I, a learner who has been identified as having emotional needs and is said to lack motivation in virtually all subject areas, is able to articulate the differences between her group's first attempt and their second one: 'we walked differently; we acted a little less savage because we understood them a little bit more' and 'they were actually human beings'. This revealed an insightful engagement with the task and stimulus. Lots of subjects promote the idea of students doing 'research' to enhance their knowledge; it seems the models promotion of student 'action-research' results in positive outcomes for Student I who appears to prefer learning in an active way. Student I actually presents as being more able during this activity. David Fontana explores 'intelligence' in his book 'Psychology for Teachers' he explore the difficulties associated with measuring intelligence and states, 'we are only able to infer its presence by watching people's behaviour' (Fontana, 1995: 95); this promoted a more forensic look into Student I's 'behaviour' when sharing her highly reflective answers. She talked using a fairly assured

tone of voice and each sentence ends with the upward inflection which had a rhetoric quality to it. There is an inactive quality to her approach; she stands very still and the only bodily movements come from her head which she slightly tilts when thinking about her answers. This is in sharp juxtaposition to her earlier mannerisms (constant playing with her scarf whilst listening to the feedback of others).

Chapter 9: Knowledge for Drama

Topic: **Greek Mythology** Lesson: **4 of 10**

Unit introduction/ Task 1 Rationale:

The self-directed learning approaches employed during the Skills for Drama and Empathy for Drama units resulted in positive outcomes in terms of ‘creation, development and refinement of ideas from stimuli’ and ‘engagement with the process of refinement’. The ‘explanation of creative intent’ strand of the GCSE component one criteria, however, encompassed its own diverse set of pedagogical challenges (Edexcel GCSE Drama specification, 2016: 21). Achievement in the top band requires students to offer ‘comprehensive explanations of their creative intentions’. This part of the examination was assessed through written work, and teachers were permitted to provide students with writing frames to guide students’ writing. One of the main challenges for this unit will be finding ways that E.S.C.A and Beyond can be used to promote ‘discovery’ of theatrical genres and mediums, and the subsequent synthesising of this knowledge during the rehearsal process, but without further direction.

I experimented with self-directed learning methods for lesson 1 and 2 of this unit – when introducing students to theatre-in-the-round staging, I created an environment where they got to explore what performing in-the-round felt like when sharing a short scene and then provided students with the opportunity to connect by asking them to reflect on the difficulties, limitations and benefits immediately after to promote understanding. Whilst this activity promoted ‘connection’ to the demands of theatre-in-the-round, students struggled to justify their creative decisions in relation to this. For example, students were able to articulate the need for voice projection when performing in the round since audience members are often behind them. But when asked why it would have been

crucial during Ancient Greek times, more able students were unable to make the link between the audiences of up to 15,000 or outdoor setting.

Sofia Souli discusses Greek mythology juxtaposition – ‘(the gods were) vulnerable to human weakness’ but yet, ‘so powerful...they were severe, punishing every unjust act’ (Souli, 1995: 6). Whilst simply sharing this information with students early on in the lesson would provide them with some information about mythology and potentially elicit engagement with historical and cultural circumstances, it would be considered ‘too leading’ at GCSE level. Fontana’s view of children and the fact that ‘powers of conceptualisation are linked to their physical activity’ (Fontana, 1995: 67) encouraged me to explore ways in which a children’s game could support develop. I chose to adapt the game ‘what’s the time Mr Wolf’ and examine the extent to which it could be used to share Sofia Souli’s insights with students, but in a physical and interactive way. I also wanted to examine the extent to which my ‘teacher-in-role’ characterisation (the use of archaic language, histrionic gestures and verse to communicate a fictitious Greek god) would help students to develop an understanding of the relationship between the mortals and the gods.

1. Preparatory task: Zeus’s footsteps (E/S/C) 04:12. I took on the role of ‘The Greek god’. I explained to students (who were standing in one long line) that they were allowed to advance towards me in slow motion when my back was turned. I portrayed a terrified Greek god. I chose two students to ‘stand guard’ (next to me while my back was turned to the class who slowly advanced towards me) and identify the still image skills being used by the class when they froze the moment I turned around; I concluded by asking Student C what the game had taught him about the relationship between the gods and the humans.

Task 1 observations

The outcomes suggest that this design and the clear adaptations of popular childhood games are not only, 'the key to successful interaction' (Heddon and Milling, 2016: 34), but an effective way to intertwine contextual information into the lesson without resorting to behaviourist approaches. In this case, social circumstances surrounding the world of the devised piece (Greek mythology) are communicated through teacher modelling (and becoming a 'stimulus' in many respects), scripted interactions between students 'in role' and the structure of the 'game'.

Student C's response during this activity highlights how 'E.S.C.A and beyond' creates opportunities for more able students to engage with higher order thinking when taking part in seemingly 'straightforward' warm-up games. At 12:24 Student C stated, 'the gods thought they were superior (to) the humans'. When asked why he thought this, he continued with '...because they didn't go near you'. 'They were afraid and only went closer to you when your back was towards them'. He was clearly able to interpret my performance and that of the students in the class. He was also physically engaged in this activity and experimented with the use of body tension, balance and countenance. His response revealed a greater 'connection' to the circumstances surrounding the world of the play. This scaffold's subtle use of differentiation, which can be referred to in an educational context as, 'matching your tasks or activities and your teaching approaches to the needs and preferred learning styles of the children in your classroom' (Ellis, 2012: 51) clearly challenge this more able students and promotes self-direction in a very literal way – he portrays the Greek god without being 'directed'. It is said that 'self-direction is dormant without challenge' (Gibbons, 2002: 11); the complete removal of support following teacher modelling appears to drive this student towards giving a stronger performance as evident when he shares his interpretation of a Greek god (which was

slightly different to mine in that he didn't explore vulnerability and focused more on fury) during the second round. In role, he said (10:20), 'you have no chance against me, put your weapons down'. His use of facial expressions and language clearly communicated the status and feelings the gods had towards mortals. This is also a clear example of how the model promotes differentiated outcomes for all students whilst maintaining an inclusive approach to learning. The re-casting of the Zeus role provided Student C with the challenge of sharing his interpretation of Zeus through performance, whilst the majority of the class got to apply their use of performance skills non-verbally and revealing great discipline in terms of going from movement to stillness in rapid succession. Through this activity they clearly 'explore' characters from the underworld and 'share' their interpretations thus promoting the model's ability to promote joint attention. The casting of two 'guards' also promoted analytical learning which resulted in rich outcomes: both students were able to articulate which 'underworld' characters were being portrayed and the skills students were using to present these characters thereby revealing increasing levels of 'connection'. They also revealed the knowledge they had acquired during the Skills for Drama unit and how their peers used them to portray stylized characters; this level of analysis reveals progress towards 'affecting' in that students are able to engage with diverse theatrical approaches. The test at GCSE will be whether students can draw on this knowledge and exploit approaches such as this to communicate meaning in their own theatrical pieces.

Task 2 Rationale:

Initially, I shared the story of 'Pandora's Box' with the students and encouraged them to re-cap it with one another. Whilst this was successful, the narrative demands appeared to hinder E.A.L students in terms of their ability to actively contribute during the rehearsal process. This meant I had to interject during rehearsals in order to support these

students. Deryn Hall refers to, 'the skills of negotiating, prioritising, investigating, drafting, sequencing and matching' (Hall, 1995: 13) as part of the problem solving process for students learning English as an Additional Language. The 'problem solving' addressed in his book focused on subjects like Geography and Science; there wasn't any mention of Drama education. I wanted to examine whether encouraging two students learning English as an additional Language to teach each other the story would promote clarity of thought in terms of the narrative and organising their ideas, and whether this would result in greater independence during the rehearsal activities that followed.

2. Reciprocal teaching/ Pandora's box (S) 14:20. For this part of the lesson, I asked students to get with a partner and to stand facing them somewhere in the room. I then put the first three parts of the Pandora's Box myth on the board. I gave the students who could see the board thirty seconds to read the information and take it in. I told them they'd have to teach their partner as much as they could remember about the myth 'Pandora's Box'.

Task 2 observations

In defining self-directed learning, Gibbons states, 'SDL (self-directed learning) is any increase in knowledge, skills, accomplishment or personal development that an individual selects and brings about by his or her own efforts' (Gibbons, 2002:2). The design of this particular scaffold promotes the development of all four areas to some degree.

Firstly, the reciprocal teaching approach introduces 'knowledge' which in this case is the plot points/narrative of a Greek myth. At 14:26, Student A's concentration levels were high; her gaze remained fixed on the board and she actually mouthed the stages of the

story thereby immediately working on the pronunciation of these words: at 14: 38 she hesitated and stopped mouthing the words which suggested some initial difficulty with pronunciation. Moments later, the more fluent mouthing of words continued. Student A swayed from side to side in a manner which may have been a result of her sequencing in her mind; her engagement here was significantly more energetic when compared to reciprocal teaching earlier in the unit that called for the memorisation of facts only (mime lesson).

Secondly, the task requires the student to demonstrate the 'skill' of absorbing information, making sense of it and then communicating it to others.

At 04:43 she communicated the first three stages of the story to her partner and clearly accentuates key words when her partner looks slightly unsure. There is an instance where she quickly clears up a misconception which suggests the plot points have been embedded with some 'skill'. Her partner's (who is also learning E.A.L) body language reveals growing levels of confidence; she sways both arms out in front of her, from left to right, in a rhythmic fashion which is actually in time with her spoken recollection of the story.

Thirdly, this activity builds in an additional element whereby the 'learner' is encouraged to repeat what they have learnt to their partner, thereby creating an opportunity for students to feel a sense of accomplishment. Hall affirms that, 'students who engage orally in the language of a subject with their peers are more likely to understand and internalise' (Hall, 1995:8) – her partner's response reveals clear evidence of this, especially since her body language grows in confidence whilst recapping the story and her ability to contribute ideas relating to the structure of the performance is clear during rehearsal.

Evidence of this activity promoting personal development could be seen at various moments. At 01:58, Student A can be seen contributing ideas and actively arguing her case as to why the gods should in fact be 'on the floor during the first act', thereby revealing problem solving skills. Student A's partner has clearly benefitted from her input; at 02:02 she compromised and contributed new ideas to the first still image (which is the part of the story that Student A told her about). Student A was actually placed in a group with three very able and socially confident students, but it appears the earlier 'sharing' of the story has supported her in contributing ideas without teacher intervention. The reciprocal teaching activity and the structure of the lesson up until this point had clearly engendered a sense of ownership and supported her in revealing more than 'adequate engagement throughout the process of engagement'; this is the descriptor for the second to lowest GCSE achievement band (where her key stage 2 achievements predict she will end up).

Task 3 Rationale:

During previous teaching of this topic I encouraged students to go straight into the rehearsal process – the cognitive demands for this task were fairly low since it merely required students to transfer information from one medium to another. As a result, students immediately attacked the rehearsal process with energy. However, the slight contextual shift during the reciprocal teaching activity (which students had become quite used to) resulted in a slight loss of ardour. JR Green states that playwright Thucydides, 'introduced speeches into his narratives whenever he wanted to examine motives for action' (Green, 1994: 3). I originally planned to interweave questions that focused on character motivation into a written activity, but when the motivation of the students emerged as a potential issue, I decided to introduce an activity that explored their own

motivations to see if this would re-engage students and promote stronger levels of 'connection' with the stimulus.

3. Questioning (C) 19:17: I asked students to think of a time when they had been told not to do something and they ignored the instruction. I asked them to share this with each other.

Task 3 observations

This impromptu task once again accentuates the fact that planning for self-directed learning can result in the facilitator interjecting with un-scripted learning activities to move the learning forward. The task exists solely to address an emergent issue: disengagement.

At 19:30, students engaged with this activity in a focused way. There was a clear shift in energy when compared to re-sharing of the Pandora's Box story – students laughed a lot more and there was considerably more smiling. It seems this 'connecting-focused' activity actually revealed more 'connected' engagement between participants who began to use gesture and their voices in a more emphatic way when sharing their own experiences and choices with each other. This activity also resulted in lots of students wanting to share their stories with the class thus revealing growing levels of comfort and enjoyment. This enthusiasm in fact carries over to the next activity and students engage in the rehearsal process meaningfully. In terms of modelling, there is often an emphasis on the teacher and, 'their own display of desirable learning behaviours in the presence of others' (Costa and Kallick, 2004: 84). Whilst this activity does have the desired affect and students continue the lesson in a more focused and energised way, the fortuitous nature of the scaffold is not shared with the students. It would also perhaps have been useful to let students see their teacher's self-direction in 'action', as this may have generated some

fruitful questions from them and further discussion. Encouraging students to reflect on the impact engaging with their own lives had on their overall enjoyment and engagement with the activities that follow during a written activity could be a way for students to engage in a meta-cognitive way.

4. Main task rehearsal (S/C) 00:00 (clip 2). I put the students into groups of 5. I

instructed them to choose three key moments from Pandora's Box, and capture each one with a still image. This rehearsal ended with an activity and this was essentially pre-test measure: I asked all students to share their self-directed work with the entire class in order to establish the standard before given them individualised question to answer (activity 5).

Task 4 observations

Booth and Ainscow's 2001 collaborative research project resulted in 'The Index for Inclusion'; this ended up being 'a school development instrument' (Ainscow, 2002: 29) that was rolled out internationally. When the data from this international research was analysed they decided to 'concentrate on the development of aspects of classroom practice'. Two of these indicators were (a) 'children are actively involved in their own learning' and (b) 'lessons are made accessible to all pupils' (Ainscow, 2002: 31).

All students engaged with the process of rehearsal instantly and in the 'active' manner that was highlighted as a classroom practice indicator (when moving towards a more inclusive working environment).

At 01:00, Student E, a student with physical learning difficulty instantly altered her physicality when experimenting with the moment Pandora opens the box. She slightly raised her left leg and both arms were raised above her head in a claw position; she

achieved vicious facial expression through the tensing of her facial muscles and slightly burrowing her eyebrows. This task did not contain any specific modification to address her specific need, but it is clear this learning activity inspired her to break down her own personal barriers to learning in order to bring the scene to life. Her entire group engaged with the process of rehearsal and there wasn't any inattentiveness to speak of. The structure of E.S.C.A and Beyond and its initial focus on 'sharing' and 'skills' supports students in delving straight into the rehearsal process through 'active' discussion; students are inspired to apply skills instantly thus resulting in them being able to refine their work at quite a rapid rate for their age.

Fontana states, 'all teachers are teachers of creativity'. (Fontana, 1995: 133) It is clear from pupil outcomes during the lesson that careful sequencing of activities promote creativity in a manner that allows students to demonstrate it more independently; this challenges the conventional notion of 'teaching' and highlights the model potential for teachers to have a strong impact on pupils through their pedagogy alone. For example, the students' knowledge of the story, experimentation with still image skills and paired reflection enable them to work collaboratively and creatively for fifteen minutes without any additional guidance; this meets the demands of the new GCSE specification and the majority of the class reveal at least 'clear engagement with the process of rehearsal'. The 'free expression' is perhaps a result of the structured and uniformed pedagogy and sequencing of the model.

Students display an innumerable amount of skills during the course of the rehearsal process. Lots of these fundamentals (team work, listening, turn-taking) were developed and nurtured earlier on in the curriculum. An example of this was seen during the Empathy for Drama unit's scheme of work on Identify; students had to capture a moment from their own life, share it with their group and then engage with the process of simultaneous dramaturgy. Students interviewed each other before engaging in group

work activity. One of the questions they were asked is, 'what difficulties might students wearing the orange jacket (learning facilitator's) face'? Students were able to pinpoint fundamentals like listening skills, focus and the importance of accepting; students built upon these fundamentals instinctively as evident in their high levels of communication skills during rehearsal.

Ken Robinson asserts that, 'the distinctive feature of human intelligence is imagination and the power of symbolic thought' (Robinson, 2001: 111). At 07:07 Student X from the same group chose to wrap a rope around his body. When asked why, he was able to articulate that he wanted to show that Pandora was not free and was 'under the control of the gods' thereby communicating a 'coherent explanation of the creative intentions for the performance' (working towards middle band achievement) since his incorporation of symbolic representation was completely independent.

Task 5 Rationale:

Traditionally, this part of the lesson was where I told students where they were in terms of achievement (satisfactory, good, excellent) and what they needed to do to improve. To ensure that self-directed learning approaches are consistent across the curriculum, I opted to use the 'question-only' 'E.S.C.A. and beyond' convention. This involved intervening with a targeted question, letting students continue to rehearse, and then checking the extent to which students were able to progress in a less 'assisted' and 'directed' fashion. As mentioned, the GCSE criterion is quite broad which allows for some variation in terms of how students meet the criteria. I wanted to examine whether it was possible to promote differentiated outcomes within the 'connecting' stage of the taxonomy, and the extent to which audience, empathy and genre focused questions elicited incremental levels of achievement.

Colour:	Question:	Inquiry/objective:
Blue	How did your character feel during still image 1 or 2, and which skills could you use to make this clearer to a three-year-old?	Does this promote a greater connection to the audience and emotions of characters?
Red	Which skills could you use to make the gods or the underworld characters stand out more?	Does this promote greater connection to the performance demands of this genre?
Green	Does there appear to be a key message in the story of Pandora’s Box, and how could you use either lighting, physicality or sound FX to make this stand out?	Does this promote a greater contextual and theatrical connection?

5. Brief presentation (S, C, A) 09:05: I asked each group to share their still images with the class. Students were then instructed to answer one of the questions above.

Task 5 observations

At 13:15 (straight after completing the written activity) all students stood immediately and began contributing their new ideas and insights following their engagement with the question on the board. Instead of keeping them in their mind, students immediately share their changes with others; one student learning E.A.L could be heard responding with, ‘I have an idea’ as soon as her group stood up again.

At 14:09 Student A pointed at her face and made a circular motion when telling her partner one of the ways she will respond to the ‘blue question’; she followed this by motioning her hand towards a different position that she planned to move into afterward in time for the second pose. Her contribution during this stage of the rehearsal process is strong and reveals the model’s inclusivity: the higher levels of the incremental scale are accessible to less able students and this is made possible through carefully tailored

questioning that builds on prior attainment (in Student A's case starting with addressing basic emotions), and prompts students to use their own answers to develop depth of understanding. Her ability to share ideas, implement changes instantly and respond to the ideas of others demonstrates 'connection' on a myriad of levels and convincingly meets the, 'clear engagement with the process of rehearsal' criterion.

In terms of personal development, this approach appears to promote pupil motivation and the removal of the notion of 'failure' which can, as Ken Robinson asserts, "have a deep effect on self-esteem and motivation: more especially where the experience is repeated' (Robinson, 1989: 87). All students were just as enthused as they were before being given the question. It appears that the use of colours as opposed to the graded method has meant that the differentiation here is harder for students to see and as a result there is no sign of unhappiness or disappointment with their current 'achievement'.

The practice-research nature of this activity is evident through the use of inquiry questions that are attached to each question that students were asked. This practice, whilst clearly informed by hermeneutic engagement with the mark scheme and teacher subject knowledge, demonstrates an openness to the possibilities that the question posed may not elicit the desired 'level' of response; this suggests that the way in which students respond will be monitored, and these questions may be adjusting for future learners. The structure of this activity clearly allows for students to share their answers to the question, but, once again, it may be useful to see if students are aware they came up with their own learning strategies and how this could be applied in future rehearsals.

6. Post-test 16:36: I asked each group to re-share their still images with having been given time to refine their work.

Task 6 observations:

Helen Nicholson refers to the challenges of globalization and asks, 'how theatre education is maintaining its traditional commitment to providing learning experiences that are artistically challenging' (Nicholson, 2011: 84). It appears the removal of 'teacher directors' is a sign of the examination board's response to this. One challenging aspect of this particular task is the fact that students are given a mere fifteen minutes to bring to life three still images capturing a Greek myth, and each learner has very different needs which result personal artistic challenges.

Guglielmino refers to the research conducted in *The Handbook of Self-determination Research* and its reference to, 'autonomy, competence and relatedness' being essential to 'achieve optimal motivation and wellbeing' (Guglielmino, 2013:7). The openness of this question and structure of the activity has given this student an opportunity to demonstrate autonomy within the scope of the assessment criteria; it could also be argued that the sequencing of the activities up to this point have promoted relatedness as her idea reveal a strong engagement with the character of Pandora and context of the performance.

An example of artistic challenge paying off can be seen at 19:02 when Student E (who was given the green question) was able to articulate how she met her target. She identified 'consequences' as a key theme in the story of Pandora's box and explains how she tried to communicate 'actions have consequences', 'I did lighting and physicality; when making Pandora we moved into the white light to create a profile'. This response demonstrates a clear understanding of symbolic representation. Her ideas could be considered 'effective' (working towards achievement in the second highest achievement band) in the sense that

this idea of a 'profile' being cast to communicate consequences is evocative and non-traditional. The 'connecting-focused' question has revealed a very different outcome for Student E who has made a significant amount of progress when compared to her responses during task 4 (please see time-stamp).

Task 7 Rationale:

In terms of progression, Knowledge for Drama is the unit that encourages students to come out of their comfort zone and explore theatre from different epochs. I wanted to explore what impact providing students with six different sentence starters that included archaic words would promote greater connection to the historical circumstances surrounding the world of their devised pieces; this was to ensure the 'devising' aspect of this assessment was not lost.

7. Rehearsal (C/A) 00:16 (clip 3). I asked students to return to their groups and experiment with bringing each of their images to life. Finally, I introduced students to the list of six archaic language sentence starters and encouraged them to incorporate these into their performance. **03:35** (clip 3)

Task 7 observations

The introduction of archaic words clearly promoted strong levels of progress in terms of refinement and stronger interpersonal skills where more able students are concerned. Student G, a more able student of drama, went from using familiar language like 'are you disobeying me? You are supposed to be my slaves' during the rehearsal, to discussing the validity of his character delivering the line 'Behold the evil power that I have!' during the opening scene. This judicious choice demonstrates his growing understanding of the

language and even stronger levels of engagement; targeted questioning was the only support he was given.

The design of this activity promotes 'building knowledge of the topic by problem-solving', a characteristic of the cognitivist learning approaches (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 51), by encouraging students to interweave archaic language into the performance in an attempt to set it in historical context.

At 04:54, he further analysed the stimulus of archaic words and provided his peers with guidance on how they could re-shuffle the lines so that there are archaic words in each section of the performance. His group take this on board and by the end of this stage of the rehearsal, are able to use this language without a script thus revealing he has affected the group in a positive way. This could clearly be interpreted as 'effective engagement during the collaborative process' (2016:21). When discussing E.A.L students, Deryn Hall asserts that, 'expressive narrative and storytelling are important to the production of learning transactional formal prose' (Hall, 1995:16). It is clear that this unit promotes engagement with un-familiar language thereby placing all students, irrespective of the fluency in English, in a position where they need to explore and share a new language then make connections; this strategy supported all students in reaching this aim.

In addition, the promotion of ensemble devising which Robinson defines as 'when problem-solving is done collaboratively with everyone in the company in the same room...whether structured by a director, teacher or writer' (Robinson, 2016: 9), is achieved by combining the initiation of ideas where performance style is concerned, and also interjecting a 'literary focus' into practical exploration (new dialogue being added). This promotes the 'building understanding through dialogue' characteristic synonymous with social constructivism (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 51), thereby highlighting the models potential (and devising per se) in terms of preparing students for the demands of the examination reform. Student G's response to the task is so strong, however, that it could be argued that his could potentially

promote the less desired, 'passively learns correct response' behaviourism characteristic where some of the other students are concerned.

Greek Mythology – part 2

Task 8 Rationale:

Helen Nicholson states, ‘one response to the pace of scientific and technological change has been to re-focus learning on what has become 21st Century Skills (Nicholson, 2011: 176)’. The P21 framework includes ‘learning and innovation skills’ as a big part of the 21st century skills that students need to develop and there is also an emphasis placed on ‘creativity and collaboration’. Whilst I am in agreement, the GCSE examination in Drama still places an emphasis on knowledge and theoretical understanding. This is implicit throughout the mark scheme – ‘an assured understanding’ cannot be demonstrated through rehearsal unless there is sustained engagement with theory and ‘hard facts’. I wanted to examine the extent to which ‘E.S.C.A and beyond’ can promote traditional forms of research and innovation concurrently.

8. Re-cap of performance and individual rehearsal preparation (E/S/C/A) 00:00 (clip 4)

16:50 (sharing work in progress) 07:58 (research). I gave students the opportunity to recap their devised pieces and share their works in progress with the rest of the class. After this, I sat them in a circle and gave each student a research-focused task that honed in on the historical circumstances surrounding the world of the play. I provided students with a few sentences worth of information about the ancient Greek period (taken from the two Greek theatre textbooks listed); they silently wrote their answers down before getting up to share their findings and creative decisions.

Task 8 observations

This activity clearly models engagement with research, thereby satisfying the specification’s statement that, ‘there should be some evidence in your work and portfolio that you have done research on or inspired by the stimulus’ (Elsden et al, 2016: 17); this is supported by

the clear distilling and condensing of research material that students are able to access, and see the significance of in relation to their performance. This resource also places an emphasis on getting students to articulate their finding, demonstrate their engagement with them and most importantly how they will use them to refine the performance.

At 14:00 Student G shared his idea with the class; he was able to recall his research findings ('audiences were used to 'enjoying a level of participation') and explained, 'I might make sure the audience participate by making them create Pandora because maybe the gods couldn't'. Using E.S.C.A and beyond to promote the 'personal thinking and learning' associated with 21st century skills has supported Student G in coming up with creative ideas in a very short space of time and he developed growing flexibility. He seemed more than happy to make changes to his work in light of new information – a desirable trait in a 21st century learner. His response also demonstrates his ability to make connections to stylistic fundamentals and the circumstances surrounding the world of the myth.

When discussing the additional demands of ensemble devising in preparation for full-length shows, Robinson states, 'they need more rehearsal, more feedback, more self-examination, more discussion, more outside eyes ad more collaboration....' (Robinson, 2016: 108). It could be argued that this is also true of students working towards an examination that requires self-directed learning strategies. This activity also promotes group discussion by giving some students the same research information to discuss and creates a forum whereby students get to have more 'outside eyes' contributing to their ideas.

Student G's response leads to my fortuitous questioning of Student C, 'what will you do if the audience do not stand up and partake?' Student C at 14:42 responded with, 'in my performance I ask the gods to bow down, if the audience do not do it, I could like "this is why I'm angry...' It appears placing emphasis on interpreting and exploring theatre studies extracts, followed by questioning that encourages students to share their ideas with the

class, inspires Student C to make connections between audience reactions and the ways in which a performer can modify their performance. This response affected Student G who uses this idea to ensure there is no loss of concentration from the audience during his performance, thereby further promoting the model's ability to develop collaboration and creativity in response to a small amount of contextual information.

Student A, a student learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) shone during her four minutes wearing the 'orange jacket' and responding to her research activity: 'Medicine was poorly understood during Ancient Greek times; children were not allowed to attend the theatre' (Rehm, 1994: 8). Student A was given the question – what problems might three-year-old children have faced if they watched the performance that was just shared with the class and what could you do to help children of Athens forget about their ill health?

This activity goes some way in addressing the emergent issues that were evident during activity 7; placing all students in the role of 'director' gives them all the opportunity to, 'develop a piece of theatre through trial and error, risk-taking and experimenting (Robinson, 2016:2). Student A certainly does this at 08:24 she clearly shared her ideas with the group; she started by identifying the skills that each member of the group need to make use of if they are to engage the target audience of three-year-olds. This is a clear example of the 'refinement' that is referred to throughout the component one mark scheme and it is clear that the model's focus on individual input results in higher levels of success for the pupils in her group. Her approach throughout this activity points towards the effectiveness of the model: she is essentially making full use of her 'skills for drama' learning when providing her group member with skill-specific guidance and direction regarding performance fundamentals. Moreover, her actual delivery whilst sharing ideas reveals very strong use of performance skills outside of the confines of performance thus revealing the model's ability to foster life-long communication skills for students learning English as an additional language who may come to rely on non-verbal cues elsewhere in the curriculum. She

demonstrated critical thinking throughout and as a result has a visual impact on the work of her peers.

When discussing the process of ensemble devising, Robinson also states, 'if faculty guide all the work, students will never have a chance to earn to lead' (Robinson, 2016:96). This design's emphasis on student directors promotes leadership. For example, at 10:10 Student A began to model exactly what she wanted from the group in terms of Pandora's emotions and state of mind. She could be seen clutching at her heart area and her facial expressions reveal despair as she acts out exactly what she'd like the group to achieve; she clearly draws upon her learning from the Empathy for Drama unit to 'connect' with these emotions. Her tone of voice is quite emphatic and she clearly enjoys being given the chance to input her ideas; she has a captivating demeanour and clearly has the potential to affect the performance outcomes of her peers in a positive way.

Chapter 10: Conclusion

It is said that, 'since scaffolding requires close monitoring and direction it can be difficult to apply with whole classes' (Long, 2000: 36). The outcomes of this study, however, reveal that whole classes can make progress if structural underpinning, in this case Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting inspired scaffolds (E.S.C.A and Beyond), is used to promote the building and hierarchical development of skills specific to devising. Examples of this can be seen in all lessons from this study:

- In the Skills for Drama lesson on mime, all students went from exploring what mime was to sharing interpretations using key skills, and then establishing connections to the material (p51-70). Scaffolds then provide students with the opportunity to use the skills and understanding they have developed to inform strategy choices (with the aim of affecting their peers as they watch).
- In the Knowledge for Drama lesson on Pandora's Box, students were all able to go from exploring Pandora's Box to sharing their understanding of the story through discussion and the creation of still images (p93), to refining their work (at different levels) with a strong sense of purpose.

These outcomes are partially due to the intricate development and creation of resources, sequencing of the scaffolds and embedded differentiation which takes into account the individual learners whose needs emerged/were visible in prior lessons. Moreover, the structure of the overall model promoted sequential engagement with skills before focusing on the empathy and wider knowledge necessary for subject specific progress in Devising.

Pedagogy

Pedagogy is referred to as, 'the interplay between a teacher's professional craft of teaching and their judgement about what to do for the educational good of the students in unfolding and complex situations which they encounter every day in their practice' (Gregson and Hilier, 2015: 248). The pedagogical strengths of this model appear to be the hermeneutic/interpretive engagement with relevant assessment criteria and synthesising of this to create resources that elicit a range of skills associated with devising (collaboration, refinement, research, improvisation etc. {P103 and 109}).

Example of which can be seen in the following parts of the thesis:

- In the Skills for Drama unit, mime scenarios were adapted to incorporate characterisation; this was a strategy employed to promote the verbalizing of enacted understanding necessary to meet criteria in the higher achievement bands for devising (p76) and resulted in very positive outcomes for all learners whether they struggled with using mime skills, or articulating how skills were used to communicate meaning.
- The Empathy for Drama unit boasted engagement with the 'refinement' demands in the specification; this inspired the use of experimental research methods (pre and post-testing) being interwoven into the lesson for students to engage with. These assessment criteria-inspired activities allowed students to be researchers and then refine their own work in an instinctive and autonomous way; this resulted in progress for all groups of students, many of whom exhibit the qualities identified in the higher achievement bands (p91).
- The Knowledge for Drama unit demonstrated an engagement with the adjectives the exam board uses describe achievement ('comprehensive' for example) and the subsequent creation of activities to provide students with the opportunity to demonstrate wide ranging and in-depth engagement with genre-specific conventions (p103-109). All students made a significant amount of progress in response to this activity.

There is also the reference to the fact that effective pedagogy enables students to ‘flourish as individuals’ (Cohen et al, 2010:189). The outcomes for students with a range of learning needs and dispositions including A.D.H.D (p67), physical disability (p100) and those learning English as an Additional Language (p53) for example points to a fully inclusive learning model that supports a range of learners to overcome the issues that came to light in previous lessons (and over the course of their learning journey). In many cases, activities contribute to changes in behaviour and a reduction in the traits associated with the learning need – examples include a student with hyperactivity presenting as calm, focused and engaged in response to a series of scaffolds (p68). Another example is a student learning English as an Additional Language (E.A.L) demonstrating greater understanding, practical ability and an increasingly confident use of the English language (p81).

The social benefits of the model are also evident. A clear use of social constructivist approaches, other than scaffolding, results in strong self-directed outcomes for all students. In one lesson (p102) this was achieved through the incorporation of a scaffold that encompassed a silent interval that allowed students to engage with a targeted question and come up with a strategy to address it. This was followed with some allotted time for students to discuss their ideas with one other person before re-connecting with their group.

‘Metacognition means pupils are understanding their own learning, how they learn best and how they learn less effectively’ (Cohen et al, 2010: 90). There are instances where students are given opportunities to recognise their achievements; an example of this was seen during the pre and post-test activity during the Empathy for Drama unit, and when students were when placed in the position of ‘learning facilitators’ and questioned about their experience of learning from each other (p87-89). There does, however, appear to be scope for metacognition to be promoted more explicitly by allowing students ‘in on the pedagogy’. It was not always clear if students knew exactly what it was about a specific activity that helped them in the learning process, although they clearly

benefitted from them. An example where this could have been exploited was during the Knowledge for Drama lesson where students explored times when they had misbehaved and ignored their parents (p99) and then engaged with the following task purposefully. An activity that encourages students to articulate how the scaffold helped to re-engage and motivate them may enable them to draw on these experiences outside of this Drama context and self-regulate.

Embodiment, modelling and verbality/non-verbality

Some scaffolds have been constructed in a way that encourages embodiment; an example of this was seen in the Empathy for Drama unit where physical performance-based activities were introduced as a way to allow students to demonstrate their understanding and refine their work (p88). This also highlighted the model's potential to promote both devising and performance concurrently through its encouragement of whole class exploration very soon after the introduction of a stimulus; this scaffold promoted achievements specific to the performance criteria as well.

Modelling has been promoted through scaffold in a myriad of ways. In the case of the Skills for Drama lesson on mime (p61), scaffolds that promoted pair work and included pre-selected partnerships provided opportunities for peer-to-peer modelling. The sequencing of scaffolds reveals strong potential in terms of modelling positive learning behaviours and strategies conducive to Devising. For example, peer assessment activities are used frequently and the peer-to-peer feedback is always followed by rehearsal/development time thereby modelling a potential structure for the refinement process. Moreover, research-based activities are often followed by questions to promote engagement and additional rehearsal time (103). Plenaries that pose questions regarding the sequencing of activities may help students to revise such processes; this may help them to eventually use them instinctively and without the need of a scaffold.

As discussed earlier in this conclusion, whilst scaffolds promote progress for all students, subtle differentiation inspired by research into behavioural difficulties supports individuals to develop a

range of skills. An example of this can be seen in the Skills for Drama unit where scaffolds are developed to encompass strategies such as slow motion and questioning to help promote a holistic engagement with activities and meet all course demands (p76). The 'blind listener' activity in particular demonstrates the learning scaffold's potential to fully engage learners irrespective of their preferred learning styles, by closely examining their responses to tasks over the course of the term.

Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting: evaluating the effect on each scaffold stage

Exploring

Sub question 1: *to what extent does starting lessons with exploration focused scaffolds promote active learning, engagement and the enthusiasm necessary for personal development? Do these scaffolds help prepare students for the 'practical expression' necessary to access 'sharing-focused' activities?*

Exploring-focused activities promoted active learning in an explicit and effective way. An example of this was the use of interactive games that contain embedded educational aims – the mime bingo activity, for example was crafted to promote exuberant movements and students excelled in terms of the range of non-verbal skills and their overall perseverance during the guessing process (p54-56). Another example was a learning scaffold that provided students with the opportunity to come up with their own questions in response to a stimulus that required them to interpret a photograph (whilst engaging in a role play activity – p80).

The promotion of active learning and engagement was made explicit through the way in which students approached the 'sharing-focused' activities that followed: all students were able to answer questions related to the exploration-focused activity (which required slow motion miming – p76). This revealed at least an 'adequate engagement with the process of rehearsal' (Pearson, 2016: 20); some members of the class revealed a 'confident' engagement.

There is also evidence of built in progression; the demands of the exploration tasks in the 'Empathy for Drama' unit were greater than the exploration activities in the 'Skills for Drama' unit which required interpretative skills amidst a role play activity (p79). The Knowledge for Drama exploration activity has higher order thinking demands interwoven thus promoting strong outcomes for more able students who were asked to interpret their teacher's characterisation and make inferences about the social circumstances surrounding the world of the scene they were working on (p93). This highlighted the model's ability to promote very different outcomes in response to a single task; this resulted in a slight loss of pace which had an effect on the focus levels of less able students that were not being targeted directly during the activity (and found it hard to 'freeze' whilst other students answered questions).

Sharing

Sub question 2: to what extent do activities with a 'sharing focus' promote the non-assisted exchange and development of ideas, skills and knowledge during the devising process (and support students in establishing a greater connection and 'desire for change' when refining their work)?

The 'sharing-focused' activities did promote increased social competence through the range of grouping dynamics across the curriculum: students worked in pre-selected (p76) and self-selected partnerships (p80) as well as in larger groups, and at times, individually and with other students working very close by (p87), but without any loss of focus. The model's emphasis on students sharing their interpretations of stimuli often results in vastly different practical outcomes despite all students working from the same stimulus (p85). These scaffolds promoted self-directed learning; this was fostered in a range of ways including the removal of adverbs which promotes decision making regarding 'how' to communicate ideas for one activity (p67), and the use of different intermittent questions that targeted students according to the level they were working at.

Progression is also built into the curriculum where sharing activities are concerned. Reciprocal teaching is used to promote the sharing of information during the Skills for Drama unit (p63), but the tasks in the Empathy for Drama unit encourage the sharing of opinions about the information received rather than placing emphasis on memory (p89). Examples of students challenging themselves beyond the demands of the task could be seen when many opted to choose the harder option of miming the information on the board, rather than simply saying it – this provided further evidence of the self-directed readiness the model promotes (p82).

The final unit, Knowledge for Drama clearly showed growing independence and the inclusion of previously explored strategies like still images being interwoven into the tasks to support the collaborative process and sharing of ideas (in the absence of a structured rehearsal frame - p100). Future research into ways in which self-direction can be fostered when approaching written elements of the examination could provide further insights and potentially create a sense of cohesion across the whole examination.

Connecting

Sub question 3: *to what extent do activities with a 'connecting' focus promote a deeper connection with stimuli and independent refinement to communicate ideas? Do they prepare students to 'operate autonomously' and demonstrate a wide-ranging use of styles to communicate their deeper understanding?*

Connecting-focused outcomes often emerge organically from the sharing-focused activities that preclude them. This transition from sharing to connecting is often supported by a shift in the scaffold convention applied. For example, the move from structured rehearsal frames (that create an opportunity for students to 'share'), to activities that began with question that promote closer engagement with the circumstances which surrounded the world of the performance as seen during the lesson on mime (p69). Another example of this was a 'connecting-focused' activity which

required students to establish a connection to the tribe by exploring their culture and the issues they faced (p89); here pre and post testing methods were employed which enabled students to make connections between their actions and the information received. This also promoted a very different use of skills (p90).

Once again, progress where connecting activities are concerned is evident as the curriculum develops from the Skills, Empathy to Knowledge unit. For example, students refined their work based on feedback of peers during the mime unit, thereby demonstrating growing connections to the material (p72); this feedback, however, tended to focus on the acquisition of skills and emotional connections with the characters. The Knowledge for Drama unit, however, revealed strong learning scaffolds that created an opportunity for students to establish connections between archaic language, its meaning and suitability of line use depending on the characters portrayed (p107). Further progress is evident when students are given specific questions to consider when creating still images; in most case, students not only address the principle question, but also address issues that arise during the process of refinement and this is without 'formal' scaffolds (p107). These scaffolds appear to embed of self-directed readiness: some students begin to demonstrate these qualities instinctively during the final unit.

Affecting

Sub question 4: to what extent do activities with an 'affecting focus' promote greater consideration of audience and how theatrical styles and approaches can be used to promote desired outcomes from your peers and the audience?

Despite there being less activities that promote this higher level outcome, a number of responses that influence and inspire others are given during activities with a 'sharing' or 'connecting' focus. An example of this was insightful responses to questions about the emotions of the tribe members which influenced the performance decisions that other students made and inspired debate (p83).

Moreover, mixed ability groups create a platform where more able students can also demonstrate their creativity and ability to influence and inspire others; this highlights the fact that students are not limited by the parameters of the task and have adequate room to express their ideas and excel beyond the task (p105).

Questioning is a key strength of the model, especially as a tool to promote higher order thinking. In the Knowledge for Drama unit lesson on Pandora's Box, careful scaffolding throughout the lesson meant that Year 7 students could be asked rather complex questions like, 'can you identify a key theme in this myth and a way in which lighting could be used to communicate it?' This resulted in developed responses that students were able to apply very quickly when refining their performances (p105).

The most notable promotion of affecting aims was evident during research-focused activities. It's clear that the facilitator's own engagement with research into the relevant genre or theatrical style and subsequent distilling of information, plays a significant role in students' success and ability to progress. Activities promoting refinements specific to genre-specific conventions like audience participation in Ancient Greek theatre, followed by formalised 'directing time' allows students to both enlighten others in their group and refine their work with a purpose (p110). These outcomes are not only reserved for the most able; some students were given the opportunity to engage with literature that is relevant to the topic being explored. An example of this was providing students with information about sickness during the period and consideration of how skills can be used to engage child audiences of the time (p111). The promotion of research earlier in the curriculum may serve to promote independent research which could provide a more compelling argument that some students are working towards the 'comprehensive' band.

My research suggest that the Exploring, Sharing, Connecting and Affecting (E.S.C.A and Beyond) scaffolds are an effective way to prepare Key Stage 3 Drama students with a range of needs and dispositions and prepare students for the self-directed demands of the Devising component at GCSE (and for success in the subject in general). My research also suggests that the learning scaffolds promote progress towards the standard required for students as young as eleven; this highlights outstanding potential for the model if students are exposed to such teaching methods throughout their Key Stage 3 journey.

Bibliography:

Ainscow, M, Farrell, P, 2002, Making Special Education Inclusive, David Fulton Publishers.

Alban-Metcalfe John, Alban-Metcalfe Juliette, 2001, Managing Attention

Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder in the Inclusive Classroom (Practical Strategies for Teachers), David Fulton Publishers.

Anderson, Michael, 2012, MasterClass in DRAMA EDUCATION Transforming Teaching and Learning, Bloomsbury

Barrett, Estelle, Barbara Bolt, 2010, Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry, I.B Tauris & Co Ltd.

Bloom, Benjamin Samuel, 1956, Taxonomy of educational objectives: The Classification of Educational goals, D McKay.

Booth, David, 2012, Drama Research: International Journal of Drama in education.

Brown, P., Roediger, H, & McDaniel M, 2014, *Make it Stick: The Science of Learning*

Cohen Louis, Manion Lawrence, Morrison Keith, 2000, Research Methods in Education, Routledge Falmer.

Costa, Arthur L, Kallick Bena, 2004, Assessment Strategies for Self-Directed Learning, Corwin Press.

Drama in schools (second edition), 2003, ART COUNCIL ENGLAND.

Ellis, Viv, 2012, Learning and Teaching in Secondary Schools, Sage.

Espinosa, J, Exam regulators clamp down on re-marks, The Guardian, 26th May 2016.

Fleming, Mike, 2003, *Starting Drama Teaching*, David Fulton Publishers

Fontana, David, 1995, *Psychology for Teachers*, Palgrave in association with BPS Books.

GCSE Drama Specification, 2012, Edexcel.

GCSE English Literature Specification, 2012, AQA.

Gibbons, Maurice, 2002, *The Self-Directed Learning Handbook: Challenging Adolescent Students to Excel*, Jossey Bass.

Gillet, John, 2014, *Acting Stanislavski, London and New York*, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Graham, Scott, Hoggett, Steven, 2014, *The Frantic Assembly Book of Devising Theatre*, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Grantham, Barry, 2000, *Playing Commedia Dell'Arte (A training guide to commedia techniques)*, London, Nick Hern Books.

Grotowski, Jerzy, 2013, *Towards a Poor Theatre, 1975*, Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Green, J.R, *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society, 1994*, Routledge Publishing.

Hall, Deryn, 1995, *Assessing the Needs of Bilingual Pupils – Living in Two Languages*, David Fulton Publishers.

Hartnoll, Phyllis, 1968, London, *The Theatre*, Thomson and Hudson.

Heathcote, Dorothy, 1978, *Of These seeds becoming*. In: Shuman, R. (ed) *Educational Drama for Today's Schools*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.

Heddon, Deirdre, Milling, Jane, 2016, *Devising performance*, Palgrave.

Hillier, Yvonne, Gregson, Margaret, Reflective Teaching in Further and Adult Education,

Bloomsbury.

Holcomb L D, 2000, *The Last Yahí, A novel about Ishi*, Writers Club Press.

Lamden, Gill, 2000, Devising: A Handbook for Drama and Theatre Students, Hodder and

Stoughton.

Long, Martyn, 2000, The psychology of education, Routledge Falmer Taylor and Francis Group.

Manion, L, Cohen, L, Morrison, K, Wyse, D, 2010, A Guide to Teaching Practice, Routledge Taylor

and Francis Group.

Mitter, Shomit, 1992, *The System of Rehearsal*, Routledge.

Neelands, Jonathan, 2010, *Creating democratic citizenship through drama education,*

Trentham books.

Nelson, Robin, 2013, *Practice as Research in the Arts*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Nicholson, Helen, 2011, *Theatre, Education and Performance*, Palgrave Macmillan.

OFSTED, London, 2013, *Improving standards in literacy: a shared experience.*

Pope, A, Porter, D, Ellen-Rix, L, Elsdon, 2016, EDEXCEL GCSE DRAMA STUDY GUIDE, Rhinegold

Education.

Prytys Cesia, Ayers Harry, 2002, an A to Z Practical Guide to Emotional and Behavioural

Difficulties, Davi Fulton Publishers.

Rehm, Rush, 1992, Greek Tragic Theatre, Routledge Publishing.

Robinson, Davis, 2016, A Practical Guide to Ensemble Devising, Macmillan education Palgrave.

Robinson, Ken, 1988, The Arts in Schools – Principles, practice and provision, Calouste

Gulbenkian Foundation.

Robinson, Ken, 2001, Out of Our Mind Learning to be Creative, Capstone Publishing Limited.

Scott David, Usher Robin, Understanding Educational Research, 1996, Routledge.

Selligman, Martin, 2011, A Visionary New Understanding of Happiness and Well-being, Atria

Books.

Souli, Sofia, Greek Mythology – The creation of the gods-the gods- the heroes- the Trojan war- the odyssey, Toubi's Editions.

Taylor, David, 1999, *The Greek and Roman Stage*, Bloomsbury Publishing.

Van de water, Manon, McAvoy, Mary, Hunt, Kristin, 2015, Drama and Education.

Performance Methodologies for teaching and Learning, Routledge Taylor and

Francis Group.

White, Gareth, 2013, Audience participation in theatre, Palgrave/Macmillian.

Appendix A: Making use of E.S.C.A and Beyond

Other teachers can practically use the methods unveiled and analysed as part of this study. Below is a list of possible approaches:

- **Entire lessons/mini schemes (for example 'Pandora's Box') could be delivered by engaging with each activity in turn and preparing the required resources; the rationale section that precedes each activity could serve as a potential guide in terms of objectives for the task and predicted outcomes (hypothesis).**
- **Lesson activities could be adapted in terms of stimulus, content, groupings and spatial configurations for example; engagement with the methodology could support you with developing activities to meet the individual needs of your students in line with the exam criteria (or serve as a model in terms of the way I approached activity creation).**
- **Individual activities could be used within pre-existing lesson plans and used to promote self-direction where specific skills and explorative strategies are concerned (for example 'Mime bingo').**

Appendix B: Participant information sheet

18th May 2017

Re: permission to use Drama lesson footage as part of the Head of Drama, Tyronne Lewis', MA thesis

Dear Parents/carer,

In September last year I started a Masters by Practice as Research project entitled 'The Sequential Learning Model – an approach to teaching year 7 Drama', at the University of Kent. The study focuses on the refinement process of my self-created curriculum/model which underpins all Key stage 3 Drama lessons at Lampton (and has done since September 2015). The inquiry question is: what does the Sequential Learning Model offer a group of Year 7 students in terms of progress towards the Component One GCSE exam and personal development?

The methodological process involves filming a series of year 7 Drama lessons, watching the footage after school, and using these preliminary findings to inform my research, pedagogical choices and the learning activities in subsequent lessons.

Up until this point, the footage has not been viewed by anyone other than me. I am writing to ask for permission to submit some of the lesson footage as part of my thesis.

What does the footage consist of?

The footage consists of three drama lessons that students have attended as part of the year 7 curriculum. During these lessons students engage in preparatory drama activities, explore a range of stimuli and work collaboratively with their peers.

Will the work students did during these lessons count towards their final grade in Drama?

The outcomes of these lessons in terms of 'achievement' have contributed to each child's final grade in Drama. My research outcomes (in terms of my methodology and analysis) do not affect their grade, but success in these areas will result in approaches being embedded in all Drama lessons next year as students continue through the Key stage 3 curriculum (and hopefully towards GCSE).

Is it compulsory for my child to appear in the footage?

Whilst the study of Drama is compulsory at Lampton School, your child being included in the footage that is submitted is not. Being included in the lesson footage simply helps me to illustrate the students' progress during the course of the year (learning from the revised 'Sequential Learning Model').

What is the Sequential Learning Model?

I first created The Sequential Learning Model when I joined Lampton, and began developing it when I took on the role of Head of Department in January 2015. I created the model to address the fact that Drama was not formally recognized on the national curriculum at Key stage 3; my aim was to introduce students to GCSE content from Year 7 but in a manner that was engaging and diverse in content (exploring a range of stimuli and theatre studies).

The model seeks to introduce year 7 students to secondary school Drama through three key modules:

- ‘Skills for Drama’ – this introduces students to a range of explorative approaches and helps students to develop the skills of a performer.
- Empathy for Drama – students get to develop their use of performance skills when tackling a range of issues that affect children from around the world.
- Knowledge for Drama – students are introduced to different theatrical styles and genres from a range of epochs, and given the opportunity to use this knowledge to enhance and develop their work.

What is the reason for the refinement process - how will it benefit the students?

Whilst the last two year 11 cohorts received outstanding results (97% and 100% A* - C respectively), the recent examination reform (9-1) prompted me to re-engage with the model’s potential lower down the school and examine the extent to which it can prepare students for the tougher exams ahead. The refinement process focuses on embedding personal development opportunities into the curriculum in a more explicit way, since qualities like resilience, reflectiveness, resourcefulness and independent learning skills are implicit in all of the GCSE Drama criteria (especially the top bands).

Who is funding the project?

I am funding this research project myself, but will use all findings to promote the progress of all Lampton School drama students. The participating students will not need to take part in any out-of-class activities or interviews.

What procedures have been adopted to ensure privacy and data protection of my child?

- Lesson segments where your child is referred to by their full name will not be used.
- The material will not be posted on the internet or elsewhere and will be used solely for academic purposes.
- No identifying materials will be referenced anywhere in the thesis (such as personal numbers, home addresses and individual pictures with the pupil’s first and last names).
- The footage used is from lessons that have taken place during the school day and features students in their school uniform (some clips may feature the use of props or additional clothing accessories such as scarfs and jackets to explore different characters).
- The footage will not be available to the general public and will have ‘Permanent embargo’ status.

What will happen with the data at the end of the research period (after it has been viewed by the examiner)?

I have selected the ‘Permanent embargo’ option. This means I have restricted all access to my thesis; the footage will not be re used in any way, nor will it be electronically accessible to anyone. A full-

text copy of my thesis and accompanying footage will be kept by the University, but will not be released without my permission. Only a bibliographic record of my thesis will be made available.

Will the thesis, visuals and findings be shared privately at any point? Who will see the footage?

Yes. I may share the thesis, accompanying visuals and findings privately with other professionals. The hope is that the practice I've developed at Lampton has the potential to help students in other contexts excel. The footage will be seen by my supervisors at University, the examiners and by professionals that I choose to share the work with privately.

Thank you very for reading this Participant Information Sheet. If you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me at tlewis@lampton.org.uk or on the school number: 020 8572 1936 (extension number 333).

Yours sincerely,

Tyronne Lewis (Head of Drama)

Appendix C: Consent forms

Title of project: E.S.C.A and Beyond – an approach to Year 7 Drama

Name of investigator: Tyronne Lewis

Participant Identification Number for this project: 0020

Please initial box

1. I confirm I have read and understand the information sheet dated 18th May 2017 for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my child's participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason. (*Contact details for lead researcher – tlewis@lampton.org.uk*).

3. I understand that my child's responses/achievements will be anonymised before analysis. I give permission for members of the research team to have access to my child's anonymised responses.

4. I agree to take part in the above research project and for my child to appear in the lesson footage that is submitted as part of the final thesis.

Name of participant	Date	Signature
---------------------	------	-----------

Name of parent/guardian

Lead researcher	Date	Signature
-----------------	------	-----------

Appendix C: Year 7 curriculum outline and assessment criteria

E.S.C.A and Beyond				YEAR: 7			
Unit 1: Skills for Drama							
	Week 1:	Week 2:	Week 3:	Week 4:	Week 5:	Week 6:	
<p>Introduction:</p> <p>Students are to explore the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is drama? • What are the key rules we must follow when performing on stage? • What will we learn about this year? 	<p>Improvisation and baseline testing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to learn what improvisation is and the key performance skills required • Students are to be taught the key principles of improvisation • Students are to be experiment with key performance skills as they create a three minute piece on ‘extra-terrestrial’ activities • Students should perform their work in front of an audience, and be given a chance to refine their work • They should be given the chance to write reflectively: what they understand about improvisation, and areas of strength/weakness. 	<p>Script work:</p> <p>Students are to explore the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is a script? • What are the key rules for performing a script? • Students should be given a short ‘action-driven’ scripted scene to rehearse (and apply the key skills) • They should explore how the characters in the scene feel and consider which skills can be used to convey this • Students should present their work to a small group and also be given the chance to ‘spontaneously’ improvise a suitable ending? 	<p>Mime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students to revise what mime is, the skills required and learn how they should be used (clarity, pace, energy) • They should explore the main issue that children living in developing countries face • Students should bring a short scripted mime scene to life during rehearsal, and then present it to the class • Students should write reflectively and analytically their practical journey. 	<p>Choral speaking:</p> <p>Students should be able to answer the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is choral speaking? • Which skills are important? • How should they be used (pace, timing, arrangement)? • Students should be given the chance to bring a short children’s poem to life using the choral speaking strategy • Students are to be introduced to ‘stylization’ and be given the chance to experiment with this approach when performing the poem • Students must share their choral piece. 	<p>Storytelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students should be able to articulate the role of a narrator, and access the key skills required • Students are discover what Wilderness Survival is • Students are to create a short play that demonstrates their understanding of the topic. • Students must be able to articulate these ideas to a small group and provide direction, and also access mime skills when bringing their peers ideas to life. 	<p>Still images:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students to be taught what a still image is and know how to create a successful one (dynamics, proxemics etc.) • Students should explore what the education system is like in a poor part of the world (unit 2 preparation) • Students should be given the opportunity to capture this using still images • Students are to be taught about transitions and be given the chance to experiment with this in performance. • Students to present their work to an audience. 	

E.S.C.A and Beyond		YEAR: 7		
Unit 2: Empathy for Drama				
Week 1:	Week 2:	Week 3:	Week 4:	Week 5:
<p>Identity introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to explore the answer to the following question: What is identity? • Students to explore this through a script scene that is replete with facts. • Students to discover the conventions of a children’s television? • Students use these conventions to create a piece of theatre-in-education • Students to provide other groups with technical feedback • Students are to present a fairly developed piece • Students must fill in their own identity silhouette with the help of friends and family 	<p>Identity discovery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to ask and answer questions about themselves during hot-seating type activity. • Students are to experiment with characterisation when taking on the role of a game show host? • Students are to make inferences about their peers based on their answer to reflective questions like, ‘what would you do if you found a wallet....?’? • Students must identify the use of a split screen in performance (Freaky Friday clip) • Students must experiment with the use of a split screen in performance and consider why it is used on stage. • Students must use their voice and body to capture the identity of their peers. • Students must perform a short scene whereby they introduce themselves as their partner (who displays a stock emotion) adopting appropriate intonation and physicality. 	<p>Identity of Tribes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students must demonstrate their ability to interpreting a photograph of Ishi (observations regarding appearance, status, etc.). • Students should be given the opportunity to use their observations to inform performance choices. • Students should have opportunity to access skills during an improvisation activity. • Students should create a stylized collective gait (to portray the tribe) in groups. • Students are to be given a template and devise a piece depicting the tribes’ life • Students are to rehearse this piece showing consideration of set design. • Students must share their work with an audience. • Students must write analytically/reflectively about their performance. 	<p>The issues faced by tribe members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students must explore some of the issues affecting tribes? • Students are to experiment with Stanislavski’s ‘Magic if’ and live imaginatively as the tribe during a spontaneous improvisation task (putting themselves in the tribes’ shoes). • Students must discuss the feelings tribes would have felt • Students use this lesson’s activities to help them write a monologue as a tribe member that’s under attack. 	<p>Monologue performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students should be given some time to revise the key voice and movement skills that can be used to convey a character’s emotions. • Students should be given the opportunity to experiment with these skills during whole class preparatory activities • Students music peer assess each other using technical terms • Students are to perform their monologues • Students should be given some time to reflect on their performance and make links to the identity of their character when they justify their performance choices. • Students should discuss how they have grown throughout the unit and add to their identity silhouettes

E.S.C.A and Beyond		YEAR: 7		
Unit 3: Knowledge for Drama				
Week 1:	Week 2:	Week 3:	Week 4:	Week 5:
<p>Theatre-in-the-round:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to learn what theatre-in-the-round staging is • Students are to be taught the key rules that should be followed when performing in this way • Students must demonstrate the ability to follow these rules, and experiment with this staging whilst rehearsing a short related improvisation piece • Students should provide their peers with feedback on how to apply the relevant rules/styles to in-the-round staging • Students are to present their theatre-in-the-round pieces to an audience demonstrating their understanding of the performance demands • Students should reflect on, and evaluate the extent to which they achieved today's stylistic aim 	<p>Theatre-in-the-round (IBSEN):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to revise what theatre-in-the-round staging involves • Students are to learn key facts about Ibsen • Students are to explore the plot outline of Peer Gynt • Students are to be given a short scene from Peer Gynt to rehearse. • Students are to experiment with in-the-round staging when rehearsing this scene • Students are to take a closer look at their characters and be given the chance to let inferences inform their practical and stylistic (costume) choices • Students are to perform these scenes to an audience (in-the-round). 	<p>Ancient Greek Theatre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to learn key facts about Ancient Greek Theatre • Students are to be given the chance to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding • Students are to watch an excerpt of a documentary and identify the basic conventions • Students are to be put into groups; they must create a student-friendly documentary, for students their age, about Greek Theatre • Students are to consider how technical fundamentals such as lighting and sound F.X. could be used to enhance their work. • Students should refine their work independently during rehearsal and adapt their performance to meet theatre-in-the-round demands. • Students are to present their work showing a creative awareness of their purpose and audience. 	<p>Greek Mythology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to discover Mythology and it's place in Greek theatre • Students are to revise what a still image is and how it should be used in performance (dynamics, levels, proxemics) • Students are to explore the story of Pandora's box • Students are to use still images to capture key aspects of Pandora's Box • Students are to demonstrate their understanding of this myth as they share their still images with the class Students must bring each image to life for thirty seconds • Students must incorporate the use of some archaic language • Students are to respond to teacher feedback and improve their theatrical works. • Students are to have a dress rehearsal of their performance in front of an audience. • Students are able to reflect on and evaluate their performance work (and the work of others) in relation to style (mythology) and historical context 	<p>Greek Mythology performance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students are to be given time to rehearse their performance pieces building on the feedback they received to enhance their work • Students are to consider stylistic and technical fundamental • Students are to present their finished presentation to a wider audience.

