

Asia-Pacific Journal for Arts Education

Special Issue ***Current Issues, Trends & Practices in Drama/Theatre Education: Perspectives from the Asia Pacific and Beyond***

Guest Editor:

Samuel Leong

Consultant Editor:

Larry O'Farrell

<http://www.ied.edu.hk/cca/apjae/apjae.htm>

ISSN 1683-6995

Volume 11 Number 11

December 2012

Dramatic Art for Second Language Education: Appropriate Process Objectives for Hong Kong Schools

Matthew DeCoursey
Department of Literature and Cultural Studies
Hong Kong Institute of Education
China
matthew@ied.edu.hk

Abstract

If drama is to work as a technique for language education, it needs to work as drama, but in Hong Kong, the objectives of each lesson must be language objectives. This implies that we need intermediate objectives, process objectives, to make drama work for language education. This article examines two previous models of drama in language education, drawing imagination, aesthetics and emotion from them as process objectives. It is proposed that all three should be used in a single complex model. This study focuses on a course that presented this three-part model to student teachers, examining survey and interview data together with their essays for the course. Student teachers find the model to be usable in practice. Obstacles arise from the school system, however.

Introduction

Teachers working in Hong Kong and other parts of East Asia often experience a conflict between an idealistic view of education and the demands of the system they work in. They frequently talk about pursuing the goals of responsibility, self-respect, mutual respect and the capacity for independent thought. They also talk about real communicative competence and discuss the access to a wider world that comes with second language acquisition. Drama techniques connect well with theories of learning that make sense to students. For example, Lev Vygotsky called for collaborative learning. Constructivist educators appreciate drama's appeal to imagination, and the possibility for students to build their own understanding. Drama fits well with views that reject the conceptual dryness both of traditional education and of behaviourism. Teachers work, however, in an exam-based system. Schools consequently set out demanding syllabuses, covering every topic that might appear on the exam.

Drama techniques in language teaching are caught between these tendencies. Many education students are enthusiastic about them. They can connect the use of drama to their ideal vision of education. In language learning, drama creates situations quite different from the normal situations of the classroom. Students can use English to express themselves on questions that have significance for them. They can find uses for elements of English which otherwise would remain detached in classroom learning.

For the purposes of language learning, drama is a means. Each period in a language course will have language objectives. In some school systems, it might be possible to assign periods to "developing fluency" or "increasing confidence," but in Hong Kong this will rarely be true. Teachers want to use drama considerably because of its perceived impact on broad education, but it must justify itself in each period as a means. There must be something about drama, then, that enables effective language learning. This effectiveness may not come into

existence on its own, simply from adopting the form of a drama technique. One must in some sense do drama well. How should we conceive of "good drama" for this purpose?

This paper will suggest that there is a need for process objectives in lesson planning. We need to know what it is about drama that can promote good learning, and maximise it. I will examine three candidates for "process objective": imagination, emotion and aesthetics. I will argue that it is most productive to create a model involving all three. I have taught a teacher education course on "Drama in the ESL Classroom" using this model. Most students in that course went straight from my class to teaching practice (Block Practice, BP). Ten of them volunteered to be research subjects and reported on their use of this model and its perceived effectiveness.

I asked two questions about the model. Given that most other models have only a single process objective, is it too complicated to have three? Does this model help to resolve the difficult problem of fitting drama lessons into the Hong Kong school system? We shall see that the model is not too complicated. It helps to create an adaptable model for a range of school situations, but especially at the senior secondary level, there remain problems.

Improvisational Drama Education and Imagination

Drama in the language classroom as it exists today is not independent of drama education for native speakers. The forums for discussing drama for language education are almost all within the institution of drama education more generally. The principal conference for this area is the International Drama in Education Research Institute, which is primarily concerned with drama education for native speakers. Influential articles on this topic are published in general drama education journals such as *Research in Drama Education*. There is one journal on this topic specifically, *Scenario*, but it is not on any index and is not at all comparable to the established general journals. The most influential book on this topic,

Words into Worlds: Learning a Second Language Through Process Drama (1998), is co-written by Cecily O'Neill, who made her reputation in drama education for native speakers. The most recent book on the topic *Second Language Learning Through Drama: Practical Techniques and Applications* (2012), was edited by Joe Winston, co-editor of *Research in Drama Education* and primarily a specialist in drama education for native speakers.

The mainstream of drama for second language learning, like the mainstream of drama education in general, has to do with improvisation, and most specifically with process drama. I will examine the models of two prominent models of process drama for language learning, those by Betty J. Wagner (2004) and the team of Kao and O'Neill (1998).

Wagner made the best-grounded single effort to relate process drama to language development, not with second language learners but with native speakers (1998, 2004). Her involvement with the Whirlwind Literacy Project in Chicago produced some interesting results. A major study showed that "the students who participated in the Whirlwind program improved three months more than the control-group students in their Iowa Test of Basic Skills reading scores" (Wagner, 2002, p. 6). She grounded this approach in socio-cultural and constructivist learning theory, and suggested that the same approach could be used for second language education, making arguments by analogy (p.10). Wagner places imagination at the centre of her understanding of learning. She writes:

In drama (just as in thinking, reading, and writing) students make meaning by connecting their prior experience to the challenge of the moment – to come up with an apt image and response as a player in an improvisation. (p. 6)

Wagner conceives of learning as "the construction of meaning," thereby agreeing with both Vygotsky and Bruner. She quotes Susanne Langer: "Imagination is the primary talent of

the human mind, the activity in whose service language has evolved" (1957, p. 57). Her central process objective, then, what allows learning, is imagination.

Her examples in discussing imagination often have to do with imagining social roles. She tells the story of two little girls playing "doctor's office." They are discussing the illness of a doll:

As they take off the doll's imaginary diaper, one reprimands the other for using the word "poo poo" when in role as the doctor (p. 94). The act of taking on a new persona demands a word choice beyond the language of her everyday life. The experiences the child has had in the society of adults is brought to bear on the task at hand, and the pull is toward internalising a diction that had not ever before been part of the child's own repertoire. This experience is not different in kind from that of the foreign-language learners who must try on a new way of expressing ideas. (p. 10)

One strength of imagination as a mediating factor, then, is that it creates a need for a range of registers that the learner would not otherwise have to use. Wagner also stresses the emotion:

Because of the immediacy of the dramatic present and the pressure to respond aptly in role in a social setting, participants become vividly alive to the moment and alert to what is expected of them. As they get caught up in the emotion of the dramatic activity, they are often able to express themselves in a more mature manner and language than they could otherwise. (pp. 9-10)

The above quotation shows that she sees emotion as contributing to imagination. Since students are "alive to the moment" owing to emotion, they imagine better. Since they imagine better, they better construct what they have learned.

Process drama and the aesthetics of dramatic tension

Wagner's article constitutes an adaptation of work with native speakers. Kao and O'Neill's *Words into Worlds* has the advantage of being thoroughly about second language learning. Their book lays much stress on motivation, stating at the beginning that they want their students to get "kicks" from the language learning process (p. ix) and asserting that "the motor that propels language acquisition is the desire to do things with words" (p. 4). There is a need, then, for a process objective. How does one stimulate this desire? Their answer is "tension." Kao and O'Neill draw the idea of tension from Robert Di Pietro's book on second language learning through drama, *Strategic Interaction* (1987). For Di Pietro, it is clear that tension has to do with the way a scenario is set up for dramatic improvisation. He distinguishes two or more contrasting roles and intentions for two or more characters. Kao and O'Neill confirm that they have retained the same definition: "Tensions arise from the dramatic situation and the intentions of the roles" (1998, p. 15). They rightly call this feature of drama "aesthetic" in nature (p. 28). In one example, they suggest that a particular lesson was unsuccessful because it "may have lacked sufficient dramatic tension" (p. 65). They conceive of "tension," then, as a process objective, enabling language learning.

Previous research, then, offers links to all of my three "process objectives", which are clearly intertwined. The motivation that Kao and O'Neill see as growing out of tension may certainly be seen as emotional in nature. The emotion may create more vividness in imagination, exactly as Wagner suggests. The difficulty I wish to resolve here has to do with the application of these principles to a wider range of activities, more suited to the Hong

Kong context. While I have no complaint with the construction of imagination that appears here, I suggest some expansion on "emotion" and "aesthetics" is needed.

Expanding our Understanding of Emotion and Aesthetics

Advances in neuroscience of the last twenty years suggest that emotion has a different and wider role in learning than was previously thought. In *Descartes' Error* (1994), Antonio Damasio sets out the case of "Elliot", who had brain damage such that his cognitive function was unimpaired but he was unable to have emotions. He could solve problems and answer questions in interviews, but his practical judgment was severely impaired. His previously successful business went bankrupt, his marriage broke up and he was unable to make accurate judgments in life. This suggests a crucial role for emotion in learning that might be applicable especially to language learning, for one does not learn language in order to be able to explain its principles, but in order to act in the world. Damasio suggests that emotion contributes to learning especially in marking things as important, to be remembered (165ff.). From our own experience, we know that it is sometimes difficult to force oneself to remember something, but some things stick in the memory whether we like it or not. Damasio suggests that when there is an emotional response to a perception or a bit of learning, the brain marks it as useful to the organism. So why do drama in the language classroom? In order to mark elements of language with emotion so that students will remember them.

Immordino-Yang and Damasio defined a theoretical model on the implications of these findings for education (2007). They proposed that emotion and cognition overlap. Effective cognition for practical purposes is necessarily emotional. Working with Douglas Faeth, Immordino-Yang proposed strategies for the classroom making use of these findings, including a suggestion of using drama (2010). They use the phrase "skilled intuition," which

seems appropriate to language learning. One does not want to speak or write by thinking through the principles of grammar, but by being intuitively aware of how to use the grammatical characteristics of the language. Emotion, then, not only contributes to imagination, but has an importance of its own in learning.

The category of the "aesthetic" could also helpfully be expanded. Kao and O'Neill's stress on "tension" suits their exclusive focus on process drama and low emphasis on linguistic accuracy as a goal. The tradition of theatre, however, also offers views of aesthetics that focus on detail. In rehearsal, directors and actors typically look for a good way of presenting some element of the play: a line or a movement, for example. A line may be delivered in too flat a way, or with emotion at variance with the needs of the play. A movement may be too tentative or too strong for the moment. Potentially, this focus on the details of performance could be harnessed to the service of accuracy as a classroom goal, for a student who wants to put in a good performance in a good show will be, for instance, motivated to pronounce accurately in performance, not for communicative reasons but for aesthetic ones.

A Teacher-training Course in the Use of Drama for Language Education

In this section, we will look at one effort to prepare education students language to use drama in the second language classroom. In the autumn of 2011, I taught a course entitled "Drama in the ESL Classroom" to education students of the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Those from the largest of the three education programmes had taken a previous course I had taught, "Theatre and Dramatic Performance." All students had applicable previous experience of drama.

"Theatre and Dramatic Performance" focused on the means a theatre group has at its disposal for presenting a story to an audience. Issues of voice were introduced first by the

interpretation of poems. Improvisations were used to introduce dramatic tension and ways of accentuating it using voice techniques and visual impact. Students interpreted a two-page play by the use of these variables. They read a longer play to look at how the playwright put things together, dealing with flashbacks and transforming a neutral theatrical space into fictional settings. Finally, students were asked to write a play in a group and perform it. The course was then aesthetic in its emphasis, focusing on ways of achieving dramatic impact based on both tension and the details of performance. Students had related the aesthetic to emotion in writing and performing plays. This was necessarily done through imagination, but none of the three terms had been in any way theorized.

How the Theoretical Model plays out in Course Design

At the first session of "Drama in the ESL Classroom," ideas of emotion and aesthetics were introduced and students asked to perform a standard drama exercise called the Invisible Tug o' War. Four or six students lined up to play the well-known children's game in two teams, each pulling on an invisible rope in an effort to pull the other team across a line. They were asked to do it once straight, a second time with a little play built up around it, and a third time with lines added to give practice in grammar or vocabulary with a repeated word or expression. For example, one team chose the word "win," and inserted the lines "we will win," "we are winning" and "we have won." By doing this, they took a basic aesthetic form (complication-crisis-dénouement) and used it to emphasize a series of emotions. The three verb tenses thereby acquired an emotional charge and became memorable. A feeling of triumph served to distinguish the last tense, the present perfect, from other tenses. The aesthetic of the Invisible Tug o' War is an aesthetic of tension, corresponding in a simple way to the priorities of Kao and O'Neill.

I presented a conceptualization of the relation between drama activities and language learning and divided drama activities into four categories: Theatre as text to be read; Theatre as text to be performed; Theatre as text written and performed by students; and Theatrical improvisation. I suggested that different categories were good for different purposes. The first and second, for example, could introduce new vocabulary and grammar and give a chance to practise them in speech. Improvisation is very good for developing fluency and for internalization. The student teachers were asked to develop lesson plans and reflect on how the material in the readings would impact lesson plans.

A highlight of the course was a demonstration lesson presented by the distinguished practitioner Prudence Wales. It was a story theatre lesson gauged to a Primary 2 level class. The students played the roles of children. In the follow-up, I asked students to recreate for themselves the experience of each phase of the lesson, considering stimulus, structure, outcomes and transition to the next activity in each case. A commentary was provided on each activity, especially in terms the three process objectives: aesthetics, emotion, imagination. Students then prepared lesson plays, using the three process objectives to build lesson plans with two drama activities in each. They wrote the script of a classroom lesson with lines for both teacher and students. They were to create difficulties for their teacher in two ways: a classroom management issue and an issue with a special-needs student. They wrote a final essay relating both the lesson play and (where applicable) drama activities during Block Practice to learning theory.

The course ended in October, allowing student teachers to go out to schools for eight weeks of Block Practice (BP). Student teachers were all given charge of classes for whole periods and in most cases for weeks. Supervisors from the Institute of Education visited student teachers three times to observe them teach language lessons for assessment. While

not identical with the situation of a qualified teacher in charge of a class, BP offers a real classroom within which students can test out their understanding of drama in teaching.

Questions about the Model in this Context

One question is whether the three-part model of process objectives is too complicated for practical use: it can certainly be difficult to plan lessons. A traditional grammar lesson involves only one objective: the grammar point being taught. Any drama lesson is more complicated. Drama as technique must be made to “work”: it has to do something effective from the point of view of language learning. If it is to work as language teaching, it must be successful as drama, that is, from an aesthetic point of view. Kao and O'Neill have one process objective, tension. My model proposes to have three kinds of process objectives. The three elements are interrelated in complex ways. Can student teachers retain all of these elements while lesson planning? One might say that this is an intrinsic worry: can the teacher deal with the complexity of the model and still function well from moment to moment in the classroom?

A second problem is extrinsic. As asserted at the beginning of this paper, the Hong Kong system is not necessarily receptive to drama as a technique. Many principals and panel chairs imply that they welcome the use of drama, but conditions may still be difficult in practice.

Methodology

A research project was initiated toward the end of the course. The whole class was surveyed on their views of the course and especially the three-part model. Ten volunteers who were about to go to Block Practice (BP) were recruited and interviewed in focus groups. All agreed to teach at least one drama lesson during their FE. It was agreed that I would come

to record as many as possible. Student teachers would themselves record the rest. As part of the course, all students had to write an essay. In it, they were asked to discuss their demonstration lesson / lesson play and their use of drama techniques in BP in relation to learning theory presented in the course. Participants agreed that their essays could be used as research material.

By this means, I obtained a range of perspectives on the experience of the course and the potential for application in BP. The survey gave some indication of the views of the whole class as the course ended. They had not had a chance to apply what they had learned in the real classroom, but the lesson play assignment had given them the opportunity to think about how the material in the course related to their experience of teaching in the previous BP. The survey material could be related to the ten volunteers where the results from the survey matched what the volunteers said in pre-BP focus groups. The ten volunteers were not necessarily representative of the class as a whole: it was possible they were more interested in the course material than the others.

I had expected that the experience of using the model in a real classroom would alter views and was interested in knowing how. This sample cannot show what teachers in general would do, but it can show how a range of motivated students went about using this material in a real classroom. This, of course, was a first effort, working with students they had only known for a short time. Student teachers were unable to introduce drama conventions for repeated use over a whole semester, and in many other ways were in a worse situation than a regular teacher in his or her own classroom.

Ten volunteers were interviewed in small focus groups in the week before BP began, to get further detail on their view of the three-part model and their expected use of it. I observed the lessons of seven of the ten and recorded them. Two of the three others recorded their own lessons.

The evidence of student teachers' essays must be treated with caution. Students were required to relate their experience to theoretical material, so the decision to do this was mine, not theirs. What is of interest for this study is their manner of understanding the use of the material in practice, their efforts to get their teaching done by means of this material.

Survey results were compiled and where possible quantified with comments listed under each question. Focus group interviews were transcribed. The transcriptions and essays of participants were coded using NVivo qualitative data analysis software, under a range of codes, including aesthetics, emotion and imagination; and in the context of this model, choice of focus, lesson planning and practicality. More general codes about such matters as good qualities in a lesson and classroom management were related to these.

Student Teachers' Response to the Three-part Model before BP: Survey

The survey results must be treated with caution in another way, as the elements of the course had not been fully digested. It is evident that there was some shifting as a result of the experience of the classroom. Theorizations of the three ideas had been introduced to the students through readings. Most responses were positive. Negative responses to the readings had to do with their linguistic and conceptual difficulty. Response to theoretical lectures was quite similar. When asked separately about the linkage between theory and practice, there were three negative responses. These looked for more clarity and a more practical link with the classroom. The categorization of drama activities according to usefulness in language teaching was positively received by a majority of students and negatively by only one. Prudence Wales' demonstration lesson was extremely well received, with often emphatic positive responses. One student, however, doubted whether the lesson was practical in a Hong Kong classroom. I had conducted a follow-up lesson, placing Wales' lesson in the context of my model, interpreting each of her activities in terms of the three-part model.

There were five negative responses to my follow-up: student teachers suggested that the practical application of the model in analysis was less difficult than I imagined. They said they had got the idea after two or three activities, and I needed not explain them all. One person doubted whether the three-part model could be used on practice.

I asked about ways of simplifying the model, suggesting within the question that it was too complicated. The results show that most student teachers did not find the model too complicated, and those who suggested changes offered no consensus on what needed doing. 16 of 28 student teachers who answered the question refused to suggest improvements, saying the model was fine as it is. Of those who did suggest ways of improving the model, six suggested removing one of the three, but there was no consensus as to which one should be removed. Not all of the six were strong in their views, most saying they were not sure any should be removed. Four wished to centre the model on one of the three, making the other two subordinate. There was one vote for each of the three, and one said that one should be central, without specifying which one. One student teacher rejected the whole model, saying it was “too ideal and theoretical,” more helpful for “the evaluation stage, after a lesson” than for lesson planning.

Overall, it appears that at the end of the course, the conceptual complexity of the model was not the principal issue. Many respondents expressed doubts about the practicality of using any of these techniques in the classroom, for one of two interrelated reasons: the lesson planning is difficult; or the lesson planning is time-consuming. One respondent suggested that drama activities might work well with younger students but not with older.

Student Teachers' Response to Three-part Model before BP: Focus groups

Discussion of the aesthetic in focus groups before BP was relatively limited. When participants were asked which of the three they thought would be their principal focus in

lesson planning, only three named the aesthetic. Two defined it simply in terms of being able to offer an enjoyable lesson, and using the enjoyment to enhance learning. The third added more nuance by saying that students “can get satisfaction from doing something beautiful in their eyes ... and that’s what keeps them doing drama and motivates them to do something further.”

Six participants said “emotion” or connected emotion with imagination as the means of achieving emotion. Two who named emotion related it to motivation. The connection between imagination and emotion in all cases had to do with the need to use imagination to understand the emotions of others, or of characters in a story. This kind of imagination is also called “empathy,” suggesting student teachers’ broader concern with their students’ ethical development.

One said “imagination,” because it is the first requirement of any successful drama activity.

Student Teachers’ Synthesis of Three-part Model following BP: Essays

In the essays, written after the Block Practice (BP) period, the process objective most frequently and extensively discussed was aesthetics. After BP, participants offered much more subtlety in their views. One, M, emphasized the need to teach students something about stage conventions so that they have a disciplined way of presenting emotional expression. She had students come to the front and she offered a limited model of “how it should be done” by way of guidance. Others were more philosophical in their approach. Two identified “the power of art” or “the power of language” as key issues. One of these (T) asserted that the power of art in itself need not be taught: people recognize it naturally. She presented emotional response as intrinsic to aesthetic experience: “Therefore the meaning of the same piece of art may have different understanding towards different people. People tend to

understand a piece of art more, by sharing and providing their thinking and emotional response.” At the same time, art can unify the response of a collective audience. She had shown an excerpt from *The Phantom of the Opera* to her students, and said, “I could tell from students’ eyes and expressions that they were conquered, impressed and amazed by the play.” Another participant, (D), stressed literary aesthetics, saying that the original form of the in-class project her group had done had been lacking. They had chosen a story without “round characterization,” meaning that characters in the story lacked depth and complexity. Three participants used the words “beauty” or “beautiful,” being perhaps influenced by Joe Winston, who had visited Hong Kong to lecture on the notion of beauty (2010). Two participants suggested that the aesthetic relates to student behaviour in class. One, (V), thought that “aesthetic and emotion interests students and make them behave themselves.” The other, (U), also suggested that beauty can create good behaviour, saying that it comes from the process of creation: “When students develop a sense of ownership and think of making something better, disciplines [sic] just disappear.”

References to emotion were heavily influenced by Damasio and Immordino-Yang. B and F latched on to the notion of Immordino-Yang and Damasio that emotional thinking is necessary for learning to be of practical value. Both discuss the place of emotion in their (separate) group lesson plays. In B’s BP school, she found it impossible to do any drama, but worked emotional response into reading a book about Princess Diana. She suggested that emotional response allowed for an improved ability to use modal verbs to give the princess advice in a speaking and writing exercise that never quite became drama. One (M) quotes Immordino-Yang and Damasio in using emotional thought to define creativity. Rather than trying directly to foment creativity, she applied my model in stressing emotion rather than stressing creativity directly. A primary-programme student teacher (K) stressed that her group’s play “The Hungry Giant” worked with fear for its effects, for the giant is very large,

very violent and a bully besides. She worked to make the emotion vivid by, for example, showing a picture that zoomed in on angry eyes. T noticed that it is the strong emotions of *The Phantom of the Opera* that drew students' attention and encouraged them to remember elements of it and repeat them. D noticed that it is not enough if emotion is simply strong. The original form of her group project, involving domestic violence, had emotional force, but not such as to encourage learning.

In the post-BP essays, imagination always appeared as a step toward emotion, though one participant paused to emphasize the pleasures of imagination in itself along the way. Being influenced by the neural evidence, student teachers appear to see emotion as the essential thing for learning. Frequently, that emotion belongs to a character or to another person, such that through imagination students learn to empathize. Three student teachers stressed the role of props or sets to stimulate the imaginations of their students, thereby picking out specific techniques for building imaginative involvement.

Overall, then, the experience of BP appeared to turn secondary-programme students' minds toward the aesthetic, with emphasis on ways and means of achieving impact on students. Primary-programme student teachers retained their emphasis on imagination. Both related these aspects clearly to emotion.

Participants viewed the three-part model as a single unit with three aspects. They articulated the relations in different, but largely mutually consistent, ways. D wrote as follows:

The flow of the lesson could be linked up by one and only one of the aspects with the other two serving as peripheral device since I think the three aspects are intertwined. When making one aspect as the focus, other aspects will be taken care of on their own. For instance, if we take imagination as the focus, aesthetics will be

there effortlessly and emotions can be imagined, too. If we focus on aesthetics, it is natural that students will be emotionally drawn to such a beautiful act and their imagination will be opened up as well. If we focus on emotion which according to Immordino-Yang and Damasio, is the platform for learning, students will be driven by their emotions and to use their imagination to put together a successful act.

This very clear statement shows a student thinking actively about the interrelations of the three parts of the model. Others stated that the three parts were intertwined without getting into such detail. In the short term, this awareness of complexity was a problem for her lesson-play group, because she felt that her group's plan lacked cohesion since the transitions followed different paths depending on the stress of different activities. In the context of a whole career, this vision of interrelation might be a strength, as it comes nearer to doing justice to the reality of the experience. T, taking to heart Damasio's assertion that emotion can be a form of cognition, wrote: "when a person provides emotional response, he/she relates him/herself to that object." The aesthetic then appears as a form of cognition/perception that uses emotion for interpretation.

Student Teachers' Discussion of Ideal Education and Practical Issues in the System

Participants tend to connect the use of drama with their more idealistic thoughts about education. D, for example, writes:

Drama for me is the best way to instill in young minds the social skills and critical thinking skills which are essential for students' development. I have experienced the beauty of drama and I want to share it with my students.

F considers whether, at a given moment in a lesson, his group should provide students with scripts. He worries that “they will lose the chance to use the language both critically and creatively which is also very important for their personal growth.”

Idealism, then, pushes them to use drama techniques. They often perceive the education system as working against the very valid possibilities of drama techniques in language education. At every stage, participants raise the exam-oriented nature of the schools as an obstacle to the use of drama, especially those who taught senior forms. Student teachers knew from the outset that parents stress exams and that schools generally pursue parents’ wishes in these matters. They did not necessarily know that the students themselves would demand to know how a drama lesson related to the final exam.

The emphasis on exams in turn results in a heavily loaded syllabus, with more emphasis on getting through all the topics than on deep learning. Participants say that many teachers introduce grammar points directly, and this may take only a few sentences. Drama techniques, they say, cannot compete in terms of speed of presentation with a more abstract approach.

Student teachers’ experience of students leads them to stress two aspects: motivation and classroom management. Motivation is a large part of the reason why these student teachers are interested in drama techniques at all. At the same time, we have seen that these student teachers are in many cases very idealistic about learning. They do not simply want their students to be motivated; they want students to be in love with language, as some student teachers say they are themselves.

How do these observations relate to the three-part model? Three participants stress the good effects of aesthetic absorption on classroom discipline. One draws this from watching a film and two from asking students to draw pictures. None of these three examples is about aesthetic absorption in doing drama, but we may fairly say that there is potential. The wide

understanding of the aesthetic, with an interest in ways of producing effects onstage, appears successful with some student teachers. The distinction between primary and secondary responses tends to support the use of the model: where primary- and secondary-programme student teachers are together in the same classroom, this model allows them to pick the aspects that make most sense for their situation. Both primary- and secondary-programme student teachers are able to make the connection to emotion, though the present evidence does not allow us to say that this makes for better lesson planning.

Student teachers' observations about their situation in the schools have implications for this model's usefulness in real schools. It is quite clear from what they say that in senior secondary forms, teachers need to be able to tell students that this work will help with exams. If their doubts about the worth of the activity can be assuaged, there may be room for aesthetic absorption in their work, and therefore for improved classroom management and motivation.

Conclusion

The two questions addressed here have distinct answers. There is no evidence that the three-part model is excessively complicated or difficult to apply. Student teachers who found the ideas difficult attribute the difficulty to the readings or to shortcomings in my mode of presenting them. In the survey, most student teachers feel that all three parts of the model are necessary. The ten research subjects have no complaint about the complexity of the model even after using it in Field Experience, and are able to use one or two parts of the model at a time to plan their lesson where that is appropriate. The experience of real teaching seems to lead student teachers, especially in secondary, to put more stress on aesthetics. The receptivity of the system to drama in the language classroom is a much bigger problem.

Supporting teachers often think that the use of drama is in principle a good idea, but the system and the mentality that it produces creates many barriers.

There are steps that might be taken to alleviate these difficulties. The difficulty of the readings appears to be a technical problem that might be addressed with special course materials written for student teachers. The course as it stands gives student teachers basic principles that they find useful and practice in using them in a situation where lesson planning can be given a lot of time. If drama techniques are to be practical from day to day, teachers need to be able to introduce drama techniques early in the school year and use them repeatedly. That is, there needs to be an aspect in this course of curriculum planning. It is time-consuming in planning to create activities that are economical with time in the lesson. Perhaps it could be an assignment in the course to design a basic activity that is economical with time, such that student teachers could share them.

Overall, the results of this study show difficulties that can be overcome, if not in Field Experience, then in the process of teaching once young teachers have their own classes.

References

- Damasio, A. (1994). *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. New York, NY: Putnam.
- Di Pietro, R. J. (1987). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Immordino-yang, M. H., & Damasio, A. (2007). We feel, therefore we learn. *Mind, Brain and Education* 1(1), 3-10.
- Immordino-yang, M. H., & Faeth, M. (2010). The role of emotion and skilled intuition in learning. In D. A. Sousa (Ed.), *Mind, brain and education: Neuroscience implications for the classroom* (pp. 66-81). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Kao, S.M., & O'Neill, C. (1998). *Words into worlds: Learning a second language through process drama*. New York, NY: Ablex.
- Langer, S. (1957). *Philosophy in a new key*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Wagner, B. J. (2004) Educational drama and language development. In R. L. Clements & L. Fiorentino (Eds.), *A child's right to play* (pp. 347-358). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Wagner, B. J. (1998). *Educational drama and language arts: What research shows*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Wagner, B. J. (2002). Understanding drama-based education. In G. Brauer (Ed.), *Body and language: Intercultural learning through drama* (pp. 3-18). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Winston, J. (Ed.). (2010). *Beauty and education*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Winston, J. (2012). *Second language learning through drama: Practical techniques and applications*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

About the Author

Matthew DeCoursey is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Literature and Cultural Studies of the Hong Kong Institute of Education. His academic background is in Comparative Literature and he has extensive experience as a theatre director. He has published on Renaissance literature, drama education and the use of narrative analysis in qualitative research.