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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate to what extent using process drama in an international primary classroom context could develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced English as additional language learners (EAL learners). In order to investigate this, I set out to answer four research questions: 1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons? 2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities? 3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? 4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama? In this thesis, process drama refers to a teaching strategy that uses drama conventions e.g. role play and improvisation to structure lessons. The research took place in an International School in the Netherlands. Using a qualitative methodology, this research undertook a case-study approach. Six pupils were selected from a Year 5 class (9-10 year olds) who were advanced EAL learners. Alongside being the researcher, I led a series of nine videoed science lessons on the topic of ‘lifecycles’ using process drama. Triangulation was used to consider if participation and speaking opportunities were developed through the researcher’s observations of the videoed material, the class teacher’s written observations, a research journal, two interviews and a focus group using the case-study sample. Content analysis was used to reach the findings. This research suggests that by using process drama as a teaching methodology, participation does increase but not immediately. It also suggests that process drama improved speaking opportunities for those pupils who did not previously participate in classroom interaction. Pupils’ perspectives suggested that they considered that their participation increased and speaking opportunities either remained constant or increased when compared to their other lessons.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATIONS</th>
<th>EXPLANATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>A Learner of English as an Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>A Learner of English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSA</td>
<td>Learning Support Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLT</td>
<td>Pedagogic/logistic talk - managing of school and lesson behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCT</td>
<td>Sociocultural talk - engaging the cultural, social and moral potential of the lesson and aiming to create shared accounts and public reasoning practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRT</td>
<td>In role talk - students demonstrating their understandings of the expectations signalled in the sociocultural talk (SCT) and improvising reactions to scenarios as they display these in role as character-participants in the drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

There is a growing recognition of the role of drama in education (Heathcote, 1991). Previous studies show drama is no longer considered simply as another branch of art education, but as a unique teaching tool, vital for language development and invaluable as a method in the exploration of other subject areas (Heathcote, 1991). Lee et al. (2015) in their meta-analysis of 47 studies between 1985 and 2012 illustrate the breadth of research on the use of drama as a teaching tool and they highlight the need for research which investigates educational outcomes other than those focused on achievement. The area of enquiry I consider in this thesis is to the extent to which the use of process drama in the classroom affects the participation and speaking opportunities of advanced English as additional language learners (EAL learners).

My interest in this topic is due in no small measure to the fact that I experienced a period in my school experience during which participation and speaking in class were unattractive options whereas drama activities, although infrequent, still provoked an enthusiastic response in me. I had at times noticed a similar response from my students and I was curious to find out if participation and speaking opportunities could improve through the use of process drama. As a practitioner in schools in Ireland, England, France, Malta and the Netherlands I was frustrated when attention was diverted from the pupils when they acquired proficiency in language. This was due to funding and time constraints. Whilst my primary interest was neither language acquisition nor the attainment of knowledge, the additional challenges arising from engaging with EAL students was inviting and added another dimension. Consequently, the four research questions I wish to examine are: 1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons? 2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities? 3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? 4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?
The structure of this research will begin with a review of the literature. All key terms will be defined and explored including: participation, speaking opportunities, process drama and EAL learners. Links to similar studies will be narrated and critiqued with acknowledgement of theoretical perspectives employed. The methodology chapter will justify a case-study approach, discussing my theoretical and contextual framework alongside my methodological considerations, while providing an outline of the methods used and exploring the analysis tools employed. The findings will be listed of my case-study observations alongside the perspectives of the pupils. Afterwards, my conclusion, limitations of the research and recommendations are outlined.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This study aims to investigate to what extent using process drama in the classroom could develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an international primary classroom. The structure of this literature review is divided under the headings: The History of Process Drama, Defining Process Drama, Theoretical Perspectives used within Process Drama, Benefits and Challenges of Process Drama, Participation in Lessons and Speaking Opportunities.

As this study is an investigation of the use of process drama in the classroom, it will begin by tracing the history of drama in the classroom to enable a definition of the term process drama, showing how it has evolved as a pedagogical approach while explaining links between the theatre and education. Contrasting theoretical perspectives on the topic will be unpicked before existing literature on process drama, participation and speaking opportunities are critiqued, with a particular emphasis on studies that consider EAL learners.

2.1. The History of Process Drama

Children’s Theatre paved the way for the use of drama within schools. Theatre written specifically for children was given recognition from the opening of Miss Joan Luxton’s children’s theatre in the 1920s. However, it was not until after WWII that drama was discussed in terms of its usefulness in the context of learning. The 1940s saw an increased interest in children’s theatre in the United Kingdom as evident from the opening of many new theatres. These included: The Young Vic, Amersham Repertory Theatre, Brian Way’s Theatre Centre, Bertha Waddell’s Scottish Children’s Theatre and the Osiris Players. This increased the popularity of children’s theatre, which paved the way for theatre in education (Allen, 1979).

Prior to the 1950s, drama in schools was mostly restricted to rehearsing, performing and reciting verse. Afterwards however, the relationship between theatre and teaching started
to be considered more critically, particularly through the work of Brian Way in England (Way, 1967). Allen (1979) explained that it was awarded greater status when county advisors were given responsibility for drama in schools and Caryl Jenner cemented this recognition when he toured the country with a ‘mobile theatre’, securing sponsorship from the Arts Council. Gordon Vallins advanced the cause in 1965 with his ‘Belgrade Theatre’ when he staged performances in schools with the appellation he coined - ‘theatre in education’. Following on from this, the distinction between theatre and drama alongside its usefulness started to be explored, eventually leading to discussions and research within drama in education. Lee et al. (2015) explained that this “debate that started in the 1960s regarding the overall effectiveness of drama has continued to the present day” (p.7).

Although school performances are frequently treated like a theatre in that the focus is on reciting lines and knowing where to be and how to interpret a script, differences between drama in schools and the theatre have been brought to the fore. Way (1967) mentioned that the distinction between theatre and drama is that theatre is largely concerned with communication between actors and audience, whereas drama is largely concerned with the experience of participants: irrespective of any function of communication to an audience. Furthermore, Karavoltsou and O’Sullivan (2011) add that in drama the emphasis is placed on the value of the process for the participants themselves rather than the value for an external audience. Therefore, theatre is mainly concerned with the impact on an audience and drama is mainly concerned with the impact on the participants. To summarise Way’s (1967) ideas, he suggested drama can be used to investigate, refine ideas and interpret rather than recite. McGregor (1976) elaborated on the ideas of Way (1967) stating that drama developed from theatre to incorporate physical, visual and immediate experiences on a social and interpersonal level. More recently, Dawson and Lee (2018) summarised the discussion of theatre versus drama by stating that theatre is oriented towards a performative product and drama is oriented towards a nonperformative process. However, this is simplistic and drama based work can move towards a production and theatre based work can engage in reflective practice in preparation for a performance.
Bolton (1979) summarised the movement from traditional skills associated with theatre in education to using drama in education. His claim was that it required a move from knowledge based, polished performances, which are presented to an audience within theatre in education, to a skill based approach - drama in education, that does not exploit an audience in a traditional sense. In the 1970s the distinction between actors and teachers became blurred further when they trained together. However, it was not until the 1980s that drama was recognised as distinct from theatre. Whilst this suggests an enhanced status, this is somewhat misleading as Hornbrook (1991) points out, that unlike art and music, it was not awarded curricular legitimacy under the 1988 Education Act. O’Neill (1995) explained that drama is distinct from theatre in that it doesn’t use a script but instead involves role play and the pupils are the audience, collectively reflecting on what has happened. Heathcote (1991) referred to this entity as ‘educational drama’. This was then redefined to focus more on the learning process and became known as process drama which is the teaching methodology that will be explored in this thesis.

The transitions from ‘children’s theatre’, to ‘theatre in education’, to ‘drama in education’ to ‘educational drama’ are all documented before the use of process drama came into play. These changes in terminology imply that process drama emerges from many developments and series of debates on its definition, purpose, content and approach. Process drama has at times also been used interchangeably with drama based pedagogy (Lee et al., 2015), drama in education (Bolton, 1979), theatre in education (Jackson and Vine, 2013) and theatre games (Spolin, 1986) but process drama will be the term that is explored and unpicked in this thesis as it more specifically looks at learning through drama (Karavoltsou and O’Sullivan, 2011). The distinction is that process drama is focussed on the process of learning through the subject drama rather than rehearsed performance.

2.1.1. Defining Process Drama

Wells and Sandretto (2017) explain that the term ‘process drama’ is “used to describe a model of drama in education in which the students work within a variety of drama conventions and improvised roles alongside their teacher, who also often works in role to guide and structure the lesson” (p.182). Drama conventions are a reference to specific
techniques or strategies employed such as: freeze frame, tableaux, dramatisation, puppetry, depiction, slow motion, hot seating, open and close, seven levels of tension, still image, teacher monologue and dialogue (Farmer, 2012). They are interactive conventions that are used to add creativity to learning. They are tools used by a drama teacher to help develop enquiry skills, to encourage negotiation, understanding and creativity. **Improvised roles** refer to an unrehearsed performance without specific or scripted preparation that may be facilitated by the teacher. Freebody (2010) explains that improvisation incorporates spontaneous speech and movement. **In role** means the teacher or pupils are pretending to be a different character and delivering instructions as that person. Freebody (2010) discusses how the “students belong to (at least) three memberships simultaneously: student, drama creator and character” (p.213) when they are in role. Therefore, according to Wells and Sandretto (2017), process drama is a method of teaching and learning in which both the students and teacher are working in and out of role, through improvisation.

Varying definitions of the term have been presented. Dawson and Lee (2018) state that using drama is something that “uses active and dramatic approaches to engage, students in academic, affective and aesthetic learning through dialogic meaning making in all areas of the curriculum” (p.17). It is a process-orientated approach (Lee et al., 2015), that is one which enables students to participate in a learning inquiry or discovery and is used to improve imagination, creativity and learning outcomes through problem solving (Heathcote, 1991). Wells and Sandretto (2017) explain that drama typically privileges the modes of the gestural system while also making use of the spatial, linguistic, visual and audio systems. Bolton (1979) outlines the complexity of the subject stating “it is not the study of dramatic texts, although this could be part of it; it is not the presentation of school play, although this could be part of it; it is not even teaching drama or teaching about drama, although this could be a large part of it” (p.18). For O’Neill (1995) process drama, proceeds without a script, its outcome is unpredictable, it lacks a separate audience and the experience is impossible to replicate exactly. This unpredictability comes from the synthesis of movement, sense, language and communication, thought and feeling. Furthermore, Haseman (1991) claims it is shaped by an educational context which places an emphasis on the quality of learning from educational art encounters. Therefore,
combining the definitions presented above process drama can be defined as a process-orientated approach (Lee et al., 2015), used to improve imagination, creativity and learning outcomes (Heathcote, 1991) which is achieved without a script (O’Neill, 1995). It can be used throughout the curriculum (Dawson and Lee, 2018) using spatial, linguistic, visual and audio systems (Wells and Sandretto, 2017), shaped by an educational context (Haseman, 1991).

Process drama has been an influential classroom tool since the 1980s and is associated with the work of the British practitioner and researcher Dorothy Heathcote. Heathcote (1991) described process drama as a way of engaging in education for self-direction. It is used to activate, sustain, or intensify engagement in learning (Bolton, 1979). The aspiration is that by engaging in education for self-direction, learners are engaged more fully in the lesson. O’Sullivan (2018) discusses the magnitude of its influence saying that “role play is being called into service as a way of encouraging engaged, enjoyable and deep learning from early years to adult education” (p.607). Heathcote (1991) encouraged this teaching methodology as a collective, whole class experience in which topics are explored through the use of techniques and spontaneity, however, individual and group work are also incorporated, as drama conventions lend themselves to different scenarios. Heathcote (1991) developed the term ‘process drama’ by promoting conventions used within it such as ‘mantle of the expert’ and ‘teacher in role’.

The theatre influenced Heathcote and this is particularly evident in her use of her method ‘teacher in role’, which is a form of process drama, as the teacher becomes the actor and the classroom his or her stage. Using this drama convention, the teacher sets the scene by taking on a role to understand the motivation behind someone that they may differ from (Heathcote, 1991). They have the flexibility of coming in and out of role so sometimes use a prop or alter their voice to show when they are in role. This is distinctive from ‘actor in role’ as it is presenting an attitude, or showing a point of view or perspective, rather than inhabiting the role more fully as the actor knows the character’s journey (O’Neill, 1995). The aspiration is that the teacher’s confidence in improvising will encourage their pupils to do the same. They provide dramatic exploration in real and imagined contexts, which results in full agency in learning
through role play. By utilising such methods, it is the responsibility of the teacher to build up tension, complexity and layers, whilst the students must develop multiple perspectives alongside exploring problems, situations, or themes (O’Neill, 1995). When using ‘teacher in role’, the teacher is also adopting other drama conventions and methods to further knowledge and exploration. On a practical level this means that the teacher uses improvisation within a lesson in which the pupils are both the performers and the audience. Farmer (2010) explains how this can be developed into the other convention associated with the work of Heathcote ‘mantle of the expert’ which involves the creation of a fictional world where students assume the roles of experts. It is based on the premise that treating children as responsible experts increases their engagement and confidence.

The definition used in this thesis will be taken from the work of Wells and Sandretto (2017). They stated that process drama refers to a teaching strategy that uses drama conventions e.g. role play and improvisation to structure lessons. They also outlined its purpose, stating it is to allow students to participate in a learning inquiry or discovery rather than present a rehearsed performance to an audience. Process drama has attracted practitioners and researchers from different theoretical perspectives.

2.2. Theoretical Perspectives used within Process Drama

The theoretical grounding for process drama combines traditional and liberal, alongside radical and progressive educational views. The following discussion examines the theoretical perspectives associated with the work of Vygotsky and viewpoints of sociocultural theory, social constructivism and critical pedagogy, as these have all influenced process drama research. While the previous section defined process drama, explaining that drama is the subject and the process refers to the pedagogy, this section will acknowledge the particular theoretical or philosophical understandings of teaching and learning that it involves.
When discussing theoretical perspectives used within process drama, it is essential to acknowledge the contribution of Vygotsky (1896 – 1934). There is a nexus between ‘process drama’ and Vygotsky’s work on play, imagination and spontaneity. Vygotsky encourages the former ‘play’ as he claims it promotes cognitive, social and emotional development in children (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987). This is summarised in the familiar Vygotskian contention that in play a child becomes “a head taller than himself” (Vygotsky (1927) in Bodrova et al., 2013). “Real” play, according to Vygotsky, features three components which also mirror the goals of process drama. Firstly, children create an imaginary situation, secondly, they take on and act out roles and finally, they follow a set of rules determined by these specific roles. These three components can be seen throughout process drama devices including: teacher in role, mime, mantle of the expert, thought tracking, freeze frames and hot seating (Farmer, 2012). Within a Vygotskian perspective, child development is enabled (in other words, children are working within the zone of proximal development) through the use of play. He claims that play must not remain frozen at the same level, but instead it needs to evolve to reach its most mature level, which is also the aim of the former drama device ‘teacher in role’ (Heathcote, 1991). This mature level refers to children being able to take on and sustain a specific role by consistently engaging in pretend actions, speech and interactions that fit their particular character. Mature play also characteristically produces high-quality play scenarios that integrate many themes and span the time of several days or even weeks (Vygotsky (1927) in Bodrova et al., 2013), like process drama pedagogy. While these similarities between play and process drama exist, Vygotsky limited the scope of play to typical dramatic or make-believe play and he did not include many kinds of other spontaneous activities such as movement, object manipulations and explorations that process drama may also combine (Vygotsky (1927) in Bodrova et al., 2013).

As mentioned above, Vygotsky (1930, in Hakkarainen, 2004) highlights the importance of ‘imagination’ – an aspect that process drama aims to uncover, promote and extend. He emphasises the benefits of creative imagination as he believed that it is through this that cognitive skills are cultivated. Vygotsky also discussed the benefits of ‘spontaneity’ within their imagination and believed this was achieved through mature make-believe
(Vygotsky (1927) in Bodrova et al., 2013). ‘Spontaneity’ is also a key element of process drama due to its reliance on improvisation. The role of the teacher is key to unlock their imagination and spontaneity. Daniels (2016) reflected on the work of Vygotsky, stating it is the responsibility of the teacher to establish an interactive instructional situation in the classroom, where the child is an active learner, and the teacher uses their knowledge to guide learning. In respect of ‘process drama’, this research wished to investigate to what extent process drama could therefore be the ‘interactive instructional situation’ that could allow the children to be ‘active learners’ within this ‘social environment’. The aim of process drama is to facilitate learning, allowing pupils ideas and understanding to evolve through play, imagination and spontaneity.

The work of Vygotsky is principally associated with the fields of developmental psychology, sociocultural psychology and social constructivism. The wide parameters demonstrate the breadth of his theories and their influence on a diverse collection of contrasting theorists. ‘Social constructivism’ has been linked to drama practices as the concept considers ‘reality’ as a direct result of human actions and similarly ‘drama’ as in essence the dynamics of human actions and interactions. It is understandable that drama theorists draw on the ideals expounded by Vygotsky and suggest that learning through drama, with its social and interactive nature reflecting a variety of different contexts, can be viewed through the lens of social constructivism. Even (2008) postulated a practical representation of a constructivist viewpoint in showing how the application of process drama can enhance teaching and learning of foreign languages. This approach requires a step away from the teacher as a lecturer, to the learner constructing his or her own meaning through interaction with the teacher. Even (2008) promotes social constructivism to aid learning languages because of its emphasis on interaction which vicariously lends itself to the practice and understanding of language. The fact that this study embraced science was not accidental. O’Sullivan (2018) explains that within a sociolinguistic constructivist approach, role play can help learners access and communicate abstract ideas in science and I set my work in a scientific context to explore the efficacy of this approach. The aim of constructivist practices is to invite students to actively engage in the teaching and learning process.
Another perspective associated with process drama is a critical pedagogy with origins in neo Marxian literature on critical theory. Paulo Freire’s view on critical pedagogy addresses issues of power and oppression. In liberating students from their silenced positions, educators take part in a radical transformation and democratisation within the context of schools. This is relevant to this area as drama produces opportunities to understand experiences as well as having close links to text and literacy (Freire and Macedo, 1987). Chan (2009) states that drama students move from a position of ‘oppression’ and are encouraged to have a voice, showing a critical insight. Innes, Moss and Smigiel (2001) assert that the restoration of teacher student dialogue through listening to student voices echoes the critical pedagogical epistemology in drama education. This is built on by the work of Alexander (2012) who stated there is growing acknowledgement of the importance of student voice in education both as a vital aspect of classroom learning and as the basis for democratic engagement. As mentioned above, Dawson and Lee (2018) affirm that drama offers educators tools and a structure to activate their pedagogical beliefs that align with sociocultural theories (Vygotsky, 1934) but also with the critical theories of learning (Hooks, 2014; Freire, 2018). Hooks (2014) stated that “the function of art is to do more than to tell it like it is – it is to imagine what is possible” (p.281).

Chan (2009) conjectured that drama was growing in popularity to meet the demand for more innovative and humanistic pedagogies in educational reforms. This innovation and support of creativity are also evident in the teaching of Modern Languages (Hulse and Owens, 2019). In particular, attention to student voice was brought to the fore as a means of school improvement (Rudduck and Flutter, 2000) in line with more democratic and dialogic pedagogies. Drama lends itself to innovation due to its interactive and spontaneous tendencies and also to more humanistic pedagogies as it opens up student and teacher dialogues. Therefore Chan (2009) points out that “good drama educators are able to act as receptive artists capable of going beyond surface realities of classroom interactions” (p.194) resulting in innovative and humanistic pedagogies. On a more practical level, Marjanovic-Shane (2016) explains that drama is easily portable, requires only a modest budget and its interactive nature facilitates the social aspects of learning. This idea of the social aspects of learning builds on Chan’s (2009) ideas when he outlined
that drama facilitates, self-initiated collaboration, responding to others’ thoughts, feelings and needs and therefore creates dialogue between teachers, students and peers. These social aspects can also be demonstrated in the work of Way (1967) who discussed the importance of learning responsibility through drama, individually and collaboratively. This collaboration was celebrated by Bolton (1979) when he stated drama is a group sharing of a dramatic situation as it is more powerful than any other medium in education. Furthermore, Heathcote (1991) explained that drama collects attitudes to problem solve collectively.

It is not solely theoretical positions that have influenced the pedagogy method. Different theatrical umbrellas, such as realism and naturalism, have inspired process drama. Guttman et al. (2008) outline the simplicity of realism, which is utilitarian for schools on a practical level as stage settings do not need to be elaborate and the characters are credible and realistic. It encourages pupils to consider motives and reactions in greater depth and prompts their individual constructs and personal perspectives. It is chronological in structure and allows the audience to care about the lives of characters onstage whereas naturalism places an emphasis on movement and exploits the human body as a medium of storytelling (Haseman, 1991). It is abstract, stylised and representational. Current social issues are explored in classrooms drawing on naturalism which enjoys a nexus with sociocultural theories. On a practical level, this is in existentially where a human character is formed: in essence from what they have inherited from their family and environment. It provokes pupils to consider detail e.g. accuracy of costumes in terms of the time period (Guttman et al., 2008).

It is no surprise that drama educators still refer to the 19th century revolutionary work of Stanislavski who famously stated that there are no small parts, only small actors. This precept encourages educators and pupils alike to consider how whole class groups can work together whilst simultaneously progressing on an individual basis. Stanislavski was a committed follower of realism (the 19th century theatrical movement showing real life on stage). Stanislavski’s platforms reflect real life. His techniques have been adopted internationally and are in evidence in the work of the American Viola Spolin (1906-1994) who assisted actors and pupils to focus in the present moment through improvisations
with specific directorial techniques. Drawing on his work, teachers encourage pupils to inhabit the role they are playing. The system involves drawing on emotional memory, exploiting physical actions and the exploration of symbolism. This is achieved through realistic action shown through the mundane conversations of ordinary people in real settings. Unlike the methodology of Stanislavski, Brechtian theatre placed greater emphasis on the role of the audience. Drama educators find this useful in whole class settings to prompt pupils to consider scenarios whilst distancing themselves from emotional involvement. This approach draws on the ideals behind epic theatre in that they avoid emotional investment in characters. This attitude can be productive when exploring political, social or moral messages with disparate dialectics. It can be deployed in classroom settings through the use of narration, coming out of role, speaking stage directions, direct address, placards, multi rolling, split role, symbolic props, lighting and gestures. Epic theatre is objective, approaching unresolved issues with an absence of empathy and is nonlinear. Whilst the work emanating from Russia of Stanislavski (1863-1938) and from Germany of Brecht (1898-1956) was not designed specifically for schools, their lasting influences in the theatre has provided a platform for drama educators to utilise their methods to further learning in classrooms throughout the world.

The English academic and teacher Dorothy Heathcote (1926-2011) developed the ideals of Brecht through the construct of ‘teacher in role,’ which will be mentioned in the section 2.1.1. Defining Process Drama, to make pupils (like the audience) think, whilst also coining the convention ‘mantle of the expert’ as an approach to teaching. Dewey and Vygotsky also influenced her by virtue of their interest in progressive education and use of language as Vygotsky (1934, in Rieber, 1999) alludes both to the spontaneity and continuity of speech. Furthermore, two other English educators Gavin Bolton and Brian Way, worked alongside Heathcote in developing the work of Brecht further. Peter Slade developed child drama philosophy that was more ‘spur of the moment’ - giving consideration and recognition to the dramatic play that children devise when left alone. Slade’s child drama (1955) was an extremely important publication as it laid the foundation for the assumption that children learn best through absorbed play. Linking back to the discussion on theatre versus drama, his ‘child drama’ movement of the 1950s separated drama education from theatre activities. From this perspective, the
teacher’s function was not to teach the skills and arts of performance but to encourage self-realisation. Slade’s drama strategies were very personal and affected the individual rather than the group. Similarly, Way (1967) placed emphasis on the notion that all human beings need to play to make sense of the world. Drama teaching, he suggested, should reject adult theatre and focus on the natural and truthful play of the child. His ‘development’ in drama demonstrated that the child developed through creative self-expression. He was less obviously entrenched in progressive education approaches than Slade and he used short controlled exercises: unlike Slade’s more ‘spur of the moment’ approach.

The promotion of the importance of the basic teacher ‘attitude’, more than any other feature, is what sets Heathcote (1991) apart from her predecessors in drama in education. Heathcote was a major force in the pulling back of drama to the track of pursuing knowledge. Her central concept of the purpose of drama was to ‘walk in another’s moccasins’, meaning you have to get existentially ‘into character’ (Heathcote, 1991). Bolton (1979) demonstrated that the contribution of drama to education depends on what general educational philosophy is in vogue at the time and its place in the curriculum depends on the kind of assumptions that are established about education and knowledge, the status of drama as a subject and the status of the drama teacher. Links to progressive education are overt in the work of Bolton and Heathcote.

Heathcote’s work showed similar characteristics to the work of Way and Slade. However, although Heathcote mirrored Slade’s desire for minimal props, she differed in that she used the teacher in a facilitating role rather than as an observer and she rejected Way’s linear model of moving from personal to group activity and the emphasis on a series of actions or exercises. The significance of the teacher recognised by Slade complemented Heathcote’s emphasis as he outlined the most important single factor in the use of drama as a genuine part of education is the teacher. To summarise, Way (1967) was more concerned with information that led to academic education ending with concise and accurate information. Conversely, Slade (1955) focused on direct experience, exploration of drama resulting in an enriched individual experience. Heathcote (1991) suggested that the process should take precedent over the product.
This section wished to consider theoretical perspectives. Considering sociocultural theory, social constructivism and critical pedagogy. It wished to acknowledge key thinkers in the area, dating back to the work of Stanislavski and Brecht but also acknowledging more recent academics and practitioners in the field, in particular the work of Dorothy Heathcote. In the section (2.4) with the title ‘Speaking Opportunities’ there will be a deeper analysis of theoretical perspectives with comparisons of the contrasting positions of interpretivism (Saracho and Spodek, 2007; Atas, 2015) and positivism (Van den Bergh, 1987; Tahriri, Tous and MovahedFar, 2015) as these authors were all interested in the concept of speaking. Likewise, positivist perspectives (Bozyigit et al., 2014) will be contrasted with constructivist perspectives (Even, 2008).

2.2.1. Benefits and Challenges of Process Drama

In 1979, Bolton posed a question about whether it is possible to steer a course that does not come down in support of any particular point of view but causes children to examine and re-examine their own views and values. This in essence is process drama. Consequently, researchers and practitioners have reflected on its usefulness in the hope of allowing children the opportunity to achieve Bolton’s (1979) aim. Lee et al. (2015) said that, “one promising arts integration method is drama” (p.3). Kana and Aitken (2007) emphasise this point stating, “process drama is an effective and empowering learning tool” (p. 698). Stabler (1978) outlined the goals that therefore make it an effective and empowering learning tool. He stated that it wishes to explore morals, extend language, produce and explore knowledge, discipline, cooperate, improve speech and confidence. Its usefulness is also celebrated on a practical level as it can be used across subjects, it has an instant effect as you do not need instruments and is versatile across age groups and language abilities.

A number of studies have outlined the benefits of process drama in a variety of contexts and affirm Heathcote’s belief that it should and can be used across the curriculum. Wells and Sandretto (2017) in a small scale qualitative study postulate that process drama is a productive pedagogy with many benefits within multiliteracies. Wells and Sandretto’s
evidence from two teachers in New Zealand suggest higher levels of engagement, more
detailed writing and enhanced depth of thinking. They highlighted that students who
sometimes made less contributions in class were more likely to join in. Likewise, Wang
(2014) using a case-study approach, looked at process drama within museum theatre
educational projects in Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan. In these projects the students
were able to reconstruct their own interpretations of historical events and narratives.
Success was monitored in the context of their understanding of their own cultural
identities and an ability to overcome geographical, historical, cultural and community
borders. Dawson and Lee (2018) celebrate the success of such projects saying drama can
improve social, emotional and academic learning.

Improvisation is used within process drama. Reed et al. (2014) stated that
improvisation is an excellent technique to use in the foreign language classroom as it
motivates the learners to be active participants in authentic situations, thereby reducing
their self-consciousness. Another advantage of improvisation is the level of freedom
that participants are able to exercise during the execution of the creative session.
Stinson and Freebody (2006) build on this saying that the power of improvisation within
process drama is that it involves all of the students all of the time, rather than being an
experience where some students demonstrate, model or perform to others.

Lee et al. (2012) explain that drama is more closely related to language arts due to its
narrative subject matter, so it may have a stronger positive effect when linked with this
subject. However, although not used as frequently they did highlight studies that
showed positive outcomes between science and drama, which was the subject used in
this thesis. The choice of a scientific crucible rather than an Arts matrix is unusual but
excited my interest. Dorion (2009) outlined two strategies of drama in science. The
first aimed to simulate social events which might draw on the drama convention of role
play and the second employed a combination of the conventions mime and role play to
convey abstract physical phenomena. Sloman and Thompson (2010) facilitated
undergraduate students on a marine biology degree programme to experience a large
group drama aimed at allowing them to explore how scientific research is funded and
the associated links between science and society. Findings suggested that knowledge, critical thinking ability, confidence and communication skills increased as a result of the drama. Dorion (2009) completed a multiple case exploration of the characteristics of drama activities used in secondary science lessons. McEwen et al. (2014) linked role play and science. They explored role play pedagogies in learning about cutting-edge flood science focussing on participant perceptions of their learning experiences. They reported increased confidence in science communication. Another study that incorporated science and role play was Braund et al. (2015) who observed six voluntary beginning teachers use science and drama during a lesson and found it can “facilitate interdisciplinary border crossing between science and the arts” (p.107).

Some studies have highlighted the limitations of process drama and one of the critical constraints is lack of confidence exhibited by some teachers. Teachers need to be secure in the method and confident to execute it ‘within role’ by thinking on their feet and responding creatively to student contributions. It is their responsibility to stimulate pupils in their democratic thinking and behaviour through a topic that can be executed ‘in role’. Dunn and Stinson (2011) highlight how proponents have to balance being the actor, director, playwright and teacher simultaneously. Jacobs (2016) discusses the difficulty of assessing such learning as there is a tension between being the teacher and assessor as they are required to be both the facilitator of the learning experiences and the assessor of the creative work. Dundar (2013) also discussed potential challenges in implementing drama activities in the foreign language classroom. Such issues include: limitations in the syllabus to allow drama games, a large amount of preparation needed for role play, a need to balance many skills when improvising and techniques such as mime do not allow language communication. Furthermore, students may lack familiarity with the theatre.

Academic collaborations between drama and science are sparse (Dorion, 2009; Sloman and Thompson, 2010), and consequently it will be intriguing to explore links between participation and speaking opportunities.
2.3. Participation in Lessons

Varis et al. (2018) articulate that participation is essential in classrooms in order to assess learning, improve knowledge and to prepare pupils for society. As a consequence of this imperative, the value of participation has attracted attention of researchers from disparate epistemological and ontological positions. The activity has been assessed through different methodological positions and viewed through different theoretical frameworks. What exactly constitutes ‘participation’ will first of all be discussed. I will then paint a picture of what participation may look like in the context of process drama and acknowledge the additional difficulties EAL learners may have with participating in English speaking classrooms. I will explore as to how studies, in particular the work of Bozyigit et al. (2014), Gay and Hanley (1999), Even (2008) and Pérez-Moreno (2018), have measured participation while linking their ideas to my own study interests.

In its most basic form, participation refers to the action of taking part in something. This action could refer to talking (Bozyigit et al., 2014), listening or involvement (Gay and Hanley, 1999). Whilst these three terms are commonly associated with and used to define participation; the ways in which they are discussed theoretically, epistemologically and methodologically are contrasting. The subject ‘talking’ draws on transdisciplinary frameworks including inter alia the disciplines of psychology, sociology and linguistics. The transdisciplinary element is apparent in the work of Robertson and Graven (2018). They drew collectively on Vygotsky’s sociocultural psychology; Bernstein’s sociological work and Halliday’s linguistic meaning making to define and discuss ‘talking’ in a second language classroom environment. Bozyigit et al. (2014) refer to ‘in-class activity participation’ as students ‘talking’ during discussions. Through talking, Bozyigit et al. (2014) contended that “this shows learners taking responsibility for their own learning, thus leading to effective participation” (p.15). Walqui and Heritage (2018) reflect on the role of practitioners in aiming for this ‘effective participation’. They suggested that the practitioners’ role in this exchange is to make classroom talk or substantive oral practice meaningful in order for it to be considered ‘effective’ participation. They claimed teachers must create a trusting classroom culture.
in which students feel that whatever level of language they can produce, their contributions will be valued in relation to their talking and listening.

Talking and listening work in unison. Mercer et al. (2017) through their work on ‘oracy’, showed how talking is closely linked to the concept of listening and both are required to constitute effective participation. Saricoban (1999) claimed that listening is the ability to identify and understand what others are saying. Therefore, listening is a complex, active process of interpretation in which listeners match what they hear with what they already know. Listening is a receptive skill, it is one that gives way to productive skills ensuring participation. However, it is also an active mental process that improves through good learning strategies (Aponte-de-Hanna, 2012). In order to observe listening in the classroom the students need to respond through interaction. The two concepts work in harmony, so within this research, talking and listening will be grouped together.

In the context of this research, participation refers to talking, listening and involvement. Involvement is the act or condition of being involved in something. It includes monitoring and informing which consequently leads to participation (Simic, 1991). In relation to this research specifically, Gay and Hanley (1999) outlined that ‘involvement’ through process drama occurs through creating and performing, which when combined, showcases participation. Involvement will refer to movements that show interaction but may not be verbal, this includes: movement and expression and therefore differing from talking and listening. They also stressed its ability and affirm that drama requires participation due to its multidimensional, multiskilled holistic approach to learning. Even (2008) combines the three concepts of ‘talking’, ‘listening’ and ‘involvement’ calling them ‘interactive exchanges’, which lead to participation. When students join in discussions, it allows their views to be heard through ‘talking’ and they can also build on the ideas of others through ‘listening’, thus becoming physically ‘involved’ in the lesson. Participation refers to the act of taking part in something and within this study the act of participation will accommodate actively talking, listening and being physically involved in lessons by partaking in movement.
Bozyigit et al. (2014) and Even (2008) are examples of authors with contrasting viewpoints who both had an interest in the concept of participation. The former wrote from a positivist perspective and the latter, a constructivist. Bozyigit et al. (2014) were able to target a large population of 5th to 7th grade learners in Turkey, using a sample of 627 students and acquiring the responses of 319 participants from a questionnaire. By creating an in-class project model on active learning and effective participation, Bozyigit et al. (2014) were able to conclude, through their in-class project, that learning is a success when students are actively involved and are in effect responsible for their own learning. Even (2008) conversely, wished to have a more in-depth analysis of student responses than Bozyigit et al’s. (2014) ‘yes, no and unsure’ options in their questionnaire and therefore approached the concept of participation from a contrasting viewpoint and methodology. From this perspective, Even (2008) suggests that traditional instruction by the teacher is gradually substituted by the learners’ autonomous construction of learning content, emphasising the importance of interaction. Using process drama for foreign language teaching and learning, Even (2008) posited that it provides a platform for interaction that profoundly stimulated language learning and language acquisition.

The constructivist Even (2008) drew on research from language acquisition, communicative language and interactional approaches and demonstrated that drama creates interactive exchanges that leave behind the dialogues and role plays of textbooks. As a result, a comprehensive overview of procedures and drama techniques were created to enhance foreign language learning and participation. Contrastingly, Bozyigit et al. (2014) were inspired by research on active learning allied with technological advances and wished to reach more students to facilitate generalisations. Although the two articles are written from contrasting perspectives and deploy different methodologies, they both emphasised the importance of participation and deduced that it can lead to curiosity and questioning.

Although writing from different academic disciplines, (social studies and music education) Gay and Hanley (1999) and Pérez-Moreno (2018) both approached the concept of participation from a broadly interpretivist perspective. Theoretical perspectives that led to this interpretivist viewpoint for Gay and Hanley (1999) were
multicultural empowerment and for Pérez-Moreno (2018), a combination of developmental and educational psychology alongside education and anthropology. Pérez-Moreno (2018) wrote an ethnographic study in Catalonia focussing on the formats of participation through participatory observation. The results found four different types of participation:

1. Active audience (actively observing or listening)
2. Performer pointer (partial performance of an activity)
3. Performer proof with an expert (playing explicit actions with another member)
4. Performer proof without an expert (playing explicit actions independently).

Gay and Hanley’s (1999) findings also discussed how participation can be seen in different ways, but rather than grouping them into different ‘types’, they grouped them in terms of activities e.g. generating a theme, improvisation, developing the script, developing concentration and sensory awareness, rehearsal and performance and debriefing and reflecting. This research combined the types of participation of Pérez-Moreno (2018) with Gay and Hanley’s (1999) types of activities and questioning, which will be utilised in my methodology chapter. Their approach and theoretical underpinnings resonate with my area of interest and theoretical perspective.

All four of the articles (Gay and Hanley, 1999; Even, 2008; Bozyigit et al., 2014; Pérez-Moreno, 2018) discussed participation in the classroom. Alongside Vygotsky’s influence on process drama discussed in section 2.2. ‘Theoretical Perspectives used within Process Drama,’ his influence on participation due to his discussions on social interaction should also be acknowledged. Vygotsky contended that children do not develop in isolation but conversely that learning takes place when the child is interacting with the social environment. This links to the work of Bozyigit et al. (2014) when they discussed effective participation and active learning within the social environment of the classroom. Daniels (2016) explained that Vygotsky’s participation model considers individual cultural development as a validated process of transformation of individual participation in sociocultural activity, which reflected the work of Gay and Hanley (1999). Vygotsky (1934, in Gauvain and Cole, 1978) articulated that transformation of participation involves assuming changed responsibility for the activity, redefining membership in a
community of practice and changing the sociocultural practice itself. This transformation of participation was broken into different types of participation by Pérez-Moreno (2018), which demonstrates how responsibility can change within and between activities. Vygotsky (1934) posited that knowledge is communicated, along with skills and attitudes, both in social and academic situations between people and is a product of social interaction. He concluded that learning cannot be separated from its social context: in essence a symbiosis, which was demonstrated in the work of Even (2008) when process drama was used interactively to optimise foreign language learning.

I have discussed the different epistemological and ontological influences of my chosen authors, but they also differed, not only from a theoretical perspective but also from a methodological perspective. Whilst similar in content due to their shared interest in participation, how they approached the topic differed methodologically. Bozyigit et al. (2014) had a cohort of 627 students in their project. As mentioned previously, the assessment was completed over a two month period and the method they employed was a survey method using a questionnaire with 319 students. Conversely, Gay and Hanley (1999) suggested that responses from participants should be both oral and written to ensure depth but Bozyigit et al. (2014) could not have had as large a sample if this was the case. Like Gay and Hanley (1999), Even (2008) wrote from a qualitative perspective, allowing a depth of analysis of his chosen drama techniques. Pérez-Moreno (2018) conducted an ethnographic study predicated on participatory observation. Data was collected using 40 hours of video recordings that were then summarised. Field notes with a description of tasks were carried out and the reflections and observations of the teachers were collated. This ensured that the findings could be validated as the activities were contrasted with the data from the field notes and interview notes made with the teacher.

Due to my interest in participation, the authors that were prioritised in this section were: Bozyigit et al. (2014), Gay and Hanley (1999), Pérez-Moreno (2018) and Even (2008). Bozyigit et al. (2014) researched active learning and effective participation and similarly I wished to focus on in-class activity participation, whilst also considering pupils’ opinions on in lesson processes’ and the teacher’s observations on the element of participation. Gay and Hanley (1999) combined my interest in participation with my
focus on drama. Whilst also focussing on the arts, Pérez-Moreno (2018) looked at the participation of kindergarden children during musical activities. Even (2008) added the dimension of foreign language learning in her drama workshop which has relevance for my matrix of advanced EAL learners. This research also addressed the efficacy of 'teacher in role' which Even (2008) suggests “offers the possibility of inserting new impulses into the improvisation, modelling verbal output and manipulating the course of the interaction” (p. 168). This is salient to my subject. These articles outline the multicultural (Gay and Hanley, 1999) and international interest in participation including Turkey (Bozyigit et al., 2014), Catalonia (Pérez-Moreno, 2018) and Indiana (Even, 2008). This resonates with my teaching in an international classroom context.

To summarise, Bozyigit et al. (2014) define participation as learners taking responsibility for their own learning. Furthermore, they postulate that learning is successful when students are actively and effectively involved, showing the importance of participation. Pérez-Moreno (2018) identified two main but mutually exclusive roles of participation: children either playing an ‘active audience’ role in an activity or alternatively, they are the ‘performers’. This distinction lends itself to a way of measuring and observing participation in its different forms. Gay and Hanley (1999) take participation for granted in drama activities but by using Pérez-Moreno’s template, the amount, type and effectiveness of the participation can be observed. EAL learners are faced with an additional challenge when a second language is involved, so the aim of this research is to investigate if participation can be enhanced by using process drama.

2.4. Speaking Opportunities

Liu and Littlewood (1997) define ‘speaking opportunities’ in the classroom as teacher and student interactions. Their significance has been articulated in the literature. McCormack and Klopper (2016) declared that the ways in which we are able to communicate are predominantly through speaking and listening. How we use the oral skills of speaking and listening has gained momentum in education over the last decade and has been referred to as ‘oracy’ (Mercer et al., 2017). This emphasis on the importance
of optimising speaking opportunities in the literature has prompted my interest in investigating if speaking opportunities can be enhanced through process drama. Mercer et al. (2017) suggest students need oracy skills to participate effectively in classroom life and in wider society. They emphasise the importance of all young people learning to use talk effectively for social and democratic engagement, alongside work-related activities. As a result, the optimisation of opportunities in schools to encourage speaking is paramount to help equip pupils with the skills to tackle social and professional interactions. With the import of this in mind, this thesis will consider as to whether process drama lends itself to this projection with advanced EAL learners. This section will trace historical ideas on speaking and listening, consider theoretical perspectives on the topic, provide definitions on the subject, consider current findings in the field and examine and explain how previous research addressed the combination of speaking opportunities and process drama.

When discussing speaking opportunities, it is imperative to acknowledge the influence of Vygotsky and his work on thinking and speech. Vygotsky viewed thinking and speaking as dynamically related. He discussed transition from thought to word and from word to thought. He suggests that speech does not simply follow practical activity or thought but plays some relatively important and specific role within it (Vygotsky, 1934, in Rieber, 1999). He connects these two areas under the umbrella of language by stating that the social activity of speaking is connected with the active process of thinking. Vygotsky (1934, in Gauvain and Cole, 1978) stated that language is the most important psychological tool as language gives a tremendous boost to cognition by permitting forms of thinking that are not possible without the help of language. He asserted that language, in terms of psychological development is of fundamental importance. Vygotsky (1934, in Gauvain and Cole, 1978) asserted that students acquire both language and progress through dialogue with their teachers, their peers and their environment. Van der Veer and Valsiner (1991) summarise his view of language into two functions: 1) a means of social coordination of the actions of various people and 2) a tool of thinking. In order to facilitate students to allow social coordination and a tool of thinking, practitioners must therefore try and provide speaking opportunities.
The previous section discussed participation and outlined how children can play an ‘active audience’ role (Pérez Moreno, 2018) rather than using speech. However, Vygotsky emphasises the importance of the ‘performer’ role (Pérez Moreno, 2018) and significance of speech to accomplish the given task (Daniels et al., 2007).

“Speech does not simply follow practical activity, but plays some kind of relatively important and specific role in it…The child’s speech is an inseparable and internally necessary part of the process, just as important as the action for achieving the goal…The child solves a practical problem not only with his eyes and hands, but also with the help of speech…Sometimes speech becomes so important that without it, the child is definitely not capable of concluding the task” (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber, 1999, p.15).

Vygotsky stated that speech is a means of social interaction alongside a means of expression and understanding (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987). Vygotsky averred that a child does not simply act in isolation to achieve a goal but speaks contemporaneously (Vygotsky (1934), in Rieber, 1999). Vygotsky (1934, in Rieber, 1999) emphasises the centrality of this dialogue as speech facilitates the planning of one’s own actions, the control of behaviour and the accommodation of other agencies and actors. Speech and action are related to each other. The more complex the action required and the less direct the path toward solution, the more important does the role of speech in the whole process become (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber, 1999). This belief system resonated with the concept of oracy in education. The term ‘oracy’ originated in Britain and was coined by Wilkinson (1965) referring to the ability to use the oral skills of speaking and listening. This definition was developed in relation to students by Alexander (2012) who claimed it improved children's capacity to use speech to express their thoughts and communicate with others, in education and in life. Mercer et al. (2017) created an oracy assessment toolkit: linking research and development in the assessment of students' spoken language skills at age 11 and 12 in partnership with School 21 (a school in London which has put oracy at the core of its curriculum). They divided this
framework into four areas: physical, linguistic, cognitive and social and emotional. They summarised the concept of oracy as spoken language skills. Their findings suggest that teachers found this an easy and effective way to assess oracy. As this thesis wishes to consider speaking opportunities, research in oracy will be of great significance. The definition by Liu and Littlewood (1997) of ‘speaking opportunities’ will be utilised, which refers to teacher and student interactions.

Mercer et al. (2017) explained that language development consists of diverse skills that can be developed and that teachers can aid students in gaining effective talk skills. Speaking and listening and how they are used (oracy), have received attention from practitioners and researchers alike. Speaking in schools has been researched from different epistemological and ontological positions and theories. These have included inter alia: interpretivism (Saracho and Spodek, 2007; Atas, 2015), positivism (Van den Bergh, 1987; Tahriri, Tous and MovahedFar, 2015), developmental psychology (Mercer et al., 2017) and linguistics and cognitive development (Mercer et al., 2017; McCormack and Klopper, 2016). Disparate discussions have lent themselves to the deployment of different methodologies. Topics have included: assessing speaking (Mercer et al., 2017; Van den Bergh, 1987), speaking and drama in preschool education (Tombak, 2014), drama and English as an approach to foreign language learning (Reed et al., 2014; Hulse and Owens, 2019), reducing EAL speaking anxiety through drama (Atas, 2015) and music and oracy (McCormack and Klopper, 2016). Findings have suggested that the assessment of oracy skills on a large scale is feasible in primary education (Mercer et al., 2017; Van den Bergh, 1987), drama is the most important medium of expression in preschool education (Tombak, 2014), drama is an innovative and desirable approach to foreign language learning (Reed et al., 2014; Hulse and Owens, 2019), drama techniques significantly lower speaking anxiety (Atas, 2015) and all participants demonstrated an increase in oracy when paired with music (McCormack and Klopper, 2016). Not all studies have suggested enhanced effects (Ingersoll and Kase, 1970; Lawton and Brandon, 2005). Ingersoll and Kase (1970) demonstrated that while drama has an effect both on learning and retention, the relationship varied based on the training that the child had received and they also claimed that the higher the grade the less desirable and teaching technique it was. Furthermore, Lawton and Brandon (2005) found no significant
differences between schools who participated in a year long drama intervention and control schools on reading achievement. Consequently, the topic and purpose of these projects, have attracted different methodologies and methods, alongside different findings and I would like to add to this body of research.

Quantitative methodologies have been useful when there has been a desire to access greater samples to make generalisations to inform research and practice. This can be seen in the work of Van den Bergh (1987) who gained data on the oracy skills of two hundred 10 to 12 year olds. Conversely, qualitative methods have been utilised when more individual detail has been required. The qualitative approach is evident in the work of McCormack and Klopper (2016) who used action research to improve oracy through the medium of music. Similarly, while exploring through qualitative approaches, Tombak (2014) completed a descriptive analysis, by observing and revealing the results with preschool children partaking in speaking activities through drama. Mercer et al. (2017), also using a qualitative methodological approach, exploiting the potential of video recordings to enable close analysis of students' performances and to facilitate discussion with teachers and others for standard setting purposes. Mixed methods were the preference of Reed et al. (2014) when examining the perceptions of ten university students on an activity-based ‘English as a foreign language’ drama course at a Korean university. They collected data via a questionnaire and journal into which the pupils reduced their perceptions to writing after every session. The questionnaire consisted of nine questions with answers on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 referring to ‘strongly disagree’, 2 ‘disagree’, 3 ‘neutral’, 4 ‘agree’ and 5 ‘strongly agree’. McCormack and Klopper (2016) used qualitative participatory action research data collection techniques through observations and informal interviews. These differing methodological approaches show the significance of the topic ‘speaking opportunities’ but also outline how different types of discussions and lines of inquiry suit differing methodological choices.

While the literature mentioned above shared the common interest of speaking opportunities, they differed in what they wanted to investigate or create. Alexander (2012) explains that there is a strong case for revisiting the 1975 Bullock Report’s
advocacy of ‘language across the curriculum’ in order to underline the argument that educationally productive talk is the responsibility of all teachers, not just those who teach English. McCormack and Klopper’s (2016) research allowed them to use music as a pedagogical tool and demonstrated (to varying degrees) its potential to promote oracy with EAL pupils. Atas (2015) was also interested in EAL learners and the arts, showing how drama techniques significantly lowered speaking anxieties through creative and effective teaching techniques. Another study promoting drama as a methodology was mentioned in my section on participation by Freebody (2010) who explored teacher and student interactions and moral reasoning practices in drama classrooms.

Alexander (2012) states that talk is essential to children’s thinking and learning and to their productive engagement in classroom life, especially in the early and primary years as high quality classroom talk can raise standards in the core subjects. Freebody (2010) stated that talk is structured differently in process drama classrooms and this difference has the potential to allow students deeper engagement with the themes and content being explored. This body of work extrapolated from three settings of conceptual and methodological inquiry includes: the sociological setting of socioeconomic theory; the curricular and pedagogic setting of educational drama; and the analytic setting of ethnomethodologically informed analyses of conversation analysis. Findings showed that process drama vicariously accommodated moral development by exploring controversial issues. This study also considered the multiple manners of speaking. Freebody (2010) identified three different types of ‘talk’:

1. Pedagogic/logistic talk (PLT) - managing of school and lesson behaviour.
2. Sociocultural talk (SCT) - engaging the cultural, social and moral potential of the lesson and aiming to create shared accounts and public reasoning practices.
3. In role talk (IRT) - students demonstrating their understandings of the expectations signalled in the SCT and improvising reactions to scenarios as they display these in role as character-participants in the drama (p.214).

Within my research, I want to look at the balance of these types of talk that will be explored further in my analysis of data section (3.5).
Research emphasises the importance of speaking opportunities across all ages but the significance of this topic is even more pressing when EAL learners are involved. Stinson and Freebody (2006) explain that generally EAL learners do better in reading and writing than they do in speaking and listening. They considered what impact a short term series of ten process drama lessons had on the communication skills of high school pupils in Singapore and found that it improved their communicative skills. Atas (2015) also used mixed methods to explore if drama techniques lowered anxiety of English as foreign language learners with 12th grade students in Turkey. Using pre and posttests, semi structured interviews and diaries he found a reduction in anxiety and discovered that “students who were always abstaining from speaking English, started to raise their hands when asked for a volunteer” (p.966). The most common cause of anxiety was lack of confidence in pronunciation. He claimed that mistakes cannot be combatted unless speaking opportunities are created in a nurturing environment. Aponte-De-Hanna (2012) also adds that through planning and continuous practice, language teachers can help their students acquire strategic skills that enhance listening comprehension and develop autonomy. I would like to investigate if process drama can create such an environment. Drama is interactive in nature, lending itself to speaking. Tombak (2014) found that the confidence of children increased as a result of the interactive nature of drama. Likewise, the findings of Reed et al. (2014) showed that the drama activities increased their confidence, communications skills, awareness, competence and thinking ability.

As the importance of speaking opportunities are apparent, many researchers have tried to enhance EAL learners speaking opportunities through a variety of contrasting approaches. These have ranged from philosophy based language teaching in Iran (Shahini and Riazi, 2011) to metacognitive instructional design, techniques and exercises for non-native English speakers (Penrose, 2007), emphasising the importance of using specific questions about intercultural communication and encouraging the sharing of cultural differences. While I am also interested in advanced language learners, my interest is around the experiences of primary school pupils. I would like to explore as to whether process drama has the intrinsic ability to increase speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners and to be effective, it is of paramount importance to invite and give
cognisance to the perceptions of the pupils on the opportunities they feel they have been afforded.

Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child enshrines the rights of children to have their views given due weight in all matters affecting them (Murphy *et al.*, 2013). This universal statutory protection permeates every aspect of society – no more so than in the field of education. Lundy (2007) is an ardent adherent to this tenet and advocates that children should be given space, a voice, an audience and influence. Inter alia, students should be encouraged to express their individual and collective viewpoints in a context that is inclusive and addressed to a forum that will take cognizance. Murphy *et al.* (2013) in their study of assessment in science primary education in England and Wales emphasise that the duty is not on the child to find a way to express their views, but rather on the adults to provide such a vehicle for them. Not only should children be given an opportunity to express their perspectives, they must also be facilitated in formulating their position. Lundy’s (2007) study indicated that children felt they did not enjoy an input into decisions made about them. Ancillary problems suggested by the authors included the paucity of training for adults to promote the skills of active listening and recognition of non-verbal cues. This study included the views of 1064 schoolchildren from a cohort of 27 schools. Lundy *et al.* (2011) are advocates of the premise that it is the responsibility of teachers and researchers in the first instance to provide a safe space for students to express their views and to ensure thereafter that their views are listened to and acted upon. There are many benefits derived from providing this platform and model. Lundy (2018) explains that participatory experience develops and enhances both aptitude and confidence in children. Even when the process is less than perfect, there are opportunities for both the child and adult to advance.

This research prompted my desire to explore children’s perspectives in order to optimise data collection and quality. Murphy *et al.* (2013) point out that by including and respecting children’s perspectives, we may be in a position to make better decisions regarding all aspects of their education as they articulate a valuable, legitimate and important voice.
To summarise, drama has had positive effects on oral language outcomes (Hendrickson and Gallegos, 1972; Lee et al., 2015). Mercer et al. (2017) claim that in order to participate effectively in both classroom life and the wider society that good oracy skills are required. In 1965, Wilkinson coined this term oracy meaning the ability to use the oral skills of speaking and listening. This research project is dedicated to investigating whether the speaking opportunities of pupils can be enhanced and exploited during process drama sessions. Interest in speaking is not a new concept and can be dated back as far as the work of Piaget and Vygotsky when they discussed language acquisition. Recently, Mercer et al. (2017) explained that interest in speaking has surfaced in a number of academic disciplines including literacy because it has been accepted that schools should be helping students to develop effective talk skills because talk stimulates children's cognitive development. McCormack and Klopper (2016) outline its importance as it holds the capacity to express oneself in and understand speech. This explains the focus oracy has enjoyed over the last decade and the attention oral skills have received in education. Researchers have had different goals in terms of speaking but all agree on its benefits. Drury (2013) examined the complexity of language learning for EAL learners in the early years. All of these studies had fascinating findings, but it made me consider if the early years and beginning language learners are supported more frequently than advanced EAL learners in the primary school. Ofsted (2005) remarked that advanced EAL learners refer to pupils who have had all or most of their school education in the UK (or in this case through an International School that follows the British Curriculum). They are generally proficient in English to a level that is indistinguishable from that of pupils with English as first language, but their writing may still show distinctive features related to their language background. Using the Bell Foundation EAL assessment framework advanced EAL learners would be described as working at bands D (competent) and E (fluent). Therefore, this study will outline the methodology I chose to consider advanced EAL learners speaking opportunities and participation in a Key Stage 2 classroom.
2.5. Summary of Literature Review

This Literature Review was an endeavour to explore the existing literature in the fields of process drama, participation and speaking opportunities. For the purposes of clarification, whilst my sample cohort consisted of advanced EAL learners and the context was scientific, I was not addressing the advancement of neither scientific knowledge nor language acquisition. My interests were exclusively the disciplines enumerated above.

To facilitate an understanding of the concept of process drama, this Literature Review commenced with a chronology: demonstrating its origins from the embryonic UK Children’s Theatres in the 1920s. This innovative organisation emerged through the medium of mobile theatres and migrated from rehearsed, polished performances to a chrysalis of a pedagogical approach to enhance learning. A retrospective definition by Wells and Sandretto (2017) suggested that process drama is “used to describe a model of drama in education in which the students work within a variety of drama conventions and improvised roles alongside their teacher, who also often works in role to guide and structure the lesson” (p.182). Theoretical perspectives were posited and analysed. Of particular interest was the work of Vygotsky in the fields of developmental psychology, sociocultural psychology and social constructivism and their application and relevance to process drama. The work of Vygotsky is relevant to and resonates with all areas of this thesis including: process drama, participation and speaking opportunities.

Furthermore, the case-study sample of ‘EAL learners’ facilitated reflection on his influence in the understanding of language development. Section 2.2. ‘Theoretical Perspectives used within Process Drama’ discussed the nexus between ‘process drama’ and his work on play, imagination and spontaneity. Section 2.3. ‘Participation’ linked Vygotsky’s discussions on social interaction with current understanding on participation. 2.4. ‘Speaking opportunities’ then highlighted Vygotsky’s contributions on thinking and speech, highlighting the centrality of speech and confirming its functional complexity in the context of problem solving (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber, 1999). The three areas were linked when Vygotsky claimed that “child speech is not the personal activity of the child but individual speech must be viewed as part of dialogue
of cooperation and social interaction” (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987, p.27). Therefore, his ideas on individual speech and dialogue linked to the area of ‘speaking opportunities,’ his contributions on cooperation mirrored the ideals of the ‘process drama’ device ‘teacher in role’ and his discussions on social interaction, resonated with the area of ‘participation’. The seminal work of Heathcote was highlighted with an emphasis on the two process drama conventions she coined - ‘mantle of the expert’ and ‘teacher in role’. This overview paved the way for a discussion on the benefits and challenges of process drama.

An exemplar of existing studies was summarised in the work of Lee et al. (2015) who completed a meta-analysis of PreK to 16 outcomes. He suggested that previous studies can best be categorised into three categories: a) immediate achievement and learning outcomes in nondrama curriculum b) immediate achievement and learning outcomes through the drama curriculum and c) other psychological and social outcomes related to learning, including engagement, attitudes toward school and academics, academic self-concept and prosocial attitudes and behaviour.

Following from this critical exploration of the concept and constituents of process drama, I progressed to an analysis of the volume of participation and the number of speaking opportunities. The existential importance of participation was highlighted by Varis et al. (2018) in a discussion of the benefits and averring that it was fundamental to assess learning, improve knowledge and to prepare pupils for society. A comparison followed predicated upon four studies of the concept from differing theoretical and methodological positions (Bozyigit et al., 2014; Gay and Hanley, 1999; Even, 2008 and Pérez-Moreno, 2018). The latter study considered participation from four different perspectives: active audience (actively observing or listening), performer pointer (partial performance of an activity), performer proof with an expert (playing explicit actions with an experienced member) and performer proof without an expert (playing explicit actions independently). These differentiations were retained throughout the methodology and findings of this thesis when observing behaviour. The definition used for speaking opportunities was adopted from the work of Liu and Littlewood (1997) as a reference to classroom teacher and student interactions. McCormack and Klopper (2016) emphasised
the primacy of these interactions as communications are predominantly through the media of speaking and listening. Explorations of other works included Mercer et al. (2017) who created an oracy assessment toolkit, Reed et al. (2014) who considered university students' perceptions of an activity based EFL drama course and McCormack and Klopper (2016) who studied how music can promote oracy for EAL students.
3. METHODOLOGY

As outlined in Chapter One, this thesis aims to investigate the extent to which using process drama in an international primary classroom context could develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced English as additional language learners (EAL learners). The focus was not on language acquisition or scientific subject knowledge.

This chapter discusses the methodological approach taken in this investigation in order to address my four research questions:

1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?
2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?
3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy?
4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?

Lee et al.’s. (2015) meta-analysis of PreK to 16 outcomes, demonstrates that we do not yet have a clear understanding of the overall effectiveness of drama. Previous studies can be categorised into three categories: a) immediate achievement and learning outcomes in nondrama curriculum b) immediate achievement and learning outcomes through the drama curriculum and c) other psychological and social outcomes related to learning, including engagement, attitudes toward school and academics, academic self-concept and prosocial attitudes and behaviour. The title of this thesis is ‘a case-study of process drama in the classroom: developing participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School’. This links to both ‘a’ (nondrama curriculum) as lessons took place within the science curriculum and ‘c’ (other psychological and social outcomes), specifically participation and speaking opportunities. With neither participation nor speaking opportunities featured in any of their 47 quasi-experimental studies, this research follows the advice of Lee et al. (2015) to examine the teaching tool of drama and its impact on areas other than achievement. Furthermore, the literature
review of Chapter Two, outlined the benefits of participation (Gay and Hanley, 1999; Even, 2008; Bozyigit et al., 2014; Pérez-Moreno, 2018) and speaking opportunities (Freebody, 2010; Mercer et al., 2017) for students. Dawson and Lee (2018) also discussed the benefits of the arts, specifically drama, to improve social, emotional and academic learning. Therefore driving this research is the question to what extent does process drama aid participation and speaking opportunities and I felt this would be of greatest importance for EAL learners. While drama has been utilised with beginning language learners (Even, 2008), there is a gap when focusing on advanced EAL learners despite research suggesting that drama is a particularly helpful tool to improve motivational outcomes when used with older age groups in the primary school (Podlozny, 2000).

Consequently, the research aims to investigate to what extent the use of process drama in the classroom can develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School from both my own and the pupils’ perspectives. The definition provided in the literature review of process drama is a teaching strategy that places the whole class at its core and uses drama conventions and improvisation to structure lessons. In the context of this research, participation refers to learners taking responsibility for their own learning and actively joining in with the lesson through talking, listening and involvement; these actions were then broken further into four types of participation: active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert (Pérez-Moreno, 2018) and speaking opportunities described targeted teacher and student interaction that were discussed in terms of three different types of talk: pedagogic/logistic talk, sociocultural talk and in role talk (Freebody, 2010). I would wish to reiterate that this is a drama inspired process set in a scientific setting not a science subject delivered dramatically.

3.1. Approach to Research

To address the research aims, this thesis adopts a case-study approach focusing on six children in a Year 5 class, aged nine and ten, who are advanced EAL learners. Ponelis
(2015) explains that a research design is the logic that links the research purpose, meanwhile the questions link to the processes for empirical data collection and data analysis, in order to make conclusions drawn from the data. In this thesis the ‘research purpose’ is to investigate to what extent process drama in the classroom can develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School; the ‘research questions’ seek to evaluate the impact of process drama combining the students’ perspectives on the matter; the ‘process for data collection’ includes teacher observations, video recordings, a focus group, a research journal and pupil interviews, ‘data analysis’ will draw on content analysis of the data collected, with the intention of ‘forming conclusions drawn from the data’. Before I can achieve this, it is important that I explain why I believe a case-study was the best approach to answer my research questions and achieve my research aim, outline the context I was working in, articulate the focus of my study, acknowledge and justify my theoretical and conceptual framework and outline my methodological considerations. At the outset I will explain as to how the concept of ‘student voice’ was exploited in this case-study.

Murphy et al. (2013) addressed the decline in children’s engagement with science in upper primary and lower secondary school. This influenced my decision to pair process drama with science. In constructing my interview questions, I reflected on the work of Lundy (2018) who posited that dialogue exchanged between the child and adult, rather than just listening, is crucial for meaningful child participation. I decided on a semi-structured interview approach to promote dialogue. I had to be cognizant (with EAL students) of their proficiency in English. Whilst working with Year 1 children, Lundy et al. (2011) overcame barriers by exploiting many visual and kinesthetic strategies such as laminated images as prompts because of literacy and numeracy deficits. They recognised that some students were reluctant or unable to express their views through the medium of drawing. Lundy (2007) addressed this reticence by offering a variety of approaches: drawing pictures, writing stories, designing posters and undertaking tasks. I exploited a variety of speech and drama techniques to unpick the students’ perspectives to optimise data collection and quality. Murphy et al. (2013) guaranteed anonymity of the 1009 participants by the online nature of their research whereas I was
compelled to anonymise all of the names of the students and school within this qualitative study.

Lundy (2018) suggested four components (the four ‘F’s) to ensure participation was productive:

1. Full – Requires the adults to engage and allow children to explain responses.
2. Friendly – All language needs to be accessible.
3. Fast – Participation should prompt immediate acknowledgement and quick initial responses.
4. Followed-up – Conversations should be ongoing, lasting for duration and demonstrating transparency.

The first constituent ‘Full’, I encompassed by allowing the children unlimited response time to engage, explain and elaborate. The second tenet ‘Friendly’, I secured by using visual stimuli such as the whiteboard and child friendly language allied with props such as teddy bears. The third stricture ‘Fast’, I accomplished by expressing gratitude at every opportunity to the children for their participation. The final prescription ‘Followed-up’, I addressed by involving the children from start to finish through lessons, interviews, focus group and the sharing of narrative summaries.

3.1.1. Theoretical and Contextual Framework

As assumptions have been made and questions have been raised it is imperative that I begin by outlining my theoretical position and debates around this. Based on a combination of the existing literature and my own personal viewpoints, this methodology will outline my ontological and epistemological position and acknowledge theoretical perspectives that influenced my study. The reason for this is to follow the advice of Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) who noted, researchers need to be clear not only about how they are doing research but also why they take this approach rather than another. Hitchcock et al. (1995) also stated “ontological assumptions give rise to epistemological assumptions; these in turn give rise to methodological considerations; and these in turn give rise to instrumentation and data collection” (p.21). Therefore, as
my ontological beliefs are based around researchers and informants being interdependent and mutually interactive (Hudson and Ozanne, 1988), my epistemological position is written from an interpretivist viewpoint, which will justify a qualitative methodology, combining the use of instrumentation such as interviews, focus group, video recordings, observation and a research journal, through an overarching case-study methodology.

Ponelis (2015) emphasises the importance of positioning a research project within a paradigmatic framework. This thesis will be written from an interpretivist perspective. Interpretivism is an approach that places people at the centre and is popular within the social sciences as it distinguishes between human and nonhuman subjects. It differs from its predecessor positivism as it is concerned with detail and consequently lends itself to qualitative data with smaller samples. Its fundamental underpinnings suggest that the world is dependent on the many subjective experiences and does not exist independently of experience. This approach resonates with my research questions as in order to gain students’ perspectives, I will be focussing on a small sample of people, hoping to gain detailed qualitative data. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that the criteria used to evaluate the findings generated by interpretivism as opposed to positivism differ. Glaser and Strauss (1967) also explain that positivism is concerned with generalisation whereas interpretivism is more concerned with the perspective of the participants and in the case of my research, this refers to the students. I am interested in participation and speaking opportunities, but these areas have also been approached from contrasting positions.

Bozyigit et al. (2014) who were discussed in the literature review were also concerned with effective participation but approached this from a contrasting ontological and epistemological position. Realism is the ontology used within the paradigm they drew on. As realists they agree there is a truth about reality waiting to be discovered. Consequently, the research was written from a positivist perspective which is aligned with the philosopher Auguste Comte (1798-1857), who declared that reality could be observed and through the process of observation and experiment, authentic knowledge could be achieved. Mack (2010) elaborates on this definition stating positivists are viewed as adopting a strict view of objectivity in their pursuit to gather knowledge. Consequently, they were able to make assumptions and generalisations that are consistent with a
positivist philosophy (Onwuegbuzie, 2000) such as learning is a success when students are actively involved and are in effect responsible for their own learning as positivists state truth is an objective reality. Another benefit of this research is the fact that they were able to target a large sample of 627 students. While I was also interested in effective participation I would like to challenge this positivist position due to their strict view of objectivity and the methods and procedures employed for producing scientific knowledge within positivistic research (Sandberg, 2005). I wished to target a smaller group, gaining their perspectives and detailed accounts of the type of participation occurring and therefore an interpretivist lens allowed this.

The types of participation outlined by Pérez-Moreno (2018) can be further explained through the work of Vygotsky. Pérez-Moreno (2018) divided participation into two categories, those that play an ‘active audience’ role in an activity or those that are ‘performers.’ Vygotsky emphasised the need for pupils to learn from their own activities and he claimed their role should not be reduced to one of passively receiving accepted knowledge (Van der Veer and Valsiner, 1991). Therefore the first type of participation, although absent of dialogue is called ‘active audience’ as opposed to solely ‘audience member’. This involves an adult or a child performing the activity while the other children observe and listen with attention to the actions. However, Vygotsky does suggest that the more complex the action required and the less direct the path toward solution, the more important the role of speech in the whole process becomes and leads to the ‘performer’ types of participation. These were further subdivided into the categories: performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert (Pérez-Moreno, 2018).

Performer pointer participation is observable when copying behaviour that we interpret as partial performance but not furthering the action. This involves the imitation of behaviour. Vygotsky points out that a common misunderstanding is the belief that children are capable of imitating anything as if imitation is nothing but a mechanical, automatic process (Daniels et al., 2016, p.44). Therefore, although the child is joining in, this type of participation also has its limitations. The term ‘performer proof with an expert’ refers to a form of participation when a child is learning alongside an adult or a
more knowledgeable peer. Vygotsky argues that this is how the most successful type of participation occurs as children experience the world mediated by adults as they create a means by which the child can participate effectively in the activity (Daniels, 2016). Vygotsky explains this is a “unique form of systematic cooperation between the teacher and the child as the child is able to do in collaboration something that he has never done spontaneously” (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987, p.55). Furthermore, it can be achieved through demonstration, leading questions and by introducing the initial elements of the tasks solution (p.59).

The first three types of participation (active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert), involve the collaboration with other peers or adults. Vygotsky believed that when a student is in the zone of proximal development in a particular task, provided with the appropriate assistance, it will give the student enough confidence to achieve the task (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Woolock, 1997). Therefore, whilst Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development can be determined by independent problem solving, the higher level of potential development (as determined through problem solving) occurs under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers. The final type of participation is called performer proof without an expert. This is when the activity is carried out autonomously. The child partakes in full without assistance from an adult or peer. Vygotsky would proffer that whilst the pupil is repeating instructions or activities independently, the collaboration is invisibly present (Daniels, 2016). He would advance that previous behavioural reactions have included stimulus reception, processing of stimulus and responding to the stimulus before the independent activity occurs (Van der Veer and Valsiner, 1991). He discusses the difficulty of defining participation into these distinct types categories as he explained why “speech, the tool of social interaction, is at the same time the tool of intimate interaction with oneself” (Van der Veer and Valsiner, 1991, p.58). Furthermore, he outlines that every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first on the social levels and later on the individual (Daniels, 2016). However, within this research, participation will be viewed and analysed within these four distinct categories, while also acknowledging overlaps and limitations.
Interpretivism is associated with the views of Max Weber (1864-1920). He outlined that we need to understand why people do things to understand their actions. As I wished to research the students’ actions in relation to participation and speaking, this resonates with me. Interpretivists suggest that social reality is unfixed and changeable. It is defined ontologically as holding to a subjective conception of social reality as unfixed and changeable and a view that there may be multiple versions of reality. Wahyuni (2012) explains that epistemologically, interpretivism focuses on the subjective meaning of details and of motivating actions and in this research, I wished to explore if process drama can be this motivating action. Denzin and Lincoln (2018) suggest that interpretivists outline that human action is meaningful and attempt to interpret phenomena in terms of these meanings brought by people through natural settings, in this case, the classroom. As interpretivists study human behaviour, they rely on qualitative research to analyse. I wish to add to this research, looking at participation and speaking opportunities.

3.1.2 Methodological Considerations

Denzin and Lincoln (2018) explained qualitative research studies take place in their natural settings attempting to make sense of, or interpret phenomena, in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Interpretivists suggest that people are different from the natural world and have a wide range of different perspectives. Berg and Lune (2014) state that this refers to the meaning, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols and descriptions of things. They tend to research specific instances and not make generalisations (Wahyuni, 2012). Qualitative research produces data that is arrived at by any means other than statistical testing or other means of quantification. Qualitative researchers claim that it is necessary to get as close to participants’ actual experience as possible (Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). Furthermore, Ezzy (2002) suggests these researchers engage with the complexity of analysing human action in terms of meanings. The rise of qualitative research came from a belief that people are different from the natural world and can be observed and reported on as its strategies allow us to study social action and social organisation in a multiplicity of social settings (Atkinson et al., 2003). Bryman (2016) outlined the main methods associated with qualitative research, which are: interviewing, focus groups, ethnography and language focused approaches and I will be drawing on some of these ideals. Others include observations, field notes, documents,
Methodology within qualitative research is not concerned with generalisability but an in depth focus on human experience. There are several methods to support qualitative research, all of which have in common the desire to understand and explain experiences from the participants' perspectives. This can be seen through ethnography, which focuses on exploring the behaviour of people in their own environment and looking at how the individual understands their world (Parahoo, 2014). It is through this approach that cultures can be studied including values, beliefs, behaviours and language. Another methodology, which requires extensive immersion, is grounded theory. Grounded theory can gather data from participants in their own environments and assist in ensuing theory (Hays and Wood, 2011). This means that people’s experiences are studied with a process and they create a theory of explanation of how that process works. It is as much about the strategic design and conduct of empirical field research as it is about techniques for data analysis (Atkinson et al., 2003). This is due to the fact that the theory is generated only from the data collected in the study and is not taken from other sources. On the other hand, phenomenology strives to uncover rather than develop theory. It wishes to interpret and explore lived experience describing the essence and the nature of the phenomena. It is a report on social life that focusses on detailed and accurate description rather than explanation, as it is a nonnumerical assessment of observations made through participant observation, content analysis and in depth interviews (Babbie, 2013). While they are time consuming, these qualitative designs can produce rich descriptions.

Petty et al. (2012) explained that qualitative research has been criticised as an ‘unscientific’ method as it makes assumptions. I therefore used the perspectives of the pupils alongside the class teachers’ reflections to help minimise these issues and at all times was aware of my impact as a researcher and acknowledged the problems that my presence created in gaining reliable results. Issues raised most frequently with qualitative research are its sample size and validity. While, I am aware of my small sample size, I wanted detailed reflections from my subjects and believed that this was the best approach
for this work. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) added to these criticisms saying alongside this, problems with its generalisations and reliability have also been brought to the fore. As a result, I endeavoured not to generalise and outlined my understanding of the limitations associated with reliability in the project. Denzin and Lincoln (2018) stated that qualitative researchers assume that qualified, competent observers could, with objectivity, clarity and precision report on their own observations of the social world including the experiences of others. Furthermore, the approach has been criticised for merely gathering anecdotal and personal impressions that are strongly subjective and that it could contain research bias as it is difficult to reproduce.

Despite these criticisms, my position maintains that it is the most appropriate fit for my research as in order to investigate if participation and speaking opportunities are affected, I need to observe advanced EAL learners closely and gain their perspectives. As mentioned above, qualitative research is not concerned with issues of representativeness and generalisability and this is true of my research, as I wished to target a specific sample. Shank and Brown (2007) stated qualitative research has brought much value across all spheres of education and in the past few decades there has been a growing qualitative presence in the field. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) added that this can be demonstrated through evaluative research as increasingly researchers in education are examining how effective projects and policies are once they are implemented. The contribution of qualitative research can therefore be regarded as being more holistic in nature as opposed to researching a phenomenon and exploring elements of it in isolation. However, I still wished for my data to be rigorous and I kept in mind the four criteria for judging the trustworthiness of qualitative inquiry outlined by Guba and Lincoln (1994), which include: credibility, dependability, conformability and transferability.

Bailey (2014) celebrated that qualitative research has at last achieved full respectability in the academic sphere. The positive contribution is undeniable: it provides a platform to research lives, narratives, behaviours, social movements or interactional relationships. Interpretivists use qualitative methodology as they wish to study human experience in its natural settings. They rely heavily on naturalistic methods including interviews, observations and analysis of text. The rise of qualitative research came from a
dissatisfaction with positivist theory, as they believed humans should not be categorised scientifically. Instead the meanings emerge throughout the research process based on human experience. Qualitative data is used throughout many academic disciplines and is traditionally associated with and used frequently within the social sciences. As I wished to gain rich detailed data, qualitative data was more effective and sat within my interpretivist viewpoint.

I am aware that this does not mean that qualitative methodology is always the most appropriate type of research to use. The research approach needs to reflect the question and the best type of methodology must be chosen. All educational research must be carried out in a systematic and rigorous way and the most appropriate methodology selected, as it must be congruent with the research being conducted (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2018). Limitations with this type of research include lack of generalisability, research bias and validity. Quantitative researchers have made valuable contributions to the field of participation and speaking opportunities and also within process drama which can be seen in the work of Lee et al. (2015) through their meta-analysis which suggested that effects of using drama were strongest when it was a) led by a classroom teacher or researcher rather than artist b) included more than 5 lessons c) integrated into English language arts or science curriculum. Therefore all three of these suggestions were embraced. However, unlike their quantitative methodology, a qualitative approach was taken to gain an in depth understanding of the experiences of six case-study participants, gaining their perspectives. My research drew on the work of another interpretivist - Pérez-Moreno (2018) who influenced my work due to her work on participation and her analysis tools were used as a template for this study. As I wanted to see if process drama motivated participation or speaking opportunities, by including the teacher and students’ perspectives, opinions and views, I argued that interpretivism was a useful lens to help understand the experiences of advanced EAL learners.

3.1.3. Case-Study

Case-studies encourage observations within real contexts using multiple sources of evidence. The ‘real context’ in this case will refer to the school in which I am currently
employed and the ‘multiple sources of evidence’ mentioned previously includes teacher observations, video recordings, a focus group, a research journal and pupil interviews. Bell (2010) discusses how a case-study methodology is concerned with the interaction of factors and events and although observation and interviews are most frequently used, no method is excluded as the researcher aims to identify or attempt to identify various interactive processes at work. In relation to this research ‘interactions’ will refer to the participation of my six case-study participants, the ‘factors’ will be the process drama activities and the ‘events’ will refer to the nine science lessons. A focus on a limited number of students allows me to observe more closely and in greater detail their participation and speaking opportunities within the series of science lessons that use process drama. Therefore, this section will provide a definition of a case-study, a justification of its use and an explanation of what methods will be used within the process.

Case-study is a way to describe processes, involving individuals or groups, in natural settings and observing behaviour over a sequence of events. In the context of my research the ‘processes’ will be in reference to process drama, the ‘individuals’ will be my six-case-study cohort, the ‘group’ will be the class, the ‘natural setting’ will be the classroom and the ‘sequence of events’ will be the series of nine science lessons that combine process drama. O’Sullivan (2018) explains that “role play facilitates participatory research in case-study method” (p.612) emphasising further why this method is useful in this particular study. Creswell (2014) articulates that a case-study engages in conversations with the research participants in natural settings. As mentioned above, in the context of my research this will be in the students’ classroom. It focuses on ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions. During my observations I will be asking myself questions as to ‘how’ children are participating, drawing on the types of participation discussed in section 2.3 and as outlined by Pérez-Moreno (2018): active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert, performer proof without an expert and also observing if speaking opportunities are enhanced and if so, ‘why’? Mouton (2011) articulates that the case-study approach is appropriate for descriptive studies and Mason (2002) agrees that this type of qualitative research produces holistic understandings of rich, contextual and generally unstructured nonnumeric data.
Davies (2007) advocates case-study as an approach within which various methods can be embraced within it. This aligns to my research aim: to investigate to what extent using process drama in the classroom affects participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners, and like the suggestion of Davies (2007) will draw on multiple methods of data collection, e.g. class teacher observations, video observations, alongside a research journal. Yin (2017) valued a case-study approach because it allows the researcher to capture the voices of the participants. In this research I combine interviews and a focus group in order to gain the students’ perspectives to achieve Yin’s (2017) values. Drama was also used in the focus group session in the hope of aiding any potential language barriers. Furthermore, through case-study a rapport with the research subjects can be made. As I will be the teacher and the researcher, I felt this was of particular importance, but I am aware that this can also have limitations in relation to reflexivity which will be addressed in section 3.6. Case-studies are useful to gain rich descriptions that can be transferred to similar situations and this resonates with the two research questions: ‘To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?’ and ‘To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?’ Alongside this, Ponelis (2015) promotes case-study for its ability to provide in depth insight and as the final two research questions wish to focus on individual perspectives and experiences, a case-study was useful to answer: What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy”? and ‘What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama”? While the literature review provided examples of how process drama can encourage younger children and beginning language learners, there is a lack of research on the participation and speaking opportunities of advanced EAL learners and as a result, the case-study approach will contribute to advancing this field’s body of knowledge.

This case-study took place in an International School in the Netherlands, which has an intake of 97% EAL pupils and is split across five campuses. While I was previously a class teacher for eight years, my current role within the school is as a music specialist with a focus on the early years but I also teach year group choirs and provide weekly class cover. However, due to my area of interest of advanced EAL learners, the year group of
focus was Year 5 in which the children are 9 or 10 years old. I take this particular class for choir sessions weekly and also teach them for one hour a week to allow the teacher preparation time or help her with interventions, depending on her requests and needs. In this particular campus, there are three classes in each year group and classes contain a maximum of twenty-four students. The school enjoys specialist EAL teachers who work alongside a teacher and classroom assistant. Although International Schools attract a transient population, this particular campus has less movement and most of the students by Year 5 have been learning through English for around six years.

3.1.4. Focus of study

The focus of my study was the experiences of the six case-study participants within the nine science lessons conducted through a process drama pedagogy. Therefore, it is important to highlight what content was covered in each of the science lessons. It is also useful to highlight the drama conventions that were given focus in this study and what the data analysis focused on in order to answer my research questions. After these have been summarised, a week by week account of what the study focused on will be outlined.

Key learning outcomes in the science lessons included: describing the differences in the life cycles of mammals including humans, amphibians, insects and birds, the life processes of reproduction in some plants and animals and the changes as humans develop to old age. The drama conventions deployed included: hot seating, teacher in role, marking the moment, conscience alley, mantle of the expert, spotlight, thought tracking, still images, narration and role play (Farmer, 2010). Analysis will assess the participation and speaking opportunities afforded to the advanced EAL learners in these science lessons, using the students’ perspectives articulated in interviews and a focus group, my observations based on the day, video observations and the class teachers’ observations noted in the adapted version of Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) participation template.

During week one the pilot study took place. The purpose of the pilot study was to optimise the potential of the class teacher to assist. It was imperative that she understood her role, the nature of the collaboration and to ensure that her observation template would
be comprehensive and utilised most effectively. It also provided an opportunity to make any changes necessary to interview questions before the process took place. My interview questions were discussed with my supervisor and class teacher. The class teacher took part in a session to gain an understanding of the types of participation we would be looking for and to trial observations using preselected videoed material. The template for observing and interview questions were then adapted accordingly after the trial. The first lesson took place during week two looking at the lifecycle of flowering plants. Issues were identified and improved upon for the next lesson. The lesson was then transcribed, class teacher observations collected and the research journal was filled in during but mainly after the lesson. This process occurred after every lesson. The second lesson took place in week three and the learning objective in this lesson covered the lifecycle of nonflowering plants. In week four, the third lesson compared the lifecycle of plants and animals while week five considered the lifecycle of amphibians and reptiles.

The first set of interviews took place in week six. The individual interviews were held and audio recorded before they were transcribed and read to the six case-study participants to ensure accuracy and understanding. Narrative summaries were then gathered of the individual interviews. During week seven the focus was on the lifecycle of insects. Week eight looked at the lifecycle of mammals and like all previous lessons the lesson was then transcribed and data collected. Week nine contained the double lesson and a variety of activities took place that were completed on a rotation about the different animal lifecycles. There were four activities that all children completed and these were interspersed with learning songs that would be used in the next lesson. Week nine also involved the second set of interviews later in the week. They took place on a one-to-one basis and the questions were similar to the first set of interviews but focussed more on the lessons that occurred after the first set of interviews took place. Week ten involved the final lesson. The children partook in a lesson called ‘lifecycles the musical’, when they performed as actors while the researcher took on the role of director pretending it was a read through following an audition. O’Sullivan (2018) points out that role play can involve scripted and/or unscripted elements. In this final lesson it was the former. However, she also stated that “a more structured, scripted role play does not allow for the same level of discourse and flexible response as improvised role play” (p.618), so this
type of structure was limited to the final lesson. Week eleven leant itself to a one hour videoed focus group that took place with the six case-study participants and was transcribed. The data analysis began in week twelve.

3.2. Sample

Previous sections justified a qualitative design within an interpretivist paradigm. I identified a sample of participants and established research methods that were appropriate to this paradigm. Guba and Lincoln (1994) suggested that naturalistic enquiry (the classroom), can be effective in achieving transferability rather than seeking generalisation and generalising was not the aim of this interpretivist study. My sample of six children has drawn on the ideals of Eisenhardt (1989) who stated that “between four and ten cases are optimum” (p.545) and Crabtree and Miller (1992) who advocated a sample size of six to eight. However, due to this small sample I had to be conscious of risks of confidentiality. I attempted to address this by anonymising the school and students.

The sampling was purposive and driven by my research questions. The students were chosen by the EAL specialists and included students who are advanced EAL learners but those that still received individual English teaching. The year group chosen was Year 5 and most children in the class had been learning through English for almost six years. While the linguistic proficiency of the pupils was therefore impressive and confidence tended to be at a level that facilitated participation, after exposure to process drama with a different year group, I noticed increased participation. This provoked my professional curiosity as to causation. Therefore, I wished to study a small sample to see if they had similar results, if a positive result was met, I wished to discover if the explanation was simply the consequence of enhanced ‘speaking’ or if the energy and interest perhaps emanated from something more visceral in the drama process itself.

The literature affirms that drama has been exploited as a medium to assist in the formative phases of English language instruction but there is a paucity of research or experience on the efficacy of utilising drama to assist advanced EAL learners. As outlined, the
demography of my charges is one in which 97% of the cohort is learning English as an additional language. The difficulties and challenges were compounded by the varying degrees of proficiency in the language to begin with and compounded by innately varied linguistic aptitudes. My aim considered to what extent process drama could be an effective tool to encourage participation and expand classroom speaking opportunities with advanced EAL learners and therefore my sample was carefully selected by the EAL specialist team and class teacher. All children are assessed by the EAL specialist team annually and twenty two pupils within the class were English as additional language learners. Through these assessments, the EAL team chose the students they felt would benefit most from one to one English lessons throughout the year. Ten children in this class were chosen to receive this additional attention and the six that were seen to need the most support were the six students that they chose for my study. Luckily all of the six case-study participants gave informed consent to take part in the process. I reference below the observations articulated by the class teacher on the behaviour and attitudes of the subject pupils prior to this project.

Table 1: Overview of Pupil Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil</th>
<th>General Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1</td>
<td>When feeling confident in a subject contributes regularly. This is mostly apparent in English and History lessons. Enjoys group work and sharing her work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 2</td>
<td>Does not participate greatly. Relies on adults. Has dyslexia and dyscalculia, also suspected processing difficulties. Participation is always minimal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 3</td>
<td>Does not join in with class discussions. Sits quietly in lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 4</td>
<td>Sometimes objects to joining in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 5</td>
<td>Concentration is usually weak and she relies heavily on her friends for clues for how to progress. She gazes around a lot and accessing the curriculum can be difficult. She is usually hesitant and waits for others before committing herself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 6</td>
<td>Strong contributor in all subject areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Methods of Data Collection

This section will begin by highlighting the methods chosen to answer the first two research questions, which included: class teacher observations, videoed observations and a research journal. The methods chosen will be justified with reference to the existing literature.

1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?
2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?

Following from this the methods chosen to answer questions three and four listed below will also be highlighted and justified.

3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy?
4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?

3.3.1. Data Collection on Process Drama Effects

In order to answer my first two research questions, I used triangulation. This data included class teacher observations, observations of video recordings and a research journal. All three types of data collection allowed for observations to be made. Marshall and Rossman (2014) contended that observation is more than just looking and involves noting systematically people, behaviours, settings, artefacts and routines. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) distinguish between participant observation and participant as observer stating that the latter refers to a member of the group who reveals her role as an observer, whose knowledge of the group or situation may be intimate and who may gain ‘insider knowledge’, but who may lack the necessary objectivity to observe reliably and with whom confidences and confidential data may not be shared or given respectively. This was the role of the class teacher in my research and therefore these criticisms had to be taken into consideration. Watts (2011) suggested that participant observation strives
to be nonintrusive and since the researcher stays in the situation for a long time, they
become as familiar and unnoticed as everyday objects. Their role is to be present, listen
and watch. Furthermore, according to Marshall and Rossman (2014) they are immersed
in the situation, making field notes and recording. The ‘participant as observer’, as its
name suggests, is part of the social life of participants, documenting and recording what
is happening for research purposes. The ‘observer as participant’, like the ‘participant as
observer’, is known as a researcher to the group and may have less extensive contact with
the group.

One of the methods used was a research journal. Taylor, Bogdan and Devault (2015)
explain that the journal allows notes to be made on “emerging themes, interpretations,
hunches and striking gestures and nonverbal expressions essential to understanding the
meaning of a person’s words” (p.137). Therefore, this was a useful method to help
transparency in the research process and explore the impact of critical self-reflection
within the research design and research process.

This research was emerged in an interpretivist paradigm and Krippendorff (2004) stated
that this research paradigm suggests videos can be read as it is a research technique for
making replicable and valid inferences. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) also
commented on the usefulness of videoed material, which can also comment on postures,
expressions and gestures that may otherwise have been missed. However, it has not come
without its criticism. Lee et al. (2015) discuss how video cameras might create the
problem of reactivity even if it is not obvious to the observer and even if people are not
looking at the camera, their behaviour might change if they are being videoed, for
example, they may behave in a socially desirable or deliberately acceptable way.
Furthermore, Jewitt (2012) stated if fixed cameras are used, they might be as selective as
participant observers, including and excluding areas of focus, even if the cameras are
moveable. Despite these criticisms, as I was both the teacher and the researcher, I felt a
video would help me reflect more easily on the lessons, allowing me to see groups and
conversations that I might have missed.
The final method employed was the class teacher’s observations. Observation at its simplest is noting and recording facts and events as they happen. As the class teacher wasn’t leading the sessions she was able to achieve this. Tedlock (2005) added that observations can attempt to place specific encounters, events and understandings into a fuller, more meaningful context. This is where I felt the class teacher could help most of all. She already had an in-depth knowledge of the speaking opportunities afforded to the students as well as seven months experience of observing their participation, so I wished to draw on this knowledge in her observations as although I taught this class twice weekly, I did not have access to as detailed information as she did. Sapsford and Jupp (1996) stated that an observer may have a more objective view of what is happening and “observation can provide information on the environment and behaviour of those who cannot speak for themselves” (p.59) and as there could potentially be a language barrier, I felt this could be useful.

3.3.2. Data Collection on Perspectives

In order to address my final two research questions: What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? and What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama? I used interviews and a focus group. The audio recorded individual interviews took place with the six case-study participants after the first four science lessons that deployed process drama and again after the next four lessons, delivered within a ten week period. Following on from the ninth and final lesson, I established a one hour video recorded focus group with all six case-study participants which took place using drama activities in order to address my questions.

Kitzinger (1995) outlined that focus groups have advantages for researchers: they do not discriminate against people who cannot read or write and they can encourage participation from people reluctant to be interviewed on their own or who feel they have nothing to say. The method is particularly useful for exploring knowledge and experiences and can be used to examine not only what people think but how they think and why they think that way. The idea behind the focus group method is that group processes can help people
to explore and clarify their views in ways that would be less easily accessible in a one to one interview situation. However, the presence of other research participants also compromises the confidentiality of the research session, so I felt it best to have another conversation about the importance of confidentiality before commencing the focus group, which took place through the use of drama. The focus group allowed me to clarify pupils’ understandings of participation and speaking opportunities to ensure I had understood their perspectives clearly in the interviews. I was able to use drama to overcome language barriers for the case-study advanced EAL learner cohort. Alongside this, I used teddy bears to help explain the types of participation in child friendly language e.g. active audience participation was known and explained by ‘Winnie the watcher’, performer pointer was named ‘Connor the copier’, performer proof with an expert was replaced by ‘Pat the performer’ and performer proof without an expert was represented by ‘independent Ian’.

Willig and Rogers (2017) stated that unstructured and semi structured interviews particularly encourage a narrative mode of expression and therefore these allowed me to unpick pupils’ perspectives and write up case-study narratives. I decided to do this half way through the process and after the penultimate lesson. I thought two sets of interviews would allow me to reflect on any changes and clarify anything that was unclear in my original transcripts. Flick (2002) suggested that the use of open and nondirectional questions can be used to gain more personal or emotional detail and depth, so I consequently tried to keep my questions open ended throughout. In the case of my research, I felt that interviews offered the best opportunity to gather qualitative data based on personal experiences and they therefore allowed me to explore my research questions most effectively. There are similarities between the methods outlined above and the work of Freebody (2010) whose data consisted of video and audio recordings of process drama, student focus groups, teacher interviews and researcher field notes and like Freebody’s work “key moments were transcribed and analysed” (p.211). I also drew on his work in relation to types of talk. Transcriptions were made of both the audio recorded interviews and videoed lessons.
3.4. Procedures for Data Collection

This section will discuss the procedures that were put in place to collect my data over the ten week period. The research commenced with a pilot study and then a series of nine video recorded one hour science lessons. At the end of this, a one hour focus group took place with the six case-study participants. A research journal was kept throughout the process. The class teacher made observations during each of the nine science lessons on both participation and speaking opportunities. An interview took place with each of the case-study participants after the fourth lesson and again after the eighth lesson, each were structured to focus on their perspectives of their participation and speaking opportunities. Therefore, the methods employed included: video observations, class teacher observations, a research journal, pupil interviews and a focus group. These will now be discussed in terms of the procedures put in place for them to occur over the ten week observation period.

3.4.1. Video Recorded Lesson Observations

My case-study design considered the impact of the video and the presence of additional adults specifically during the observation. I recognised that the classroom interactions would be different because we were present, especially in the extent to which the pupils were ‘performing’ their drama activities but over time the children seemed less conscious of the presence of these. I chose to teach the lesson rather than the class teacher as although I had observed the children once a week for an hour for the previous seven months and taken them for weekly choir sessions, she knew their characters and consequently participation levels more than I did. Furthermore, the teacher didn’t have any experience in teaching drama and Wells and Sandretto (2017) found that teachers needed a great deal of support to build their confidence to use process drama. Therefore, I needed to put procedures in place to make observations of the children after the lesson in case I missed key moments while teaching. I decided to video all of the nine science lessons. I set up the video in the classroom a few weeks before so that the children would get used to its position and presence but didn’t record until the agreed date of the first science lesson. The video was later transcribed and the analysis table below was used to
summarise the observations made. This table was adapted from the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018).

Table 2: Analysis template used to summarise video recordings (Pérez-Moreno, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Drama Convention</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 1 –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 2 –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 3 –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 4 –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 5 –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil 6 -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.4.2. Class Teacher Observations**

Live observation is the most common observation method, involving pen and paper procedures and time keeping devices, in which observation and recording are simultaneous. This was the type of observation that the class teacher completed. Having taken part in a pilot study, we created a template that allowed her to reflect on two students in each lesson. The template divided each lesson into chronological activities but allowed her the freedom to make appropriate notes as events occurred. She also chose to occasionally write any observations on the other four case-study participants that she felt might be relevant. Alongside this there was room to reflect on her unique knowledge of the students’ participation in general, therefore noting anything that was similar or different in terms of behaviour. Prior to the pilot study I was still unsure of the extent to pre-categorise the information to be recorded but the class teacher voiced her opinion on what would be most useful to her. Therefore, we abandoned the type of participation in favour of direct and literal observations and added the category of prior knowledge.

Changes to the observation template were made during the pilot study to better fit the class teacher’s preferences for recording. During this time, the teacher watched five preselected videos with a template provided by the researcher. After each video we refined the template to suit the needs of the teacher. The first change was the omission of the table below, although she did familiarise herself with these terms.
Table 3: Definitions of types of participation based on the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active audience role</td>
<td>An adult or a child performs the activity while the other children observe and listen with attention to the actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer pointer</td>
<td>Observable behaviour that we interpret as partial performance. The child joins in but isn’t necessarily furthering the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer proof with an expert</td>
<td>Observable behaviour that confirms the performance of the activity with others. The child joins in, presenting their own ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer proof without an expert</td>
<td>The activity is carried out autonomously. The child partakes in full without assistance from an adult or peer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second change was an additional category to draw on the class teacher’s prior knowledge. The final change was to only select two of the case-study participants at a time to observe. Following these improvements, the class teacher was presented with the template below. She was given two per lesson to look at two of the case-study participants at a time but as mentioned above, she was free to make additional comments on the other case-study participants if changes in behaviour occurred.

Table 4: An example of the class teacher’s observation template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discuss the participation of x during these activities</th>
<th>Compare to general behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide 1 – Welcome slide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 2 – Teacher in role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 3 – Role play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 4 – Mime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 5 – Hot seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 6 – Mantle of the expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 7 – Narration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3. Research Journal

Keeping a reflective journal and using it to write up research allows experiences, opinions, thoughts and feelings to become visible. This process was therefore used during my data collection. Lincoln and Guba (1985) indicate three main types of items that might be included in a journal: a daily schedule including practical matters, a personal diary for reflection and a log of methodology. These were taken onboard and formed sections within my research journal. The structure of my journal included:
1. *General comments* – During and after each lesson reflections were made. These included positive and negative signs beside the bullet points listed to show what went well and what could be improved for future practice.

2. *Drama conventions and games* – This section discussed how each of the drama conventions and games were intended to be used prior to the lesson and then reflections were made after the lesson on how they were executed, noting any differences with the original plan.

3. *Case-study observations* – This was presented as a spider diagram with each of the case-study participants names in the centre. Initially the plan was to make notes during the lesson but in reality these occurred mainly after the session, noting any behaviours that could be remembered. Afterwards, the teacher observations were added to the diagram. Following from this, the video recordings were watched and any specific observations made of each pupil were also added to the diagram. At the bottom of the diagram, reflections that considered type of participation during each drama activity were listed.

4. *Types of Talk* – This section reflected on observations made before and after watching the video. Prior to the lesson the types of drama conventions planned for the lesson were written down, considering what type of talk (in role talk, sociocultural talk or pedagogical/logistical talk) was predicted to take place and then what did occur within the lesson was outlined.

5. *Participation* – This was used after the focus group to show pupils’ perspectives on their type of participation during each lesson which allowed comparisons.

6. *Interview one* – A narrative summary was made in the research journal.

7. *Interview two* – A narrative summary was made in the research journal of the second round of interviews which also summarised responses. Both of these summaries will be presented later in the findings section on pupils’ perspectives.

8. *Perspective summaries* - A summary of the six case-study perspectives on their participation and speaking opportunities using the interviews mentioned above alongside the focus group data were then presented.

9. *Links between participation and drama activities* - The type of participation that took place, matched with each drama convention or activity was noted.
10. Speaking opportunities – Speaking opportunities were then broken down chronologically and also by activity. Reflections were made on the participants involved. This involved noting whether they were whole class activities, smaller group work, paired activities or individual tasks. Alongside this, notes were made on participation, stating whether it was voluntary or selected.

3.4.4. Focus Group

Kitzinger (1995) stated focus group sessions should be relaxed: a comfortable setting, include refreshments and take place sitting in a circle to help to establish the right atmosphere. I used cushions and the circle idea to do this but decided against refreshments, so participation didn’t feel like bribery! He continued to state that the ideal group size is between four and eight people and my case-study sample meets this requirement. Furthermore, he adds sessions may last one to two hours and in the case of this research it was the former. He stated the facilitator may also use a range of group exercises which occurred through drama activities in this case. He suggested a common exercise consists of presenting the group with a series of statements on large cards which was how the session was opened, eventually leading to debating the two statements I was particularly interested in: ‘using drama in lessons helps me join in more’ and ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than those that don’t’. He suggests that ideally the group discussions should be tape recorded and transcribed, so this session, like the nine science lessons was video recorded and later transcribed.

As mentioned previously, I conducted a focus group after the final lesson. The purpose of this was to ensure that the case-study participants fully understood the meaning of participation and speaking opportunities and could consequently reflect on the lessons. This focus group used drama conventions and games to address the research questions in the hope of overcoming any language difficulties and extrapolating reflections that were more accurate. O’Sullivan (2018) stated that role play can help explore meanings and the ways in which people understand things and it can be controlled by participants as they can stop, pause or extend the activity at will. Consequently, role play was used in the focus group setting. I explained to the focus group that there were no right, or wrong
answers and it was a time to reflect upon the lessons. We began with a drama game called ‘Where do you stand’? I invited the participants to stand in a position determined by their viewpoint. The terms strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree or strongly disagree were displayed along the line to guide participants but it was explained that it was permissible to stand between these terms. To simplify the challenge, statements such as ‘I prefer cats to dogs’ and ‘chocolate ice cream is the best flavour’ were used to ensure children understood the task. When I was confident they did understand, we continued with statements such as ‘using drama in lessons helps me join in more’ and ‘you get more changes to speak in science lessons with drama than science lessons without drama’.

The next part of the focus group involved participants being asked to use the drama convention freeze frame followed by thought tracking to show what their understanding of participation was. In order to ascertain pupils’ opinions on the different participatory roles (active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert) four teddy bears were introduced to represent these types (Winnie the watcher, Connor the copier, Pat the performer and independent Ian). These types of participation were explored and explained through drama conventions such as role play and still images and drama games such as ‘I went shopping’ and ‘mirroring’. To finish the session, we played the drama game ‘Who’s who’? - giving pupils the opportunity to reflect on their type of participation in each of the nine lessons by going to the teddy that they thought most represented them in the lesson and also articulating their reason why they identified with that particular type of participation. The pupils also compared the type of participation they felt they displayed in other lessons compared with the main type they adopted in these drama lessons. These were then noted in a table:

Table 5: Analysis table template of type of participation identified by the case-study group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pupil 1</th>
<th>Pupil 2</th>
<th>Pupil 3</th>
<th>Pupil 4</th>
<th>Pupil 5</th>
<th>Pupil 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active audience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer pointer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer proof with an expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer proof without an expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.5. Interviews

Keats (1999) suggests that semi structured interviews allow you to gain information to answer research questions without changing the respondent’s point of view, so this process was chosen. Although questions were preselected, the interviews still followed a semi structured approach as at times prompts and probes were used. Prompts are directed towards what participants know but have not yet mentioned and encourage people to talk and jog their memory, whereas probes are directed at what people have already said, asking them to clarify and explain, but not to justify or defend. I had originally intended to use my research journal during the interviews to make notes about the participant’s body language and gestures, but I worried they may feel uncomfortable, so I decided against this and relied on the audio recorded interview.

My face to face individual, semi structured interviews took place on two occasions - once after the first four lessons and the next after completing another four. The nine science lessons took place between April and June. Each interview took approximately ten minutes on a one to one basis and I conducted it through English in a private room that had a glass wall in a shared area in the school. Prior to taking part in the interview, the participants had given informed consent, had been given reassurance of anonymity and an explanation for the invitation to participate was provided. However, before the initial interview was audio recorded, I reiterated my background, the purpose of my research and offered a further opportunity for withdrawal. I also explained that with their permission, the interviews would be audio recorded and quotations from the interview could potentially form part of my thesis. These questions received the approbation of my supervisor and the team of Year 5 teachers in my school, both of whom affirmed that they were pitched appropriately, were coherent and invited an open and honest response. I utilised some of the suggestions from O’Sullivan (2018) who discussed the debriefing of role play sessions as participants were invited “to share their feelings about the role play” and asked them to elaborate on “what they had learned from it” and ended the interview “on a positive note” (p.623).
The first set of interviews constituted a reflection upon the first four one hour lessons and structured around the following seven questions: Can you tell me what lifecycles we have been learning about in science? Can you tell me what we talked about when we looked at the lifecycles of flowering and nonflowering plants? What did we discuss about the lifecycles of animals? Do you think you talked much in the lesson? Did you talk more, less or the same amount in these lessons compared to your previous science lessons? Did you join in with the lesson? If yes, how? Did you enjoy learning science through process drama and if so, why? I invited the children to answer verbally or by using freeze frames, thought tracking or hot seating but they unanimously chose to reply verbally. The second set of interviews considered the following questions: Can you tell me about lifecycles we have been exploring? Can you tell me anything you know about any of those? Can you remember any activities we did to learn about mammals? Can you remember any of the activities we did about insects? Can you remember any activities we did to learn about amphibians? Can you remember any activities we did to learn about birds? Do you think you joined in more, the same amount or less than your other lessons? Why and how? I reminded them of lessons seven and eight which consisted of four activities in which they went around in a carousel and asked if anyone could tell me about it. During that lesson do you think you joined in more, less or the same amount than other lessons? Why? In what way? Do you think you had more, less or the same amount of chances to speak in those lessons than science lessons normally? Do you enjoy learning science through drama? Why?

I felt it was important to have interviews as well as the focus group as O’Sullivan (2018) points out that a key element of role play for researchers is the debriefing and she states it allows the sharing of experiences and perspectives on the role play as people’s views and experiences will differ and I thought if I solely used a focus group they may not voice their own opinions and be influenced by others. After the data was collected from the observations, research journal, focus group and interviews they were then analysed. A summary of the procedures for data collection, to answer all four of the research questions, is presented in Figure 1. This focussed on both pupil observations and pupil perspectives.
3.5. Analysis of Data

Content analysis is a careful, detailed, systematic examination and interpretation of a particular body of material in an effort to identify patterns, themes, biases and meanings (Berg and Lune, 2014; Leedy and Ormrod, 2005). Content analysis was employed in this research, by using ‘careful’ and ‘detailed’ transcripts, followed by a ‘systematic examination and interpretation.’ This took place about participation and speaking opportunities, in ‘an effort to identify patterns’, with each individual and across cases, through preselected ‘themes’ such as type of talk and type of participation, acknowledging ‘biases’ and through triangulation finding ‘meanings’. The types of data collected included nine one hour video recorded lessons, a research journal, class teacher observation notes, two sets of individual interviews and a one hour focus group. Miles and Huberman (2002) aimed to reduce complexity in analysing qualitative data and divided it into three phases which were used throughout this research: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Following their advice this involved coding and sorting transcripts into useable tables that became the basis for conclusions. They stated that “the critical question is whether meanings you find in qualitative data are valid, repeatable and right” (p.245). This was of paramount importance throughout my methodology and analysis.
This section will discuss how the different types of data collected were analysed, linking these processes to the literature outlined in section two. It will begin by looking at the video recorded lessons and discuss how nine hours of videoed material were analysed using the ideas of Pérez-Moreno (2018) and Freebody (2010). After this, the collected teacher observations analysis system will be presented before the research journal is also discussed. Triangulation will be used for these three types of data to address the research questions:

1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?
2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?

Denzin and Lincoln (2018) categorised triangulation into four different types: data triangulation, investigator triangulation, theory triangulation and the one used in this research which is methodological triangulation.

Following from this, the data analysis will be presented that will unpick the two sets of individual interview transcripts and the one hour long video recorded and transcribed focus group. This focus group used role play as O’Sullivan (2018) outlined that it “offers particular advantages to the researcher who is interested in exploring and analysing data which may not be easily accessed through other methods. It is a unique blending with case-study method” (p.616). Through analysis of this collected data, I will be able to address my final two research questions:

3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy?
4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?

Miles and Huberman (2002) suggested that first level conclusions from qualitative data will come from noting patterns, themes, making contrasts, comparisons, clustering and counting. These will be completed individually first and then comparisons drawn across the case-study sample will take place, linking findings to the existing literature.
3.5.1. Analysis of the Video Recorded Lessons

The camera is seen as a useful tool in the social sciences (Taylor, Bogdan and Devault, 2015). It can capture details that would otherwise go unnoticed, can record for long periods of time and makes visible patterns that can be looked at with an appropriate pace. As outlined in my procedures for data collection section (3.4), I planned and taught nine science lessons (Appendix A - H). I collected nine hours of video recorded material. These nine, one hour lessons were transcribed as the first step of the analysis (Appendix I). I then adapted Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) horizontal analysis system to unpick these transcripts, using the categories: time, context, drama convention or activity, participants, description and observations. An example is summarised in the table below of a section from lesson three.

Table 6: Analysis table used to summarise video recorded observations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Drama Game</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ends 8.55</td>
<td>Fruit Bowl</td>
<td>Pupil 1: Joins in enthusiastically, understands game and vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Talk</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Pupil 2: Joins in immediately, moves to be closer to friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PLT) – Teacher led and (SCT) – vocab</td>
<td>Teacher assigns parts of the flower to each individual</td>
<td>Pupil 4: Wins competition, talking in the beginning but later answers questions and joins in with game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil 5: Plays game and when put out moves closer to the circle to continue watching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children sit on a cushion. They’re given a name: anther, filament or stamen. Once they have practised, a pillow is removed, the child is out if their assigned plant part is called and they don’t manage to swop places.</td>
<td>Pupil 6: Talks a little to peer but then answers teachers question and plays game successfully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories have been adapted slightly as Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) area of interest was music whereas this study considers drama. The ‘time’ allowed me to see how long each of the activities were before looking at the ‘context’ which considered preselected categories. The context analysed was ‘type of talk’ which referred to the work of Freebody (2010) and included: in role talk, sociocultural talk or pedagogical talk. Later the ‘type of participation’ was categorised into Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) four areas (active...
audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert or performer proof without an expert) but these were only added to the narrative summaries when all data had been collected. The ‘drama convention’ game or activity was listed and these were inspired by the work of Farmer (2012). The materials were at times listed and included anything from props, resources to audio or visual materials. The participants allowed an overview of whether individual, group, paired or whole class activities were taking place. The penultimate category ‘description’ allowed for an explanation of what the task entailed, while the final category ‘observations’ allowed the actions of the six case-study participants to be outlined. These were then added to the data collected in the next section.

Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) aims were twofold:

1. She wished to study the different kinds of musical activity that take place during one school day.
2. She hoped to shed light on the different ways children participate in musical activities.

The former aim has similarities with mine in that we are both looking at specific activities. However, I am interested in the different kinds of speaking opportunities as opposed to different types of musical activities. Nevertheless, I felt a similar data analysis was appropriate to answer my research question ‘to what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities’? The second aim of Pérez-Moreno (2018) resonates with me as I am also interested in participation and therefore utilised her four types of participation in my methodology. I thought it conducive to exploit her analysis tools in my research project which looked at what extent process drama used in the classroom affected participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School.

Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) process began by watching the video recordings and on a preliminary table, reducing to writing what happened. To obviate bias, she spent less than five minutes on the same point. I transcribed each lesson and afterwards watched the video, while pausing if I wished to write an observation. I then later read through the transcripts and coded the observations. Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) didactic framework included musical activities such as songs, nursery rhymes, pieces of music or musical
productions. My model referred to drama conventions or drama games. Following from these preliminary notes, she used a horizontal analysis that would contribute with data to explain how one activity developed during the observation period. I wished to replicate these categories which were treated manually and included: time, context, sound material, materials, actors, description and observations. I altered the category ‘sound material’ to ‘drama convention or game’ and the ‘context’ included type of participation (Pérez-Moreno, 2018) or type of talk (Freebody, 2010). After she finished her table, Pérez-Moreno (2018) continued analysis by colour coding the table to register different activities. As I am looking at individual experiences, I colour coded based on each participant.

Therefore, to summarise the analysis of the video recordings, the steps that took place were:

1. Videos were transcribed after each lesson took place with timings added.
2. Additional notes or observations were made of the video and added to the research journal’s spider diagram of each of the six case-study participants.
3. Coding took place on the transcript, labelling the type of participation taking place throughout the lesson. These were colour coded for each of the six case-study individuals.
4. Coding took place, labelling the drama convention or activity taking place throughout the lesson.
5. Coding took place, labelling the activity as paired, individual, whole class or group.
6. A table was produced, based on the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018) that summarised the following information: time, context, drama conventions, materials, participants and description.
7. The video was watched again, pausing for no more than 5 minutes at any particular point to note observations on the six case-study participants. These were colour coded and included, gestures and contributions.
8. The information gathered was added to the individual case-study narrative summaries.
3.5.2. Analysis of the Class Teacher’s Observations

As outlined in section 3.3, I completed a pilot study with the class teacher, prior to commencing the research in her classroom. This allowed time to familiarise the class teacher with the four types of participation being studied and also enabled us to produce the observation template, making it more user friendly and fit for purpose (Appendix J). The class teacher received a similar template for each lesson and was asked to observe two preselected children out of the six case-study participants in each of the science lesson. These were then given back to the researcher and content analysis was used, keeping in mind the three steps of analysis outlined by Miles and Huberman (2002): data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Therefore, I achieved ‘data reduction’ through coding and selecting the most useful information. ‘Data display’ involved the narrative summaries and ‘conclusion drawing’ could occur when comparisons were made with the other data collected. I will now outline an example of the first lesson observation that the class teacher wrote, which was later coded and made into the narrative summary mentioned above. During lesson one, the class teacher received the following template and was asked to observe Pupil 1 and Pupil 5 simultaneously. She was given a separate template for the two participants which outlined the lesson in chronological order and listed all of the drama techniques. The teacher also chose to occasionally add information about the other case-study sample if she felt that their behaviour differed significantly to their normal routine.

*Figure 2: An Example of the Class Teacher’s Observations*
As explained, these observations then followed the advice of Miles and Huberman (2002) and were coded and notated which can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3: An Example of Coding of the Class Teacher’s Observations

Following from this, the information gathered on each individual was summarised in the research journal as can be seen in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Summary of the Class Teacher’s Observations of Pupil Three
During the lesson the class teacher then made notes on two of the six case-study participants. This way she observed all of them twice in detail by the end of lesson six and for the three remaining lessons she observed all six throughout the sessions as she felt that this would be useful towards the end of the process. Therefore five steps were carried out to analyse the class teacher’s observations:

1. Step one involved the class teacher familiarising herself with the template.
2. Step two occurred during the lesson when she made live observations but also drawing on her prior knowledge of the children (Figure 2).
3. Step three involved coding observations using the preselected categories (Figure 3).
4. Step four consisted of a summary of each individual using the class teacher’s observations in the research journal (Figure 4).
5. Step five resulted in additional information being gathered and therefore added to the narrative summary on each individual in terms of their participation and speaking opportunities in the lesson.

3.5.3. Analysis of the Research Journal

A research journal was used throughout the research process, beginning as early as the pilot study. The areas included in this journal were noted in section 3.4.3. Like the previous two methods used, this led to content analysis, through coding, inserting the relevant information from all types of data collection into a summary table and the writing of narrative summaries that led to conclusions being made. This section will therefore unpick how each of the sections in the research journal were subsequently analysed.

When outlining my procedures for data collection, section 3.4.3. discussed how information was gathered for my research journal. Ten sections were identified and this section will now explain how they were subsequently analysed with scanned documents provided to demonstrate this. After the pilot study, the first input to the diary occurred during and after the lesson. Reflections were made on things that had gone well (coded with a plus sign) and things that didn’t go well (coded with a negative sign). This was in relation to the teaching, reflecting on how activities were received. This informed future
lesson plans but was also useful to use in the category ‘description’ in my analysis table when looking at the impact of activities with the six case-study participants.

Figure 5: An Example of Lesson Reflections

Lesson 3 - General comments

+ New environment brought enthusiasm.
+ End of topic + nothing in books.
+ Children all participated in freeze frames.
+ Teacher should have been given heads up.
+ Behavioural expectations needed to be clearer.
+ Everyone had an equal part in dance.
+ Feedback should have been given on mine.
+ Children showed seed dispersal clearly.
+ New knowledge was gained.

The next section ‘drama conventions and games’ allowed me to ensure that activities and conventions were varied throughout the process and by analysing them individually, I was able to compare the behaviour of the six case-study participants during them to see if any correlations or differences could be identified. These were then summarised in my analysis table under ‘drama convention or game’.
The third section ‘case-study observations’ was the bulk of the research journal as each of the six case-study participants observations were noted in each of the nine lessons. Step one involved initial observations made immediately after the lesson. Step two then saw the addition of the class teacher’s observations. Step three used the video recorded lessons to add any additional observations from the video on each of the individuals which may have included direct quotes, movements or gestures. An analysis of each convention was also added to every lesson, noting what type of participation (if any) was most apparent during the activity.
The next section was based solely on dialogue as it examined the work of Freebody (2010) who discussed types of talk. Therefore, each drama activity was listed for each lesson and the dominant type of talk that took place was then noted. Afterwards, it was added to my analysis table. Any contributions from the case-study participants were also highlighted to help discuss speaking opportunities in my findings.
Following from this, information from the focus group and interviews were then linked. The responses from the six case-study participants were used for cross case analysis beginning in the research journal. Their answers to the question ‘did your participation increase, stay the same or reduce’ were taken from interview one, interview two and the focus group to see if any changes occurred within each individual and across the cases. By summarising these on one document, trends became visible.

The sixth section outlined in the procedures for data collection was a narrative summary of the first set of interviews. As will be outlined in the section ‘analysis of interviews’ (3.5.5) step one involved conducting the interviews, step two transcribing the interviews, step three coding the interviews and step four resulted in a narrative summary of each interview written in the research journal. The same process took place for interview two which was the seventh section in the journal.
The next section gathered the information from the two interviews and focus group, just like the fifth section of the journal but this time summarised the perspectives further on their participation and speaking opportunities. These were then shared with the case-study participants to ensure their responses had been understood and summarised appropriately. Following from this the drama convention and type of participation were linked in the journal before being added to the analysis table. The final section focussed specifically on speaking opportunities, breaking them down into each lesson and reflecting on whether they were whole class, groups, paired work or individual, alongside noting if participation was voluntary or selected.
Once the information noted above was gathered in the research journal, the information was added to the analysis table (Table 5). This allowed for summaries to be made and consequently, conclusions were drawn. The research journal was a useful tool throughout the process from data collection, to data analysis and eventually to outlining findings.

3.5.4. Analysis of the Focus Group

Kitzinger (1995) explained that by analysing focus group material, the researcher draws together and compares discussions of similar themes and examines how these relate to the variables within the sample population. The ‘themes’ I wished to examine were speaking opportunities and participation and the ‘sample population’ included six case-study participants so this was achieved through an analysis of my one hour video recorded focus group which was planned (Appendix K), carried out and later transcribed. While
trends were noted and discussed based between the students, Kitzinger (1995) also stated that it is important to try to distinguish between individual opinions expressed in spite of the group from the actual group consensus, so this was taken into consideration by creating individual narratives.

The case-study sample answered a series of questions, justifying their opinions on a range of topics. This was to ensure they understood what the task involved, had a chance to articulate their views on particular topics and had an opportunity to clarify anything they were finding difficult about the task. The children chose to stand on a scale that ranged from strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree to strongly disagree. They were also told they could stand between statements if they gave reasons for doing so. Using the statement: ‘using drama in lessons helps me join in more’ allowed me the opportunity to analyse responses around participation and the statement ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than those that don’t’, allowed me to analyse their responses on speaking opportunities. I then created a narrative summary of each pupil based on how they justified their response after they had chosen their position. These will be noted in the section on Pupils’ Perspectives (4.3.).

Table 7: Responses to statements about participation and speaking opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Using drama in lessons helps me join in more”.</td>
<td>Pupil One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“You get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than those that don’t”.</td>
<td>Pupil One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil Six</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The children were taught about the different types of participation that we looked at within the lesson and then reflected on their own opinions on their dominant type of participation which was taught through the use of teddy bears using child friendly
language. Each type of participation was attributed to a particular teddy and their character traits were explained through drama so that the children could identify the type of participation they felt they displayed most frequently by choosing the correct teddy. The four names were: Winnie the watcher for active audience, Connor the copier representing performer pointer behaviour, Pat the performer replaced performer proof with an expert and independent Ian was the final bear showing performer proof without an expert actions. An example of the transcription can be found below.

**Researcher:** I want to introduce you to my friends. This is my first friend ‘Winnie the Watcher’. Winnie likes to watch the teacher, she listens to the teacher and nods along...So sometimes when I’m at the front I think people are joining in because although they’re not saying anything, they’re going like this or this. They’re making different expressions that show me they are joining in. I’m going to be the teacher and you’re all going to be Winnie the Watcher. Ok class, thank you for coming here today, we’re going to have a science lesson. Today we will be learning about...Well done that was perfect. I saw lots of nodding and I got lots of eye contact. Who’d like to be the teacher now?

**Pupil 5:** Hello children thank you for coming...

Therefore, I was able to create narrative summaries to analyse their responses. The table below summarises the responses gained from the focus group when the case-study participants reflected on the type of participation they felt they showed most frequently in each lesson.

Table 8: Type of participation identified for each lesson in the focus group by each pupil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pupil 1</th>
<th>Pupil 2</th>
<th>Pupil 3</th>
<th>Pupil 4</th>
<th>Pupil 5</th>
<th>Pupil 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winnie</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7a, 7b, 8b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 and 5</td>
<td>3, 6, 7a, 7b, 8b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 4, 9</td>
<td>8b, 9</td>
<td>1 and 9</td>
<td>3, 8b, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 9</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 9</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7a, 7b, 8a</td>
<td>2, 8a</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>5, 8a, 8b</td>
<td>6, 7a, 7b, 8a, 8b</td>
<td>5, 8a</td>
<td>1, 5, 6, 7a, 7b, 8a</td>
<td>2, 8a</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus group aimed to ensure children understood what participation was, what different types of participation looked like and also understood what is meant by speaking opportunities. Through a series of drama activities responses were video recorded, transcribed and consequently were able to be analysed in order to gain pupils’ perspectives on their own participation and speaking opportunities. The language used was child friendly and allowed opportunities for further clarification.

3.5.5. Analysis of the Interviews

The next platform deployed to analyse the pupils’ perspectives was through the transcribing of audio recorded interviews. Each case-study participant took part in two interviews that used between seven and ten semi structured questions (Appendix L) and they were transcribed chronologically. Each transcript was reread a number of times to ensure understanding. I made notes about potentially significant issues or experiences, in the aspiration of identifying patterns, themes or categories within the collected data. I then coded these into the preselected following categories: type of participation, speaking opportunities and type of talk but also added engagement, knowledge and scientific vocabulary as they came up frequently in the interviews. I noted these on the original transcript when they appeared or surfaced in the individual interviews. After the initial capturing of notes, they were broken into subcategories, which are outlined below under overarching areas. The areas included: perspectives on participation and perspectives on speaking opportunities.

- Perspectives on Participation
  - Active Audience
  - Performer Pointer
  - Performer Proof with an Expert
  - Performer Proof without an Expert

- Perspectives on Speaking Opportunities
  - Classroom Talk
  - Scientific Knowledge and Vocabulary
  - Engagement
The coding structure overarched by ‘Perspectives of Participation’ (POP) was used as an analysis tool to answer the research question: What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? The code ‘Perspectives on Speaking Opportunities’ (POS) was placed beside any information that could help tackle the question: What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?

The second step that took place was writing up case-study narratives and within case analysis. After transcriptions had been completed and accompanying notes made using my coding system, I endeavoured to create further coherency and structure to them to aid cross case analysis. Ponelis (2015) explains “rich descriptions in the form of case narratives allow the reader to judge the transferability of the interpretation and also the results, thereby also increasing dependability” (p.542). A case-study narrative was compiled in my research journal after the first set of interviews and again after the second. I wished to use a content analysis approach to the group and compare ideas from the focus group and interviews. The three case-study narratives per person (based on the two interviews and a focus group) were both chronological and thematic (participation, speaking opportunities), in that they told the ‘story’ of how each participant felt they participated in the lessons but also focused on issues that seemed to relate to personal learning, development and enjoyment. In relation to participation, these narratives looked at the types of participation discussed: active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert (Pérez-Moreno, 2018). After the creation of the narratives, I read them to and with the case-study sample, to ensure what I had written had been interpreted correctly. Afterwards, I created one narrative per person based on the three groups of data: interview one, interview two and the focus group.

Like Ponelis (2015) I used qualitative content analysis and the third level of analysis was determining findings through cross case analysis. The comparisons were drawn using the categories ‘Perspectives on Participation’ (POP) including: active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert, performer proof without an expert and ‘Perspectives on Speaking opportunities’ (POS) which included classroom talk: in role
talk, sociocultural talk and pedagogical talk and as a result of the information collected the additional categories: engagement, scientific knowledge and vocabulary. I drew on a priori directed approach, meaning themes were established prior to the analysis based upon the literature, in this case, the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018) and Freebody (2010). The final level of analysis considered interpreting and enfolding findings in the literature and this will be interspersed in my narrative summaries within my findings and discussion.

3.6. Problems

Potential difficulties had to be considered from the outset of my research. This included issues around consent, lesson schedules and sample size. A pilot study took place in the hope of reducing any potential problems in the research. As a result of the pilot study, changes took place in relation to interview questions and observation templates. More generic criticisms of qualitative research will also be brought to the fore including problems arising from reliability, validity, objectivity and generalisability alongside an explanation of how I tried to tackle these issues. Guba and Lincoln (1994) renamed these terms when conducting qualitative research, referring to reliability as dependability, validity as credibility, objectivity as confirmability and generalisability as transferability.

Before my research could commence I had to receive consent from my head teacher, class teacher, all pupils in the class including the case-study sample and parents or guardians. I also needed a contingency plan if consent was not gained from my initial sample. If I was not able to recruit my initial sample of students suggested by the EAL specialist team, I planned on trying to recruit different children in the class, as twenty two out of the twenty four children are additional language learners (although not necessarily still on the EAL register) and if still unsuccessful, my plan was to try the same process with another class as there are three Year 5 classes in the school, all of whom would be learning about life cycles, at the same time, in science lessons. If consent was not gained for the video (which would only be accessed by myself), it would have been replaced by notes taken during the lesson and my written observations would have been made after the session.
alongside the notes gained from the recruited adult observer. However, although consent letters took a while to be returned from the parents and guardians, after a reminder was sent out electronically via the school office staff, all opt in consent forms were returned.

Another difficulty faced in my research was around the lesson schedules. It was difficult to confirm how many science lessons I would be able to take as there were many interruptions to the curriculum, so I had to remain flexible around this. On the morning of the seventh lesson, I was given an hour’s notice that I could take a double lesson which is why the structure of this lesson was quickly adapted to vary activities for an extended period of time. Although deliberately chosen, another problem with this research was the small sample size. Using only six children as my case-study group means that generalisations cannot be made. While, I am aware of my small sample size, I wanted detailed reflections from my subjects and believed that this was the best approach for this work. After the pilot study took place, adjustments were made in relation to the interview questions and observation templates. With the help of my supervisor and the Year 5 class teacher, the interview questions were reworded to become more open ended and child friendly. The pilot study allowed the class teacher to become familiar with the types of participation being observed in the lesson, but it became apparent that she didn’t have space to use her prior knowledge of the children which would be useful to reflect on changes or similarities in terms of participation or speaking opportunities, so the template was consequently adopted.

Positivists have criticised the trustworthiness of qualitative research and therefore it was important I was aware of these criticisms to help reduce problems within this research. Bloomberg and Volpe (2006) built on the definitions of the terms outlined in the introduction of this section by Guba and Lincoln (1994) when referring to the trustworthiness of qualitative research. These included: dependability (reliability), credibility (validity), confirmability (objectivity) and transferability (generalisability). The former ‘dependability’ rests on the quality of the data collection and analysis and whether it can be replicated, considering “if the researcher is aware when inconsistencies occur in the findings that are collected” (p.177). I attempted to overcome this by focusing on any inconsistencies that arose in my findings and discussing these. They also
elaborated on ‘credibility’ saying it refers to how well the researcher’s portrayal of participants matches the participant’s perceptions and say that this can be enhanced by triangulating data sources and collection methods. Consequently, although time consuming, I chose to use a variety of data collection techniques. ‘Confirmability’ refers to findings being a result of the research, “rather than an outcome of the biases and subjectivity of the researcher” (p.177). Furthermore, Petty et al. (2012) explain that qualitative research has been criticised as an ‘unscientific’ method in its neglect of procedures for verification, for making assumptions and for its subjectivity which is why I wished to cross reference my findings with the perspectives of the class teacher and pupils themselves.

Perhaps the greatest criticism of qualitative research, outlined by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2018) is the fact that generalisations cannot be made. This is why Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Bloomberg and Volpe (2006) discuss ‘transferability’, which refers to the degree in which the study has made it possible for the reader to apply the findings in the situations investigated to other similar situations. This therefore refers to the ability to transfer rather than generalise. As a result, I endeavoured not to generalise but to be transparent in my approach completing a detailed plan of my research including lesson plans (Appendix A - H), transcriptions (Appendix I), observation template (Appendix J) and data analysis tools and tables (Table 5) to allow the study to be replicated if required. Furthermore, Lee et al. (2015) stated that providing lesson plans with drama strategies can help provide models of reflective practice.

Problems also have to be reflected on in relation to my reflexivity in this research. Heikkinem et al. (2012) provided a definition of this term stating that “reflexivity means that the researcher is aware of the impact of his or her personal experiences while interacting with the other participants” (p.8). Whilst there were benefits derived from conducting the research and leading the lessons myself as the students knew and trusted me, I had to exercise a degree of caution. I needed to be conscious that the students may tell me what they thought I wanted to hear and appreciate my own enthusiasm could have been infectious and therefore corrosive (Atkinson et al., 2003). I wanted to ensure that the experience did not transcend the method in order to remain empirical. Although I am
not their class teacher, prior to the research commencing, I enjoyed a good relationship with the students in our weekly choir lesson and weekly class lesson and was conscious that this could prove prejudicial if they were predisposed to attempt to impress me. I attempted to reduce this through the information session prior to the research commencing alongside reassuring the children before the interviews and focus group that there were no right or wrong answers to my questions. This discussion occurred in the information session also.

3.6.1. Ethical Considerations

This section will address ethical considerations, which are of paramount importance, particularly when working with children. All ethical decisions are in line with the BERA (2018) guidelines and before beginning the research, ethical approval was granted from the Queen’s University Belfast Ethics Committee. In order to gain this approval, I clearly outlined all the methods being used in this research, provided information about the age of the participants taking part, acknowledged my relationship with the students, explained how the participants would be recruited and outlined locations involved in the research. The steps undertook to ensure consent was fully informed will be discussed and included in my appendices e.g. recruitment letters, consent forms, participant information sheets, interview questions, lesson plans and observation templates. The people involved in the process were the head teacher, parents or guardians, the pupils themselves and the class teacher. All of the above were therefore presented with an information leaflet and an opt in consent form before the research commenced. Issues surrounding confidentiality and anonymity will be addressed and the challenges of ensuring reliability/dependability, validity/credibility and reflexivity that were mentioned in the previous section (3.6.) will be acknowledged.

In order to gain informed consent, I first spoke to the head teacher, providing her with an information leaflet (Appendix M) about my project and proceeded after I gained verbal and written consent (Appendix N). The information leaflet included: the title of the project, background to my research, study design, information on how data would be collected and an explanation of what would be expected from participants. An
opportunity was provided for the head teacher to ask any further information or ask for any clarification that she needed. The head teacher gave consent to the Year 5 children taking part in video recorded lessons, audio recorded interviews and a video recorded focus group. Issues of confidentiality were discussed, explaining that the pupils’ responses and school name would be anonymised when used as part of my doctoral dissertation. Prior to the lessons being video recorded, consent was also needed from all children, the class teacher and parents or guardians in the class as they all partook in the video recorded lessons. Additional consent was needed by the case-study sample chosen by the class teacher and EAL specialists as they partook in the audio recorded interviews and video recorded focus group.

After the head teacher gave her approval, I approached the parents through an information leaflet (Appendix O), or a translated information leaflet (Appendix P), alongside a consent opt-in form (Appendix Q). All parents and guardians in the class received a letter to consent to their child being video recorded and the six selected case-study students received additional information on what they should expect from the interview process and focus group with a separate opt in consent form (Appendix R). The information leaflet given to the parents and guardians contained a similar layout to the head teachers and included my own and my supervisors email address, in case any further information was required. Furthermore, I provided the parents with reassurance that participation in the study was entirely voluntary and while all pupils were required to participate in the normal school lessons, they did not have to be within the camera view. Alongside this, reassurance was given if any student or parent or guardian objected to the video in the classroom, it would not be used. If consent was not gained from these perspective parents or guardians, I intended to begin recruitment again, still using the guidance of the EAL specialists and class teacher. However, this luckily was not a requirement as consent was gained.

The students then partook in an information session about the project and their role in it (Appendix S). When all questions had been answered about the PowerPoint and research, students received an opt in consent form for the video (Appendix T) or an opt in consent form to be part of the video and the case-study (Appendix U). The class teacher was
responsible for completing observations using the provided template and therefore consent was also needed to use the information that she provided about the students’ participation and speaking opportunities (Appendix V). After consent was gained, I prioritised confidentiality by anonymising all names in my research. As I had a small sample, this was of even greater importance. The schools name is not used at any time in this thesis and the students are not referred to by their name. The twenty four students in the class all participated in the lessons as part of their normal science curriculum but only the six anonymised case-study participants were quoted in the interviews and focus group.

Ethically it is important to reflect on the reliability (also known in qualitative research as dependability) of the work. Section 3.4. ensured my procedures for data collection were clearly highlighted and following from this, section 3.5. allowed an opportunity to be transparent with the analysis of the data. This enhanced the reliability of the project as the research could consequently be replicated. In my findings I will also address reliability by acknowledging any inconsistencies that occurred in my findings, particularly when comparing interview and focus group responses. While steps were presented on how to imitate this research, generalisations were not made about its effects. The validity or credibility of the project was also addressed by using methodological triangulation e.g. using pupil interviews, observations and a focus group. Once transcriptions were written and narrative summaries created, they were read to the case-study participants to ensure they were happy with what was written and felt they were true representations of their responses.

3.6.2. Researcher Bias

It is imperative that I also reflect on my reflexivity in this research. Heikkinem et al. (2012) defined this term as the researcher “being aware of the impact of his or her personal experiences while interacting with the other participants” (p.8). Alongside being the researcher, using process drama I led a series of nine videoed science lessons on the topic of ‘lifecycles.’ This section will consider the challenges faced with being the teacher, observer and researcher. All decisions made needed to consider potential bias from my choice of sample, research approach, chosen subject, relationship with
children, methods deployed, data analysis, presentation of findings and conclusions drawn. By doing this, Dodgson (2019) claims that readers will know that the criteria for trustworthiness has been carefully, continually and significantly addressed.

Six case-study participants were chosen. In order to try and avoid potential bias, I decided that the EAL specialist team would choose the sample from their assessment in relation to English Language ability as opposed to myself or the class teacher. In order to be aware of reflexivity, Dodgson (2019) suggests that the context of the research should be explicit. Therefore in the section named ‘Case-study’ (section 3.1.3.), the context was outlined. This research took a case-study approach and was written from an interpretivist perspective. I endeavoured to be transparent with my theoretical perspective (section 3.1.1.), as Mitchell et al. (2018) argued that you should aim for a continual internal dialogue and critical self-evaluation of your positionality. Alongside this, Westaway (2019) discusses how you need to be aware of social structures that condition the manner in which you express your role as a teacher, meaning you need to be aware of your own identity.

Hizli Alkan and Priestley (2019) explain that reflexivity is an important concept in choosing subjects and content as it leads teachers to ask, ‘what matters’ and ‘what to do next.’ I chose to pair process drama with science as it is paired less often with this subject, but as my sample size was small I was unable to generalise if the same results would occur if paired with another subject. Throughout the teaching of this module I had to make decisions on ‘what matters’ and ‘what to do next.’ However, I did refer to previous plans and the British National Curriculum throughout the process. Whilst there were benefits derived from conducting the research and leading the lessons myself as the students knew and trusted me, I had to exercise a degree of caution. I needed to be conscious that the students may tell me what they thought I wanted to hear and appreciate my own enthusiasm could have been infectious and therefore corrosive (Atkinson et al., 2003). Although I am not their class teacher, prior to the research commencing, I enjoyed a good relationship with the students in our weekly choir lesson and weekly class lesson and was conscious that this could prove prejudicial if they were
predisposed to attempt to impress me. I attempted to reduce this through the information session prior to the research commencing alongside reassuring the children before the interviews and focus group that there were no right or wrong answers to my questions in the hope of achieving Dodgson’s (2019) aim of ensuring rigor and quality by determining trustworthiness. She also outlines that if a researcher clearly describes the contextual intersecting relationships between the participants and themselves (reflexivity), it not only increases the creditability of the findings but also deepens our understanding of the work. Therefore I endeavoured to be transparent about the contact I had with the children prior to the research commencing and the class teachers insight of her eight months teaching the class.

I wanted to ensure that the experience did not transcend the method in order to remain empirical. Therefore this research was in line with the advice of Dodgson (2019) who stated that in the methods section, when describing the choices made in sample selection criteria, you should provide a rationale not only on the research aim but also considering the researcher’s positionality. Therefore in my methodology chapter I provided a rationale for my research aim (based on my own experiences as a student and teacher) and discussed my interpretivist position, showing how it fits within current research. I used triangulation to cross reference my own observations, the class teachers and the pupils’ perspectives to help overcome researcher bias. It was also imperative that my research journal was used to acknowledge my own influences, beliefs and impact on the participants. However, Dodgson (2019) stated that the majority of the content about the researchers’ reflexivity belongs in the data collection and data analysis sections of the manuscript. In these sections the process of conducting and analysing are described in detail which provided a step by step procedure for data collection and followed an existing data analysis system provided by Pérez Moreno (2018). Hizli Alkan and Priestley (2019) add that data analysis suggests that reflexivity provides a useful lens for understanding teachers’ particular approaches to curriculum making.

The findings and conclusions were presented as narrative summaries and in order to avoid researcher bias they were shared with the class teacher. The interview and focus
group summaries were also shared with the case-study participants. This allowed me
the opportunity to reflect on the lessons and the process as Hizli Alkan and Priestley
(2019) stated reflexivity has the potential to build on the notion of a reflective
practitioner. No generalisations were made on the research but detailed feedback was
provided on each individual.

3.7. Summary of Methodology

This methodology chapter began by outlining the aim of this thesis and presented my key
questions while explaining how they would fill a gap in the literature. My theoretical and
contextual framework alongside my methodological considerations were presented,
justifying a case-study approach. A qualitative approach was justified which refers to
nonnumeric information. When referring to my research sample, the population was
discussed and an explanation was provided on how my six case-study participants were
chosen. Methods of data collection included a research journal, class teacher
observations, video recorded lessons, two sets of individual pupil interviews and a focus
group. These were justified through links to the literature, before the pilot study that took
place was unpicked, linking to the reliability and validity of the research. The procedures
for data collection were presented for each of the methods through a step by step guide,
including length of times, how things were recorded and how instructions were given to
participants about confidentiality. Procedures that took place to ensure I met both the
University and BERA (2018) ethical guidelines were brought to the fore. How the
different types of qualitative data were analysed, drawing predominantly on the work of
Pérez-Moreno (2018) were then unpicked. The type of analysis used was content analysis
which refers to the process of categorising verbal or behavioural data to classify,
summarise and tabulate the data. To summarise, the steps taken included: transcription,
developing and applying codes, identifying themes, patterns and relationships before
summarising the data.

The research discussed in this thesis utilised a case-study approach as the primary
research strategy. I addressed my four research questions: To what extent does process
drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons? To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities? What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama? I addressed the former two questions through methodological triangulation - using the data collected from my own observations and the observations made by the class teacher, alongside my research journal while utilising the didactic framework of Pérez-Moreno (2018). The information was unpicked using her horizontal analysis system that summarised this information in a table using the following categories: time, context, drama convention, participants, description and observations. The context referred to preselected categories: type of participation – active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert, performer proof without an expert and type of talk: in role talk, sociocultural talk or pedagogical talk. My aspiration was that my exploitation of triangulation would ensure dependable and credible results. The latter two questions relate to pupils’ perspectives, so it was imperative that I ascertained these through the interview process and the focus group with my six case-study participants. These were subsequently analysed using the advice of Miles and Huberman (2002) who aimed to reduce complexity in analysing qualitative data by breaking it into three phases: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing. Analysis tables were created that summarised the individual students’ perspectives and also broke responses into individual lessons. This allowed for narrative summaries to be made.
4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings and discussion of this investigation on the extent to which the use of process drama in the classroom affects the participation and speaking opportunities of advanced English as additional language learners (EAL learners). It will begin by presenting the findings on participation and speaking opportunities in the nine science lessons that used process drama, reached through content analysis using methodological triangulation of the research journal, class teacher observations and the videoed material. These findings will be presented through individual narrative summaries of the six case-study participants and will be presented chronologically before a summary is presented. There will be a section on the pupils’ perspectives and these results were met through a combination of the two sets of pupil interviews and the focus group. These will also be written as narrative summaries before a summary is presented. All of the findings will be linked to Chapter Two, the Literature Review, showing similarities and differences between my findings and existing literature. There will then be a synopsis of the answers to the two questions on participation, followed by the two questions on speaking opportunities. A final summary will complete this section.

4.1. Participation and Speaking Opportunities

This research was designed and structured to answer the question - ‘to what extent does process drama increase participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons’? The class teachers’ observations utilising an adaptation of Pérez-Moreno’s (2018) template on participation allied with my own observations extrapolating from and interpreting the video recorded material addressed this challenge. The teacher volunteered observations on the participation within the case-study group and we categorised the type of participation from the list below (Pérez-Moreno, 2018):

- **Active audience role** was designated if students’ facial expressions or body language suggested participation by awarding attention to the actions of others.
The performer pointer was attributed when partial involvement was observed but participation was not fully consistent or involvement was manifest but not necessarily by speaking or listening but copying the actions of others.

Explicit actions in conjunction with an adult were referred to and coded as performer pointer with an expert. This was determined by the three observable concepts of participation mentioned in the literature review: speaking, listening and involvement. This was displayed through the actions of the students.

The most easily identifiable type of participation is performer proof without an expert – in essence, when students were carrying out activities independently.

The second question I wished to address was ‘to what extent can process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities’? The answer for this question was not as easy to see a trend as it was for participation and varied between each person and type of activity. Through reflections of my research journal, comparisons with previous planning, analysis of the video recorded material and class teacher observations we found that speaking opportunities remained constant for pupils that volunteer more regularly. Regarding quieter pupils, they had slightly more opportunities as they were selected to speak more regularly in a combination of group and whole class games and speaking activities. Therefore, six individual narrative summaries will follow in chronological order reflecting on the participation and speaking opportunities afforded to this case-study sample. This will be followed by the analysis tables and Figures that summarise the observations. The types of talk considered can be found below.

Table 9: Types of talk based on the work of Freebody (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Talk</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic/logistic talk (PLT)</td>
<td>The managing of school and lesson behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural talk (SCT)</td>
<td>Engaging the cultural, social and moral potential of the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using scientific vocabulary, curiosity and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In role talk (IRT)</td>
<td>Students demonstrating their understandings and improvising reactions to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scenarios as they display these in role as character participants in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>drama.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1. Narrative Summary of Pupil One’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

Pupil 1 displayed the four different types of participation in lesson one in the course of the disparate activities. During the drama convention known as ‘teacher in role’, she became an ‘active audience’ member by following the researcher physically and responding to instructions. Throughout the ‘mime’ activity, she displayed copying traits, demonstrating ‘performer pointer’ attributes. Examples of ‘performer proof with an expert’ were evident during ‘role play’ activities and ‘hot seating’, when she introduced some of her own ideas after questioning. The final type of participation, ‘performer proof without an expert’ was recognisable during the ‘mantle of the expert’ activity when she worked independently on her script and assisted her peers. This device matched the findings of Even (2008) who stated that drama allowed participants to spontaneously react to others contributions. Vygotsky affirmed his belief that speech appears spontaneously in the child and continues to develop thereafter. “This process of invention or artistic creativity demands a substantial participation by both realistic thinking and imagination” (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987, p.349). The two act as a unity. However, the class teacher concluded that although these different types of participation were evident in the lesson, there was not necessarily an overall increase in her participation when compared to her contribution in other lessons. While she evidently enjoyed the group work, it took her quite some time before she was sufficiently confident to volunteer. She appeared self-conscious.

During the second lesson, Pupil 1 was an active and proactive audience member: she listened carefully to the video material pre-recorded by the researcher and later demonstrated the knowledge she had gained from it. This animated attitude was evident again during the narration task when comparing and contrasting the flowering and nonflowering plants. She also replicated ‘performer proof with an expert’ traits during ‘spotlight’ and ‘teacher in role’, when she was advancing her own ideas in the collective discussion about the class investigation into growing conditions for flowers. The third type of participation demonstrated in the lesson was ‘performer proof without an expert’, when she edited her own video script and recording, playing the role of team leader in the ‘mantle of the expert’ activity. However, during this period, Pupil 1’s participation did
not increase substantively from her normal contribution to lessons. Pupil 1 showed two types of participation in the third lesson: performer pointer and performer proof with an expert. She enthusiastically embraced the former during drama games such as: fruit bowl, fizz buzz, dance and the quiz show. The latter type of participation was evident during the freeze frame activity, when she choreographed her own poses and then contributed her ideas during the mime rehearsals and performance. Although the types of participation were less than the previous two lessons, Pupil 1’s investment increased in this lesson, as she never showed signs of being distracted and engaged in all activities with enthusiasm and spontaneity.

In addition to the two types of participation demonstrated in the previous lesson, Pupil 1 was demonstrably an ‘active audience’ member in lesson four. This was particularly palpable during the ‘teacher in role’ convention and during the ‘two truths and a lie’ activity when she voted without hesitation having listened to the statements and digested the content. She laughed spontaneously during the rapping activity when she imitated the teacher showing ‘performer pointer’ participation. Throughout the lesson, she interjected in class discussions and entered into activities. She expressed interest in a variety of drama conventions and activities including: mantle of the expert, pass the story, quiz show and jumping frogs. During this lesson, according to the class teacher, she participated in a similar degree at least and sometimes to a greater degree. Pupil 1 exhibited three distinct types of participation in lesson five. She was an ‘active audience’ member during the ‘freeze frame’, ‘performer pointer’ during the ‘rap’ and ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘narration’ and ‘hula hoop story telling’. In the final activity, ‘agony aunt’ Pupil 1 did not immerse herself fully. Perhaps her comprehension was constrained but, in any event, this was later addressed in lesson seven when she demonstrated understanding in her responses. As with the previous lesson, Pupil 1 joined in more in lesson five with the exception of the final activity.

At the beginning of lesson six, Pupil 1 took on an ‘active audience’ member during the ‘counting game’, ‘guess the reader’ and the ‘mammal game’. Her type of participation changed to ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the next three activities, which included, ‘rock, paper, scissors’, ‘two truths and a lie’ and the ‘quiz show’. She became
distracted during the final ‘narration’ activity but did exhibit ‘performer pointer’ attributes at the outset. The class teacher commented that she joined in, listened, volunteered, played well and read with confidence. During the double lesson (seven and eight) Pupil 1’s participation greatly increased. It was in the context of this lesson that she demonstrated the participation ‘performer proof without an expert’ most. She adopted the role of ‘expert’ on multiple occasions in her own group as well as working in pairs and independently. This lesson included written, singing and speaking tasks. She volunteered, her disposition was animated and her approach was proactive throughout. The class teacher commented that she enjoyed the work, encouraged others, was organised, louder, confident, got stuck in straight away and quoted her saying “I want to speak first”. The final lesson did not lend itself to ‘performer proof without an expert’ as it required ‘teacher in role’ in the capacity of director to organise the lesson as a ‘pretend’ rehearsal for ‘Lifecycles the Musical’ (Fink and Heath, 2006). Pupil 1 did however demonstrate the other three types of participation and her involvement and contribution did increase in this lesson.

To return to my research question - ‘does process drama increase the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons’? the conclusion for Pupil 1 would be in the affirmative with the qualification that it was not immediate. These findings are in line with the work of Bozigit et al. (2014) who claimed that active learning ensured increased participation in in-class activities. It definitely required time before Pupil 1 adjusted to the different approach to learning and embraced the drama conventions. Her levels of participation increased commensurately with her confidence. However, the class teacher felt that while her participation did increase, speaking opportunities were of a similar level to other lessons as she tended to take advantage of these in all lessons. These findings on speaking opportunities were contrasting to the work of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who found that active learning ensured students talked more often in the classroom discussions.

4.1.2. Narrative Summary of Pupil Two’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

Pupil 2 suffers from learning difficulties. Consequently, two weeks prior to this research commencing, she was provided with a Learning Support Assistant (LSA). The class
teacher affirmed that the assistant had helped her learning and confidence but that she relies heavily upon her support in lessons to repeat instructions and explain tasks. She displayed three different types of participation in the course of disparate activities in lesson one. During the drama convention known as ‘teacher in role’, like Pupil 1, she became an ‘active audience’ member by laughing at the researcher’s jokes and following any instructions outlined on the board. She also embraced this type of participation during the ‘mantle of the expert’ activity when she watched her peers instructing her on where to stand in the video. Throughout the ‘role play’ and ‘mime’ activity, she displayed copying traits, demonstrating ‘performer pointer’ behaviour. Examples of ‘performer proof with an expert’ were evident during the ‘hot seating’, when she nominated herself to play the role of the statistician early in the lesson. Her LSA was unavailable for this lesson and she relied on her peers for reassurance. Consequently, whilst she engaged in the lesson, her level of participation did not increase.

The class teacher commented that Pupil 2’s participation in lesson two expanded when she had technological responsibilities but decreased when there was a mathematical constituent in the drama. This observation was in line with the findings of Pérez-Moreno (2018) who discovered that using the arts resulted in different abilities being displayed according to the context of the activity. She showed elements of ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘mantle of the expert’ activity by rehearsing her lines confidently with her LSA. She demonstrated ‘active audience’ traits during the ‘teacher in role’ and ‘spotlight’ activity - laughing along in the context but she did become distracted periodically. Lesson three allowed Pupil 2 to show two types of participation that replicated Pupil 1. These were ‘performer pointer’ and ‘performer proof with an expert’. The former type of participation was evident during the drama games ‘fizz buzz’, ‘freeze frame’, ‘fruit bowl’ and the ‘dance’ when she quickly imitated the researcher and her peers. The latter was perceptible in the ‘quiz show’, ‘mime’ and ‘performance’ when she listened attentively to her LSA and joined in with her friends. Therefore, in lesson two Pupil 2’s participation did not increase but in lesson three her concentration and enthusiasm and consequently participation, did increase.
In lesson four, Pupil 2 emulated Pupil 1. In addition to the two types of participation evidenced in the previous lesson, Pupil 2 also demonstrated her ability to be an ‘active audience’ member. This was palpable through ‘teacher in role’, ‘mantle of the expert’, ‘whole class – pass the story’ and the ‘quiz show’. Whilst she lacked confidence in the group ‘pass the story’, she was a good audience member in the other activities: she laughed at appropriate moments and imitated instructions. She laughed alongside her peers during the rapping activity. She imitated the teacher showing ‘performer pointer’ participation and looked to her peers during ‘two truths and a lie’. She demonstrated the final type of participation in lesson four and was ‘performer proof without an expert’ when she volunteered during the ‘jumping frogs’ activity. Throughout the lesson, she volunteered comments in class discussions and gained support from her LSA. Pupil 2 replicated the behaviour of Pupil 1 when she exhibited three distinct types of participation in lesson five. However, these did not necessarily occur in the same activities. She was an ‘active audience’ member during the ‘freeze frame’ and ‘two truths and a lie’, ‘performer pointer’ during the ‘diagram drawing’ and ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘narration’ and ‘hula hoop story telling’. In the final activity, ‘agony aunt’, Pupil 1 did not immerse herself fully. As with the previous lesson, the class teacher and I felt Pupil 2 joined in slightly more in lesson five than usual.

At the beginning of lesson six, Pupil 2 participated in the ‘counting game’ with the guidance of the researcher and assumed ‘performer proof with an expert’. She reverted to ‘active audience’ during the ‘guess the reader’, ‘the mammal game’ and the ‘quiz show’. Her type of participation changed to ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the other four activities, which included ‘rock, paper, scissors’, ‘two truths and a lie’ and the ‘narration’. The class teacher commented that she was sometimes on the outskirts in group work, didn’t call out in ‘the mammal game’ and relied on her LSA. However, she also remarked that her participation had still increased as a consequence of listening with friends, volunteering and reading confidently.

During the double lesson (seven and eight) Pupil 2’s participation, just like Pupil 1, greatly increased. This was the first lesson in which she demonstrated all four types of participation within one lesson. She copied the researcher immediately during the
‘singing’ task, showing ‘performer pointer’ traits, became an ‘active audience’ during the instructions, nodding and smiling along. She was a ‘performer proof with an expert’ during ‘who am I’? ‘two truths and a lie’ and ‘agony aunt’ by adding her ideas but gaining from the knowledge of her LSA and peers and showed elements of ‘performer proof without an expert’ during the ‘narration’ task. The class teacher commented that she thought her participation peaked during this lesson but also noted certain difficulties during the tasks e.g. difficulty following song words, reliance on her LSA or other pupils and problems with the yes or no concept in the ‘mammal game’.

The final lesson was delivered at a quick pace and whilst it was difficult for Pupil 2 to keep up with things such as lyrics, she stayed enthusiastic throughout and tried her best. This finding was in line with the work of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who found that their active learning approach ensured that the lesson was enjoyable. She showed all three types of participation with the exception of ‘performer proof without an expert’. She read confidently, tried to participate fully in singing and looked for reassurance during movement activities. Consequently, when posing the question ‘does process drama increase the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons? I would answer in the affirmative in respect of Pupil 2 with the caveat as with Pupil 1 that it was not immediate. It definitely required time before Pupil 2 adjusted to the different approach to learning and embraced the drama conventions and required the support of her LSA to achieve this. These findings are in line with the work of Even (2008) whose findings suggest that foreign language learners were provided with a forum to engage in in-put-driven interactions when using drama. Unlike Pupil 1, the class teacher felt that speaking opportunities did increase for Pupil 2 as she was required to partake in different types of work e.g. individual, paired, group and whole class at a quicker pace than other lessons. These findings are relevant to the work of Vygotsky (1934, in Rieber, 1999) as he discusses the importance of dialogue to help master organisations and planning of own actions and behaviours. In addition, “the teacher, working with the child on a given question, explains, informs, inquires, corrects and focuses the child to explain” (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987). As Pupil 2’s confidence grew when working alongside an adult, this type of teaching methodology allowed her to contribute more.
4.1.3. Narrative Summary of Pupil Three’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

Like the previous two pupils, Pupil 3’s participation did increase but not immediately. The previous two pupils only started to show increased participation in lesson three and peaked by lesson seven. Pupil 3 was absent from school during lessons two and three and when she returned for lesson four her confidence was low and her participation suffered. Her behaviour displayed in this lesson contradicted the findings of Even (2008) who found that drama resulted in higher levels of motivation. It was not until lesson six (Pupil 3’s fourth science lesson using process drama) that the class teacher commented on a marked change. Although the class teacher wished to focus on Pupil 1 and 2 in this lesson, she noticed a fantastic increase in Pupil 3’s participation and this amelioration continued throughout the remaining three lessons. She displayed two different types of participation in lesson one, but these were somewhat reactive rather than proactive as she was responding to instructions and actions (performer pointer) and asked to make hand gestures to provide her opinion (active audience). She did volunteer to be a team leader but looked for reassurance and only spoke when addressed. Her participation was minimal and she remained timid and quiet throughout.

As mentioned previously, Pupil 3 was absent for lesson two and three and when she returned in lesson four she struggled to adapt to the new structure of learning. The class teacher pointed out that she lacked confidence and seemed self-conscious. She did not volunteer and physically removed herself to the back of the group to reduce the chance of selection or questions. At times she did participate e.g. during the rap she showed ‘performer pointer’ traits with the class teacher commenting that she did the rapping and did sing and she took part in ‘pass the story’. The class teacher said that her behaviour was similar to that in the other lessons she had taken part in during that day following her absence. In lesson five, Pupil 3 participated more than the previous lesson, but this was still not an increase when compared with her normal behaviour in lessons. She showed ‘performer pointer’ traits during the ‘diagram’, ‘narration and ‘two truths and a lie’ when she read with confidence and at times showed ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘hula hoop story’ and ‘freeze frame’ activities when she extended the
action. However, the class teacher also noticed that she did not volunteer, couldn’t remember words and wasn’t part of the freeze frame. Therefore, overall her participation did not increase and while the class teacher felt more speaking opportunities were provided in these lessons, they were not embraced by Pupil 3.

Lesson six was a turning point for Pupil 3: she volunteered to read, asked for help from the class teacher, joined in during the ‘counting game’ and ‘narration’ and followed the action throughout. This improved her security in confidently demonstrating ‘active audience’, ‘performer pointer’ and ‘performer proof with an expert’ within the lesson. This enhanced behaviour reflects the findings of Vygotsky (1934, in Rieber and Woolock, 1997). Vygotsky avowed that to assist a person to move through the zone of proximal development, the presence of someone with knowledge and skills beyond that of the learner, which refers to a more knowledgeable other, is required (Daniels, 2016). The class teacher volunteered that this was a great improvement in comparison to the behaviour she had witnessed throughout the academic year and that she was surprised and impressed by this sudden involvement and contribution to speaking opportunities.

The double lesson (seven and eight) was the first one in which Pupil 3 demonstrated all four types of participation. She also had the opportunity to work as a whole class, in a group, in a pair and individually in this lesson. Her contributions were maximised by paired activities. During the instructions she was an ‘active audience’ member: nodding, smiling and following instructions. The singing, although achieved quietly, allowed her to become a ‘performer pointer’. She took on the ‘expert’ role herself in her paired activity during ‘Who am I’? and worked well in groups and independently in the insect, bird and amphibian tasks. Certain tasks were difficult as noted by the class teacher, she stated that the words of the songs were tricky, but she had a go and copied from the sheet. She also noted that she was very enthusiastic.

The final lesson consolidated Pupil 3’s increased confidence, public speaking and participation. She quickly followed instructions even when they differed from the written script. She readily assumed new responsibilities e.g. playing an instrument, followed movements and helped a peer find their place. This new approach to learning was not
immediately met by Pupil 3 with enthusiasm or assurance but over the course of the lessons, it became apparent that this learning style and deploying drama as a teaching methodology did benefit her in terms of confidence, enthusiasm, participation, speaking opportunities and language learning. Therefore, in this case the findings were in line with the work of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who found that engaging in active learning is beneficial for learning in other subjects.

4.1.4. Narrative Summary of Pupil Four’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

Pupil 4’s participation journey did not follow the trajectory of the previous three pupils discussed. There were similarities in that, after a couple of lessons, his level of participation did increase in comparison to his normal classroom behaviour. However, there were exceptions to the rule in that he could still become easily distracted and participate less in whole class activities. Pupil 4 did volunteer some of his own ideas in lesson one. He volunteered to be a statistician and when prompted answered questions. He contributed from his own knowledge and took on a leadership role at times in group work. This demonstrated ability as ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘hot seating’ and ‘performer proof without an expert’ during the ‘mantle of the expert’ activities. During the ‘role play’ and ‘mime’, he looked for reassurance and copied actions showing ‘performer pointer’ participation. The class teacher explained that Pupil 4’s participation fluctuates dramatically and he can alternate from being very distracted to being fully engaged. This was displayed in the lesson at times when he began to fidget, became quiet and did not always watch the board or activity. His level of participation was broadly similar to his behaviour in other lessons.

In lesson two, Pupil 4 was an ‘active audience’ member during the ‘narration’ and ‘mantle of the expert’ but there were still occasions when he became distracted. He did join in each activity but was passive and took a back seat. In lesson three, he still lost concentration in the group work and was quiet in the performance. This behaviour contradicted the findings of Even (2008) who found that it facilitated cooperation. Conversely, during the other activities he was animated, answered questions and solved problems. This was facilitated by speaking opportunities as Vygotsky highlighted the
importance of speech, showing its complexity as a mental function directed towards problem solving (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber, 1999). Pupil 4’s ‘performer proof with an expert’ participation increased during the drama games such as ‘fruit bowl’ and ‘fizz buzz’ but during the movement activities such as ‘dance’ and ‘mime’ he would initially exhibit ‘performer pointer’ traits but subsequently became distracted. These reflections were also made by the class teacher.

Lesson four generated a great increase in participation. Whilst he was initially distracted during ‘teacher in role’, for the remainder of the lesson he volunteered, continuously raised his hand, enjoyed sharing facts, joined discussions and dominated the amphibian game. He predominantly showed ‘performer proof with an expert’ participation. In lesson five, Pupil 4 reverted to his usual pattern of behaviour: full participation followed by distraction and disconnection. During the narration and sequencing activity of ‘The Hungry Caterpillar’, he allowed the other children to debate his position but did not advance his own opinion. The class teacher noted that he had no confidence in this activity. He also became distracted and giggly during the whole class insect story. However, in an after class discussion with the researcher, he demonstrated a depth of knowledge that suggested a level of engagement higher than what was at least overtly apparent. He fulfilled all four types of participation in this lesson but did not always engage in activities and was noticeably disengaged in whole class contexts.

Lesson six saw Pupil 4 fully engaged: voting confidently, volunteering, talking to the researcher and calling out answers. There were still episodes of giggling and distraction during whole class activities, maximal in the quiz show. However, throughout most of the lesson, Pupil 4 showed the capacity to become a ‘performer proof with an expert’. With the exception of the singing tasks, (Pupil 4 choose not to participate), the double lessons seven and eight, at times provided the platform for his optimal engagement. He demonstrated his ability to participate in all four variations of the definition. He requested assistance if struggling, completed all the tasks, ensured he understood instructions and was animated throughout. After the lesson the class teacher commented that this was an unusually high level of participation for this particular student. However, her notes also suggested that he took a while to understand the amphibian and reptile task alongside the
insect activity and he took a backseat in the bird task. Consequently, I later returned to the class teacher to clarify her observations as there seemed to be inconsistency between her verbal and written comments and she explained that she had noted any small distractions she noticed but her opinion was that participation on the whole had significantly increased in this two hour session.

In the final lesson, Pupil 4 engaged slightly less than the other case-study participants did. This was due in no small measure to the fact that he became repetitively distracted by his costume that had been provided! This contradicts the findings of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who found that active learning allowed the lesson to pass more efficiently. However, he did assume a much greater role in the singing than exhibited in the week previous. He delivered all of his lines with enthusiasm and showing an understanding of characterisation. He was chosen to do the ‘conscience alley’ and gave his own feedback on the experience. He was an ‘active audience’ member during the ‘hot seating’ activity, displayed ‘performer proof with an expert’ traits during the ‘conscience alley’ and for the remainder of the time demonstrated ‘performer pointer’ participation. The class teacher concluded that his participation did increase in these lessons albeit with fluctuations and while speaking opportunities were offered, it depended on the activity as to whether they were embraced fully by Pupil 4.

4.1.5. Narrative Summary of Pupil Five’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

In lesson one, Pupil 5 was enthused by technology and volunteered immediately for a role in the ‘hot seating’. However, she was constantly distracted by the camera, ignored future speakers, relied on peers to repeat instructions and required frequent prompting. Some of the Year 1 children in Lundy et al’s (2011) study proved overly enthusiastic Photographers! However, not everything was recorded as per (Lundy et al 2011) - occasionally they were unable to provide a reason for the photo! We followed the same protocol with facets of the behaviour demonstrated by Pupil 5. This behaviour contradicted the findings of Even (2018) who found that using drama provided opportunities for intense, personalised understanding. She did show ‘performer pointer’ copying ability at times. The class teacher felt that the distraction of the camera resulted
in a lesser than usual degree of participation in lessons. Apparently according to the class teacher, she is oblivious of the fact that accessing the curriculum can be challenging for her.

On a few occasions in lesson two, Pupil 5 was an ‘active audience’ member. She had her eyes closed whilst focussing on the narration and during the videos of ‘teacher in role’, she laughed along with the humour. However, as in lesson one, she was easily distracted and only really engaged when encouraged by an adult. Lesson three manifested a great improvement in terms of participation. Although principally on the periphery of groups, she nevertheless partook in all of the drama games and performed confidently. This was also noted by the class teacher. She demonstrated definitively all three types of participation in the lesson with the exception of ‘performer proof without an expert’. This was not attributed, as she required peer or adult support throughout.

With the exception of the whole class ‘pass the story’, (during which she became distracted and confused), Pupil 5 improved in terms of understanding and participation in lesson four. Again, she demonstrated the three types of participation that she had in the previous lesson. She volunteered, contributed to discussion and answered questions confidently. These three types of participation were manifest again in lesson five. With the qualification that she remained conscious of the camera and uncomprehending of the humour, she nevertheless impressed the teacher with increased levels of participation. During the ‘hula hoop’ activity, she focussed more on the action of not breaking the circle than on the narration, but she did sing in the rap, voiced her opinion in the sequencing activity and volunteered.

The principal component of lesson six was ‘performer proof with an expert’. Pupil 5 acquired this status by her contribution in being vocal in the counting and mammal game, volunteering and sorting gestation periods in the challenge. She did not allow herself to become distracted by the camera. This allowed Pupil 5 the opportunity to work within the zone of proximal development (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber, 1999) as she was supported through activities provided by her peers. In the double lesson, whilst she did require adult support, Pupil 5 participated in every task and for the first time demonstrated
'performer proof without an expert’ participation. She sang enthusiastically, was animated throughout the mammal game and completed the narration. The class teacher commended her comprehension which is in line with the findings of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who suggested active learning ensured students learnt through performance and experience. The class teacher also stated she became more animated using accents in the audio task but also noted that she took a long time to put pen to paper in the written task. She exuded confidence in the final lesson: characterising reading, singing loudly, using dynamic movements and acting competently. She showed the three types of participation in this lesson other than ‘performer proof without an expert’. It came as no surprise that she regarded this as her favourite lesson. The class teacher mentioned that her participation did increase despite being distracted by the camera at times and in a similar pattern to Pupil 4, speaking opportunities were offered, but it depended on the activity as to whether they were embraced by Pupil 5.

4.1.6. Narrative Summary of Pupil Six’s Participation and Speaking Opportunities

The class teacher described Pupil 6 as a strong contributor in lessons and consequently it was more challenging to identify an increase in participation as it was going to be marginal. Whilst he did not contribute until the end of the ‘hot seating’ activity, he was obviously engaged as he followed conversations and answered questions. Interestingly, he was the only case-study participant who managed to show all four types of participation in the very first lesson. However, he was quite reserved in the lesson and preferred to listen rather than speak. The class teacher observed that in lesson two he enjoyed the videos, confidently improvised and volunteered in the narration. She also noted that he relied heavily on peers to understand tasks and became distracted afterwards. This behaviour contradicted the findings of Even (2008) which suggested that drama ensured deeper understanding of subject matter. Whilst he most certainly showed that he was a ‘performer proof with an expert’ during the ‘mantle of the expert’ activity, his participation did not substantively increase in the course of this lesson. Pupil 6’s behaviour in this lesson contradicted the findings of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who found that active learning helped contribute to the development of different points of views.
Replicating the other case-study participants, Pupil 6’s dominant type of participation in lesson three was ‘performer pointer’. He attained this status in the following activities: freeze frame, fizz buzz, quiz show and movement. He showed elements of ‘performer proof with an expert’ during fruit bowl, the mime and the performance. He was focussed, gave quick responses, encouraged peers, played the games and performed confidently. The only deviation was allowing himself a giggle during the dance routine! The teacher affirmed that this sustained commitment was not unusual although she felt he made more personal contributions during ‘Are you smarter than a 5th grader?’ than he usually would in whole class activities. The most prevalent participatory element displayed by Pupil 6 in lesson four was ‘performer proof with an expert’. This type of behaviour, according to the work of Vygotsky allows students to move into the zone of proximal development through social interactions with a skilful tutor that allow the learner to observe and practice their skills (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Woolock, 1997). Pupil 6 participated well, with the exception of the whole class ‘pass the story’ task, during which he became distracted. In this lesson, he shared knowledge, volunteered in discussions and activities and performed the rap. The class teacher stated that peers can easily distract him but commended his engagement.

As in lesson five, the prevalent type of participation for Pupil 6 was ‘performer proof with an expert’. He voted, spoke confidently and helped peers during the ‘hula hoop game’. During the rap, he was initially inhibited but grew in confidence. He did become distracted towards the end of the lesson. This high level of commitment is normal for Pupil 6. In lesson six, he exhibited all four types of participation. He volunteered, voted unhesitatingly, debated, encouraged peers, reflected on links to previous lessons and was attentive throughout. The class teacher noted that he participated fully throughout and that she did not feel he ever became distracted. In the double lesson Pupil 6 did not initially engage in the singing task, the class teacher noted that he was looking but found it tricky to follow. This was noticeable again when singing was reintroduced. However, during the rest of the lesson he showed secure examples of ‘performer proof with an expert’ and ‘performer proof without an expert’. He appreciated the humour immediately in the insect task, was very animated in the mammal task, completed the amphibian task and listened (although not narrating himself) in the bird task. The class teacher noted that
he encouraged peers, wanted to do more, started strong and got stuck in straight away. Pupil 6 was one of the most confident performers in the final lesson. In contrast to the previous lesson, he sang all of the songs. He delivered lines enthusiastically and theatrically. He even added improvisation, causing the teacher to state that he seemed even more confident than usual. This discovery reflected the findings of Pérez-Moreno (2018) who discussed the increase of spontaneous activity when using the arts.

4.2. Summary and Discussion of Pupils’ Participation and Speaking Opportunities

In conclusion, this section was scheduled to firstly address the question, ‘to what extent does process drama increase participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons’? The answer to this, in relation to the six case-study participants, is that it does increase but the effect may not be immediate. The students required time to adjust to the new type of teaching methodology, which involves an imagined world created by and for the participants themselves (O’Neill, 1995) but when familiarised, the level of participation of these six case-study participants did increase. The benefits of increased participation shown in this analysis of my advanced EAL learners fall in line with the positive experiences found through drama and foreign language acquisition of other authors (Even, 2008; Bournot-Trites et al., 2007; Erdman, 1991). This successful outcome was best achieved in paired and group work as opposed to individual and whole class activities which was in line with the findings of Bozigit et al. (2104) who suggested that active learning encouraged cooperation. Furthermore, another similarity with my findings was O’Sullivan’s (2018) claim that role play encourages participation, engagement and active learning. The conclusion was reached through a combination of reflections on the video recorded material, teacher observations and a research journal. Content analysis was used that reflected on the four types of participation (Table 2) suggested by Pérez-Moreno (2018) using her horizontal table of analysis (Table 1).

This section also considered the question. ‘to what extent does process drama increase speaking opportunities”? Findings showed that speaking opportunities remained constant for pupils that volunteer more regularly and for quieter pupils they increased slightly as
they were selected to speak more regularly in a combination of group and whole class games and speaking activities. Likewise, such conflicting results were reflected on in my Literature Review including large meta-analysis of the effectiveness of drama in schools (Conard and Asher, 2000; Lee et al., 2015). They outlined that drama has had positive effects on oral and written language outcomes (Hendrickson and Gallegos, 1972) but also point out that in other studies it has had no effects (Ingersoll and Kase, 1970; Lawton and Brandon, 2005). Furthermore, my findings in particular for Pupil 3 were in line with those of Atas (2015) who found that “students who were always abstaining from speaking English and acting, started to raise their hands when I asked for a volunteer” (p.962).

4.3. Pupils’ perspectives

The final questions (three and four) referred to the perspectives of the pupils: ‘what are pupils’ perspectives on their participation and speaking opportunities during lessons that utilise process drama’? In order to gain their perspectives, two sets of pupil interviews were held with each of the case-study participants and also a focus group in which all six case-study participants were present. In order to analyse these, as discussed in my analysis of data (section 3.5), I used levels of analysis which included transcribing and capturing of notes, writing up case-study narratives and within case analysis, determining findings through cross case analysis and interpreting and enfolding findings in literature. Alongside this, I also considered the data collection and recording process itself.

The first stage involved conducting the two individual interviews (Appendix L). A focus group was also conducted after the final lesson (Appendix K). The children were aware that although the research took place during science lessons and although EAL pupils were chosen that the research was in relation to participation and speaking opportunities as opposed to scientific knowledge or language acquisition. Firstly, I transcribed each interview chronologically and transcribed the focus group. I familiarised myself by rereading each transcript a number of times and made notes about potentially significant issues or experiences, identifying categories. Afterwards a case-study narrative was compiled in relation to each participant. The case-study narrative was both chronological
and thematic, in that it told the ‘story’ of each participant’s perspective on the lessons chronologically and also focused on themes that related to participation, scientific vocabulary and knowledge, enjoyment and speaking opportunities.

To maintain an interpretivist approach, each case-study narrative was written at the level of lived experience without reference to extant literature, representing a crystallisation and condensation of what the participant had said, still using as much as possible the literal words of the participant (Hycner, 1985). These narratives are shared below and written chronologically: interview one, interview two and then the focus group and divided by each case-study participant. While the interviews discussed participation and speaking opportunities, the focus group was used to help the pupils understand the different types of participation and what speaking opportunities may look like. These were described in child friendly language by attributing a teddy bear to each type of participation and giving practical examples through role play of each type. Once understanding was met, the students identified the type of participation they believed they demonstrated most in each lesson. ‘Active audience’ was represented by ‘Winnie the watcher’, ‘performer pointer’ was known as ‘Connor the copier’, ‘performer proof with an expert’ was ‘Pat the performer’ and the final teddy ‘independent Ian’ represented ‘performer proof without an expert’ participation.

4.3.1. Narrative Summary of Pupil One’s Perspective

In interview one, Pupil 1 mentioned she participated in all of the sessions. She thought that she participated more than her usual lessons. The scientific knowledge she referred to included: the lifecycle of plants, nonflowering plants and frogs. She recalled drama activities such as ‘fruit bowl’ – “the one we did with cushions” and ‘role play’ – “we had a card and chose what thing we had to do to show the seeds move”. Pupil 1 referred to her enjoyment of the lessons “they were very fun, that’s why I liked them, yeh it was fun…because you don’t sit in your chair the whole time and then I think I can concentrate better if I do stuff”. Collaboration and interaction seemed to be recurring themes that she discussed, “you did teamwork with your group and more stuff together”. This statement was in line with the findings of Gay and Hanley (1999) who found that through the use
of drama, students practiced skills of collaboration. Pupil 1 referenced an example of speaking opportunities, “everybody had to answer a question, I introduced the team”. Pupil 1 had a basic understanding of the content of the first four lessons she was interviewed after, she mentioned seeds moving but not types of seed dispersal and she said parts of the plant but didn’t name them.

In interview two, Pupil 1 stated she participated more in all of the science lessons, she said she did this by “communicating”. Her scientific knowledge included: “mammals have a back bone and are warm blooded”, “insects have three body parts” and she understood metamorphosis. Drama activities that she mentioned were: who’s who? agony aunt, narration, two truths and a lie and singing. Pupil 1 stated she had more chances to speak when using drama to learn science. She also referred to collaboration and movement in the lessons and stated that this new approach helped her learning as “you’re not always sitting in your chair, you also work together and do some drama with it and I think that helps learning”. This linked to the views of Gay and Hanley (1999) who stated that drama helped students practice skills of cooperation. Pupil 1 showed a greater depth of understanding in interview two which took place after lesson eight and reflected on lesson five, six, seven and eight. As she claimed in both interviews that her participation and speaking opportunities had increased using drama as a teaching methodology, I wished to discover in the focus group what type of participation she thought took place and to see if her perspective was consistent with her interview responses.

In the focus group, Pupil 1 stated that “using drama helps me join in more”. She also chose ‘strongly agree’ when provided with the statement: ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than science lessons that don’t use drama’ (Table 6). After learning about types of participation through role play, Pupil 1 reflected on the dominant type of participation that she felt took place in each lesson. The double lesson had four very separate and diverse activities so these were broken into seven a, seven b, eight a and eight b. She never felt that her dominant type of participation was ‘active audience’ and she felt her most dominant type of participation was ‘performer proof with an expert’. She said this took place in lesson one, two, four, six, seven a, seven b and
nine. Next in line she felt she demonstrated ‘performer proof with an expert’ in lesson five, eight a and eight b and once showed ‘performer pointer’ in lesson three (Table 7). Therefore, Pupil 1’s perspective was consistent in her interviews and focus group as she felt both her participation and speaking opportunities had increased using process drama in lessons.

4.3.2. Narrative Summary of Pupil Two’s Perspective

In interview one, Pupil 2 outlined that she participated in all of the sessions. She stated that she thought she participated more than other lessons. Scientific vocabulary and knowledge she mentioned included: the lifecycle of a flower and a frog, pollen and nectar, flower spreading seeds and eggs and froglets. She remembered some of the drama activities that we did including: ‘fruit bowl’ - “the circle of cushions”, ‘mantle of the expert’ – “the video”, ‘jumping frogs’ – “the jumping game”, ‘lifecycle of a flower dance’ – “dance” and ‘the amphibian rap’ – “rapping”. Pupil 2 referred to her enjoyment of the lessons, “I enjoyed it more, I liked it, it’s funner and you make more activities and yeh that’s fun”. Reference to speaking opportunities were made mainly based around the ‘mantle of the expert’ task. Pupil 2 had a basic understanding of the content of the lessons. She remembered the variation of ‘fruit bowl’ but didn’t name the parts of the flower. She remembered that her group investigated changing temperature but stated that they changed the temperature of the room rather than the location of the plant.

During interview two, Pupil 2 said she participated more in the science lessons by “joining in with games and writing” and added that they “were quite fun”. Her knowledge included: mammal stages and the different animals we had discussed. Drama activities that she mentioned were: rock, paper, scissors, who’s who? two truths and a lie and narration. Other activities were recalled but she was unsure about the learning objectives of them: “the circle we did and then the hoop”. This referred to an activity that discussed the lifecycle of a worker bee. Pupil 2 mentioned that she spoke the same amount in these lessons and referred to her enjoyment due to diversity within the lessons, “it’s funner when we do different activities and the whole class does the same, but we do it in the circle”. This statement was in line with the findings of Gay and Hanley (1999) who found
that through the use of drama students participated in a communal event. Therefore, to summarise Pupil 2’s perspective discussed in the interviews, she stated she participated more in these lessons that utilised process drama but that the speaking opportunities remained the same as other lessons.

When faced with the statement ‘using drama in lessons helps me join in more’, Pupil 2 chose ‘strongly agree’ from the list: strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree, strongly disagree. Following from this, when presented with the statement ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than science lessons that don’t use drama’, she chose ‘agree’ (Table 6). Pupil 2 felt her most dominant type of participation was ‘performer proof without an expert’ and she felt this occurred in lesson six, seven a, seven b, eight a and eight b. ‘Performer proof with an expert’ received two votes for lesson one and nine and chose ‘performer pointer’ in lesson three. ‘Active audience’ was chosen for lesson two and four and she chose not to vote for lesson five as she couldn’t remember her behaviour clearly (Table 7). Therefore, Pupil 2’s perspective was consistent in terms of increase in participation and speaking opportunities remained the same between her interviews and focus group. However, the type of participation she stated she demonstrated more frequently differed from my own observations as I felt she relied heavily on adults and peers in the classroom.

4.3.3 Narrative Summary of Pupil Three’s Perspective

Pupil 3 missed two out of the first four process drama science lessons. She felt she participated more in the lesson about the lifecycle of plants and the same amount in the lesson on amphibians. Scientific knowledge or vocabulary that she mentioned included: frogs, seeds, plants and eggs. In terms of speaking opportunities, when prompted, she referred to her role as the team leader when she “had to begin the video, telling the names of everyone”. Pupil 3 remembered the ‘pass the story’ drama activity, “we went into a circle and we were first saying one word and then there was one with a ball that you had to throw and say a bit about the lifecycle of a frog”. This statement was in line with the findings of Gay and Hanley (1999) who found that through the use of drama students practiced skills of participation. Pupil 3 had a limited understanding of the lessons that
had taken place. This contradicted the discussion of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who suggested that active learning ensured that knowledge learned by students was permanent. She had very little recollection of the first lesson on the lifecycle of plants even when prompted. She had missed the two follow up lessons within the first four, which resulted in a dip in confidence.

During interview two, Pupil 3 mentioned she participated more in the science lessons, saying the reason for this was because she “found it fun”. Her knowledge included a basic understanding of metamorphosis and naming species such as insects and mammals. Drama activities she discussed were: ‘rock, paper, scissors’, ‘gestation periods’, ‘agony aunt’ and ‘two truths and a lie’. Certain knowledge was recalled but lacked clarity e.g. “some lay eggs and some don’t”. When asked about her speaking contributions she thought she spoke more by “putting her hand up more and reading out”. She said she enjoyed the lessons “because it’s funner and you can move around and we do drama”. Pupil 3 was much more confident after the second series of lessons than the first set.

Pupil 3 chose ‘strongly agree’ for both statements that asked whether there was an increase in participation and speaking opportunities when process drama was used to teach lessons on lifecycles (Table 6). Pupil 3’s perspective on the type of participation that took place were in line with my own observations in relation to ‘performer pointer’ being her most dominant type of participation. She never chose ‘active audience’ as her dominant type of participation in a lesson but picked ‘performer pointer’ for lessons six, seven a, seven b and eight b. ‘Performer proof with an expert’ was selected for lessons one, four and nine and ‘performer proof without an expert’ was picked for lesson five and eight a (Table 7). She couldn’t vote for lessons two and three as she was absent. With the exception of the lesson on amphibians, Pupil 3’s perspective was that she participated more in these lessons and that she had more speaking opportunities in these lessons also.

4.3.4 Narrative Summary of Pupil Four’s Perspective

When asked in interview one about participation, Pupil 4 said he participated more than he does in other lessons. Science vocabulary and knowledge that he referred to included:
plants, flowers, seeds, anther, lifecycles, effect of temperature changes and amount of sunlight, investigations, eggs and frogs. Drama activities and conventions that he referred to were: ‘fruit bowl’ – “sat on the pillow”, ‘mantle of the expert’ – “four groups which were insects, temperature, water and sunlight”, ‘freeze frames’, ‘pass the story’, – “played with the ball and we told a story”, ‘jumping frogs’ – “answered questions about the frog and went to the other side”. Pupil 4 referred to speaking opportunities, “my job was to tell how we’re going to do the experiment…giving some ideas”. This statement matched the findings of Gay and Hanley (1999) who found that through the use of drama students practiced skills of decision making. He also discussed how it helped collaboration, “working as a team” and recall, “it explains it more and helps you remember, as if you act it out and you forget a bit then you can act it out to help you remember it”.

When asked in interview two if he felt his participation had increased, stayed the same or decreased he responded, “I think a bit more because I think of a sentence and think if it is right or wrong and then if I think it’s right I say it and I took it a bit serious”. In terms of knowledge he articulated a basic understanding of metamorphosis and recalled different species such as mammals, insects, amphibians and nonflowering plants. Drama activities mentioned were: rock, paper, scissors, pass the story, who’s who, agony aunt and two truths and a lie. He outlined he had the same amount of speaking opportunities and stated “yeh it’s fun and you learn more stuff”. Therefore, to summarise Pupil 4’s responses in the interviews, his perspective is that his participation increased in these science lessons but speaking opportunities remained the same to the other lessons that the class took part in.

Pupil 4 chose ‘strongly agree’ when asked if using drama helps increase participation but felt speaking opportunities remained the same as other lessons that the class took part in throughout the year (Table 6). When exploring what type of participation, he felt he showed most often, he chose ‘performer proof without an expert’ for lesson one, five, seven a, seven b and eight a. ‘Performer proof with an expert’ for lessons eight b and nine. ‘Performer pointer’ was never selected and ‘active audience’ only once in lesson four. He chose not to vote for lesson two and three as he found it difficult to recall (Table
7). Therefore, like the previous three case-study participants, his responses were consistent in his interviews and focus group.

4.3.5 Narrative Summary of Pupil Five’s Perspective

Pupil 5 stated she participated the same amount in the lessons on the life cycle of plants and said she wasn’t sure if her participation increased during the lesson on amphibians and reptiles. The scientific knowledge and vocabulary that she mentioned included: plant, seed, stigma, sun, water, temperature, frog, froglet and egg. Drama activities that she recalled were the songs that the class had looked at during the double lesson and the final lesson ‘Lifecycles the Musical’, cushions (fruit bowl) and professor (mantle of the expert). She referenced speaking opportunities when she said, “you get to perform and talk” and also referred to her enjoyment of the lessons, “because I like drama”. Pupil 5 was very distracted by the camera as seen in the video and the class teacher’s notes and this was also apparent in the interview when she referenced less of the activities than the other five case-study participants. This behaviour contradicted the findings of Bozyigit et al. (2014) who stated that active learning made pupils more curious, interested and inquisitive. Pupil 5 originally responded that she felt she participated more in the lessons that used process drama but later in the interview changed her answer to state she participated the same amount as other lessons. She recalled some basic knowledge about animals and species: mammals, caterpillars, eggs, bees and stages. Drama activities she remembered were: who’s who? songs, narration, two truths and a lie and agony aunt. She said she spoke the same amount in these lessons and again expressed her enjoyment of them “because I love drama and when I do drama I learn something more from it”.

Pupil 5 chose ‘strongly agree’ to suggest she had both an increase in participation and speaking opportunities during the science lessons that utilised process drama pedagogy (Table 6). My observations were in line with hers when she felt that her dominant type of participation was ‘performer pointer’ in these lessons. She selected this for lessons three, six, seven a, seven b and eight b. Each of the other types of participation were chosen twice, ‘active audience’ for lessons four and five, ‘performer proof with an expert’ for lessons one and nine and ‘performer proof without an expert’ for lessons two and eight
4.3.6 Narrative Summary of Pupil Six’s Perspective

Pupil 6 noted he participated the same amount in lessons about the lifecycle of flowers and more in the lesson about amphibians and reptiles. His scientific knowledge and vocabulary included: lifecycle of plants, seeds, roots, frog and spawn. Drama activities that he discussed included: ‘freeze frame’ – “making a flower”, ‘role play’ – “are you smarter than a 5th grader”? ‘mime’ – “you made people act out different stages of the frog” and ‘mantle of the expert’ – “I was team leader”. He also referenced speaking opportunities “I mostly sat there and answered questions…If it was tricky and somebody already had their hand up I just kept my hand down, but I did answer questions and help my friends”. Pupil 6 discussed enjoyment also, “I was excited about it, I enjoyed it very much. You get to learn and be active and I don’t like sitting on my chair, I like to be active all the time”. When asked about his participation in lessons five to eight during interview two, Pupil 6 stated he felt he participated the same amount as he does in other lessons. He was able to compare and contrast mammals and reptiles in the interview.

The drama activities Pupil 6 recalled were: two truths and a lie, who’s who? singing and agony aunt. When asked about speaking opportunities he felt he spoke “a bit more as I was more relaxed and had more time”. He also acknowledged that in the singing he didn’t sing every song which links to the findings of Pérez-Moreno (2018) who found that there was a wide range of levels of engagement in the activities. Pupil 6’s responses varied from the ‘same amount’ to ‘more’ speaking and participation in the lessons that used process drama to teach science.

When asked in the focus group, Pupil 6 chose ‘strongly agree’ when asked if using drama helps increase participation but felt speaking opportunities were the same amount as other lessons (Table 6). When exploring what type of participation, he felt he showed most often he chose ‘performer proof without an expert’ for lesson one, two, four, five, six,
seven a and seven b. This links to the findings of Gay and Hanley (1999) who found that through the use of drama students were in charge of their own learning. ‘Performer proof with an expert’ was chosen for three, eight b and nine. ‘Active audience’ was never selected and ‘performer pointer’ only once in lesson eight a (Table 7). Like Pupil 5, his responses varied from the same amount to more for both participation and speaking opportunities in the lessons.

4.4. Summary and Discussion on Pupils’ Perspectives

- Pupil 1’s perspective was consistent in her interviews and focus group. She felt both her participation and speaking opportunities had increased using process drama in lessons.
- Pupil 2’s perspective was consistent in her interviews and focus group. She felt her participation increased and speaking opportunities remained the same when using process drama in lessons.
- Pupil 3’s perspective was consistent in her interviews and focus group. She felt both her participation and speaking opportunities had increased using process drama in lessons.
- Pupil 4’s perspective was consistent in his interviews and focus group. He felt his participation increased and speaking opportunities remained the same when using process drama in lessons.
- Pupil 5’s responses varied between the same amount and more when reflecting on both participation and speaking opportunities but weren’t always consistent between the interviews and focus group.
- Pupil 6’s responses varied between the same amount and more when reflecting on both participation and speaking opportunities but weren’t always consistent between the interviews and focus group.

This research wished to look at participation and speaking opportunities but through interviews with the case-study participants in order to gain their perspectives, the idea of engagement, learning, movement and collaboration were also brought to the fore by the
case-study participants. Links between these concepts will now briefly be discussed linking to the relevant literature but the focus of this thesis was the two former areas of participation and speaking opportunities in the process drama classroom. Bolton (1979) suggested drama could be an effective medium to activate, sustain, or intensify engagement and Wells and Sandretto (2017) showed evidence that process drama resulted in higher levels of engagement, more detailed writing and enhanced depth of thinking. This idea that process drama helps engagement was brought to the fore by my case-study participants. In interview one, Pupil 5 said “I like drama” and in interview two she added “because I love drama” while Pupil 4 stated “yeh it’s fun”. Pupil 2 claimed “it’s funner when we do different activities” and Pupil 3 reflected “because it’s funner and you can move around and we do drama”. They all claimed that this enjoyment helped their engagement.

Freeman *et al.* (2003) explained that improvisation incorporates spontaneous speech and movement and the movement during these activities did not go unnoticed by the children and was seen as a positive concept. Pupil 1 articulated “because you don’t sit in your chair the whole time and then I think I can concentrate better” and in her follow up interview “you’re not always sitting in your chair, you also work together and do some drama with it and I think that helps learning”. Pupil 2 reflected “you make more activities” and “it’s funner when we do different activities and the whole class does the same, but we do it in the circle”. Pupil 3 also celebrated this “because it’s funner and you can move around” as did Pupil 6 “you get to learn and be active and I don’t like sitting on my chair, I like to be active all the time”. Furthermore, this movement allowed for collaboration between individuals, groups and the class. Chan (2009) outlined that drama pedagogy facilitates, self-initiated collaboration, responding to others’ thoughts, feelings and needs and therefore creates dialogue between teachers, students and peers. Way (1967) discussed the importance of learning responsibility through drama, individually and collaboratively. This collaboration was celebrated by Bolton (1979) when he stated drama is a group sharing of a dramatic situation and it is more powerful than any other medium in education. These ideas relate to Pupil 1’s comment when she said “you also work together”. 
4.5. Case-Study Summary of Participation

This section will summarise the findings on participation that answered the research questions:

- To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?
- What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy?

In order to answer the first question on participation, effects were discussed using content analysis, using the video recordings, class teacher observations and the research journal. I drew on ‘a priori directed approach’ for participation, which means that the themes were established prior to the analysis based upon the literature discussed, in this case, the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018). She used a horizontal approach to content analysis. Gay and Hanley (1999) took participation for granted in drama activities but by using Pérez-Moreno’s template, the amount, type and effectiveness of the participation can be observed formally. These observations took place by both the class teacher and the researcher. The conclusion met, was participation does increase for the case-study participants but not immediately and the four types of participation (active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert) were witnessed at different times with all six case-study participants in different parts of the lesson.

Alongside the methods mentioned above, the pupils’ perspectives uncovered in the interviews and focus group were used afterwards in order to answer the second question on participation: ‘What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy’? Cross case comparisons were used when I wished to find commonalities between the six case-study participants ideas and responses which can be seen in the response to the statement on participation shown in the following Figure.
Bozyigit et al. (2014) define participation as learners taking responsibility for their own learning and Dawson and Lee (2018) link this to the benefits of the arts, specifically drama, to improve social emotional and academic learning. This idea that participation in drama activities can enhance learning was also mentioned in the interviews. Pupil 1 linked this idea to the idea of collaboration in drama helping learning when she said, “you also work together and do some drama with it and I think that helps learning” furthermore, she linked it to concentration when she stated, “because you don’t sit in your chair the whole time and then I think I can concentrate better if I do stuff”. In the first set of interviews Pupil 4 also discussed a link between learning and process drama when he said, “it explains it more and helps you remember, as if you act it out and you forget a bit then you can act it out to help you remember it” and he added in his second interview “you learn more stuff”. Pupil 6 stated “you get to learn and be active”. These statements resonate with the work of Even (2008) who stated that traditional instruction by the teacher is gradually substituted by the learners’ autonomous construction of learning content, emphasising the importance of interaction which links to the concepts of learning and movement.

Wells and Sandretto (2017) highlighted that students who sometimes made less contributions in class were more likely to join in when using drama and therefore, I
wished to see if this was also the case with my advanced EAL learners. This was answered by Pupil 5 when she stated, “I like drama as you get to perform and talk”. Even (2008) combines the three concepts of ‘talking’, ‘listening’ and ‘involvement’ calling them ‘interactive exchanges’, leading to participation. The children, class teacher and my own observations suggest that these three concepts occurred when using process drama.

4.6. Case-Study Summary of Speaking Opportunities

This section will address the two research questions (two and four) that were specifically interested in speaking opportunities:

- To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?
- What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?

The former question was answered using the class teacher’s observations predominantly but also observations of the video recorded material and use of the research journal. Findings suggested speaking opportunities remain the same for pupils who volunteer regularly and increase for those that do not. When uncovering pupils’ perspectives, notes were also made on scientific vocabulary and knowledge also when asked about this topic. Pupils’ perspectives on speaking opportunities were summarised in Figure 12, showing that Pupil 1, 3 and 5 strongly agreed that they got more opportunities to speak in science lessons that used process drama, pupil 2 agreed and pupil 4 and 6 neither agreed or disagreed. This uses a theatre diagram to summarise the findings. Each section of theatre seating was attributed with a Likert scale showing strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree and strongly disagree. The pupils’ responses to the statement ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons that use drama than those that don’t were then visually represent on this diagram. This was followed by the scientific vocabulary that arose most during the interview process in Figure 13. This figure demonstrates how scientific vocabulary can be taught and communicated through the use of process drama, as the children were able to discuss and recall the language in the interview process unprompted.
4.7. Summary of Findings

This research aimed to investigate to what extent the use of process drama in the classroom can develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School from both my own and the pupils’ perspectives. This aim was met and summarised in the table below.
### Table 10: Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?</td>
<td>By using process drama as a teaching methodology, participation does increase but not immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent does process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities?</td>
<td>Process drama improved speaking opportunities for those pupils who did not previously participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy?</td>
<td>Pupils’ perspectives suggested that they considered that their participation increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama?</td>
<td>Speaking opportunities either remained constant or increased when compared to their other lessons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section began by outlining the types of participation (active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert and performer proof without an expert) and types of talk (pedagogic/logistic talk, sociocultural talk and in role talk) that would be discussed within these findings. These were based on the work of Pérez-Moreno (2018) and Freebody (2010). Each pupil then received a dedicated section discussing the results from the class teacher observations, research journal and video observations on their participation and speaking opportunities within the science lessons that used process drama as a teaching methodology. These were presented as a narrative summary. An overall summary and discussion was then presented, dedicated to answering the research questions: ‘To what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons?’ and ‘To what extent does process drama advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities. The results suggested that although the effects were not immediate, participation did increase whereas for speaking opportunities, pupils who were less likely to speak out increased and those that regularly volunteered remained constant.
Following from this a section on Pupils’ Perspectives was presented. Again narrative summaries were presented but this time they were based on the results from the interviews and focus group. This section answered the question: What are pupils’ perspectives on their participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy? It suggested that pupils’ felt that their participation did increase when this teaching strategy was used. It also presented results for the question: What are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama? The mixed responses of speaking opportunities increased or remained constant were then presented through the individual narratives before the summary and discussion occurred. The two questions (one and three) on participation were then compared and contrasted before the two questions on speaking opportunities (two and four) were discussed.
5. DISCUSSION

This final section will include a synthesis of the research conducted using the following subheadings: Conclusions, Research Question Conclusions, Limitations of Research, Recommendations and Contributions to Field.

5.1. Conclusions

The aim of this research was to investigate to what extent process drama can promote participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners in an International School. This was investigated by completing a case-study and consequently the experiences and observations made about my six case-study advanced EAL learner participants were documented and analysed. This research has contributed further to the fields of process drama, participation and speaking opportunities and attracted attention to the previously neglected area of advanced EAL learners in the primary school. The benefits derived from participation (Gay and Hanley, 1999; Even, 2008; Bozyigit et al., 2014; Pérez-Moreno, 2018) and speaking opportunities (Freebody, 2010; Mercer et al., 2017) for students were outlined in the literature review in which I also articulated the benefits of process drama in the context of language learning (Stinson and Freebody, 2006; Piazzoli, 2010). The influence of Vygotsky is visceral in this field. Daniels (2016) explains that the theories of Vygotsky are central to any serious discussion about children’s learning processes and in particular, any discussions on speech. Vygotsky (1934, in Rieber, 1999) elevated the centrality of speech: confirming its functional complexity in the context of problem solving. This body of research extrapolates from his work on social interaction – a subject he referred to as a unity of thinking and communication (Vygotsky (1934) in Rieber and Carton, 1987). This concept was relevant to and resonated with the areas of participation and speaking opportunities in this thesis. Vygotsky stated that pedagogy is both the science and art of education (Daniels, 2016). It is perhaps apposite that my work entailed delivering science lessons through an arts based medium – perhaps the perfect symbiosis?
This research highlighted the extent to which process drama can help promote these areas of participation and speaking opportunities. Whilst drama has previously been deployed for beginning language learners (Even, 2008) and secondary pupils (Dunn and Stinson, 2011), there was a lack of focus on advanced EAL learners at primary level and this research has now addressed this deficit.

5.1.1. Research Question Conclusions

The first question posited - to what extent does process drama affect the participation of advanced EAL learners in lessons? This question was seminal to my endeavours in the specific context of EAL pupils. Whilst process drama pedagogy may not have delivered immediate amelioration, the six case-study candidates participation did increase with the passage of time. This conclusion was reached through an amalgam of the class teacher’s observations and my own analysis of the research journal and video observations. The nature of the participation differed - depending on the type of drama activity taking place. Paired and group work resulted in more focussed participation than whole class activities during which the children would sometimes get distracted. These findings were similar to existing literature on participation. Bozyigit et al. (2014) findings found that active learning ensured increased student participation, Even (2008) contended that it resulted in higher levels of participation and cooperation, Gay and Hanley (1999) stated it allowed students to practice skills of participation and collaboration and Pérez-Moreno (2018) outlined that the children played an ‘audience’ role in an activity or are ‘performers.’

Triangulation was a key stratagem to answer with confidence the second research question: to what extent can process drama provide advanced EAL learners with more speaking opportunities? I availed of the same three methods: the class teacher’s observations, the research journal and the video recordings. The observations of the class teacher was critical to an empirical analysis as the class teacher had previous knowledge of the pupils’ contributions. We concurred that speaking opportunities remain the same for pupils who volunteer regularly and increase for those that make less frequent contributions. This approach is particularly accommodating for quieter pupils selected to speak more regularly in a combination of group and whole class games and speaking
activities. This work is significant for current understanding and practice of ‘oracy’ – a concept that has gained increased attention in education over the last decade. There is now unequivocal recognition that good levels of ‘oracy’ are imperative to secure effective participation in the education environment and subsequently transferring into society at large (Mercer et al., 2017). There is an onus now on schools to provide the resources and methodologies to ensure students develop confident and cogent linguistic skills. Conversation and articulation stimulate children's cognitive development. This research provides practical examples as to how process drama can be a vehicle for this objective – even in combination with an unusual pairing such as science.

By using a case-study approach, I was able to gain an in depth understanding of the experiences of my participants (Ponelis, 2015). I engaged in conversations with the research participants in the natural setting of their classroom environment (Creswell, 2014), building up a rapport with the research subjects and subsequently gaining their perspectives. I examined their perspectives to utilise triangulation and garner a deeper level of analysis. The optimum sample size of six (Eisenhardt, 1989) resulted in rich qualitative data (Crabtree and Miller, 1992). The interviews and focus group allowed me to gain pupils’ perspectives and facilitated an answer to the question - ‘what are pupils’ perspectives on participation during lessons that adopt a process drama pedagogy’? An empirical extrapolation from pupils’ perspectives affirmed that participation increased.

The fourth question raised in this research attempted to glean the perspectives of the pupils: ‘what are pupils’ perspectives on the amount of speaking opportunities during lessons that embrace process drama’? The data collated suggested that pupils’ indicated that speaking opportunities either remained constant or increased. The pupils’ perspectives varied on this topic: from a belief that speaking opportunities did not increase but remained the same as other lessons, to an opinion that speaking opportunities did increase when using process drama in lessons. When concentrating on speaking opportunities both in the interviews and within the focus group, expressions from the pupils included inter alia: “I spoke a bit more as I was more relaxed and had more time”. The children discussed the different types of participation that they enjoyed in the lessons and could distinguish between ones that leant themselves more to speaking opportunities
e.g. performer proof with an expert and those that may demonstrate participation but not necessarily speaking e.g. active audience. Inexorably this resulted in more mixed responses to this research question.

5.1.2. Limitations of Research

There were limitations to this research and the small sample size was an obvious constraint. In addition, the pupils already knew me personally and Lincoln and Guba (1985) discuss how such limitations may compromise neutrality or contaminate confirmability of trustworthiness. This inherent danger impels me to postulate as to whether the pupils simply said what they thought I wanted to hear because of my position and our personal relationship. Furthermore, this study’s findings were context specific. This data represents a particular group at a specific time and could potentially have delivered different results had the research been conducted at a different time and with a different group. I must also concede that there were limitations with my methodology. Hsieh and Shannon (2005) discussed how researchers might find supportive evidence of a theory and that in the cases of interviews; probe questions might lead to participants agreeing with questions to please the researcher. I tried to address these issues through reassuring the pupils and holding an information session prior to commencing my research. Of course, a limiting factor of case-study research is that it does not allow generalisations to be made (Yin, 2013). I needed to be conscious of these constraints and conceivable compromises. Time constraints precluded a more extensive collaboration with the class teacher and vicariously restricted the available data. Although it was a conscious decision to adopt both the researcher and practitioner roles, managing both was intrinsically problematic. Whilst it allowed me to have valuable insight into the planning and delivery, making decisions as actor, director, playwright and teacher simultaneously, inevitably it restricted my ‘field of vision’ when delivering the lessons (Dunn and Stinson, 2011). I had to divide my attention between teaching and researching and consequently I was compelled to relinquish my research journal. I attempted to obviate the problem by videoing the sessions and subsequently reflecting on them and collating evidence. Despite these limitations, I am confident that a case-study qualitative approach to address my research aim was the most apt. I applied the ethics requirements with due diligence.
Despite the constraints of size, I am convinced that the data collated was sufficiently detailed, clinical and uncompromised to merit scientific scrutiny.

5.1.3. Recommendations

I must confess that having conducted this research, I would suggest that the topic would benefit from a more protracted study and one in which a larger number of classes would participate. A large scale project would facilitate contrasts across different schools and disparate age groups. It would also be a personal goal to repeat the study but being solely the researcher to avoid the tensions and turmoil inherent in the ‘duopoly’ of teacher and researcher. Whist I recognised the dilemma from the outset, I had no alternative as the school insisted on the continuum of my teaching. Although engagement was not a focus of this thesis, the theme recurred in the interviews and focus group when gaining pupils’ perspectives on process drama. Pupil 1 began by saying “I liked it because you don’t sit in your chair the whole time and then I think I can concentrate better if I do stuff”. Pupil 2 claimed, “you make more activities and yeh that’s fun”. Pupil 3 added, “because it’s funner and you can move around and we do drama”. Pupil 4 also said, “it’s fun and you learn more stuff”. Pupil 5 stated, “I love drama and when I do drama I learn something from it”. Pupil 6 claimed, “I was excited about it, I enjoyed it very much. You get to learn and be active and I don’t like sitting on my chair, I like to be active all the time”. The recurrence of this theme was coded in my data analysis and findings but as my research was not focussed on engagement; my attention to the subject was somewhat cursory and personally would be an interesting concept for future research.

An existential aspect of this research was unravelling and identifying the pupils’ perspectives on their participation and speaking opportunities. The children had no input into the format of the research or into the analysis of the data. Lundy et al (2011) cautioned that examples of young children as ‘co-researchers’ remain rare but there is a movement away from using children as simply research participants to either peer or co-researchers. The rationale for this evolution is to optimise the findings extrapolated from the data whilst ensuring the integrity and import of the contribution by the children. Murphy et al (2013) demonstrated how children could assume the role of co-
researchers at all stages through the agency of children’s’ research advisory groups (CRAGS) – challenging them to explain as to how they would approach assessment if they themselves were the teachers. Another novel approach was predicated upon an invitation to answer not in a personal capacity but as a representative ‘children like themselves’. The approach appears to have ensured greater objectivity and generated detail. This could be an interesting model to trial in the future. These studies successfully contributed to methodological discussion about the involvement of young children. I trust that my focus group, executed entirely through drama, also makes a valuable contribution. Research should always be open to new ideas and collaborative in nature and I would welcome an opportunity to avail of other tools and models such as these in any future projects.

Finally, from a policy perspective, this study’s findings suggest that there is a plethora of benefits when one exploits the potential of process drama in the classroom. The project demonstrated that process drama, properly delivered, instils confidence and provokes creativity. The subject stimulates children as individuals and prompts them to embrace group activities with energy and enthusiasm rather than reluctance and action. O’Sullivan (2018) outlines that within research studies, it is “beginning to feature as a key teaching, learning and assessment strategy in many publications across a diverse range of academic and professional disciplines” (p.623). Yet despite the overt outcomes and other covert gains, drama is not given the status of a distinct subject and is subsumed within English. The subliminal, if unintended, message to practitioners delivering the British National Curriculum is that process drama is not deserving of a separate status, should not be used cross curricularly and only within the English curriculum. This demotion is something with which I would take issue – particularly after the outcomes from my research.

5.1.4. Contributions to Field

My review of the literature had highlighted the inherent benefits of participation e.g. helping assess learning, improve knowledge and to prepare pupils for society (Varis et
al., 2018) and speaking opportunities e.g. allows pupils to participate effectively in classroom life and in wider society (Mercer et al., 2017). However, whilst it gave recognition to the application of process drama, I am confident that this thesis made a further contribution and addressed some deficits. Drama had been exploited as a teaching strategy with beginning language learners (Even, 2008), but until now, there had been no attention or attempted analysis on its efficacy with a cohort of advanced EAL learners in the upper primary school ages. Although I exploited the existing analysis tools created by Pérez-Moreno (2018), the study was unique in its application of them in a contrasting area. This research was predicated to a degree on previous results from similar research topics but makes a distinct contribution because of the unique amalgam of process drama, participation, speaking opportunities and experiences of advanced EAL learners.
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Appendix A - Lesson One Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.4.19</td>
<td>How do you plan an investigation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Objective
To plan an investigation about the lifecycle of a flower

Introduction

Slide 2: Teacher in role - Hello everyone and thank you so much for coming here today. As you can see we have gathered the top scientists from all over the world to help us with our investigations about the lifecycle of plants. I think it’s important that we first introduce ourselves today before we get down to work. My name is Professor Philomena Plant and I would like to welcome you all to my Botanical Gardens in Ireland. Professor R would you mind standing up and telling us what country you have travelled from today to be with us.
(Class teacher “Hello I am Professor R and I have come all the way from England today”)
Fantastic! I believe we have four French scientists today, could they please make themselves known to us, hello and you are Professor? We also have 1 Danish scientist, 1 Spanish, 3 Dutch, 2 German, 1 Italian, 3 British, 1 Belgian, 1 Indian, 1 Portuguese, 1 Ukrainian and 1 Kenyan.

Slide 3: Role play - (Put apron on and in role begin planting seeds) – I would like to begin with a team building exercise, as we are all plant experts, I would like to begin by making these botanical gardens even more beautiful and doing some planting. Ok so make sure you spread yourselves out as these plants definitely need room to grow. Make sure you take a seed and begin planting. What must we do first? Yes, we need a hole, let’s dig out a hole for our seed firstly. So, let’s place our seed and cover it up with dirt, make sure it is nice and deep, so it doesn’t wash away. What do our seeds need to grow? Now we need to water our seeds. What else do we need to grow? I am now the sun shining down on you.

Slide 4: Mime – What do all plants start as? What happens? Let’s all pretend to be a seed. Each time one of these instructions are articulated I will clap my hands and you will become the seed/flower. Seed, wiggle ready to burst, sprout appears, roots planted in the ground, rain, sun, grow tiny seedling, full sized plant, blossom, seed distribution, land somewhere else.
Main Activities

Slide 5: Hot seating – Today we are going to be split into four teams, we are all going to be given the same plant and we are going to plan an investigation on how either sunlight, temperature, water or availability of insects affects the lifecycle of a plant. I believe in the room we have four chief investigators, could you please come forward? What is it you want to find out? What do you think will happen? Great, if you could go and stand in the four investigation areas. Next we have four statisticians. What will you keep the same in the experiment and what will you change? Now I would like to introduce my data analysts. Can you explain how you might display the data that you collect? Last but not least, I would like our four team leaders to come forward.

Plenary

Slide 6: Mantle of the expert – In your groups you are going to prepare a video presentation. I will be giving funding to the best planned investigation. You will video this in the next lesson and send to me.

Key Vocabulary
Lifecycle

Cross Curricular
Drama, Maths and Science

Resources
Apron, water spray bottle, PowerPoint, Prompts, Stickers
Appendix B - Lesson Two Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.5.19</td>
<td>How do conditions affect the lifecycle of a plant?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Objective**

To plan an investigation on how conditions affect the lifecycle of a plant.

**Introduction:** Slide 1: *Mantle of the expert* – All children will sit in their table groups from the previous lesson and have a short recap of what each table was investigating and the names of the roles of each of the children. Reference back to drama vocabulary will occur.

**Slide 2: Teacher in role** – Teacher will return to the role of Professor Philomena Plant and explain that we need to improve our videos if they are to be successful in gaining funding. Explain we are going to watch a selection of videos that have already been submitted.

**Main Activities:** Slide 3 – 11: *Spotlight and role play* - Each video entry will be scrutinised and discussed. Talking partners, group discussions and whole class will be used to consider what makes a good video presentation. These have been pre-recorded by the class teacher to show successful examples of entries. They will be completed using a snap chat filter to give the impression of different characters but also to explain how we can work in and out of role.

**Slide 12: Mantle of the expert** – Videos will be made and submitted. Reference should be made to the prompt sheets and videos when explaining tasks before they are emailed.

**Plenary:** Slide 13: *Narration* - We all have a passion for plants in this room, so I would like to finish our investigation today with a bit of meditation. Close your eyes and let’s imagine the lifecycle of a flowering plant. If I tap your head I would like you to read: 1. The Flowering Plant Life Cycle. 2. The seed starts to grow when conditions are suitable. 3. Roots grow, usually underground. 4. A stem and leaves form and the plant makes its own food. 5. This is called photosynthesis. 6. Seeds are produced from flowers. 7. Seeds are spread out, so they can grow where they are not fighting for space with the parent plant.

After this activity they will repeat it but this time about the lifecycle of a nonflowering plant which will differ in number six when it states - “Spores are produced without flowers”. The children will be asked if they noticed the difference.

**Key Vocabulary**

Lifecycle and Photosynthesis.

**Cross Curricular links**

Drama, Maths, Science and Computing.

**Resources**

Apron, water spray, four group signs, chair and prompts.
Appendix C - Lesson Three Plan

**Date** 3.5.19  
**Time** 9.00am

**Question(s):** What is the difference between reproduction in flowering plants and nonflowering plants?

**Learning Objective(s)**
To find out about the life cycle of flowering and nonflowering plants. Be able to name parts of the flower.

**Introduction**

Slide 1: *Fruit Bowl* – Children will sit in a circle and they will be given three names Anther, Filament or Stamen. They will play fruit bowl but instead of fruit use these names of the parts of the flower.

Slide 2: *Freeze Frame* – An explanation will be given that these are the male parts of a plant and shown afterwards on the screen. Children will create freeze frames to recreate parts of the flower (petals, leaves, stamen). The children will be grouped in fours or fives.

Slide 3: *Fruit Bowl* – Children will repeat the game, this time saying: stigma, style, ovary.

Slide 4: *Freeze Frame* – I will explain that these are the female parts of a plant and shown afterwards on the screen. Children will create freeze frames to recreate parts of the flower.

**Main Activities**

Slide 5: *Teacher in role* – The researcher will take on the role of host and introduce ‘Are you smarter than a 5th grader’? A quiz naming the parts of the flower.

Slide 7: *Movement* – A whole class dance will take place showing the lifecycle of a flower. Seed dispersal will be demonstrated through the ‘shooting out of a flower’. The teacher will talk through the movements with accompanying music. Group 1 – seed, group 2 - roots, group 3 – stem, group 4 – leaves. Group 1 - inside of the flower, group 2 – petals, group 3 – seed dispersal, group 4 - plant as separate seeds, so the lifecycle can repeat again.

Slide 8: *Mime* – Children will be split into four groups and given a type of seed dispersal (wind, water, fruit that animals eat and then scatter or stick to animals) to devise a mime.

**Plenary**

Slide 9: *Performance* – Guessing what type of seed dispersal each group was given.

**Key Vocabulary**
Lifecycle and seed dispersal.

**Links:** [http://nicertube.com/4w7bzn](http://nicertube.com/4w7bzn)

**Cross Curricular links**
Drama, Science and PE.

**Resources**
Chairs  
Envelopes.
Appendix D - Lesson Four Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Question(s):</strong> What are the main stages of a lifecycle of a frog?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>What makes an animal an amphibian?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Objective (s):</strong></td>
<td>To find out about the lifecycle of amphibians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

Slide 1: *Teacher in role* – Last week we crowned the 5th graders the winners of the semi-final ‘Are you smarter than a 5th grader’? We have invited the finalists back today to see if they can beat the other 5th grade finalists. The International School of Neverland managed to come up with nine facts! Can we beat their record?

**Main Activities**

Slide 2: *Role play* – What do you know about our topic – lifecycle of a frog?

Slide 3: *Role play* – Children fill in a minimum of ten facts.

Slide 4 to 13: *Rap* – Explain their award is that they have been chosen to perform live on TV, singing in the closing ceremony of ‘Are you smarter than a 5th Grader’? Are there any additional facts after the performance that we can add about amphibians?

Slide 14: *Pass the story* – They will learn how to play pass the story and then in groups, pass the ball and add a line each time telling the lifecycle of a frog, taking it in turns to say one line at a time. Afterwards, the children will play as a whole class but only saying one word at a time.

Slide 15 and 16: *Two truths and a lie and teacher in role* – Pretend to be a game show host and get three children to call out three statements, while the class vote for which one they believe to be false.

Slide 17: *Teacher in role* – Continue the gameshow but this time getting the children to match definitions to the glossary.

**Plenary**

Slide 18: *Jumping frogs* – Get the children to mime being frogs and if they successfully answer a question they can jump onto a lily pad and leave the room.

**Key Vocabulary:** Metamorphosis, Life Cycle and Amphibian.

**Cross Curricular links:** Drama, Science and Music.

**Resources:** Hat for rap and four soft balls.
Appendix E - Lesson Five Plan

**Date:** 22.5.19  
**Time:** 1.15pm  

**Question:** What is the difference between incomplete/complete metamorphosis?

**Learning Objective:** To find out about the life cycle of insects.

**Introduction**  
**Slide 1:** Draw the outline/diagram of two lifecycles in books showing complete v’s incomplete metamorphosis.  
**Slide 2 - 16: Narration** – Fifteen children will take a prop from the prop bag about the story of ‘The Very Hungry Caterpillar’. The five remaining children will then try to match the sentences to the props. As a whole class they will try to sequence the story. Why are we reading this book?  
**Slide 17 – 24: – Butterfly rap** – Remind children about the rap that I performed and explain that today they’re going to be the performers. Split the class into two and follow instructions on slides which explain when each group or soloists should perform during each section.

**Main Activities** (Bees):  
**Slide 25: Hula hoop** – Explain that we are moving onto a new lifecycle now. The children will stand in a circle holding hands with a hula hoop added between two children. The children will read a sentence each on the PowerPoint about the lifecycle of a bee. If they break the circle they have to start again. They will pass the hula hoop around.  
**Slide 26 - 27: Freeze frame** – 1 person becomes the body (thorax) of the bee, 1 person becomes the abdomen, 6 people become the legs, 2 people become the antenna, 2 people become the wings, 1 person will be curled at top with 5 fingers for the bees eyes. The children have to guess what part of the bee each pupil is representing. Then the children will be read a description of each body part and will have to sit down after the description has been called.  
**Slide 28 - 29: Two truths and a lie** – Play two truths and a lie based on the lifecycle of bees.  
**Slide 30: Detectives** – Play voice over. Treat the children like detectives and get them to complete the three stage lifecycle in their books. Play the ladybird and dragonfly lifecycle and play voiceover (time permitting). Quiz on lifecycle and add to books.

**Plenary**  
**Slide 31 - 36: Agony Aunt** – Act as host of a talk show and read out the letter from the caterpillar, ask for advice from the children about what we should reply before showing the response. Ensure children are using scientific vocabulary.

**Key Vocabulary:** Lifecycle, Caterpillar, Bee and Dragonfly  
**Cross Curricular links:** Drama, Science, Music and English.  
**Resources:** Hula Hoop, Puppets, Agony Aunt letters, Bee Layout, Butterfly Rap and Hat.
Appendix F - Lesson Six Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: 5.6.19</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time: 1.15pm</td>
<td>To understand what a mammal is and learn about its lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Objective(s)**

To understand what a mammal is and its lifecycle.
To introduce the gestation period of a bird.

**Introduction**

Slide 1: *Counting game* – Children will play the number game. They have to count to ten as a class but if they say a number at the same time as someone else then they start again.

Slide 2: *Guess the reader* - Envelopes will be stuck under random chairs, one child will leave the room, six children will be invited one by one to read their definition of a mammal and the person who left the room has to guess who is reading. What animal family have we discussed?

**Main Activities**

Slide 3: *Mammal game* – Refer back to our number game, as a whole class pupils have to name as many mammals as they can, without repeating any or saying one at the same time.

Slide 4: *Rock, paper, scissors* – Lifecycle of a mammal. Instead of saying the terms – rock, paper and scissors, they will use the terms embryo, young and adult.

Slide 5 and 6: *Two truths and a lie* – Three children will be called to the front to read two, truths and a lie and the class have to guess which they think is the lie.

Slide 7 -10: *Who wants to be a millionaire? Teacher in role* - discussing gestation periods. Eight children will find animals in their tray and then stand in the order they guess the gestation period lasts.

**Plenary**

Slide 11: *Narration* – Introduction to the gestation period of a bird. Twenty one sheets of paper will be read in the order of days, so every child will speak over background music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Vocabulary</th>
<th>Cross Curricular links</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mammals, embryo and gestation</td>
<td>Drama and science</td>
<td>Envelopes, two truths and a lie sheets and eight animal pictures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix G - Lessons Seven and Eight Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question(s): What characteristics do mammals have? What is the lifecycle of a bird? What are the similarities between amphibians and reptiles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Objective(s):** To compare and contrast lifecycles.

### Introduction

**Slide 1:** Instructions on where to sit and what to do. Explain carousel of activities.

**Slide 2:** Mammal – *Who am I?* – What group do these animals belong to?

**Slide 3:** Mammal – *Who am I?* – What characteristics does a mammal have?

**Slide 4:** Mammal – *Who am I?* – What are the three stages of the life cycle?

**Slide 5:** Mammal – *Who am I?* – Explanation and demonstration of task using mammal cards.

**Slide 6:** Amphibians and reptiles sorting – What group do these animals belong to?

**Slide 7 and 8:** Two truths and a lie – Explanation and demonstration of task.

**Slide 9:** Hula hoop – Explanation of extension – Venn diagram of amphibians and reptiles

**Slide 10:** Insects - What group do these animals belong to?

**Slide 11 and 12:** Insect Agony Aunt - Reference back to previous Agony Aunt lesson and explain that they will respond to a similar sob story from a honey bee and hoverfly.

**Slide 13:** Bird narration – Watch the lifecycle of a bird, press mute and improvise over it.

### Main Activities

Move between four groups every ten minutes completing the carousel of activities.

Encourage children to change partner for each activity. In between each activity a new song from ‘Lifecycles the Musical’, will be taught and rehearsed.

### Plenary

Tidy up stations and provide an opportunity to clarify any misunderstandings.

### Key Vocabulary

- Mammals, birds, amphibians, reptiles and insects.

### Cross Curricular Links:

- Drama, Science, English and Maths.

### Resources:

- Mammal flash cards, amphibian fact sheet, reptile fact sheet, whiteboards, hula hoops, posted notes, Dr K Fisher responses.

**Links:**

[http://nicertube.com/j2bvbt](http://nicertube.com/j2bvbt)
**Appendix H - Lesson Nine Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Question(s): How do animals affect other species lifecycles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.6.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.15pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Objective (s):** To perform Lifecycles the Musical

**Introduction**
- *Teacher in role* – Pretend to be a director and introduce myself and the musical ‘Life Cycles’ by Ron Fink and John Heath.
- *Mantel of the expert* – Treat students like acting experts who have passed the audition to take part in the show. Pretend that we are taking part in a first read through.

**Main Activities**
- *Dancing* – ‘Seed in the ground’. *Freeze frame* – Part of the plant lifecycle. *Script reading* of hosts, animals and plants.

**Plenary:** *Final song* – Lifecycles, create competitive atmosphere.

**Key Vocabulary:** Metamorphosis, pollution, ice age and reproduction.

**Links:** [www.badwolfpress.com](http://www.badwolfpress.com)

**Cross Curricular links:** Drama, Science, English, Dance and Music.

**Resources:** Script, prop per person, microphone, audio material and piano.
Appendix 1 – Extract from Video Transcriptions

Extract from Video Transcription of Lesson Four

Researcher: So, we are back with our ‘smarter than a 5th grader’ and we are in the final! Congratulations give yourself a pat on the back or a round of applause. Today we are going to find out what you already know. So, this is the final, you haven’t been told what our topic is going to be about. Neither were the International School of Neverland, but you have been given the same category, can you guess what it is?
Class: Frogs.
Researcher: Frogs. Ok, I want to see can you beat the International School of Neverland, do you know ten facts at least because they got 9 facts about frogs. You can talk on your tables for one minute.
(Children discuss)
10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. Don’t get disqualified…. silence. Fact number 1, hands up if you have a fact. Pupil 2?
Pupil 2: Some frogs are poison.
Researcher: Some frogs are poisonous, it’s true. Pupil 4?
Pupil 4: Some frogs can glide down?
Researcher: Glide?
Pupil 4: Yes, from trees.

Extract from Video Transcription of Lesson Five

Researcher: I’ve had some very sad news. As you know I’m an agony aunt which means that everyone writes to me to ask advice and tell me their sad news. So, this letter is called ‘Battle of the bulge’. Do we know what bulge means?
Class: No.
Researcher: It means that they feel really fat, it’s not a nice feeling, they are very self-conscious.
Researcher: Battle of the bulge. Dear Mr K Fisher (my name of course), I’m a caterpillar and I’m worried about myself. My body has grown alarmingly and my
skin’s so tight I feel it’s going to burst. Could my eating habits be to blame? I feed all
day on juicy green leaves – they are surprisingly delicious – and I just can’t stop, do you
think this could be the problem? Always hungry, in the leaves. Poor, poor caterpillar.
What should we respond to this caterpillar?

**Pupil 15:** Don’t worry because it is just a bit of the lifecycle of the caterpillar and when
you’re fat enough you will build a cocoon and this is part of the lifecycle.

---

**Extract from Video Transcription of Lesson Nine**

**Researcher:** Congratulations everyone you have passed the audition! You have been
chosen to be my cast of ‘Lifecycles the Musical’ so welcome to our first rehearsal. Put
your costumes on and get ready, some of them are a little small so just place on your
head. Remember we are professional actors, so I expect that you don’t talk in between
as they are paying me a lot of money as I am a famous director. If you settle down and
we are going to start with our song. You heard it in the audition last week. I would like
you to stand up and remind me why I picked you.

**Class sing:** Here’s our show about some life cycles
How plants and critters grow
Here’s our show about some life cycles
We’ll tell you what we know.

**Researcher:** Ok, I know you are sight reading this, but you have been learning music
for the past 24 years of your life. So, I would like to invite our professional musicians,
Pupil 19 and Pupil 3, at the start of each verse they are going to give us a clear 4 beats.
Let’s have this a lot louder.

**Class sing:** Here’s our show about some life cycles
**Researcher:** Brilliant.

**Class sing:** How plants and critters grow
Here’s our show about some life cycles
We’ll tell you what we know.
Appendix J – Classroom Teacher Observation Template

Class teacher’s template for observations of Pupil one’s participation during lesson one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discuss the participation of Pupil one during the following activities</th>
<th>Comparison with her general behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slide 1 – Welcome slide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 2 – Teacher in role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 3 – Role play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 4 – Mime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 5 – Hot seating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 6 – Mantle of the expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 7 – Narration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accompanying definitions provided by Pérez-Moreno (2018):

1. Active audience role - “an adult or a child performs the activity while the other children observe and listen with attention to the actions”. This is achieved by observing the pupils’ facial expressions and body language and determining whether they are participating in the activity in this role. Therefore, they make visual contact with the players and are quiet and connected.

2. Performer pointer - “observable behaviour that we interpret as partial performance of the activity”. Therefore, participation may not be apparent throughout but still worthy of noting and pupils seem to copy other peers or adults within the activity.

3. Performer proof with an expert - “the child participates in the activity and carries out observable actions that allow us to verify their participation”. This means they develop the activity or parts of it with the help of an adult or peer, doing observable actions that demonstrate their participation in the activity.

4. Performer proof without an expert - “the activity is carried out autonomously”. The children in this scenario do not require adult assistance.
Appendix K - Focus Group Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>26.6.19</th>
<th>Question: Did learning science through drama affect your participation or speaking opportunities?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1.15pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Objective: To reflect on the lessons and gain pupils’ perspectives.

Introduction: Explain that there are no right or wrong answers in the focus group and it is a time to reflect on the lessons they have been doing with me.

Slide 1 – 7 - Where do you stand? – Introduce the game ‘Where do you Stand’? Children will stand along the line depending on their views. The terms ‘strongly agree, agree, neither, disagree or strongly disagree’ will be displayed along the line to help children but they will be told that they can also stand between terms. To ensure understanding, statements such as ‘I prefer cats to dogs’ and ‘chocolate ice cream is the best flavour’ will be used to ensure children have understood the task. When I am confident they understand we will use the statements ‘using drama in lessons helps me join in more’ and ‘you get more chances to speak in science lessons with drama than science lessons without drama’. Children’s opinions will be discussed.

Main Activities: Slide 8 – Freeze frame – Children will be asked to make a freeze frame of what joining in and participating means to them to make sure we come to an agreement of the term when we discuss it.

Slide 9 – 12 – In order to get children’s opinions on the types of participation reflected on in this study (active audience, performer pointer, performer proof with an expert, performer proof without an expert) four teddy bears will be introduced to represent these types (Winnie the watcher, Connor the copier, Pat the performer and independent Ian). These will be explored and explained through drama conventions such as role play and still images and drama games such as ‘I went shopping’ and ‘mirroring’.

Slide 13 – 19 – Who’s Who? – Children will reflect on their type of participation in each of the nine lessons by going to the teddy that they thought most represented them in the lesson, giving their reason why.

Plenary: Children will compare the type of participation they feel they display in other lessons compared with the main type they have shown in these drama lessons.

Key Vocabulary: Participation, speaking opportunities and reflections.

Cross Curricular links: Drama, Science and English.

Resources: Four teddies, chairs and tape.
Appendix L – Interview Questions after the First Four Lessons

1. Can you tell me what lifecycles we have been learning about in science?
2. Can you tell me what we talked about when we looked at the lifecycles of flowering and nonflowering plants?
   *If you would prefer to tell me using freeze frames and thought tracking you can.*
3. What did we discuss about the lifecycles of animals?
   *If you would prefer to do this through hot seating you can.*
4. Do you think you talked much in the lesson?
5. Did you talk more, less or the same amount in your other science lessons?
6. Did you join in with the lesson?
   *If yes, how?*
7. Did you enjoy learning science through process drama?
   *Why?*

Interview Questions focussing on Lessons Five to Eight

1. What lifecycles have we been learning about?
2. Can you tell me what you know about these?
3. Can you remember any activities we did in these lessons?
4. In these lessons do you think you joined in more, the same amount or less than your other lessons in school?
   *Why?*
5. In the science lessons that used process drama do you think you had more chances to speak in those than science lessons normally or less, or the same amount?
   *Why?*
6. Do you enjoy learning science through drama?
   *Why?*
Appendix M – Information Leaflet for Head Teacher about Research

Title of the project
A Case-study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.
Process drama refers to a teaching strategy that uses drama conventions e.g. role play and improvisation to structure lessons (Wells and Sandretto, 2017).

Background
Alongside working in your school, I am a postgraduate research student at Queen’s University Belfast. The course I am enrolled in is a Doctorate in Education. For my dissertation I hope to investigate the use of process drama in science lessons and its impact to see if it affects participation and speaking opportunities in the classroom. I wish to explore student opinions, alongside the observations made by the class teacher in Year 5 and my own observations.

Study Design
I will teach a series of nine science lessons on life cycles over a period of ten weeks, which will cover the same learning objectives and scientific skills outlined in the British Curriculum and our current school policies. The lessons will incorporate process drama. All children in the class will partake in the session and if permission is granted, the session will be videoed. There will be six children chosen to be the focus of the case-study if informed consent is granted. Any contributions during the sessions that these children make will be transcribed. The same children will later be interviewed and take part in a focus group, to gain their perspectives on the sessions. These interviews will be audio recorded. I hope that I can avail of the school student council room for the interviews.

What happens to the information collected?
All the information transcribed will be anonymised and the videoed and audio recorded data will be stored on a protected drive. The intention is that this will only be viewed by myself and my supervisory team. Data will be destroyed five years after the project’s completion.
Participation
Although research will take place during normal class lessons, participation in the study i.e. video and audio recorded interviews alongside the focus group is entirely voluntary and the participants, parents or guardians are free to withdraw from the study. Research will take place between April 24th and June 25th 2019. You, as the head teacher can withdraw by 8th May 2019. Furthermore, the class teacher can withdraw, preventing her observations being used by July 2nd 2019. The students, parents and guardians can withdraw a week after the interviews have taken place on July 9th 2019.

Further information
Research will not take place without full ethical approval from the University and consent from the school, parents or guardians and pupils.

If you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many thanks
Investigator: Mrs Dearbhla McDonnell    dmcgdonnell13@qub.ac.uk
Supervisor:  Dr Aisling O’Boyle        a.oboyle@qub.ac.uk
School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work - Queen’s University Belfast.
Appendix N – Head Teacher Consent Form

Title of the project: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

I have read the attached information leaflet, which explains the research about using process drama in the classroom in order to develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners.

I understand that the letter is asking Year 5 children to participate in videoed lessons, interviews and a focus group.

I understand that all the information gathered would be kept strictly confidential and that the children’s names and the name of the school will not be included in any reports.

I understand that participation is voluntary and that pupils, parents or guardians can withdraw consent during the time of data collection and up to one week after the interviews on July 9th 2019.

I understand that this research will be published in the form of a doctoral dissertation.

  o I agree that Year 5 pupils can take part in videoed sessions.
  o I agree to pupils in the school partaking in interview sessions and a focus group.
  o I agree pupils’ responses can be used if anonymised and understand that they will form part of a doctoral dissertation through Queen’s University Belfast.
  o I am aware I or the school cannot have access to the video or audio recordings.
  o After 9th May 2019 I am aware that I will no longer be able to withdraw consent.

Signature of Head Teacher: ____________________________ Date: ___________
Appendix O – Parent or Guardian Information Leaflet

Title of the project
A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

Process drama refers to a teaching strategy that uses drama conventions e.g. role play and improvisation to structure lessons (Wells and Sandretto, 2017).

Background
I am currently a music specialist in the school your child attends. Previously I taught as a class teacher for eight years. I am currently enrolled on the Doctorate of Education course through Queen’s University Belfast. For my dissertation I intend to explore to what extent using drama affects participation and speaking opportunities in the classroom. I wish to explore student opinions, alongside the observations made by the class teacher.

Study Design
I will teach a series of science lessons on life cycles, which will cover the same learning objectives and scientific skills outlined in the British Curriculum and our current school policies. These lessons will incorporate process drama. All children in the class will partake in the sessions and if permission is granted, the session will be videoed. There will be six children chosen to be the focus of the case-study if informed consent is granted. Any contributions during lessons will be transcribed and the case-study children will later be interviewed and partake in a focus group to gain their perspectives on the sessions.

What happens to the information collected?
All the information transcribed will be anonymised and the videoed and audio recorded data will be stored on the University’s protected drive. The intention is that this will only be viewed by myself and my supervisory team. Data will be destroyed five years after the project’s completion.
Participation
Although research will take place during normal class lessons, participation in the study i.e. video and audio recorded interviews alongside the focus group is entirely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the study until 9th July 2019 without explanation. Your decision to decline the invitation will not affect your child’s learning experience or have any other implications.

Further information
Research will not take place without full ethical approval from the University and consent from the school, parents or guardians and pupils.

If you have any questions or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Many thanks

Investigator: Mrs Dearbhla McDonnell      dmcdonnell13@qub.ac.uk
Supervisor:    Dr Aisling O’Boyle         a.oboyle@qub.ac.uk
School of Social Sciences, Education and Social Work - Queen’s University Belfast.
Appendix P – An Example of a Translated Parent or Guardian Information Leaflet

Formulaire de consentement pour l’étude de cas d’un parent ou d’un tuteur

J'ai lu le dépliant d'information ci-joint, qui explique la recherche sur l'utilisation de la pédagogie fondée sur l'art dramatique en classe afin de développer la participation et les occasions de s'exprimer pour les apprenants avancés en ALS.

Comme on a demandé à mon enfant de participer à l'étude de cas, je comprends que la lettre demande à mon enfant de participer à des leçons et à des entrevues filmées.

Je comprends que tous les renseignements recueillis resteront strictement confidentiels et que le nom de mon enfant et le nom de l'école ne figureront dans aucun rapport.

Je comprends que ma participation est volontaire et que je suis libre de retirer mon consentement en tout temps (ou au moment de la collecte des données ou jusqu'à la soumission d'une transcription anonyme).

Je comprends que cette recherche sera publiée sous la forme d'une thèse de doctorat.

☐ J'accepte que mon enfant puisse participer à des sessions vidéo J'accepte que mon enfant participe à des entrevues et à des séances de discussion.
☐ J'accepte que les réponses de mon enfant soient rendues anonymes et fassent partie d'une thèse de doctorat de l'Université Queen's de Belfast.

Signature : ____________________________ Date : ___________
Appendix Q – Parent or Guardian Video Consent Form

Title of the project: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

I have read the attached information leaflet, which explains the research about using process drama in the classroom in order to investigate participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners.

While my child will not be part of the interview process, I understand that the letter is asking my child to participate in videoed lessons.

I understand that all the video material will only be accessed by the researcher and her supervisory team and if any of my child’s responses were transcribed they would be anonymised alongside the name of the school.

I understand that participation in the video is voluntary.

I understand that this research will be published in the form of a Doctoral dissertation.

Please tick one of the boxes below:

☐ I agree that my child can take part in videoed sessions.
☐ I agree that my child can take part in the videoed lesson, but I would prefer that they are not visible in the video.
☐ I do not want the lesson to be videoed.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________________
(Name)
Appendix R – Parent or Guardian Case-Study Consent Form

Title of the project: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

I have read the attached information leaflet, which explains the research about using process drama in the classroom in order to develop participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners.

As my child has been requested to partake in the case-study, I understand that the letter is asking my child to participate in videoed lessons and audio recorded interviews alongside a focus group.

I understand that all the information gathered would be kept strictly confidential and that my child’s name and the name of the school will not be included in any reports.

I understand that participation is voluntary and that pupils, parents of guardians can withdraw consent during the time of data collection and up to one week after the interviews on July 9th 2019.

I understand that this research will be published in the form of a doctoral dissertation.

☐ I agree that my child can take part in videoed sessions.
☐ I agree to my child taking part in audio recoded interviews and a focus group.
☐ I agree for my child’s responses to be anonymised and form part of a doctoral dissertation through Queen’s University Belfast.
☐ I understand that I can withdraw without explanation one week after the lessons and interviews have taken place on July 9th 2019.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________________________
Appendix S – Pupil Information Session PowerPoint

TEXT SLIDE 1 – Hello Year 5, I have come to talk to you today about a research project that I would like to do with your class. The title of my study is: A Case-study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

A case-study is when you choose a few students and you write down what they say and do and then talk about what their responses might mean.

Process drama is using drama activities in lessons. I will be teaching your science lessons next term and I would like to do this using drama.

Participation means taking part or joining in during lessons and an EAL learner refers to anyone who speaks another language other than English at home.

TEXT SLIDE 2 – As you know, my name is Mrs. McDonnell and I am a music specialist and teacher in the school. I am a teacher, but I am also a student. I will be teaching the
lessons and also doing the research. A researcher is someone who studies something. I will be studying how people participate in the lessons that I am teaching to try and help me become a better teacher and understand more about your participation and speaking opportunities.

TEXT SLIDE 3 – linked to slide 2.

TEXT SLIDE 4 – I would like to do this research for two reasons. I am a student doing a Doctorate in Education and I am writing a thesis. The second reason is I would like to find out if using drama helps participation or speaking opportunities. If it does, I will use it more in my lessons and if it doesn’t I would like to find a different way to help with these two things.

TEXT SLIDE 5 – I have been reading lots of articles about using drama with children who are learning English, but I haven’t found much information on using drama with advanced EAL learners (children who are very good at speaking English but use other languages at home). I would like to use this class to focus on this.

TEXT SLIDE 6 - I will be teaching your science lessons on life cycles through drama. Everyone in the class will take part in the lessons but if you don’t want to be in the video you don’t have to. I will be writing what everyone says in the lessons but without using their name. I will be asking six people to let me write down what they say and do in the interviews and focus group too. You don’t have to agree to this and you or your parents can withdraw up until July which means that if you don’t want to take part in it anymore you don’t have to.

TEXT SLIDE 7 – If you take part in the case-study you will be part of the normal lessons. Alongside this your teacher will observe you, that means she will write down what you are saying and what you are doing in the lesson. Twice I will also ask you to come for a ten minute interview to tell me what you thought of your participation and speaking opportunities in the lesson and if you allow me, I will record what you say. I will also ask if you would take part in a focus group with the five other students.
TEXT SLIDE 8 - I am hoping to reflect, that means think about my teaching. If my case-study tells me that process drama didn’t help your participation or speaking opportunities I will think about other ways of teaching that might help this. Although your name will be changed on the thesis, people will be able to read what you said in a lesson if you agree. How might that make you feel? This is why you can withdraw at any time during the research if you would prefer not to share what you said in the lesson, interview or focus group.

TEXT SLIDE 9 - Although I will video the session, the only people who may see the videos will be myself and my supervisors. I will write down what some people say and this will be written into my thesis, but the name of the pupil who said it and the name of the school will not be listed.

TEXT SLIDE 10 – The information will be used in my thesis and stored for five years securely before it is destroyed.

TEXT SLIDE 11 - The University I go to make sure that my research is ethical, this means they make sure that consent is given by schools, parents and pupils before I start and that all of your identities are hidden.

TEXT SLIDE 12 – Your parents are going to receive information about my research and if you or they have any more questions they can email me or my supervisor. Any questions?
Appendix T – Pupil Video Consent Form

Title: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process drama – acting in class without learning lines</th>
<th>Participation – joining in</th>
<th>Speaking opportunities – talking as part of the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image of process drama" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image of participation" /></td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Image of speaking opportunities" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I listened to the PowerPoint

I know I am being asked if I can be videoed.

I know I can say no to being videoed.

I know it will be stored on a computer.

I understand that this research will be published in the form of a Doctoral dissertation without my name or the name of my school.

Please tick one of the boxes below

- [ ] I am happy to be videoed in the lesson
- [ ] I am happy for the lesson to be videoed, but I would not like to be seen
- [ ] I am not happy to be videoed in the lesson

Signature: _____________________________   Date: ___________________________
Appendix U – Pupil Case-Study Consent Form

Title: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process drama – acting in class without learning lines</th>
<th>Participation – joining in</th>
<th>Speaking opportunities – talking as part of the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image of process drama" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image of participation" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image of speaking opportunities" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I listened to the PowerPoint

I know I am being asked if I can be videoed.

I understand that if I agree to an interview it would be recorded.

I know that my name and the name of my school will not be used and that the video will be stored on a computer.

I know I can withdraw until July 9th 2019.

☐ I understand that this research will be published in the form of a Doctoral dissertation.

☐ I am happy to be videoed in the lesson

☐ I agree to taking part in interview sessions and a focus group that will be recorded

☐ I agree for my responses will be anonymised and form part of a doctoral dissertation through Queen’s University Belfast

☐ I understand I can withdraw until July 9th 2019.

Signature: _____________________________ Date: ____________________________
Appendix V – Class Teacher Consent Form

Title of the project: A Case-Study of Process Drama in the Classroom: Developing Participation and Speaking Opportunities for Advanced EAL Learners in an International School.

I have read the attached information leaflet, which explains the research about using process drama in the classroom in order to investigate the effects on participation and speaking opportunities for advanced EAL learners.

I understand that the lessons will be videoed and interviews will take place with the six children chosen in the class. I understand that all the videoed material will only be accessed by the researcher and her supervisors and if any of the children’s responses were transcribed they would be anonymised alongside the name of the school and my written responses.

I understand that participation in the video is voluntary.

I understand that this research will be published in the form of a doctoral dissertation and may include my written observations.

☐ I agree that my class can take part in videoed sessions
☐ I agree that my written responses can be used in the final dissertation
☐ I agree to be videoed

Signature: ____________________________ Date: _______________________
(Name)