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This research offers an examination of the application of a resource to support Drama in Education (DiE) as a teaching tool. The scope of this small-scale, qualitative research was two-fold: i) to develop a teacher resource; and ii) to study its effectiveness in supporting teachers. My goal was to explore the experiences of professionals to see if the resource I created was effective in developing teacher confidence in integrating drama-based methodology into their regular programming. The research undergoes three phases: i) the formulation of the professional resource, ii) field-testing of the resource and data collection, and iii) data analysis with the final stage being modification of the resource. Based on the data collected from semi-open-ended interviews with two elementary teachers, and personal notes shared by the participant teachers, there appears to be clear evidence the resource is effective in developing educator confidence. The research also offers various implications for teachers and administrators, school boards, and other research in DiE.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This research examines the application of a drama in education resource as a teaching tool. The aim of the research is two-fold: first, to develop a teacher resource, and second, to study its effectiveness in supporting teachers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of a curriculum-based resource in supporting elementary teachers’ efforts to use more drama methods in their regular teaching. As the researcher, I have a background in theatre, so I am most interested in the use of drama as a teaching tool. The research questions for this study include:

- What do teachers, with little to no drama background, need and want in a teaching resource so that they feel supported in their efforts to use drama methods?
- How well would a curriculum-based resource that provides specific activities and lesson plans meet teachers’ needs for integrating drama into their teaching?
- How does the integration of drama methods affect the teaching experience?

Personal Interest in the Topic

Some of my fondest memories of school involve teachers allowing some of my classmates and I to create and perform skits or experiments based on a topic we had studied or were interested in. Throughout the 1980s, I had a few teachers who were willing to carve out some time in the instructional day for student-conceived, creative explorations, or allowed a different form of presentation – again, student-initiated – and those lessons and projects stood out for us as students more than anything else.
Eventually, I realized I had a passion for theatre and, after starting my university career in science, chose to study theatre full-time. Over the years since my undergraduate degree, I discovered how much I owe my theatre training and experiences for helping me through life’s challenges. In fact, once I began teaching, I discovered I used more of my theatre training than my actual teacher training in the classroom. I also noticed that my students tended to be more involved in lessons if they were interacting with each other or preparing for some sort of presentation connected to their ideas or interests. However, not everyone liked to perform or present something to an audience, so I limited these kinds of activities despite my passion for them. I had not yet realized a very important fact: drama does not always involve a polished presentation for an audience (Schonmann, 2005).

In 2015, when I began reading articles for my Masters of Education degree, I learned there is some difference between the two: theatre involves communication with an audience, whereas drama focuses on the experience of the learner (Bailin, 1993, as quoted in Schonmann, 2005). Even though I majored in Theatre Arts for my undergraduate degree, I used the terms drama and theatre interchangeably. I have since learned, however, that they are different entities. Theatre and drama are not mutually exclusive, though they do share some overlapping qualities, they are not entirely the same thing (Andersen, 2004; Schonmann, 2005). The main difference for me is that theatre performances require an audience which is separate from the performers, while drama activities do not necessarily need a separate audience or an audience at all beyond the performers themselves – although they can, if the situation warrants that experience.
Supporting Drama in Education

Backstory

In 2003, I moved to Japan to teach English to young children (ages 6 months to 12 years) with a company called Model Language Studio (MLS). The company had developed a drama-based method of teaching English, which is what attracted me to their table at a local job fair. Classes involved copious amounts of gesturing, singing, dancing, playing games, using puppets, props, costumes, and visuals – all to teach English language skills. The lessons required the students to be active participants, practicing the language in various situations. It seemed to be very effective. It did not take me long to develop a passion for teaching, and to theorize how effective many of the activities I learned with MLS could be for teaching and learning French. In fact, I remember a few of them were used in my first three years of French Immersion. MLS students over the age of 2 years old had to perform a short play, which was usually a fairy tale, for the parents at the end of the term to demonstrate how much had been learned. The rest of the time, student learning was demonstrated through their participation in the games and activities in class.

After returning from Japan, I received some training in the integration of arts in teaching, and there was some information regarding the use of theatre in teaching other subjects. The main focus of the course text and articles was visual art, but my classmates and I – myself being the only one with theatre training – took it upon ourselves to explore the use of role-playing, improvisation, playwriting, and music in teaching social concepts which were often covered in elementary classrooms. Once I began teaching, I found few resources to support the use of arts in regular classroom teaching outside of teaching that specific subject. The art form, which tended to be visual art, was often the main focus,
using some general theme from another subject instead of the other way around. A few resources applying dramatic arts seemed to demand a certain amount of theatre experience or knowledge, or that the teacher was teaching a drama class, while others were so thick even I would not even bother reading them due to time constraints. I began to wonder if teachers would use the arts more if there were easy-to-use resources available to support them.

**Background to the Problem**

I believe there is a fundamental, on-going problem in education that drama in education (DiE) could effectively address. In Paulo Freire’s work, including a chapter entitled, “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” (1970), Freire describes an education system suffering from, “narration sickness” (p. 71) in which teachers deposited information into passive listeners (students) who were presumed ignorant. Freire called this style of education *banking education* (p. 72). Admittedly, education has been through several reforms since 1970, so do we really need to be concerned about *banking education* anymore? Sir Ken Robinson would assert we need to be.

A TED Talk by Robinson, a creativity expert and arts education advisor in the United States, explains that our education system is shaped after an industrial model which is linear, prioritizes conformity, is standardized, and produces batches of people (2010). During that same talk, Robinson also declares that schools kill creativity. Moreover, bell hooks describes children as, “relentless interrogators” (2009, p. 8) – but that this natural desire and passion for thinking ends when they enter the world of education, in which the goal is to have them conform and obey. As students progress through traditional education, they even begin to dread thinking, and adopt a strategy to
simply, “consume information and regurgitate it at the appropriate moments” (p. 8).
Robinson and hooks suggest that banking education is still alive and well. Hooks does mention that some individual Professors prioritize critical thinking, but the fact that she can pinpoint individuals suggests that education as a practice of freedom is the exception rather than the rule (2009). If the promotion of critical thinking was commonplace, for instance, it would be easier to pinpoint the educators who do not make it a priority for their students; the educators whose approach to teaching includes an emphasis on encouraging and challenging students to think for themselves would not be the outliers.

Freire’s (1970) proposed solution was to have teachers and students adjust their dichotomized relationship into a joint partnership, and to engage in problem-posing education (p. 79). Problem-posing education (PPE) involves students and teachers continuously working out problems or concepts together without any narration of information. The problems would have to be relevant to the current realities of the students involved and be presented to them for their consideration. By applying drama methods as a teaching tool, with PPE as the instructional context, PPE would be easier to adopt and, therefore, may make it a common reality. Hence, I explored the literature to find out what research existed regarding the implementation of drama methods. Who is applying them? Where are these methods being taught? Are they being taught, and to whom? What are the barriers? Do these methods help to meet the same curricular expectations and test scores as current methods, or maybe exceed them? In other words, what does the literature say about using drama in various contexts and its subsequent impact on student learning outcomes?
**Educational Context of the Problem**

When reading through articles and studies regarding the use of drama methods in education and teacher training, a few recurring themes emerged. First, over the course of several decades, in several countries such as England, Australia, the United States, and Norway, various forms of drama methods have been studied and found to be highly effective tools for learning a wide range of subjects and skills (Betts, 2005; Cogswell & McLauchlan, 2014; Duffy, 2014; McFadden, 20012; McKean & Sudol, 2002). Second, after reading different case studies, narratives, and surveys regarding both teachers’ perceptions of drama and arts in education (Andrews, 2010; Hundert, 1994; Murray, 2001) and teacher training and the use of process drama (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; O’Toole, 2011), I discovered that teachers often express an interest in learning more about and using drama methods, but have little support or resources to help in that endeavour. Some studies indicate that an ongoing, comprehensive approach to teacher training is the most effective and supportive for teachers, but a lack of time and resources – such as funding, trained facilitators, teacher materials, etc. – prevent or discourage further development (Andrews, 2010; Steele, 2015). Studies also indicate that a large proportion of teachers emphasize a need for drama and arts integration training during teacher education or pre-service programs (Kaaland-Wells, 1994; Sæbø, 2011). Moreover, teachers have also expressed a need for supportive materials such as lesson plans and learning assessment tools to help them with their efforts in integrating drama methods into their teaching (Hundert, 1996). With an expressed need for more time to practice, more interaction or collaboration with colleagues and trainers over time, and more support from administration as being helpful (Betts, 2005), the goal to develop
curriculum material for DiE is justified. Hence, my goal with this research study is to develop a curriculum resource and assess its efficacy at supporting elementary teachers apply basic drama methods into their teaching practice.

This study will involve two to three experienced teachers teaching at the Junior level (Grade 4 to 6). I aim to explore the experiences of these professionals to see if the resource I create would be effective in developing teacher confidence in integrating drama into their regular teaching. By connecting the methods to curricular expectations and subject matter that the teachers are familiar with, as well as drama expectations and the life skills often associated with DiE, I hope to emphasize the value and validity of DiE. As a secondary application, these connections could also serve to provide the teachers with information they could use to demonstrate the value of this methodology to colleagues, administration, or parents, if needed.

**Researcher Assumptions**

My first assumption that underpins this project in its entirety is that drama methods are effective teaching tools, primarily because I believe they offer opportunities for creative and critical thinking for both students and their teachers, which, in turn, helps to make the learning and teaching experience more effective, engaging, and rewarding. Secondly, I assume that drama methods and activities allow for the development of several skills at once, in addition to a deeper understanding of concepts due to their experiential nature and cognitive connections. My third assumption is that teachers are under immense pressure to meet a multitude of expectations simultaneously, and often feel overwhelmed and under-supported, which could then lead to teachers losing their passion for education. Finally, I assume that if teachers had a chance to try basic DiE,
they would see that further professional development (PD) in that area would help their students achieve better outcomes in all subject areas. This way, teachers could, perhaps, feel more free to pursue whichever Additional Qualification (AQ) courses they prefer rather than feeling pressured to take subject-specific or skill-specific courses to ensure that their students achieve higher test scores.

**What’s Next?**

The remainder of this document will present a review of the related literature, an explanation of the research design and methodology, an analysis of the results, and a discussion of the implications of this research. Chapter Two, the literature review, will address research related to DiE, its connection to curriculum expectations and design, teacher identity, and pre-service and in-service teacher training and professional development. Chapter Three will explain the development of the handbook, and the steps followed for data collection and analysis. Chapter Four will present the handbook used by the participants in their classrooms. Finally, Chapter Five will share the results from the data collection and the resulting changes made to the handbook, in addition to the implications for researchers, teachers, and public-school board administrators alike.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Two, the literature review, is divided into four main sections. First, an overview that defines Drama in Education (DiE) is presented, followed by a review of literature connecting drama to the three main concepts that will serve as the design framework for my handbook: i) creative and critical thinking; ii) collaboration and communication; and iii) motivation and engagement. Each of these concepts are interconnected and are directly involved in the application and practice of drama – both as requirements for application and as results of participation.

Drama in Education: An Overview

Drama in education is, “a tool of education” (Schonmann, 2005, p. 32). It is not about simply producing a play, doing drama for its own sake to expose students to the arts, or teaching acting techniques (though it could include these elements); rather, the aim of DiE is to create experiential and inclusive learning experiences which enable learners to develop in a multitude of ways (Fels & Belliveau, 2008; Schonmann, 2005).

Drama strategies or structures – the ways that we, as practitioners, integrate drama into learning – are usually kept within the classroom, though it can take many forms, with the main purpose of using them to create contexts or frameworks for students (Johnson, 2002; Schonmann, 2005; Stinson & Freebody, 2006). Within these contexts, critical spaces are formed in which students become collaborative problem-solvers (Duffy, 2012). When drama strategies are employed within a learning context – for instance, a school or a workshop – that it is when it is often called Drama in Education (DiE).

Blatner (1995), a psychotherapist and drama therapist, describes DiE as a form of mental hygiene by learning not only information but also problem-solving,
communication, and self-awareness via experiential forms of education such as role-playing or socio-dramas. Similarly, Blatner (1995) explains that, “[d]rama in education reflects a shift from an over-emphasis on informational content to a more balanced inclusion of attention to the processing of ideas” (p. 92). Likewise, Patrice Baldwin (2008), a renowned DiE practitioner, explains that DiE involves physical and mental activity, where participants interact and respond for the purposes of social development, learning, and thinking. Indeed, DiE is about, “exploring ideas, issues, and relationships through imaginary, metaphorical, symbolic, creative play” (Fels & Belliveau, 2008, p. 60), and not about acting for a separate audience or being in the spotlight. As Fels (2008) puts it when discussing performative inquiry, which is a form of DiE,

Performative inquiry in the classroom brings to the curriculum a spirit and practice of inquiry, critical and creative thinking and reflection, and embodied engagement. The ambition is not simply to “put on a play” or expose children to the arts, but to use the arts as an active means of critical and creative inquiry in pedagogical engagements across the curriculum. (p. 8)

For educators, this description may sound intriguing – but what does it really mean to be creative? What is involved in critical thinking? What does embodied engagement look like, and how might it benefit students or teachers? And, more specifically, how might a specific art form, such as drama, be applied across the curriculum? The following literature review will address these questions and bring into focus the main research questions of this project and the formation of the professional resource that emerges from this work. The first three sections of this literature review involve the three main concepts which underpin that professional resource and the
analysis of the data collected from participant teachers who will field-test the resource. The final two sub-sections also address the research questions regarding the needs of teachers.

**Creativity and Critical Thinking**

This section seeks to define *creativity* as a concept and highlight literature focussing on research involving drama methods and their ability to encourage students to apply higher-order thinking and imaginative capabilities. There are also studies examining the cognitive connection between DiE and learning that will be reviewed. Figure 1 lists some commonly-accepted evidence of creative and critical thinking as described by creative experts, educational researchers, and Ontario curriculum guides that are discussed in this chapter.

**Creation and Creative Thinking**

There is a common view of the arts which assumes that simply participating in an art – and, therefore, creating something such as a painting or a song – means that you are being creative (Bailin, 2011). While original creation can certainly take place within artistic practice, there are some pedagogies that diminish creativity. According to Bailin (2011), there is great scope for creativity, but simply *doing* art does not necessarily indicate that you are *creative*. Take a typical arts and crafts activity in the elementary classroom, for example, where teachers assign a specific design or model for students to follow for a specific purpose – let’s imagine, for instance, a hand-print turkey for Thanksgiving. Here, the educator will provide the required tools, some materials with a limited range of colours, sizes, textures, and step-by-step instructions. When students are instructed to replicate a model exactly as shown, the children will be evaluated or praised based on
Critical and Creative Thinking:

- problem-solving, reflection, improvisation, original ideas, self-assessment, questioning (self, others, information, situations, etc.), expression through a role (with words or movement), using imagination, decision-making, adapting to something new.

Figure 1. Evidence of Critical and Creative Thinking.
how accurately they mimic the model. Whatever the result, in this scenario, the children did participate in art-making, but were not encouraged to be creative. Consequently, the teacher’s assessment of the product alone, using grades and feedback, will indicate whether or not creativity is valued.

Another belief about creativity, according to Bailin (2011), is that participants are free from all constraints when practicing the arts, but this is not entirely accurate. Creativity does not have to be described as chaos, though it can have messy moments. DiE is not confined to spontaneous improvisation or free-play, but rather, often includes constraints and guidelines, making creativity possible in all aspects of dramatic work (Bailin, 2011). Within the constraints of the dramatic form, Bailin (2011) suggests that there is an interplay between invention and critical judgment, and imagination, knowledge, and skill. In this way, drama promotes organized – but creative – thinking, necessitating the mastering of skills and knowledge of form, combined with imagination and invention.

Other creativity and education experts, such as Cogwell and McLauchlan (2014), find that among other various features that make process drama effective as a teaching and learning tool was that it, “allowed students to create and express ideas through art, a communicative experience that enriched both cognitive understanding and affective response” (p. 72). Students often appreciate opportunities to demonstrate creativity. For instance, written student responses to an arts-based intervention study by Pruitt, Ingram, and Weiss (2014) included statements such as: “[Art] helps my brain function right so I can be creative” (p. 14). Another student in Pruitt et al.’s (2013) study spoke of how art allowed for a better visualization of ideas that were then more easily transferred into
writing (p. 14). In a survey designed to measure aspects of students’ higher-order thinking skills, 73% responded that they often or always, “understand many different points-of-view about the same subject” (Pruitt et al., 2014, p. 16). Other aspects that got very high ratings involved creation and invention. Similarly, in a separate study, a more common reason (63%) students in Norway said they should study drama was for, “increased creativity when learning” (Sæbø, 2009, p. 68).

The skills and processes noted when engaging in art can be described as transferable skills. Specifically, higher-order thinking skills like decision-making, visual interpretation, and critical perspective-taking are valued skill sets across contexts. Providing opportunities for students to be creative does not mean they stop questioning or thinking about their actions. In fact, students are required to think more actively about the topic, their choices, and their understanding, which further develops their learning and creativity. This can be seen in a study by Duffy (2011) in a Grade 3 social studies class. Duffy found that the participation in role-playing led to students actively working through, “problem spaces” (p. 125), in which they explored different perspectives within a fictional framework. This engagement transformed the, “historical third person (this person does this on this date) to the active first” (Duffy, 2011, p. 125). Subsequently, students were able to produce more accurate and rich writing (in-role) by employing empathy, inference, and other higher-order thinking skills. Duffy (2011) concludes that these drama methods were an excellent avenue to provoke changes in thought and action.

As Bailin (2002) explains, fostering creativity is more a matter of developing critical judgment rather than withholding it. In their book, Fels and Belliveau (2008) share an example of an introductory science lesson with elementary students in which a
variety of skills are needed. Here, Fels personally describes a 10-day project in which she and a classroom teacher combined all the core subjects under the theme of air pressure to prepare students to engage in improvised scenes, which eventually become a complete public performance of five historical moments of flight. Throughout this project, the students conducted research, applied principles of design and physics, observed weather conditions, wrote letters (in historical roles) to famous aviators, and created and developed dialogue to communicate their understanding, learning, and ideas for the story and their characters. Students had to get creative with the creation of backdrops, sound effects using every-day objects, dialogue, and the story line. Students also had to re-evaluate their airplane design and their dialogues as they explored and discovered new information. The teacher supported their performance by taking on the role of a Quality Control Engineer. On the day of the performance, even the audience got drawn into the scene as the students’ model plane’s first flight appeared to go awry (above the audience), but then succeeded just as the Wright Brothers’ flight did, bringing the whole experience to life. DiE does not need to include a full performance or outside audience as in this example, but the experience clearly demonstrates how comprehensive the integration of drama can be, especially in terms of student and teacher creativity and critical thinking.

Hendrix, Eick, and Shannon (2012) explored the connection between creative teaching approached and the development of critical thinking during a study that combined creative drama with an elementary school inquiry-based science program. The researchers found that drama and science share many of the same objectives: communication, the expression and sharing of ideas, inquiry, problem-solving, critical reasoning, and imagination. These researchers also note that both disciplines are socially
constructivist in nature – a belief shared by Gül and Gücüm (2015). The results of the study show that even high-achieving students demonstrated a deeper understanding of abstract science concepts resulting from the creative drama methods used in combination with the hands-on materials. Additionally, scientists who promote a *Brain Targeted Teaching Model* (Hardiman, 2003) suggest that different creative and drama-based activities enhance cognitive and higher-order thinking. In Hardiman’s model, there are six different but interrelated “brain targets of the teaching and learning process” (p. 2) which are linked to research and applied through various hands-on and interactive activities. Hardiman mentions the visual and performing arts specifically should be, “included in every learning unit” (p. 3).

**Metacognition and Critical Thinking**

Johnson (2002) and Duffy (2011) note the potential for developing critical thinking abilities through participation in process drama. Johnson’s (2002) research, (which is heavily influenced by Baldwin’s 2008 work), focuses on metacognition at the elementary level (ages 5 to 11 years-old). Johnson (2002) points out that children are active thinkers. She compares the types of thinking drama demands with McGuinness’ (1999) concept of *high-quality thinking* (p. 597, as cited in Johnson, 2002): both are complex, non-linear, involve problem-solving, finding or making meaning, and exploring multiple viewpoints and criteria that may conflict. The role of questioning and reflecting – both in and out of role – is a key factor in developing the complex thinking in children as they create (Johnson, 2002). One student pointed out that, “[d]rama makes you think about what’s going on around you” (Johnson, 2002, p. 600). Johnson (2002) concludes that, “drama has the potential to enhance children’s thinking skills and metacognition,
which are pivotal to their learning” (p. 601). She adds that as a bonus, teachers may also benefit by improving their questioning strategies and increasing their awareness of the scope of thought brought about by focused questioning.

In addition, DiE has the potential to promote critical thinking in relation to power differentials. As a renowned advocate of critical pedagogy, Freire (1970) recommends that teachers and students engage in a dialogic relationship to counteract and think differently about the top-down narration of information commonly seen in classrooms. He argues that education should be both transparent and transformative, and that teachers and students need to play interactive, collaborative roles to release them from what he calls “narration sickness” (1970, p. 1). Nelson (2011) adds that regarding power and community, drama’s communities of learners engage, “in a collective struggle against the status quo” (p. 81). Students involved in Nelson’s (2011) study reported that the helping roles within the role-drama activities where the ones that most enabled them to feel empowered. Moreover, participants demonstrated a positive change toward critical thinking, and specifically, an increased sense of empowerment and agency to affect change in their realities.

Beyond thinking critically in the cognitive domain, Blatner (1995) writes about how drama methods such as role-playing and improvisation develop curiosity, empathy, the courage to question, mental flexibility, and other healthy habits of mind. He points out that thinking skills such as metacognition, receptivity of the ego, and shifting personal assumptions are all connected as natural outcomes of participating in popular drama methods. In fact, role-playing is portrayed as a means of allowing us to explore
and accept, “real elements in human life” (Blatner, 1995, p. 94) such as intuition and imagination.

**Collaboration and Communication**

As the second focus of this literature review, this section brings together studies and articles discussing the communal nature of DiE, and the effects that collaborative activities and problem-solving have on learning. Included in this review is scholarship which illustrates the power of DiE to promote dialogue, communication, and a sense of cooperation among students and teachers. Also, several connections are made between the curricular expectations relating to communication and collaborative skills for core subjects such as language arts, math, and science, and the skills developed by the use of DiE methods in a variety of studies. Figure 2 lists characteristics of collaboration and effective communication mentioned in the literature that follows.

**Connectedness and Collaboration**

In the classroom – or in any working group setting – a sense of community can be developed as group members share ideas and collaborate to solve problems. Given that the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) curriculum places an equal emphasis on the cognitive, emotional, physical, and social development of students, it makes sense to consider the role that DiE could play in achieving those outcomes. There have been several articles and studies addressing this topic from different perspectives. Firstly, Ferrari (2011) makes that case that dramatic acts in education are
**Collaboration and Communication:**
offering and accepting ideas, expressing thoughts and feelings, offering suggestions, working together, supporting others, being flexible to situations or the needs of others, active listening, writing, speaking, partnership, student-teacher relationships

*Figure 2. Evidence of Collaboration and Communication.*
intrinsically collaborative and explore human connectedness due to its social nature – meaning DiE involves, “the recognition of, attendance to, and synchronization with others” (p. 74). Likewise, citing the work of Fuglsang and Olsen (2004) and Steinsholt and Lovlie (2004), Sæbø (2011) explains that the field of drama, as we know it, is primarily, “connected to a student activated pedagogy with an inextricable foundation in progressive pedagogy” (p. 23). Connecting this progressive pedagogy to socio-constructivism, Sæbø (2011) suggests that student potential in the learning process is dependent on the possibilities he or she has access to or imagines. This link to socio-constructivism is echoed by Hendrix, Eick, and Shannon (2012), who posit that creative drama supports this paradigm in that, “the learner makes meaning through firsthand experience in a social setting with an informed facilitator” (p. 826). In other words, DiE offers students opportunities to work together, constructing their own experiences through perspective-taking and role-play, while at the same time, working with subject matter.

Other researchers have expressed congruent views of the collaborative, or communal, elements of drama, both as a discipline and as a pedagogical tool. For example, Schonmann (2005) declares that DiE contexts celebrate human interactions, thereby allowing students to create and share meanings together. McLauchlan (2007) similarly describes the transactional pedagogy (as opposed to transmissive) as being the most effective in teaching teachers about DiE. Transactions, by their very, nature require collaboration – or, a give and take of ideas. Conversely, Nelson (2011) promotes process drama, play making, and in-role improvisation as being uniquely positioned to create a sense of community and agency among the players. Moreover, Julie Dunn (2016)
promotes process drama as a form of complex dramatic improvisation which can lead to “collaborative creativity” (p. 29). She points out various writers in the field who recognize the cooperation required by participants to explore and create a shared dramatic experience or reality. Finally, Swartz (2015), while describing Additional Qualification (AQ) courses for DiE in Ontario, shares one of the main underpinnings of the field, which is that, “[d]rama is dependent on group participation, and being present, face to face with others” (p. 46). Clearly, experts in the field, teachers, and students exposed to DiE, among other educational theorists, have observed the communal aspect of drama in the classroom – but how does it work?

Learning happens when students are engaged together in drama; one of the crucial elements of DiE is collaboration (Duffy, 2012). Sæbø (2011) demonstrates how collective learning and individual learning processes are reciprocal, but the quality of the collective learning and teaching correlates to the quality of individual learning. This is because, “[c]urriculum is ‘brought to life within a performative context that is relational and collaborative - meaning making is deepened, and what is learned is immediately relevant” (Fels & Belliveau, 2018, p. 44). These authors further their point by explaining that when students are collectively creating contexts in which content matters, curricular material becomes, “situated so that relationships, issues, prior knowledge, personal experience, consequences of decision making, and gathering information become integral to student learning” (Fels & Belliveau, 2018, p. 45). They emphasize that a variety of collaboration and communication skills are required for students to work and learn together. This thought leads to the other half of the equation: communication. Collaboration cannot happen without effective communication and dialogue.
Communication and Dialogue

Communication and dialogue are both natural elements of any drama activity. An example of the communicative environment that drama can foster can be found in Hendrix, Eick, and Shannon’s (2012) study of an inquiry-based elementary science program integrated with creative drama. They found that the two disciplines shared many of the same objectives, including an emphasis on discourse and oral communication, and the sharing, expressing, and formulation of ideas. In this study, the teacher acted as a facilitator, engaging in discussions with students, listening to discussions between students, and taking advantage of teachable moments as they emerged. In the end, the researchers formed a theoretical framework for integrating drama with science which was primarily social in nature.

According to Swartz (2015), all students, no matter their abilities or exceptionalities, can participate in improvisation and dialogue on some level. Communication through movement, improvised sounds, and even frozen expressions can be just as – or, if not more – effective as words. Drama methods include a wide variety of expressive options so that teachers can provide every student – with every ability – a chance to express their ideas and feelings. Swartz (2015) explains that learning through drama develops critical 21st century communication skills (both orally and written) including innovation, creativity, imagination, problem-solving, and the ability to work with others. Admittedly, this may seem like a tall order to fill for one approach, and yet, it seems that students participating in drama activities tend to achieve them. Consider the following studies and their results.
McLauchlan and Winters (2014) found that students who participated in drama in high school listed one of the positive influences of that experience as being able to create and collaborate based on their interests and experiences. Drama not only gives students an outlet of expression, but also their own agency. It is a collaborative experience that is under the control of the entire group. In this way, it, “allows the possibility of student ownership of the learning situation…” (Stinson & Freebody, 2006, p. 29). For instance, Stinson and Freebody (2006) explain that in their study, process drama methodology was contrasted with more typical language teaching and described it as collaborative, inclusive, and a safe space for language experimentation. Their project was called the Drama and Oral Language (DOL) project, and it involved the use of drama interventions to engage students in Singapore in several language activities including, “interviewing, collaboratively creating roles and relationships, explaining, describing, persuading…” (Stinson & Freebody, 2006, p. 35). The researchers found that when ‘not-so-authentic interactions’ resulting from the typical contrived and rigid teacher-student relationship were replaced with conversations that took place during process drama activities, the students were better equipped to solve problems, question, answer, report, etc. The results of the study were significant and positive across all areas of assessment.

Equally positive results were found in another study by McFadden (2012). This study was conducted in New Jersey, and involved integrating theatre arts techniques into regular curriculum. The study highlights that elementary students from the experimental groups, “overwhelmingly agreed with the following statements: ‘The workshops helped me to work better with my classmates in groups’ and ‘The workshops have had a positive effect on how we treat each other in our class” (McFadden, 2012, p. 90). These
encouraging results appear to be repeated in a later study by Steele (2015), which credited drama methods for shifting student attitude and energy about learning. In this case study, elementary teachers observed students who were typically reluctant to participate in class willingly join in collaborative storytelling activities. The participating teachers witnessed their students energetically supporting each other during their collaborations, which was a departure from the norm. The end results of the students’ engagement included a higher quantity and quality of writing – everyone was capable and willing to participate. Therefore, it seems that support from peers is not only an element of positive communication and collaboration, but also acts as a motivator for continued engagement.

**Motivation and Engagement**

Lastly, the following section describes the scholarship surrounding the third foundational pillar of this study: motivation and engagement. Here, connections will be made between student attention, participation, and learning, as well as how DiE can hook students into becoming active participants in their own learning. Then, there is an examination of how learning occurs through the use of simple drama methods. Figure 3 lists evidence of motivation and engagement based on observations by researchers and teachers, as shared in the literature that follows.

A common theme that is salient within the research regarding DiE is that the key to effective teaching and learning is student motivation and engagement. Some educators choose to apply drama structures because they make learning fun, they engage the students, and allow for deeper meaning-making than more standard teaching methods, such as lecturing. Using the rationale that students tend to be bored in history class due to the standard practice of memorizing facts and passively listening to lectures, Cogswell
Motivation and Engagement:
showing interest, making an effort, taking risks, expressing a desire to learn or continue with an activity, participating, paying attention (to the group, one’s self, or a discussion, etc.), confidence

Figure 3. Evidence of Motivation and Engagement.
and McLauchlan (2014) decided to explore process drama as a means of effectively engaging learners. The combination of engaging stimuli – including photos, newspapers, letters, and diaries – with physical activities was intended to stimulate emotions and imaginations, thereby bringing history to life and making it more personal and real. The approach to the historical material, responses, and the creation and expression of ideas through process drama were identified as being especially effective in fostering the students’ enthusiastic engagement in the topic. Students were motivated to attend the lessons, saying that they wanted to do more and that they were excited to for the next session.

This positive feedback is consistent with the findings in another study focusing on high school students (McLauchlan & Winters, 2014). Here, students were asked to explain, among other things, how they felt about drama class. Most students (95%) reported that drama increased their enjoyment of school, with over 60% crediting drama as a motivator to attend school and that it gave them more motivation to learn. A significant number of boys cited the physical nature of drama activities as a motivator to take drama. Among student comments were feelings that drama had a positive influence because it involved learning through play, physical activity, and creating and collaborating based on their interests and experiences. This is a sentiment echoed by the 30 Grade 6 students learning science through creative drama methods in a case study by Gül and Gücümc (2015); here, connecting lessons to student interests and adding an element of physical activity appears to be fundamental in engaging students and motivating them to be active participants in their own learning. Moreover, Lepp (2011) articulates findings with DRACON, which is an integrated, school-based program.
designed to engage students so they might learn to handle conflict in every aspect of their lives. In this study, they used role-playing and re-enactment to explore thoughts, feelings, and body experiences relating to conflict in a meaningful way. The results showed that students seemed easily engaged because drama mixes playfulness with serious involvement in the daily issues of every teenager. Students reported many positive changes in attitude, a willingness to accept difference, and increased self-confidence in public. The success of the DRACON project led to other international projects aimed at promoting collaboration and conflict resolution; these projects also resulted in increased collaborative dialogue, the development of cooperative goals and valuing diversity, among other things. Clearly, then, learning is occurring – but how is it happening? What is it about drama that encourages such positive learning?

Duffy (2014) was curious about how learning occurs through drama, and he found that Grade 3 students in his experiment were, “eager, engaged, and committed to playing together within our classroom fiction” (p. 91). The engaged participation in Duffy’s study resulted in evidence of conceptual blending seen in the student writing samples; here, students were able to bring the third-person accounts in texts into a first-person experience through drama, and then transfer that into accurate and detailed writing. Duffy (2014) suggests that, “[d]rama creates scaffolded engagements for students which map their own lived experiences onto the curriculum” (p. 96). In other words, drama brings third-person text into a first-person experience which is more relatable and memorable. Simply put, it is easier to get into and reflect about a lived experience than something expressed second-hand, such as from a book or a lecture.
A student quoted in Sæbø’s (2009) article seems to know intuitively what Duffy is saying: “…I also think one learns more from Drama. One must in a way be engaged, and it is easier to learn something one is engaged in” (p. 66). In fact, approximately half of the students involved in Sæbø’s study claimed that they learned better when drama was used. Sæbø (2009), who was mainly focused on the prevalence of DiE and the needs of and challenges for teachers, encountered an interest and desire for drama by the students. The students, who spanned Grades 3 to 10, expressed many reasons for wanting to do drama activities, but the top three were: i) the variety of activities (including physical activity); ii) the opportunity for creativity; and iii) engagement in learning. In fact, 69% of students cited, “increased engagement in their own learning and learning process” (Sæbø, 2009, p. 68) as a main reason that they should study drama. Here, an interesting result of increased student engagement is an increased motivation by teachers to apply DiE.

Moreover, in her book combining creative drama with social studies, Fennessey (2000) sums up her main point succinctly when she states, “When students are motivated, they can accomplish just about anything” (p. 3). She also shares that one of the most important reasons she uses creative drama and theatre in her lessons is because of how excited the children get about it. This reasoning leads me to the other side of the engagement factor – the development of teacher motivation.

**Teacher Development**

In the previous sections of this study, DiE has offered positive benefits to students in elementary and high schools. But, what effects does it hold for teachers? This section will describe the various effects researchers – and participants in such research – have
observed. The impacts drama methods have had on professional development with teachers will be explored, along with the effects that student motivation and engagement have on teachers. The needs of teachers as they learn and undertake new-to-them pedagogy will be highlighted and connected to the need for more supportive resources. Through this section, it will become clear that all three foundational anchors used within this study – creative and critical thinking, collaboration and communication, and motivation and engagement – are directly linked to each other. Figure 4 demonstrates that student and teacher development is the result of the presence of all three anchors.

I believe that drama can have a profound effect on teaching experiences, and one area that can help make it more rewarding, from a practitioner’s perspective, is teamwork and collaboration among colleagues. Indeed, professional development within schools has been shown to be more effective – resulting in transformative learning or changed practices – when teachers are included in the planning of workshops, designing of curriculum or lessons, and/or collaborate with each other and any visiting experts, such as a drama specialist or arts educator (Andrews, 2010; Betts, 2005; Brown, 2006; Murray, 2001; Steele, 2015). Positive results regarding the development of knowledge and skills for subject integration via drama have also been recorded in studies where the teachers practiced various drama methods – for instance, role-play with their colleagues (Andrews, 2010; Swartz, 2015) or applied their learning with their own students in consultation with a specialist (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Mckean & Sudol, 2002; Murray, 2001, Steele, 2015).

Cawthon and Dawson (2009) explore the impacts of a drama instructional model on professional development in their study. Key components to this model’s success in
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achieving sustainable change are that it is done in partnership with the teachers, it is interactive and on-going, research projects are teacher-led, lesson plans are teacher-developed, and the learning goals are identified collaboratively. This gives the teachers an authentic experience of drama-based instruction, where teachers get to be life-long learners. Learners, whether they are the teachers or their students, have opportunities to engage, “in a collaborative process” (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009, p. 148) when using drama methods. Clearly, then, teachers need to have a sense that their own – and their students’ – specific needs will be met, that their voices are heard, and that there is support available when needed. In this study, through the drama methods utilized during training sessions, teachers transformed their teaching practices – which is quite powerful.

Collaboration through drama not only benefits teachers with effective professional development, but it can also help their students feel engaged and motivated to learn. It seems a major predictor of the success of any lesson is the level of motivation students have to participate in the activities. Perhaps, the more motivated they are, the more teachers might be compelled to keep doing what they are doing – and thus, might feel more confident in their abilities as a teacher.

Like the teachers in Steele’s (2015) study, the teachers in Cawthon and Dawson’s (2009) study reported very positive results regarding the engagement and learning of both their students and for themselves. The teachers were learning to integrate drama into their teaching, and found that the positive experience in the workshops, combined with the positive results of their students, encouraged them. Cawthon and Dawson (2009) highlight that teachers who commit to long-term integration of drama into their teaching typically are already excited – in other words, motivated – by the perceived benefits of
the arts in education. This means they are already prepared to task risks – thereby, engaging – and invest the time and energy into learning something new. One of the goals of Cawthon and Dawson’s (2009) study was to investigate if the Drama for Schools program would increase teacher engagement in their own teaching. The results were not as high as they were for the students, but the researchers suggest this may be because the teachers already had a high investment in their classes.

The teachers in Swartz’s (2015) study about Ontario’s AQ courses in drama gave very positive reviews, too, which certainly point to a high level of engagement and motivation by the teachers. For example, one teacher wrote, “Drama is so much more diverse than I realized. I used to compartmentalize drama into my ‘Arts’ teaching - not now. I see it as an extension of all core curriculum subjects” (Swartz, 2015, p. 48). Others wrote about learning to take risks, the cognitive, social, and physical benefits for their students, and about the different aspects of themselves they did not know before, but that will benefit their teaching. One teacher wrote, for instance, that “When I use drama in my program, I realize that I can reach so many more students. Drama demands differentiated instruction” (Swartz, 2015, p. 49).

Compare these results to Steele’s (2015) study, in which the teachers saw their success as being a validation of the drama strategies they implemented. The positive feedback from the teachers suggests, “teacher comfort, confidence, and commitment to taking risks grew when they saw evidence of impact on student learning” (Steel, 2015, p. 82). Teachers from a multi-year study in Ottawa also described positive changes in their motivation to learn and their willingness and confidence to teach the arts (Andrews, 2010). The teachers in this study only wished they had more time for deeper learning,
much like the teachers from other studies of professional development and teacher needs (Betts, 2005; Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Kaaland-Wells, 1994; Steele, 2015).

**Barriers to Teacher Engagement**

After learning about all the positive impacts DiE seems to have on student learning and teacher professional development, it begs the question: what is preventing more teachers from engaging in it? This final section will address the various barriers to teacher engagement in DiE. Teacher needs, perspectives, and various pressures and demands on teachers – by administrators, community, school boards, etc. – will be examined. Suggestions proposed by different researchers and education experts will also be shared.

When Sæbø (2009) investigated the challenges for teachers in meeting national standard of drama curriculum in Norway, he found that the more training teachers had, the more likely they were to integrate drama into their practice. This, however, is not a new idea. Kaaland-Wells (1994) notes, for instance, that, “as teachers increasingly use drama and become more comfortable with it, their perceptions of obstacles lessen … and their support for its uses increase (p. 25). Kaaland-Wells (1994) also notes that interest in using common drama methods was significantly higher than actual use. Sæbø (2009) found that only about 18% of teachers had formal training, and 41% only had a few days of it – therefore, drama was not as widely used as the compulsory curriculum suggests. A similar result can be found in Australia (O’Toole, 2011) and the United Kingdom (Johnson, 2002). Johnson (2002), for instance, finds that teachers struggle to fit drama teaching into their crowded schedules. O’Toole (2011) also describes a national curriculum with drama as a core subject from early years to graduation; however, in this
case, students are not getting consistent instruction or exposure to drama, just like in Norway. The reason for this is likely that teachers are getting limited training and, so, there are few teachers who can model it for pre-service teachers entering the field. Johnson (2002) also found the same problem in the United Kingdom with elementary pre-service teachers; here, the educators were learning and getting excited about DiE, only to find no one to model it in the schools during their practicum.

In an Ontario context, McLauchlan (2006) describes her efforts to train Ontario pre-service teachers in DiE and foster positive attitudes towards drama as seemingly futile. The education students echo the inconsistent experiences with drama throughout their schooling; thus, many are apprehensive to try to integrate drama into their teaching. After the course, the students did feel more excited and motivated to get into the classrooms to try out their newfound knowledge, but when the pre-service teachers make their attempts to implement DiE, the supervising teachers are not comfortable with the idea and discourage their efforts.

McLauchlan (2006) also discusses in-service drama teachers who feel marginalized in their own schools. Some of those teachers do find some motivation to persist in the, “soft support of administrative praise, and most often in the enthusiasm of their pupils” (McLauchlan, 2006, p. 134). Administrator support is mentioned in several studies as an important, sometimes secondary, motivator for teachers (Andrews, 2010; Betts, 2005; Murray, 2001; Stinson & Freebody, 2006). This suggests that without administrative support or pressure from administration to focus on other priorities, teachers may feel deterred from attempting DiE. One study (McFadden, 2012) based in New Jersey addressed this dilemma, noting that many teachers face different demands
that are at odds with each other, such as being accountable to administration for student achievement on standardized tests while spending time planning engaging lessons. The results from McFadden’s (2012) study demonstrate that arts integration and solid test scores could happen simultaneously; in fact, McFadden (2012) shared her research with the hope it would reignite teacher passion for the arts.

Supporting teachers to apply drama methods when they lack experience or confidence is a challenge with different possible solutions. O’Toole (2011) recommends extensive pre-service training in DiE or an undergraduate degree in drama followed by post-graduate education training. Alternatively, O’Toole (2011) suggests in-service training along with workshops, professional development, courses, and whatnot, but admits these kinds of options in drama are currently rare. One of the biggest barriers for accessing such training, for instance, is a lack of specialists; but O’Toole (2011) mentions that music education already faced this dilemma, and discovered that at the primary level, at least, some of the best music teachers were generalist teachers with a love of music but little to no formal training in music education. Sæbø (2009), too, suggests that new texts and guidelines for how to integrate drama into the learning process are needed, in addition to courses for teachers. In an article by Christophersen (2015) reviewing arts education in Norway, music and visual arts were described as highly-valued by the public and school system alike, with a requirement of 1 hour per week of instruction. Some schools spent up to three hours per week on arts and crafts, and a few schools also included drama and dance. In all cases, Christophersen (2015) noted that the arts were generally taught informally and, in the younger grades – especially in music – taught by those with little to no experience in the subject.
An online search for DiE resources brings up plenty of options for drama teachers and resources to support the teaching of drama and drama techniques – but it takes a lot of time and effort to find any resources that use drama methods to teach curriculum such as English language arts (for instance, fluentu.com or teachhub.com). Often, the online resources are made for an American school setting, as well. There are books available such as Fels and Belliveau’s (2008) *Exploring Curriculum: Performative Inquiry, Role Drama, and Learning*, but they are thick, and the lessons are long, which can seem overwhelming to even someone who is familiar with drama. The information in this and other resources is comprehensive, but for a teacher pressed for time and lacking experience or confidence, it is unlikely that lengthy books or websites – which may or may not be reliable – would be appealing. Thus, the challenge to bring drama methods into the teaching toolkit continues. Given that drama offers so many relevant possible learning opportunities and positive effects for both students and teachers, and that it clearly intersects with the core curriculum in Ontario, it only makes sense to explore avenues that will bring it into the classroom. Teachers are facing a tremendous amount of pressure to effectively teach children in diverse and, sometimes, challenging situational contexts, and an easy-to-use, intuitive resource for integrating DiE would be a welcome addition to any practitioner’s pedagogical repertoire.

Therefore, the following chapter will describe the methodology of the research project and the process for designing the resource handbook. It will also describe the methods followed for the study including participant recruitment, data collection, coding, and analysis.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

The following chapter will describe the three phases of this research in detail. Phase One will describe the formulation of the professional resource. Phase Two will lay out the methodology for field-testing the resource and the data collection process. Finally, Phase Three will outline the plan for data analysis and modifying/finalizing the resource.

**Phase One: Handbook Design**

Phase One of this research project was to design a professional resource in the form of a handbook for educators and drama in education (DiE) practitioners, either current or aspiring. The following sub-sections will describe the theoretical framework utilizing in the design of this handbook, the rationale for the choices of drama strategies explained in the handbook, and the development of the sample lesson plans that comprise the practical component of the resource.

**Theoretical Underpinnings**

It is evident in the literature that there is significant crossover between disciplines regarding learning objectives and the resulting skills, abilities, and cognitive developments that they foster (Mezirow, 1997; Philips, 2013; Pintrich, 2002). For example, all core subjects (Math, Science, Social Studies, and Language Arts) for grades 4-6, plus Drama, include overall objectives to understand, apply, analyze, and create. The aim is to develop communication/ expression, and critical/ creative thinking. To meet these objectives students will practice and develop skills such as interpreting, differentiating, planning, and representing. These objectives and results for higher-level thinking, demonstrated through analysis and synthesis of new information, can be conceptualized with Mayer’s (2002) revised taxonomy of
Educational Objectives which includes six categories of knowledge retention and learning transfer, with 19 cognitive processes fitting within those categories. Upon seeing the connections and overlaps with the Ontario Arts curriculum (OME, 2009), three main anchors for the handbook began to crystallize: i) critical and creative thinking; ii) collaboration and communication; and iii) motivation and engagement. Each of these anchors are interconnected and are directly linked to the actions of teachers and students. As teachers and students actively develop these skills or engage in activities which focus on one (or more) of them, they feed each other’s development in those areas. Figure 5 visually illustrates the three theoretical anchors for the handbook which emerged from the synergies found between the work of Mayer (2002) and the Ontario Arts curriculum (OME, 2009).

**Choice of Drama Strategies**

The drama strategies explained within the handbook are purposefully selected for their ease of use and because of their frequency of application across a variety of sources in the field of DiE, including books, articles, and anecdotal evidence from experts (Baldwin, 2008; Fels & Belliveau, 2008; Fennessey, 2000; Glover, 2014). Each strategy is rooted in one or more of the three anchors, but most emphasize the development of critical and creative thinking, as it is assumed that there will be collaboration, communication, and motivation or engagement due to the nature of drama-based activities. This assumption is supported in the Ontario Arts curriculum in both its description of the learning that will take place for students and within the expectations connected to the three interconnected strands which emphasize communication, critical
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and creative thinking, and active participation (OME, 2009).¹

From a practical standpoint, example lesson plans that employ the described strategies are included to confirm for practitioners and readers that the learning objectives in the curriculum align with at least one of the anchors in the handbook’s model, and can be achieved by leveraging such DiE strategies. The plans are also designed for ease of application by teachers who may not have a drama background.

Finally, to extend the handbook’s design to the theoretical realm of education, Freire’s (1970) work helps to inform the pedagogical underpinning of the resources by assisting educators in establishing a more equal relationship between teachers and students. This is a further strategy that can be used to promote student motivation and engagement which, theoretically, leads to a more rewarding and productive teaching experience.

In total, there are 12 strategies (or drama structures) included in the handbook:

- Embodiment
- Fishbowl
- Improvisation
- Interviewing In-Role
- Mantle of the Expert
- Picture-to-Story
- Quick-Write
- Role-Play
- Soundscape
- Tableau
- Writing In-Role
- Visualisation

Each strategy highlights the drama structure, the goals for collaboration between teachers and students, and the ease of application, to varying degrees. Debriefing is to be applied

¹ Please refer to pages 13 and 14 of the Ontario Arts curriculum for specific discussion of this.
in every lesson in the handbook due to DiE’s demands for communication, reflection (critical thinking), and whole-group engagement. Lesson plans included in the handbook also illustrate the integration of drama with core subjects such as language arts, social studies, math, and science.

**Lesson Plan Development**

The lesson plans were developed through a careful examination of the Ontario Arts curriculum (OME, 2009), in addition to drawing upon a combination of sample plans which exemplified subject integration with drama as described in available resource books (Baldwin, 2008; Fels & Belliveau, 2008; Fennessey, 2000), scholarly literature (Cogswell & McLauchlan, 2014; Downey, 2005; Johnson, 2002), websites for drama teachers, previously designed lessons, and past personal teaching practice.

More specifically, once the core subject(s) and curricular expectations chosen for each lesson clearly connected to one or more of the anchors, then a drama strategy was chosen which would allow for the achievement of those expectations. An emphasis was placed on limiting the number of expectations to be assessed in each lesson, as this gives teachers who are new to DiE opportunities to be present and engaged with the students – rather than being overwhelmed by assessing multitudes of curricular expectations. That said, the expectations that are chosen in each lesson plan will help guide teachers’ interactions with students during activities and their assessments, in addition to providing some accountability and reassurance that the curriculum is covered.

Even though the emphasis of each lesson is to meet learning expectations of the core subject, drama expectations are also included. Since drama activities will be used in the facilitation of the core subject learning experience, students will likely develop skills
and knowledge in that area – even if it is not being explicitly taught. The connection to drama learning expectations can also allow for collaboration between core subject and drama teachers in schools, if they choose.

**Formatting the Handbook**

While designing the handbook, certain teacher needs (and challenges) were kept in mind: support, clarity of purpose, accountability, and time. Based on some of the literature concerning effective professional development (Andrews, 2010; Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Steele, 2015; Swartz, 2015), teachers with little background and experience in the arts appear to need extra support in this area to boost their confidence and to help them plunge into the ‘unknown’ – that is, for them, the world of drama. It is clear that guidance and practice are very important for effective professional development. With that in mind, an introductory section along with a section entitled “Notes for Beginners” are both included to preface the handbook for readers.

In a professional, yet somewhat personal writing style, tips, reassurance, and evidence of positive impacts on student learning is provided. A brief literature review focusing on the effectiveness of drama strategies for promoting student learning is included for those teachers who are interested in the research behind the pedagogy, and also for those who may need to provide some accountability to administration to support their instructional practice. An excerpt of an article entitled *Drama techniques: Why use drama or theatre games in your teaching?* (Clark, 2013) is included after the notes for further suggestions of easy-to-use drama-based warm-up exercises, games, and extensions, as well as some further reasoning for integrating drama strategies into one’s teaching.
As is made clear in the literature – and is known from personal experience – a teacher’s time is a precious commodity. Consequently, a Table of Contents is included to allow for easy navigation of the resource. Also, when the handbook is opened electronically, the different sections, lessons, and appendices (detailed curricular expectations) can be selected in the Navigation View to take the reader directly to them.

Next, before introducing the lesson plans, it was logical to provide a description of the 12+1 common drama strategies that would be discussed in the handbook. Each description includes the lesson number(s) in which that particular drama structure is modelled. This way, a teacher can simply read through a few descriptions and skip to the lesson they are interested in, rather than reading through everything.

For easy readability, the lesson plans are laid out in table form. The first column is for the detailed activities and steps. The second column outlines the purpose for each activity and step in the lesson, highlighting areas that connect to either the main underpinning anchors or to specific curricular expectations. The third column offers extra notes and tips regarding possible challenges to expect (for instance, student behaviour), ways to adapt the lesson/activity, assessment ideas, or options for deeper teacher engagement such as Teacher In-Role. The rows divide the lesson into various parts such as introduction or set up, developing activities, wrap-up or conclusion, and possible extensions. Any required materials needed to implement the lesson are listed under the learning expectations, followed by any special notes such as suggested time lines, level of difficulty for students, or ideal resources. Supportive scripts and models of writing are included after each plan as supporting documents. Finally, all the curricular expectations have number codes (taken directly from the Ontario curriculum documents) which are
listed at the beginning of the lesson plans in the handbook. The text description of each, also taken directly from the Ontario curriculum documents, is added in a subject-specific appendix at the end of the handbook. Each appendix is organized by grade and strands – for instance, reading or writing – according to the curriculum guides.

### Phase Two: Assessing the Efficacy of the Handbook

Phase Two is the application phase of this research project, during which participant teachers will field-test the strategies and lesson plans from the handbook and provide feedback. This section which follows includes a rationale for the methodology of field-testing, a description for the recruitment of participants, details of the ideal participants, and the plan for data collection. Details regarding the results of the field-testing phase will be discussed in Chapter Five.

### Methodology

The methodology and accompanying research methods chosen for this project were selected and employed based on their connections to constructivist, pragmatist, and transformative perspectives. This project is a qualitative study using field-testing, semi-open-ended interviewing, and theme-based and emergent data analysis. Typical characteristics of a qualitative study relating to constructivism include positioning the self and personal values within the research, using semi-open-ended interviewing, conducting a thematic and emergent analysis of multiple perspectives, and interpretation of the qualitative data that results (Creswell, 2014). As such, these elements are all evident within the current study, as described below.

**Study design.** The theoretical underpinnings and experiential nature of qualitative research not only guide the data collection and analysis process of this project, but also
shape the handbook itself. I chose to create a tangible product – a professional resource handbook for teachers – and modify it in collaboration with participant teachers with the aim of it becoming a catalyst for change in some small way within the field of elementary education in Canada. I anticipate that the experience of using the resource can lead participating teachers to decide to support and promote the practice of DiE to their fellow teachers.

It is important, then, that I focused on conducting semi-open-ended interviews, thematic and emergent coding, the triangulation of data sources, and using both thick description/analysis, and member-checking in order to create an effective, professional resource that teachers can feel confident using. The handbook was provided to, and actively tested by, participant teachers, who will then share their experiences, reflections, and constructive suggestions for improvement on how the handbook can better meet their needs. In this way, the study will add to the, “local knowledge” (Bradbury-Huang, 2010, p. 105) of DiE, thereby giving a voice to the participants and contributing an alternative perspective to the current literature. The participants and researcher may experience some changes in thinking or practice as a result of the actions taken and shared. However, it is impossible to predict what these changes may be prior to undertaking the project since qualitative research is an emergent form of research – but the final design of the handbook will implement suggestions that will have been brought forward by participants.

**Recruiting Participants**

Choosing the participants’ professional context and grade levels for inclusion criteria was based on my familiarity, as the researcher, with the geographical area and my
experience with the elementary level up to Grade 6. The focus was narrowed further to Grades 4 to 6 because younger grades often employ play-based learning; this is very similar to DiE and, therefore, provides limited opportunity for transformative teacher development. Moreover, drama is often more prominent in the primary years, again making the handbook less of a transformative resource for teachers who may already be utilizing its espoused strategies.

The small scale of this study limits the number of participants to merely two or three educators. The sites chosen for this study will be elementary schools located in an urban area of a southern region of Ontario. Specific sites for recruitment will be selected based primarily on convenience; then, referrals from the initial contacts through principals or teachers will snowball participant recruitment efforts.

**Participant details.** The ideal participants sought for this study will be generalist teachers assigned to teaching in the junior division – Grades 4 to 6 – who have little to no formal training or experience in drama or theatre. Finding participants can be very challenging regardless of the time of year due to the constant demands on teacher time. Therefore, a brief introductory letter will be included in the initial contact to emphasize the goals of making the teaching experience more effective and rewarding, and the flexibility of the time required to conduct the study. In sum, these recruitment strategies can help ensure that participants recruited for the study fit within the inclusion criteria, are fully aware of what to expect in terms of their participation, and are able to participate fully in the field-testing of the handbook.
Data Collection

At the first meeting with participants, the informed consent letter (Appendix B) and the short questionnaire (Appendix C) will be reviewed with the participants. This questionnaire will be emailed to participants ahead of the meeting as a Microsoft Word document, thus giving participant teachers the option of filling it in ahead of our first meeting; if teacher participants do not choose to complete the questionnaire prior to the first meeting, they will complete it after they review the informed consent document (a hard-copy will be provided in case they prefer to fill it in on paper rather than electronically in advance of the first meeting). Finally, a brief orientation of how to use the handbook will be provided. Participants will have already received a digital copy of the handbook prior to the meeting, but will be given a hard copy at the first meeting.

This meeting will not be audio-recorded, but the information from the questionnaires will be used for context in the findings. Some observational notes will be recorded in writing in a research journal immediately after the meetings. Data sources will include researcher observational and reflective notes from meetings and interviews, semi-open-ended interview data (ideally conducted in-person), and any participant notes about their experiences related to piloting the teacher resource (which are collected after each interview).

The meetings and interviews will be scheduled around the availability and at the preference of the teacher participants. The suggested time will be during after-school hours to avoid disrupting teaching time, and also to give the researcher and participant ample time to deeply discuss their experiences with few disruptions. The initial meeting is planned to be a short 10-15-minute introduction to the research process and the
handbook resource. At the end of the initial meeting, the next interview(s) will be scheduled, if possible. If it is not possible to schedule a specific time at that moment, a timeframe for a follow-up check-in will be set at which point the first interview will be scheduled. The first interview will ideally take place around the mid-point of the project timeline, approximately two to three weeks after the initial meeting, with the second interview taking place another two to three weeks later. Keeping in mind the constant changing and demanding realities of teachers and schools, this timeline will have to be flexible. Ideally, the teachers can complete one or two units of study, depending on the subjects chosen, and be able to notice any changes or developments in themselves and their students over time, thereby enabling them to authentically reflect on their experience with utilizing the handbook. Each interview should take between 30 to 45 minutes, depending on the amount of detail participants provide and any interruptions that may arise. Precise timing of interviews is subject to teacher schedules and availability, in conjunction with researcher availability. Possible challenges may also include technology glitches with recording equipment, or teacher inability to meet in-person. To adapt to these and other possible challenges, I will take key-word, short-form notes during the conversation which will then be written out in full immediately after the interview and send a copy of the notes for the participant to review to ensure accuracy. I will be open to suggestion from the participants in terms of how and when they can be interviewed.

**Phase Three: Data Analysis**

Once the data have been collected, it will be analysed and interpreted. Phase Three will outline the plan for utilizing this data, including what sources will be used, how it will be coded, and how validity will be established. Finally, a description of how
the results will be communicated and an acknowledgement of the limitations of this project is included.

Sources

Audio-recorded interviews, along with researcher notes on both the meetings and interviews, will be transcribed and analyzed in the days and weeks immediately following them. The journals or teacher notes will also be analyzed and compared to the results from the interviews. The transcripts will include content, tone, and interruptions in order to better encapsulate the “affective nature” of the experience (Bird, 2005, p. 234), combined with the reported details of the experience. During the transcription process, which generally takes several hours for each interview, any personal observations and reflective thoughts about the interviews will be recorded in a reflective journal – a helpful suggestion leveraged from Bird (2005).

Coding

Initial coding is based on the three main anchors used to design the handbook: i) collaboration and communication; ii) motivation and engagement; and iii) creative and critical thinking. In addition to these main anchors, the research questions will also guide the coding process:

- What do teachers, with little to no drama background, need and want in a teaching resource so that they feel supported?
- How would a curriculum-based resource that provides specific activities and lesson plans meet teachers’ needs for integrating drama into their teaching?
- How does the integration of drama strategies affect the teaching experience?
Key words and phrases that indicate a link to these anchors and questions will be listed in a codebook (see sample excerpt in Appendix B). Any key words or phrases that do not fit the initial anchors, but appear to be relevant to the questions or important to the participants in some other way, will be circled and noted separately as new categories in the codebook as they emerge. The data will then be sorted into groups related to the research questions and anchors.

**Triangulation of Data**

The codebook helps to visually connect similar concepts and isolate any new or unique categories of thought from the participants. The codebook will be divided into columns which separate the codes found in the data sources for each participant. As new key words or phrases emerge in one source, they will be added to the code book, and then subsequently used to code the other sources to see if there are recurrences or connections between sources. Then, the codes will be organized into categories, and the groups of codes will be lined up between each participant. Each category will be colour-coded (one colour for each pre-determined theme, and one colour for any emergent themes) so that the prevalence and overlapping of the themes is obvious; moreover, anything that is present in the data which is connected to the research questions will also be clear, as these data will be colourless. This visual organization makes it easy to see a) what is common between each participant and source; b) what may be unique to each participants, but is still in connection with the theoretical underpinnings of the handbook design and/or the research questions of the study; and c) anything that may be completely new or unconnected to the initial themes, but is still relevant to the participants. Finally, once
coding is completed, the information will be interpreted with the help of any reflective notes from the researcher.

**Establishing Validity**

Establishing validity in this study will include two components, involving a member-checking process and a dissemination plan, each outlined briefly below.

**Member-checking.** As per standard practice for qualitative studies involving interviews, it is important to establish credibility through member-checking (Tracy, 2010). *Member-checking* is a data validation strategy where participants receive a copy of the transcript of their interview(s), which they then review for accuracy by adding, deleting, or modifying any content according to their perspective or experience. In the context of this study, any changes for accuracy and suggestions for modifying the handbook will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

**Communicating results.** A final report of the findings and implications of this study will be submitted to the participant school board and to the university where the researcher studies. Participant teachers will also receive a copy of the final report and separate, final versions of the handbook that they helped to shape (either in hard-copy or electronically, depending on their preference).

**Limitations**

The first limitation regarding the methodology of this study is that the small number of participants; this was, unfortunately, unavoidable mainly due to the many demands every teacher faces in their practice. Teachers willing to stretch themselves further while under constant pressure from a variety of stakeholders – administrators, students, parents, colleagues, and the community – are difficult to find, thereby impacting
the recruitment of participants for this study. The second limitation is also related to the small scale of the current study. As is typical of qualitative studies, the small-scale limits generalizability (Yilmaz, 2013), but the “local knowledge” (Bradbury-Huang, 2010, p. 105) found is invaluable to the larger field of teacher professional development and DiE, and therefore cannot be ignored.

**Conclusion**

This chapter described the choices of methodology and methods for the development of the handbook, the site and teacher selection to field-test the handbook as a professional resource, the data collection process, and data analysis. Limitations for the study in terms of data collection were also acknowledged.

The following chapter – Chapter Four – is the handbook itself, complete with final adjustments recommended or suggested by the participants. Their contributions, and the benefits of these changes as described by the participants, will be noted in the final chapter. Any suggestions made by the participants that were not incorporated into the final version of the handbook will also be noted, including the reason for not implementing such recommendations. The final chapter will be a discussion of the findings gleaned from the data analysis, a description of the changes made to the handbook after field-testing the resource with teacher participants, and suggestions of possible implications for DiE and teacher professional development, as well as ideas for further study.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE HANDBOOK

The culmination of this research project was the creation of a resource handbook designed to facilitate teachers’ implementation of Drama in Education (DiE) in the classroom. Please refer to *Welcome to Drama in Education: A Curriculum-Based Guiding Resource for Integrating Drama in Elementary Classrooms* to review this resource.
CHAPTER FIVE: RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The benefits for using drama in education (DiE) with students has been thoroughly researched over many years. Studies regarding how to support experienced, practicing teachers in this endeavor, however, mainly been center around professional development sessions and visiting drama educators (Andrews, 2010; Betts, 2005; Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; McKean & Sudol, 2002, Steele, 2015). Also, as Swartz (2015) points out, the numbers of teachers attending the courses for DiE have fallen drastically due to a variety of reasons, such as school boards focusing instead on literacy and numeracy test results. Moreover, other professional development events are unevenly offered based on budgets and available specialists – or a lack thereof – to teach the courses or visit classrooms, in addition to constraints on teacher time. For all these reasons, a teacher is usually already convinced that DiE is either something unattainable or is an extra ‘frill’ for them. For these reasons, I decided to explore an alternative option: to assess the efficacy of a professional resource – an instructional handbook – to act as both an introduction and on-going support for teachers who are new to drama.

I proposed the following research questions:

- What do teachers, with little to no drama background, need and want in a teaching resource so that they feel supported?
- How would a curriculum-based resource that provides specific activities and lesson plans meet teachers’ needs for integrating drama into their teaching?
- How does the integration of drama strategies affect the teaching experience?

In addition to these questions, I used a theoretical framework to guide the design of the study and the analysis. The framework included three intersecting key elements common
to DiE: i) collaboration and communication; ii) motivation and engagement; and iii) creative and critical thinking (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). At the intersection of these elements is the evidence of student and teacher development (see Figure 4).

I used a qualitative methodology using field testing with experienced teachers to explore their needs as they developed their skills using drama in their programs. The entire project involved three phases: i) the development of a curriculum-based handbook; ii) conducting field testing of the handbook by participant teachers; and iii) an analysis of the effectiveness of the handbook to support teachers. There were 2 participants who field tested the curriculum handbook during 6 to 8-week period; these teachers were experienced elementary teachers who had little to no experience in the dramatic arts, but did have some experience with integrating subjects. Both participants had positive experiences overall with the field-testing process, and had few suggestions for improvement of the resource.

The following chapter will share the results of the study, including some major challenges, the main findings from the teachers’ experiences, and a discussion of the implications of this project both for further research and for teachers, administrators, and professional development programs involving DiE.

**Findings**

Both participants, Jamie and Mary (pseudonyms), experienced challenges and positive results when using the handbook, sharing several statements and reactions in common, as well as each offering a few unique reflections. This section will share the findings that answer the three research questions. Each participant also offered a couple
of ideas for improving the resource in order to better meet their needs, which will be discussed in the final subsection.

**Meeting Teacher Needs**

The first research question – regarding how a text-based, curriculum-centered resource that provides specific activities and lesson plans might meet teacher needs – provided valuable insights. Upon analyzing the interviews, it was clear that among the various elements in the resource valued by the participants, one element stood out as being equally valued by each participant: the inclusion of the curricular learning expectations and the clear links made between them in the sample lessons plans. Each participant mentioned, for instance, that because they could see the specific learning expectations connected to the activities, they felt more confident in what they were doing. Confidence is a frequent theme among the studies relating to professional development with DiE (Betts, 2005; Johnson, 2002; McKean & Sudol, 2002; Murray, 2001; Swartz, 2015). Each teacher also emphasized that the lessons were easy to adapt to meet their needs for flexibility and differentiation, indicating that they were better able meet their students’ needs as a result. For example, Jamie explained that she could add more structure where needed, and she discovered different ways to adapt the activities so that all learners could accomplish the goals of the lessons. Specifically, she was able to easily incorporate a concept she had previously taught for Language Arts – RAFTS: Role, Audience, Format, Topic, Strong Verb – into the Writing In-Role activity. Putting this DiE activity along with a shared writing strategy gave her students more direction and more overall support for their writing tasks. Also, during her first interview after spending three weeks with the resource, Jamie pointed out that the different sections in
the lesson plans – before, during, and after – in addition to the extensions and bolded emphasis on certain aspects of each lesson were helpful in achieving the positive results she had experienced.

Mary was not quite as specific in terms of the physical design elements of the guidebook, but in her first response to the resource, she indicated that even though she was experienced with subject integration, she was, “able to use the lessons as-is” and that it was simple to follow – a necessary element to any handbook! Mary appeared more motivated to use drama structures, perhaps because of her improved confidence and practice with using the handbook. Steele’s (2015) study demonstrates similar results: that positive results prompt higher confidence and, thus, more motivation by teachers to engage in newly acquired practices.

Resource Requirements

The second research question asked: what do teachers, with little to no drama background, need and want in a teaching resource so that they feel supported in their efforts? An idea that emerged during the analysis of the participant interviews and field testing process was that of trust. Considering the amount of pressure teachers are under to be accountable, they need to trust the makers of the curriculum when trying out something new (Andrews, 2010; McLauchlan, 2006; Murray, 2001; Steele, 2015; Swartz, 2015). Mary did not use the word *trust* specifically, but she did express the sentiment of needing confidence in what materials she was using. First, she said:

It was very easy to follow. I added a couple of things I needed for something else as well but because everything was clearly outlined I knew I was meeting all of those expectations.
Then, she explained that the clear outlining of the curriculum was important because,

I’m not somebody who looks up online and gets these ideas because I need to know what’s good for me…. I think this level would adapt for someone who, like me, has no real drama experience but is confident in being with their class.

In other words, Mary needed to trust the materials or resources she used. Jamie, however, used the word *trust* explicitly in her final interview, stating, “It’s like a trust thing. If I do this, I know that something good is going to come out of it… I trust the process.” She credited the work that was put in to connect curriculum expectations with each lesson and the breakdown of tasks to keep her on track as the reason for her trust in the resource handbook designed as part of this study.

When it came to integrating drama and applying the activities to her regular subjects, Mary remarked about how easy the resource was to use, to understand, to adapt, or to tweak. Early on, Mary expressed her belief that integration in general provides greater inclusivity for students. Later, she explained that she needed the resource to be flexible due to various attendance and behavioural issues she had experienced with her class. Mary expressed that due to the inclusive nature of the design of the handbook, it is was easy to meet her students where they were: “The presentation of the lesson is very inclusive. No matter the starting point is of a student in their understanding they’re still able to participate.” The theme of inclusivity was consistent throughout Mary’s experience with the resource. Right from the outset, for instance, he emphasized that element and the fact that the lessons and assessments met, “the expectations of the grade curriculum.”
Jamie did not directly mention *inclusivity* as a concept, but she did bring up the idea of accessibility. Jamie explained that the Writing In-Role activity, for example, allowed for better accessibility to all students. She said it helped her reach more of her students with their wide variety of skills and needs, something she had been struggling with all year. Likewise, Mary mentioned that the language of the resource was accessible to anyone and that the whole resource was accessible for all levels of ability. She went further in her reflection stating that,

> It doesn’t talk over anyone’s head. You don’t have to be a seasoned, experienced teacher to be able to use this resource. But if you are a seasoned, experienced teacher… you could still use it. So, at any level of experience this is still a usable resource for you.

**Teaching Experience**

The third research question explored how the integration of drama in education affects the teaching experience of teachers who are new to drama, but not to teaching? According to previously mentioned studies (Andrews, 2010; Betts, 2005; Hundert, 1996; Steele, 2015), transformative learning can occur when the teachers are involved in the professional development process in some way – such as planning the workshops, designing lessons, or collaborating with experts – over an extended period of time. Teachers have experienced changes in perspectives and teaching methodologies, and they learned something about themselves during professional development (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; McKean & Sudol, 2002; Murray, 2001). In this research project, the most profound experience for both participants was the increased level of confidence in their abilities to integrate drama. Both Mary and Jamie expressed clear motivation to keep
applying the drama structures from the resource because of the boost in confidence they felt from using it. Mary’s confidence grew specifically with a drama-integrated curriculum. She stated that she would not have signed up for an AQ course in DiE before this experience but she, “would for sure now.”

Both teachers also remarked how they had been challenged to meet the diverse needs of their students all year, but now, by using drama approaches, they could differentiate their lessons more effectively and reach more students.

Another benefit both participants emphasized was how much fun they had. Their students had fun and expressed continual interest and eagerness for more, which made for a more enjoyable teaching experience. Mary emphasized that her only challenge was facing the unknown and she,

wouldn’t even say that was really a challenge. That’s just, you know, something that’s different or change. You go ‘ok, I need to be ready. What happens if it doesn’t work? What am I gonna do if it doesn’t work? But every single thing was successful, and it was…really fun. And it was fun for me as well as them which… who doesn’t want that in their classroom?

Likewise, Jamie said she looked forward to the lessons because her students looked forward to it and, thus, she was a happy teacher.

There were some distinct differences in each of the participant’s learning from utilizing the resource, too. For instance, Mary was already very familiar with the practice of subject integration, but prior to applying the lessons from the resource, she could not visualize or understand how drama could be integrated. For instance, she explained that, “I was really unsure at the beginning that I would be able to integrate it as effectively as it
was. Just because I have not integrated drama ever before.” Indeed, like with all embodied learning, she needed to experience it. She began cautiously but learned quickly that drama could be integrated with other subjects easily – similar to what Sudol experienced (McKean & Sudol, 2002). Mary emphasized frequently how she experienced few challenges from beginning to end. She could use all the same assessment tools she could before, and found that her students took to it willingly, and supported her and each other very naturally. It was like a, “flow of water” for her. Mary noted that the lessons were designed such that all her students could participate and learn, no matter where they were in terms of understanding of a subject. She could challenge certain students more than she could before, and also learned to cut back on how much she had to tell the students about how they were doing. Mary noticed that her students were more active in their own learning as well, especially once they knew they had been successful doing drama. She also noted that the whole experience confirmed for her that she is still a life-long learner.

Jamie was impressed by the extent of assessment notes she could attain just by listening to and noting what her students were saying in their reflections and class discussions; consequently, this had an effect on how she approached her report cards. She claimed that she would be better able to, “speak to what they did” as a result of using the handbook, which supported her recent efforts to switch to an asset model of reporting. Jamie, although familiar with the arts, admitted to more personal learning than Mary. Jamie realized she had to learn to take risks, such as doing Teacher In-Role activities, so she could model for her students how to also take risks—similar to learning noted by teachers after their AQ training in DiE (Swartz, 2015). She also had to learn to let her
students go – meaning she had to relinquish instructional control – once they understood the task and her examples. The challenge and positive results of learning to let go of control was noted in a case study by Steele (2015). Jamie’s approach to planning also changed in that it became more deliberate and, yet, easier to do. Based on her observations of her students, Jamie added more structure to the lesson introductions, spread the lessons out over longer periods of time, and built-in time to check-in with her students while they worked. Jamie’s adjustments demonstrate a teacher applying metacognition as a result of her reflections during and after lessons, similar to what is described in an earlier study connecting drama and metacognition (Johnson, 2002). Jamie’s descriptions of her conversations and the adaptations she made for her students seem to illustrate Freire’s (1970) descriptions of the more equitable student-teacher dialogical relationships, which required for the acts of cognition (p.7) in problem-posing education. Jamie also learned there is, “more than one way to approach language development” as a result of using the resource handbook. Jamie added that it was not necessarily new learning for her, but more like a re-affirmation that student engagement is key.

**Recommended Changes to the Handbook**

There were four main suggestions made by the participants regarding adaptations and changes they could see being made to the handbook; these tie in with the participant experiences, with the resource itself, and with the application of drama strategies. Details of which suggestions were implemented, and which were not, and the reasoning for each, will be discussed later in this section. First, the suggestions:
• Add some sample graphic organisers for students to help with the organization of thoughts or ideas to help set them up for the Interview In-Role portion from Lesson 12. This could encompass something students can use to separate out the emotions or background/history from “me as a writer” so they can get deeper into thinking about how their character writes and, eventually, they could apply it to themselves (see Figure 5);
• Condense the front matter;
• Add more writing samples, such as a reply to Writing In-Role texts (see the Sample Writing at the end of Lesson 1, p. 20)
• Add more lessons to cover all subject strands, such as for Social Studies to include both geography and history, or for all the science strands, so teachers can pick up the handbook at any time during the school year to use.

Jamie felt that a few more exemplars for the writing components and a black line master (exemplar) of a graphic organizer might help students organize their thinking more effectively (for an Interview In-Role, for example). Mary also suggested condensing the front matter of the resource so that it is not as long. It seemed to her that it was, “too extensive for what the resource is.” Mary added that it would be helpful for her to have a few more lesson plans; she thought that, if it were possible, adding plans connected to every strand in Math or Social Studies, for example, would allow a teacher to use the resource at any time of the year regardless of where they were in navigating the provincial curriculum.

The easiest suggestion for me to address is the front matter. This one connects to the lack of spare time teachers have and makes sense. So, I revised the section to make it
more succinct and moved an excerpt of an article to after the lesson plans. Next, I created a sample graphic organizer to Lesson 12 as per Jamie’s suggestion but emphasized that teachers may use whatever tools they prefer. Additional writing samples may prove beneficial, so long as there are not so many that they take away from the creative portion of the writing. These may be added when I prepare the resource for wider publication. Adding more lessons is another good idea, but again, the objective of the lesson plans is to model the use of the drama-based strategies defined in the resource, and that they are easily changeable. Providing more lesson plans might suggest, then, that if the plan is not provided for a particular unit of study in a subject, then it must be because it cannot be done using drama-based strategies. The goal of the handbook is to help teachers to see the possibilities for themselves, to get a feel for the approach, and begin to design their own plans. And, therefore, this suggestion may be problematic to implement not from a practical standpoint, but more so from an ideological one. However, considering the feedback from my participants, the additions may yet be added in the future.

Jamie noted that though the lessons were for intended for implementation with students in Grades 4 to 6, she actually used them with her Grade 7 class because of the wide variety of cognitive and social needs within that group. Moreover, instead of using the Grade 4 Habitats unit, she switched it to Particle Theory with great success. Indeed, this conversation inspired me to consider adding another Math lesson or two in the future, a Geography lesson since there was not one in the original handbook, and another Science-centered lesson since there are several different concepts in the curriculum that are not yet represented in the handbook.
Mary pointed it out that the lessons, though written for a specific grade, can easily be tweaked to be applicable across the grades:

SO useful because sometimes people say ‘Oh, I teach grade four so I can’t do that lesson because it’s grade five.’ Look at the expectations. You know what? That is something that can be tweaked. But look at the whole lesson too, because it’s something that students can participate in if you just change something, maybe their interest level is different. Change that.

Therefore, a balance could be struck by adding another plan or two to address very different unit of study (ex: Geography, Science), thereby providing a little more variety and choice for educators and students alike.

In sum, since both teachers experienced success with the handbook and both expressed a clear desire to continue using the resource and the structures within it, I believe they will learn to create more lessons on their own, especially if they attend further professional development training in DiE. And that is, after all, the main intention of this resource.

**Discussion**

The three theoretical foundations gleaned and developed from the literature review of this study (see Figures 1, 2, and 3) were certainly evident in the responses of both teachers. There were also a few emergent ideas which mainly addressed the core research questions, but were also connected to the key elements. The following discussion will connect what the literature says about these key elements of DiE to the experiences of the participants.
Motivation and Engagement

One theme which was consistent between both participants, and mentioned with high frequency, was regarding the significant level of student engagement during the lessons and, consequently, the increased motivation experienced as a bi-product by both teachers and students to continue doing the DiE activities. This result was anticipated based on previous research results (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Cogswell & McLauchlan, 2014; McLauchlan & Winters, 2014; Sæbø, 2009). At the first interview, Jamie said that the positive results she had experienced thus far was, “engagement itself. Interest level has increased for about half of them.” She added that her students, “showed better comprehension [both the ELL students and the others], and an increase in retention.”

Participation and engagement did not happen automatically, however. Jamie described her students as being, “uncomfortable” and, “out of their comfort zones at first but that is part of learning – part of the goal. Some students really excelled. The results [of the writing] were wow!”

To help boost her students’ confidence, Jamie employed a few strategies of her own. First, she had her ELL students work with an educational assistant to do shared writing, which led to some oral work, consequently leading to the writing and performing of scene work. As that group was working, Jamie reflected the following: “So why not everyone?” As a result, the whole class began working together and submitted letters written in-role as part of the idea sharing stage. When she saw how uncertain some of her students were about letter writing – stating, “some students had a hard time with the new way of thinking” – Jamie realized she needed to scaffold more with shared writing before, “letting them go on their own.”
By the second interview, about three weeks later, Jamie mentioned how her Grade 7 students were motivated to learn more about specific poets and lyricists during a poetry unit which involved the drama strategy Interview In-Role. She said, “there was entertainment in it” during the Interviews In-Role, which explains the reason for students’ engagement. She also expressed how impressed she was by the depth of self-evaluation and the student-generated success criteria that was communicated by the students during a whole-group debriefing session. Jamie shared that she surprised herself in spontaneously engaging in Teacher In-Role alongside her students, helping them better understand and get comfortable with the activity when they expressed nervousness about doing in-role interviews. When Jamie engaged in the activity as a CBC host and as an interview guest, she found it helped her students see how to be someone else and to just, “make it up”. As Jamie explained, “it put them at ease. I was being a goof.” It was mainly during the debriefing sessions that student motivation to learn more and to continue the activities became clear. Jamie noticed improvements, for instance, in her students’ attention, input, and reflections. She enthusiastically shared her notes from the debriefing session which included student reactions which ranged from, “It was fun to be someone you’re not” and, “It’s thrilling to just take what you know” to “Acting is fun”, “To step out of yourself is a good feeling”, and “It was pretty cool.” This was significant for Jamie because she had struggled all year up to this point with several students who used, “negative self-talk, displayed poor work ethic, and would put in as little effort as possible to avoid looking uncool.”

The word fun came up in Mary’s second interview as well, as she stated, “It was fun for me as well as them which… who doesn’t want that in their classroom?” At the
time of the second interview, Mary said her students were still enjoying the Writing In-Role Science and Language Arts lesson, demonstrating clear motivation to learn and understand more about their chosen animals. The students demonstrated their motivation through questioning and offering suggestions to help themselves during the activities. For example, during class, a student asked if he could move around the room like his chosen animal, so he could get a deeper understanding of that animal (essentially, adding embodiment to the activity). Mary allowed it and soon, the class had moved desks out of the way and students were trying out their moves, while others tried to guess what animal they were. At other times, students in both classes could not wait until they could get back to their role work. Jamie shared a specific example of a student asking if they would be working on the writing project for particle theory that day, and when told that they were not because they had French class, the student was disappointed. Jamie had students asking, “Can we please do this again?” Mary also had students asking, “Can we do something like that again?”

Both Jamie and Mary expressed that their own motivation had increased as they observed their students’ interest and engagement growing – similar to results in previous studies (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; Steele, 2015). Moreover, the ease with which Mary and Jamie could apply the resource and adapt lessons and activities to meet their needs and their students’ needs very much echoes the results from McKean and Sudol’s (2002) study.

The ease with which the participants could apply the strategies within the handbook also touches on the second research question regarding teacher needs. Mary was emphatic about how easy the resource was to use and to adapt:
It was very easy to follow. I added a couple of things I needed for something else as well. But because everything was clearly outlined, I knew I was meeting all those expectations… It was very thoroughly covered.

She later explained she, “gained so much confidence” in her abilities to use drama because the curriculum in the handbook, “is so accessible.” She went on to say that, “The language is accessible. It doesn’t, you know, talk over anyone’s head.” The idea of increased teacher confidence as a factor for increased motivation to apply DiE is a frequent theme in prior studies (Andrews, 2010; McKeon & Sudol, 2002; Steele, 2015; Swartz, 2015). When the participants of this study were asked if they would continue to integrate drama methods into their teaching, both replied positively with enthusiasm.

Mary stated in her second interview, for instance, that, “I gained so much confidence and I want to continue to use it. I wish there wasn’t just a few weeks left… I will be using it again, and again, and again.” Jamie echoed this sentiment in her first interview with, “Yes, it makes sense to use cross curricular lessons, and they [the kids] like it.”

**Creative and Critical Thinking**

Fels and Belliveau (2008) propose a list of benefits that can be incurred when incorporating performative inquiry across the curriculum, including critical and creative problem solving, and critical and reflective thinking. Problem-solving and decision-making is often mentioned by the teachers and researchers as something they observe students doing, particularly when working in groups (Downey, 2005; Fennessey, 2000; Stinson & Freebody, 2006). Stinson and Freebody (2006) conclude their study, for instance, by stating that, “Process Drama can give students a vehicle for thinking on their
feet, solving problems, and making connections between the world of the classroom and the real world” (2006, p. 39).

During the second interview with Jamie, she shared an example of one of her students making connections between her real-world experience and the poetry they were studying in class. During a debriefing session involving Interviewing In-Role, one of her students remarked that she had remembered hearing one of the poems they had been studying (“Annabelle Lee” by E. A. Poe) in a recent popular movie, Holes. Jamie found and brought up the clip from that movie on the class projector, the scene where the poem was being recited by one of the main characters. Jamie’s reaction was, “Oh my gosh… that informs me about her… about her long-term memory, her connections to media, and literature, and recognizing it.” The real-world, personally relevant connection that was communicated and then shared with the rest of the class made the whole unit of study that much more meaningful and interesting for the students, thus highlighting the correlation between the key elements of communication and collaboration, and critical thinking (see Figure 4). This example also shows evidence that student engagement is connected to communication and collaboration through the teacher being open to the student’s thinking and ‘going with it’ by interrupting her plan to search for and share what her student was talking about.

As Jamie reflected upon the sharing of thoughts and experiences by her students during a debriefing session, she recalled the community circle she had been conducting with her class all year:

A community circle should be about checking in with self-regulation, giving appreciations, and practicing our attentive listening… It’s giving our kids a voice
so I’m not going to shut it down. But this was more…to take that circle that they’ve been working on all year and turn it into assessment opportunities… It’s awesome!

The community circle is a practice wherein students gather in a circle and take turns sharing something (such as a thought, an experience, a story) important to them with the group. The intent is to build trust and a sense of community, and to develop oral communication skills such as self-expression and active listening. Jamie felt is was a natural choice to use that time for the debriefing session of their lesson.

Mary demonstrated a similar flexibility and openness to her students’ creative thinking when she described the example shared in the motivation and engagement component highlighted in the instance of her student asking to move like his chosen animal. By working with her student’s idea, Mary applied decision-making, improvisation, and adaptation skills associated with creative and critical thinking, as she immediately allowed the movement of desks and students to take place, suggesting a fun guessing game by saying, “ok, you do that but you can’t tell anybody what your animal is…” Likewise, the students demonstrated connection-making and critical self-awareness when they took on their animal moves and guessed at their classmates’ roles. One student recognized that moving like his animal could help his classmates better understand their writing. Jamie expressed similar student learning as she described an active particle theory lesson in which her ELL students – who were, “having a really hard time writing in role” – acted out being particles changing states with the help of their ELL teacher.

Jamie described the results:
I had students who had never produced a thing in writing smiling, engaged. It was… thrilling. To watch these kids demonstrate their understanding of particle theory… So, if I can’t write it, maybe I can act it out and then maybe I can write.

As mentioned in Chapter Two of this study, DiE is not confined to spontaneous improvisation or free play, but rather often includes constraints and guidelines (Bailin, 2011); within those constraints, Bailin (2011) suggests that there is an interplay between invention, critical judgment, imagination, knowledge, and skill. In this way, drama promotes organized, but creative thinking, necessitating the mastering of skills and knowledge of form, combined with imagination and invention.

Jamie discovered with her initial attempts at Writing In-Role that this can prove to be both challenging for students new to drama and, at the same time, equally rewarding. Jamie explained in her first interview that her students were, “like fish out of water.” Specifically, one student claimed to not have an imagination and, therefore, could not do the writing. Additionally, “about half of the students are not as vocal as the rest,” and many would only produce three lines and believe they were finished their work. Thus, Jamie, upon seeing the positive results with her ELL students, applied her own critical and creative thinking and adapted the lesson plan by adding more structured writing examples, modelling what a letter written by one character written to another would sound like, connecting previously taught skills to the task, and adding shared writing practice to the whole group. The results showed some students truly excelled and all students were better, “able to produce evidence of understanding,” a result similar to what Duffy (2011) found with his Grade 3 students.
Another challenge for Jamie’s students was combining knowledge with invention in order to be interviewed in-role. The interplay between invention, critical judgment, and imagination is what Bailin (2011) suggests occurs within the constraints of dramatic forms, and is how drama promotes creative thinking. Jamie found herself assuming the role of a CBC journalist in order to set the tone and to demonstrate a possible approach to interviewing in one of her lessons. The Teacher In-Role strategy is highly encouraged by drama in education experts such as Belliveau and Belliveau (2015), Heathcote and Herbert (1985), and O’Neil (1985) because it is user-friendly and offers an accessible way to frame a situation, inviting students into a story and allowing for unexpected learning to occur. Noticing the strategy in the Notes section of the lesson, Jamie also played the role of one of the lyricists. Here, the class was studying to show how to let go and just, “make it up” – to improvise. The initial hesitation resembles Steele’s study (2015), where the concept of, “no wrong answers” (p. 78-79) was a challenge for both students and teachers alike. With Jamie’s help, however, her students relaxed into their roles and began to infer answers and take some, “artistic liberty.” During the debriefing session after the interviews, Jamie appeared impressed with the level of reflective thinking of her students had shown, and how that produced student-generated success criteria and the steps they would take next time, including doing more research, taking more risks, adding an accent, and becoming more familiar with the information, to name a few.

It is this kind of higher-level thinking Duffy (2011) was discussing, specifically where students are required to think more actively about their choices and understanding. Bailin’s (2002) point about creativity occurring within structured parameters also applies.
According to Jamie, the depth of the discussion was not like anything Jamie’s students had done before – even with the year-long commitment to the growth mindset and practicing a daily community circle of sharing. Jamie realized the power of debriefing and the potential for valuable assessment: “The community circle is obviously important to [the class], but… to take that circle that they’ve been working on all year and turn it into [drama-based] assessment opportunities – it’s awesome!”

Mary did not face the same challenge, but she did notice her students overcame a similar mental block to her own. She recognized that she was very unsure of her abilities to integrate drama, and was a little cautious at the beginning. She did not tell her students at first that they were doing drama due to earlier comments they had made such as, “I’m not creative” or, “I can’t do drama.” She knew her students needed to experience success before they would all join in. After the first three weeks, Mary informed them they had been doing drama, and they reflected on what they had been able to do. Mary expressed how nice it was to see them understand that without her telling them, that they could ‘do’ drama – that, in fact, they had already done it! Suddenly, the students realized they could ‘do’ drama successfully on their own, which had a direct impact on their level of engagement. As suggested by Figure 4, there is a direct link between critical thinking and both motivation and engagement. In this case, reflection upon success led to higher participation and confidence. Mary explained that her students were familiar with her integrating subjects, but did not always participate actively due to lack of interest. The immediate participation, and then sudden increase in engagement, was thus a pleasant surprise for her.
As Mary continued with her attempts, she admitted to making some mistakes, which she shared with her class to model them as learning experiences. Her students responded with ideas of what to do instead, as Mary notes that, “they were starting to pull it back together for us.” Not only did Mary reflect critically on her own performance, but her students showed clear creative thinking through the offering of solutions – further evidence of what prior research has shown (Cogswell & McLauchlan, 2014; Johnson, 2002; Pruitt, Ingram, & Weiss, 2014). The entire scene offers more evidence of the link between creative and critical thinking, and communication and collaboration.

**Collaboration and Communication**

As Ferrari (2011) notes dramatic acts in education are intrinsically collaborative and social in nature. Sæbø (2011) connects DiE to socio-constructivism, and Schonmann (2005) declares that DiE contexts celebrate human interactions, allowing students to create and share meanings. This was certainly evident in the interactions of the students of both participants. For instance, students in Jamie’s class shared with the whole group their reflective thoughts about their own performances, their reactions to their peer’s performances, their ideas for further self-improvement, and their connections to prior knowledge – which led to further discovery for the entire class, thus making the whole unit more meaningful. One student remarked (as quoted by Jamie) to the group that, “You know, I was really nervous and then I watched Linda and everybody would react to her and she was so funny and she had so much fun, I thought, I want to do just like she did.” Jamie went on to say, “So she upped her performance. It ups everybody.” This suggests that just the observation of their peers led to an improved level of performance by students. Jamie found herself communicating with her students to track progress – for
instance, asking, “Are you doing what’s expected?” – and questioning them to encourage deeper thinking and independent decision-making – asking questions like, “Are you researching enough so that you can get into character?” This led her to adapt her strategies (as described earlier) to help her students. She found that pedagogies such as modelling, shared writing, and strategies like Teacher In-Role eased her students into drama and took the pressure off regarding performance or right answers. She reflects that, “I saw lots of learning, struggle and discomfort, mistakes. They have been learning all year to accept mistakes as part of the Growth Mindset. It’s not about the right answer.”

Moreover, Jamie had many students whose first language was not English and, therefore, generally struggled to meet the same expectations as the rest of the class. When she adapted the Writing In-Role activity to include shared writing in partnership with an Educational Assistance (EA) and ELL teacher, those students seemed to show higher engagement, comprehension, and retention. Seeing that go well, Jamie decided to add it to the whole group lesson.

Similarly, when Mary shared her mistakes with her students with the intention of modelling how to see them as learning opportunities, her students responded by supporting her and working together using their own ideas. Another specific example of collaboration within drama was the time when Mary granted the student request to move around the room as animals. She was open to the idea and allowed the students to move desks out of the way in order to have the space they needed. Students started trying to guess the animal while other students explored through movement. Mary remarked, “There’s nobody laughing at one another. They’re trying to guess….” She went on to say,
“Whatever they chose we went with, and it is really neat to see the support they’re giving each other for that.”

From the teacher perspective, several professional development studies and articles (Andrews, 2010; Betts, 2005; Brown, 2006; Murray, 2001; Steele, 2015; Swartz, 2015) share that teachers highly value the interaction with peers and experts, as well as a hands-on application of their learning with their students (Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; McKean & Sudol, 2002; Murray, 2001; Steele, 2015) above other strategies for professional earning. Both Jamie and Mary shared the resource developed as part of this study with their colleagues. Mary explained that, “Just having that confidence to share it, of course I’m going to share it.” In Jamie’s case, she was working with an EA who ended up helping the ELL students write a script, which they performed. By the mid-point of the resource trial period, even though Jamie was communicating with her students and adapting the resource as needed with more writing examples, she had not yet tried the debriefing strategy at the end of the lessons. During our first interview, she explained some of her plans for the second half, but was unsure about taking the time for debriefing. In the spirit of action research and as a visiting expert, I encouraged her to read about it and give it a try. This one intervention by the researcher suggests that a little one on one time with a visiting artist would be beneficial in connection with the resource, if only to offer encouragement and to give the teacher someone to talk to and avoid the feeling of isolation, as described by McLauchlan (2006). When asked directly if they would recommend the resource to their colleagues, both participants answered without hesitation, “Yes!” Jamie went on to say that, “it would be silly not to” and that, “it would be neat to use it if I’m being evaluated… it’s a great opportunity to show a different side
of me as a teacher.” Clearly, the participants felt confident enough to share the resource and had experienced positive results from their efforts, but what was it that gave them this confidence to try something new to them?

**Implications for Practice**

This was a small-scale study and therefore, it admittedly lacks the generalizability of larger studies. However, the results show a clear connection to previous research regarding professional development and student learning, and the teachers who participated shared an overall positive experience, highlighting that there is clearly some value to it. The possible implications of this are broken down into three categories: recommendations i) for teachers and administrators; ii) for school boards, and iii) for research for DiE in schools.

**Implications for Teachers and Administrators**

Freire (1970) suggests that problem-posing education would bring about a more equitable, dialogical relationship between teachers and students because it would require active thinking and participation by both sides. I proposed in this research study that DiE shares many of the same qualities of problem-posing education, as well as inspiring more creativity, which is something creativity and education expert Sir Ken Robinson declares is being “killed” in schools (2010). Due to the flexible and creative nature of the drama-based techniques employed in DiE, practicing these techniques could also bring about more freedom of education (hooks, 2009) by supporting children’s natural desire to question and learn. The positive results of high levels of engagement, in-depth student reflections and discussions generating valuable assessment and success criteria, supportive community atmospheres, and a general feeling of fun felt by all seem to
suggest that DiE does, indeed, bring about positive change in classrooms. Both Mary and Jamie, the teacher participants in this study, were actively promoting a sense of community within their classrooms and applying different strategies to both engage their learners and to meet their diverse needs when they began trying DiE. Both used the words “amazing” and “fun” to describe the resource and the experience. In sum, both participants in this study appeared grateful to have the opportunity to use the resource and could not think of a reason why they would not share it with their colleagues.

Teachers face many pressures and demands on their time (Johnson, 2002; O’Toole, 2011), and the administrators I encounter actively fend off what appears to be more pressure or demands on their teachers. The irony is, though, if they could take a little time and look through the lessons in the resource, like my two participants did, teachers may find something that would help them to use their time more effectively with their students and to bring more positive experiences and feedback to the class, which will, in turn, lead to more enjoyment of the teaching experience in spite of its administrative pressures and demands for accountability. The research is there, as described in Chapter Two, to support the use of drama in the classroom, clearly demonstrating the benefits to students. Some research illustrates the benefits to teachers, too (Andrews, 2010; Cawthon & Dawson, 2009; McKean & Sudol, 2002; Swartz, 2015). The biggest challenge for researchers in getting drama strategies and resources like this handbook into the hands of teachers is getting past the resistance at the administrative level and the mental block that teachers without arts experience have, as they feel that they cannot ‘do’ arts or drama. As highlighted by Andrews (2010), Betts (2005), Murray (2001), and Stinson and Freebody (2006), administrative support can be an important
motivator for teachers, or a detraction from attempting something new if administration is
pressuring them to focus on other priorities (McFadden, 2012). Getting a useful tool, such
as this handbook, into the hands of these teachers with the support of administration and
with clear connections to the curriculum appears to be the key to overcoming teacher
resistance to implementing DiE. A tool grounded in the research and designed to meet
curriculum expectations, to differentiate instruction, and to engage students to think
creatively and critically may, therefore, lead to positive implications for school boards.

Implications for School Boards

There have been several articles addressing the barriers to getting DiE
implemented in schools (Kaaland-Wells, 1994; McLauchlan, 2006; Murray, 2001;
O’Toole, 2011; Sæbø, 2009). Those same studies point out that outside support from the
education system and community would either positively or negatively influence how
open teachers would be to implementing new strategies. Andrews (2010) and Sæbø
(2009) mention that getting teachers more supporting materials and training would help
in that endeavor. Perhaps through in-service training sessions, a resource could be
provided so teachers have something they can use after their training, for instance. But
how do teachers get these materials? Quite simply, if the school board approves a
resource and provides it to the schools, it is made available to the teachers. Based on my
experience recruiting participants for this study, and the experiences described by various
other researchers such as Cawthon and Dawson (2009), McKean and Sudol (2002), and
Swartz (2015), the best way to reach teachers is through direct contact. This would
suggest that if the school boards approved a resource – like that proposed in Chapter Four
of this study – and made it available to schools, they should also provide an in-service
training session connected to it so administrators and teachers know they have the support of the board for its implementation. This effort would require budgetary allotments, as O’Toole (2011) and Sæbø (2009) note, but would benefit teachers by providing them with direct support to compliment the handbook. Teachers would be able to voice any apprehensions, ask questions they have, and begin thinking about how to apply the handbook to their own situations as they are guided through the handbook during such a training session, for instance. This can also help them see where it can be adapted, how lessons can be differentiated, and where they can find helpful tips and guidance.

**Implications for Research for DiE in Schools**

This research took the form of a qualitative study with field testing. Qualitative research involves positioning the self and personal values within the research, semi-open-ended interviewing, thematic and emergent analysis of multiple perspectives, and interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2014). In other words, qualitative research requires a certain amount of flexibility on the part of the researcher. This section will describe the significant challenges and limitations of this research, along with specific recommendations for future researchers.

**Challenges and limitations.** Working with teachers and the realities of school life can be challenging – as experienced by even just scheduling time to discuss and set up the current research project. Finding enough time for interviews can also be a barrier. Smaller, manageable challenges facing this study include a couple of glitches during the first two interviews. For the first mid-point interview, for instance, the recording device malfunctioned, so I wrote rapid notes in short-form as the participant answered questions. This interview took place over the phone during recess and snack time due to scheduling
conflicts on the part of the participant. After some discussion of possible times she inquired if a phone interview were possible. I prepared for the call but then my recording device would not activate so I informed my participant of the difficulty and how I would proceed regarding note-taking and that she would have a chance to look them over later. She understood and proceeded with the interview. The notes were shared with the participant for member-checking, along with a copy of the questions in case she wanted to add anything (she did not). The second participant also had challenges with scheduling time for the first in-depth interview. The interviews made it even more evident how the time constraints and demands of teaching make research in schools a challenge. For instance, Mary was tied down with standardized testing and other obligations and so she could not meet or talk at all at the mid-point of the project. She requested that the questions (see Appendix A, first page) be emailed to her so she could answer the questions in writing. This turned the first interview into a structured, long-form survey, however, that saved time with the member-checking stage. As mentioned earlier, scheduling time for interviews was a challenge, but both participants were able to meet for the final interview – though neither interview was interruption-free. As a result, such operational and logistical challenges should be considered when conducting research on DiE with teacher participants.

Both teachers applied the resource consistently and frequently through the entire trial period. Mary had to balance her efforts with the mandatory standardized testing of her Grade 6 students for a couple weeks, but otherwise, she had no issues integrating the resource into her practice. In Ontario, there are annual standardized tests for literacy and numeracy for certain grades, which generally take place over two weeks in May; this
requires preparation time prior to the testing. Time was a limitation of this research, which it seems would have been a limitation regardless of the number of participants. The small number of participants allowed this limitation to be manageable.

However, the most significant obstacle faced throughout this entire project was the recruitment of volunteers. Initially, three teachers who taught in separate small- to medium-sized schools in different parts of the same city signed up for the study. Taking the suggestion from McLauchlan (2006) that developing relationships with school administrators can lead to more positive results in promoting DiE in schools, I decided to approach the administrators first to recruit participants. This was a lengthy process: being relatively new to the area, I began my recruitment by approaching the Principals of a few local elementary schools conveniently located near me. Each Principal offered positive feedback about the concept of DiE, but it took a lot of effort to make it clear that the project was about helping teachers learn to use drama as a tool to teach their regular subjects, as opposed to teaching drama as separate subject. Several Principals referred other schools as potential locations, which I contacted with little result. Some Principals, knowing how their teachers were eager professionals who often try new things, were concerned about letting their teachers take on too much because of reasons like standardized testing or other administrative initiatives, and therefore, they, too, suggested other locations I could instead try. Others claimed it was a very busy time of year, so the teachers would not be able to take on anything else at that time.

This represents a conundrum for researchers who want teachers directly involved in projects: no matter what time of the school year, teachers are always under a lot of pressure with many demands on their time and energy. This makes the idea of
participating in yet one more task, or going through the effort of trying something new to them, seem overwhelming. One volunteer suddenly dropped out of the project during the first meeting for this very reason. She found the idea of trying out these different teaching strategies without any coaching or modelling by me, the researcher, overwhelming at that time due to other pressures outside of school. Of course, the whole point of having teachers apply the drama methods and lesson plans from the resource is to allow them to see first-hand how DiE can make the task of teaching more effective, more fun, more rewarding, and, therefore, easier and less stressful – thereby allowing teachers to better handle the demands of teaching and help their students meet the required learning expectations. Eventually, a chance conversation with a teacher led to a connection with an enthusiastic participant: “Jamie.” Through direct contact with the teacher, I was able to secure her a research subject. My second volunteer, “Mary”, was referred to me through a university contact who had gone to a local school for an unrelated professional development session. In a follow-up conversation with Mary, I found that she was interested in the project.

**Recommendations.** Regarding the time and scheduling challenges, it would be easier if the researcher was the one going into the classroom, with the teacher either observing the artist or leaving the room to do something else, such as in Duffy’s (2014) and Johnson’s (2002) studies. This turned out to be the expectation of one potential participant who dropped out when it was made clear that was not going to happen. With research where the teacher is the one being studied, demands on their time offer the biggest challenge: this is a reality seen in previous studies such as Andrews (2010) and Betts (2005), and in my own recruitment process for this study, as well.
With the goal of the handbook being a tool teachers can use without prior experience or training, the choice was made to leave out a consultation step. The initial meetings with participants included a short overview of the contents of the resource, highlighting areas that were important to read in advance, so that the first meeting could be kept relatively short. In hindsight, a little more time spent going through the resource might have helped Jamie, for example, helping her see the benefits of strategies such as debriefing and Teacher In-Role sooner. Mary did not seem to need any extra time, however. She already had her first lesson planned by the time we first met. The resource was also sent electronically in advance of the first meeting so participants could have a chance to look it over. However, considering the positive results of other professional development studies such as Betts (2005), Cawthon and Dawson (2009), and McKean and Sudol (2002), in which the teachers collaborated with the researchers or artists, perhaps adding a little more specific coaching to the initial introduction to the resource would be beneficial in helping teachers face any apprehensions or trepidations before they make their first attempts with DiE on their own. This would align with what Jamie did when she provided more structure for her students at the beginning when she encountered their resistance.

A suggestion for future researchers when recruiting participant teachers is to not only reach out to administrators very early on in their research process, but to also maintain an on-going communication with them as the stages for ethics approval and any strategy or resource development progress. This may give the researcher some insight into what administrators need from the researcher to feel assured that the research will
not add more pressure on their teachers. Therefore, this potentially removes or reduces the barrier to accessing teachers directly, thus allowing for smoother recruitment.

**Conclusion**

My focus on teachers for this research project, rather than a focus on student learning, is a direct result of what I found in the literature. Various experts through the decades (see Chapter Two) have researched and described the benefits that DiE has for students, and several offer examples and resources of various teaching activities and strategies applying drama (Duffy, 2014; Fels & Belliveau, 2015; Fennessey, 2000; Hendrix, Eick, & Shannon, 2012; O’Neil & Lambert, 1982). Other education experts have explored and experimented with applying DiE strategies to professional development programs with positive results, but also with great demands on teacher time and other resources, including funding (Andrews, 2009; Cawthon & Dawson, 2010; Swartz, 2015). Out of all the literature I came across, none of the scholarship created a supportive resource for teacher participants to use as part of the study.

My aim with this research was thus to explore the experiences of professionals to see if the resource I created might be effective in developing teacher confidence in integrating drama into their regular teaching, without adding to their workload (which was explained in the initial conversations during the recruitment stage). Based on the feedback from the participants, not only was this aim achieved, but also, there appears to be clear evidence that a resource of this nature is effective in developing educator confidence. By connecting the drama structures to other subjects’ curricular expectations and to the subject matter that teachers may be more familiar with, this resource has the
potential to build the confidence teachers need to take risks in educating students’ and trying something new – such as DiE.

As a secondary application, this approach was designed to provide teachers with information they could use to demonstrate and share knowledge and experiences with colleagues, administration, or parents, if needed. This secondary goal was not as clearly demonstrated, but there were hints at its achievement. For example, the participants did not hesitate to share the resource with colleagues. Mary’s colleague remarked on how easy the lessons were to understand and follow, echoing Mary’s own comments about the handbook. Furthermore, Jamie did suggest that the handbook would be useful to employ during her own evaluation by administration, and would help her provide a more positive asset-based reporting approach when it came time to do report cards.

In Chapter One, I listed some of the motivations that underpinned this research. My first motivation was based on something I had read: that drama strategies are effective teaching tools because they offer opportunities for creative and critical thinking for both students and their teachers, which helps to make the learning and teaching experience more effective, engaging, and rewarding. This appeared to be confirmed. Secondly, I had seen from past experiences that drama strategies and activities allow for the development of several skills at once and a deeper understanding of concepts due to their experiential nature and cognitive connections. That said, this finding was not entirely confirmed during my research study, but there was some evidence that both participant teachers were able to seamlessly use drama alongside – and with – other subjects. My third motivation for this study was that I know teachers are under immense pressure to meet a multitude of expectations at once, and often feel overwhelmed and
under-supported – which could lead to teachers losing their passion to teach and experiencing burn-out. Though this topic was not addressed directly in the research design, the time constraints and demands of the teaching profession were certainly made clear from both the recruitment of participants to their sharing of their experiences.

Neither teacher participant expressed any regrets in participating in the study nor utilizing the handbook; rather, they both expressed gratitude and clearly positive emotions about the experience, along with increased motivation from beginning to end. The participants also expressed that they hope to continue applying this new-found approach in their teaching. Finally, I wondered that if teachers had a chance to try basic DiE, would they see that further professional development in that area would help their students achieve better outcomes in all subject areas? This way, might teachers feel less inhibited to pursue whichever AQ course they prefer, rather than feeling pressured to take subject- or skill-specific courses to ensure their students achieve higher test scores?

Again, Mary’s statement expresses that this experience was, “just the tip of the iceberg” in terms of the potential of DiE. She acknowledged that she would never have considered taking an AQ course in DiE before, but she certainly wants to now. At the end of Swartz’s (2015) article, he asks, “What will motivate teachers to take a drama course?” (p. 51). I believe I have offered a potential solution with this resource and research.

My initial inspiration and motivation for this research stemmed from a variety of teaching and learning experiences throughout my life. I wanted to create something that teachers could use in conjunction with their best practices that would encourage higher-level thinking and learning, along with professional satisfaction. I also wanted it to be tested in real classrooms with real teachers who had little no experience with drama, with
the aim of breaking through any preconceived ideas that only specially trained teachers can bring drama into their teaching. Although there were some challenges along the way, especially when it came to recruiting volunteers, the two teacher participants who piloted the resource certainly demonstrated evidence of overcoming their initial apprehensions and self-doubt through their positive experiences and feedback.

This research might be the first step of a new momentum for DiE. Once the volunteer feedback is implemented and the handbook is published, and with the influence of Jamie and Mary in their respective schools, perhaps more teachers will discover how easy it can be to include DiE strategies in their teaching toolbox, which means more students will reap the benefits.
Appendix A

Interview Guide Templates

Interview Guide #1 (Mid-Point)

Please note I will be recording this interview so that I get every detail right.

[Test recording device; begin recording]

Just a reminder if there are any questions you, the participant, do not want to answer you may feel free to decline to answer. This interview should take approximately 45 mins to complete. If you have any notes or reflections you have taken during the past few weeks, you may consult them to answer the questions. Also, if you have reflective notes, pictures, or so forth you would like share, I will take those now. Do you have any questions or comments before we begin?

Note: Questions may be re-worded as the interview progresses.

1. Please describe in detail how you have been using the resource in your classroom over the past few weeks.
2. What have been your positive results or successes in terms of student learning and engagement as a result of applying the drama methods?
3. What about the resource has been helpful in achieving these positive results?
4. What have been your challenges or limitations with using the drama methods?
5. Please describe anything you were missing or needing that wasn't available in the resource which might have helped you to avoid or address those challenges.
6. What would you like to change or improve about the resource so that it could be more supportive of your teaching?
7. How have the students been reacting to the drama methods you have applied so far?
8. How has the use of drama methods effected your experience as a teacher?
9. What are your plans for the rest of the trial period?
10. How are you feeling about integrating drama methods into your teaching as compared to when you started this project?
11. Would you recommend this resource to other colleagues? Why or Why not?

Please note: Additional questions that may spring to mind during the interview will be noted here.

Thank you so much for your time and your thoughts today. I look forward to our next meeting.

[End recording]

[Schedule next meeting]
Interview Guide #2 (Final Meeting)

Please note I will be recording this interview.

[Test recording device; begin recording]

Just a reminder if there are any questions you, the participant, do not want to answer you may feel free to decline to answer. This interview should take approximately 45 mins to complete. If you have any notes or reflections you have taken during the past few weeks, you may consult them to answer the questions. Also, if you have reflective notes, pictures, and so forth you would like share, I will take those now. Do you have any questions or comments before we begin?

12. Comparing the results of the first half of this project to the second, describe, in detail, changes you have noticed in:
   - your use of the resource
   - level of confidence in applying drama methods
   - your approach to lesson planning
   - interactions with your students

13. Describe any differences you noticed in student engagement and learning when drama methods were applied over the course of this project as compared to when none were applied.

14. Now that you are at, or near, the end of your unit of study which you began when we started this project, how has the use of drama methods effected your assessments and evaluations of student learning?

15. What about the resource have you found the most helpful or useful? Why?

16. What did you find challenging about this experience?

17. What would you like to see improved in the resource so that it might better meet your needs?

18. Will you continue to integrate drama methods into your teaching? Why or why not?

19. Reflecting over the whole experience, what did you find most remarkable (positive or negative)? What have you learned?

20. Would you recommend this resource to other colleagues? Why or Why not?

21. How has this experience/ use of this resource affected your feelings about taking an AQ course in Drama in Education? (What did you feel before and now?) / or Would you consider taking an AQ course in Drama in Education now that you have given it a try? Why or Why not?

Note any additional questions here:

Thank you so much for your time and effort with this interview and with the project. I greatly appreciate it.

[End recording]
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Informed Consent Form

April 10th, 2018

Title: Supporting Drama in Education: Developing a Professional Resource

Student Principal Investigator: Susan Reichheld, Masters of Education student, Brock University, sr15sj@brocku.ca, 289-219-3295

Principal Investigator: Dr Kari-Lynn Winters, Department of Education, Brock University, kwinters@brocku.ca, 905-688-5550 ext. 5494

Invitation: You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to pilot, in the Niagara Region, a professional teaching resource designed to support P/J teachers and the use of drama methods in their classrooms. This resource is a collection of lesson plans and detailed descriptions of drama-based methods, all connected to Ministry of Education curriculum outcomes, that has already been developed and vetted by a professional. The feedback from the pilot session will be used to further develop a resource to better support teachers.

What is involved: You will be asked to engage in an orientation session (approximately 20 minutes), to use the resource for a period of 4-6 weeks, and to participate in two feedback interviews of approximately 45 minutes. The orientation and interviews will take place outside school hours. You may choose to keep reflective notes to better illustrate your experience during the feedback interviews. Copies of the interview transcripts will be emailed to you as a Word document so that you may make changes or provide feedback and email it back to me. If you choose to provide feedback on the interview transcripts, it will take as much or as little time as you want, possibly 20 to 30 mins in total. The transcript feedback needs to be returned to me within seven days of receiving it. If you do not return the transcript, it will be considered acceptable and used for analysis as is. The total amount of time involved to complete this project includes: 1) the instruction you provide; 2) the feedback you offer; and 3) the interviews.

Potential Benefits and Risks This experience should give you the opportunity to try out new teaching methods, engage in the curriculum in new ways, and share your experience and knowledge with an interested colleague. Since drama education is already a part of Ontario’s curricula and it is on the Ontario report cards, teachers are already required to incorporate this subject in schools. There are no known or perceived risks to the participant in participating in this project.

Confidentiality: The information you provide will be kept confidential. You or your students will not be directly identified in any report or presentation of the data nor in the analysis from the interviews. Also, the school(s) will be unnamed and described only in general terms to avoid identification, ex: an elementary school in an urban community of
Southern Ontario. With your permission, some quotes under a pseudonym may be used. Also, any mentions of student names will be given pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality. Soon after the interviews, you will be provided with a copy of the transcript to review for accuracy of our dialogue and to clarify any statements. The interviews will be recorded (audio only) and notes will be taken. All hard copy data collected will be stored in a locked cabinet and any digital data will be stored electronically with password protection. Data will be kept until the completion of the project. Six months after this time, electronic data will be erased and hard copy data, including all data linking participant pseudonyms to their identities, will be shredded. Access to this data will be restricted to myself and my advisor, Dr. Kari-Lynn Winters.

**Voluntary Participation:** Engaging in this research project is completely voluntary. You may decline to answer any question or to participate in any other portion of the process. Also, you may choose to withdraw from this study at any point with no penalty or consequences. If you choose to withdraw, all data you have provided will be destroyed immediately.

**Publication of Results:** Results of this project will be reported in a Major Research Paper (MRP) submitted as part of a Master’s degree. The handbook and my own process, created as a result of the MRP may be published in academic journals or in book form, or presented at academic or arts-based conferences. Participants will be offered a copy of the final product after the project has been completed and approved.

**Contact Information:** This project has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Brock University Research Ethics Board (file #16-201). If you have any questions or need any more information, please contact me, Susan Reichheld, using the contact information at the top of this form. This project has been reviewed and have been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the Research Ethics Board of Brock University. If you have any questions, concerns, or comments about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics office at 905-688-5550 ext. 3035, reb@brocku.ca.

**Thank you** for your help with this project. Please keep a copy of this information for your records.

**Consent:** I agree to participate in the research project as described above. I have made this decision based on the information provided in this Informed Consent form. I have had an opportunity to receive any further details I needed/ wanted about this project and understand that I may ask questions in the future. I understand that I may withdraw my consent from any part or the whole project at any time.

Name: _________________________________________________________

Signature: _______________________________________________________

Date: _________________________
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Introductory Questionnaire

Dear participant,

The information you provide in this questionnaire will be used only for context purposes for the final report of this pilot project. You may return the form at our first meeting or you may email it directly to me on or after our first meeting.

Please check or complete the following questions:

1. How long have you been teaching?
   __0-1 years    __2-5 years    __6-10 years    __11-15 years    __15+ years

2. What grade levels do you teach? (Please check all that apply)
   __ Grade 1    __ Grade 4    __ Grade 7
   __ Grade 2    __ Grade 5    __ Grade 8
   __ Grade 3    __ Grade 6

3. What subjects are you currently teaching? (Check all that apply)
   __ Language Arts    __ Math    __ General Science    __ Social Studies
   __ French    __ Other (please specify)_______________________

4. Sex: __ M    __ F

5. Education: (check all that apply)
   __ Bachelor of Education
   __ Bachelor Degree other than Bachelor of Education
   __ Master Degree
   __ Doctoral Degree
   __ Additional Teaching Qualifications
   Please specify:______________________________

6. Have you received formal training on integrating Drama Methods into your classroom teaching?
   __ Yes    __ Yes, and I have also taught myself    __ No
   __ No, but I have taught myself

7. If you answered yes to the above Question 6, please check the type of training you received (please check all that apply):
   __ School- or board sponsored professional development
   __ Training I paid for on my own
   __ Informal training from colleagues
   __ College or university
   __ Other (please specify):______________________________
Number of years since your last training in Drama: _____

8. Why are you interested in integrating drama methods into your teaching?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your time and information.
## Appendix D

### Sample Excerpt From Code Book Used for Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview with Jamie</th>
<th>Interview with Mary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Understanding</td>
<td>Students want to understand (more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiate (able to)</td>
<td>Differentiate (able to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort (all becoming)</td>
<td>Interest (students have)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discomfort (some level of)</td>
<td>Participation (by all, esp. those who don’t normally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable (the students)</td>
<td>Engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking the pressure off</td>
<td>Mental blocks: “I can’t do drama,” I’m not creative, I can’t be another character” (students, before)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease them into it</td>
<td>Outside student comfort zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Hard time understanding (teacher, before) experiencing it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success criteria (student generated)</td>
<td>Have to experience it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure if able to integrate (teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthusiasm (student)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Still loving it (students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (positive aspect of resource)</td>
<td>No experience needed (in drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t matter what grade you are (swapping subjects)</td>
<td>Any experience (can use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to access, to understand, to tweak, to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible for all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language is accessible (resource)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexible (plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use as is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptable (resource- easy to adapt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wow (student results, writing)</td>
<td>Experienced success (students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation ramped up (after learning they’d done drama)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>No challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>Fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting into (role, improvisation)</td>
<td>Confidence/ confident (teacher must have)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not just reading a script</td>
<td>Very successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrilling</td>
<td>Everything was successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good feeling</td>
<td>Learning experience (for teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loved it</td>
<td>Wonderful (to see students come together)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascinated (students were in poetry)</td>
<td>Easily presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Can we please do this again?”</td>
<td>Amazing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Research Ethics Board (REB) Approval Letter

Brock University
Research Ethics Office
Tel: 905-688-5550 ext. 3035
Email: reb@brocku.ca

Social Science Research Ethics Board
Certificate of Ethics Clearance for Human Participant Research

DATE: 2/14/2017
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: WINTERS, Kari-Lynn - Teacher Education
FILE: 16-201 - WINTERS
TYPE: Masters Thesis/Project STUDENT: Susan Reichheld
SUPERVISOR: Kari-Lynn Winters
TITLE: Supporting Drama in Education: Developing a Professional Resource

ETHICS CLEARANCE GRANTED

Type of Clearance: NEW Expiry Date: 2/28/2018
The Brock University Social Science Research Ethics Board has reviewed the above named research proposal and considers the procedures, as described by the applicant, to conform to the University’s ethical standards and the Tri-Council Policy Statement. Clearance granted from 2/14/2017 to 2/28/2018.

The Tri-Council Policy Statement requires that ongoing research be monitored by, at a minimum, an annual report. Should your project extend beyond the expiry date, you are required to submit a Renewal form before 2/28/2018. Continued clearance is contingent on timely submission of reports.

To comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement, you must also submit a final report upon completion of your project. All report forms can be found on the Research Ethics web page at http://www.brocku.ca/research/policies-and-forms/research-forms.

In addition, throughout your research, you must report promptly to the REB:
   a) Changes increasing the risk to the participant(s) and/or affecting significantly the conduct of the study;
   b) All adverse and/or unanticipated experiences or events that may have real or potential unfavourable implications for participants;
   c) New information that may adversely affect the safety of the participants or the conduct of the study;
   d) Any changes in your source of funding or new funding to a previously unfunded project.
We wish you success with your research.

Approved:

Ann-Marie DiBiase, Chair
Social Science Research Ethics Board

**Note:** Brock University is accountable for the research carried out in its own jurisdiction or under its auspices and may refuse certain research even though the REB has found it ethically acceptable. If research participants are in the care of a health facility, at a school, or other institution or community organization, it is the responsibility of the Principal Investigator to ensure that the ethical guidelines and clearance of those facilities or institutions are obtained and filed with the REB prior to the initiation of research at that site.
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