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SUMMARY

Several authors have identified strong links between Applied Theatre and Critical Pedagogy (CP), a social justice oriented educational paradigm (Doyle, 1993; Freebody & Finneran, 2013; Grady, 2003; O’Connor, 2013). While these links have been explored in international settings (Dawson, Cawthon, & Baker, 2011; Finneran & Freebody, 2016b), they have seldom been analysed in a Latin American context. Chile has a long-standing CP tradition (Pinto Contreras, 2011). However, the practice of this paradigm by Chilean school teachers is limited by the neoliberal orientation of the educational system (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016; Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010). Examining methodologies that can open up spaces for Chilean teachers to apply CP in their classrooms appears to be an important endeavour.

This study explored the questions: How can Drama in Education (DiE) open up spaces for CP in Chilean teachers’ practices? What factors facilitate or hinder the opening of such spaces? DiE is understood here as a branch of Applied Theatre that uses theatrical and dramatic strategies as a methodology for teaching and learning across the curriculum (Ackroyd, 2007; O’Neill, 2006c). An initial review of literature showed numerous points of alignment between Applied Theatre and CP’s transformative aim (Giroux, 1988), its promotion of dialogic classrooms (Freire, 2000b), and its fostering of conscientization (Freire, 1973, 2000b). To analyse these empirically, a case study approach was adopted focusing on a unique Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme designed and facilitated by the researcher in a School in Santiago, Chile, in 2016. This included a 15-hour workshop where fifteen teachers explored diverse DiE strategies, reflecting about their potential for CP. Afterwards, eight teachers collaborated with the researcher coplanning and coteaching (Murphy & Martin, 2015) lessons where DiE was applied. Finally, data was collected about the teachers’ evaluation of the programme. Participant and non-participant observation, interviews, questionnaires, and document analysis were used to gather data. Although the main participants in the study were the teachers involved in the programme, data were also gathered from their students and the School’s Management Board to achieve triangulation and a deeper level of analysis. Data were analysed thematically with the assistance of the computer software NVivo 10.

The study found that DiE opened up several spaces for CP in these teachers’ practices. It enhanced the dialogic quality of their lessons by encouraging them to collaborate with their students more equally, particularly through the teacher-in-role strategy. DiE helped teachers to exert their authority in non-authoritarian ways. Additionally, it allowed them to enhance participation opportunities for students, by involving them physically, emotionally, and cognitively. However, when DiE activities caused embarrassment or was dependent on a level of factual knowledge, habitual classroom inequalities were reproduced.
DiE also helped some teachers to promote conscientization, that is, critical reflection and action in relation to social oppression and transformation (Freire, 2000b). Findings suggest that there is potential in performative DiE strategies, like still-images, to behave as Freirean codifications (Freire, 2000b; Pompeo Nogueira, 2002), eliciting conscientization in students. This potential was also found in role-playing. However, such potential was restricted in these teachers’ practices due to a disconnection between the DiE lessons and their students’ thematic universe, which decreased the relevancy of the experiences for their own lives. This study corroborated the importance of emotional engagement for critical reflection in Applied Theatre (Bundy, Dunn, & Stinson, 2016).

In the programme, emotional engagement was facilitated when teachers offered a journey of exploration to students through a coherent sequence of DiE activities, thus substantiating previous research (Dunn & Stinson, 2011). Additionally, it was found that DiE helped teachers to promote critical thinking, metacognition, and motivation, which were seen as key precursors of conscientization in this specific context.

Aligned with process drama theory (Dunn & Stinson, 2011; Piazzoli, 2018), this study found that teachers’ opening of spaces for CP through DiE required a degree of artistry. This included planning, flexibility, risk-taking, belief, and questioning abilities. Teachers’ values about teaching were also a factor as they seemed to determine the aspects of CP embraced by teachers through their practice of DiE. Finally, the role of the researcher as leader of the programme both enabled and hindered teachers’ opening of spaces for CP through DiE. This suggests that CPD programme leaders require significant expertise to guide teachers fruitfully. These findings expand available knowledge on Applied Theatre and CP, while also contributing to strengthen the emergent field of Applied Theatre in Chile.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Introduction

This chapter introduces the study by identifying its focus and the rationale that motivates it. The chapter also presents the research questions and the methodological design adopted to answer them. I also position myself as a practitioner researcher, establishing my personal interest in this inquiry. Finally, the chapter provides an overview of the different chapters of the thesis, offering a glimpse of the journey ahead.

1.2. Research focus

This research investigates the critical pedagogical potential of Drama in Education (DiE). Critical pedagogy (CP) is a heterogeneous educational movement committed to social justice (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009). Following Ackroyd (2007), DiE is understood in this study as a methodology for teaching and learning across the curriculum that utilises a range of theatrical and dramatic strategies (Bolton, 1985, Heathcote, 1984d). Thus understood, DiE is a subcategory of the larger field of Applied Theatre. While this study focuses on DiE, an overview of the literature shows very few discussions of the links between CP and DiE specifically. Therefore, this study explores scholarship on the general field of Applied Theatre. This field encompasses diverse theatre-related practices that occur outside conventional theatre institutions to “improve the lives of individuals and create better societies” (Nicholson, 2005, p. 3). Specifically, the present study examines how learning about DiE and incorporating it into their classrooms can help Chilean school teachers to open up spaces for CP. To explore this I designed and implemented a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme for teachers in Santiago, Chile.

The study is based on the work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire, a founder of the CP movement (Giroux, 2013b; Lynn, Jennings, & Hughes, 2013). As a highly influential figure in the Chilean educational context (Pinto Contreras, 2011) and one of the CP exponents who bridges theory and practice most clearly, Freire’s perspectives are particularly meaningful for this research. His (1973, 2000b, 2004b; Shor & Freire, 1987) notions on dialogic education and critical consciousness or conscientization constitute the main lenses of this study. These two aspects of CP were particularly meaningful for interpreting empirical data. They guide the analysis of whether and how the dialogic and reflective qualities usually attached to Applied Theatre work in general (Freebody & Finneran, 2013; O’Neill, 2006b) can infuse and transform the specific subfield of DiE into an effective teaching and learning methodology to practice CP in Chilean classrooms.
1.3. **Rationale of the study**

This study is motivated by several interrelated aspects. Firstly, it is inspired by the Chilean social context. For over a decade, the Chilean educational system has been at the centre of agitated public debate. Massive protests occurring since 2006 have denounced the deleterious effects of the system’s neoliberal orientation, which was set up by Pinochet’s dictatorial regime (1973-1989) (Kubal & Fisher, 2016). As will be further explained in Chapter Three, in recent years, social movements have demanded greater equality and the end of for-profit education (Bellei, Cabalin, & Orellana, 2014). Importantly, secondary and tertiary-level students have been the main leaders of these movements, signalling a change in Chilean culture (Kubal & Fisher, 2016). As Aguilera Ruiz (2012) argues, the period known as the ‘transition’ from dictatorship to democracy (1989-1999) was defined by a lack of popular manifestations. Chilean young people, in particular, were perceived as unengaged with politics (Aguilera Ruiz, 2012; Kubal & Fisher, 2016). This “culture of silence”, as Freire (1985, p. 72) would name it, was part of the dictatorship’s inheritance (Pinto Contreras, 2008). As Pinto Contreras (2008) maintains, Chileans had become accustomed to silencing their demands as a result of the years of dictatorial ruling characterised by repression and Human Rights violations. So when student-led groups raised their voices, that culture of silence cracked (Pinkney Pastrana, 2010). This struggle against neoliberal education seems akin to the project of Critical Pedagogy (CP), namely, to make schools “safe from the baneful influence of market logics” (Giroux & Giroux, 2006, p. 28). It is argued that CP could prevent the re-emergence of a culture of silence by fostering Chilean young people’s critical reflection and action. Therefore, it seems pertinent to explore if and how teachers in Chile can practice CP in their classrooms.

The field of Applied Theatre has been identified as a possible site for CP (Doyle, 1993). Already in 2003, Grady noticed the growing value that several Applied Theatre practitioners were finding in CP’s theories. In following years, CP’s appeal for Applied Theatre has continued to grow, as attested by a number of projects aligned with this paradigm (Chinyowa, 2013; Coleman, 2014; Dawson, Cawthon, & Baker, 2011; Finneran & Freebody, 2016b). Therefore, Grady’s (2003) call for an in-depth examination of the ideological and practical consequences of Applied Theatre’s adoption of critical pedagogical premises remains pertinent. Recently, this call has been answered by a few authors from a variety of international contexts (Dawson et al., 2011; Finneran & Freebody, 2016b; O’Connor, 2013). Their scholarship suggests that Applied Theatre approaches can be conducive of CP. However, there is a lack of investigations inquiring into how school teachers can incorporate such approaches into their practices to open up spaces for CP in the Latin American context. This study hopes to contribute through bridging this knowledge gap.
Finally, this research is motivated by a dissonance between CP theory and practice. As argued by several authors (Gore, 1993; Neumann, 2011, 2013; Teemant, Leland, & Berghoff, 2014), the convoluted language and abstract theorising that is common to CP texts has prevented the paradigm from reaching and impacting on schools more strongly. Huerta-Charles (2007) expresses this criticism well: “the theoretical discourse of critical pedagogy is becoming a kind of exclusionary tool that keeps teachers distanced from the possibility of having real experiences with critical practices” (p. 252). As a response to this dissonance, Huerta-Charles submits that CP theory be brought closer to teachers and school communities. This explains the applied nature of this study. Refusing to arrive at simplistic formulas of CP (Giroux, 2013a; Macedo, Araújo Freire, & Freire, 2005; Motta, 2013), the study wants to examine in depth the experience of Chilean teachers when attempting to bring CP from the page into the classroom through the practice of DiE.

1.4. Research questions

Considering these knowledge gaps and dissonances, the study addresses the following main questions:

- How can DiE open up spaces for CP in Chilean teachers’ classrooms?
- What factors facilitate or hinder the opening of such spaces?

This idea of ‘opening up spaces’ is inspired by Cavieres-Fernández and Au (2010). These authors speak about the need for teachers to find “cracks” in the educational system to practice CP (p. 72, my translation). The research questions are also inspired by Da Porta (2017) who believes that Latin American Applied Theatre teachers must open up fissures in neoliberal educational systems that reject the questioning of the taken-for-granted which in contrast is promoted by arts-based learning (Eisner, 2002). Teachers, like geologists, must find fissures that can “crack that monochord representation of reality, showing that there are other possible ways of imagining educational relationships, the transit through school spaces, and the connection with knowledge” (Da Porta, 2017, p. 20, my translation). This study examines participating Chilean teachers’ search for such fissures through the use of DiE in their classrooms.

A number of related functional sub-questions are also considered. These are used to explicate the theoretical framework of this enquiry and to situate the study in Chile, but also to focus the process of data analysis and reflect on the study’s findings. Bearing in mind the heterogeneity of the CP movement, an initial sub-question to be addressed is:

- What is the meaning of CP?
To respond to this, I review the literature on CP considering the principles and concepts of the paradigm that can help make sense of empirical data gathered in this study. A related theoretical question is:

- How does the theory underpinning DiE, and Applied Theatre in general, relate to CP?

Other sub-questions necessary to situate the inquiry are:

- What is the status of CP and DiE in Chile? What is the status of CP and DiE in the research school and in the practices of the teachers who participated in the CPD Programme? How do these teachers interpret CP?

Empirical data will be analysed and discussed in relation to the following sub-questions:

- How did teachers’ practice of DiE open up spaces for their creation of dialogic classrooms and for conscientization?

- What possibilities and challenges did teachers face for opening up spaces for CP through DiE?

Finally, and in view of the impact that the design, implementation, and context of professional development programmes have on teachers’ learning (Joyce & Showers, 1980; Opfer & Pedder, 2013), these sub-questions will also be asked of empirical data:

- How did teachers evaluate the CPD Programme? What impact did the Programme have on teachers’ views and practices of CP? What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?

To address these questions, a comprehensive methodological design was created.

1.5. Research methodology and design

As will be explained in Chapter Four, this study is grounded in a qualitative research paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This aligns with my intention of considering the CPD Programme in depth rather than trying to achieve generalizable conclusions. A qualitative paradigm also emphasises the meaning participants make of the phenomenon under study, which coheres with my axiology as a researcher. The study is also informed by a critical research stance (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011; Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011). The metaphor of the critical researcher as a bricoleur, advanced by Kincheloe et al. (2011), epitomises my dual role as a practitioner/researcher who continuously negotiated the methodological specificities of the fieldwork in response to participating teachers’ emerging needs.
A case study methodology (Stake, 1995) was adopted to respond to the CPD Programme’s complexity and to the impact of its context. The Programme was developed in a school in Santiago, Chile in 2016, over a period of five months. The School adhered to CP in its view of education and welcomed the Programme as a way to support the practice of this paradigm. The Programme involved four stages that succeeded a Preparation Stage where I arranged formal details. During the Baseline Stage I gathered baseline data. Following this, a five-sessions, 15-hour-long Workshop was conducted for 15 teachers who enrolled voluntarily. These teachers taught diverse academic subjects and levels in the School. While some had extensive knowledge of CP, others were vaguely familiar with it. Except for one teacher, none of them used drama-based approaches regularly in their teaching. In the Workshop, the teachers and I explored the concept of CP using Boal’s (2002) image theatre techniques. I also exemplified the planning and application of DiE lessons that incorporated a variety of Applied Theatre approaches, including process drama-type approaches (Taylor, 2000), drama conventions (Neelands & Goode, 2015), Boal’s (1993) forum theatre, and drama games. The Workshop was followed by an Application Stage, where eight of the fifteen teachers decided to collaborate with me in the planning and application of DiE lessons in their own classrooms. The final Follow-up Stage gathered data about the impact of the Programme. Diverse data collection methods were used in this bricolage, including participant and non-participant observation, interviews, questionnaires, and document analysis. The data were analysed thematically (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

1.6. My personal interest in this research

With Leyva and Speed (2008), I believe that research is not a neutral endeavour but is strongly shaped by the researcher’s biography and ideology. As such, it is important to begin the thesis by positioning myself as a researcher, making my personal interest in this inquiry explicit.

I began experiencing the reflective power of theatre and drama as I was growing up in Santiago, Chile. For me, acting was a way of self-expression, but, more importantly, an avenue to make sense of life. Later, when I became a professional actress, I learned a bit more of the world with each character I assumed. The stage offered me a platform for reflection and critique. Seeing theatre’s potency as a medium to analyse reality and seeking to share this with younger generations, I got involved in educational theatre plays and in facilitation of theatre clubs. I slowly gained experience of how to teach acting skills and theatrical knowledge. However, it was not until I travelled abroad that I considered the role that theatre and drama could have in the teaching and learning of other areas of the school curriculum. As will be explained in Chapter Three, Chile has a rich theatrical tradition, which has had applications in the area of education for several years. In schools, what is locally named as ‘Pedagogía Teatral’ (‘theatre pedagogy’) is mostly limited to
extra-curricular spaces where specialised teachers, most often actors and actresses, teach acting skills and produce plays with their students (Aguilar & Arias, 2008). Non-drama teachers are generally unaware of the educational potential of theatre and drama (Aguilar & Arias, 2008). Lately, the term ‘teatro aplicado’ (‘applied theatre’), has begun to take hold (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 2018). Recent Applied Theatre projects (Escuela de Teatro UC; Ponce de la Fuente & Olivares Rojas, 2017) suggest that the understanding of the educational value of theatre and drama is expanding beyond an emphasis on theatrical products and the teaching of acting skills, and that some efforts are underway to make this value available to school teachers. However, there is a lack of research in the area in general that can give it theoretical and/or practical legitimation. Therefore, a personal interest in this study is to contribute to the development of Chilean Applied Theatre by exploring, in theory and practice, novel ways of incorporating theatre and drama-related practices in Chilean classrooms.

As noted before, this study is motivated by the popular struggle against the market orientation of the Chilean educational system. This relates to other aspects of my biography that encouraged me to embark on this study. As a university student in my last year of Theatre School, I joined the first wave of mass protests against for-profit education in 2006. Along with my classmates, we used theatre to manifest our discontent. Although I did not have the theoretical knowledge to name it yet, I began to align with a critical perspective on education as I perceived the harmful effects of a neoliberal-oriented educational system. Later, as I undertook an MA in Drama and Theatre Education at the University of Warwick, I discovered the work of Paulo Freire and the paradigm of CP for the first time. My master’s thesis began with the aim of studying the possibilities of Applied Theatre to promote this type of pedagogy, but I decided to narrow the focus onto critical thinking instead. From that research I learned that Applied Theatre experiences can enhance questioning of the taken-for-granted, encouraging students to make well-grounded judgements (Villanueva, 2010). But in spite of this learning, I went back to Chile with the unresolved question of how Applied Theatre approaches could encourage critique of wider social issues and of social injustices in particular. This query was emphasised as I worked as a school teacher, and later as a researcher and facilitator of professional development projects in Applied Theatre. I witnessed first-hand Chilean teachers’ adverse working conditions and their struggle against technocratic constructions of teaching (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010). Examining the capacity of DiE to support teachers’ roles as “transformative intellectuals” (Giroux, 1988, p. 125) is, therefore, a personal motivation for me in undertaking this PhD journey.
1.7. Thesis layout

Having introduced the inquiry in this chapter, Chapter Two presents the review of literature. In section 2.2, I review the theory on CP identifying principles and concepts of special relevance for this study and analysing their interpretation by present-day authors. I also problematize the paradigm by paying attention to criticism and critique of CP and to possibilities and challenges associated with its practice. In section 2.3, explicit and implicit theoretical connections between CP and Applied Theatre are examined. As mentioned before, although my focus is on the subfield of DiE, the scarcity of literature on its critical pedagogical potential requires me to examine scholarship on the general field of Applied Theatre to build the study’s theoretical framework. In Chapter Three, I contextualise the study by reviewing literature on the Chilean educational system. I also examine the local presence of CP and the influence of Paulo Freire's work, and refer to the nascent Applied Theatre practices in the country. Chapter Three concludes with a presentation of the research site (the School), and a brief profile of the 15 teachers who collaborated in the study, to further contextualise the inquiry. Chapter Four explains the research methodology adopted. Here, I also discuss ethical considerations and the measures taken to advance the study’s trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and validity (Lather, 1986). The adoption of a thematic analysis approach is also explained in this chapter (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In Chapter Five, empirical data are analysed in relation to the research questions. The analysis is presented chronologically to honour the journey that teachers and I underwent throughout the various stages of the CPD Programme. Empirical data are discussed against the relevant theory in Chapter Six, where answers to the central research questions are highlighted. The ways in which DiE opened up spaces for CP and the factors affecting teachers' learning throughout the CPD process are discussed here. Chapter Seven concludes the thesis by summarising the knowledge which emerged from this study. This final chapter offers reflections on the limitations of the investigation and proposes recommendations for future research and practice.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the theoretical framework of the study, which developed throughout my research journey following a deductive/inductive approach to theory. While some concepts emerged early along the journey through an initial reading of the literature, others became relevant from my engagement with the field and the participants. Two forms of enquiry were undertaken: a general or narrative literature review about Critical Pedagogy (CP) and Applied Theatre, and a systematic review of 100 recently published articles (2007-2014) designed to answer two related questions specifically about CP: Do recently published articles align themselves with the key tenets of Freire’s praxis? What possibilities and challenges for CP practice are reported in the current literature? (see Chapter Four for details about the approach adopted to the systematic review). A decision to present the findings in this chapter from both the narrative and the systematic reviews was taken in order to enrich and inform the discussion about the origins and seminal practices of CP, and its more recent use in a very different world from when and where it emerged.

The chapter opens with an exploration of the meaning of CP, and outlines the definition of CP adopted in this research. This provides an initial response to the sub-question on the definition of CP adopted in this research. Some of the possibilities and challenges for applying CP in the classroom reported in the systematic review of literature are also discussed (specifically in section 2.2.4). CP’s principles are then used to examine possible links with Applied Theatre in general and Drama in Education (DiE) in particular (section 2.3). The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the main findings from this theoretical exploration, which will set the stage for discussing the empirical data presented in later chapters.

2.2. Critical Pedagogy

The origins of CP can be traced to the philosophers Socrates and Plato, and their recognition of the value of dialogue for human interaction and education (Guilherme, 2017; Wink, 2010). An ability to critically analyse issues concerning autonomy and the transformation of society emerge during this time and can be found throughout history. These are the foundational pillars in what began to emerge in the 1960s and ‘70s as a defined area of study, directly influenced by the thinking of Paulo Freire (Guilherme, 2017). Later, the Canadian scholar Henry Giroux popularised the term ‘Critical Pedagogy’ to name an educational movement emerging in the 1980s in North America (Gottesman, 2016). Almost four decades on, CP has become an umbrella term that covers multiple
As the systematic review of present-day articles on CP evidence, contemporary authors draw on this paradigm to support theory and practice in fields as diverse as nursing education (Perron, Rudge, Blais, & Holmes, 2010), information technology (Caruthers & Friend, 2014; Öztürk, 2012), Special Needs education (Löfgren-Mårtenson, 2012), and physical education (King-White, 2012; Lorente-Catalan & Kirk, 2013). Authors discuss CP in light of multiple ideological lenses, interweaving it with feminist (Brown, Collard, & Hoogeveen, 2014; Zimmerman, McQueen, & Guy, 2007), ecological (Brantmeier, 2013), and postmodernist stances (Bernal Guerrero, 2012; Bruce, 2013). In spite of this heterogeneity, some points of commonality are visible amongst the numerous present-day branches of CP. Perhaps the most evident is the prominence of the work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire. His work is referenced in 76 of the 100 articles included in the systematic literature review, being the most frequently cited author in this sample. Although Freire himself rarely used the term critical pedagogy to identify his approach, his influence is central within the CP movement (Giroux, 2013b; Gur-Ze’ev, 2005). He has been named the “father of critical pedagogy” (Lynn et al., 2013, p. 604). For these reasons, Freire’s work is essential to defining CP. His centrality in this study is also premised on the significant impact he had in Chile’s educational tradition, as will be discussed in Chapter Three. Additionally, Freire was identified by participants in this study as a highly inspirational figure (see Chapter Five). Finally, unlike other prominent authors in CP, Freire discusses classroom practice in more depth (Gore, 1993). His work can provide valuable insights on how to bring CP from theory into practice, making it crucial for this research.

In this first major section, I will discuss principles and concepts of CP, as well as some tensions around them. The intention here is not to offer an ultimate definition of CP, something that would go against the philosophical underpinnings of the paradigm (Darder et al., 2009). Rather, the aim is to present aspects of CP that have been meaningful in this study. In so doing, I pay heed to Gallagher’s (2016) remark on how paradigmatic terms linked with social justice “have been effectively co-opted by the market and sold back to us, disguised as transformative in and of themselves, when they may be no more than powerful agents of the status quo” (p. 63). I begin this section by delving into how CP has been interpreted in this specific research journey in the hope of avoiding misconceptions like those signalled by Gallagher.

While Freire’s influence on CP is evident in the discussion below, this study is also interested in exploring how the paradigm is understood and enacted by critical pedagogues in the 21st century. The systematic literature review conducted as part of this study that analysed 100 articles about CP, aimed at determining whether there was fidelity to the key concepts in CP which Freire had developed, or whether current practices had evolved, and if so, why and how. In what follows, narrative and systematic methodologies of literature review are interweaved to discuss original
conceptions of CP and their understanding, adaptation, and critique by contemporary authors under the umbrella of CP.

2.2.1. Critical Pedagogy's transformative aim

As the word ‘critical’ suggests, CP has its roots in critical theory (McArthur, 2010). That school of thought was developed in the early 20th century by members of the Institute of Social Research in Germany, also known as the Frankfurt School (Kincheloe, 2007). Critical theory emerged as a response to drastic changes in the Western World that made class, race, and gender divisions more apparent (Kanpol, 1999). Although diverse in their theories, members of the Frankfurt School were united by their aim of exploring human emancipation from oppression within an evolving capitalist structure (Giroux, 1983). They also challenged a positivistic stance that saw science and knowledge as neutral (Giroux, 1983), acknowledging their political role as social scientists committed to denouncing injustice (Henning, 2017).

The CP movement took inspiration from critical theory’s premises and examined them in the realm of education (Weiner, 2007). Like critical theorists, exponents of CP recognised the political and ideological nature of knowledge production and dissemination. Giroux (2011), drawing on Gramsci’s concept of “ideological hegemony”, argues that domination is not just exerted through force, but also through culture (p. 22). Certain norms, values, and epistemologies that correspond to the interests of dominant groups, permeate society, becoming legitimised and normalised. In the area of education, ideological hegemony can be detected for instance in the selection of specific contents and reading materials that conform to a national curriculum. This selection “often reflects the perspectives and beliefs of powerful segments of our social collectivity” (Apple, 2004, p. 8). Whereas previously, sociologists of education like Bowles and Gintis (2011), had held a deterministic view of schools as spaces conditioned by society’s economical substructure, critical pedagogues advanced that schools could also be spaces for resisting hegemony (Cho, 2010; Giroux, 1981). As Freire (1998) asserted: “education never was, is not, and never can be neutral or indifferent in regard to the reproduction of the dominant ideology or the interrogation of it” (p. 91, emphasis added). In this, and several other aspects, CP followed Freire’s teachings. His writing became central for the movement, both in North America (Giroux, 1985; Guilherme, 2017; McLaren, 2004), and in Latin America (Pinto Contreras, 2008).

Bringing together various referents like critical theory, phenomenology, and liberation theology (Kincheloe, 2007; Kress & Lake, 2013b), Freire advances a view of education that combines “the language of critique with the language of possibility” (Giroux, 1985, p. xii). Following Marx, Freire denounces capitalist society for being fundamentally unfair (Kress & Lake, 2013a). Throughout his work, he explores the dialectical relationship between oppressors and oppressed
(Freire, 2000b, 2007). But, as Kress and Lake (2013a) maintain, whereas Marx refers only succinctly to the role of education in this dialectic, Freire goes further by emphasising its emancipatory possibilities. For Freire, schools present “cracks” or spaces for resistance to domination where transformation can occur (Giroux, 1985, p. xix). In this way, besides denouncing injustice, Freire upholds a hopeful view of the future of society, proposing alternatives through education to disarm the contradiction between oppressors and oppressed (Freire, 2000b, 2004b). This is grounded on his ontology. In Freire’s view, all human beings have a “transformative force” (Pinto Contreras, 2008, pp. 175, my translation). Endowed with consciousness, people fulfil their human vocation “only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation” (Freire, 2000b, p. 84). For Freire (2000b), that vocation is inhibited in the oppressed, who are alienated from their capacity to make meaning of reality and effect change. Education can either reinforce that dehumanisation, or transform it (Freire, 1998). Freire’s stance is, therefore, fundamentally transformative (Pinto Contreras, 2008). This is further evidenced when he states: “the essence of my ethico-political choice is my consciously taken option to intervene in the world” (Freire, 1998, p. 122). His aim of contributing to transforming social injustices through education seems to have persisted to this day amongst critical pedagogues. The goal of promoting social justice is central in all the 100 articles surveyed in the systematic literature review. Moreover, according to several of their authors, this transformative aim constitutes the pivotal characteristic that defines CP in all of its forms (Breunig, 2009; Foster & Wiebe, 2010; McArthur, 2010; Tutak, Bondy, & Adams, 2011). This is why it is employed in this study as an essential characteristic of the paradigm.

For Giroux (1985), the CP movement is united, in spite of its heterogeneity, by “a mutual respect forged in criticism and the need to struggle against all forms of domination” (p. xxiv). This is visible in the 100 articles reviewed systematically, which discuss various modes of oppression. While some focus on issues of race and ethnicity (Biggs-El, 2012; Cuesta, 2008; Czyzewski, 2011; Johnson, 2012; Lynn et al., 2013), age (Estes & Portacolone, 2009), special needs (Löfgren-Mårtenson, 2012), ecological factors (Brantmeier, 2013; Fassbinder, 2008), gender (Brown et al., 2014), or social class (Markovich & Rapoport, 2013), others centre on oppressive teacher-student relationships (Giacomelli, 2012; Page, 2012; Vassallo, 2012), and others discuss intersectional oppression (Chapman, 2011; Zimmerman et al., 2007). Agreeing with Giroux, there appears to be a shared opinion within the current literature that, in its present form, CP challenges oppression of all kinds (Lee & Givens, 2012; Vassallo, 2012; Widdersheim, 2013). This wide perception of oppression differs from Freire’s early writings, where he focuses almost exclusively on class-based oppression (Freire, 1973, 2000a, 2000b). However, it aligns better with Freire’s later oeuvre, as, from the 1980s, he refers also to race and gender discrimination (Freire, 1998; Horton & Freire, 1990; Shor & Freire, 1987). Critics like Weiler (2001) claim that Freire did not truly engage with feminist perspectives nor analysed his own patriarchal influences in depth. Even so, Freire had
insisted that he had always defied essentialist views of oppression and the erroneous notion that “suffering is a seamless web always cut from the same cloth” (Freire, 1993, p. x). For Roberts (2003), there is an evolving postmodernism in Freire’s writings as he developed a less universalising notion of oppression. Yet, as Roberts (2003) points out, Freire never abandoned some modernist meta-narratives. One such is his denunciation of capitalism as the main source of human domination in our epoch (Freire, 1978, 1985, 1998; Horton & Freire, 1990; Shor & Freire, 1987). Although Freire recognised that some forms of oppression could not be explained solely as a result of the economic system, he did not believe “in the possibility of overcoming racism and sexism in a capitalistic way of production” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 167). Similarly, present-day authors included in the systematic review seem united in denouncing capitalism, and its associated neoliberalism, as the root of current oppressive social relations (Ellison, 2009; Fassbinder, 2008; McInerney, Smyth, & Down, 2011; Morley & Dunstan, 2013; Motta, 2013; Vassallo, 2012; Widdersheim, 2013). Only one author in the systematic review questions the predominant rejection of capitalism in CP when he argues that critical educators who use Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed in their classes “usually are not trying to undermine capitalism”, but are attempting to “bolster democracy in the classroom” (Cammarota, 2011, p. 68). The majority of authors however, appear aligned with Freire on this.

Another persistent modernist view of Freire’s is his insistence on the need for localised movements to relate to each other at a more global level (Freire, 1985, 2004a; Shor & Freire, 1987). Consequently, he arguably never fully adhered to an identity politics stance. In contrast, several recent authors strongly advance identity politics (Bernal Guerrero, 2012; Ford, 2014; Toyosaki, 2007). For instance, Bernal Guerrero (2012) draws on Foucault’s (1988) theory of “technologies of the self” (p. 16), to advocate for individual subject agency rather than mass revolution as the epicentre of transformation in contemporary CP. While most of the present-day authors reviewed systematically do not explicitly adhere to identity politics, none seems to further mass revolution as the path to social transformation, thus contrasting sharply with Freire’s earlier writings (Freire, 1978, 1985, 2000a). However, as Weiler (2001) maintains, Freire does tend to abandon talk about social revolution in later work. This makes sense when considering Freire’s evolving context. According to Pinto Contreras (2008), his Chilean friend and colleague, Freire’s faith in the revolution, patent in Pedagogy of the Oppressed, was coherent with the common thinking amongst Latin American educationalists in the 1960s. The suppression of democracy through long-lasting dictatorships in Latin America led Freire to distance himself from wide-sweeping revolutions (Pinto Contreras, 2008). His hope was then placed on the “re-knitting of social connections”, promoting a local/global dialectic (Pinto Contreras, 2008, pp. 178, my translation). In 1987 Freire stated: “I know that teaching is not the lever for changing or transforming society, but I know that social transformation is made by lots of small and great and big and humble tasks! I have one of these tasks. I am an agent of humility for the global task of
transformation” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 46). Similarly, contemporary critical pedagogues’ rejection of revolutionary struggles in favour of localised change is typical of the current zeitgeist (Cho, 2010). The failure of the communist project and other historical factors caused disillusionment in top-down coalitions, fragmenting political projects into localised initiatives (Cho, 2010). There appears to be clear consensus in the literature reviewed systematically that the way towards transformation “lies in a slow evolution” (Su & Jagninski, 2013, p. 113) and in contextualized approaches rather than radical revolution. Valuing small-scale but feasible transformations seems helpful for guiding the daily, localised work of teachers in schools. However, such a stance has been criticised, most notably by McLaren (McLaren & Jaramillo, 2010). He is concerned that by abandoning radical change in favour of reformist transformation and identity politics, there is an implied surrendering to capitalist arrangements. Despite his call for current CP advocates to re-engage with revolutionary struggle, his clarion call is not answered in the 100 articles surveyed, with one notable exception (Fassbinder, 2008). Moreover, there are authors who oppose it on the grounds of its impracticability (Ellison, 2009; Neumann, 2013). Neumann (2013) argues that the sweeping changes advocated by renowned CP theorists are generally detached from the realities of classrooms: “they bypass the contextually contingent, sometimes fraught, always nuanced relationship between teachers and students” (p. 737). In so doing, they fail to promote the kind of tangible transformation that, in his view, should be the main concern of critical pedagogues (Neumann, 2013). As will be discussed in section 2.2.4, this theory/practice disconnection is one of the problems faced by present-day adherents to CP. To surmount the tension between making CP’s transformation feasible and the risk of excessive individualism and adaptation to a capitalist system, it seems important to pay heed to Freire’s (2004a) advice of maintaining a dialectic between the local and the global, recognising that local struggles are also lived elsewhere. Developing what Segal (2011) refers to as “social empathy” (p. 266), namely the capacity to understand individual emotions and life experiences in connection with structural inequalities, appears a vital mission of critical pedagogues. Such a mission is visible in a number of the 100 articles surveyed, for instance in Foster and Wiebe’s (2010) contention that empathy is a necessary trait of social citizenship and a requirement of critical educators. This is also visible in Hickey and Austin’s (2007) use of autoethnography as a method for connecting narratives of self with wider social struggles. The issue of empathy will re-emerge when analysing possible links between CP and DiE later in this chapter.

As has been discussed so far, contemporary critical pedagogues in general appear aligned with Freire’s later work in their understanding of transformation, which unites modernist with postmodernist influences. Freire (2004a) refers to his stance as progressive postmodernism. He rejects a “reactionary modernity” that, by declaring the death of shared ideologies and classes, also eliminates the possibility of transformative utopias (Freire, 1996, p. 84). That kind of postmodernism reveals an effort to humanise capitalism, which, for him, is antithetical (Freire,
1996). Instead, his progressive postmodernism tries to eschew fixed certainties and dogmatisms (2004a), opening to the “politics of difference”, while still upholding the project of social emancipation (Roberts, 2003, p. 459). For some present-day critical pedagogues, achieving this balance between modernism and postmodernism is a key chore of CP (Bernal Guerrero, 2012). As Sicilia-Camacho and Fernández-Balboa (2009) assert, CP’s challenge is to “keep a strong commitment to the moral project that it represents (i.e. social justice) while avoiding the presumption of having the best (not to say ‘the only’) pedagogical solution to societies’ problems” (p. 445). Being open to diverse forms of transformation is highly pertinent to this study because it allows a consideration of the different ways in which DiE may contribute to practicing CP in the participating research school.

Giroux’s (1988) notion of “teachers as transformative intellectuals” (p. 125) is also relevant to a discussion of CP’s transformative aim. Giroux (1988) criticised the technocratic view of teachers held by the behaviourist educational paradigm dominating the United States in the 1980s. A similar policy dominated the education system in the United Kingdom following Thatcher’s structural reforms in the 1980s and early 1990s (Beauvallet, 2015). Regarding teachers as passive technicians in the ‘delivery’ and implementation of the curriculum, a new managerialism was instrumental in de-professionalising teachers and reflecting the rhetoric of government policies rather than issues pertaining to the learners and to child development more broadly (Leaton Gray, 2007). Experts completely alien to the realities of classrooms dictated the curriculum. The curriculum was removed from what Brown and Kelly (2001) call a democratic and dialogical space, aligning itself with the priorities of the existing power groups (Macdonald, 2005). A teacher’s role was reduced to applying the experts’ decisions within a neoliberal and neoconservative tradition in education policy (Mac An Ghaill, 1992). Apple (1986) referred to the ‘technification of teaching’ to describe a process whereby teachers were alienated from their contexts of practice, and were forced to implement a curriculum that had little or no relevance to students’ lives and their communities (Leaton Gray, 2006). Teacher education at that time centred on how to efficiently accomplish that technical task and not on reflecting about pedagogical practice at a deeper level. Teachers’ autonomy was atrophied and their work became routine (Giroux, 1988). In Freire’s (2000b) terms, teachers became de-humanised by negating their creative and critical abilities and by dichotomising their practice from reflection. As an alternative, Giroux (1988) proposed that teachers become empowered in their role as political agents. Figure 2.1 displays some of the tasks of teachers “as transformative intellectuals” envisioned by Giroux (1988, p. 125).
These tasks aim not just at humanising the teachers, but the students as well, who are also seen as transformative intellectuals. The end goal is to promote critical reflection and action in students, “to help [them] develop a deep and abiding faith in the struggle to overcome economic, political and social injustices, and to further humanize themselves as part of this struggle” (Giroux, 1988, p. 127).

Arguably, the vision of teachers upheld in the UK and the United States more than three decades ago is not the same as the one in present-day societies. Yet, the systematic review revealed that the technification of teaching persists today (Abednia & Izadinia, 2013; Bernal Guerrero, 2012; Ellison, 2009; McInerney et al., 2011). Additionally, a technification of teaching is visible in Chile, where this study is situated. Although Pinto Contreras (2008) points out that Chilean education is currently dominated by a constructivist paradigm, not a behaviourist one, teachers commonly face an excess of teaching hours to the detriment of planning hours (Cornejo Chávez, 2009), and they are subject to heavy accountability measures through standardised tests (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016). Hence Chilean teachers’ work conditions seem to preclude reflectivity and autonomy, enforcing a technocratic view akin to the one criticised by Apple (1986) and Giroux (1988). Therefore, his notion of teachers as transformative intellectuals is germane to this study.
McLaren (1988) has equated the notion of teachers as transformative intellectuals with that of teachers as liminal servants. He distinguishes this type of pedagogy from that of teachers as entertainers and teachers as hegemonic overlords. Entertainers engage students but they remain an uncritical audience to the teacher’s actions. Hegemonic overlords are unable to arouse engagement, provoking numbness in students and reproducing dominant culture unquestioningly. Liminal servants, on the other hand, elicit students’ active and critical participation. They defy traditional schooling where students’ culture is not valued, but suppressed by legitimating rationalistic, “eros-denying” epistemologies (McLaren, 1988, p. 169). Liminal servants offer alternative spaces where felt understanding can emerge. As critical pedagogues, they are aware of the relationship between power and knowledge in society. Through critical dialogue and as-if experiences, liminal servants promote conscientization (McLaren, 1987). The characteristics of liminal servants are directly relatable with the traits of teachers as transformative intellectuals. In addition, there are patent links with DiE in McLaren’s (1988) idea of promoting ‘as-if’ experiences in the classroom. These links will be discussed in more detail in section 2.3.

In order to organise the review, the responsibilities of teachers as transformative intellectuals identified in Figure 2.1 are divided into two aspects: the creation of dialogic classrooms (three upper orange circles), and the promotion of critical awareness or conscientization (two bottom lavender circles). The identification of these two aspects emerged from the review of literature on CP. The centrality of these two aspects was later corroborated in my interpretation of empirical data. As will be seen in Chapter Five, some teachers participating in this study used DiE to enhance the dialogic quality of the relationships created in the classroom. Others, also applied DiE to promote conscientization. Although both aspects of CP are entwined, considering them in turn will help to operationalise the analysis of literature and of empirical data in subsequent chapters.

2.2.2. Critical Pedagogy’s development of dialogic classrooms

Teachers as transformative intellectuals contest unjust power relationships outside and inside schools (Giroux, 1988). Challenging authoritarian relationships in the classroom is, therefore, a central aspect of CP and essential to furthering its transformative aim (Kilgore, 2011; Lee & Givens, 2012; Motta, 2013; Widdersheim, 2013). As O’Brien (2013) remarks, the CP movement is greatly influenced by Freire in this respect. Working with peasants in Brazil and then in Chile, Freire criticised the traditional adult literacy programmes that were completely disconnected from the realities and interests of the learners (Freire, 2000a). He saw the imposition of extraneous knowledge over peasants as part of the systematic oppression they suffered. The purpose of literacy teaching was to enhance the peasants’ productivity to support the modernisation of the agricultural system (Freire, 1973). Peasants were seen as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge. Freire (2000b) termed this as the “banking” model of education (p. 72) where learners
are objectified and their human vocation for meaning-making and transformation is quashed. As an emancipatory alternative, he (2000b) proposed dialogic classroom methods that value the creative power of students and encourage a less vertical teacher-student relationship. Freire’s proposal is taken up by the vast majority of authors included in this study’s systematic review, who consider Freire’s dialogic education in theory and/or in practice (Giacomelli, 2012; Gill & Niens, 2014; Kaufmann, 2010; Ott & Burgchardt, 2013).

In Freire’s (1973) view, true education is an act of communication that should take the students’ existing knowledge as the core point of departure (Shor & Freire, 1987). He states:

> For the dialogical, problem-posing teacher-student, the program content of education is neither a gift nor an imposition—bits of information to be deposited in the students—but rather the organized, systematized, and developed ‘re-presentation’ to individuals of the things about which they want to know more. (Freire, 2000b, p. 93)

To address what learners wanted to know more about, Freire (2000b) and his collaborators in the literacy programmes began by identifying their generative themes. As Kincheloe (2008) explains, a generative theme:

> is a topic taken from students’ knowledge of their own lived experiences that is compelling and controversial enough to elicit their excitement and commitment (…)

Generative themes arise at the point where the personal lives of students intersect with the larger society and the globalized world. (p. 11)

This relates to the task of teachers as transformative intellectuals addressing students’ “problems, hopes, and dreams” (Giroux, 1988, p. 128). In Freire’s (2000b) dialogic model of education, having identified generative themes and words, these were codified, most frequently through images. Codifications translated the themes into a concrete depiction, allowing learners to gain distance from their own situation in order to critically analyse it (Freire, 1973, 2000a, 2005). The educational encounter problematized the learners’ reality and in so doing opened up dialogue about their position in society and their possibilities for transforming it (Freire, 2000b). Problem-posing education, therefore, is meant to lead to critical reflection or conscientization, a notion that will be explored later on. Several authors in the systematic review refer to the cardinal importance of placing students’ life experiences at the heart of any educational encounter (Markovich & Rapoport, 2013; Mutemeri, 2013; O’Brien, 2013; Perron et al., 2010). There are various accounts of basing learning on lived experience in the 100 articles, for instance when Abednia and Izadinia (2013) invited their students to keep self-reflective journals to use as a base for classroom discussion. Another notable example is seen in Vakil’s (2014) practice where his middle and secondary-level students identified a problem affecting their communities to develop a mobile
application. These examples evidence that Freire’s problem-posing or dialogic model continues to be practiced in contemporary classrooms.

Challenging injustices within the classroom also means encouraging students to have an “active voice” in their learning process (Giroux, 1988, p. 127; Robinson & Taylor, 2007), another task of teachers as transformative intellectuals. Freire (1985) clarifies that this does not place teachers and students in the same position. In a CP classroom, teachers and students are equal in human dignity (Freire, 2000b). However, they hold different roles. Freire (Shor & Freire, 1987) distinguishes between authority and authoritarianism. Whereas the latter is oppressive, the former is a teacher’s responsibility as facilitator of the educational encounter (Shor & Freire, 1987). In order for freedom to exist, there must be certain limits, usually regulated by the teacher, to foster a communicative environment (Freire, 1996). Also, although students’ experiences and knowledge are the starting point, the learning process does not stop there: “we cannot educate if we don’t start-and I said start and not stay- from the levels in which the people perceive themselves (...)” (Horton & Freire, 1990, pp. 66, emphasis in original). It is a teacher’s responsibility to promote critical reflection about generative themes. Biesta (2017) draws from Rancière’s (1991) early work to argue that a teacher and their teaching is an indispensable component of emancipatory education. He argues against a liberal interpretation of constructivism and extreme forms of student-centred education where the impression is given that anyone can learn without a teacher. Such alleged freedom to learn does not constitute a moment of emancipation (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2015). Within the domain of emancipatory education, Biesta (2017) identifies an indispensable space for emancipatory teaching which is not to be conflated with emancipatory learning. In CP, teachers approach students as subjects whose life experiences and how they perceive and understand the world around them matters. Such vision of equality between teacher and students contrasts with a classically modernist and Marxist interpretation of empowerment, and one which is described as resulting in ‘equality’ (Biesta, 2017). A modern view of empowerment perceives students as being ignorant about their state of freedom, not really aware of reality until the teacher as emancipator makes a “powerful intervention” to free them from their previous state of ignorance (Biesta, 2017, p. 55). While this resonates with a common criticism of Freire’s notion of conscientization (Greenhalgh-Spencer, 2014), as will be discussed later on, Freire’s (2000b) conception of equality is very different from that classically modernist take because he understands oppression otherwise. He regards oppression from which people require emancipation as alienating situations which prevent people from being “more fully human” (Freire, 2000b, p. 44). Freire (1985) rejects the idea of teachers as saviours and advances that only the oppressed can liberate themselves. His (2000b) is a pedagogy of the oppressed, not for the oppressed (Biesta, 2017). Freedom here is understood as a practice which involves autonomy and responsibility (Biesta, 2017; Freire, 2000b). This worldview is reflected in the role of a teacher in Freirean CP through a praxical
approach to education, where teacher and students engage in dialogue through a process of transformative reflection-action.

Fostering critical dialogue is another task of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). For Freire, education, which is communication, is performed through dialogue (1973, 1985, 1998, 2000b; Shor & Freire, 1987). He defines dialogue as “a moment where humans meet to reflect on their reality as they make and remake it” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 98). In his view (Freire, 1973), dialogue impedes authoritarianism, as it involves the cooperative exploration of knowledge and the problematization of reality. The centrality of dialogue as an educational approach in CP permeates the majority of articles included in the systematic review. Dialogue is explored in three out of every four of these 100 articles. For example, Gill and Niens (2014) conduct a literature review on the area of peacebuilding education and argue for the value of critical dialogue in this field. Giacomelli (2012) posits improvisation as a true form of dialogue in the music classroom. Derince (2011) analyses the import of critical dialogue in the teaching of foreign language to Turkish tertiary-level students. These authors agree with Freire that by transforming the traditional teacher monologue into a dialogic exchange of ideas, students become empowered to reconstruct and critically question knowledge and their habitual ways of seeing the world, recognising their socio-political implications. Freire’s dialogic concept of education, therefore, seems to have transcended through time, continuing at the forefront of present-day versions of CP.

This radical pedagogy is similar to Habermas’ (1984) concept of ‘communicative action’ which is the use of language oriented towards achieving understanding (Widdersheim, 2013). This understanding of the transformative power of dialogue and ‘communication as dialogue’ which underpins contemporary discourse on student voice, also draws on Bakhtinian (1984) ideas that life itself is dialogic and communication involves a participatory process of ‘co-creation by co-participants’ (Bakhtin, 1986). However, these models of dialogue present communication as transparent and unproblematic, and ignore the micro-power relations operating in classrooms by accommodating difference within existing power relations, which of themselves, remain largely or wholly unchanged. Taylor and Robinson (2009) acknowledge that there is both a lack of theoretical and practical tools at the disposal of student voice proponents within the parameters of these humanist and progressivist models. This charge has also been levied against Freirean pedagogy (Biesta, 2017). As a result, CP may not have the tools to contend with the many different ways in which power relations operate in schools. Some have questioned whether meaningful cooperation can exist unimpeded by unequal power relationships in the classroom. Despite Freire’s attempts to avoid monological educational practices more akin to a modernist, banking mode of emancipatory education, he discovered the difficulties of realising this in practice (Biesta, 2017), as have others more recently. Based on her experience teaching an anti-racist
university course in the United States, Ellsworth (1989) claims that CP’s ideal of equal dialogue is utopian and potentially repressive. In her context, students came from diverse backgrounds and held multiple and contrasting individual positions in terms of oppression. This made for complex power dynamics within her classroom. Ellsworth questions that when applying CP “all members have equal opportunity to speak” and that all “respect other members' rights to speak and feel safe to speak” (1989, p. 314). Additionally, Ellsworth highlights that teachers hold an inherent position of power in relation to students, which also obstructs equal dialogue. More recently, Kaufmann (2010) and Bali (2014) have made similar claims. They denounce that power dynamics in their classrooms made it unsafe for cultural minorities to speak. Like Ellsworth (1989), Bali (2014) also comments on how teachers’ position of power can sometimes silence students’ alternative points of view. One suggestion that Ellsworth (1989) makes to enable more equal participation in classroom communication is to “experiment with forms of communication other than dialogue” (p. 317). In this way, more avenues for equal participation could be given to students that transcend speech-based interchanges. As Hao (2011) contends, CP’s valuing of voice carries with it a negative perception of silence as failure to participate. Li (2004) similarly challenges the notion that silence is always a signal of oppression or disengagement. He encourages more opportunities for listening and observing in the classroom, recognising that silence can be expressive. He recognises that people communicate in other ways than in the noisy and chatty dimensions of participation, which Jones (2004) describes as “the Talking Cure” (p. 57), i.e. all problems should be talked through until a solution is found, which tends to dominate CP. The centrality of speech as a conduct of ‘voice’ in CP could also be expanded by an embodied approach. Moreover, adopting a listening and observing stance, as recommended by Li (2004), would give the teacher an active role in the learning-teaching nexus, much more than merely facilitating leaning. The present study aligns with these suggestions and takes up this challenge through exploring the use of an arts-based CP intervention by teachers in a mainstream school.

In relation to power imbalances in the classroom, Freire agrees with Shor (Shor & Freire, 1987) that teachers must make efforts so that minorities are not silenced by privileged speakers. However, he also points out that the emancipation of minorities is not the teacher’s duty (Shor & Freire, 1987). Rather, this must emerge from minorities themselves. While he touches on the issue of equality of participation in this conversation with Shor, I agree with Schugurensky (1998) in that Freire does not respond to the above criticisms sufficiently. He does not examine in depth the nuanced realities of classrooms where multiple identities are present, in circumstances where who is oppressed and who is oppressor might not be clear-cut. It is also important to acknowledge that Freire’s experience and that of his later collaborators was principally with adult learners in further or higher educational settings, and in non-traditional educational contexts. While there is clear resonance to the lives of children and young people, his experience was not with such groups nor does he directly explore the complexities of mainstream primary and secondary-level classrooms,
or their relationships to wider socio-political, historical, economic and cultural factors that impact on their lives. As Weiler (2001) notices, Freire tends to speak about learners in general (the “peasants”, the “workers”) instead of referring to specific participants in the learning encounters (p. 81). In addition to concern about nuanced student-teacher relations, there is a dearth of information available in the literature on CP and on student voice and empowerment around age, stages of student readiness, and child development more generally (Burbules, 2016). These factors also impact on theoretical and practical considerations of when and how CP might be introduced into complex school systems. Burbules (1990) notes that there is not one approach that will work for all students with different needs, learning styles, and interests, in all contexts and across all disciplines. There may be merit in considering how power relations in student voice could facilitate a process ‘of becoming’ (Freire, 2016), one which is never fixed or predictable, but always open to contestation and contingency (Biesta, 2005). This pays heed to recent scholarship that explores postmodern insights in the field of CP (Biesta, 2017; Burbules, 2006, 2016; Giroux, 2003; Lather, 2001; Peters & Besley, 2014). For Taylor and Robinson (2009), a postmodernist lens can open up rather than close down possibilities for a radical, democratic society. It facilitates a broader understanding of change and of the potential impact of student voice at the micro-level of the individual and of the classroom (Taylor & Robinson, 2009). For instance, MacBeath (2006) adapts Giroux’s notion of ‘border crossings’ to examine the idea of identity as a “process rather than an entity” (p. 203). In a Scottish-based project called the Learning School, which ran over a period of six years, ninety secondary-level students from nine different countries spent four to six weeks living with host families and researching how students in other cultures live and learn (MacBeath, 2006). The study found that participants were able to tune into a range of hidden voices which do not find expression in the routine life of classrooms. These experiences in very diverse cultural settings brought to the fore concepts of self and identity, which highlighted for students the process of self-realisation of voice and ‘of becoming’ (MacBeath, 2006). As Taylor and Robinson posit (2009) opportunities for student voice can be found not through systematic transformations but through small, localised endeavours, which pays heed to Minh-ha’s (1989) idea of change existing “in-between grounds... [the] cracks and interstices... [which] are like gaps of fresh air that keep on being suppressed because they tend to render more visible the failures operating in every system” (p. 41). Such a postmodernist lens about power in student voice echoes Freire’s (Giroux, 1985, p. xix) and other Latin American critical authors’ (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010; Da Porta, 2017) recognition of schools providing ‘cracks’ as spaces for resistance. They also align well with Freire’s and contemporary followers’ valuing of localised transformations in CP, as previously discussed.

Postmodern approaches, however, lend themselves to possible misapplication. A common critique of postmodernism is that in moving beyond absolutist notions of value, truth, knowledge, and power, it privileges relativism (Bruce, 2013; Chubbuck, 2007). For instance, there is a danger in
Rancière’s later work (2009, 2010) of moving closer to a kind of relativistic neo-liberal freedom where everyone is free to form and express their own individualistic understandings (Biesta, 2016). Similarly, a significant challenge that Freire’s dialogical model has met is its potential de-contextualization. Macedo (Macedo et al., 2005) points out how some educators have stripped this model from its political underpinnings, reducing it to “a form of group therapy” (p. xiv) where people express their disconformities, but without connecting them to larger socio-political issues. Related to this, some have noticed a strong connection between Freirean CP and progressive educational stances like constructivism (Breunig, 2011; Torres, 1998). While links between these stances are palpable, the politics behind them are dissimilar (Beckett, 2013). As Roberts (2000) argues, constructivist approaches “lack the overt Freirean imperative to relate classroom knowledge to wider political issues” (p. 55). Problem-solving approaches, where knowledge is co-constructed, differ from problem-posing ones, where knowledge is collectively criticised (Derince, 2011; Roberts, 2000; Shor, 1992). Freire (Shor & Freire, 1987) himself states that critical education is “more democratic than simple student-centered [sic] teaching” (p. 30). However, Breunig (2011) suggests that subverting the verticality of teacher-student practices “can be an act of social justice itself” (p. 255) in certain contexts. Arguably, realising that “culture is all human creation” (Freire, 1973, p. 47) can be empowering for students. An example of this is given by Freire (1973) when he recounts how a shoemaker, comprehending his own reflective and transformative capabilities, asserted: “now I see that I am worth as much as the Ph.D. who writes books” (p. 47). That shoemaker had begun to challenge the dominance of cultural hegemony (Freire, 1973, 2000b). In light of this, Breunig’s (2011) remarks seem valuable and will emerge when analysing this study’s empirical data. To continue to understand action, critical engagement, and problem posing exactly as in the socio-historical context of Freire’s world almost 50 years ago, is to fail to acknowledge the rapid changes in society which have occurred since the 1960s and ‘70s. We are in a time of unprecedented change, largely achieved through advances in technology (Dobbs, Manyika, & Woetzel, 2016). Therefore Breunig’s (2011) evocation to broaden our understanding of social justice issues and what constitutes action is more reflective of the complexity of life and of classrooms in the second decade of the 21st century. In a post-industrial society, poverty and urbanisation are differently understood. For example, in the last 20 years, more than 620 million people have exited poverty, while city populations are growing by 65 million each year (Dobbs et al., 2016). Technological change, consumerism, increasing life expectancy, climate change, the decline of capitalism, the changing nature of careers, and dislocation in the job market, are producing change at a monumental level (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Winter & Teitelbaum, 2013), disrupting what stabilised societies for generations. While decisions before were taken on the basis of experience, in this new world we are being encouraged to scrutinise our previous conventions. Questioning the taken-for-granted, using our inventiveness, imagination, and courage are advocated as ways to help people navigate this
changing landscape (Dobbs et al., 2016). These skills are reminiscent of the transformative dispositions advocated by CP. Therefore, the work of Breunig (2011), Bernal Guerrero (2012), and other authors discussed above who recognise change somewhat differently than modernistic-oriented humanists such as McLaren (2010), de Oliveira (2018), and Zeichner (2014) when adopting CP practices in their classrooms, seem better fit for the needs of societies in the 21st century. The time is arguably ripe for CP in a landscape where education is no longer seen as a separate activity from people’s daily lives, and is increasingly less isolated as a separate branch of government policy (Halkett, 2012). Undergoing a non-reversible ‘climate change’ of its own, the four C’s associated with the new forms of learning in 21st century education (communication, collaboration, creativity, and critical thinking) bear striking resemblance to the key tenets of CP, and in particular, to dialogic classrooms. Yet, many of the clarion calls to action are uttered by the world of business, and while their advice resonates with the key principles of CP, it reflects them in a very different landscape from that in which Freire and his followers were living, and carries with them the danger of being consumed by a neoliberal agenda (Gallagher, 2016).

It is clear that for Freire (2000b; Horton & Freire, 1990), as for several critical pedagogues after him (King-White, 2012; McLaren, 1988; Reza-López, Huerta-Charles, & Reyes, 2014; Shor, 1992), a dialogic classroom is not an end in and of itself. Dialogic education is a means to encourage critical analysis of social injustices as Horton (Horton & Freire, 1990), and more recently, Vakil (2014), and King-White (2012) recognise. Put another way, dialogue is a path to conscientization (Freire, 1985; Shor & Freire, 1987). It is possible that the future might consist of an expansion of the life style of the poor and oppressed (Chatterton & Newmarch, 2017), and the role, therefore, of ‘becoming’ aware of political and social conditions as a precondition to challenging inequalities, becomes all the more pressing (Freire, 2016).

2.2.3. Critical Pedagogy’s promotion of conscientization

Going back to Figure 2.1, Giroux’s (1988) teachers as transformative intellectuals also have the task of problematizing knowledge so as to promote social justice. Giroux argues that critical educators should encourage students to recognise the nexus between knowledge, power, and social arrangements. Promoting awareness of social oppression involves transforming the curriculum to connect contents with the social reality outside of the school (Giroux, 1988). Instead of passively applying a given curriculum, teachers as transformative intellectuals problematize it, enhancing its meaningfulness for students and opening possibilities for conscientization.

The notion of conscientization (conscientização) is integral to Freire’s theory. This concept rests on Freire’s (2000a) central assumption that human beings are capable of standing back from their reality so as to analyse it and transform it. According to Freire’s original conception of
conscientization (2000a), in order for the oppressed to liberate themselves they must develop a critical awareness of their situation and their possibilities for exerting change. The notion of conscientization is explicit in half of the articles studied in the systematic review, which suggests that this principle of CP is less prominent than the promotion of dialogic classroom practices in that sample. Still, a number of authors place this notion at the centre of their analysis, showing that conscientization continues to be key for many present-day CP adherents (Abrahams, 2008; Cammarota, 2011; Huerta-Charles, 2007).

There is an interesting distinction in the interpretation of this Freirean concept in the 100 articles surveyed. Whereas some define conscientization as the process whereby the oppressed become aware of their domination and identify their capacity for liberation (Hickey & Austin, 2007; Reza-López et al., 2014; Vakil, 2014), others expand it to refer to the critical awareness of students who are not necessarily on the margins, and even those who are considered privileged (Foster & Wiebe, 2010; Hickey & Austin, 2007; King-White, 2012; Motta, 2013). According to the latter authors, conscientization in a privileged classroom involves inviting students to contest social injustice after becoming “aware of the various levels of power and privilege operating on, in, and through different aspects of their lives” (King-White, 2012, p. 390). Although Freire coined the notion of conscientization based on his work with oppressed minorities, his theory is not opposed to these present-day authors’ understanding. Freire does occasionally refer to the importance of elite members to develop critical awareness, aligning with the causes of the oppressed (Freire, 1998, 2000b). He recognises himself as one of those who have “become converted” (Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 190). Moreover, the fact that these present-day authors discuss conscientization of the privileged seems to respond to Freire’s calling to adapt his theories to the specificities of one’s practice (Giroux, 1985), considering that these authors work in university settings rather than with the marginalised populations Freire used to work with. There is therefore alignment between these contemporary authors and Freire’s notion of conscientization.

An essential requirement for conscientization is the development of “epistemological curiosity” (Freire, 1998, p. 37). Freire (1998) distinguishes this from “ingenuous curiosity”, which results in experiential, intuitive, non-reflective, common sense knowledge (p. 37). This type of curiosity becomes epistemological when a desire emerges to analyse reality with methodical rigour, in collaboration with others. Only such curiosity can lead to conscientization. Problematizing the curriculum through continuous questioning and dialogue can foster epistemological curiosity (Freire, 1998). Importantly for this study, epistemological curiosity implies a pleasure for learning and an emotional connection with the material studied (Freire, 2005).

As discussed before, a premise underpinning CP is to value and integrate learners’ existing knowledge into the curriculum. In literacy programmes, Freire (1973) built the curriculum from the relevant themes of learners themselves. These were problematized through codifications,
which mediated between theory and learners’ reality so as to promote epistemological curiosity leading to conscientization (Freire, 2000b). However, creating the curriculum from the bottom-up can be difficult when working in mainstream schools where curriculum contents are pre-established. However, by finding “cracks” within the boundaries of the schooling system (Giroux, 1988, p. xix), it is possible to link curricular contents, students’ experiences and knowledge outside of school, and wider socio-political issues (Giroux, 1988). Freire (2004b) defines this as one of the responsibilities of critical educators: “teaching learners how to think critically, while teaching them content” (p. 83). Moreover, Freire (1973) believes that “everything can be presented problematically” (p. 125). This is confirmed when looking at the present-day CP practices described in the systematic review. Authors problematized various subject areas, including foreign language learning (Derince, 2011; Fredricks, 2007), mathematics (Tutak et al., 2011), music (Abrahams, 2008), and social studies (Cammarota, 2011). For Freire, while analysing wider social issues, critical education should not neglect the teaching of dominant knowledge. On the contrary, the oppressed need to be able to navigate this knowledge to fight more efficaciously against the injustices that subjugate them (Freire, 2005). Some aspects of CP find surprising parallels in the much debated 21st century skills alluded to above. The notion of being able to navigate knowledge appears consistently in the literature as being as important as knowing facts (Halkett, 2012). Alongside cognitive skills, non-cognitive skills or dispositions are also advocated, including social intelligence, emotional resilience, enterprising behaviour, and inner discipline (Robert, 2009). Like Freire, Halkett (2012) recognises that these skills do not replace the need for content and the mastery of subject disciplines, but are very much needed in combination with them. In contrast however, what continues to mark Freire and CP out from recent thinking on 21st century education is a steadfast commitment to conscientization, to an explicitly socio-political process of exploring and tackling social inequalities in a post-Marxist critical theory tradition. Rejecting the processes of “marketisation” and “learnification” of education which regard learners as clients and consumers (not as students), CP aligns with the conception of teaching as a form of “revelation” (found in Levinas, Buber, Kierkegaard), where the teachers’ presence and intervention is essential in guiding students’ and teachers’ learning experiences (Guilherme & Souza de Freitas, 2018, p. 953).

At one point of his career, however, Freire momentarily abandoned the notion of conscientization (Cruz, 2013; Gerhardt, 1993). He (1985) recognised that his earlier work gave the impression that a heightened consciousness was enough to end oppression. This led him to emphasise in his later work that change was impossible without praxis (Freire, 1985) – “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (Freire, 2000b, p. 51). Conscientization, in Freire’s (2004a) view, should stir reflective action that modifies oppressive structures in material ways. The question that emerges here is: how can a school teacher promote such praxis in students? As the systematic review revealed, some current educators who practice CP incorporate direct action outside the
classroom into their programmes. For example, in a course on social justice taught by Cammarota (2011), secondary-level students were encouraged to recognize a problem in their schools or communities and to propose a solution to relevant authorities. In Su and Jagninski’s (2013) research on a community-led educational programme for secondary-level students, young people were constantly involved in neighbourhood-improvement initiatives. Rouhani’s (2012) university-level students transformed an unused building into a community centre as part of the Anarchist Social Theory Club the author sponsored. These authors speak of concrete transformations deriving from critical education. However such direct action might not always be feasible. As Shor (Shor & Freire, 1987) asserts, many times school and outside society are distinct realms of practice. He acknowledges that “often, all I can accomplish in any single course is a moment of transition from passivity or naïveté to some animations and critical awareness” in students (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 34). Shor’s hope is that this critical awareness will gradually shape students’ actions outside the classroom. This hope is also evident in some of the present-day authors’ understanding of CP, as shown by the systematic literature review. For instance, Neumann (2011) posits that CP adherents have the conviction that students “will take the critical path or will at least adopt some measure of criticality into their daily lives even after they have left the educator” (p. 602), and that therefore, CP efforts will not remain confined to the classroom. Considering this uncertainty over the impact of classroom work, Shor and Freire (1987) agree that there are various stages of transformation. While a more critical awareness is not equated with social change, it is however, “a step in the right direction” (Freire, 2004a, p. 23). Valuing these steps, even when limited, is indispensable for teachers not to become discouraged in the pursuit of impactful and large-scale transformations (Shor & Freire, 1987). As argued before, this localised, small-scale understanding of transformation continues to be relevant for present-day critical pedagogues. Moreover, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, this gradual view of transformation was meaningful for teachers in this study.

Some have criticised the notion of conscientization. Ellsworth (1989), for instance, detects a patronising element in CP’s consciousness-raising project. In her experience exploring anti-racist pedagogy with university students, she found that they had an awareness of racism that was deeper than hers and unknowable to her as a teacher. From an analogous postmodernist perspective, contemporary authors included in the systematic review also challenge this notion. Similarly to Biesta’s (2017) criticism of modernist views of empowerment mentioned before, Greenhalgh-Spencer (2014) argues that by trying to increase students’ awareness it is assumed that their habitual view of reality is somehow lacking and that they must be guided by the teacher towards the ‘correct’ perception of the world. Some writers express concern about the powerful role bestowed upon the CP teacher of ultimately deciding what counts as socially just (Bali, 2014; Bruce, 2013). Sicilia-Camacho and Fernández-Balboa (2009) criticise the rigidity and universality of CP’s moral grounds, which can also be oppressive and indoctrinating. These authors propose a
postmodern questioning of the notion of social justice that acknowledges subjectivities and multiple perceptions of the world. They recommend a less directive teacher stance that is more comfortable with uncertainties. In this sense, these authors would seem to agree with Masschelein’s (2010) ‘poor pedagogy’, which promotes attentiveness rather than consciousness-raising. What is sought is a “displacement of the gaze that enables experience” without any clear end goals (Masschelein, 2010, p. 45).

Looking at Freire’s writings, a patronising tone can be detected in some passages. For instance, this is so when he asserts that teachers possess “more instruments of analysis to operate in the process of illuminating reality” than students (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 49). Freire was always clear about the directive nature of education (Freire, 1998; Shor & Freire, 1987). He asserts that “education as a specifically human action has a ‘directive’ vocation, that is, it addresses itself to dreams, ideals, utopias, objectives, to what I have been calling the ‘political’ nature of education” (Freire, 1998, p. 100). Teachers have a political position and their selection of knowledge and teaching methodology reflects this, covertly or overtly. However, Freire (2000b) also insists that conscientization cannot be imposed, precisely because it requires an active approach from students. Furthermore, he continuously disputes authoritarian and indoctrinating tendencies in education and in political action (Freire, 1998, 2000b; Horton & Freire, 1990; Shor & Freire, 1987). In fact, his critique of these practices motivated him to develop a dialogical model of education (Freire, 1973). As noted above, this explicitly socio-political dimension is largely missing from the so-called ‘climate change’ occurring currently in education in relation to 21st century teaching and learning.

In connection with the challenge against CP’s moral bases, Freire assumes what could be described as a middle ground or what he termed as progressive postmodernism. As explained before, Freire (2004a) abhors a modernist rigidity that ceases to continuously question itself. However, he also criticises an excessively relativistic stance that impedes the denunciation of social injustice (Freire, 2004a; Roberts, 2003). Considering this, Freire would have probably seen Masschelein’s (2010) ‘poor pedagogy’ as a laissez-faire approach. However, Tinning’s (2002) idea of ‘modest pedagogy’ may be closer to Freire’s stance. Like Freire (2004a), Tinning (2002) rejects modernism’s obsession with certainty, while still upholding social justice as a worthwhile aim. He also casts off the view of reason as the path to emancipation. Modest pedagogies avoid making large, universalising claims and value gradual changes instead. Moreover, modest pedagogies recognise that, for changes in awareness to occur, reason must be intertwined with emotional and bodily engagement. Similarly, challenging a strict Marxist inspired view of justice and conflict which involves taking sides, Sibbett (2016) calls for an iterative process of critique, one that recognises the emotional aspects of political language and communication. Moral outrage and outcry arise not only from cognitive engagement but from the powerful and often raw, ‘pre-
reflective' emotional impulses which give rise to it. This resonates with Freire’s theories, especially his later works (Freire, 2005; Horton & Freire, 1990), where he underscores the importance of emotions and the body alongside cognition in critical reflection. This also resonates with McLaren’s (1988) idea of teachers as liminal servants who enable felt learning. Tinning (2002) does not discuss practical ways to pursue modest pedagogies. However, his views are particularly relevant for this study which is examining the potential role of DiE as a way of introducing CP to the classroom.

Before moving to that discussion, it is important to look at the experiences of current critical pedagogues when applying the paradigm in the classroom. This may provide valuable information about the possibilities and challenges that teachers participating in this study may face when trying to open up spaces for CP in their classrooms.

2.2.4. Critical Pedagogy in practice in the 21st century: Possibilities and challenges

One of the purposes of the systematic literature review on present-day interpretations of CP was to examine practices of this paradigm reported in contemporary scholarship. While some of the data from this review has already been discussed above, in what follows I concentrate on the possibilities and then on the challenges found in practice by these contemporary critical educators.

2.2.4.1. Possibilities for critical pedagogues

An overview of the 100 articles included in this systematic review corroborates McLaren’s assertion that CP is “as diverse as its many adherents” (2009, p. 61). Authors discuss the paradigm from a variety of disciplines and educational levels, as depicted in Figures 2.2 and 2.3.
As such, the data offer an optimistic vision for the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme involved in this study, which also encompasses a diversity of subject areas and school levels. However, it is noteworthy that only 40% of these papers discuss practical applications of CP at length, with the rest focusing on theoretical analyses of the paradigm. This corroborates the claims proposed by a number of authors and discussed later on, that there is a gap between the
theory and practice of CP (Edwards, 2009; McArthur, 2010; Neumann, 2011, 2013; Teemant et al., 2014). Nonetheless, the 40 articles which focused on practice report generally favourable experiences. For instance, Fredricks’ (2007) application of CP in his course on English as a Foreign Language for Tajikistani young people helped him to make the curriculum more culturally relevant for students by placing decisions over reading materials in their hands. Similarly, Chubbuck and Zembylas (2011) report on how adopting a CP stance helped a novice teacher in the United States to promote a critical analysis of violence amongst her secondary-level students. Particularly pertinent for this study is Sangster, Stone, and Anderson’s (2013) experience. They conducted a CPD programme on CP and critical literacy for 23 school teachers in Scotland. The programme lasted two years and included three sessions led by university academics during the first year. Throughout the programme, teachers could also request special assistance from programme leaders on specific topics of concern. The programme helped participating teachers to understand the CP paradigm more and to apply it in their classrooms. According to the authors’ findings (Sangster et al., 2013), as a result of this programme, teachers, for example, fostered questioning skills and invited students to analyse concepts like bias and manipulation by examining publicity. This article does not offer a detailed description of the programme. Its data are also limited to the accounts given by participating teachers rather than including direct observation of the impact of the programme on their practices. However, this account is very hopeful for the empirical aspect of the present study, as are the other examples presented above. Still, a number of authors in the sample reviewed refer to difficulties when CP is applied in the classroom.

2.2.4.2. Institutional resistance

Clashes between the principles of CP and the ethos, protocols, and priorities of institutions are commonly reported in the current literature (Abednia & Izadinia, 2013; Brown et al., 2014; Harlap, 2014). This is not surprising considering that CP was born as a marginal educational stance that opposed mainstream views and practices (Widdersheim, 2013). Some authors notice that the technicist understandings of teaching that neoliberal education promotes opposes radical forms of teaching (King-White, 2012; McInerney et al., 2011). Institutional resistance on political grounds can also be found at the level of educational policy, as illustrated by Cammarota’s (2011) experience in the United States. This educator’s CP project was the target of strong opposition from right-wing politicians who tried to pass a law to ban this type of approach from local schools, seeing it as promoter of Marxism and contrary to American values. This evidences the strength that politically-based resistance against CP can have. Other present-day authors also remark that educators interested in CP can be hesitant to embrace the paradigm because it may harm their work prospects (Harlap, 2014; Kaufmann, 2010). For example, Brown et al. (2014) observe that
when writing a teaching statement to apply for a position in North America, adherents to CP may prefer to use ciphered language to avoid being perceived as too radical. Additionally, the politics of critical pedagogues can be in stark contrast with the politics of school administrations. The latter can mistrust CP’s overt non-neutrality, arguing that it promotes indoctrination (Giroux, 2006; Harlap, 2014). Also, many present-day educational institutions prioritise standardised testing and measurable outcomes (McInerney et al., 2011). As a stance that emphasises educating reflective students rather than training academic achievers, CP does not find fertile ground in these conditions. As McInerney et al. (2011) assert, when schools prioritise academic achievement it becomes hard for educators to incorporate critical outlooks and not to “conform to narrow, technicist conceptions of their work” (p. 9). Trying to be a transformative intellectual in that scenario is challenging. Additionally, school policies that accentuate disciplinary and authoritarian measures to manage behaviour can also be at odds with CP’s dialogical classroom approaches as Chubbuck and Zembylas (2011) found when examining the experience of a novice school teacher. Inspired by CP and non-violence education, the teacher tried to address misbehaviour through a communicative approach, yet she was overruled by the institution’s punitive disciplinary position. As Freire (2000b, 2005; Horton & Freire, 1990) remarked, transformative and liberatory education is a daring and risky teaching stance.

The School in Santiago, Chile where this study was conducted was publicly aligned with CP. It welcomed this research project as it responded to their need to explore ways to bring CP more powerfully into their classrooms. Therefore, teachers who participated in the study did not meet significant institutional resistance. However, teachers and the School in general, still had to navigate a market-oriented national educational system that constrained their work in several ways (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016). The characteristics of this system will be explained in Chapter Three.

2.2.4.3. Student resistance

Critical pedagogues also report resistance from inside the classroom to this way of working (Abednia & Izadinia, 2013; Giacomelli, 2012). The study of social justice issues can elicit complex emotional responses from students (Duarte, 2010; Fobes & Kaufman, 2008; Huang, 2012; Nelsen & Seaman, 2011; Zembylas, 2013; Zimmerman et al., 2007). Duarte (2010), for example, speaking about tertiary-level education, refers to students’ cynical or apathetic stances towards social justice matters. Similarly, Zembylas (2013) notices that students can be overtaken by negative sentiments when facing narratives of oppression, reacting with anger, feeling pressured into guilt, or distancing themselves from situations that they feel incapable to transform. Students can also resist dialogical classroom approaches (Freire, 1985; Shor & Freire, 1987). These can be met with puzzlement and antagonism by students who are deeply accustomed to
vertical classroom relationships (Fobes & Kaufman, 2008; Giacomelli, 2012). As Giacomelli (2012) points out referring to music education, students may be overburdened by the agency that CP demands. She reports that some learners feel more comfortable passively following specific directions and norms. To face this form of student resistance, Abednia and Izadinia (2013) suggest being open from the outset about the student-teacher relationship that wants to be fostered and the educational perspective that underlies it, as well as granting students the necessary time to get acquainted with the active role involved in CP. Similarly, addressing the silent attitude that some students adopt in the critical classroom, Zimmerman (2009) advises that, rather than putting pressure on them to speak out, educators should offer alternative ways of participation like small group work or journal writing. Zimmerman’s (2009) recommendation has implications for DiE.

Importantly, Nelsen and Seaman (2011), stress that student resistance should not be seen as a character flaw, a personal inadequacy or unwillingness to examine social justice issues, but as an epistemological problem. For these authors, this problem might be best tackled by promoting a questioning attitude amongst students first so that they can be open to interrogate their previous seemingly stable conceptual resources and beliefs, particularly those that might reinforce social oppression.

Markovich and Rapoport (2013) observe a final form of student resistance. These authors conducted an ethnographic case study of a CP art class at an underprivileged secondary school in Israel, focusing on the students’ interpretations of the experience. The art course aimed at empowering students by developing their ability to produce high-art while encouraging them to add political meaning to their pieces and to express their personal narratives as part of a marginalised culture. As reported by these authors, both aims were resisted by students. Creating high-art was seen by them as an alien practice that belonged to privileged groups, and they generally felt they did not possess the needed knowledge for its production. At the same time, most students rejected the idea of expressing political views on their marginality seeing this approach as one usually tailored at disadvantaged groups. The authors remark how, in the context of their study, the association of CP with underprivileged settings had turned it into a “labelling tool” that the students rejected (Markovich & Rapoport, 2013, p. 16). In view of these findings, the authors conclude that CP was still able to foster critical reflection about the students’ identities, although, contrary to the project’s goals, this was not readily conducive of student empowerment. Markovich and Rapoport’s (2013) study points toward a certain ghettoisation of CP, whereby the approach itself can reinforce marginalised identities. This form of student resistance has some bearing for the empirical aspect of this study, which was also conducted in a lower socioeconomic setting.
2.2.4.4. Difficulties taking CP from the page to the classroom stage

A further theme which emerged from the systematic review was a gap between theory and practice in CP identified by a number of authors (Akbari, 2008; McArthur, 2010; Neumann, 2013). A common criticism against CP is its absorption with general theorising rather than with the pragmatic reality of the classroom (Gore, 1993; McArthur, 2010). This was corroborated by the fact that, as previously mentioned, the majority of these 100 articles did not discuss practical applications of CP in depth, but focused on theory instead. As King-White (2012) suggests, this scarcity of empirical discussions in the CP literature may not evidence the actual impact that CP has in educational sites. It may be that teachers are in fact enacting CP actively, but not reporting on this in academic platforms. However, several authors dispute this hypothesis, claiming that beyond its influence in academia, CP has not been able to establish a prominent place within schools (Edwards, 2009; Foster & Wiebe, 2010; Neumann, 2011). These present-day authors substantiate what Gore (1993) argued over two decades ago: that CP as an educational movement has realised its philosophical but not its pedagogical potential. In fact, a search for articles in professional journals about CP, which could have added valuable insights about the practice of this paradigm, returned very few results. This challenge appears to be at the heart of the debate in contemporary discourse about CP (Gur-Ze’ev, 2005), despite having been identified as a concern from the early 1990s onwards. As will be discussed in the following chapters, the gap between CP theory and practice was one of the serious issues faced by the School where the fieldwork in this study took place. Bridging that gap was an underlying aim of the CPD Programme at the centre of this inquiry.

The systematic review found that the problematic transit of CP from theory to practice appears to hinge on two factors:

- **A language difficulty.** Several authors perceive an excessive use of jargonistic language pervading the CP literature which distances teachers from the paradigm (Chubbuck, 2007; Gore, 1993; Huerta-Charles, 2007; Kanpol, 1999; Tinning, 2002; Weiner, 2007). Neumann (2011) poses a significant question: how can CP “speak to the teacher in the school down the street?” (p. 618). Rather than over-simplifying CP theory, some have called for a more approachable style of communication that can be accessed by teachers and not just by academics (Edwards, 2009; McArthur, 2010). There is another aspect of language in CP which has received consideration. Heilman (2005) posits that the emphasis on dialogue and verbal forms of communication are not the only mode of expression, and she discusses embodied forms of learning and non-verbal forms of communication, something that resonates with Ellsworth’s (1989) recommendation, mentioned in section 2.2.2. These recommendations were heeded in the design of this study’s CPD Workshop. Applied Theatre approaches were used with the aim of making CP theory more accessible.
and meaningful for teachers, and to provide access to other forms of communication and expression.

- **Lack of specific practical guidelines.** Some authors also notice a reluctance amongst CP’s main theorists to provide specific practical guidance (Chubbuck, 2007; Hjelm, 2013), with Freire being a notable exception, as he “focused on *how* such a dialectic worked itself out in the theory and practice of the classroom” (Giroux, 2016, p. 7, emphasis in original).

Gur-Ze’ве (2005) offers a biting criticism when he writes:

> Currently next to no attempts are being made to confront Critical Pedagogy with reality in actual, enduring, pedagogical engagements. No wonder then that next to no attempts are being made to articulate an educational framework for critical teachers’ training either, and certainly no ongoing practice of teachers’ training at schools. (p. 10)

This reluctance seems to be grounded on a concern about turning CP into a definite set of heuristics (Gore, 1993; Macedo & Bartolome, 1999). There is a concern that this might lead educators to overlook their contexts (Tutak et al., 2011), diluting CP into a mere technique void of its political foundations (Motta, 2013). This argument seems valid, for instance when considering how Freire’s literacy approaches have been misused in the past (Roberts, 2003). However, as Chubbuck (2007) points out, lack of practical considerations can greatly dishearten newcomers to CP. Gur-Ze’ве (2005), like Neumann (2013), attributes it to what he perceives as the current detachment of CP from the wholeness and richness of life, despite an extraordinary onslaught of the technologies of globalising capitalism. Therefore, it seems necessary to discuss this paradigm in a contextualised way in relation to specific practices (King-White, 2012; Sicilia-Camacho & Fernández-Balboa, 2009). This does not mean the creation of manuals that univocally state how CP *should* be done. Rather, this implies a sharing of the detail of how CP *has been enacted* in particular circumstances so that others can learn from its successes and challenges, and imagine how they might apply CP in their educational settings and contexts. Freire himself was insistent that education was not a form of training, and that his work was best understood through reinventing his ideas in your own context: “If you follow me, you destroy me. The best way for you to understand me is to reinvent me and not try to become adapted to me” (Giroux, 2016, p. 7). Macedo and Bartolome (1999) describe this “fetish for methods” (p. 113) as running completely counter to Freire’s radical democratic ideas. It is only through praxis, not decontextualized, reductive educational methods, that Freire’s critically dialectical themes can be reimagined afresh (Macedo & Bartolome, 1999). This emphasis on praxis informed the development of the CPD Programme in this study.
2.2.5. Summary

Although CP has been around for over 50 years, and its precursor critical thinking for many years before that, this literature review found that its impact has mostly remained at the level of philosophical theorising rather than practical application in educational settings. The discussion of narrative and systematic literature reviews in this study showed that the theories of Freire, CP’s principal proponent, continue to be relevant for present-day critical pedagogues, particularly his later work where he assumes a progressive postmodernist stance akin to the current zeitgeist. Yet, while Freire was committed to the transformation of people, policies, and practices, and his writings focus on how these principles might be enacted, many of those who collaborated with him and who succeeded him, do not appear to share the same concern with praxis. This is unfortunate, as the term ‘pedagogy’ in the title of this social movement would appear to suggest a practical role for this ‘theory and teaching’ approach which exists to help students and teachers challenge hegemony. In an increasingly unstable and rapidly changing world, there are calls for critical and creative thinking across all sectors of society, but particularly in education. Despite a synergy between many of the so-called 21st century skills and the philosophy underpinning CP, it is noteworthy that there is little or no reference to CP in this broader discourse about education. One wonders why? Whilst mindful of the dangers of becoming complicit with and subsumed by a neoliberal agenda (Giroux, 2016), it would appear that many CP theorists have remained safely on the margins rather than at the frontier of the battleground for education. Indeed, with its explicit focus on fostering the attitudes and skills of social, political, and cultural criticism among students, it would seem that the introduction of CP to mainstream education offers a more complete experience than any of the other approaches to education currently being advocated. This would suggest that the time is ripe for CP to fully develop into a radical teaching and learning praxical approach in mainstream education, building on the work of people like Freire, but also Grant Morrison [comics, graphic novels and screen writer], and in the Latin American context, Quino [comics], Anita Tijoux [musician], Patricio Guzmán [Nostalgia for the Light, 2010], and Guillermo Calderón [dramaturgy], all of whom have explored the world of CP across a number of popular genres. The challenge for most writers who advocate the idea of a democratic society, is how to realise it in practice. Like Freire, Postman and Weingartner (1969) recognised schools and education as the instruments of a democratic society wherein

[…] they must develop in the young not only an awareness of [this] freedom but a will to exercise it, and the intellectual power and perspective to do so effectively. This is necessary so that society may continue to change and modify itself to meet unforeseen threats, problems, and opportunities. Thus, we can achieve what John Gardner calls an “ever-renewing society”. So goes the theory. (p. 1)
Having demonstrated in the first part of this chapter that a gap between theory and practice continues to exist in the field of CP, this study is interested in examining whether a creative, critical praxis in arts-based education could form a nexus between CP and classroom practices in a school in Chile. Heidegger’s (1996) notions of ‘handlability’ and ‘praxical knowledge’ in relation to creative arts practices where research, tacit knowledge, and experience begins in practice (a bottom up rather than top down approach), provides an opportunity to rethink and reposition CP in classrooms. Therefore, in the following section, I will use the theoretical framework developed so far to analyse Applied Theatre and DiE, and explore possible synergies which have been hinted at in the literature but not yet tested in a Chilean context.

2.3. Drama in Education and Applied Theatre

In this study, I am exploring the potential for CP within the specific area of Drama in Education (DiE). DiE can be understood as a methodology for teaching and learning applicable across the school curriculum (Ackroyd, 2007; O'Neill, 2006c). As a tradition, DiE emerged in full force from the work of Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton (O'Toole, Stinson, & Moore, 2009). It denotes a collaborative classroom experience where teacher and students explore an aspect of being human by engaging with fictional worlds and working in and out of role (Bolton, 1985; Bowell & Heap, 2010). This form of work stood in stark contrast with previous applications of theatrical and dramatic activity in schools, where the emphasis had been on either the staging of plays, on development of communication skills, or on individual expression (Bolton, 1985). In Heathcote’s and Bolton’s DiE, the focus was on the collective and reflective exploration of issues of social and personal significance (Bolton, 1985; Heathcote, 1984d). DiE was later furthered by other practitioners, like Cecily O’Neill (1995) and John O’Toole (O'Toole), who developed ‘process drama’ (Landy & Montgomery, 2012), an approach to DiE characterised by an extended and episodic improvisation that aims at generating an imagined world collaboratively between teacher and students (O'Neill, 1995).

The DiE tradition, and its associated process drama, imply a number of central ideas and methods that characterise this mode of work. It is worth succinctly mentioning these here, as they will emerge recurrently in the subsequent analysis of theory and practice. A key method in DiE is that of teacher-in-role, where the teacher assumes a fictional role to interact with students, positioning them in an imaginary situation and inviting their participation in the construction of the experience (O'Neill, 2006c). Importantly for CP, and as Neelands (1984), drawing from Gillham, points out, the teachers’ use of a role can vary the type of power relationships that is established with students, and, therefore, the learning opportunities that arise.
The concept of pretext is also crucial in DiE. For O’Neill (1995), who popularised this concept, a pretext is “a source of impulse for the drama process” (p. xv). A pretext denotes situations or roles, can be linked with a variety of themes, and helps structuring the experience by working as an “animating current” (Taylor & Warner, 2006, p. 6). Notions of protection and safety are also characteristic of the DiE tradition. For Heathcote (1984f), the drama encounter needs to be established as a “no-penalty” area (p. 128), where students can try ideas and responses without the consequences of a real-life context. Protecting students into a fictional situation or role is another feature of good practice in DiE. For Davis (2014), this means helping students connect with that situation or role, finding a link with their own experience in order to avoid stereotypical responses. Also important within the DiE tradition is the notion of dramatic conventions, associated with the work of Jonathan Neelands (2000). Conventions are devices that manipulate space, time, and presence to facilitate analysis and meaning-making in theatre and drama (Neelands & Goode, 2015). What has been termed as the “conventions approach”, uses both “representational” and “presentational” traditions (Neelands, 2000, p. 3). In some conventions, participants live-through an imaginary context (representational), while in others they showcase views of reality in front of an audience without being immersed in the fiction (presentational). Conventions can work as building blocks to shape the drama experience (Landy & Montgomery, 2012).

In this study, my focus is not on the ‘drama classroom’ as a subject on its own right, nor on the production of plays within a school context. Rather, I am interested in the application of DiE and related theatre-derived activities by teachers of various academic subjects to support their pedagogical praxis. However, in the review of the literature I found very little scholarship explicitly discussing the possible connections between this way of applying DiE and CP. For this reason, I have expanded the review of literature to explore the broader field of Applied Theatre in general, albeit paying more attention to applications in school contexts. Although not always addressing the specific focus of this study, the Applied Theatre theories and practices discussed here provide valuable insights to analyse the CPD Programme at the centre of this research.

The field I am referring to as Applied Theatre has received various names (Balfour, 2009; Nicholson, 2005). In 2000, Ackroyd utilised the term to denote a heterogeneous range of activities with a common belief in “the power of the theatre form to address something beyond the form itself” (p.1). Prendergast and Saxton (2013) have established a distinction between the terms ‘Applied Theatre’ and ‘Applied Drama’, with the former corresponding to activities that are performance-centred, and the latter, to activities that are more process-centred. For Nicholson (2005), on the other hand, these terms can be used interchangeably as umbrella terms to refer to a range of theatre related-practices that usually take place outside the limits of conventional theatre aiming to “benefit individuals, communities and societies” (p. 2). In the latest edition of her book *Applied Drama: The gift of Theatre*, Nicholson (2014) utilises ‘Applied Theatre’ to name the field
due to the greater popularity of the term. Similarly, in this study ‘Applied Theatre’ is preferred to denote the multiple theatre-related practices, including performance-oriented (like community theatre, Theatre for Development, etc.), and process-oriented ones (like process drama), that encompass the field. Additionally, the term is preferred here given the recent adoption of its Spanish version (‘teatro aplicado’) in Chile (see Chapter Three). Hence, ‘Applied Theatre’ might be more meaningful in the Chilean context, where this study is situated, than ‘Applied Drama’. Although the authors reviewed next do not always identify their work as ‘Applied Theatre’, as several were writing before the term became wide-spread, I am using this term for ease of reference when commenting on their theories and practices.

The following section begins with an overview of the general alignment between Applied Theatre and CP, particularly in relation to their transformative aim. Possible opportunities for creating dialogic classrooms through Applied Theatre are discussed next. Finally, I consider how Applied Theatre experiences could open up spaces for promoting conscientization.

2.3.1. Transformations through Applied Theatre: An overview of links with Critical Pedagogy

Looking at the Applied Theatre literature, several points of philosophical alignment with CP can be perceived. Perhaps the most evident are to be found in the work of Augusto Boal, who has been recognised in the field of CP as a translator of Freire’s theories into the domain of theatre (Darder et al., 2009). Like Freire, Boal (1993) worked with illiterate peasants in South America, using participatory theatre as a platform for critical reflection. He believed that theatre could serve as “a rehearsal for the revolution” (p. 98). Similarly to Freire’s (2000b) denunciation of the banking concept of education, Boal (1993) also rejects the traditional passive role of spectators in Western theatre. While agreeing with Brecht’s political stance, Boal notices how in Brechtian theatre spectators continue to rely on performers to effect action. As an alternative, Boal advances the Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) approach. Through TO, Boal (2002) promotes an active stance in spectators, who influence theatrical action directly, becoming “spect-actors” (p. 15). The theory and practice of Boal’s TO have been very influential in the Applied Theatre field (Landy & Montgomery, 2012; Plastow, 2009), and in the exploration of social justice issues in particular (Giambrone, 2016; Saldaña, 2005; Shelton & McDermott, 2010).

Beyond Boal, several Applied Theatre authors have also adhered to CP theorists explicitly (Aitken, 2009; Alrutz, 2003; Dawson et al., 2011; Finneran & Freebody, 2016b; Freebody & Finneran, 2013; Manley & O’Neill, 1997; O’Connor, 2013; O’Neill, 2006b; Taylor, 2000;). Clar Doyle (1993) is perhaps one of the first to discuss the link between Applied Theatre and CP in more depth. In his book Raising curtains on education: Drama as a site for critical pedagogy, Doyle engages with critical theory and maintains that “drama (…) provides a medium for critical
thinking to the extent that it can hold up images of life that question and contradict the existing reality” (p. 78). Through such critical thinking, argues Doyle, students can question society’s injustices, engaging in Freirean conscientization. In the second part of his book, Doyle gives some consideration to practice, advising the staging of canonical texts with students as a way to enact CP. However, as Coleman (2014) points out, Doyle’s (1993) focus on staging existing texts does not allow students’ views to be emphasised, neglecting a central aspect of CP.

Kelly Freebody and Michael Finneran’s (Finneran & Freebody, 2016b; Freebody & Finneran, 2013) work is a more recent contribution to the study of the links between CP and Applied Theatre. Using Applied Theatre projects as illustrations, these authors argue that “drama operates within social justice contexts” by promoting conscientization, metaxis, dialogue, and reflection (Freebody & Finneran, 2013, p. 48). In their edited collection, Finneran and Freebody (2016b) explore the opportunities for CP through Applied Theatre. Their book gathers a number of authors’ viewpoints and experiences on how Applied Theatre can open up spaces for social justice. Although there are no examples of DiE, as understood here, these books offer important insights for the present study, which will be analysed in the rest of this chapter.

One of the few examinations of the possibilities for CP in DiE that I have found has been developed by scholars of the University of Texas (Cawthon, Dawson, & Ihorn, 2011; Dawson et al., 2011; Dawson, Deckard, Cawthon, & Loblein, 2018). Drama for Schools centres on a professional development programme for local teachers where they learnt how to integrate drama-based pedagogy, which is analogous to DiE, in their classrooms. Their results show that drama-based activities can open up spaces for students to gain creative ownership and become empowered in their learning process (Cawthon et al., 2011). This project examines in depth the enactment of CP’s dialogic classroom principle in school settings. However, it does not explore how DiE could transform curricular contents to address socio-political issues. Some authors in the edited collection Dreamseekers (Manley & O’Neill, 1997) engage in this type of practice in DiE. However, they do not refer specifically to CP nor theorise extensively about the relationship between DiE and social justice. Yet, they do present valuable descriptions of their use of DiE to look at issues of racism across the humanities curriculum.

An author who has frequently touched on the potential of Applied Theatre to contest social oppression is Jonothan Neelands. He is a firm believer in the possibility of “dramatising human experiences in order to challenge race, gender, and class oppression in society” (O’Connor, 2010, p. 75). He (2010b) challenges the banking concept of education, advancing Applied Theatre alternatives where students gain agency to use theatre as a lens to explore the world. He (2004b) also refers to the potential of drama as a curricular subject to question and transform the official curriculum. This echoes the perspective of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). As O’Connor (2010) maintains, Neelands’ work has postmodernist tendencies, but is
“unreservedly modernist in its view of the world” (p. 118). He sees identity as fluid and oppression as multifarious. Still, he holds an unwavering belief in the project of emancipation (O’Connor, 2010). In this way, Neelands’ approach appears aligned with Freire’s (2004a) progressive postmodernity and Tinning’s (2002) modest pedagogy.

Cecily O’Neill has also addressed CP explicitly in her writings about process drama, a form of DiE practice where teacher and students explore issues together through fictional roles and worlds (Taylor & Warner, 2006). In her paper Dialogue and drama (2006b), she draws a parallel between McLaren’s (1988) liminal servant, explained in section 2.2.1, and the notion of the authentic teacher developed by DiE proponent Dorothy Heathcote (1984i). O’Neill (2006b) asserts that the liminal servant is epitomised in Heathcote’s teacher-in-role convention. The liminal servant and the teacher-in-role challenge ‘the accepted commonplace’, enhance dialogue, rearrange power in the classroom, and give relevance to students’ interests and knowledge, aspects that will be examined in the following sections. Additionally, O’Neill (Manley & O’Neill, 1997) refers to Freire’s theories in her introduction to the book Dreamseekers mentioned above. She defines the experiences described in it as “liberation dramas” against racism (Manley & O’Neill, 1997, p. vii). Besides these valuable instances, O’Neill does not embark on a systematic analysis of the links between CP and Applied Theatre in the rest of her oeuvre, according to my readings of her work. Still, her practice addresses social justice issues that could be connected to a CP stance (Taylor & Warner, 2006). An illustration of this is the process drama she devised with Lambert about Victorian homeless children, particularly evident when they propose the reflective question: “Is it right that the family at the Big House are rich, while chimney-sweeps sleep on straw?” (1982, p. 15). There are further examples in her practical work revealing an interest in exploring socio-historical and cultural oppression through process drama.

Besides these more overt links, implied connections with CP can also be detected in the work of several other Applied Theatre writers. Various examples corroborate Freebody and Finneran’s (2013) assertion that “social justice often pervades many aspects of classroom drama work, without necessarily being the explicit focus” (p. 55). The work of Edmiston is one example. He has stated that he does not use the word ‘critical’ “in its neo-Marxist sense of Critical Theory and Critical Pedagogy” (Edmiston, 2014, p. 221). Although Edmiston follows Bakhtin’s (Holquist, 1990) rather than Freire’s theories, a similarity with CP can be detected when he argues that dramatic pedagogy can “make oppression visible” and can foster examination of transformative possibilities with students (Edmiston, 2012, p. 105). Others, like Perry (2011), Medina, Weltsek-Medina and Twomey (2007), and Gallagher and Service (2010), for instance, have explored how theatrical performance devised by young people can engage them in critical reflection. The work of David Davis can also be linked with CP’s emancipatory transformation (Fleming, 2014). Like CP authors, Davis (2014) launches a savage critique on capitalism and looks for ways to contest it
through drama in the classroom. Inspired by the work of Bolton and Heathcote, and more recently, playwright Edward Bond, he believes that a drama approach that reunites reflection and emotion can foster a much needed critical imagination. Although Davis (2014) himself does not explicitly refer to CP or to Freire in his seminal text, his collaborator and close colleague Mike Fleming directly links Davis with CP when he writes in the Afterword that in Davis’ theory considerations of content in drama classrooms cannot be separated from the dominant ideology in a society. Fleming (2014) posits that only a small number of people involved in drama “may not see drama and education as being political in any way”, whereas “the vast majority of drama writers and practitioners [who] believe in the importance of criticality and are attracted to theories of critical pedagogy will I suspect be sympathetic to the analysis of the current social context” in Davis’ work (p. 180). He does acknowledge however that drama practitioners and writers may differ somewhat in how these philosophical priorities might be implemented in practice, recognising that Davis offers a particular approach to drama in the classroom. Drawing heavily from Bolton’s (2010) concept of ‘living through’ drama and Bondian drama (Bond, 2013), Davis (2014) argues for a form of praxis in classrooms which is socially engaged and responsive, and in which reflection is in-built into the immediacy of the experience itself and not tagged on as an afterthought. Understanding that thinking, emotional engagement, and reflection are all intertwined in the modes of involvement in a drama class, Davis (2014) recommends that children are not distanced from an event but immersed in the present [what Bolton (1984) calls metaxis], in order to create a powerful connection to the situation and be simultaneously self-aware from within the drama. As will be seen later in this and subsequent chapters, such amalgam between reflection and emotional engagement appears key to opening up spaces for CP though DiE.

As Landy and Montgomery (2012) assert, in general, practitioners in the field share an aspiration for promoting “changes in cognition, consciousness and behaviour” (p. xxi). Parallels can be drawn between this aspiration and CP’s transformative aim. Clear examples of this aim are visible in the work of Dorothy Heathcote and Gavin Bolton, two highly influential figures in the field of Applied Theatre, and specifically, pioneers in the development of DiE. Bolton (1979; Bolton & Davis, 2010) continuously highlights drama’s ability to question existing views, as does Heathcote(1984a) who argues that “drama is about shattering the human experience into new understanding” (p. 122). Both Heathcote (2015c) and Bolton (1979; Bolton & Davis, 2010) seek to challenge students’ prejudices through drama. They also frequently deal with power issues in their practice (Bolton & Davis, 2010; Eriksson, 2011; Heathcote, 2015a; Landy & Montgomery, 2012). However, they do so from a differing political stance than critical pedagogues. Their transformative target is set on what they see as unauthentic educational practices, but they do not appear to engage extensively with a criticism of social and systemic injustice in their writings. Heathcote (1984i) does express what could be read as a poignant criticism of oppressive social structures when she asserts that “we have made [students] toys of society when small, and
exploited them shamelessly as consumers when large” (p. 191). However, this type of denunciation is not common in her writings. She had a strong moral compass and sensibility, and as Bolton (1998) remarks: “[Heathcote] wanted her pupils continually to make judgements but not necessarily political ones” (p. 181). Her drama scheme Teaching Political Awareness videoed in 1981 could be regarded as an exception. In it, she explores with students a case of water pollution provoked by a company in a small Japanese village (Eriksson, 2011). According to Muir (1996), while this drama scheme engages students in a discussion of human rights, it does not provoke criticism of ideological hegemony.

Even though a more direct dealing with political and ideological issues is rare in their work, Heathcote’s and Bolton’s approaches have potential for the practice of CP (Coleman, 2014; Davis, 2014; Doyle, 1993; Hickey-Moody & Kipling, 2015). Besides the transformative power they perceive in drama, their views of teachers align with the notion of transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). For instance, Bolton (1984) rejects the idea that teaching “is the training of children in the neutral observation of objective facts” (p. 39). This echoes teachers as transformative intellectuals’ contestation of positivistic and technocratic understandings of teaching (Giroux, 1988). Similarly, Heathcote (1984i; Piazzoli, 2014) frequently speaks about enhancing the authenticity of teaching. Valuing students’ freedom and decision-making abilities and problematizing the curriculum are all traits of authentic teaching that Heathcote (1984i) discusses and exemplifies. These strongly echo some characteristics of teachers as transformative intellectuals: to problematize knowledge, promote critical dialogue, give voice to students over their own learning process, and pay attention to the particularities of the context of the groups they work with (Giroux, 1988). Throughout her work, Heathcote (1984i) underscores the importance of having a belief “to stand for” as a teacher (p. 175). This resonates with Freire’s (Horton & Freire, 1990) view of teaching as non-neutral. It is also reminiscent of the interweaving of reflection and practice (praxis) that teachers as transformative intellectuals pursue (Giroux, 1988). As will be discussed in the following sections, Heathcote’s and Bolton’s theories are valuable for understanding the opportunities that Applied Theatre can open for dialogue and critical reflection. Before moving on to that discussion, it is important to consider how some authors problematize the transformative aims that seem to pervade Applied Theatre.

### 2.3.2. Concerns about transformative pedagogies in Applied Theatre

From a feminist poststructuralist stance, Grady (2003) identifies a universalising and patronising potential in CP theories, noticing that this can be repressive in certain circumstances. Based on this, she questions the growing allegiance to CP in Applied Theatre. Similarly, Nicholson (2005) also questions:
If applied drama is socially transformative, is it explicit what kind of society is envisioned? If the motive is individual or personal transformation, is this something which is done to the participants, with them, or by them? Whose values and interests does the transformation serve? (p. 12)

Like Grady (2003), Nicholson (2005) cautions against authoritarianism disguised as transformative pedagogies. She sees this in approaches that originated with an overtly emancipatory intent, like Boal’s TO, and which have been used in corporate settings to further capitalism. Drawing from Schechner, Nicholson (2005) proposes to move the focus from transformation to ‘transportation’ in Applied Theatre. She explains that while the former implies fixed, predictable results, the latter does not make grand claims about outcomes. Although there are clear goals, there is also space for the unforeseen and consideration of the gradualness of change. This resembles Tinning’s (2002) modest pedagogy, referred to earlier.

In a similar vein, Neelands (2007) warns against confusing personal transformation with social transformation. For him, when “theatres of healing and entertainment masquerade as political spaces for radical social transformation” the result can be the reaffirmation of inequality (2007, p. 313). To avoid these harmful misconceptions and misappropriations, Neelands advises Applied Theatre practitioners to reflect rigorously about the aims and ideologies underlying their practices. In relation to CP, Grady (2003) had issued a similar recommendation. For her, considering the premises of CP in depth could prevent establishing “accidental” ideological alliances within the Applied Theatre field (2003, p. 79). The significance of reflecting in this way is highlighted when we consider that Applied Theatre approaches do not have inherent qualities (Cahill, 2016; Neelands, 2004b). Rather, “it is what we do, through our own human agency, with drama that determines the specific pedagogy and specific powers” of its application (Neelands, 2004b, p. 48). In other words, Applied Theatre projects are shaped by the aims and perspectives of practitioners. Like Freire (2000b) in the realm of education, Neelands (2004b, 2007) and Grady (2003) reject a neutral stance in Applied Theatre, advancing self-awareness and ideological transparency instead, as mooted also by Davis (2014).

In line with this, setting explicit transformative aims in Applied Theatre can strengthen the transformational potency of its practices (Neelands, 2004b). Whereas instances of transformation are often reported as ‘miracles’, Neelands (2004b, p. 53) believes these should be the rule and not the exception. On the other hand, Balfour (2009) challenges the transformational principle in the field. For Balfour, this principle has become wide-spread in Applied Theatre due to funding agendas that usually require promises of impact. In order to respond to these agendas Applied Theatre practitioners routinely claim that big changes ensue from their practices, while the nature and quality of these changes are rarely examined. For Balfour, this has led to an instrumentality in Applied Theatre, many times to the detriment of the aesthetic. This harks back to Davis and
Bolton’s (2010) perspective of ‘being in the moment’ in the drama as discussed above, in order to facilitate both artistic engagement and self/social awareness. In Balfour’s (2009) view, this meta-narrative of transformation has prevented a recognition that theatrical work “is not always linear, rational and conclusive in its outcomes, but is more often messy, incomplete, complex and tentative” (p. 357). This led him to advance a “theatre of ‘little changes’” that does not promise transformation but focuses on “how theatre actually works” (p. 356).

While Balfour’s calls are done so with integrity, it is questionable whether aiming for such ‘little changes’ is sufficient from a CP perspective (Chan, 2016; Finneran & Freebody, 2016a). This is also what Fleming (2014) was referring to when he noted that many authors and practitioners in the field of Applied Theatre and DiE may understand and tackle social issues quite differently from Davis whose practice tends to be full on, rather than piecemeal, in this regard. Eschewing the hope for transformation completely could be seen as a cop-out conducive of the kind of reactionary postmodernism Freire (2004a) rejected. Representing a different tradition, Balfour and several of his contemporaries in the field of Applied Theatre appear to have become more entwined with a neoliberal agenda (Davis, 2014; Jackson & Vine, 2013; Massey, 2015; O’Toole, Stinson, & Moore, 2009), than to the ideas of Postman and Weingartner (1969) as mentioned in section 2.2, which were highly influential on Davis, Bolton, and Heathcote, among others. In seeking to redress what they perceived as a poorly functioning education system, where children put their ‘real lives’ on hold until break-time, and struggled to create gaps in the curricular straitjackets which constrained them (Heathcote, 1998a, 1998b), many of the early pioneers in DiE were drawn to a more progressive, socially oriented, creative, and critical education system as advocated by Postman and Weingartner (1969):

> If it is irrelevant…if it shields children from reality…if it educates for obsolescence…if it does not develop intelligence…if it is based on fear…if it avoids promotion of significant learning… if it punishes creativity and independence…it must be changed. (p.13, emphasis in original)

A balance is needed between maintaining a critical commitment to transformation while also reporting honestly on the ways in which projects do, or do not, achieve changes of any scale. This will be attempted in the analysis and discussion of the findings from the CPD Programme based on DiE which is at the centre of this study.

While Balfour’s (2009) stance could be challenged for being too laissez-faire, it is recognised that there may be some merit in his concerns. There is emerging educational scholarship which points to the risks of being overly fault-finding (Hodgson, Vlieghe, & Zamojski, 2017). In calling for a post-critical pedagogy, these authors invite:
a shift from a critical pedagogy premised on revealing what is wrong with the world and using education to solve it, to an affirmative stance that acknowledges what is educational in our existing practices. It is focused on what we do and what we can do, if we approach education with love for the world and acknowledge that education is based on hope in the present, rather than on optimism for an eternally deferred future. (Hodgson et al., 2017)

This contains echoes of Davis and Bolton’s (2010) call to ‘be in the moment’ and experience the drama as it unfolds, rather than perpetually adopting a distanced stance through more Brechtian approaches to DiE. In proposing a move from CP to post-critical pedagogy, Hodgson et al. (2017) suggest that learners are no longer asked to reveal what is or should be happening, based usually on an assumption of inequality, social injustice, and exclusion, but to re-establish their relationship to a common world. Haraway (2004) calls for a reclaiming of those aspects of our lives which have been devalued, opening them up to question and the possibility of transformation at the individual and collective levels. It is not an acceptance of the status-quo, but an awareness of what is good and worth keeping, in the present, and worth passing on. In a post-critical pedagogy, education has a value in and of itself, harking back to Rancière’s (1991) ‘intellectual emancipation’ and Latour’s (2004) cynical abhorrence of “critical barbarity” (p. 240) where it “feels so good to be a critical mind” because “you are always right” (p. 238-239). It differs from traditional CP in that it does not appropriate education as always being ‘for’ something else in an instrumental sense (education for citizenship, education for social justice, education for sustainability, etc.), but encourages a sense of working in a common space and for the common good. This idea of the common space can also be identified in Chinyowa’s (2013) notion of post-critical pedagogy in Applied Theatre. He argues that approaches such as Boal’s forum theatre promote an oppressed/oppressor binary that can be repressive and antagonising in post-conflict societies where these roles are contested and unclear. For Chinyowa (2013), Boal’s approach “treats the ‘oppressor’ as a dominant system stripped of human qualities” (p. 14), and in so doing, neglects to consider the complexities of social conflict. Instead, following Jansen, Chinyowa proposes a post-critical pedagogy that can offer spaces for students in post-conflict zones like South Africa, to dialogue in a common space about their troubled past and present but avoiding a direct confrontation that strengthens hatred. Interestingly, to exemplify post-critical pedagogy, he uses an extract of a forum theatre experience, the very approach he criticises. Unlike other examples he recounts where forum theatre leads to confrontation, this post-critical example does not conclude with the ‘defeat of the oppressor’, but with forgiveness between all involved. This shows that the approach can, in fact, open up spaces for the kind of reconciliation Chinyowa endorses, depending on how it is applied, thus echoing Neelands’ (2004b) belief that Applied Theatre approaches do not have unescapable outcomes, but depend on their application. As Chinyowa (2013) admits, his notion of post-critical pedagogy does not stray far from Freire’s
(2000b) theory, in that it promotes the humanization of both oppressed and oppressors. In this way, his post-critical pedagogy is not a completely new stance, but one that preserves the goal of humanization that can be lost when binary oppositions between oppressed and oppressors are emphasised. Post-critical pedagogies like the ones discussed here hold promise as ways of addressing Grady’s (2003) concerns about the potentially patronising and universalising impact of CP.

Having examined some broad philosophical connections between CP and Applied Theatre, the following sections will explore in more detail Applied Theatre’s potential to open up spaces for the creation of dialogic classrooms and the promotion of conscientization, which are key concepts in this study.

2.3.3. Dialogic classrooms and Applied Theatre

As Nicholson (2005) remarks, a permanent and wide-spread preoccupation of Applied Theatre practitioners is the creation of democratic learning processes. All of the authors mentioned in the previous section seem to be united by a rejection of authoritarian teaching stances. Bolton (1984) locates the emergence of DiE as a counter argument to a traditional metaphor of the student as an “empty pitcher” whereby “something external to the child, valued by the teacher, is ‘poured in’ to the passive open-mouthed vessel, the teacher of course doing the pouring” (p. 3). There is an obvious resemblance between this and Freire’s (2000b) denunciation of the banking concept of education. A review of the literature reveals that Applied Theatre practitioners appear united in promoting alternative classroom relationships characterised by:

- Valuing students’ lived experiences and interests
- Uncrowning teachers
- Empowering students to take creative ownership
- Fostering participatory dialogue.

These aspects can be directly connected with the traits of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988), as shown in Figure 2.4.
Figure 2.4. Links between CP’s dialogic classrooms and Applied Theatre

How these aspects connect to the underlying premises of CP will be discussed below.

2.3.3.1. Valuing students’ lived experiences and interests

Authors across the Applied Theatre field highlight the value of students’/participants’ lived experiences. For example, different forms of Boal’s TO (1993), like simultaneous dramaturgy, image theatre, and forum theatre, take spect-actors’ topics of interest, problems, and opinions as the initial material. In relation to invisible theatre, a theatre piece that is performed in a public space without the knowledge of the audience, Boal (2002) asserts: “the chosen subject must be an issue of burning importance, something known to be a matter of profound and genuine concern for the future spect-actor” (p. 277). In forum theatre it is the spect-actors and not the Joker who propose solutions and decide their efficacy (Boal, 1993). Boal (1993) also emphasises that in TO, theatrical symbols must be meaningful for spect-actors. This evidences that Freire’s (2000b) generative themes are central to Boal’s approach.

In the area of drama, the work of Heathcote epitomises the high value given to students’ existing experiences and interests. Her praxis is characterised by her respect for “the validity of the knowledge and experience which her pupils already possess” (Johnson & O'Neill, 1984, p. 11). She incorporated students’ interests as the bedrock of dramatic experiences (Heathcote, 1984e). Meeting “the children where they are” was one of her basic principles (Heathcote, 1984c, p. 18, emphasis in original). Similarly, Neelands (2010a) speaks about valuing students’ culture, establishing links between theatre and the aesthetic forms they are interested in and accustomed to,
like television or cinema. Neelands distinguishes between an “economic needs curriculum” and a “child-centered [sic] curriculum” (p. 74), where the former aims to train future workers to fit into the economic system, and the latter addresses students’ existing needs and culture. Neelands’ child-centred curriculum resonates strongly with CP.

O’Neill (2006b) directly links the student-centred premise of Applied Theatre with McLaren’s (1988) concept of the liminal servant. She maintains that the centrality of students’ interests in drama emphasises their voices, just like liminal servants do. Moreover, O’Neill (2006b) argues that the “spontaneous, negotiated and permeable quality of drama” enables students’ interests to surface even when they are not central at the outset of the work (p. 106). This trait of drama can be “a powerful antidote” to students’ alienation from schools, which they can perceive as a place that is disconnected from their own lives and desires (p. 107). This is especially meaningful for this study, as student apathy was one of the barriers to CP that the School where the fieldwork took place was facing at the outset of the CPD Programme (see Chapter Three).

An example of basing learning on lived experience can be seen in the project Everyday Theatre, developed in New Zealand (Aitken, 2009). The project, conducted in schools, combined performance by a professional theatre company with drama workshops for students (O’Connor, O’Connor, & Welsh-Morris, 2006). It incorporated video-games as a dramatic frame to address the issue of domestic violence. In Aitken’s (2009) examination, integrating students’ interests in video-games elicited engagement and showed them that their culture was valued. It also provided a familiar context from which to examine the social issues at the heart of the project. Everyday Theatre did not merely highlight students’ interest but also invited them to explore a social issue critically, thus evidencing that student-centredness is commonly not an end in itself in Applied Theatre. As Bolton (1985) points out, practitioners of the mid-20th century focused on freedom of expression as the chief aim of school drama. However, Bolton (1985) argues that a more important potential of school drama is that of questioning students’ previous experience: “What knowledge a pupil already has is placed in a new perspective” (p. 156). Applied Theatre’s transformative aim emerges again here. Doyle (1993) has claimed that when Applied Theatre experiences take students’ culture rather than imposed culture as the starting point “then critical pedagogy is already in place” (p. 136). However, following Freire (2004a), this is not enough for CP to be fully enacted. It is arguable that critically analysing that starting point through Applied Theatre is more aligned with CP than just incorporating students’ culture without critical questioning. That would be consistent with Freire’s (Shor & Freire, 1987) contention that student-centredness, while important in itself, should lead to conscientization. Applied Theatre’s potential for conscientization will be analysed later in this chapter.
2.3.3.2. Fostering creative ownership

In Applied Theatre, emphasising students’ voices implies fostering their agency over the learning process. This is visible in the work of several Applied Theatre proponents, such as Boal’s (1993) notion of spect-actors. In contrast to audiences in traditional theatre, spect-actors actively shape the development of the theatrical encounter. Analogously, Woodson (2000) believes that a “critical pedagogy of theatre” for/with/by children should give them “power over the conditions for the production of knowledge, and ownership over their own learning” (p. 11). Similarly, Neelands (2009) suggests that ensemble work can promote students’ agency. Young people can experience the responsibility of collectively shaping their own work.

For Gallagher (2001), student agency is a founding principle of Applied Theatre. In fact, Landy and Montgomery (2012) define the process drama approach as “a methodology that empowers students to take ownership in the meaning they make of any topic” (p. 19). As Piazzoli (2014) points out, encouraging students’ agency is one of the traits of authentic teaching advocated by Heathcote. In Heathcote’s (1984g) praxis, and that of other practitioners (Bolton, 1979; Karavoltsou & O'Sullivan, 2011; O’Neill, 1995), students have responsibility over the creation and direction of the dramatic world. The Mantle of the Expert (MoE) approach illustrates this well. In it, students are framed as experts who perform a fictional job, encountering diverse problems (Aitken, 2013; Heathcote & Bolton, 1994). Assuming responsibility and ownership over the fictional task is an essential part of what MoE demands of students. This is highlighted by Cawthon et al. (2011) when analysing the results of the Drama for Schools project. They report that students gained ownership over their learning process when MoE and role-play were used. Pre-post measures showed that students posed more questions and worked collaboratively to create knowledge when learning through drama in that project than they did in their non-drama lessons.

Creative ownership helps to strengthen students’ belief over the fictional world, provoking engagement (O’Neill, 1995). Importantly, as will be discussed later, creative ownership and engagement can impact the level of critical reflection stirred by the dramatic experience.

Fostering creative ownership in students in Applied Theatre can be problematic (Enciso, Cushman, Edmiston, Post, & Berring, 2011; Landy & Montgomery, 2012; Munday, Anderson, Gibson, & Martin, 2016). For example, Heathcote (2015b) comments that active involvement is rare in traditional education, so it takes time for students to develop this kind of responsibility. For Heathcote (2015b), teachers “have to carry the burden not only of working against the stream but also of creating classes who will revel in taking decisions” (p. 54). Students’ ‘need’ to unlearn their passive role in schooling was also identified as a challenge to the practice of CP in subsection 2.2.4. The underpinning philosophy in DiE in particular resonates strongly with the pedagogy of unlearning (Dunne & Seery, 2016), and challenges the traditional beliefs that continue to uphold
most education systems worldwide, resulting in silencing learners’ voices and acting as a roadblock to change (Duffy, 2003).

Those problems notwithstanding, the ongoing discussion demonstrates that the aim of empowering students’ agency is uncompromisingly endorsed in Applied Theatre. This offers robust links with CP, representing one of the traits of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988). It is particularly important from a CP perspective when considering that, as Nicholson (2005) argues, emphasising students’ voices “is a powerful antidote to more authoritarian forms of learning” (p. 54).

2.3.3.3. Uncrowning teachers

Challenging vertical teacher-students (or actor-spectators) relationships is a strong theme in the Applied Theatre literature. Looking at Boal’s (1993) TO approach, this is evident in his description of the Joker, a kind of master of ceremonies who mediates the theatrical event. According to Boal (2002), the Joker must never manipulate spect-actors or decide for them. The Joker mediates but does not direct the theatrical encounter. Analogously, teachers in classroom-based forms of Applied Theatre are frequently denoted as facilitators of learning (Alrutz, 2003; Heathcote & Bolton, 1994; Nicholson, 2005). Speaking about ensemble work, Neelands (2009) refers to this redistribution of power as an “uncrowning” of the director/teacher (p.183). Drama teachers abandon the traditional stance of the knower, establishing a more horizontal collaboration with students (Bolton, 1998; Edmiston & McKibben, 2011; O'Connor, 2010). All of this connects directly with CP’s dialogic classroom principle, which, as discussed earlier, aims to establish a more egalitarian and communicative teacher-students relationship (Freire, 2000b). However, it is arguable that there is a general lack of theorising around the definition and understanding of the role of facilitator in the field of Applied Theatre, which in essentials is more closely aligned with Freirean notions of equality in the classroom than with the more radically progressive idea of a facilitator who leaves her students completely to their own devices in a largely unstructured learning environment (as critiqued by Freire, see section 2.2.2).

The teacher-in-role strategy is signalled as a crucial way to provoke this shift in relationships in Applied Theatre (Bolton & Davis, 2010; Johnson & O'Neill, 1984; O’Neill, 1995). When teachers take on a fictional role to interact with students, “the regular teacher/student relationship is laid aside for that of colleague/artist” (Heathcote & Bolton, 1994, p. 4). For Heathcote (1984h), besides enabling this collaboration, teacher-in-role is also liberating for teachers. They become disburdened by the task of instructing and find a wider range of modes of interaction with their students.
As Aitken (2009) found in her analysis of *Everyday Theatre*, altering the verticality of teacher-students relationships does not mean completely reversing them. Several drama authors agree that boundaries must be purposeful and structured by teachers so that students’ creative freedom can exist (Aitken, 2009; Bolton, Davis, & Lawrence, 1986). The importance of careful structuring on the part of the teacher is, therefore, paramount in Applied Theatre. As Morgan and Saxton (1989) explain, the skilful construction of dramatic tension and engagement will “produce their own discipline” (p. 49). This suggests that while drama teachers reject authoritarianism they must still assert their authority as teacher-artists, understood as responsibility for managing the creative and pedagogical aspects of the lesson (Aitken, 2009). This resonates powerfully with Freire’s (Shor & Freire, 1987) distinction between authoritarianism and authority and with his belief in the responsibility of the teacher in guiding the educational process.

### 2.3.3.4. Promoting participatory dialogue

Another key aspect of Applied Theatre that presents strong possibilities for CP is the promotion of dialogue. It could be argued that Boal’s TO approach is premised on opening opportunities for spect-actors to actively participate in a theatrical dialogue (Mady & Cohen-Cruz, 1994). O’Neill (2006b) argues that the emphasis on dialogue resonates powerfully in both Applied Theatre and in McLaren’s (1988) notion of the liminal servant. She asserts that “drama in education is a model for authentic classroom dialogue” (O’Neill, 2006b, p. 112). For her, DiE can create a liminal space, that is, a no-penalty area where students are free to collaborate in shaping the fiction. Correspondingly, Freebody and Finneran (2013) find in Applied Theatre’s concern for dialogue a prominent connection with CP. Cawthon et al.’s (2011) *Drama for Schools* project demonstrates this. Whereas before their project verbal exchanges occurred generally between teacher and students, when DiE was integrated they found that “student-to-student dialog [sic]” was much more emphasised (p. 15).

Edmiston (2012, 2014) has paid special attention to the issue of dialogue and dramatic inquiry, drawing from Bakhtin’s theories. He argues that dramatic inquiry offers possibilities for polyphonic dialogue. Such dialogue does not aim to reach a consensus, but welcomes a plurality of voices. By considering others’ views through polyphonic dialogue, students and teacher can question “status-quo oppressive practice” (Edmiston, 2012, p. 118). While Edmiston’s theoretical framework is Bakhtinian rather than Freirean, his arguments align also with CP. Moreover, his emphasis on the indeterminacy of dialogue could correspond with forms of CP that avoid universalising stances on social justice, like Freire’s (2004a) progressive postmodernism and Tinning’s (2002) modest pedagogy. I will return to discuss the indeterminacy of dramatic inquiry in the next section of this chapter.
Possibilities for dialogue in Applied Theatre appear to be premised on the idea of active and egalitarian participation. Neelands (2007), for instance, asserts that drama and participatory theatre can be “an artistic model of ‘parity of participation’” (p. 316). This is due to the collective-based work that characterises the field. Additionally, this can be related to the multiple forms of participation that Applied Theatre involves: participants engage verbally and physically, emotionally and intellectually (Nicholson, 2005). As signalled before (see section 2.2.2), expanding the possibilities for participation beyond speech acts can increase the meaning of critical dialogue in CP.

The emphasis on the body in Applied Theatre is especially relevant for CP. McLaren (1988) notices that schools usually celebrate discarnate, intellectual forms of knowing that are characteristic of middle classes. Schools are then disconnected from the everyday life of working-class students, whose “streetcorner” culture emphasises bodily experiences (p. 169). This disconnection results in the alienation of students from schooling and a lack of emotional investment with formal learning. For McLaren, critical pedagogues – or liminal servants – must restore value to students’ ways of knowing outside school. They must establish a “felt context” for students to engage critically with the subject matter (McLaren, 1988, p. 172). Recognising dramatic activity’s emphasis on embodied and affective participation, McLaren (1986) goes as far as suggesting that drama must be placed at the centre of the schooling process. Moreover, he proposes that drama be incorporated “as a valuable pedagogical or instructional technique open for use by teachers in the teaching of all subjects” (p. 233). In other words, he encourages DiE. This proposal is at the heart of the present study.

McLaren’s views, like Freire’s (2005; Horton & Freire, 1990), underscore the importance of bodily and emotional engagement in critical reflection. While dialogic inquiry is key to Freire’s pedagogy, its aim is for people to “reflect on their reality as they make and remake it” (Shor & Freire, 1987, p. 98), and not to become a disembodied ‘alienating blah’ when CP is subsumed into a form of verbalism. DiE and Applied Theatre enhance the quality of participatory dialogue through embodied praxis. In the next section, I will examine the possibilities, reported in the literature, for Applied Theatre to foster conscientization.

2.3.4. Conscientization and Applied Theatre

The aim of promoting critical consciousness through Applied Theatre is present in the work of certain authors. In Boal’s (2013) case, this appears in his definition of TO as a system that can allow a distanced reflection about social/personal problems and their possible solutions. For him (2006), TO can bring aspects of our surrounding reality into the light. He offers several examples of moments of conscientization elicited by TO encounters. One such took place in Chile, when an
opponent to the local dictatorship realised that he was being a dictator in his own home (Boal, 2006). TO helped that person analyse his own reality, and criticise it. Practitioners after Boal have also applied TO to develop conscientization in areas such as education (Schroeter, 2013), social work (Barak, 2016) and social research (Dennis, 2009).

Besides Boal, other authors have also referred explicitly to conscientization as a possibility in Applied Theatre. For instance Doyle (1993) asserts that drama can lead to critical consciousness as it can “hold up images of life that question and contradict the existing reality” (p. 78). Equally, Freebody and Finneran (2013) see the development of conscientization as one of the possibilities that Applied Theatre can create for CP. Neelands (2004b, 2007) has also referred to setting consciousness raising as a goal for Applied Theatre.

Conscientization is also implicit in the work of several other authors in the field who might stand on a theoretical and ideological base other than CP. However, they seem to share a transformative aim, so links can be drawn between their approaches and the fostering of conscientization (Landy & Montgomery, 2012). Potential for conscientization can be seen, for instance, when Heathcote (2015c) states that through dramatic experience the “old jaded views must be given a new look of shocking proportions” and that “somehow prejudice must be bypassed to let in new light upon old matter” (p. 43). In other words, dramatic experience can question the taken-for-granted, an integral part of Freire’s (2000b) notion of conscientization. This idea of questioning what is normally assumed is a recurrent theme across the Applied Theatre literature (Bolton & Davis, 2010; Edmiston & McKibben, 2011; Gallagher, 2000; O’Connor, 2013; O’Neill, 2006a).

Critical pedagogues as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988) problematize knowledge to challenge social injustices. Put differently, they promote conscientization. To organize the analysis, I identify three ways in which Applied Theatre can connect with teachers as transformative intellectuals in their fostering of conscientization (Figure 2.5).
2.3.4.1. Problematizing knowledge and advancing social justice through Applied Theatre’s codifications

To promote conscientization, Freire (2000b) problematized learners’ generative themes through codifications that connected them with wider socio-political issues. Codifications are “objects which mediate the decoders in their critical analysis” (Freire, 2000b, p. 114). They allow a reflective distance between the learners and their reality. Freire (2000b) commonly used images as codifications. Although he mentions the possibility of employing dramatizations as codifications (Freire, 1985, 2000b; Shor & Freire, 1987), he never develops the idea fully. A few authors in the Applied Theatre area have briefly suggested theatre’s potential to act as Freirean codifications (Desai, 1990; Pompeo Nogueira, 2015). In her doctoral thesis, Pompeo Nogueira (2002) offers a deeper discussion of this potential, focusing on Theatre for Development. She argues that Freire’s concept of codification as a representation of reality could be expanded in theatre to include “imaginary” codifications (Pompeo Nogueira, 2002, p. 238). Instead of only representing social problems realistically, these theatrical codifications, which are symbolic, emphasise the possibilities of eliciting multiple views. She concludes that attention to aesthetic form in Theatre for Development can expand opportunities for critical reflection. Her research focuses on theatrical creation and performance. However, it is arguable that non-performative forms of Applied Theatre may also open up spaces for conscientization. The experience of role-taking in the classroom for example, may lead to what could be termed as

**Figure 2.5. Links between CP’s conscientization and Applied Theatre**
dramatic codifications. Examining this possibility is important for the present study, as most of the work in the CPD Programme was not performance-oriented.

The concept of metaxis is key to examining this potential (Freebody & Finneran, 2013; O’Connor, 2013). It is defined by Boal (2013) as a dual awareness of the real and fictitious contexts. Metaxis can occur through role-taking (Bolton, 1979, 1984; Freebody & Finneran, 2013; O’Neill, 1995; O’Toole, 2003). Bolton (1979) describes this dual awareness of living-through drama as “a sense of ‘it is happening to me’ and ‘I am making happen’” (p. 53). When in-role, students experience the fiction and are aware of their experience at the same time, something O’Neill (1995) refers to as “I am watching this happening to me, and I am making it happen” (p. 125), expanding on Bolton’s idea to reflect this experience of self-awareness and spectatorship. Possibilities for reflection can be created through this dual awareness as students reflect on why they are acting in a certain way within the context of the drama. Reflective opportunities are enhanced when what O’Toole terms “tension of metaxis” occurs (p. 166). O’Toole (2003) draws on Vygotsky’s concept of ‘dual affect’ to explain the tension of metaxis. According to Vygotsky’s (1976) study of child play, children can experience contrasting emotions at the same time when playing. They can suffer ‘in-role’ within the imaginary context while utterly enjoying the experience as a player. This provokes a gap between fiction and reality. According to O’Toole (2003), the same can happen when in-role in drama: this is “the tension of metaxis” (p. 166). That tension emerges when there is a contradiction between the fictional and the real settings. O’Toole (2003) exemplifies this by recounting a process drama where students in-role tricked their teacher-in-role: “The children were exercising both power and control over the person who in real life exercised both over them by virtue of position and status” (p. 166). Referring to Applied Theatre for/about social justice, Bundy, Dunn, and Stinson (2016) draw on O’Toole’s notion and argue that critical reflection is enhanced when there is a clash between how participants react in-role and how they would react if the situation was real. Their habits are problematized. The distance afforded by the fiction has the potential of encouraging students to question how they think and behave in real life.

Eriksson (2011) has explored distancing in the work of Heathcote, linking it with Brecht’s notion of ‘estrangement’ (Verfremdung or V effect). Brecht’s V effect makes the familiar strange, distancing the object of analysis and making it striking to provoke critical examination through theatre. For Eriksson (2011), estrangement devices can allow reality to be “seen in a new light, with a new awareness” (p.103). He argues that provoking estrangement is a key aspect of Heathcote’s pedagogy and of process drama. Arguably, estrangement devices work similarly to Freirean codifications by allowing a reflective distance from daily life. Moreover, for Bolton (1984), an engaged distance allows the participant in drama to “see his[her] experiencing as an object to be reflected upon” (p. 147). As Prentki (2015) powerfully states in relation to Theatre for Development, distancing can help participants “to explore their lives with both the emotional
integrity of lived experience and the critical analysis necessary for understanding that experience in relation to the governing forces of their society” (p. 69). Because of the experiential and embodied nature of the work, dramatic codifications could not only allow a distanced experience, but also one premised on engagement. They are “felt” (McLaren, 1988, p. 172). Emotional engagement and its impact on critical reflection in Applied Theatre will be examined later in this chapter.

Dramatic conventions may also serve as codifications. Conventions can allow a many-sided and detailed exploration of a problem (Cahill, 2016; Gallagher, 2000). Presentational conventions, namely, those that imply an audience (although usually of peers who are actively participating in the experience), can slow down the life-like pace of role-play so that reflection can be enhanced (O’Neill, 2015). In so doing, it is proposed that they allow students to be distanced from reality in order to analyse it critically, thereby revealing their potential as codifications.

Davis (2014) negates the value that conventions have for questioning dominant ideologies. In his view, conventions emphasise rationality, disregarding the experiential value of ‘living-through drama’. This would appear to chime with McLaren (1988) who prioritises the importance of bodily and emotional engagement as students make and remake their reality through a process of reflection-in-action, rather than on-action as would be associated with a conventions approach. On the other hand, Cahill (2016) has demonstrated that dramatic conventions can in fact foster critical reflection about domination and oppression. This challenges Davis’ (2014) assumption that conventions, unlike ‘living-through drama’, always lack an experiential aspect. This may be true of conventions where students are not assuming a role, which work more like the kind of theatrical codifications identified by Pompeo Nogueira (2015). However, conventions that rely on role-taking may preserve the metaxis between fiction and reality. Moreover, there may be room for tension of metaxis to emerge. An example of this is the “conscience alley” convention (Neelands & Goode, 2015, p. 125). In it, participants form an alley and advise a person in-role as someone facing a decisive moment. When participants forming the alley are also in-role, a clash may arise between their in-role advice and what they would recommend in real life. Hence, a distanced but arguably ‘felt’ critical reflection could be promoted.

Considering the discussion above, it can be claimed that role-play could result in Freirean codifications. These dramatic codifications would meet the characteristics of codifications outlined by Freire (2000b, pp. 114-115):

- Represent situations that are familiar to learners
- Not be too enigmatic nor too explicit
- Offer various decoding possibilities (to avoid propaganda)
- Point towards multiple other themes.
- **Represent situations that are familiar to the learners.** As discussed in section 2.3.3.1, Applied Theatre usually draws from participants’ previous interests and experiences. This is particularly true in role-playing where, as Davis (2014) argues, students need to find a connection with the role they are assuming: the role must have a quality with which “the child can relate to, one that belongs to his/her life experience” (p. 97). This can help protect students into role so that stereotypical responses are avoided.

- **Not be too enigmatic nor too explicit.** O’Neill’s argument relates directly to this characteristic:

  Too explicit an approach may degenerate into mere propaganda with no real decoding to be done, beyond stating the obviously predetermined content. Too enigmatic, and the drama runs the risk of appearing merely to be a puzzle or a guessing game. (O’Neill, 2006a, p. 149)

Incorporating participants’ lived experiences in Applied Theatre might help prevent against excessive enigma, making the codifications relatable to students. Also, several authors recommend approaching issues indirectly in drama, which serves as a further protective and distancing device (Aitken, 2009; O’Connor, 2013; O’Toole, 2003; O’Toole & Donelan, 1996). For instance Bolton (Bolton & Davis, 2010) suggests exploring sensitive issues through an oblique angle; through roles that are not directly involved in the problem; or through analogy. Such strategies could help avert undue explicitness.

- **Offer various decoding possibilities (to avoid propaganda) and point towards multiple themes.**

  As several authors point out, Applied Theatre experiences are often unpredictable (Balfour, 2009; Neelands, 2004b). Bolton uses a valuable metaphor to highlight this:

  While it is possible to indicate the door that is being opened by the play or the classroom drama sequence, one cannot specify what any one individual will learn, or even guarantee that s/he will go through that door! (Bolton & Davis, 2010, p. 52)

Similarly, O’Toole (2003) describes dramatic meaning as having “a maverick quality” (p.225). Because themes are frequently approached obliquely and students’ creative ownership is underscored, results cannot always be foreseen. Consequently, various meanings can emerge, which is a trait of Freirean (2000b) codifications. This ‘maverick’ quality of drama could also help counter risks of indoctrination when applied from a CP perspective. Teachers may invite students to analyse socio-political issues through Applied Theatre, but they cannot control or over-influence the meanings, if any, students will draw from the experience. However, this also infers that socio-political issues may remain untouched or that their analyses might not be sufficiently deep. As Freebody and Finneran (2013) remark, “the immediacy and spontaneity of participant involvement in the dramatic action sometimes
results in a necessarily simplified response” (p. 59). Moreover, students’ creative freedom may result in the reproduction of prejudiced views or behaviour in the classroom (Freebody & Finneran, 2013; O’Toole, 2003). This would be problematic from a CP paradigm. However, it is important to consider that the teacher’s aims and interest also come into play in Applied Theatre. Although they should not restrict students’ gaze, they are still present in the planning, structuring, and managing of the work (O’Connor, 2010). There is a negotiation between what Bolton (1979), drawing from Gillham, refers to as “the play for the teacher, and the play for the students” (p. 51). Striking a balance between both ‘plays’ can make the experience both engaging and educational.

Tinning’s (2002) modest pedagogy and Nicholson’s (2005) transportation notions are pertinent here. They suggest that teachers trying to promote conscientization through Applied Theatre should remain open to the multiple interpretations the work may elicit. A progressive postmodern stance could prevail, where the utopian hope of social justice is present while multiple views are accepted (Freire, 2004a). Importantly, as the literature suggests (Bolton, 1979; Taylor & Warner, 2006), and as will be discussed in relation to the empirical data, to reach a balance between teacher’s and students’ aims in Applied Theatre requires a high level of expertise and artistry.

In the next subsection I will concentrate on the issue of engagement and its relevance for conscientization.

2.3.4.2. Engaging emotionally in Applied Theatre to critically reflect

As Bolton (1979) affirms, changes in understanding can only occur when emotional engagement is generated. Bundy et al. (2016) seem to agree when they argue that such engagement is crucial for critical reflection in Applied Theatre. This understanding in Applied Theatre that there can be no meaningful exploration of content without emotional engagement reflects CP authors’ views about the importance of emotions in the process of conscientization (Horton & Freire, 1990; McLaren, 1988; Tinning, 2002). Bundy et al. (2016) suggest that changes in understanding are more likely to arise in drama when different types of emotions are generated. They draw from Bolton’s (1984) distinction between first and second order experiences, with the former corresponding to real-life events and the latter to fictional experiences, to argue that a layering of “first order emotions” (p. 49) – elicited by the real context, and “second order emotions” (p. 42) – elicited by the fiction, is necessary for the drama experience to provoke a critical response. In this way, the fictional context becomes connected with the participants’ real lives. When this is intertwined with critical reflection about social justice issues, spaces can be created for conscientization. Importantly,
integrating different strategies both in and out-of-role offers participants opportunities to develop multi-layered emotions that enrich their experience (Bundy et al., 2016).

Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy of engagement can help to guide the analysis of emotional investment in Applied Theatre (Figure 2.6).

Figure 2.6. Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy of personal engagement (p. 28)

For Morgan and Saxton, the first mode of engagement takes the form of interest about the issue to be explored. The second implies a willingness to be involved, while the third requires students to develop responsibility and ownership over the work, becoming absorbed by it. The fourth mode of engagement, internalizing, occurs when the object of analysis is merged with subjective experience, generating emotions linked with discovery. This leads to “understanding and, therefore, ownership of new ideas” (Morgan & Saxton, 2006, p. 28). Finally, the fifth mode involves a desire to share new knowledge, while the sixth is motivated by a desire to put it to the test outside the classroom context. Questions which are pertinent to the present study are: how can these forms of emotional engagement be developed through DiE? And how can emotional engagement in DiE foster conscientization? To explore these questions, I will delve further into the theory underpinning Applied Theatre.

Applied Theatre’s concern for integrating students’ interests has been discussed earlier in this chapter. When that concern is enacted, it is arguable that the interest level of Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy should be in place. However, it is important to consider that students’ interests are likely to vary within the same group (Bundy et al., 2016). Indeed, even when the topic of the drama may be stimulating for a majority of students in a class, not all will necessarily be interested in the angle, or method, assumed to approach it. A careful reading of the group seems necessary to promote general interest.

In their analysis of emotional engagement in what they term participatory drama, Bundy et al. (2016) identify interest as a prerequisite for critical analysis. They conclude that in order to generate interest in the pretext, or source material, of a participatory drama, the pretext must be “novel, challenging and comprehensible” (p. 50). They also suggest that to preserve interest or to
raise it once the work is underway, those three characteristics must continue to feature. These offer a potential framework against which to discuss the empirical data in this study.

Neelands (2004a) points out that another prerequisite in Applied Theatre is a willingness to engage, which is the second step in Morgan and Saxton’s taxonomy. Accepting “the One Big Lie” is essential for engagement in drama (Heathcote, 2015b, p. 51), and means being open to suspending disbelief and entering the fictional context (Bundy, 2003). This can be promoted through the use of the teacher-in-role strategy (Edmiston, 2014; O'Neill, 2006d). A teacher-in-role can model engagement and challenge disbelief (Neelands & Goode, 2015). Heathcote (2015d) referred to the value of this strategy by saying: “my belief in my attitude supports their belief in theirs” (p. 23). Importantly, this requires a certain artistry from teachers, which does not involve complex characterisation but the ability to display an attitude authentically (Morgan & Saxton, 1989).

Students’ engagement can then be taken a step further into commitment by involving them in the construction of the fictional world. As Heathcote (2015d) argues, this helps promote investment in students. As they collaborate to shape the fiction, they assume responsibility and creative ownership over it, something discussed earlier in this chapter.

The fourth mode of engagement, internalizing, involves integrating new knowledge with previous experiences. This is when changes in understanding can occur (Morgan & Saxton, 2006), and therefore, when opportunities for conscientization can be created. Freire’s (1998) notion of epistemological curiosity is relevant here. As explained previously, epistemological curiosity implies an emotionally-driven motivation to learn more about social reality through a process of methodical inquiry. Correspondingly, internalizing entails a “drive to understand” that is “fuelled by feelings of excitement, concentration, perplexity and, often, anxiety” (Morgan & Saxton, 2006, p. 29). It appears that epistemological curiosity is tantamount to internalizing.

A possible link with conscientization pertains to the development of empathy in Applied Theatre. As Morgan and Saxton (2006) suggest, empathy can be developed in the internalizing phase of engagement. This is due to the interplay between objective concepts (the Other) and subjective experience (the Self) that this phase implies. Neelands (2016) defines empathy as “the willingness to listen to, understand and work with points of view that may be radically different from one’s own position” (p. 33). So when social injustices are examined through Applied Theatre, empathy towards experiences of oppression can be stimulated in students (Chan, 2016; Manley & O’Neill, 1997; Neelands, 2010b; O’Connor, 2013). Those experiences can cease to be seen as completely extraneous (Landy & Montgomery, 2012), and as McLaren (1988) asserts in relation to teachers as liminal servants, dominant ideologies can be challenged when narratives of the Other, which are commonly repressed, are brought to the fore and embodied. There is a risk of universalising and
paternalistic responses and meaningless action when empathy becomes reduced in some Applied Theatre practices to merely standing in the shoes’ of someone else. Neelands (2016) and Gallagher (2016) stress that what is required in Applied Theatre is empathy rather than sympathy for the oppressed. Whereas the latter implies a misappropriation of the experience, making it more digestible and ‘sanitised’, the former requires that otherness is met on its own terms (Gallagher, 2016). Neelands (2010b) remarks how we can never truly experience otherness; we can only imagine it. However, he believes that through imagination of the Other, prompted by theatre and drama, we can learn more about ourselves. As Greene (1978) maintains, encounters with art, like those enabled by drama, “can bring human beings in touch with themselves” (p. 166). In this way, we might analyse our own implication in oppressive social arrangements. This is an integral aspect of conscientization and relates to Segal’s (2011) notion of “social empathy” (p. 266), which, as mentioned in section 2.2.1, does not only involve an individual’s capacity to imagine what others may feel in a given oppressive situation, but also to understand their context in depth and assume responsibility towards that situation. Importantly, social empathy does not end at sharing an emotional connection, but goes further by kindling action: “Social empathy leads to a desire to take action and to improve societal well-being” (Segal, 2011, p. 271). This leap from emotional engagement into action can be missing in some drama experiences that might actually purge participants from their desire to act (O’Sullivan, 2001). This potential scission between reflection/emotional engagement and action will be discussed in the next and final section.

2.3.4.3. Fostering transformative praxis in Applied Theatre

The two final modes of engagement in Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy entail representing the new knowledge and testing it. Both modes involve acting out of the novel insights and sharing them with others. Possibly, this can open up spaces for transformative praxis, which, as Freire (2004a) underscored, is implied in conscientization.

Freire (1985) clarified in his later work that to become more aware of social injustices was not enough from a CP stance. Reflecting a quasi Marxist perspective, the world can be transformed only in material ways, through praxis, which is action and reflection. As seen in subsection 2.2.3, including opportunities for direct action in an educational programme is often not feasible. Frequently, CP adherents rely on a hope that critical education will have an impact on students’ lives, encouraging them to challenge oppression in the real world (King-White, 2012; Neumann, 2011; Shor & Freire, 1987).

Similarly, several Applied Theatre practitioners express hope that participation in drama will have an impact on students’ lives outside of school (Freebody & Finneran, 2013). For example, O’Neill (2015) refers to Heathcote, saying: “she hoped that involvement in authentic learning would alter
the learners' sense of themselves and their relationship with their world” (p. 4). Likewise, when discussing the potential of Applied Theatre for CP, Doyle (1993) claims that students can bring the learning developed in drama “back to real life and use it in other ways” (p. 53). Echoing Freire’s (Shor & Freire, 1987) assertion that education is not the ultimate source of world change, Doyle (1993) asserts: “Drama within the schooling process cannot change the world but can point to a change in consciousness in people who can change the face of lived experience” (p. 88). Hope can also be identified in Boal’s (1996) understanding of TO: “I believe that if the person has changed, something has changed around them. If you acquire knowledge of something, this knowledge changes you and you change people around you” (p. 50). Boal (1993) argued that TO can become a space for rehearsal of agency: “Maybe the theatre in itself is not revolutionary, but these theatrical forms are without a doubt a rehearsal of revolution” (p. 119). Others in Applied Theatre have also seen it as a space for students to rehearse different responses to an imaginary, but reality-connected, situation (Heathcote, 1984i). In so doing, it may help prepare students for becoming agents of change in the real world (O’Connor, 2010).

This shared hope that the impact of Applied Theatre may be felt outside of the drama classroom, seems to be founded on the particularities of the dramatic experience. Aitken (2009) explains this well. Following Bolton, she expounds that distancing devices like role framing in drama can give students a sense of safety. Students are aware that there are no real consequences from their actions in the fictional context. This frees them to act and see things differently within the fiction. They are released to question their habitual perspectives of the world. Because of this, Aitken (2009) believes that the metaxis between fiction and reality in Applied Theatre can enhance the possibilities that the learning developed “will carry over into learning in real-life terms” (p. 521).

This faith in the impact of Applied Theatre has been challenged by some. For instance, O’Sullivan (2001) criticises Boal’s TO approach for its idealistic tone, which contradicts his supposed allegiance to Marxist materialism. Boal’s (1996) hope that changes in understanding will directly translate into changes in action seems to support O’Sullivan’s critique. The possible fallacy in Applied Theatre’s hope in its impact on students’ everyday lives is highlighted when considering Chan’s (2016) views. Drawing from Žižek, Chan remarks how in late-capitalistic societies people can be aware of injustices while cynically ignoring them in their daily actions. Although these arguments are strong, it would seem contrary to CP to completely abandon hope in students’ transformative praxis outside school. Again, Tinning’s (2002) notion of modest pedagogy comes into play. While preserving our quasi-utopian beliefs we should honestly acknowledge the limitations of our efforts. As Aitken (2009) argues, Applied Theatre may not create spaces for emancipatory change by itself, but it can offer a different kind of experience to students that underscores their agency and that connects with their real lives in meaningful ways. Also, by entwining thought, emotions, and the body, Applied Theatre can offer alternative spaces of critical
reflection that go beyond more static and speech-based critical dialogue, criticised earlier. As Doyle (1993) argues, it can enact “praxis in the full sense of the word: a place to act out reflective theory” (p. 92). Following Segal (2011), if a dramatic encounter enkindles empathy about a given situation, paired with in-depth understanding of the real context of that situation, a sense of responsibility and a motivation for action could be fostered. This suggests that engagement with a fictional world in drama, stimulated by metaxis, should be combined with investigations of real-life events that connect the fiction with the real world in meaningful ways.

Going back to Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy, it is noteworthy that they describe the last two modes of engagement (which denote acting on new knowledge) as being driven by desire and need. In particular, evaluating implies a desire to share new knowledge outside of the school context. It can be deduced from this that, when this mode of engagement is activated, students will have an intrinsic motivation to act on their new insights in their everyday life. In this way, chances for transformative praxis appear to depend on the level of engagement generated by the dramatic experience. This has implications for the CPD Programme developed and implemented as part of this study.

2.4. Conclusion

I began this literature review by examining the meaning of CP, identifying premises of particular relevance to this research. From this review the following synthesised definition of CP that will be carried forward and used in this study is proposed:

⇒ CP is an educational paradigm that seeks to contribute to the examination and transformation of various forms of social injustices (Freire, 2004a). Critical pedagogues as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988) value students’ lived experiences and interests; encourage their voice and agency over the learning process; and promote dialogic forms of communication. By problematizing students’ reality and the curriculum, critical pedagogues aim at encouraging conscientization, namely, questioning of the taken-for-granted so that wider social inequities can be explored, and – gradually and locally (Tinning, 2002) transformed.

As the general and the systematic reviews of literature revealed, this definition is consistent with a late Freirean stance which has continued to inspire adherents to CP to the present day. Some significant criticisms of CP were also identified. The complexity of creating spaces for all to participate equally in critical dialogue was one (Ellsworth, 1989). Another was the patronising and universalising risks associated with the notion of conscientization (Greenhalgh-Spencer, 2014). These were also identified as problematic in the area of Applied Theatre.
This chapter examined some of the problems that critical pedagogues have experienced when practicing the paradigm. These included institutional and student resistance and an exclusionary tone evident in some of the CP literature (Gore, 1993).

Based on the understanding of CP presented in the first major section, I analysed the literature on Applied Theatre. Significant alignment was found between CP’s transformative aim and the philosophies of several Applied Theatre proponents. While not always sharing the same political underpinnings, Applied Theatre practitioners in general seek to stimulate personal and social transformations. This discussion emphasised the importance of pursuing such aims while being self-reflective (explicit about our aims and honest about results) and flexible (open to changes in the journey), as drama practitioners (Nicholson, 2005). Honouring the artistic indeterminacy of the dramatic medium can help to surmount CP’s paternalistic and patronising risks.

This review also identified many points of alignment between CP’s dialogic classrooms and Applied Theatre, such as the imperative to address students’ lived experience; promote their creative ownership; uncrown teachers to create more equal relationships with students; and foster embodied dialogue. This analysis revealed Applied Theatre’s potential to enhance equal participation amongst students by offering multiple modes of involvement. Applied Theatre can also challenge artificial divisions between cognition/emotions/body, enabling experiences that are more meaningful to students (McLaren, 1988).

In relation to the promotion of conscientization, I drew on the literature to argue that Applied Theatre approaches can become forms of Freirean (2000b) codifications. As others have posited, the metaxical experience of being in-role can open up spaces for students to gain distance from their own realities, so as to critically analyse them. Such in-role experiences are valuable in that they combine distancing with engagement (Eriksson, 2011; Muir, 1996; O’Neill, 1995). To generate engagement in critical reflection, the literature (Morgan & Saxton, 2006) suggests that teachers need to:

- address students’ interests;
- promote their willingness to participate;
- generate their investment in, and ownership of, the work;
- and lead to a questioning of their previous perceptions while they empathise with different perspectives.

Finally, this review argued that while there are no guarantees that conscientizing efforts in the classroom will carry over to students’ daily lives, the embodied and engaged nature of Applied Theatre work may increase the impact of student changes in understanding, particularly if empathy is paired with in-depth understanding of the real context, leading towards social responsibility over oppressive situations (Segal, 2011).
All of these insights are valuable for exploring in practice how a subfield of Applied Theatre, DiE, can open up spaces for CP in Chilean teachers’ classrooms. In the following chapter I will discuss the context in which the empirical aspect of this study took place.
3. CHILEAN CONTEXT

3.1. Introduction

This chapter examines the socio-political and educational context of Chile wherein this study was conducted. It builds upon the theoretical framework presented in the previous chapter by situating it within the Chilean context in general, and the research School in particular. It begins with an overview of the Chilean system of education, and examines the relevancy and status of Critical Pedagogy (CP) and Drama in Education (DiE) in Chile. A description of the School where the fieldwork was conducted is presented next. Much of these data were gathered via institutional and governmental documents. Additionally, an on-line questionnaire (Q1) was initially administered to the Head of the Technical-Pedagogical Unit (TPU) at the School, who directly oversees the work of the teaching staff. Interviews (I1) both with him and with the School’s Principal were also conducted in order to better understand the setting of the study. The chapter concludes by briefly presenting an overview of the teachers who participated. These data were gathered via an on-line questionnaire (Q2), administered following their enrolment in the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme. A decision was made to present these data here in order to contextualise the study and the pedagogical practices of the research School and some of its teachers in light of the broader socio-political, educational, and artistic practices discussed in the review of literature.

3.2. The Chilean educational system

Chilean education has been considered a prototype of a market-oriented system (Bellei et al., 2014; Bellei, Contreras, & Valenzuela, 2010). For most of the twentieth century, educational policies in Chile had emphasised an ‘extra-mercantile’ discourse, centred on public provision (Corvalán, 2013; Kubal & Fisher, 2016). Chileans regarded public education as central to the country’s development (Kubal & Fisher, 2016) and to the growth of its democracy, which was evident in the continuous policies that promoted literacy and free primary education advanced by governments throughout the 19th and 20th centuries (Corvalán, 2013). This changed drastically in the 1980s, during the dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet. Taking advantage of the country’s “state of shock” after the 1973 coup d’état, Pinochet implemented neoliberal economic measures nationwide, following the theories of Milton Friedman (Klein, 2007, p. 7). The educational sector was a protagonist in these reforms (Kubal & Fisher, 2016). Public schools began to be administered by municipalities (Corvalán, 2013). Three main types of schools emerged: municipal, semi-private, and private schools. Semi-private schools were owned and managed by private parties. Municipal and semi-private schools received state funding through a voucher system – a payment per-
student. This payment was undifferentiated regardless of whether the semi-private schools were for-profit or non-profit (Kubal & Fisher, 2016). Private schools, on the other hand, were generally completely funded by parents. The new system followed a market logic, premised on freedom and choice (Hsieh & Urquiola, 2006). Parental choice was meant to promote competition amongst schools (Corvalán, 2013; Perticá & Román, 2014). The logic was that schools would strive to offer better education in order to attract higher enrolment rates (Perticá & Román, 2014).

However, studies have shown that competitive measures have not increased the quality of education in Chile (Drago & Paredes, 2011; Hsieh & Urquiola, 2006; Perticá & Román, 2014). Hsieh and Urquiola (2006) suggest that semi-private schools have responded to competition by selecting higher-ability students rather than by increasing their productivity. In fact, selection of prospective students based on their religion, socioeconomic status, or cognitive ability, was, until recently, a common and legal practice of semi-private schools (Bellei, 2016). Selectivity was reinforced when semi-private schools started charging a co-payment to families, supplementing State vouchers. This policy was also part of the changes approved during the dictatorship, although its enactment began in 1993, after the return of democracy (Valenzuela, Bellei, & Ríos, 2013). The upshot of this policy was an “exodus of the Chilean middle class from public schools” (Hsieh & Urquiola, 2006, p. 1498). Middle class families opted to change their children to semi-private schools, where a fee could guarantee socioeconomically cohesive peer-groups (Elacqua, 2012; Hsieh & Urquiola, 2006). According to the latest official statistics, semi-public schools have the largest percentage (54.6%) of enrolment in the country, greatly surpassing public schools’ (38.8%) enrolment (Ministerio de Educación, 2017).

Parental choice policies and selectivity resulted in a stark socioeconomic segregation. In Chile, municipal, semi-private, and private schools congregate mostly low, middle, and high-socioeconomic status students, respectively (Elacqua, Schneider, & Buckley, 2006; Valenzuela, Bellei, & Ríos, 2013). Academic achievement levels also vary according to type of school and socioeconomic status (Ministerio de Educación, 2018b; Perticá & Román, 2014). Private school students perform significantly better in standardised tests than students in semi-private schools, who, in turn, perform better than municipal school students. From a CP perspective, it is questionable whether standardised tests actually assess quality of education. Rather, they measure, and try to legitimate, a dominant notion of quality education (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016). Nonetheless, these scores are relevant in the Chilean context, as they are the main instrument used to evaluate state funded school’s accountability (Meckes & Carrasco, 2010; Reyes & Akkari, 2017). Low achievement schools are at risk of losing their vouchers. In summary, it appears that rather than increasing quality overall, market-oriented educational policies have resulted in high levels of inequality in Chile.
Neoliberal policies also affected the teaching profession. Teachers’ work conditions worsened during the dictatorship through pay-cuts and precarious contracts (Pinkney Pastrana, 2010). This contributed to lowering the status of teachers in Chile, a phenomenon that persists until this day (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016; Elacqua, Hincapie, Vegas, & Alfonso, 2017; Perticará & Román, 2014). Nowadays, teachers receive low pay in comparison to other professionals, and are subject to strict accountability assessment (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016).

When democracy was reinstated in 1990, some ameliorative measures were taken to decrease inequality. However, the market-oriented structure of the educational system was untouched (Perticará & Román, 2014). This remained so until 2006, when the Revolución Pingüina (Revolution of the Penguins - alluding to the uniforms used by Chilean students) began (see Figure 3.1). Student movements protested against the market-logic in education (Bellei et al., 2014). After an insufficient response from the government, the movement took to the streets again in 2011 and intermittently continue to do so presently.

Figure 3.1. Theatrical protest during the 2006 Revolución Pingüina

At the time of the fieldwork, the government of Michelle Bachelet was responding to students’ demands through a series of reforms (Bellei, 2016). These included de-municipalizing public schools and forbidding selectivity, co-payment, and profit in State-funded schools. In theory, these measures appeared to support the rejection of a market-oriented system (Eyzaguirre Guzmán, 2014). However, several analysts have criticised these reforms for not disarming the neoliberal logic at the base of the system (González López & Parra Moreno, 2016; Reyes Barra, 2015). Currently, the de-municipalisation of public schools continues apace (Ministerio de Educación, 2018a), although the recently enstated government of right-wing president Sebastián Piñera has
placed on hold, or even altered, some of the measures advanced by Bachelet (Caro, 2018; Velásquez, 2018). Associations of parents of children attending semi-private schools have manifested their rejection towards the reforms initiated by Bachelet, as these, particularly the elimination of selectivity in State-funded schools, threaten what they perceive as their right to choose the institution their children attend (Bellei, 2016). On the other hand, members of the teachers’ union advocate for stronger anti-neoliberal measures in education (González, 2018). Like them, students’ associations in general continue to contest the market-logic of the educational system (Rivas, 2018).

The ongoing, nation-wide debate about whether education should constitute a right or a commodity makes Chile a highly relevant context for reflecting about CP. The tradition of CP in Chile is another significant contextual aspect for this investigation.

### 3.3. Critical Pedagogy in Chile

The CP tradition in Chile can be traced back to Paulo Freire’s residence in the country from 1964 to 1969 (Pinto Contreras, 2011). Exiled from Brazil, Freire collaborated with the Chilean adult literacy campaigns implemented by President Frei Montalva. Frei Montalva’s campaigns had a utilitarian end: to prepare peasants for the modernisation of the agrarian system while placating possible sources of social conflict (Fauré Polloni, 2017). However, Freire and the politically-active Chilean educators that joined the campaigns subverted the government’s aims. Working “behind the backs of the educational structure (who commissioned and funded)” the campaigns (Fauré Polloni, 2017, pp. 61-62, my translation), they adapted Freire’s approach, originated in Brazil, and used it to foster conscientization. The Chilean version of Freire’s approach helped increase literacy levels in the country (Austin, 2004) and had long-lasting practical and theoretical impact. Interestingly, Freire’s time in Chile also had a significant impact on his work. The socio-political context that embedded Freire’s residency in Chile, one of growing political awareness and class struggle, led him, according to Holst (2006), to evolve from a naïve stance in his previous writings to a more radical and mature perspective in Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 2000b). In particular, the strong Marxist adherence of Freire’s Chilean collaborators seems to have influenced his oeuvre in important ways that are not always acknowledged when reporting on his biography (Holst, 2006).

One of the most important consequences of Freire’s transit through Chile is the development of Popular Education (Educación Popular) movements in Chile from the 1970s (Álvarez Rojas, 2011). These movements adhered to Freire’s theories centring on the education of marginalised groups through transformative, dialogical, and conscientizing approaches (Álvarez Rojas, 2011). These were an important foci of resistance during the military dictatorship (1973-1990). They
offered platforms for working-class people to critically reflect on the subjugation and persecution that the regime imposed on them (Álvarez Rojas, 2011). In this way, Freire’s legacy had practical and political implications in Chile decades after his departure from the country. Moreover, Popular Education movements persist today. This is visible, for example, in Escuela Libre Luchín, a Freirean-inspired, Popular Education project organised by university students with people from a working-class neighbourhood in Santiago (Monitores Escuela Libre Luchín, 2011). This school offers children and young people a space to problematize the contents studied in their regular schools. According to this school’s educators (Monitores Escuela Libre Luchín, 2011), several similar projects have emerged in diverse neighbourhoods in Santiago. Importantly, theatre has not been absent from these endeavours. For instance, at the latest Festival Latinoamericano de Teatro taking place in 2018 in Chile, Pizarro (2018) described his experience teaching a theatre workshop at Colegio Paulo Freire, a community-based CP school welcoming adult learners wishing to finish compulsory education. He explained how theatre helped young people to assume a critical stance and share it with the community. These Popular Education projects demonstrate the long-lasting influence of Freire in Chilean educational practice. Additionally, some of Freire’s young collaborators continued to develop his theory. Particularly notable is Pinto Contreras’ (2009, 2011, 2017) work, who has written extensively on CP in the Chilean and Latin American context.

Nowadays, Freire’s influence in Chile at a more mainstream level can be identified, for example, in some universities’ teacher-education programmes and academic activities (“Facultad de Pedagogía, Universidad Academia de Humanismo Cristiano,” 2018; USACH, 2017). But, as Cavieres-Fernández and Apple (2016) point out, practising CP today in Chilean mainstream schools is complex. This is because official conceptions of quality education in Chile accentuate teachers’ efficiency rather than their critical abilities. An “assessment culture” has been established to evaluate Chilean teachers’ performance (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016, p. 271, my translation), directly affecting their salary through a system of monetary incentives and sanctions. These measures fail to consider differences in infrastructure, funding, culture, and socioeconomic context between schools and how these impact teachers’ performance. Heavy accountability measures have affected teachers’ sense of autonomy and professional dignity, emphasising their promotion of academic achievement rather than the critical scrutiny of curricular contents and their connection with students’ lives (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016). Teachers’ experimentation with forms of education whose main objective is other than academic efficiency, like CP, is therefore restricted. Also, the reigning paradigm in mainstream Chilean education is constructivist, not critical (Caiceo Escudero, 2011; Pinto Contreras, 2009). As discussed in Chapter Two, there are linkages between constructivism and the dialogic classroom aspect of CP but they are not the same. Cavieres-Fernández and Apple (2016) suggest that constructivism in Chile is only “apparently democratic” and is adopted by the system because of “its flexibility to adapt to changes in the global market” (p. 268, my translation). Despite this unfavourable landscape, there
are “cracks” in the Chilean educational system where CP can flourish (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010, p. 72, my translation). Such cracks were being seized by the School where this study took place and identified as opportunities for engagement. But before analysing the School’s approach to CP, I will provide an overview of the position of DiE specifically, and Applied Theatre more generally, in Chile.

3.4. Drama in Education and Applied Theatre in Chile

In Chile, Pedagogía Teatral has been recognised as a field in its own right for at least two decades. Pedagogía Teatral is directly translated into English as ‘theatre pedagogy’, that is, the teaching of and through theatre-related skills and knowledge. Verónica García-Huidobro is the country’s main exponent of the field and responsible for disseminating and legitimising it through a postgraduate course since the early 2000s. In 2016, the postgraduate diploma in Teatro Aplicado [Applied Theatre] was created (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, 2018). While the course on Pedagogía Teatral focuses on educational contexts, the diploma in Teatro Aplicado also deals with health and community settings (Sánchez, 2016). This diploma was created in collaboration with The Royal School of Speech and Drama, University of London and incorporates British writings, like Nicholson’s (2005). The title of the diploma evidences that the English-based term ‘Teatro Aplicado’ has been integrated into the country’s lexicon to denote a rich tradition of practices already in existence in Chile, including community theatre (Fundación Entepola, n.d.), theatre in prisons (Sarkis González, 2014), and drama therapy (Torres-Godoy, 2001). This suggests that a process of hybridization is taking place in Chile between local and foreign conceptions about the role and value of theatre in educational settings.

In the context of education, García Huidobro (2004) identifies three modes of practice of theatre in Chilean schools: as a subject in its own right; as an extra-curricular course; and as a methodology for teaching and learning. The latter corresponds most closely to this study’s understanding of DiE. However, according to Aguilar and Arias’ (2008) survey, the latter form of practice is uncommon in Chile. School teachers are generally unaware of the potential of drama as a cross-curricular methodology. The lack of attention to the arts as methodologies for teaching and learning in general is also evident in the National Plan of Arts in Education 2015-2018 (División de Educación General & Departamento de Educación y Formación en las Artes, 2015). In this document, indicating the country’s priorities in the area, there is no mention of applying the arts across the curriculum, except for rare references to developing ‘soft’ skills like problem-solving. The lack of presence of DiE in Chilean schools is also confirmed by pioneering practitioners and founding members of the International Drama, Theatre and Education Association (IDEA), the leading subject representative body internationally. Correspondence with Maria Van Bakelen
(personal communications, May 8, 2018; September 24, 2018), first President of IDEA, suggests that the focus in Chile is more on the use of theatre in communities for social development, and not on the use of theatre as a methodology for teaching and learning across the school curriculum. It is however, encouraging to note that some recent projects have begun to emerge which promote this form of practice in schools (Escuela de Teatro UC, n.d.; Fundación Teatro a Mil, 2018).

As mentioned in Chapter One, local research on Pedagogía Teatral is limited. García-Huidobro (2004) is one of the few to have theorised about her activity. However, the theoretical framework she proposes is very succinct. Her book is practical in focus, centring on model sessions where influences from Slade’s (1954) play and child development theories are evident but not discussed in depth. A more theoretical inclination is visible in the edited book recently published by the Departamento de Teatro of Universidad de Chile (Ponce de la Fuente & Olivares Rojas, 2017). In it, diverse authors discuss the link between theatre and education in Chile and Latin America. The title of the book (which translates as Theatre and education: Dialogues for a critical pedagogy of the scene) suggests a high degree of relevance for this study. However, references to CP, as understood in this investigation, are visible in only two essays. Notably, Vial Aguilar (2017) draws links between Freire’s theories and vocal expression education, while Da Porta (2017) defends the role of artistic education in contesting neoliberalism by problematizing reality. Like Cavieres-Fernández and Au (2010), Da Porta (2017) also speaks about seizing the “cracks” available for artistic engagement in a system fixed on efficiency and productivity (p. 20, my translation). Their shared metaphor evidences that both CP and DiE operate in the margins of the educational system in Chile.

Both books include examples of practical units, some of which connect with other areas of the school curriculum corresponding to this study’s notion of DiE (García-Huidobro, 2004; Ponce de la Fuente & Olivares Rojas, 2017). However, these units mostly use theatrical exercises: voice and body expression, and acting of play-texts. When role-work is incorporated it is always to be subsequently presented before an audience of peers. DiE approaches like those developed by pioneers in the West such as Heathcote, Bolton, O’Neill, and Neelands are not visible in the units nor in the books’ bibliographies. Hence, this study’s CPD Programme presented DiE approaches that were new for the Chilean context, at least judging by the two available referential sources in the area.

Introducing participants to Western approaches that are foreign to them can entail a risk of colonialism (Freebody & Finneran, 2016). This was an important consideration for my facilitation of the CPD Programme, as will be discussed in following chapters.
3.5. The research school

The School that welcomed the CPD Programme was located in Santiago, Chile. It was a secular institution comprising pre-school, primary, and secondary levels. At secondary level, it offered scientific-humanistic and technical-professional branches. It was a small school and, at the time of the fieldwork in 2016, it welcomed around 450 students in total, from pre-school to final year of secondary-level. It had a teaching staff of 48. Some teachers taught only lower-primary, others taught only upper-secondary, and some taught upper-primary and lower-secondary, in a system similar to a middle school concept (Head of TPU, I1, 26/05/2016).

The School was administered by a Chilean university, which is quite unusual. According to the School’s Institutional Educational Project (Proyecto Educativo Institucional, PEI), this link with the university afforded the School an “experimental” quality (n.d., p. 3). The School was meant to be a space where academic educational knowledge was developed in collaboration with the university. This was evidenced by the fact that annual research projects led by the university were conducted in the School, and around 30 of the university’s student-teachers carried out their pre-service practices at the School (Head of TPU, Q1). However, it is noteworthy that none of the CPD initiatives occurring in the School in the two years previous to the fieldwork had been organised by the university (Head of TPU, Q1). This is surprising, considering that the university specialises in educational sciences and, hence, it may have had valuable knowledge to offer to the School’s teaching staff. This suggests that the link between both institutions was not as close as stipulated on paper (PEI). Moreover, the School Principal referred to the university financial instability as an important problem that complicated the School’s relationship with its administering institution (I1, 18/08/2016).

The School was semi-private, receiving financial support from State vouchers and from the university. It did not receive co-payment from families. Even though it was not managed by a municipality, its students’ socioeconomic context corresponded to that of a municipal school (Principal, I1, 18/08/2016). In 2016, over 80% of the School’s student population was considered vulnerable because of their low socioeconomic status (Junta Nacional de Auxilio Escolar y Becas JUNAEB, n.d.). Students had low attendance rates, high attrition, and low academic achievement. For instance, in 2015, the School’s 6th grade students obtained scores around 20% lower than the average national score in the national standardised test, SIMCE (Agencia de Calidad de la Educación, 2016). This is consistent with the link between low socioeconomic status and low results in standardised tests, discussed above.

The School responded to the vulnerable status of its students by adopting a CP paradigm (Head of TPU, I1, 26/05/2016). Seizing the “cracks” of the system (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010, p. 78, my translation), the School designed a bespoke educational project in 2014 that tried to promote critical reflection in students (Principal, I1, 18/08/2016). This project was supported by a recently
appointed Management Team, which included the Head of TPU and the Principal, both of whom were CP endorsers. The CP-oriented project included viewing students as “active subjects”, problematizing the curriculum to help them “confront inequalities, the injustices they live with” (Principal, II, 18/08/2016). According to the School’s mission statement articulated in its PEI, the School’s aim was to educate human beings “from a social and critical perspective” (n.d., p.3). Moreover, its teachers had to have “an emancipatory intention” (n.d., p.8). The current Management Team had spent the two years previous to the fieldwork working on elaborating the PEI in collaboration with the teaching staff (Head of TPU, II, 26/05/2016). At the time of the fieldwork, the Team had begun to promote reflection amongst the staff around the CP paradigm through activities conducted at their weekly teacher assemblies. However, it was noted that some teachers in the School resisted this CP tendency (Principal, II, 18/08/2016). It was suggested that these “traditionalist” educators, who had been working in the School for several years and generally corresponded to an older segment of the staff, saw CP as an over-politisation of students (Head of TPU, II, 26/05/2016). This was presented as one of the main problems the Management Board was experiencing in the implementation of CP.

Another barrier cited was student apathy. The Principal remarked how many students did “not see a future in their lives” (II, 18/08/2016). It was reported that this led them to evasion, many times through drug abuse. This resonates with Peña’s (2017) study with Chilean children from low socioeconomic backgrounds, who tend to have a deterministically negative perception of their future.

To tackle these barriers, the Management Team was looking for ways to support teachers’ practice of CP. In this context, the CPD Programme was welcomed favourably by the Management Team (Head of TPU, II, 26/05/2016). In fact, for the Head of TPU, integrating an art-based methodology like DiE, “could perhaps be the answer to students’ lack of motivation” (II, 26/05/2016). This was suggested because of the strong interest students had for the arts (Principal, II, 18/08/2016). The School dedicated several hours a week to artistic activities. Also, the presence of the arts in the School was evident in its many murals, several of which had political messages, as visible in Figure 3.2.
These data spoke favourably about the possible reception by the School’s community of the integration of DiE to open up spaces for CP in their classrooms.

3.6. The teachers

While the chapters which follow provide much more detail about the teachers who are at the centre of this research, it is important to locate them briefly in this broader discussion about CP traditions in the School at the outset of the study. The main participants in this study are 15 teachers who engaged with a CPD Programme conducted in the School in 2016. Of these teachers, 11 were female and four were male. They taught a wide range of levels and subject areas (Figures 3.3 and 3.4).
Responding to this range was a challenge for the design and implementation of the Workshop (see section 5.3).

In general, this was a young group of teachers whose ages fluctuated from the 25 or less to the 40-49 years range, with the majority falling within the 25-29 years range. Their ages corresponded
with the ages of most teachers in the School. Nine of them had five years or less teaching experience, and the majority (12) had been working at the School for five years or less. This suggests that they were outside the group of ‘traditionalist’ teachers that opposed CP who had been working in the School long before the new Management Team was appointed (Head of TPU, II, 26/05/2016).

Overall, participating teachers reported being content with their workplace, with the degree of autonomy they had in it, and with their rapport with students. However, the majority (12) believed that they dedicated more hours to their work than the hours they were hired for. This corroborates Perticará and Román’s (2014) observations about the excess work-load commonly experienced by Chilean teachers. Importantly, most teachers (9) said they felt ‘very represented’ by the School’s principles and values. This was evident in the positive disposition they showed towards the CPD Programme when I invited the staff to participate (research journal, 18/05/2016). According to the Head of TPU, these teachers were united in their curiosity towards CP (Head of TPU, 25/05/2016). However, they had varying degrees of familiarity and commitment with CP, both in theory and practice, as will be further discussed in Chapter Five.

3.7. Conclusion

In the context of research on CP, Chile provided a relevant setting for this study. This is because of the current contestation of the neoliberal structure of the Chilean educational system and its concomitant inequality. Considering that CP seeks to transform unequal power relations provoked by capitalistic social arrangements, it seems pertinent to examine if DiE can open up spaces for CP in the Chilean school context. Additionally, an analysis of the state of Applied Theatre in Chile showed that DiE was an underexplored mode of pedagogy in schools. Thus, a study like this could expand knowledge in the area. The specific school and group of teachers who participated in the fieldwork also provided a relevant context for the study. The School’s interest in CP and the arts meant that the CPD Programme at the centre of this research could contribute to the School’s community. Finally, the teachers’ curiosity about CP and general enthusiasm bode well for their reception of the CPD Programme. Having contextualised the inquiry and deepened the literature review by paying attention to Chilean developments, in the following chapter I will present and discuss the research methodology implemented in this study.
4. METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodological approaches adopted in this study. It begins with an examination of my position as a Latin American emergent researcher with specific philosophical assumptions. Then, case study is discussed as this research’s main approach. An overview of the research project and data collection methods is presented. This is followed by a discussion of the ethical and validity considerations I faced in my research journey. The chapter concludes after a presentation of the analytical strategies employed to organise and interpret the data generated in this study.

4.2. My methodological position as a researcher

4.2.1. A flexible qualitative paradigm

Methodological decisions are intrinsically related to the researcher’s philosophical assumptions (Cohen et al., 2011). Overall, my assumptions situate this research along a qualitative paradigm. Firstly, I reject notions of neutrality and absolute objectivity in social research, usually attached to a quantitative paradigm (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2014; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Rather, from a qualitative paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011), I acknowledge that the research process has been impacted by my worldview and background.

Like qualitative inquirers, I consider reality as socially constructed, and hence, changeable (Bryman, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This is apparent in the focus of this study, Critical Pedagogy (CP), an educational stance which believes that reality can be transformed through praxis (Freire, 2000b). Also aligned with a qualitative paradigm, I have aimed at exploring a particular social phenomena in depth, rather than looking for generalizable trends (Maxwell, 2005).

In some ways, my epistemological assumptions cohere with interpretivism, a typically qualitative stance (Matthews & Ross, 2010). Like interpretivists, I am interested in understanding how social actors interpret reality (Matthews & Ross, 2010; Maxwell, 2005). Because of this, participants are continuously invited to make sense of their experience in this study. However, I depart from qualitative research in terms of knowledge generation. Qualitative and quantitative stances can usually be distinguished because they follow an inductive and a deductive approach, respectively (Bryman, 2012). In this study, I have used both inductive and deductive analytical strategies, an iterative process that will explained at the end of this chapter. I have also incorporated
questionnaires for data production, which can be seen as eminently numerical instruments (Cohen et al., 2011). In this way, I have sought, as Mejía Navarrete (2015) proposes, a “complementarity” between qualitative and quantitative approaches (p. 3, my translation). Such interweaving is characteristic of Latin American forms of knowing, which question the qualitative/quantitative dualism (Mejía Navarrete, 2015). This is why I characterise my research approach in this study as a flexible qualitative stance.

4.2.2. A critical research paradigm

A critical theory paradigm also informs my position as researcher. Firstly, I agree with critical theory that sees society, including knowledge generation and dissemination, as permeated by unequal distribution of power and privilege that favours certain groups over others (Kincheloe et al., 2011; Darder et al., 2009). Also, a goal of critical research is to unmask and challenge the power arrangements that subjugate certain types of knowledge (Cohen et al., 2011). Centring my study of CP on Drama in Education (DiE) responds to this goal. Neoliberal educational narratives in Latin America emphasise efficiency, marginalising aesthetic ways of knowing, such as DiE (Da Porta, 2017). Through this study I explore the potential of DiE to promote alternative ways of knowing.

Critical research’s commitment to praxis is also relevant for this study (Cohen et al., 2011). Praxis is central as it involves a practical intervention in a Chilean school through a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme. I acknowledge the transformative intent of this intervention, and my hope that it contributed to the School’s community, particularly to the teachers’ critical pedagogical practice.

A critical research paradigm also influenced the type of relationship I tried to establish with participants (Bhavnani, Chua, & Collins, 2014; Kincheloe et al., 2011). This involved reflecting about how my researcher role could situate me in a superior position of power. Although I shared the same regional and socioeconomic background as the teachers, being a member of academia afforded me if not a more powerful position, at least an outsider location (Loxley & Seery, 2008). In order to avoid relating with teachers patronizingly, it was crucial to advance a “reflective contract” (Schön, 1983, p. 296). In a traditional contract, researchers are positioned as “all-knowing interventionists” while practitioners assume a compliant posture (Taylor, 1996, p. 35). Conversely, a reflective contract values the areas of expertise of both practitioners and researchers (Schön, 1983). In this study, I shared my knowledge of DiE while teachers shared their expertise as educators. I also shared my doubts and uncertainties with teachers, disputing the view of external researchers as infallible experts (Taylor, 1996). I tried to respect and consider their views. A cooperative relationship was promoted throughout the fieldwork, particularly in the Application
Stage, where teachers applied DiE in their lessons. At that stage, they were invited to coplan and coteach with me. As Murphy and Martin (2015) propose, these practices differ from their hyphenated form (co-planning and co-teaching) in that they promote an equal relationship between practitioners, valuing their different expertise.

Finally, the metaphor of the critical researcher as a bricoleur (Kincheloe et al., 2011), is meaningful for this study. A bricoleur brings heterogeneous elements together into their work. S/he responds to the complexity of social phenomena. Creating a bricolage, I mixed quantitative instruments within an overall qualitative paradigm. I entwined conventional forms of data, like interviews and questionnaires, while also paying attention to drama conventions for meaning generation. I also interwove researcher and facilitator roles. Additionally, I had to become a “methodological negotiator” (Kincheloe et al., 2011, p. 168). The research design was shaped as I recognised teachers’ emerging needs and interests. Each stage in the fieldwork moulded the subsequent stage, and I responded to the uncertainty and complexity of a practitioner form of research. The specifics of how that process evolved will be discussed after addressing the study’s main methodological approach: case study research.

4.3. Methodological approach

A case study approach was adopted to answer the research questions. Case study is defined by Stake (1995) as an in-depth exploration of a particular and complex case, paying attention to its context. It involves integrating multiple sources of data (Hamilton, Corbett-Whittier, & Lagrange, 2013), and the views of the various actors involved in the case (Simons, 1996; Stake, 1995). All of this aligns with my position as a researcher, explained above. Additionally, according to Yin (2013), case study is suitable to answering “how” questions (p. 10). This applies in this investigation, which seeks to explore if and how DiE can open up spaces for CP in Chilean classrooms.

This is a single case study centring on the experiences of teachers while participating in a CPD Programme conducted in a school in Santiago, Chile. Under Stake’s (1995, p. 3) classification, it is “instrumental” by design in order to facilitate understanding about how this group of teachers engaged with the use of DiE in their classrooms to promote dialogic interchanges and conscientization. This may also facilitate learning about a broader issue: DiE’s potential for CP in Chile. However, it is also “intrinsic” according to Stake’s (1995, p. 3) terminology, because it is exploratory in nature and I am interested in the case itself rather than in generalising across cases. Following Yin (2013), it can also be deemed an “unusual” case (p. 51). This is because, as discussed in Chapter Three, at the time of the fieldwork, DiE was a little developed area in Chile.
The Programme was unique and advanced an innovative teaching and learning methodology for the local context.

Stake (1995) recommends that the case selected is “hospitable to our inquiry” (p. 4). As shown in Chapter Three, the Programme took place in a school aligned with CP and open to examining ways to apply it. Hence, teachers did not experience explicit restrictions from the School’s authorities when experimenting with DiE in their classrooms. Since the Programme was voluntary, the 15 teachers were also amenable to exploring DiE and CP. This decreased the risk of imposing my interests as a researcher over them, as there was a coherence between their interests and the research focus.

A limitation of the case study approach which is pertinent to this study is its inability to produce generalizable conclusions (Yin, 2013). The uniqueness of the case (the Programme) makes it impossible to make general claims about the potential of DiE for CP. However, this inquiry aims at provoking “naturalistic generalisations” (Stake, 1995, p. 85). As Stake (1995) explains, such generalisations can emerge when enough detail of the case is offered. This allows readers to assess the relevancy of the case studied for other cases in light of their own previous knowledge and experience. Within the space constraints, I have aimed at creating an in-depth report of what took place in the classrooms so that “vicarious experiences” can be generated in the reader (Stake, 1995, p. 63).

According to Stake (1994), it is advisable for the researcher in a case study to be as unintrusive as possible when approaching the field. However, the focus and context of this inquiry, and my stance as a researcher, demanded that I assumed a participating role. Because of the embryonic status of DiE in Chile, I found no other similar CPD Programmes in the country. Hence, it was necessary for me to facilitate the Workshop and coteach with participants (Murphy & Martin, 2015). This required me to reflect on my own practice. As elaborated by Schön (1990), reflective practitioners ponder on their practice by reflecting-in-action (as the practice occurs), and reflecting-on-action (evaluating practice a posteriori). Throughout this study, I reflected in-action and on-action, considering the impact of my practice on the teachers’ learning process in this Programme. However, it is important to emphasise that the 15 teachers’ experience of the Programme is the main focus of this study, so my reflections as practitioner are secondary.

Arguably, a participant action research (PAR) approach would have reflected a critical research paradigm to a greater extent (Brydon-Miller, Kral, Maguire, Noffke, & Sabhlok, 2011). In PAR, participants are involved in the complete research process, from identification of research problem to dissemination of results (Brydon-Miller et al., 2011). Like PAR, this case study sought to form a collaborative relationship with teachers. There was an alignment between the School and teachers’ interests and the research focus. Also, during the first stage of the Programme I identified teachers’
needs and interests, which is akin to PAR. However, teachers’ participation has been limited to the fieldwork and partial data analysis through member-checking. Given that this inquiry is framed within my doctoral studies, the responsibility of establishing research questions, interpreting data, drawing conclusions, and writing the report has fallen exclusively on me. Therefore, this cannot be considered PAR. Instead, a case study approach best describes this investigation.

4.4. Data collection

A complex methodological design was created to answer the research questions, centring on a CPD Programme implemented with teachers in a school in Santiago, Chile. Table 4.1 provides an overview of the study’s sub-questions and the data collection methods employed to respond to them.

Table 4.1. Overview of data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions and sub-questions</th>
<th>Research methods</th>
<th>Materials/Participants</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the meaning of CP?</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Current literature</td>
<td>Throughout study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Works by key proponents of CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the theory underpinning DiE, and Applied Theatre in general, relate to CP?</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>Applied Theatre literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the status of CP and DiE in Chile?</td>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>- Chilean literature on CP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chilean literature on theatre pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the status of CP and DiE in the research School and in the practices of the 15 teachers who participated in the CPD Programme?</td>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>- School policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Governmental documents about the School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>School’s Head of the Technical-Pedagogic Unit (TPU)</td>
<td>Preparation Stage (May 2015 – April 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of TPU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-participant observation</td>
<td>Observation of 15 teachers’ teaching (12 lessons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What possibilities and challenges did teachers identify for opening up spaces for CP through DiE?</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>15 teachers and researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop (June -July 2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do these teachers interpret CP?
What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?

How did teachers’ practice of DiE open up spaces for their creation of dialogic classrooms and for conscientization?
What factors facilitated/hindered the development of these spaces?
What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?

How did DiE open up spaces for CP according to students’ views?

What possibilities and challenges did teachers identify for opening up spaces for CP through DiE?
How did teachers evaluate the CPD Programme?
What impact did the Programme have on teachers’ views and practices of CP? What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Teachers’ creations in Workshop</th>
<th>Application Stage (August – October 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do these teachers interpret CP? What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?</td>
<td>Co-planning documents</td>
<td>- Lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Meeting logs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Personal communications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did teachers’ practice of DiE open up spaces for their creation of dialogic classrooms and for conscientization?</td>
<td>Non-participant observation</td>
<td>Two teachers (three DiE lessons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors facilitated/hindered the development of these spaces?</td>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Seven teachers and researcher (14 DiE lessons)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?</td>
<td>Individual interviews</td>
<td>Eight teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did DiE open up spaces for CP according to students’ views?</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>37 students (45 validly completed questionnaires)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What possibilities and challenges did teachers identify for opening up spaces for CP through DiE? How did teachers evaluate the CPD Programme? What impact did the Programme have on teachers’ views and practices of CP? What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>15 teachers</td>
<td>Follow-up Stage (December-February 2016/17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fieldwork consisted of five stages as colour coded in Tables 4.1 and 4.2:

**Table 4.2. Fieldwork stages**

**Preparation Stage (May 2015 - May 2016).**

In this stage the parameters of collaboration with the School were agreed upon. Contextual data about the School were gathered and analysed. In May, 2016, I invited the teaching staff to participate in the Programme. For this, I prepared and shared a video summarising the aims, rationale, and methodological design of the study. Following the School’s Management Team recommendation, teachers from all academic subjects and levels were invited to participate. 23 teachers enrolled voluntarily.

**Baseline Stage (May – August, 2016).**

The 23 enrolled teachers were asked to complete a baseline questionnaire to confirm their place in the Programme. 17 teachers did so. Of those, 15 corroborated their willingness to participate in the Workshop, becoming the main participants in this case study. These 15 teachers were interviewed. Baseline data about the School and the 15 teachers’ views and practices were gathered. I used these data to design the Workshop.
Workshop (June – July, 2016).

I facilitated a 15 hour Workshop on DiE and CP for the 15 teachers delivered over five sessions. Teachers were released from normal classwork to participate.

Application Stage (August – October, 2016).

Eight teachers decided to apply DiE in their lessons. We coplanned and cotaught 14 lessons. I also conducted non-participant observation of three lessons. Teachers’ and a limited sample of students’ views on these lessons were collected.

Follow-up Stage (December – February, 2016/7).

Data were collected about the impact of the Programme on the 15 teachers’ views and practices on CP and DiE.

Table 4.3 shows a visual time line of the fieldwork.

Table 4.3. Chronological view of the fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May - Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>Non-participant observations</td>
<td>Interview 2: Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Preparation Stage</td>
<td>Baseline Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned previously, although I had a general design before reaching the field, the specifics of each stage of the fieldwork were determined as the Programme progressed. For instance, it was impossible to know in advance whether any teachers would decide to apply DiE in their own classrooms after the Workshop. Hence, the details of the Application Stage were determined after learning that a number of teachers wanted to continue participating in the Programme. Like a bricoleur (Kinzeloe et al., 2011), I had to be a methodological negotiator. Flexibility and
understanding of teachers’ time and work-load constraints was fundamental for my dual role as researcher and practitioner.

4.4.1. Methods

In this case study, five data collection methods were used: literature review, research journal, document analysis, observations, interviews, and questionnaires. All of the instruments were designed in English and scrutinised by my critical friend. I then translated them to Spanish and piloted them with Spanish speaking collaborators before being administered.

4.4.1.1. Literature review

In this study, I consider literary sources as important data to respond to the research questions. Bryman (2012) makes a distinction between narrative and systematic literature reviews that is pertinent for this study. In a systematic review, a clear aim is set from the beginning; explicit and replicable procedures for the selection and evaluation of literature are followed; and the intention of synthesising information is established (Bryman, 2012). Narrative reviews, alternatively, are more open-ended and have an exploratory aim (Aveyard, 2010). In this study I have combined both types of reviews.

The first phase of the study involved a systematic literature review, or a type of meta-synthesis (Walsh & Downe, 2005), which formed the bedrock of the literature review, but was also an intrinsic part of the research design. The systematic literature review gathered both qualitative and numeric data in order to understand the concept of CP. However, while some of the findings are presented in a more formal, albeit limited, meta-analysis, the study is more interpretive in nature overall (Ryan, 2010), and reports its findings via a descriptive summary (Dixon-Woods et al., 2006).

My initial overview of literature on CP confirmed the paradigms’ heterogeneity (McLaren, 2009). This led me to question: What is the meaning of CP? This required an analysis of how CP was being defined in contemporary scholarship and whether any commonalities existed under the umbrella term of CP. This would allow me to determine the construction of the paradigm that was to be adopted in this study. The initial review also led to related sub-questions: Do recently published articles align themselves with the key tenets of Freire’s praxis and what possibilities and challenges for CP practice are reported in the current literature, and Do they describe in any detail the actual CP work they engaged in with their participants? Having identified the research questions guiding the systematic review, a set of inclusion and exclusion criteria were drawn up (Hemsley-Brown & Sharp, 2003). The initial inclusion criteria had to be modified as there was
insufficient literature on the use of CP in formal educational settings such as primary or secondary schools. The final criteria were broadened to include papers from different disciplines which focused on the use of CP in educational settings. The papers were peer-reviewed, published between 2007 and 2014, and mentioned CP in their title, abstract or key words. Papers written in languages other than English or Spanish were excluded. The search was conducted via Academic Search Complete and ERIC search engines, using the relevance sort option for their display. These articles were analysed using QSR NVivo 10 software to code and collate the texts, as will be explained in the data analysis section. The particular time parameter was chosen to reflect recent activity in the field to help answer the first research sub-question. The initial scanning of the keywords ‘critical pedagogy’ in several databases showed that it was sufficiently sensitive to use as it identified all relevant studies in this area (confirmed by cross-checking databases) although not necessarily specific in that it included studies that were not directly relevant to the study. These were discarded and a decision was taken to focus on 100 articles which met the inclusion criteria above.

Based on the initial systematic review, I identified common principles and concepts of CP in use in the contemporary literature, and examined how these aligned with Freire’s work. I continued reviewing the literature on CP through a narrative approach. That approach gave me the flexibility I needed at that point to explore literary works particularly relevant for this study. Recognising Paulo Freire’s influence on CP in Chile and abroad, I focused on his oeuvre in the next phase of the literature review. I also examined works by other key figures on CP, like Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren. Simultaneously, I began exploring literature on Applied Theatre in general, and DiE in particular.

These early literature reviews served as a platform for dialoguing with participants’ understandings on CP. I did not want to impose a meta-narrative of CP on participants (Santos, 2006). Rather, I aimed at valuing their local views and practices of CP. This dialogue pointed towards specific concepts (dialogic classrooms and conscientization) that guided the later phases of the literature review. In this way, the theoretical and conceptual framework of this study was generated in a deductive/inductive fashion. Both the narrative and systematic literature reviews also helped me develop a general design of the data collection instruments for the fieldwork.

4.4.1.2. Observations

Observation was the main method of data collection in this study. This is because of its usefulness for case study approaches (Stake, 1995). It allowed an in-depth understanding of the teachers’ practices and of the impact of my practice on their learning processes. Two types of observation were used. During the Baseline Stage (May – August, 2016), I conducted non-participant
observation of 12 lessons, one per teacher or teacher-team (as some teachers taught in the same classrooms). Throughout the Workshop which I facilitated, I used participant observation (June-July, 2016). Finally, during the Application Stage (August – October, 2016), I conducted non-participant observation of three lessons (where the teachers chose to teach themselves and invited me to observe), and participant observation of 14 lessons (where I cotaught with the teachers).

Based on the literature review, I identified the following non-participant observation criteria for use during the Baseline Stage:

- Promotion of conscientization:
  - Links drawn by teachers between curriculum contents and social justice issues.
  - Teachers fostering of (self-)reflection in relation to social oppression/social transformation.
- Creation of dialogic classrooms:
  - Equal/unequal relationships in the classroom.
  - Teachers basing learning on students’ lived experience.
  - Teachers’ promotion of dialogue.
- Use of active methodologies.

A semi-structured observation schedule was used at this stage (see Appendix B). It allowed me to address the criteria above, while also recording the emergence of new issues. A less structured observation schedule was used to guide participant observations of the Workshop. The following open-ended observation areas helped me perceive the learning experience with greater flexibility:

- My input as facilitator
- Evidence of teachers’ understanding
- Evidence of teachers’ engagement
- Facilitator-teachers relationship
- Teachers’ relationships
- Issues related to CP and DiE.

Finally, unstructured observations were conducted during the Application Stage. The criteria identified for the Baseline Stage continued to guide my observations. However, at this later stage I opted for a chronological description of the lessons. This enabled me to be receptive towards any critical events where spaces for CP were opened through DiE (Wragg, 1999).

All observations in this study were overt. This coheres with the “reflective contract” (Schön, 1983, p. 299) based on honesty that I advanced in this study. Observations were recorded as field-notes in my research journal, which I then uploaded to a database in NVivo. These notes were taken
during the non-participant observations, and immediately after the participant observations. I also registered participant observations through audio notes, which I then transcribed in my research journal. Although most of my notes were written in English, I also wrote in Spanish, particularly when recording fast-paced, non-participant observations. As Piazzoli (2015) points out, “translingual writing” (p. 77) can help combining a reflective stance with an instinctual stance. This enabled me to achieve a complex register of observations. I recorded facts as well as my intuitive interpretations of these, which I then considered reflectively when uploading my notes into the NVivo database.

Importantly, observations during the Workshop and Application Stage included capturing drama conventions. A drama convention is a symbolic manipulation of space, time, and presence derived from theatrical work (Neelands & Goode, 2015). In this study, use of dramatic conventions developed by participants were captured through field-notes, video-recordings, and photographs. The two latter forms of register served to support my field-notes, especially when conducting participant observation. Although my plan was to video-record the Workshop sessions in full, technical problems prevented some segments from being recorded. I had also planned to video-record all the lessons during the Application Stage. However, students in several classes did not agree to this. Hence, video-recording was used only when parents and students had given consent for this. For similar reasons, I obtained permission to blur the faces of students for whom consent to share their photographs was not obtained. Photographs and video-recordings – with their transcriptions – were logged into the database in NVivo.

Observations were limited by my selectivity (Flick, 2009). My physical position in the classroom and the theoretical constructs and axiological position I brought with me determined my gaze. My ability to observe was further constrained when I facilitated or cotaught lessons. In these instances my focus was split between my researcher and facilitator roles. To overcome selectivity and to include the voices of participants, additional methods for gathering data were used.

4.4.1.3. Interviews

Interviews can afford a closer view of participants’ understandings (Peräkylä & Ruusuvori, 2011; Yin, 2013). For Stake (1995), they are “the main road to multiple realities” (p. 64), a crucial aspect of a case study. Hence, interviews were applied at several points of the fieldwork.

The first sequence of interviews (I1) were applied during the Baseline Stage. I interviewed the Head of TPU (26/05/2018) and the School Principal (18/08/2016). Being key members of the Management Board of the School, their views were crucial for contextualising the study. They were asked about the status of CP and the Arts in the School, as well as their expectations for the CPD Programme. Also at this stage, the 15 teachers were interviewed (I2). These interviews were
conducted in May and June, 2016, except for one teacher, Sofía, who participated in the Workshop and wanted to join the Programme after her experience and who was interviewed in August. Through these interviews, teachers discussed and developed the information they provided in Questionnaire 2. They were asked to comment on: the School context; their educational views and practices in relation to CP and in general; their previous experience with theatre and dramatic activity; and their expectations about their potential application of DiE. Interview 3 (I3) was administered at the end of the Application Stage with the eight teachers who participated in this stage. Here, the conversation centred on their experience practising DiE in their classrooms. Teachers were asked to comment on whether spaces for CP had been opened up through DiE in their lessons. They also remarked on the possibilities and challenges they faced in this process and in the CPD Programme in general.

All interviews were individual, except on one occasion when two teachers who co-taught the same class preferred to be interviewed together (Andrea and Francesca, I2, 07/06/2016). Individual interviews were chosen as they allowed an in-depth conversation with each participant. All interviews followed a semi-structured format (see Appendix C). As Brinkmann (2014) proposes, these established general lines of inquiry while also leaving ample room for emergent issues. This type of interview is aligned with my critical research paradigm, leading me to be attentive to power imbalances in the study. A completely horizontal interviewer/interviewee relationship could not be achieved, as I was the leader of the conversation (Kvale, 2006). However, the flexibility of the semi-structured interview schedule allowed participants to introduce and develop issues of their interest, instead of having my researcher’s agenda control the whole encounter.

All interviews were audio-recorded, with the participants’ consent. Therefore, my focus during the interviews was on listening and conversing with participants rather than on taking notes. Also, audio-recordings enabled a more complete analysis of interviews (Creswell, 2007). Audio-recordings were transcribed and both the audio files and transcriptions were logged into the NVivo database.

4.4.1.4. Document analysis

Documents are central to gaining contextual information about a case (Simons, 2014). School policies and governmental reports on the School were gathered during the Preparation Stage. That information helped me understand the School setting, which was crucial to designing a CPD Programme that could be meaningful for teachers. Also, documents produced by teachers during the Workshop; by their students during the Application Stage; lesson plans created by teachers and I; and our personal communications through e-mail, were all sources of valuable data.
My research journal has been an important document in this study (see samples in Appendix G). Following O’Toole (2006), I included logs of observations, my interpretations of these, notes about methodological issues, and reflective memos. I also integrated comments about future actions (Whitehead & McNiff, 2006). My research journal had a digital format. I combined two computer applications for this: NVivo 10 and Evernote, a note-taking software. In NVivo I stored observation logs and audio notes transcriptions. In Evernote, I kept reflective and interpretive memos, and notes about methodology and future steps, as well as a record of my daily research activities. In line with a reflective practitioner stance (Schön, 1983), journaling was essential to make sense of my role as a facilitator (Taylor, 1996). Also, as Janesick (2014) suggests, this technique increased my self-confidence as a researcher, giving shape to my interpretations and setting the basis for subsequent analysis.

Teachers were invited to keep a journal during the Application Stage. This technique would have rendered invaluable evidence about the participants’ perspectives (Kara, 2015). It could have also contributed to guide their work as novice DiE practitioners (Taylor, 1996). However, no teacher took up this invitation, reporting time constraints. Unfortunately, this limited the variety of data collected for this study.

4.4.1.5. **Questionnaires**

In this case study, questionnaires were administered on four occasions. At the outset of the Baseline Stage, Questionnaire 1 (Q1) was administered via the Internet, using Google Forms. It was completed by the Head of TPU (06/05/2016). It asked about the importance of CP in the School and about the Management Board’s expectations for the CPD Programme. Because I was not yet in Chile, a questionnaire method was preferred as it allowed the respondent to complete it without my presence.

During the same stage, teachers completed Questionnaire 2 (Q2). It was administered through the Internet, using Google Forms. This allowed teachers to respond in their own time, within the time-frame of one week in May 2016 (except for Sofía, who joined the Programme later and completed Q2 in July, 2016). Of the 23 teachers who signed up, 17 completed Q2. However, only 15 of them chose to participate in the Workshop. Hence, the other two teachers’ data are not considered in this study. In Q2, the 15 teachers were asked about their teaching strategies; their planning habits; their views of schooling and education; their familiarity with CP and DiE; and their expectations of the CPD Programme. Q2 included questions specifically related to the main principles of CP identified during my initial review of the literature: a transformative aim; promotion of dialogic classrooms; promotion of conscientization; and praxis. Recognising that teachers might not be
knowledgeable of these concepts, I converted them into more specific indicators. Table 4.4 illustrates this.

Table 4.4. Example of Q2 question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of promotion of conscientization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘In an average school month, how often do you employ the following strategies in your lessons in the School?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 illustrates this.

Questionnaire 3 (Q3) was completed by a sample of secondary-level students in September – October 2016, at the end of the Application Stage. Q3 was self-administered, although I was present to provide initial instructions, to answer questions throughout the completion time, and to gather completed questionnaires. Q3 asked students about their experience of the DiE lessons. Some questions related to the dialogic quality of the classroom environment and promotion of conscientization in the DiE lessons. However, following Cohen et al. (2011), students were not asked this directly. Rather, these principles of CP were converted into questions that were more likely to be understood by students. Table 4.5 shows an example of this.

Table 4.5. Example of Q3 questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of development of dialogic classrooms</th>
<th>Indicator of promotion of conscientization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement?’</td>
<td>‘During these lessons, I felt that my opinion was heard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>‘The teacher gave us opportunities to make decisions about what happened in the lessons’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3 was administered with secondary-level students only following teachers’ recommendations. For primary-level students in this School, it was thought to be more developmentally appropriate to have a general reflective conversation at the end of the lessons. Only secondary-level students whose parents had given written consent for this were invited to complete Q3. This resulted in an eligible sample of 52 students. However, of these, only 37 agreed to respond to Q3, with some agreeing to answer two questionnaires, one per each teacher who had taught them through DiE. 47 completed questionnaires were gathered in total, 45 of which were valid. Only 38% of the 97 secondary-level students who participated in the DiE lessons completed Q3. Hence, this sample cannot be considered representative. Still, Q3 allowed some students’ voices to be represented in this study.
Finally, Questionnaire 4 (Q4) was answered by the 15 teachers who participated in the initial Workshop. It was applied in the Follow-up Stage, two months after I left the field, between December, 2016 and February, 2017. Because I was no longer in Chile, Q4 was applied over the Internet, using Google Forms. Like Q2, this enabled teachers to complete it at their own convenience. Q4 had two strands, one for teachers who had applied DiE in their classrooms either with my collaboration or independently (n=14), and one for those who had not applied DiE at all (n=1). This final questionnaire inquired about teachers’ perceptions of the CPD Programme (Workshop and Application Stage); about their views on the potential of DiE to open up spaces for CP, based on their classroom experiences; and about the sustainability of their application of DiE in the future. As with Q2 and Q3, I opted for using specific indicators of CP concepts. Table 4.6 exemplifies this.

Table 4.6. Example of Q4 question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator of DiE’s promotion of conscientization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘In relation to DiE as a form of CP, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ‘DiE helps to make students aware of inequalities in society’.

All questionnaires were semi-structured (see Appendix D). They included mostly closed, with some open questions to facilitate respondent completion (Newby, 2014). Most closed questions were Likert-scale type (Bryman, 2012). The design of the instruments followed recommendations by Bryman (2012) and Newby (2014). These included having a clear and simple layout and wording of questions and instructions. Also, as Newby (2014) advises, I based the layout and wording of some questions on existing questionnaires. For the teachers’ questionnaires, I used the SIMCE survey for teachers, a Chilean census-like survey (Agencia de Calidad de la Educación, 2010) which was familiar to them. I also adapted some questions from Yilmaz’s (2009) and Mahmoodarabi and Khodabakhsh’s (2015) questionnaires on CP for teachers.

Unlike the other questionnaires in this study, Q3 was anonymous. This was to elicit honesty in students’ responses (Cohen et al., 2011), decreasing the risk of “social acceptability” bias (Newby, 2014, p. 312), considering they would be asked to comment on their teachers’ performances. Q1 was not anonymous as it was only answered by one person. I asked teachers in Q2 and Q4 to state their names as it was important in this study to track the journey of each teacher throughout the Programme. Except for Q3, all questionnaires had a total response rate. All teachers who received Q2 and Q4 completed it and returned it to me. These largely quantitative data contributed to triangulating other sources of data, enhancing my understanding of the case.
Piloting research instruments is widely recommended (Bryman, 2012; Stake, 1995). This strategy can help to test the instruments, identifying missing, irrelevant or unclear elements (Cohen et al., 2011). It can also strengthen the researcher’s confidence in their use (Bryman, 2012).

Most instruments in this study were piloted. The schedule of Baseline Stage observations was piloted in May, 2016, by observing a teacher in the School who was not participating in this study. However, the observation schedule for the Workshop was not piloted, due to the uniqueness of that event. Q3 was piloted with a group of students from the School who did not participate in the study. While no issues emerged with the questions in this piloting experience, I did notice that my original introductory instructions were too long. Students seemed to become restless and negatively disposed towards answering the questionnaire. Hence, I shortened the introduction to better harness students’ focus. I1, I2, and I3, as well as Q1, Q2, and Q4 were piloted with the help of various Chilean teachers who are known to me. They found no problems answering the questions. However, piloting these instruments, particularly the interview schedules, helped me identify redundant questions. I also had an opportunity to practice my listening and questioning skills.

4.5. Ethical considerations

Considering my critical research paradigm, I strove to be aware and respectful of the dignity and rights of all participants in this study (Cohen et al., 2011). Several ethical principles were followed.

4.5.1. Beneficence

A research study should strive for reciprocity (Creswell, 2014). This means that the participants are positively impacted by the study. As discussed earlier, this study aspired to contribute to the School’s CP mission by exploring DiE as a new methodology. As will be seen in later chapters, this aim was, largely fulfilled. DiE opened up more spaces for CP than teachers’ regular strategies. Also, the Workshop contributed to teachers’ professional development by promoting self-reflection. The study also appeared to be beneficial for students. They generally seemed to enjoy the DiE lessons, reporting high motivation levels.
4.5.2. **Do no harm**

A research study should avoid posing harm to participants (Flick, 2009). As discussed in the Literature Review, teachers practicing CP have been known to face institutional resistance due to its overt political nature. However, the setting chosen for this study was aligned with CP and amenable to the Programme. Hence, teachers were not at risk of being censored as a result of their involvement. Also, throughout the study I tried not to cause micro-oppressions over participants. For instance, I took teachers’ views into consideration through a deductive/inductive analytical approach and through member-checking. This was especially important considering that the DiE approaches examined in the Programme are of European origin. As Finneran and Freebody (2016a) maintain, there is a risk of colonialism when presenting foreign strategies to participants. Moreover, there can be a “missionary” element in research that aims to effect transformations (Finneran & Freebody, 2016a, p. 13). To avoid such risks, I tried to respect teachers’ pedagogical choices and expertise, without imposing my own views. However, as will be discussed in Chapter Six, by not prompting some teachers more strongly into taking greater risks when applying DiE, I might have impacted their learning process.

According to Creswell (2014), the do no harm principle is particularly important when working with vulnerable populations. As the Literature Review revealed, CP can be emotionally taxing for students. When coplanning DiE lessons, teachers and I were aware of this risk and chose themes and strategies that could help surmount it. As will be discussed in later chapters, some students reported feeling embarrassed by certain DiE activities. However, these students also reported positive feelings denoting enjoyment and motivation. This corroborated observational data suggesting that, in general, students seemed to appreciate DiE as a methodology.

4.5.3. **Informed consent**

Participants should be given all the information they need to assess whether or not to take part in a study (Creswell, 2014; Flick, 2009). Informed consent was sought from the School’s Management Board at the outset of the fieldwork (see Appendix E). Upon their voluntary enrolment in the Programme, teachers signed consent sheets where they were informed in detail about the study and their participation. At the beginning of the Application Stage, informed consent was sought from parents and guardians of students involved in this study. This was complicated, as several parents/guardians did not attend School meetings nor returned consent sheets. I was able to obtain parental consent from around 50% of parents/guardians. Informed consent was then asked of their children/pupils. Most of them consented to having their data included in this study. However, a number of students were reticent to consent to certain data gathering methods, particularly at lower-secondary level. For instance, the majority of lower-secondary-level students did not agree
to be video-recorded. Some also refused to complete Q3. Although this limited the data gathered for this study, these procedures promoted respect for students’ dignity and rights. All participants in this study were offered the chance to withdraw at any point of the study (Bryman, 2012).

4.5.4. **Right to privacy**

This concerns the issues of anonymity and confidentiality (Bryman, 2012). Anonymity is secured when participants’ identity remains unknown when they provide information. Confidentiality is secured when the data provided cannot be traced back to a specific participant in any report (Cohen et al., 2011). Anonymity was only guaranteed to students when answering Q3. However, all students were guaranteed confidentiality, except, when consent had been obtained, when examining their photographs in reports.

Anonymity was not available for other participants as their identities were known in every data gathering procedure. Also, these participants’ confidentiality was not completely guaranteed. This is because it is impossible to ensure that their identities will be untraceable due to their unique roles within the School (the role of the Principal, for example). Also, all teachers agreed to be photographed and video-recorded and for that material to be shared in this and other reports. All participants were informed of this at the outset of their involvement in the study. However, as recommended by Creswell (2014), pseudonyms have been used in all research reports to help protect all participants’ identities.

Respect to privacy also implies keeping the data securely stored (Bryman, 2012; Flick, 2009), and disposing of it when appropriate (Creswell, 2014). For this study, all data have been digitalised and stored in my password-protected personal computer and backed up in a password-protected external drive.

To close this overview of ethical considerations in this study, it is important to note that all of the above measures are consistent with the norms that regulate scientific investigation in Chile (Diario Oficial de la República de Chile, 1999, 2006). Additionally, this study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education, Trinity College, Dublin (see Appendix H).

4.6. **Trustworthiness and validity**

Concern for the validity and reliability of a study is also part of the researcher’s ethical commitment (Creswell, 2014). Several authors have found the criteria of validity and reliability derived from quantitative paradigms inadequate for qualitative research (Bryman, 2012; Cohen et al., 2011; Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Agreeing with this position, in this study I
address the issue of validity and reliability by following the criteria of trustworthiness proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). I also consider Lather’s (1986) reconceptualization of validity in the context of critical, transformative research. For Lather, this type of inquiry is unashamedly based on the researcher’s values. She suggests guidelines to add rigour to this type of research and to prevent the researcher’s biases from distorting evidence. The steps taken in this study to establish trustworthiness and validity are described next.

4.6.1. Prolonged engagement and persistent observation

Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) notion of credibility refers to the extent to which the findings of a study represent participants’ multiple constructions of reality. They propose sustained field engagement and observation to achieve this. In this study, I collaborated with the School and teachers for five months. Also, I used observation as the main data collection method. This prolonged collaboration allowed me to gain awareness of the School’s culture and the teachers’ views and practices. This also helped developing construct validity, characterised by Lather (1986) as the creation of a dialogue between the researcher’s theoretical constructs and the empirical data. To further establish construct validity, I have aimed at demonstrating how “a priori theory has been changed by the logic of the data” (Lather, 1986, p. 67, emphasis in original).

4.6.2. Triangulation

Triangulation is also advanced by Lincoln and Guba (1985) as a strategy for credibility. Triangulation refers to the integration of various methods of data collection, data sources, and theories (Lather, 1986, p. 198). In this study, participants’ multiple views were gathered by integrating diverse data collection methods. Although there is an emphasis on the study’s main participants, namely the 15 teachers, the views of students and Management Board members were also gathered. My perspective as a practitioner is also considered. As seen in Chapter Two, theories from the CP tradition and the field of Applied Theatre intertwine in the theoretical framework of this study.

4.6.3. A critical friend

Also a strategy for credibility (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), having a critical friend has helped me develop and question my thinking and actions in relation to this study. This role was played by my thesis supervisor, with whom I maintained a constant dialogue throughout the study.
4.6.4. Negative case analysis

To further develop credibility, I have followed Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) recommendation of assessing disconfirming evidence fairly. For instance, when analysing data about participating teachers’ evolution throughout the Programme I considered, and reported, the case of a teacher whose change in self-perception in terms of CP, unlike that of the majority of other teachers, could not be attributed to the Programme, judging by her answers to Q4 (see subsection 5.5.2.3).

4.6.5. Member-checking

Member-checking helps assess a study’s “face validity”, that is, whether it addresses what it claims to address (Lather, 1986, p. 66). Informal member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was conducted at several points of this study. For instance, this was done when interviewing participants, as I continuously checked if I was understanding them correctly. Formal member-checking was conducted at the end of the Application Stage during I3, where I summarised previous observational and interview data and discussed it with interviewed teachers.

4.6.6. Thick description

Lincoln and Guba (1985) question the appropriateness of notions of generalizability in qualitative research. Instead, they propose transferability, that is, the degree to which conclusions from one study might be relevant to another. Like Stake’s (1995) naturalistic generalizations, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that transferability is to be assessed by the reader on the basis of detailed descriptions. Rich descriptions of empirical data have been included in this case study report to facilitate this.

4.6.7. Research journal

Keeping a reflective journal is crucial for establishing a study’s trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As discussed before, I kept a research journal throughout the study. This also helped establishing construct validity through “systematic self-reflexivity” about the impact of the fieldwork on the study’s theoretical framework (Lather, 1986, p. 72).

4.6.8. Pursuing catalytic validity

Lather’s (1986) notion of “catalytic validity” refers to a study’s ability to motivate conscientization in participants (p. 67). This means that their engagement in research results in
“self-understanding and, ideally, self-determination” to effect social-justice-oriented change (p. 67). As will be discussed in following chapters, in general, this study achieved catalytic validity. Several data sources suggest that, to varying degrees, teachers reflected about their roles in reproducing injustices in their classrooms. For some, integrating DiE in their lessons contributed, albeit to a modest degree, to challenge society’s unfair power arrangements.

4.7. Analysis of data

Thematic analysis is seen by Braun and Clarke (2006) as “a foundational method for qualitative analysis” (p. 78). It is a flexible method for “identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (p.79). As elaborated by Braun and Clarke, it encompasses several steps: familiarity with data; generating codes; identifying initial themes; reviewing themes; and defining and naming themes. This approach best describes the process of organisation and sense-making of data adopted in this study. In this section, I explain this study’s thematic analysis processes.

4.7.1. Analysis of the literature

As mentioned before, my initial review of current literature on CP could be categorised as systematic (Bryman, 2012). To analyse the 100 articles which met the inclusion criteria, I followed Braun and Clarke’s (2006) approach to thematic analysis. Firstly, I familiarised myself with the literature through detailed reading. Additionally, I coded sections of the texts relevant to my research questions, using NVivo 10. I generated multiple initial codes, or nodes, as they are termed in this software. Then, I identified potential themes to respond to the sub-questions. This enabled me to ascertain main principles and concepts of CP amongst the 100 articles retrieved (Figure 4.1).
I then continued reviewing literature on CP and on DiE, but following a narrative approach. New sub-questions were explored here: How does DiE theory relate to CP? And, what is the status of CP and DiE in Chile? I based the analysis of these sources on the themes identified in the initial systematic literature review. New themes and sub-themes were added. For instance, the sub-themes of ‘embodiment’ and ‘metaxis’ became relevant. With this tentative theoretical framework, I began collection of empirical data. Until then, I had only conducted the first three steps of thematic analysis recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006). By not fixing any final themes, a dialogue could occur between this tentative framework and the empirical data. From this dialogue, final themes and subthemes were determined which guided the concluding part of the literature review for this study.

4.7.2. Analysis of empirical data

The six steps of thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006) were followed to organise and interpret empirical data.
4.7.2.1. Organising and familiarising myself with the data

Firstly, all datasets were uploaded into a single database, using NVivo 10. For this, I began by transcribing documents, audio-recordings, and video-recordings. Oliver, Serovich, and Mason’s (2005) recommendations were heeded for the process of transcription. They distinguish between “naturalized” and “denaturalized” transcriptions (p. 1274). The former includes as much detail as possible in the transcription of utterances, displaying pauses, emphases, and non-verbal signals. This approach is suited for studies where the form of speech is relevant. Contrastingly, denaturalized transcriptions focus on accurately depicting the content of speech. This is best suited for studies where the substance of participants’ speech is central. Following Oliver et al. (2005) I reflected about the aims of this study and made transcription decisions accordingly. Given that the focus of this research was not on formal aspects of participants’ speech, but on the meaning they made of the Programme experience, a denaturalized approach was adopted for transcriptions. Additionally, I opted for doing the transcriptions myself. As Braun and Clarke (2006) submit, this allowed me to identify coding possibilities and recognise potential themes.

Other significant decisions taken at this stage concern the process of translation of the participants’ data, which is originally in Spanish. I decided to conduct the analysis of these data in their original language. This contributed to preserving the original meaning of the case’s verbal exchanges in the process of analysis. For Larkins (2016), this can increase the authenticity of a study. Therefore, I only translated into English those extracts of verbal data that have been included in this report. As a bilingual researcher (Sutrisno, Nguyen, & Tangen, 2014), I am proficient in Spanish and English. I have lived in English speaking countries for five years and have engaged in translation in the past. Such experience is informal, and, hence, might not endow me with the best credentials for translation (Squires, 2009). However, for this study, I opted to conduct the translation myself to preserve the authenticity of data, as there was no other person with my degree of familiarity with the original context. This “single translation” approach is limited in terms of trustworthiness, as it was not validated by other translators (Sutrisno et al., 2014, p. 1340). However, following Sutrisno et al. (2014) I have sought “dynamic equivalence” (p. 1340) to moderate this limitation. This means that I have tried to convey the original meaning of the extracts so that it can be well understood by Anglophone readers. As with the use of denaturalized transcriptions, this decision responds to the characteristics of this study. As this is not a study of language use, the emphasis has been on the content of participants’ speech, rather than on its form.

When transcribing documents created by participants in DiE activities, I used a nomenclature to distinguish them in this report. For documents produced during the Workshop, I used a ‘W’, the session number, and the document number (e.g. W.5.1). For documents produced by students in DiE lessons during the Application Stage, I used the teacher’s pseudonym initial and the document number (for example, the first document in Gonzalo’s lesson is ‘G.1’).
Once all datasets were uploaded into the database in NVivo, I organised them into folders per each stage of the fieldwork and per each teacher. Every folder had subfolders for each dataset. For example, within the ‘Baseline Stage’ folder there were sub-folders for ‘I1’, ‘I2’, ‘Observations 1’, ‘Q1’, and ‘Q2’. I then created participant nodes, one per teacher. These nodes would contain all the data for each individual teacher, so that I could track their process throughout the CPD Programme. Transcription and organisation procedures contributed to my familiarisation with the data. To strengthen my familiarity, once the database was ready, I reread every dataset several times.

4.7.2.2. Coding

I then moved on to Braun and Clarke’s (2006) second step: coding (see Appendix G for a sample of the coding process in NVivo 10). To begin, I assigned attributes to each participant, including their gender, age range, and academic subject and level taught. Then, I coded datasets chronologically, which is recommended for case studies (Creswell, 2007). Through “provisional coding” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 120), I coded empirical data based on the codes from my initial literature review. Simultaneously, I identified new codes that responded to the specific research questions asked from each dataset, and to the study’s main research questions. In terms of Saldaña’s (2009) categories, this could be termed as an initial coding that combined:

- “descriptive coding” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 70), where I identified topics in the data (e.g. ‘time’);
- “structural coding” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 66), indicating data extracts that responded to specific research questions (e.g. ‘challenges when applying DiE’);
- “process coding” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 77), related to processes lived by participants (e.g. ‘familiarising with DiE’); and
- “versus coding” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 93), where I identified tensions in the data (e.g. ‘the play for the teacher v. the play for the students’).

I created a node in NVivo for each code, resulting in 110 initial nodes. All the while, I conducted “simultaneous” coding (Saldaña, 2009, p. 62), assigning one or more codes to the same passages. In the case of video-recordings, I used NVivo to code the video files directly, as well as the corresponding transcripts. In this way, I was able to watch relevant video segments when conducting subsequent analysis. Throughout the coding process, I also used the memos and annotation features of NVivo, which allowed me to actively make sense of the data. Additionally, I reflected on the analysis process through my research journal kept in Evernote.
4.7.2.3. Thematising: identifying, reviewing, defining, and naming themes

With that initial list of codes, I started searching for themes. Here, I confirmed some over-arching themes that had been identified in the early literature review, namely ‘conscientization’ and ‘dialogic classrooms’. However, the themes of ‘transformative aim’ and ‘praxis’ were subsumed and transformed into other themes. The former theme became ‘transformative intellectuals’. The theme of ‘praxis’, which denoted the interplay between reflection and action, was incorporated into the theme ‘conscientization’. I also recognised new themes and sub-themes and collated coded extracts under the various provisional themes. At that point, following Braun and Clarke (2006), I examined themes according to their “internal homogeneity” (p. 91), that is, I assessed if there was a coherence between data extracts under the same theme. I also evaluated themes in terms of their “external heterogeneity” (p. 91). This involved examining whether there was enough difference between themes to justify their existence. I created a thematic map that displayed the resulting themes, sub-themes, and nodes. I then re-read all the datasets, re-coded some extracts, and made small adjustments to the map.

In the next stage advised by Braun and Clarke (2006), I settled the names of the themes and produced a final version of the thematic map (see Appendix F). Importantly, although the analysis of empirical data had a chronological order, there was also an iterative element in this process. Creswell’s (2007) “data analysis spiral” metaphor adequately describes this journey of analysis (p. 150). For Creswell, collection, analysis, and writing up of data in qualitative research are interrelated procedures. To bring order to this complex process, the use of the NVivo software was key.

4.7.3. Computer-assisted qualitative data analysis

Throughout this study I used the computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) NVivo (version 10). As various authors observe (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2007; Flick, 2009; Yin, 2013) CAQDAS does not substitute the researcher’s role in analysing data, but it simply helps the researcher in that process. In this study, I used NVivo as a platform for organising, coding, collecting, and thematising data (literary and empirical), as well as for memoing and annotating comments on data extracts. As Saldaña (2009) asserts, using CAQDAS is vital when dealing with large amounts of qualitative data. Considering the bulk of sources included in this study’s initial systematic literature review, using NVivo was crucial to achieve a thorough analysis. Moreover, the software enabled me to expand the literature review in an organised manner as the research progressed. Recent scholarship shows that CAQDAS are rarely used to support literature reviews (O’Neill, Sarah, & Lamb, 2018; Woods, Paulus, Atkins, & Macklin, 2015). The present study appears to be innovative in this respect.
Empirical data in this study can also be considered copious and multifarious. NVivo allowed me to organise all empirical datasets in one platform, including videos, audios, photographs, and text. NVivo also facilitated analysis of the case through some of its features, like queries and visualisations. For example, I queried how frequently concepts were mentioned by participants in their interviews. Importantly, throughout the study I did all the coding myself, without resorting to automatic features of NVivo, like auto-coding. In this way, I replicated the procedure of manual coding. This helped me achieve familiarisation with the data, surmounting one of the pitfalls of CAQDAS use, namely, that of becoming overly distanced from data (Creswell, 2007). However, I did meet problems in my use of NVivo. At times, the number of nodes I was able to easily create through NVivo became overwhelming. This complicated the thematising stage, although it also honoured the complexity of the qualitative data.

For the analysis of quantitative data, I used another computer software: IBM’s SPSS (version 24).

4.7.4. Organisation and initial analysis of quantitative data

Most of the data in this study was qualitative. However, some numerical data were gathered through questionnaires. An editing process was required before analysing these data. Following Kent (2015), this involved identifying missing answers and biased responses in completed questionnaires. In Q2 and Q4 a few missing answers where noted. These were minimal so they did not invalidate the whole completed questionnaire. However, in Q3, of the 47 questionnaires completed by students, two were considered invalid. This is because these particular students answered in relation to their schooling experience in general, rather than to the specific DiE lessons. A section of another completed Q3 was also discarded, as there was evidence of response set bias to Likert-scale questions. Nonetheless, I decided not to discard this full completed questionnaire, as the open questions section appeared to have been responded to validly. Hence, Q3 resulted in 45 validly completed questionnaires.

After editing, I transcribed and assigned identifiers to each completed questionnaire. The notation used for these identifiers is explained in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7. Questionnaire identifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample identifier</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Head of UTP’s responses to Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1</td>
<td>Responses to question one of Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.7L</td>
<td>Q3 responses of student number 7 in Laura’s class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.1</td>
<td>Responses to question one of Q4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I then uploaded completed questionnaires into SPSS. This is a well-reputed and broadly used software for statistical analysis (Bryman, 2012). It allowed a straightforward examination of the numerical data collected. I used SPSS to summarise and code these data, applying basic analytical strategies, like summary statistics (Matthews & Ross, 2010). I also generated charts in SPSS to visualise data better. For cosmetic reasons, I created charts for this report using the online platform Infogram (https://infogram.com).

After this initial analysis, I used the codes, themes, and sub-themes generated in the analysis of qualitative data to deepen the examination of closed answers to questionnaires. For instance, I coded the results from Q2’s question about the frequency with which teachers addressed socio-political issues in their lessons (see Table 4.4) under the node ‘conscientization’. In this way, qualitative and quantitative data were intertwined as I made sense of all the datasets in an integrated fashion.

4.8. Summary

This chapter presented and discussed the methodological decisions taken in this study. Firstly, I positioned myself as a researcher who abides by a flexible qualitative approach, as well as a critical paradigm. The research was then identified as a case study about a CPD Programme on DiE and CP implemented with a group of Chilean teachers. An overview of the five stages of the fieldwork was presented, as well as the methods for data collection applied in each stage. These included literature review, observations (participant and non-participant), interviews, documents, and questionnaires. The characteristics of the instruments’ schedules were discussed, along with the piloting procedures. I then examined the ethical and validity considerations in this study. Criteria for trustworthiness and validity in critical research were presented as particularly germane in this case. Finally, I discussed the process of thematic analysis of qualitative and quantitative data conducted in this case study, explaining how NVivo and SPSS were used for these purposes. In the following chapter, I present the results of this analysis. This is done in chronological order, to best represent the learning journey entailed by the CPD Programme at the heart of this case study.
5. DATA ANALYSIS

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter I interpret empirical data gathered in this study. The analysis is organised according to the various stages of the Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme developed for this study: Baseline Stage, Workshop, Application Stage, and Follow-up Stage. This way of presenting data honours the progression of the Programme, offering a view of the journey experienced by the participating teachers and by myself as researcher/facilitator. The chapter finishes with a synthesis of findings.

5.2. Baseline Stage

Baseline data were gathered about the 15 teachers’ opinions and practices in relation to Critical Pedagogy (CP) and Drama in Education (DiE). Upon enrolment, the 15 teachers completed an online questionnaire (Q2), followed by individual interviews (I2) to explore their responses to Q2 in more depth, and finally, I conducted non-participant observation of their lessons (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1. Observations – Baseline Stage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberto</td>
<td>08/06/2016</td>
<td>Upper-primary</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>09/06/2016</td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernarda</td>
<td>10/06/2016</td>
<td>Upper-secondary (technical-professional)</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patilla</td>
<td>14/06/2016</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>15/06/2016</td>
<td>Upper-primary</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea and Francesca</td>
<td>21/06/2016</td>
<td>Lower-primary</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>22/06/2016</td>
<td>Lower-primary</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violeta</td>
<td>24/06/2016</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inés</td>
<td>28/06/2016</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>History, Geography, and Social Sciences (HGSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalo and Cristián</td>
<td>29/07/2016</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>HGSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>04/08/2016</td>
<td>Upper-primary</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofía and Tamara</td>
<td>09/08/2016</td>
<td>Lower-primary</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I observed each teacher or teacher-team only once at this stage. Hence, the observed lessons cannot be considered exhaustive representations of the teachers’ practices. Observational data serve to triangulate data from questionnaires and interviews.
Baseline data is presented thematically. Teachers’ views and practices are analysed first in relation to CP. Their familiarity with DiE is examined later. After analysing other factors that could affect their opening of spaces for CP through DiE, the section closes with a summary of findings.

5.2.1. Critical Pedagogy in the teachers’ views and practices

5.2.1.1. Teachers’ familiarity with Critical Pedagogy

The baseline stage aimed to ascertain teachers’ level of familiarity with CP. Five of the 15 appeared highly committed to this paradigm. Inés, for example, affirmed: “For me [CP] is my religion, is how I understand life” (I2, 03/06/2016). Like her, Violeta, Gonzalo, Michelle, and Sofía declared being very familiar with CP and the work of Paulo Freire (Q2). This was evident in their definitions of critical pedagogues as dialogical agents of conscientization and transformation (I2). Their descriptions cohere with Giroux’s (1988) notion of “transformative intellectuals” (p. 121), and with the definition of CP derived from the review of literature (see Chapter Two). However, unlike these five teachers, the majority were only somewhat familiar with CP (Figure 5.1 and Figure 5.2).

Most appeared to have an imprecise idea of what CP was (Q2; I2). They loosely associated it with the promotion of reflection and empathy and with inviting students to reformulate knowledge. As
seen in Chapter Two, these are all important aspects of CP according to the literature (Freire, 1985; Neelands, 2016). However, most teachers did not refer to conscientization or the integration of social justice issues in the curriculum when defining the paradigm, which are fundamental aspects of CP (Freire, 1985; Shor & Freire, 1987). They seemed unaware of the critical theory that underlies CP.

Two groups could be identified. Group one was formed by those knowledgeable and aligned with CP (Inés, Violeta, Gonzalo, Michelle, and Sofía). The other was formed by the majority of teachers who seemed less familiar with CP. This distinction is substantiated when comparing the authors that teachers found inspirational, as reported in Q2 (Figure 5.3 and Figure 5.4).

As Figure 5.3 shows, Freire and Giroux were most commonly named by teachers in group one. The other ten teachers, in contrast, showed a stronger tendency towards constructivism than to CP (Figure 5.4). In fact, socio-constructivist Lev Vygotsky was mentioned twice as much as Paulo Freire by this group. This makes sense considering that, as mentioned in Chapter Three, constructivism is the leading educational paradigm in Chile (Caiceo Escudero, 2011; Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016; Pinto Contreras, 2009). These data suggest that the majority of teachers were not yet aware of, nor inspired by, the CP vision the School was promoting.

However, it is noteworthy that 13 of the 15 teachers considered the advancement of social justice a key mission of schools, even though they did not mention this aspect when defining CP (Figure 5.5).
Although most seemed unfamiliar with CP, the vast majority of teachers agreed with its transformative aim. An exception here was Patilla, an Arts teacher. He was one of the few undecided about schools’ social justice aim. Moreover, he was the only teacher who answered ‘no’ when asked whether he considered himself a critical pedagogue in Q2 (Figure 5.6).
In his interview, Patilla strongly criticised CP. He saw it as an outdated model and questioned the oppressed/oppressor dualism (I2, 01/06/2016). All other teachers appeared receptive towards CP. Moreover, for several, learning more about this paradigm was one of the main expectations they had about the upcoming Workshop (Q2; I2).

5.2.1.2. Creating dialogic classrooms

Another aim of the baseline data collection stage was to explore if, and how, teachers were opening spaces for CP in their lessons before the Workshop. There was some evidence of their promotion of dialogic classrooms during the baseline. Most seemed to avoid authoritarianism in their demeanour towards students. This is a central aspect of CP (Freire, 1973). For instance, teachers usually managed behaviour through positive reinforcement rather than authoritarian reprimands in the lessons observed. In their interviews, several teachers also referred to the importance of this. For instance, talking about solving behavioural problems with her secondary-level students, Bernarda said: “You cannot just boss them around (…). I try to relate with them differently, I try to reach out to them” (I2, 27/05/2016). This exemplifies the non-authoritarian approach to classroom management common amongst these teachers.

In Q2, all teachers declared that they always or frequently connected curricular contents with students’ lives. This suggests that they valued students’ “streetcorner knowledge”, a trait of critical pedagogues (McLaren, 1988, p. 169). However, links with students’ out-of-school culture were
rare in the lessons observed. One exception was Sofía and Tamara’s lesson. This used the story of a child going to a toy store to teach spatial directions to first-graders. Another example was Nicole, who taught algebra using the context of her sixth graders’ upcoming class party (research journal, 04/08/2016). In line with CP, these teachers incorporated generative themes in their lessons (Shor, 1992). However, they did not problematize them. More problematization was visible in Andrea and Francesca’s lesson about the creation of the Universe (research journal, 21/06/2016). Rather than examining scientific theories directly, they first asked children how they believed the Universe was created. Correspondingly, in Gonzalo and Cristián’s History lesson, secondary-level students examined links between Nazism in Europe and “our concrete reality” (research journal, 29/07/16). This provoked a lively discussion around the students’ knowledge of, and personal experiences with neo-Nazism in Chile. In these two lessons, students’ previous knowledge was valued and then problematized in light of curricular knowledge. Unlike most of the lessons observed, spaces for reflective dialogue, key for CP (Shor, 1992), were opened in these lessons. Moreover, students’ voices were highlighted. Students in Violeta’s lesson also had active voice (research journal, 24/06/2016). Although the overall theme of ‘Women’ was set by Violeta, students decided the specific focus from which to frame the theme as they created short documentaries reflecting their points of view. Importantly, dialogue was promoted by these five teachers by asking open questions (Morgan & Saxton, 1989, p. 64). Teachers seemed authentically interested in learning about their students’ knowledge on these topics. In contrast, in most other lessons, teachers frequently raised questions which answers they knew in advance. These were “phony questions” (Wrigley, 2009, p. 73). These merely examined if students had retained academic knowledge. Students became reproducers of knowledge, which is closer to a “banking” model of education than to a dialogic one (Freire, 2000b, p. 72). Seemingly more knowledgeable students tended to dominate these information-centred exchanges, and so spaces for equal participation were not created.

Teachers adhered ideologically in their questionnaire and interview responses to promoting dialogic classrooms. However, although they avoided openly authoritarian stances, only a minority fostered a dialogic educational encounter in the lessons observed.

5.2.1.3. Promoting conscientization

As mentioned in the Literature Review, developing dialogic classrooms is not enough for critical pedagogues. Rather, this needs to lead to the fostering of conscientization (Shor, 1992). In Q2, the majority of teachers (10) agreed or strongly agreed with conscientization being a crucial teaching goal (Figure 5.7).
Figure 5.7. ‘One of the main goals of teachers should be to make students conscious of inequalities in society’ (Q2)

Additionally, around half the group stated that they always or frequently established connections between curricular contents and socio-political issues in their lessons (Figure 5.8).
Teachers knowledgeable about CP were amongst those who did this regularly or always. Laura, Roberto, Cristián, and Patilla also said they integrated these themes usually in their lessons. Teachers mentioned challenging sexism, capitalism, and mass-media, as illustrations of this (I2). However, in the observed lessons, few spaces for conscientization were identified. Links between contents and socio-political issues were explicit in only three lessons. In his Language lesson, Roberto briefly lectured about xenophobia and class-based discrimination in Chile (research journal, 08/06/2016). However, he did not dialogue about these issues with his eight-graders. Contrastingly, in Gonzalo and Cristián’s History lesson, dialogue about socio-political issues emerged. For instance, when examining the power of mass-media to promote hegemonic views, a student said: “it’s like when they only show the violent side of student protests in the news” (research journal, 29/07/2016). Similarly, in Violeta’s lesson, students created documentaries where they exposed their views on feminism and gender violence (research journal, 24/06/2016). Critical reflection emerged in both these lessons.

For Sofía (1st grade) and Michelle (pre-school), discussing socio-political issues was not the only way to promote conscientization. Both agreed that stimulating critical thinking was a developmentally appropriate precursor of conscientization for young children (I2). Observational
data showed some evidence of critical thinking being fostered by these teachers (research journal, 09/08/2016; 09/06/2016). At times, they encouraged children to make well-grounded decisions. This was also visible in Andrea and Francesca’s (3rd grade) discussion about the creation of the Universe, mentioned previously. Students’ “epistemological curiosity” seemed to be kindled in those lessons (Freire, 1998, p. 37).

Again, teachers seemed ideologically aligned with the notion of conscientization. However, their practice showed little evidence of this being promoted, except for the few cases mentioned above.

5.2.2. Teachers and Drama in Education

During the baseline, data were also gathered about the teachers’ previous experiences with ‘theatre pedagogy’ (Pedagogía Teatral), the common term in Chile to refer to Applied Theatre practices (see Chapter Three). All teachers reported being unfamiliar with theatre pedagogy or unsure about what it implied (Figure 5.9).

![Figure 5.9. How familiar are you with theatre pedagogy? (Q2)](image)

Additionally, most teachers rarely or never included dramatizations or role-play in their lessons (Figure 5.10).
Amongst the exceptions, Bernarda said she occasionally used dramatizations in her Customer Services course (I2, 27/05/2016). Also, Gonzalo had sporadically used “historical simulations” in another school (I2, 30/05/2016). But the most notable exception was Michelle. She said she used role-play frequently with her pre-schoolers. For her, “children learn best through role” (I2, 27/05/2016). Furthermore, she believed that desk-bound strategies promoted passivity in students, whereas active methodologies were more conducive of CP.

Still, there was little sign of dramatic methods in the observed lessons, including Michelle’s. Some teachers, though, did apply active methodologies in the observed lessons. For example, in Inés’ History lesson, secondary-level students collectively arranged a puzzle with images of Colonial institutions (research journal, 28/06/2016). Nicole, Michelle, and Sofía and Tamara also employed similar games. Their apparent familiarity with active methodologies was seen as favourable for their prospective use of DiE. These rare active episodes were very well received by students, whose work was desk-bound for the majority of the time (research journal, 04/08/2016; 09/06/2016; 09/08/2016). In their interviews, most teachers highlighted the meaningfulness of embodied and experiential learning for students (I2). This was one of the contributions that most believed DiE could bring to their classrooms (I2).
5.2.3. Other factors

Baseline data also sought to identify factors that could impact the teachers’ opening of spaces for CP in their classrooms through DiE. The school staff’s lack of a unified understanding of CP was acknowledged by teachers as one factor. Nicole, Violeta, and Sofía signalled colleagues’ traditionalism as a barrier for their work under this paradigm. For example, Nicole declared that many teachers in the School “still believe that knowledge is transferred” (I2, 02/06/2016). For Nicole, it was very difficult to establish a communicative atmosphere when students had just been taught by a traditionalist colleague. Because these students were desperate to release energy after sitting in silence for a long period, her active, more dialogic lessons became very chaotic. According to Nicole, this lack of coherence was “the great conflict of the School” (I2, 02/06/2016).

Patilla gave an explanation for this. He stated that CP had been undemocratically imposed by a small group of teachers who “speak the loudest (…) without listening to others’ opinion” (I2, 01/06/2016). For this reason, Patilla warned: “the socio-critical model will never be evidenced here”. Baseline data seem to refute this categorical statement. As mentioned before, teachers appeared ideologically aligned with CP, and, although occasional, some signs of CP were observed in their lessons. Also, teachers’ enrolment in this Programme spoke of their commitment to, or at least, a curiosity for CP.

Lack of time was also identified as a potential hindrance for teachers. Nicole admitted she was not knowledgeable about CP because she lacked time to read the theory (I2, 02/06/2016). Additionally, the vast majority of teachers (13) seemed dissatisfied with the time available to prepare for their lessons (Q2). This was the reason given by Andrea, Francesca, and Patilla for not including strategies like role-play that they felt could diversify their teaching to a greater extent (I2). This suggested that teachers might lack the time for planning and applying DiE lessons after the Workshop.

Finally, the School’s vulnerable context was an important factor recognised in the baseline data. On the one hand, this appeared to give meaning to the work of some teachers. Josefina, for example, said: “I’ve been asked a million times ‘would you work in a private school?’ No, never! (…) here you can really generate changes” (I2, 30/05/2016). On the other hand, teachers also reported difficulties associated with the School’s context. Laura and Cristián spoke about how students were apathetic towards schooling because of their socio-cultural background. Laura commented: “I say to students ‘you should go to university’, [and they reply] ‘and what for? It won’t change anything’” (I2, 03/06/2016). Similarly, for Cristián, students had a “mentality of immobility, like they will never get out of their environment” (I2, 09/06/2016). He found that a great difficulty when trying to change that mind-set was the rigidity of the school system:
“students spend eight hours, sometimes longer, sitting on chairs, in rough conditions, and that demotivates them”. This was substantiated by observational data. Students were seated for most of the lessons observed. At several moments, they seemed disengaged with the lessons. In lower-primary, students appeared to become physically restless when disinterested. In upper-primary and secondary, where lack of motivation seemed more frequent, students used their smartphones, talked, or doodled in their copybooks. The experience of schooling seemed disembodied and dissociated from these students’ lives (McLaren, 1988). However, in keeping with Cristián’s view, when active methodologies were applied, students’ engagement and participation levels increased. Again, this seemed promising for the teachers’ subsequent application of DiE to open up spaces for CP in their classrooms.

5.2.4. Summary

The data here provided an overview of the teachers’ beliefs and practices before the Workshop began. In terms of their familiarity with CP, two groups emerged. One was knowledgeable of, and explicitly committed to CP. The other, representing the majority, was only vaguely aware of this paradigm, and seemed to lean towards a constructivist model. Nevertheless, regardless of their level of familiarity with CP, data suggest that most teachers’ views were aligned with this paradigm. They valued establishing a communicative relationship with students, and placed importance on students’ out-of-school experiences and interests. Additionally, they seemed to adhere to the notion of conscientization.

But notwithstanding this ideological convergence, spaces for CP were opened only occasionally in the lessons observed. There was some evidence of promotion of dialogic classrooms. For example, non-authoritarian behaviour management was generally preferred by teachers. However, only a few based learning on students' experiences and interests. Fewer still problematized these through dialogic interchanges. Also, conscientization was fostered in a sustained way in only two lessons. Critical thinking, identified as a precursor of conscientization for children, was advanced by lower-primary teachers, but only at certain points of their lessons.

Perhaps not surprisingly, teachers who were knowledgeable about CP seemed to open up more spaces for it than teachers who were unfamiliar with the paradigm. Andrea and Francesca, both not very familiar with CP, stood apart by fostering critical thinking and problematizing dialogue in their lesson. However, they were an exception within the group of teachers less knowledgeable of CP. This suggests that greater awareness of the paradigm may lead to greater practice of it. This highlighted a need to examine CP theory at the start of the Workshop to support teachers’ later application of the paradigm through DiE.
The data also showed that, although some teachers used active methods in their observed lessons, DiE was an almost completely novel approach for the vast majority. This suggested the appropriateness of an “experiential” format for the Workshop (Girvan, Conneely, & Tangney, 2016, p. 129). As such, teachers would be able to see DiE strategies in action before bringing them to their classrooms in the following stage of the Programme.

Finally, baseline data identified factors that could impact teachers’ practice of CP and DiE. Lack of cohesion amongst the staff about CP and lack of time were identified as major factors. As the Head of TPU had previously declared (11, 26/05/2016), students’ demotivation was an important barrier. However, it was valuable to note that the occasional integration of active methodologies in the lessons observed appeared to enhance students’ motivation.
5.3. The Workshop

The Workshop introduced teachers to DiE as a teaching and learning methodology, inviting them to examine its potential for CP. Data were gathered via participant-observation field notes, video recording, photographs, and documents (work produced by the teachers). The Workshop consisted of 15 contact hours distributed into 5 sessions (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2. Workshop sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session number, date, and duration</th>
<th>Session title</th>
<th>Learning aims</th>
<th>Absentees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One, 30/06/2016, 3 hours</td>
<td>Reflecting about CP</td>
<td>A1) to critically reflect about our work as teachers; A2) to reflect about CP using a DiE methodology; and A3) to experience DiE as a methodology.</td>
<td>Patilla, Andrea, and Francesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two, 06/07/2016, 3 hours</td>
<td>Reflecting about CP – Demonstration Lesson Plan (DLP) 1: Antigone</td>
<td>A2 and A3 A4) to analyse the critical pedagogical potential of DiE; and A5) to discuss the theoretical framework of the study.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three, 07/07/2016, 5 hours</td>
<td>DLP2: Nutritionists – Drama games</td>
<td>A3, A4, and A5.</td>
<td>Laura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four, 25/07/2016, 2 hours</td>
<td>DLP3: A folktale’s alternative version</td>
<td>A3, A4, and A6) to understand guidelines for DiE practice.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five, 27/07/2016, 2 hours</td>
<td>Forum Theatre – Workshop’s evaluation</td>
<td>A3, A4, and A7) to reflect on the Workshop.</td>
<td>Michelle, Francesca, and Andrea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Workshop’s design is briefly explained first. Then, the Workshop’s data are presented chronologically (see lesson plans in Appendix A). The analysis focuses on the research question:

- What possibilities and challenges did teachers identify for opening up spaces for CP through DiE?

The following sub-questions also guide the analysis:

- How do teachers interpret CP?
- What factors affected the Programme’s capacity to guide teachers’ learning?

The section closes with concluding remarks about the main findings from this stage and about my role as facilitator of the Workshop.
5.3.1. Workshop design

DiE was a novel approach for the vast majority of teachers (see section 5.2). Therefore, an experiential format was adopted for the Workshop (Girvan et al., 2016). Such format allows teachers-as-learners to experience the new methodology directly, which can facilitate changes in subsequent practice (Girvan et al., 2016).

I designed three Demonstration Lesson Plans (DLP). These needed to address a variety of subject areas; integrate diverse DiE strategies; address the contents of the Chilean national curriculum (Ministerio de Educación, n.d.); and problematize these contents from a socio-political perspective. Addressing curricular contents from the Chilean curriculum aimed at increasing the relevancy of the various DiE approaches, mostly originated in foreign contexts (Finneran & Freebody, 2016a), so as to decrease the risk of colonialist imposition of these approaches on teachers. I adapted existing resources to meet these requirements for the humanities subject areas (Neelands, 2004a; Taylor, 2000). However, I found a dearth of DiE resources with a social justice angle in scientific areas. Hence, I created the DLP on Biology and Mathematics myself, inspired by a Mantle of the Expert approach (Heathcote & Bolton, 1994). The Workshop also included Boal’s (1993) Theatre of the Oppressed (TO) strategies as well as drama games, as will be described in the following subsections.

5.3.2. The sessions

5.3.2.1. Reflecting on Critical Pedagogy

Baseline data showed that teachers had diverse views on, and levels of familiarity with CP. Hence, the Workshop opened with a collective examination of this paradigm. The aim was to facilitate access to CP theory for those unfamiliar with it. This section also aimed at enabling a discussion about the interpretations of CP amongst those teachers more knowledgeable with the paradigm. For this, a sequence of image theatre exercises was applied (Boal, 2002). Teachers created still-images where they represented concepts using their bodies. This opened up reflection on the teachers’ roles as educators and on the meaning of CP.

At the end of session one, teachers chose one of seven quotes provided about CP, forming groups accordingly. They represented the quotes through still-images and verbalisations. Interestingly, those teachers more familiar with CP focused on the notion of conscientization. This was the case for Inés and Sofía, for example (see Figure 5.11).
Selected quote: “Students should be made aware of the ideological and structural forces that promote needless human suffering while also recognizing that it takes more than awareness to resolve them” (Giroux, 2013a, pp. 31, my translation).

Still-image: A person kneeling looking at a book. Another person on a chair with a foot over the other’s back, throwing a banknote and a mobile phone.

Verbalisation: Sofía - “conscientization”
Inés - “alienation”.

Figure 5.11. Still-image by Inés and Sofía

On the other hand, teachers like Nicole and Bernarda seemed more interested in the notion of dialogic classrooms than in a criticism of social injustices (see Figure 5.12).

Selected quote: “Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferrals of information” (Freire, 2000b, p. 79).

Still-image: Two people sitting, each holding pieces of Lego, building together.

Verbalisation: Both - “to construct not to transfer”.

Figure 5.12. Still-image by Nicole and Bernarda

As mentioned in Chapter Two, establishing dialogic classrooms is an aim shared both by CP and constructivism (Breunig, 2011). This explains why teachers who seemed more aligned with constructivism during the baseline stage, like Nicole, were now attracted by this element of CP. In fact, Nicole explained their choice of quote saying: “we were drawn by its constructivist element” (research journal, 30/06/2016). This aspect of CP seemed to be more accessible and acceptable to teachers who were unfamiliar with the paradigm.

Teachers’ diverse stances on CP were evidenced through the image making activities. Additionally, they showed how spaces for critical reflection could be opened up by engaging with
aesthetic form (Pompeo Nogueira, 2015). An illustration of this occurred when analysing the still-image described in Figure 5.13.

Selected quote: The educator “has the duty of not being neutral.” (Horton & Freire, 1990, p. 180).

Still-image: Two persons standing side by side holding books in front of their faces. Another person standing in front of both, pointing to one of the books.

Verbalisation: Cristián and Tamara - “we are not neutral”.

Figure 5.13. Still-image by Violeta, Cristián, and Tamara

Teachers argued over the meaning of the two individuals standing with books in front of their faces. For Sofía, Gonzalo, and Nicole, they did not represent people, but pedagogical choices. Contrastingly for Michelle, these figures signified short-sighted people: “if she covers her face with the book she is only seeing what is in the book, which might be right, (…) but she is blinded to other options” (video, 30/06/2016). This led to a consideration of the risk of assuming positions uncritically, even when advocating for CP. In later comments, teachers valued how the multiple interpretations of the still-images allowed rich reflection to emerge. The use of body, voice, and props turned still-images into codifications of teachers’ educational views (Pompeo Nogueira, 2002).

The exploration of CP continued during the first part of session two. This opened with my presentation of the study’s developing theoretical framework. Based on this, teachers stated their own definitions of critical pedagogues through visual representations. Being reflective, conscious, and dialogic were amongst the most commonly mentioned traits of a critical educator (video, 06/07/2016). Again, a distinction emerged in the teachers’ definitions of critical pedagogues. Those more knowledgeable of CP emphasised its social justice orientation, whereas those less familiar with CP highlighted the dialogic model of teaching and learning.

Time constraints prevented a deeper comparison of specific views on CP. However, I evaluated this first segment of the Workshop positively. Teachers experienced first-hand the reflective potential of DiE. Also, a dialogue emerged around the study’s theoretical framework and the teachers’ understandings of CP. This served as a basis for discussion during the rest of the Workshop.
5.3.2.2. Demonstration Lesson Plan 1: Antigone

The first DLP, applied at the end of session two, was based on Neelands’ (2004a) scheme of work on Antigone (Sophocles, 2006). It addressed the subjects of Language and Communication, Arts, and History, Geography, and Social Sciences, at secondary level.

Through a whoosh! convention, teachers mimed my narration of the tragedy. This was followed by a conscience alley strategy. Here, teachers argued about Antigone’s decision on whether or not to bury her brother against the King’s command. Overall, teachers were highly participative and enthusiastic in these initial activities. Finally, teachers experienced teacher-in-role and hot-seating strategies. I assumed the role of the King and teachers took on the role of his council, who advised him on Antigone’s punishment. In general, teachers entered the convention seamlessly, using a formal tone and presenting convincing arguments. This DLP opened up spaces for discussion on issues like power relations and gender norms.

The session concluded with a brief whole-group reflection. Teachers highlighted the fostering of argumentation skills through conscience alley. A few also envisioned future applications of the strategies. Teachers also foresaw difficulties in DiE. One mentioned peer-teasing as a possible hindrance for students’ participation in the whoosh! strategy. A few others noted that unfamiliarity with the story explored might hinder students’ participation (video, 06/07/2016). These comments questioned whether a safe and equal space for participation could be established through DiE. For Inés, a solution for this was mixing DiE with more traditional methods. This suggested a lack of trust in DiE as a standalone methodology at this stage, which seemed to influence Inés’ work later in the Programme, as will be explained in section 5.4.

Overall, DLP1 fulfilled its aims. Teachers engaged with the strategies and began to envision possibilities and challenges for future DiE practice in their classrooms.

5.3.2.3. Demonstration Lesson Plan 2: Nutritionists

In session three, DLP2 was applied. It addressed curricular contents from Biology and Mathematics for an upper-primary class through an approach inspired by Mantle of the Expert (MoE) (Heathcote & Bolton, 1994). I framed teachers as nutritionists and assumed the role of their supervisor. As recommended by Heathcote and Bolton (1994), teachers established the fictional context collaboratively through introductory activities. In-role, I asked teachers-as-nutritionists to help an adolescent suffering from bulimia. Teachers used mathematical formulas to calculate the adolescent’s health condition. The DLP concluded when nutritionists presented a meal plan to the patient’s mother. Violeta assumed the role of the mother, demonstrating a student-in-role strategy.
She represented a hardworking single mother from a lower socioeconomic background, displaying great in-role belief. In general, teachers seemed to engage authentically with the fiction. They critically discussed the media’s influence on body image and the precarious situation of lower-income families, like the ones they worked with in the School.

When reflecting on this activity, Inés valued its connection with socio-political issues. For her, it is teachers’ “ethical role” to promote an analysis of capitalism’s influence on culture (video 07/07/16). Violeta also valued the interdisciplinary potential of MoE. However, Sofía critiqued the plan saying that the links between areas were slightly forced (video 07/07/2016). Moreover, she questioned the theme’s appeal for students. Sofía’s remark addressed my apprehensions about this DLP, as it was the only one I created entirely myself. From a practitioner’s point of view, this was challenging. However, DLP2’s shortcomings kindled a rich discussion. Teachers reflected about the interplay of teachers’ goals and students’ “generative themes” (Freire, 2000b, p. 103). For Michelle and Inés, students’ interests can be restricted by their socio-cultural background. Hence, it was sometimes necessary to go “beyond students’ interests”, choosing topics that promoted criticality (Inés, video 07/07/2016). Still, teachers agreed that, even when topics did not speak to students’ interests, they had to be made interesting for them, otherwise engagement levels would drop. This relates to the “delicate balance” Bolton (1979) advocates between “the play for the children” and “the play for the teacher” (p. 51). To achieve this balance, teachers concurred that time was needed to plan meaningful lessons for students. Time was signalled as a crucial factor for teachers’ prospective application of DiE.

After DLP2, I further presented the study’s theoretical framework on DiE and its connection with CP. A debate emerged around the notion of conscientization. Patilla questioned teachers’ right to determine what counts as socially just and unjust, echoing postmodern criticisms of CP (Greenhalgh-Spencer, 2014). Violeta retorted that critical pedagogues do not try to impose their views on students. Rather, they make traditionally marginalised knowledge visible to students. They also make their own stance known, but, according to Violeta, without a proselytising effort. Here, Cristián and Michelle posed a caveat. Cristián warned about the greater weight that teachers’ opinions could have on vulnerable students. For Michelle, especially for young children, a teacher’s word can be “the truth” (video 07/07/2016). Both teachers seemed concerned about the risk of indoctrination in CP, which could occur even despite the teacher’s intention. The group seemed to resolve that fostering critical thinking from the early years onwards was a solution to this. In this way, students would learn to question others’ opinions, even their teachers’. This corroborated the idea of critical thinking being a precursor to conscientization. This discussion concluded with a consideration of the teacher-in-role strategy, advanced as a valuable way of “uncrowning” the teacher (Neelands, 2009, p. 183). Its potential for a non-indoctrinating CP was envisioned by the teachers.
Session three concluded with several drama games, which were valued by teachers as ways to raise students’ motivation. Overall, session three reached its aims. More reflective dialogue emerged here, in comparison to previous sessions. This was probably due to its longer duration as teachers had numerous chances for reflecting on the potential of DiE for CP.

5.3.2.4. Demonstration Lesson Plan 3: An alternative version of a folktale

The third and final DLP was based on a plan by Taylor (2000). It explored Scieszka’s (1996) alternative version of The Three Little Pigs. The original version of this tale is well-known in Chile. This DLP questioned stereotypical views and was linked to the areas of Language and Communication and Orientation (Chilean equivalent to the subject area of Social, Personal, and Health Education in Ireland), at primary level.

I became the Head of a Law Firm and framed teachers as attorneys defending the Wolf, who was accused of murdering the piglets. After deciding on a defence strategy, a role-play was enacted. In pairs, teachers-in-role as attorneys interviewed teachers-in-role as witnesses. Teachers then took on the role of the pigs. In small groups, they created two still-images showing the pigs’ opinion of the Wolf before and after the defence attorneys’ campaign to clean up his public image. During rehearsals, teachers seemed more aware of their expressivity and spatial positioning in comparison to previous sessions. This suggested that they had understood the importance of form to convey meaning in DiE. Also, a critical stance was visible in their creations. For instance, Andrea, Francesca, Michelle, and Laura represented politician pigs whose power was threatened by the Wolf’s campaign (video, 25/07/2016). Here, I introduced the strategy of thought-tracking, whereby members of a still-image voice their role’s thoughts when tapped on the shoulder. This strategy gave everyone the opportunity to speak, adding layers of meaning to their pieces.

Teachers who had been mostly quiet during whole-group conversation, like Andrea and Tamara, participated actively in pair and small-group work (video, 25/07/2016). It seemed that the greater intimacy of the smaller groups suited these teachers better. Thus, the varied format of DiE activities allowed the emergence of “multiple avenues of engagement” (Winston, 2004, p. 21). This expanded possibilities for equal participation. However, there was no time to reflect on this potential of DiE. The session concluded with a rushed theoretical presentation on planning and practice of DiE, which I was unable to finish. I shared this presentation’s file with teachers, so they could view it later individually. However, it would have been valuable to discuss this information collectively. This could have eased the teachers’ subsequent integration of DiE in their classrooms.

Session four’s aims were only partially achieved. Teachers’ experience of DLP3 seemed valuable as it modelled a fruitful DiE encounter. Session four was conducted after the two-week Winter break, but that gap in time did not seem to affect teachers’ engagement or disposition. However,
the brevity of this lesson did seem to have an impact. Unlike session three, there was little time for reflection about DiE’s potential for CP. Lack of time and my time management deficiencies prevented teachers from making sense collectively of the rich experience of DLP3.

5.3.2.5. Forum theatre

In session five, teachers worked through a forum theatre-inspired method (Boal, 1993). In small groups, teachers confidentially discussed oppressive situations they had experienced or witnessed. Each group selected a situation and rehearsed an improvised representation of it. Figure 5.14, Figure 5.15 and Figure 5.16 show images from the resulting scenes.

Figure 5.14. Forum, scene one, centred on gender oppression

Figure 5.15. Forum, scene two, centred on class-based oppression
Following Boal (1993), spectating teachers were invited to become spect-actors: to disarm the oppressive situations by replacing the oppressed protagonists. This opened spaces for critical reflection about the impossibility of liberating others. Teachers also pondered on the value of small transformations even when the oppressive macro-structure remained unchanged. These comments resonate with Freirean CP, as presented in Chapter Two (Shor & Freire, 1987). This segment closed with a brief reflection, where teachers spoke about prospective applications of forum theatre in their lessons. Humanities teachers seemed to find more usefulness in this approach than science teachers. Some contents in the Biology syllabus, like sexuality or substance abuse, seemed to them more amenable for being addressed through this strategy. However, they doubted its utility for more abstract contents. This parallels my own difficulty when designing a DLP for scientific areas.

5.3.2.6. Evaluating the five day Workshop

The Workshop concluded with an active evaluation of the sessions. On a mind-map, teachers wrote anonymous comments about each session. Responding to session one teachers wrote: “How should an ideal teacher be?” and “Am I moulding to the system?” (Document W.5.1, 27/07/2016). These questions evidence critical reflection about their work as teachers, which was an aim of that session. Session one also elicited remarks about CP. One teacher valued the diversity of stances on CP, seeing them as joined by a “shared horizon”. Contrastingly, another teacher seemed to criticise this diversity, writing that “stances could be clarified in terms of the paradigms that define us”. These remarks epitomise the lack of coherence around CP that was identified in the baseline data and in previous sessions.

The forum theatre activity provoked commentaries like: “you cannot liberate anyone” and “can we change the world?” (Document W.5.5, 27/07/2016). These further attested the approach’s value
for stirring critical reflection. However, when commenting on the DLPs, only two remarks spoke about DiE’s power to address socio-political issues and to elicit critical judgements, linked with the fostering of conscientization (Document W.5.4, 27/07/2016). Contrastingly, six notes valued DiE for developing dialogic classrooms (Document W.5.3, 27/07/2016). For instance, teachers’ participation alongside students when teaching through DiE was mentioned. DiE was described as a way of empowering students and addressing their interests and previous knowledge.

Only two notes identified challenges in the practice of DiE. These reiterated apprehensions stated before. One referred to how different levels of knowledge in students could affect their participation (Document W.5.2, 27/07/2016), and the other expressed concern about the complexity of creating engaging experiences for students (Document W.5.3, 27/07/2016). However, these were exceptions amongst generally favourable comments about DiE.

Finally, teachers also noted ideas about future applications of DiE. For example, they suggested using teacher-in-role and hot-seating to interview historical figures (Document W.5.2, 27/07/2016). Another teacher proposed adapting forum theatre to approach scenes from the cinema or a play (Document W.5.6, 27/07/2016). These ideas were seeds for subsequent work, as will be seen in section 5.4.

To conclude the Workshop, we discussed the following stages of the Programme. All teachers said they wanted to continue participating. This suggests that they had found value in DiE for their practices. However, despite this initial enthusiasm, not all the teachers actively participated in the Application Stage. As will be noted when reporting on the Follow-up data in section 5.5, lack of time appeared to be the main reason preventing some teachers from collaborating with me in the subsequent stage.

5.3.3. Conclusions

Overall, the Workshop fulfilled its aims. Firstly, it allowed teachers to collectively explore the notion of CP. As a result, teachers’ diverse interpretations of CP became evident. Two main groups were recognised. Teachers who appeared knowledgeable about CP in the baseline data (Inés, Sofía, Michelle, Gonzalo, and Violeta) seemed more drawn to its conscientization principle and highlighted the critical pedagogue’s mission of transforming the curriculum to address social justice issues. On the other hand, teachers who had reported being less familiar with CP appeared to focus on the creation of dialogic classrooms. They emphasised student-centredness and collaborative construction of knowledge between teachers and students. This principle of CP appeared to be more palatable to teachers in this latter majority group. This can be attributed to their general allegiance with constructivism, a paradigm that also advances student-centredness (Breunig, 2011). This may explain why in teachers’ concluding comments about DiE’s potential
for CP, DiE’s value for enabling dialogic classrooms was more prominent than its power to elicit critical reflection about socio-political issues.

These two stances on CP led me to question my own understanding of the paradigm. Following Freire (Shor & Freire, 1987), I did not see the fostering of dialogic classrooms as an end-goal. Rather, it was a means towards conscientization. This placed me closer to the first group of teachers mentioned above. However, the Workshop made me consider how in a vulnerable context such as this, empowering students to be at the centre of the educational encounter could be a critical pedagogical act (Breunig, 2011). Dismissing that aspect of teachers’ interpretation of CP seemed authoritarian on my part. I realised the importance of respecting teachers’ positions and avoiding imposing my own in future stages of the Programme. Importantly, a dialogue between my constructs on CP – grounded on my initial review of literature – and the teachers’ began to emerge.

Additionally, the Workshop allowed teachers to experience a variety of DiE strategies. This enabled them to analyse possibilities and challenges for opening up spaces for CP through DiE. Teachers identified several ways in which DiE could help them enact CP: by approaching curricular contents critically; by increasing motivation and empowerment in students; and by defying teacher-students’ authoritarian hierarchies. Teachers also highlighted the value of DiE’s aesthetic form for eliciting critical reflection, which relates to the idea of theatrical codifications explored in the Literature Review (Pompeo Nogueira, 2002).

Possible challenges were also recognised. Time limitations to plan meaningful DiE lessons was seen as an important challenge. Also, some teachers mentioned peer-teasing and students’ unequal participation in the DiE activities as prospective hindrances. Despite finding educational value in DiE, these teachers seemed anxious about the effect that this methodology could have on classroom dynamics. This implied that, in order to try out this novel approach, a risk-taking capacity would be required of teachers. Such a capacity could motivate them to disrupt and unsettle their usual classroom practices.

The teachers’ learning experience was affected by my planning and facilitation of the Workshop. Overall, planning seems to have been fruitful. The structure of activities gradually increased the dramatic demands placed on teachers. Although there were errors in the planning of DLP3, its shortcomings kindled reflection about the challenges of DiE amongst teachers. In general, my facilitation was appropriate. This is attested to by the high number of teachers motivated to collaborate with me in applying DiE in their own classrooms afterwards. However, I continuously ran out of time in the sessions. This decreased the chances for reflection where teachers could have collectively made sense of DiE and CP. As will be seen in the next section, this deeply impacted their subsequent practice of DiE.
5.4. **Application stage**

In this stage, teachers and I coplanned and cotaught lessons where DiE was applied. This stage aimed at supporting teachers’ practical integration and development of what they learnt during the Workshop. As mentioned in Chapter Four, I describe the processes of coplanning and coteaching without the hyphen following Murphy and Martin (2015). As these authors explain, the terms ‘co-planning’ and ‘co-teaching’ can entail a vertical relationship between teachers of different degrees of expertise. In this Programme, the intention was to establish a collaboration between teachers and myself as professionals with different but equally valuable areas of expertise. The idea of coteaching also implies promoting dialogic classrooms (Murphy & Martin, 2015), which is aligned with CP and, therefore, relevant for this study.

Eight of the 15 teachers accepted my invitation to collaborate in this stage of the Programme. The two Special Educational Needs (SEN) Specialists (Tamara and Cristián) participated intermittently. For this reason, I focus the following analysis on the work of the eight teachers who actively engaged in this stage.

The section begins by briefly looking at coplanning, then analysing observational data from the DiE lessons where teachers and I collaborated. Students’ views of these lessons are presented and interpreted next. The section closes with my analysis of the eight teachers’ perceptions of the DiE lessons.

### 5.4.1. **Coplanning**

The coplanning process occurred over a period of approximately two months. Table 5.3 summarises the characteristics of this process.
Table 5.3. Overview of coplanning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>No. of lessons coplanned</th>
<th>Subject/level</th>
<th>Coplanning meetings</th>
<th>Who suggested the DiE strategies used?</th>
<th>Did teachers suggest socio-political focus?</th>
<th>Part of lesson where DiE was included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violeta</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Language and Literature/Upper-secondary</td>
<td>08/08/2016</td>
<td>Violeta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patilla</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>17/08/2016</td>
<td>Patilla</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Natural Sciences/ lower-primary</td>
<td>22/08/2016</td>
<td>Shared authorship</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beginning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Biology/ lower-secondary</td>
<td>25/08/2016</td>
<td>Shared authorship</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beginning, development, and closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalo</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>History, Geography, and Social Sciences (HGSS) / lower-secondary</td>
<td>31/08/2016</td>
<td>I did</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beginning, development, and closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Mathematics / upper-primary</td>
<td>06/09/2016</td>
<td>I did</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Beginning, development, and closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofía</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>Language and Communication/ lower-primary</td>
<td>09/09/2016</td>
<td>I did</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beginning, development, and closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inés</td>
<td>Five</td>
<td>HGSS / lower-secondary</td>
<td>13/09/2016 27/09/2016</td>
<td>Shared authorship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I met each teacher individually at least once. This was complemented by personal communications via e-mail and phone. Data from coplanning meetings were gathered through my field-notes. Also, documents in the form of lesson plans written by me, by the teachers, or by both, are also analysed. Coplanning data will be presented thematically, concluding with a brief summary.

5.4.1.1. Teachers' different needs and preferences when coplanning

In our meetings, all teachers seemed enthusiastic about applying DiE. However, they responded differently to the coplanning process. Gonzalo, Sofía, and Nicole asked me to suggest DiE lesson plans, which we refined in our meetings. With Laura and with Josefina, on the other hand, the work was somewhat more collaborative, as we drafted the lesson plans together. In contrast, my contribution to Patilla's planning was minor. In our meeting, we only discussed general ideas for addressing contents. Similarly, Violeta had already drafted lesson plans when we met. Hence, I
only offered feedback and recommendations. Finally, planning with Inés was mixed. She planned
two lessons independently, requesting only my feedback. Her three other lessons were planned
collaboratively. This demonstrates that teachers had diverse support requirements throughout the
coplanning process.

There were also differences around the leadership of the DiE activities, particularly the use of
teacher-in-role. Some teachers, like Inés and Gonzalo, seemed keen to experiment with this
strategy themselves. Others, like Nicole and Sofía, asked me to assume fictional roles. This
highlights teachers’ different risk-taking dispositions. It could also reflect that teachers like Nicole
and Sofía wanted to make the most of my presence in the classroom.

As visible in Table 5.3 above, teachers integrated DiE at different moments of their lessons. Inés
was particularly adamant about incorporating DiE “only for the development” phase (personal
communication, 31/07/2016). I encouraged her to use DiE more extensively, but she wanted to
maintain her habitual lesson-structure (research journal, 13/09/2016). Others, like Laura and
Gonzalo, planned complete lessons through DiE and seemed more flexible and receptive to
altering their usual structures. However, all but Patilla and Sofía planned their DiE lessons around
curricular contents which students had already been introduced to through
more traditional
methods. Most teachers appeared to regard DiE as a useful approach to deepen the analysis of
contents, but not to introduce them for the first time. This might also have been a reflection of the
level of confidence teachers had as novice DiE practitioners. Also noteworthy is that most teachers
already had a thematic plan for the year. This meant that their planning had to respond to specific
curricular contents that needed to be taught within a given timeframe. This seemed to restrict the
topics that they could address through DiE, which, as will be discussed in Chapter Six, affected the
degree of thematic relevance of the DiE lessons for students.

Following the cooperative spirit of coplanning, I attempted to welcome and respond to teachers’
diverse needs and preferences. As with Inés, I tried to gently push teachers out of their comfort
zones. However, I avoided pressing too much, understanding that DiE can be intimidating for
newcomers (Beehner, 1990). Still, teachers might have needed more prompting on my part to
encourage them to take greater risks with DiE.

5.4.1.2. Transformation of the curriculum from a critical perspective

As Table 5.3 shows, five teachers suggested socio-political angles to address curricular contents.
Of these, four had seemed particularly committed to CP before the Workshop. Their pre-existing
allegiance to CP appeared to lead them to transform the curriculum from a critical standpoint, as
transformative intellectuals do (Giroux, 1988). Patilla was an exception, as he was not part of the
group of teachers knowledgeable and committed to CP. He went from disassociating himself with CP before the Workshop (Q2), to incorporating a critical focus in his teaching of Technology. He wanted to transform the National Curriculum by working “with Critical Theory” (personal communication, 11/08/2016). For this, he applied DiE to question students about “what has been gained and lost culturally with the emergence of social networks?” This suggested that the Workshop experience led Patilla to embrace CP as a valuable paradigm.

Besides sharing a critical stance, these five teachers were also united in that they planned DiE lessons to teach humanities. In contrast, those who planned science lessons did not add a socio-political angle to their lessons. Moreover, unlike the others, these teachers had seemed less interested in the conscientizing potential of DiE in previous stages of the Programme (see sections 5.2 and 5.3). I was also unable to suggest relevant critical angles. As when planning the Workshop, I found it difficult to problematize abstract scientific contents (e.g. cellular specialization), from a critical perspective. My lack of previous experience working with scientific areas as an Applied Theatre practitioner was an adverse factor here.

### 5.4.1.3. Conclusions

In this study, coplanning was experienced as a collaborative process. I contributed my DiE experience while teachers contributed their pedagogical expertise and knowledge of their students. In this way, the process was aligned with the reflective contract between practitioners and researchers described by Schön (1983). The dialogic collaboration I aimed for seemed to be achieved. However, I question whether I encouraged teachers enough to take risks and to be flexible about their usual structures. I also question whether my level and areas of expertise as an Applied Theatre practitioner were enough to successfully support teachers’ planning and subsequent practice. This will be further assessed when looking at other datasets.

In general, during coplanning there was no evidence of teachers having changed their previous stances regarding CP as a result of the Workshop. An exception was Patilla, who radically altered his view of CP and decided to problematize the curriculum from a critical stance. However, other teachers who were not closely committed to CP originally seemed to put less emphasis on the promotion of critical reflection. Coincidentally, these teachers were also those who planned science lessons. Teachers also showed different levels of flexibility and risk-taking capacity. The practical impact of these differences during coplanning on the opening of spaces for CP through DiE will be analysed next.
5.4.2. Classroom observations of Drama in Education lessons

Classroom observations occurred from August to mid-October, 2016. 17 lessons of 90 minutes each were observed (see Table 5.4). I co-taught 14 of those lessons.

Table 5.4. Classroom Observations - Stage of Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Curricular contents</th>
<th>Date of observation</th>
<th>DiE strategies used/adapted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violeta</td>
<td>Language and Literature</td>
<td>Upper-secondary</td>
<td>Argumentation; Film analysis</td>
<td>24/08/2016 14/09/2016 28/09/2016</td>
<td>Teacher-in-role (TiR), role-play, forum theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>Cellular specialisation</td>
<td>06/09/2016 (with Cristián at the beginning) 13/09/2016 (with Cristián)</td>
<td>Games, still-image, TiR, hot-seating, Mantle of the Expert (MoE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patilla</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>The technological object</td>
<td>25/08/2016 05/10/2016 (both non-participant)</td>
<td>TiR, games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefina</td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Lower-primary</td>
<td>Digestion</td>
<td>30/08/2016</td>
<td>Puppet show, body-machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofía</td>
<td>Language and Communication</td>
<td>Lower-primary</td>
<td>Fables</td>
<td>03/10/2016 (with Tamara)</td>
<td>Still-image, role-play improvisation, whoosh!, TiR, hot-seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalo</td>
<td>History, Geography, and Social Sciences (HGSS)</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>World War II (WWII)</td>
<td>03/10/2016 (with Cristián) 07/10/2016 (with Cristián)</td>
<td>Still-image, TiR, role-play, writing-in-role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Upper-primary</td>
<td>Angles</td>
<td>14/09/2016</td>
<td>Games, TiR, role-play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inés</td>
<td>HGSS</td>
<td>Lower-secondary</td>
<td>Chilean Colony; Chilean Independence</td>
<td>01/08/2016 (non-participant) 08/08/2016 03/10/2016 11/10/2016</td>
<td>Still-images, thought-tracking, TiR, student-in-role, hot-seating, role-play, conscience alley, games</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lessons provided empirical evidence to address the research questions:
• Did Drama in Education (DiE) open up spaces for Critical Pedagogy (CP) in these teachers’ classrooms? How? What factors facilitated/hindered the development of these spaces?

Data is presented systematically. For each teacher, a brief description of the lessons is provided focusing on critical events (Wragg, 1999) of relevance to the research questions. An analysis of the ways in which spaces for CP were opened in each teacher’s practice is presented. The subsection concludes with an overview of the critical pedagogical value of the DiE experiences observed in these teachers’ classrooms.

5.4.2.1. Violeta (Language and Literature – upper-secondary)

The DiE lessons

Violeta and I cotaught three DiE lessons. The first focused on Antigone (Sophocles, 2006) and aimed at developing argumentation skills. A teacher-in-role strategy was applied after Violeta summarised the tragedy’s plot. I assumed the role of Creon, Violeta took the role of Creon’s Supreme Advisor, and students worked in-role as Creon’s council with the task of advising him on Antigone’s punishment. In general, students seemed favourably disposed towards the role-play. Lively dialogue emerged where around 80% of students intervened. In-role, several students exercised their critical thinking skills by looking at different angles of the problem while Violeta actively moderated the discussion from within her role. Violeta evaluated positively the students’ levels of engagement and fulfilment of the lesson’s learning goal (research journal, 24/08/2016).

Violeta’s second DiE lesson aimed at analysing oppressive situations shown in the film Mona Lisa Smile (Johanson & Newell, 2003), which centres on gender inequality. In small groups, students selected a scene from the film that exhibited an oppressive situation and rehearsed an improvised representation of it. A productive and enthusiastic atmosphere ensued, with Violeta supporting students’ creative process actively. The resulting scenes displayed a sufficient standard of performance skills. However, a comedic intention was palpable in the scenes, differing distinctly from the original film’s tone. Importantly, there were very few connections made between the scenes and students’ own lives, and Violeta and I did not look for opportunities during the lesson to probe these further. A light-hearted rather than reflective stance was perceivable in the classroom, which persisted through most of the remaining work. Finally, students and teachers chose a scene to work on using an adaptation of Boal’s (2002) forum theatre strategy. The selected scene showed a young woman being scolded by her parents for leaving her unfaithful husband. The original plan was to intervene in the scene during this second lesson, but this was postponed due to time constraints.
The final lesson happened after a two-week school break. The selected scene was presented and students as spect-actors were invited to disarm the oppressive situation. Realising that they would have to act on their suggestions, students seemed hesitant to comment. Only four students intervened in the scene. Most of them appeared to be trying to provoke laughter in their classmates, for example, through double entendre statements. Violeta did not challenge these interventions and my attempts at posing reflective questions were stifled by my lack of rapport with the class.

However, a space for critical reflection was opened when a female student replaced the oppressed young woman. Figure 5.17 shows a photograph and a transcription of the improvised dialogue that ensued.

5.17.1. SiR-young woman (intervener): (to the husband) Don’t touch me!
5.17.2. SiR-mother: Obey your mother!
5.17.3. SiR-father: Obey your father!
5.17.4. SiR-husband: Obey your husband!
(…)
5.17.5. SiR-young woman (intervener): You want me to be like you?
5.17.6. SiR-mother: Yes.
5.17.7. SiR-young woman (intervener): So then I have to let them beat me and trample me?
(video, 28/09/2016)

Figure 5.17. Student’s intervention in Violeta’s forum theatre adaptation

As lines 5.17.2, 5.17.3, and 5.17.4 show, students identified multiple sources of oppression affecting the young woman. Additionally, the responses given by the student-in-role as the young woman (lines 5.17.5 and 5.17.7) evidence a criticism of the reproduction of machismo by women (the mother) over other women (the young woman). Here, students seemed to engage more authentically with the problem, reflecting through role. However, this was an exception to an otherwise persistent superficial engagement with the material which Violeta and I were unable to challenge.

The lesson finished without sufficient time for final reflections. Violeta noted that she was not pleased with this lesson. Although students had been entertained and focused, the learning aims of critical analysis were not met (research journal, 28/09/2016).
Spaces for CP

Some spaces for CP were opened in Violeta’s DiE lessons. Both in her baseline lesson (research journal, 24/06/2016) and in her DiE lessons, Violeta aimed at promoting critical consciousness of gender inequalities. However, DiE established a more dialogic and motivating atmosphere. Violeta’s stance was also more communicative. Whereas in her baseline lesson she had only occasionally checked on students’ progress, here she intervened much more actively and supportively. Additionally, the collective work in her first and second DiE lessons raised students’ levels of participation, as it seemed to offer them a safer, non-exposed platform of involvement. In contrast, being singled out as the interventor in the forum theatre-inspired exercise and exposed to the limelight in front of peers seemed to threaten some students, hindering equal participation.

Spaces for CP were opened in terms of development of critical thinking (particularly in Violeta’s first DiE lesson) and, to a lesser degree, of critical reflection about sexism (Violeta’s second and third DiE lessons). At some points, role-taking appears to have given students an engaged distance from where to analyse these problems from multiple perspectives. However, the forum theatre-inspired approach was mostly unconducive of critical reflection. Whereas in Boal’s (2002) original approach the scene presents issues of great relevance for the audience, in Violeta’s adaptation, the material was foreign and imposed on students. Additionally, the lessons’ structure did not help students make connections between the material and their own lives, as it lacked introductory activities that eased students into role (Bolton & Davis, 2010). Violeta and I were unable to promote these connections through fruitful questioning and challenging of unauthentic responses (Heathcote, 2015d). This was due to my lack of rapport with the class and Violeta’s apparent lack of expertise with questioning in this methodology. Lacking an emotional and intellectual investment with the oppressive situation explored, students’ analysis remained superficial. The two-week break between lessons two and three also thwarted incipient levels of reflexivity. In general, the experience was entertaining, but not critically reflective (McLaren, 1988).

5.4.2.2. Laura (Biology – lower-secondary)

The DiE lessons

Laura and I cotaught two DiE lessons. Both aimed at strengthening students’ understanding of cellular specialisation. Lesson one opened with a warm-up game followed by a still-image activity. Students seemed reticent at first, but interest arose slowly and most participated actively. However, around one fifth of students remained as observers. Students in small groups were assigned a specific cell and asked to create a still-image that represented it. Levels of student engagement were varied during rehearsals and presentations. While some groups presented well-
rehearsed still-images, the work of others seemed improvised and one group refused to present arguing that they had nothing prepared. Seeing this, Laura joined this group and helped them create an effective still-image to share with the class. Rather than sculpting or instructing them, Laura posed effective questions and motivated students to be the main architects of their still-image, giving the lesson a favourable conclusion. Later on, Laura commented that she was impressed by the students’ active participation, which had greatly surpassed her expectations (research journal, 06/09/2016).

Lesson two began with an energetic chair swapping game based on cell specialisation, after which a Mantle of the Expert (MoE) type approach was applied. Laura put on a lab coat and a stethoscope around her neck and, in-role, she framed students as her colleagues at a Medical Diagnostics Unit. Students seemed surprised by their teacher’s change of role, but they entered the fictitious context without challenging it. I assumed the role of a patient and, through a hot-seating strategy, students-in-role as doctors interviewed me about my symptoms, identified which cell was malfunctioning, and recommended treatment. A dynamic dialogue arose. Here, several students who had been reluctant to participate before asked questions and ventured diagnostics. This suggests that the activity captured their interest and offered a safer space of participation. When compared with the previous activities, MoE and hot-seating appeared to be better received by the majority of the class. This can be explained because here the focus was on the teacher-in-role rather than on students. This might have diminished their feelings of anxiety about looking foolish in front of peers, unlike the games and the still-image activity, where they were the centre of attention.

During hot-seating, a key incident took place. In-role as the patient, I explained that I felt nauseated. One student-in-role as a doctor asked if I was pregnant and another laughed. As the Head of the Diagnostics Unit, Laura reprimanded the latter student whilst remaining in role, questioning his professionalism. This gave way to a cheerful but not jesting mood, and students approached the rest of the activity with a more committed posture. This positive reception of the rebuke seems to have been due to Laura issuing it in-role. The distance endowed by the fictional context seemed to prevent the reprimand from being perceived by the student as a personal scolding. Instead of alienating this student, the reprimand strengthened the truthfulness of the fiction while modelling the type of engagement that was expected of students (Heathcote, 1984h).

Finally, students replicated the hot-seating experience in small groups. They seemed very engaged by the activity and expressed comments such as “this lesson is good” and “it’s entertaining; it’s like pretending to be doctors” (research journal, 13/09/2016). The vast majority of them participated and only a couple remained as observers. The lesson closed with students sharing their diagnostics in plenary (whole-group discussion) and speaking as-if they were doctors, further corroborating the general commitment to the fiction.
Afterwards, Laura stated: “the last lesson accomplished 70% of the goals, but this one accomplished them 100%” (research journal, 13/09/2016). For her, the lesson addressed academic contents effectively from within a motivating fictitious context. She also valued her greater leadership of this lesson. Whereas lesson one was mostly led by me, Laura chose to guide most of lesson two’s activities. She acknowledged that her confidence in leading DiE had increased as a result of this experience.

**Spaces for CP**

Laura’s DiE lessons opened up spaces for CP by creating a dialogic learning experience. Laura’s active collaboration with students established a collegial relationship in the classroom, blurring, to an extent, the traditional distinctions between teacher and students (Freire, 2000b). She displayed flexibility in her planning, responding to students’ emerging needs. She also made fruitful use of questioning to guide students without thwarting their creativity. Being in-role enabled Laura to model behaviour and engagement and to assert her authority in non-authoritarian ways (Heathcote, 1984h). This is radically different from Laura’s baseline lesson, where she struggled to enforce her authority in front of an apathetic class (research journal, 15/06/2016).

In terms of student participation, there was a clear difference between the games and performative activities on one side and the MoE-inspired role-play on the other. Whereas the former, more exposed activities seemed to inhibit a proportion of the class, the latter appeared to offer a safer space even for reluctant students to engage as the limelight was diverted towards the teachers-in-role. This activity enhanced the possibilities for equal participation.

Like her baseline lesson, Laura’s DiE lessons did not aim at promoting conscientization in students of issues of social justice and oppression. The lessons opened up spaces for CP in their form, namely, in the development of dialogic learning experiences, but not in their content. As such, Laura’s lessons may not have enacted CP to its fullest. However, the increase of motivation for learning in students could be seen as a valuable preparation of the terrain for subsequent analysis of social justice issues in this context.

5.4.2.3. **Patilla (Technology – lower-secondary)**

**The DiE lessons**

I visited two of Patilla’s DiE lessons as a non-participant observer. The lessons aimed at raising students’ critical consciousness about technological devices. To open the first lesson, Patilla put on a cape and assumed the role of an extra-terrestrial emperor visiting a post-apocalyptic Earth. In-
role, Patilla browsed his mobile phone’s files as if he was unfamiliar with them, questioning students about the meaning of common activities displayed in the files, such as singing happy birthday. Looking at familiar actions through a stranger’s eyes seemed to capture the class’ attention. In-role, Patilla raised some analytical questions like: “why did humans save moments in their devices? Were their minds so limited that they could not store them in their own memories?” (research journal, 25/08/2016). In response, some students made reflective comments. For example, one argued that technological devices functioned like a “coffer of treasures where feelings and experiences can be saved” (research journal, 25/08/2016). However, Patilla did not probe these answers further. Moreover, only a few students intervened in this discussion, notably those who chose to sit at the front of the class and, hence, were arguably better predisposed towards the subject-area. Of the rest, the majority listened attentively, but remained silent, while a few others seemed distracted. Patilla did not pose directed questions to students who were silent. Although this showed respect for the students’ freedom not to intervene, it resulted in a conversation dominated by a few.

Once Patilla stepped out-of-role, the excitement previously generated appeared to fade. When students formed small groups to discuss their phones’ contents, an unfocussed environment ensued. Patilla commented to me afterwards that he had not planned this second part of the lesson. This was evident in that the segment lacked a coherent connection with the earlier teacher-in-role activity. The students’ analysis, presented in a concluding plenary, was mostly descriptive, with little critical reflection. Although students were given a loose role to work from, i.e. extra-terrestrials, they were not prepared for that role (Bolton & Davis, 2010), and so, engagement was not built.

The second lesson observed was conducted with another class but had a similar aim as the first: to critically analyse communication technology. Patilla began this lesson in silence, passing a ball of yarn to a student. Only by miming, Patilla asked him to throw it to a classmate to begin forming a web of thread. Students seemed confused by the lack of direction, but were able to organise themselves so that everyone received the yarn. Once the web was completed, Patilla moved to create a tangle in the web and students followed suit. A playful mood emerged where students explored different spatial levels (Figure 5.18).
Patilla led students outside the classroom and released the web. Students took control of the trajectory, touring the School. Upon reaching the entrance gate, a few students urged the rest to go outside the School, but, without any direction from Patilla, the class decided to go back to the classroom instead. This exercise gave students decision power, tapping into their self-direction skills, thus contributing to democratise the learning experience. However, some students appeared unaware of their control here. For example, a student later said to Patilla: “you steered us like we were puppies!” not realising that Patilla had stopped directing their movements after they exited the classroom (research journal, 05/10/2016). Moreover, students seemed baffled about the exercise’s objective. Patilla had to explain that its goal was to experience a different way of communication and that his silence represented the lack of oral expression characteristic of social media. Albeit enjoyable, the exercise was apparently unconnected for students, and did not motivate critical reflection.

The lesson closed with small-group work where students analysed whether technology could allow or hinder communication. The environment that emerged seemed unfocused and unengaged. Students’ findings, presented in plenary, were largely descriptive. Importantly, this second part of the lesson did not include DiE activities and had no logical link with the initial game (save the theme). As a whole, the lesson lacked dramatic tension and a coherent structure. It concluded without much evidence of achievement of its critical aim. In subsequent comments, Patilla recognised that lack of planning hindered the fulfilment of the lesson’s goals.
Spaces for CP

Spaces for CP were opened only during a few moments of Patilla’s DiE lessons. Dialogic classroom relationships were fostered when Patilla relinquished some of his authority and shared decision making power with the students in the yarn game. Additionally, here, students participated collectively and equally. However, equal participation was not visible in other activities, especially during plenary discussions.

A few spaces for reflective dialogue were opened through teacher-in-role. The fictitious context enabled by Patilla through role invited students to look at the familiar with fresh eyes, a fundamental first step towards conscientization (Freire, 2000b). However, this invitation was only seized by a few students, who seemed better predisposed towards the area. Patilla did not pose relevant questions to silent students that could motivate them to contribute. Moreover, Patilla did not use appropriate questioning to develop the hints of critical engagement offered by students who did intervene in the dialogue.

An important barrier to the achievement of his critical aims was the lack of a better structured lesson plan. DiE activities were isolated, with the rest of the lessons featuring traditional activities without a fictitious framework. The lessons did not offer students a clear journey, where intellectual and emotional investment were gradually built, and where a thoughtful consideration of social issues could emerge.

Still, Patilla’s teaching stance and aims changed significantly when compared with his baseline lesson (research journal, 14/06/2016). There, the work had been mostly individual and technical. On the contrary, in the DiE lessons, Patilla promoted collaboration and posed critical questions to students, although he was not yet able to structure a more meaningful and reflective learning experience for them.

5.4.2.4. Josefina (Natural Sciences – lower-primary)

The DiE lesson

Josefina and I cotaught one DiE lesson aimed at strengthening students’ knowledge of digestion. It began with a puppet show performed by Josefina and I, where organs ran for president of the digestive system. Students seemed to greatly enjoy the play. However, their overexcitement led to an unfocused atmosphere. Moreover, in the following plenary conversation, only about a third of the students seemed to have fully grasped the differences between organs. The novelty and flamboyance of the play distracted students from the curricular contents it discussed. Albeit enjoyable for the children, the activity did not fully reach the learning aims set by Josefina (reflective journal, 30/08/2016).
I led the following activity, where students collectively represented the digestive system using their bodies. High participation levels were observed here. When supporting students’ work, Josefina posed useful questions that allowed their creativity and critical thinking to emerge. A collaborative relationship between teacher and students emerged at these points. However, at other points of the activity, a hectic environment ensued. The activity’s structure was too loose for children unused to such freedom. At times, Josefina seemed unable to channel students’ excitement for participating. I was also restricted in terms of classroom management by my lack of familiarity with the students. Here, it would have been helpful if the assistant teacher, also in the room, had monitored the children’s behaviour, but Josefina did not secure her support beforehand. Only after Josefina reprimanded the class, a more focused atmosphere emerged. Josefina said to the children: “you have to learn that there are different times for different things, and this is the time for listening (…) it seems that only by being a witch this can work out, what a pity” (video, 30/08/2016). An authoritarian tone was perceivable in Josefina’s reprimand and imposition of her teacher’s agenda, which seems contrary to the dialogic principles of CP. However, Josefina’s stricter stance prompted students to listen to each other in the final segment. Here, students had a chance of giving their opinions of the lesson. The majority of comments were positive and highlighted their enjoyment of the experience. However, when questioned about scientific knowledge, at least a third of the class seemed unsure about their answers. Although entertaining for the students, the DiE approach used did not elicit a wholly positive response vis-a-vis educational outcomes.

Josefina seemed tired after the lesson. She commented positively on the students’ levels of participation. However, she noticed that the class was unable to self-control in freer situations like this one. Later on, Josefina cancelled the second DiE lesson we had planned, arguing a lack of time. This suggests that she did not find sufficient value in the experience to accommodate another attempt in the class’ busy schedule.

**Spaces for CP**

A few spaces for dialogue were opened in Josefina’s DiE lesson. Whereas in her baseline lesson (research journal, 22/06/2016), students’ work was limited to answering worksheets, in the DiE lesson students were empowered to make creative decisions. At certain points, Josefina was also able to collaborate with students. This blurred the teacher-students hierarchy that appeared rigid in the baseline lesson.

However, unlike in the baseline lesson, Josefina employed an authoritarian stance in the DiE lesson to manage behaviour. The class, and Josefina, seemed unaccustomed to the freer, more active dynamic and struggled to fruitfully channel the high motivation levels. They may have
responded better to a DiE approach where a fictional context would have established intrinsic behavioural limits (Morgan & Saxton, 1989), allowing the class to successfully navigate the freer learning experience (Horton & Freire, 1990). Also, ensuring colleagues’ support, particularly in classroom management, could have allowed Josefina to concentrate on seizing openings for CP to a greater extent.

A few spaces for critical thinking were opened in this lesson, when students made well-grounded decisions about how to embody their knowledge. This was facilitated by Josefina’s questioning. Critical thinking had been identified earlier as a developmentally appropriate step towards conscientization for young children (Sofía, I2, 09/08/2016). This is a positive development, considering that no evidence of critical thinking was observed in Josefina’s baseline lesson (research journal, 22/06/2016). Still, like in that lesson, Josefina’s DiE lesson did not make connections with wider social issues. It is arguable that CP was not fully enacted here as knowledge was not sufficiently problematized.

5.4.2.5. Sofía (Language – lower-primary)

The DiE lesson

Sofía and I cotought one DiE lesson. It aimed at exploring Aesop’s The dung beetle and the ant (Esopo, Fedro, La Fontaine, Iriarte, Samaniego, Tolstoi, & Barros Grez, 2001), discussing the values of solidarity and hard work. The lesson began with a modelling exercise, where students created individual statues of insects using their bodies. While Sofía and I guided this, the assistant teacher and Tamara, the SEN specialist working with this class, engaged in classroom management. A fruitful collaboration was established from the outset amongst the four educators in the classroom.

Apart from a couple of students, the class appeared very engaged with the activity. Children made creative use of their bodies to represent the insects (Figure 5.19).
I guided the following improvisation, where children interacted in-role as insects. A creative dialogue emerged here. For instance, as I stomped into the garden in-role as a human, a student approached me and said “I am a poisonous spider and I will bite you” (research journal, 03/10/2016), which I incorporated as the climax of the improvisation. In this way, the dramatic experience was co-created by teacher and students.

This was followed by a whoosh! activity, where students mimed Sofía’s narration of Aesop’s (2001) fable. Participation levels were very high here. Children respected taking turns and listened attentively. The activity developed smoothly until the end, when children became restless. Sofía quickly regained students’ attention by moving on to the final segment, a hot-seating activity. Here, students analysed the ant’s conundrum of whether or not to share food with the beetle, who had previously mocked her for working hard. I assumed the role of the ant and asked for the students’ advice. Out-of-role, Sofía moderated the conversation. Initially, all children agreed that the ant should not share her food. When questioned further, a few students evidenced critical thinking. For instance, one said: “you shouldn’t [share food with the beetle] because it’s not nice to mock others”, while another said: “you should think about yourself first, not about others” (research journal, 03/10/2016). In-role, I questioned this, wondering whether it would be good to let the beetle starve. Importantly, I posed this as a question, rather than as a moral imperative. Considering this question, some children proposed that the ant shared food with the beetle, but...
after the latter apologised. However, others maintained their initial opinion. This suggests that I had not over-influenced students with my question, as some stood by their original view. The teacher-in-role strategy seemed to contribute to this. Arguably, if the analysis had been guided by a teacher out-of-role, children might have wished to ascribe to her correct opinion. In contrast, leading the inquiry as a hesitant, low-status role enabled a fair examination of the issue.

There was little time to conduct a final reflection. Sofia criticised this, but otherwise had a positive evaluation of the lesson and reported the fulfilment of her teaching goals.

**Spaces for CP**

Sofía’s lesson opened spaces for CP in various ways. The experience had a dialogic tone, with several opportunities for teacher-student collaboration. Students connected the content with their own previous knowledge and experiences with garden insects, contributing to shape the imaginary world. The dialogic tone of the DiE lesson was more marked than in Sofía’s baseline lesson (research journal, 09/08/2016). Although she also incorporated active methodologies, students worked individually most of the time. While in the baseline lesson Sofía also drew links with students’ previous experiences, there were fewer opportunities for them to make creative decisions. However, Sofía’s teaching style was unchanged when comparing baseline and DiE lessons. In both, she taught solely out-of-role. By leaving in-role teaching to me, Sofía missed the chance of experiencing the possibilities for CP offered by teacher-in-role.

Sofía’s aims were radically different in both lessons. Whereas the baseline lesson had a factual learning aim, the DiE lesson had a critical aim: promoting critical thinking about a moral dilemma. In her DiE lesson, the teacher-in-role strategy opened spaces for critical thinking, identified by Sofía as an age appropriate first step towards conscientization for her first-graders (Interview, 09/08/2016). Teacher-in-role served to codify the moral dilemma for students to analyse it. The low-status of the role provoked a fair discussion that was not over-influenced by an adult’s authoritative opinion (Heathcote, 1984g). Arguably, the way this strategy was applied decreased the risk of indoctrination attached by some to CP (Ellsworth, 1989). Also, the students’ creative ownership over the imaginary setting of the fiction seemed to increase their engagement levels so they cared about the ant’s conundrum. However, the lesson lacked a final moment where children established explicit links between the moral conundrum and their lives. Hence, conscientization was not fully enabled (Freire, 2000b). That being said, it is noteworthy that, according to Sofía, this did occur in a following lesson where students reflected about passing moral judgements in their daily lives (I3, 06/10/2016). Also, the DiE lesson motivated students to learn more about the dung beetle in following lessons. As Sofía commented in her subsequent interview, students realised that they needed to know the insect better before being able to judge its behaviour.
Arguably, the DiE lesson kindled “epistemological curiosity” in students (Freire, 1998, p. 37), although this was more evident after the DiE lesson was over.

A favourable factor in this lesson was the good collaboration amongst teachers. Having colleagues’ help managing the classroom allowed Sofía and me to focus on developing spaces for CP. This contrasts with Josefina’s DiE lesson, also conducted with lower-primary students. Additionally, Sofía’s class seemed more accustomed to a freer dynamic, being able to interact in a self-controlled way. Sofía also appeared more used to this dynamic than Josefina, responding in non-authoritarian ways whenever concentration lapsed. The fact that Sofía’s baseline lesson included active methodologies and Josefina’s did not tends to corroborate this. Having practice with active methodologies facilitated the integration of DiE as a new approach, easing the establishment of dialogic classroom relationships.

5.4.2.6. Gonzalo (History, Geography, and Social Sciences – lower-secondary)

The DiE lessons

Gonzalo and I cotutored two DiE lessons. These aimed at enhancing students’ understanding of repression in WWII. In lesson one, students analysed a photograph of a family before Nazi occupation. Several students participated in this conversation. However, participation levels dropped when Gonzalo invited volunteers to recreate the photograph through a still-image strategy. In contrast to the initial plenary, students seemed threatened by being exposed to an audience in this activity. In the following segment, students in groups determined what a family escaping a fascist regime would take from their homes. Half the class seemed to engage thoughtfully, but others appeared unfocussed and jesting. The lesson structure was at fault here. It failed to prepare all students to engage authentically with such a demanding fictitious situation (Davis, 2014).

The following role-play strategy was better received by the class. Gonzalo, in-role as a border guard, interacted with each group of students-in-role as families trying to cross the border. Students seemed keen to participate here. This was radically different from the initial still-image activity. Even though in both activities students were exposed to their classmates’ gaze, here the limelight was shared with the teacher. In this way, the teacher-in-role strategy seemed to create a safer space for participation.

In-role, Gonzalo consistently used a stern demeanour that showed belief in the dramatic context. This seemed to increase students’ engagement with the fiction. For example, several students used the first-person to dialogue with Gonzalo, elaborating a background story for their roles. This
strategy also enabled Gonzalo to challenge unauthentic responses from within his role, rather than from an authoritarian teacher stance (Heathcote, 1984h).

The general mood seemed more reflective after the role-play. Arguably, this is because higher levels of engagement with the fiction were developed during that activity. In the final plenary, students valued the in-role experience highly. In one student’s words, this allowed them to “live History” (research journal, 03/10/2016). While noting moments of “empty fun” towards the beginning, Gonzalo assessed the lesson favourably in subsequent remarks (research journal, 03/10/2016).

The next lesson began with a collective analysis of historical accounts of concentration camps during WWII. The lesson then centred on a writing-in-role activity. Here, students imagined what a prisoner in a concentration camp would write, either in a letter to loved ones, or in a journal entry. While students wrote, a focused, thoughtful atmosphere ensued. Several writings showed engagement with second-order emotions (Bundy et al., 2016), as well as empathy. A few, also showed critical reflection, as exemplified by the extract in Figure 5.20 (translation underneath).

Figure 5.20. Letter written by student in Gonzalo’s writing-in-role activity

(…) I should have been born as a white person, blonde and blue-eyed, that way I would not be treated like the scum of society, like an ant that can be trampled and it does not matter if it dies. (Document G.13, 07/10/2016, my translation)

A criticism of the suffering caused by racial discrimination is evident in the extract above. Another student who chose to be in-role as a camp guard wrote: “I would kill [the prisoners] in cold blood, but I cannot do it as I imagine that if I got killed my family would suffer…but I do it anyway because I am a mere soldier” (Document G.6, 07/10/2016, my translation). He appears to empathise with the contradictions of those who exert domination, but who are, in turn, dominated as well, as the sentence “I am a mere soldier” conveys. The lesson finished without time for plenary reflection, so there were no opportunities to learn if students had made significant connections between the fiction and their real lives. Nonetheless, writing-in-role seemed to allow an emotionally-driven critical reflection to emerge for some students. The private and anonymous
nature of the exercise appeared to contribute to this. Students seemed unburdened by feelings of embarrassment observed in more performative activities, like still-images. Additionally, the cumulative experience of both lessons seemed to prepare students to engage reflectively in this final activity. Gonzalo reported being very satisfied with the lesson’s fulfilment of his critical pedagogical aims.

**Spaces for CP**

Some spaces for CP were opened in Gonzalo’s lessons. The teacher-in-role strategy was particularly helpful in setting a dialogic style in his classroom. It stimulated dialogue and enabled Gonzalo to model belief in the fiction and direct the lesson in non-authoritarian ways. A dialogic teaching stance was also observed in his baseline lesson (research journal, 29/07/2016). However, the teacher-in-role strategy allowed him to collaborate with students more equally. For instance, whereas in the baseline lesson he stood in front of a seated class, here Gonzalo shared the space with students, engaging alongside them in the dramatic context.

In these DiE lessons, some activities precluded students’ equal participation, while others enabled it. Still-images seemed to hinder participation by exposing students to their classmates’ gaze. Conversely, participation was facilitated when students shared the limelight with Gonzalo (teacher-in-role), or when there was no limelight at all (writing-in-role). This had consequences for the level of reflection achieved. The latter activities seemed to allow students to focus on the material studied, rather than on their feelings of embarrassment. This corroborates observations of Laura’s DiE lessons, where a similar distinction between DiE strategies emerged.

A few spaces for critical reflection about social injustice were opened in Gonzalo’s DiE lessons. An empathic understanding of repression, codified through in-role work, was evidenced at certain points. These spaces only emerged after students appeared to develop an emotional connection with the dramatic context, a phenomenon which Bundy et al. (2016) report. Davis (2014) cautions against pushing students into responding authentically without sufficient preparation, suggesting it leads to superficiality. This occurred at some points of Gonzalo’s DiE lessons, when a jesting mood prevailed. A gradual investment with the material was needed. This explains why reflection was elicited most powerfully by the final writing-in-role activity.

In his baseline lesson, Gonzalo also opened up spaces for critical reflection about oppression (research journal, 29/07/2016). However, the emotional connection provoked by DiE was rarely seen in his baseline lesson. It is arguable that this emotional connection increased the potency of the critical reflection elicited by Gonzalo through DiE in comparison to his former work (Bundy et al., 2016). Also, in-role work might have provoked a metaxis between the real and fictitious contexts that was not developed in his baseline lesson. As seen in Chapter Two, the tension of
metaxis can be conducive of conscientization. However, lack of time for subsequent reflection prevented the class in making collective meaning of the dramatic experience. Unlike Gonzalo’s baseline lesson, in his DiE lessons there were no explicit connections between history and students’ real lives.

5.4.2.7. Nicole (Mathematics – upper-primary)

The DiE lesson

Nicole and I cotaught one DiE lesson aimed at reinforcing her sixth-graders’ knowledge of geometric angles. A game was played first, where students swapped seats as different types of angles were mentioned. In general, students participated enthusiastically, as they applied their mathematical knowledge using their bodies.

This was followed by a role-play. In-role as the Director of the South American Football Confederation (CONMEBOL), I framed the students as special CONMEBOL agents summoned to an urgent meeting. As Nicole anticipated during planning (research journal, 06/09/2016), students seemed highly motivated by this theme. In-role, I informed students that players of the national football team had been kidnapped. A recording of the ransom call was played where the kidnapper explained that the footballers could only be rescued by deciphering his geometric clues. A dialogue ensued with several students inquiring about the situation.

Although we planned that Nicole would be in-role as an assistant CONMEBOL agent, she limited her participation to managing behaviour out-of-role during the lesson. This might have affected students’ belief in the fiction. For example, like Nicole, students never spoke as-if they were agents. Although they appeared to enjoy the activity they did not commit fully to the fiction.

In small groups, students-as-agents were given a number of clues about the location and identity of the kidnapped players. The activity took place in the School’s courtyard and followed a treasure-hunt format. To decipher each clue, students needed to apply their geometric knowledge, using a protractor. They also had to use their expertise about football trivia. This activity suffered from some organisational problems in terms of the distribution of the clues. However, students appeared unaware of these issues. On the contrary, they seemed to greatly enjoy the activity. All groups solved the mathematical clues correctly, discovering the identity and location of the kidnapped players.

Back in the classroom, I re-assumed my role to thank students-as-agents for rescuing the players. The lesson closed with little time for final comments nor reflections. In our later conversation, Nicole regretted our organisational errors. However, she valued highly the lesson’s fulfilment of the learning aims within a motivating context.
Spaces for CP

Nicole’s DiE lesson created spaces for CP by giving a dialogic tone to the learning experience. In the initial game, students had a chance to embody knowledge, opening ways of learning beyond more traditional written and verbal forms. This also occurred in Nicole’s baseline lesson (research journal, 04/08/2016), which opened with a physical game. However, students worked individually for the majority of the time in that lesson. In contrast, the DiE lesson offered more chances for dialogue and collaboration.

Still, Nicole’s teaching demeanour was unchanged. While maintaining a generally non-authoritarian attitude towards students, she did not assume a role. Moreover, she left the construction of the fictional world entirely in my hands. Hence, she missed an opportunity of participating alongside students in the learning experience, which could have helped her to dialogue with students even more.

However, there was a change in Nicole’s choice of themes for the lessons. Although her baseline lesson employed examples from students’ lives to address mathematical problems, her DiE lesson incorporated students’ interest more prominently. She identified a fictional context that made the curricular content relevant for students. Here, Nicole valued the students’ “streetcorner knowledge” (McLaren, 1988, p. 169). In this way, she challenged the traditional scission between everyday and curricular knowledge. This can be seen as a critical pedagogical act. However, students were not invited to reflect on this. Moreover, like Nicole’s baseline lesson, this lesson did not promote any discussion about wider social issues, so spaces for conscientization were not opened. Still, as in Laura’s DiE lessons, the value of boosting motivation should not be dismissed too easily in this context. Fostering interest in learning could help overcome student-apatathy, laying appropriate grounds for critical reflection.

5.4.2.8. Inés (History, Geography, and Social Sciences – lower-secondary)

The DiE lessons

I observed five of Inés’ lessons. Whereas my interventions in the first two were more spontaneous, the last three were coplanned and cotaught. DiE was applied in the second half of each lesson, after a theoretical introduction.

The first two lessons aimed at analysing the class structure of Colonial Chile. In lesson one, students in small groups represented Colonial social classes through still-images. Participation levels were high, but energy was low. Many students seemed embarrassed due to the performative
tone of the activity. Nonetheless, some evidence of critical analysis emerged when Inés incorporated a thought-tracking strategy. Here, students in the still-images verbalised their roles’ ideas. For instance, a student representing a Spaniard looking down on a peasant said: “My dress is worth more than your house” (research journal, 01/08/2016). The activity allowed some students to represent the socioeconomic inequalities of Colonial Chile. However, there were no subsequent activities nor fruitful teacher questioning that deepened the analysis. Still, Inés evaluated the lesson favourably, as an entertaining and memorable experience for students.

In lesson two, Inés assumed the role of a subservient foreman from a popular Chilean television show set in Colonial times. I took on the role of the Head of a newspaper and framed the students as journalists who would interview the foreman. An animated dialogue about the class-based oppression of the time emerged. The majority of students participated here. Moreover, some students used very formal language, suggesting they had engaged with their roles. The fruitfulness of this activity appeared to be facilitated by Inés’ commitment to her role. Her modified voice and bodily attitude added truthfulness to the imaginary context. Additionally, students seemed more comfortable than in lesson one’s still-image activity, as the focus was not on them, but on Inés. Also, the reference to a popular television show seemed to boost students’ interest, as it created a connection with their everyday lives. All of this raised the quality of students’ participation in relation to lesson one. In the final plenary, students had a chance of reflecting on the learning experience. A student said to Inés: “I must admit that your lessons used to bore me greatly, but now these lessons are more motivating” (research journal, 08/08/2016). This positive feedback was echoed by the rest of the class. Inés also valued the analysis of oppression the lesson promoted.

Lesson three aimed at analysing the legacy of José Miguel Carrera, a key figure of Chilean Independence. Inés took on the role of his sister, Javiera Carrera. In small groups, students represented journalists from newspapers of specific political sectors of Colonial Chile. Each newspaper team prepared questions to hot-seat Javiera Carrera. During preparation, half the students seemed engaged. Moreover, critical reflection was evidenced in these students. For example, a student from the People’s newspaper said to his teammates that they needed to be careful in the wording of questions. He argued that popular classes had very little power, so anything could be seen as an insubordination. The fictional role allowed this student to reflect on social injustices in Colonial Chile. During hot-seating, some students posed critical questions like: “did you see an evolution in the position of women in politics during your lifetime?” (research journal 03/10/2016). However, the other half of the class seemed unfocused during preparation. Moreover, they were mostly silent during hot-seating. They appeared to lack historical knowledge to actively partake in the dialogue. The lesson’s structure failed to offer everyone ways to contribute. This contrasts with lesson two’s hot-seating activity, where participation was more
equal. Unlike lesson two, students’ roles in lesson three required more historical knowledge. Also, Inés’ role was a factor. While equally committed to both roles, her role in lesson two was more connected to students’ everyday lives than the historical figure she assumed in lesson three. There was no time for a final plenary reflection. In later comments, Inés praised the dialogical tone of the exercise, while recognising disparities in participation.

Lesson four examined Manuel Rodriguez, a leader of the guerrilla group against the Spaniards. A role-play was applied. Students-in-role as Colonial peasants improvised a typical morning in a village. Around a third of the class decided to observe rather than participate. As in lesson one’s still-images, the physically exposed quality of the exercise seemed to threaten some students, a feeling that might have been enhanced because of the spontaneous audience generated by those unwilling to partake. Although participating students seemed entertained, a jesting environment emerged. Students had not been sufficiently prepared to enact the fictitious situation authentically (Davis, 2014).

Inés entered in-role as another villager and spread the rumour that Rodríguez was in the vicinity. Her demeanour was too subdued to arrest students’ attention and engagement. Inés seemed inhibited by having to improvise alongside students without the clearer structure given by the hot-seating strategy used in previous lessons. Tension and attention levels arose when I briefly entered the fiction as a Spanish captain to offer rewards for Rodriguez’s head. The high-status of the role and my greater experience in drama were favourable factors here. Then, a student who had asked to take on a prominent role, entered the scene as a wounded Rodríguez (Figure 5.21).
Both Inés (wearing a green skirt) and the student-in-role as Rodríguez (wearing a hat) showed some commitment to the fictional situation, as denoted by their physical postures. However, their energy was too shy to raise the rest of the class’ engagement levels. Soon, the class’ attention dissipated. The activity concluded with Inés being unable to successfully guide the unfolding experience from within. I was also restrained by being out of the fiction, and by my apprehension of overstepping Inés’ leadership of the lesson.

Some critical thinking developed in the final conscience alley activity. Students formed a tunnel with one side arguing for helping Rodríguez, and the other, against. For example, a student in favour of helping Rodríguez said: “the Spaniards haven’t done anything for us [the People], so maybe he will”. Another student arguing against helping Rodríguez, replied: “we should obey the King and not stir things up” (research journal, 04/03/2016). These remarks show a level of empathetic understanding of the peasants’ precarious situation. However, the lesson finished without enough time for deeper reflection. Later, Inés highlighted the greater participation of usually silent students, but noticed lower levels of concentration in comparison to previous lessons. The lesson lacked sustained dramatic tension that provoked engagement and reflection in students.

The final lesson examined Bernardo O’Higgins, the first sovereign of Independent Chile. After a Colombian Hypnosis game (Boal, 2002) where participants follow a leader’s movements, a hot-

Figure 5.21. Improvisation in Inés’ lesson four
seating strategy was used. Students-in-role as lawyers had to decide if O’Higgins was a dictator or a hero. Half the students were assigned the role of accusers and the others, the role of defenders. For the trial that followed, an SEN teacher assumed O’Higgins’ role, while I moderated in-role as the judge. Inés preferred not to assume a role this time, arguing that she did not “feel up for it” (research journal, 11/10/2016). Perhaps her problematic experience when working in-role in the previous lesson influenced this decision. Still, she actively supported the SEN specialist, advising her about historical facts.

Moments of critical dialogue arose during the trial. For instance, when the SEN specialist said, in-role, that “the People was not ready” for Democracy, a student returned: “shouldn’t that have been decided by the People itself?” (research journal, 11/10/2016). For a few students, hot-seating was a platform to critically examine authoritarianism. However, as in lesson three, the conversation seemed to be dominated by the most knowledgeable students. For others, the lesson did not appear to offer ways or motivation to engage. The lesson finished without time for substantial final comments. In subsequent remarks, Inés noted that only some students had reached the learning aim of scrutinising this historical figure.

Spaces for CP

Inés’ application of DiE established dialogic classroom relationships, particularly when the teacher-in-role and hot-seating strategies were combined. Whereas in Inés’ baseline lesson (28/06/2016), she asked most of the questions, in these DiE activities students led the inquiry. She shared creative ownership of the learning with them, establishing a more equal relationship. However, when teacher-in-role was used during improvisation, Inés was unable to dialogue with students’ contributions, making them part of the unfolding drama.

Students seemed more engaged and participative in the DiE lessons than in the baseline lesson. However, participation levels did not generally soar over 50% in the DiE lessons. Students’ connection with the dramatic context was a factor here. When students were not offered ways to relate with the material, participation levels were reduced.

Inés’ in-role work seemed to affect students’ levels of engagement. Her commitment and confidence in-role strengthened the truthfulness of the fiction, modelling authentic engagement in students (lessons two and three). In contrast, when she was insecure in-role, she was unable to arrest students’ interest.

In turn, students’ levels of engagement appeared to impact their ability for critical reflection. When investment was there, students seemed to engage more critically with the work. A few students used still-images and thought-tracking to reflect on issues of classism and racism.
Additionally, role work promoted an empathic analysis of social injustices. However, these spaces were opened for a few students only. For others, the lessons failed to offer a journey where they could engage with the dramatic contexts. In keeping with Bundy et al.’s (2016) analysis, because interest and emotional connection was not elicited in these students, they were not engaged enough to want to critically reflect on the issues explored through DiE. Moreover, links between past and present injustices were not drawn explicitly either by the DiE activities or by Inés or me during plenary discussions. Spaces for conscientization were, therefore, not fully explored in her DiE lessons.

5.4.2.9. Conclusions

Teachers’ application of DiE opened up spaces for CP in several ways. Firstly, DiE enhanced the dialogic quality of these teachers’ classrooms. The teacher-in-role strategy was an important contribution in this respect. Those who taught in-role, namely Laura, Inés, Gonzalo, Patilla, and Violeta, were able to relate more equally with students. For example, they participated alongside students in the learning experience; they facilitated more dialogue; and they enabled students to pose questions themselves. This contrasts with their baseline lessons, where the relationship between teachers and students was more vertical. Also, especially in Laura’s and Gonzalo’s lessons, the teacher-in-role strategy helped them engage in classroom management in non-authoritarian ways. This corroborates the view of teacher-in-role as a strategy that subverts traditional teacher-students hierarchies (Bolton & Davis, 2010; O’Connor, 2010; O’Neill, 2015).

These hierarchies were also challenged when students made creative decisions in the DiE lessons. In baseline lessons, students were usually limited to answering questions created by teachers. In the DiE lessons, on the other hand, students decided on how to embody concepts, how to solve fictitious dilemmas, and how to represent points of view, among other examples. Their ownership over the lessons was enhanced. Teachers and students had more opportunities of co-creating the learning experience. However, this collaboration was still restricted in the DiE lessons. Teachers kept to a tight lesson structure, with little room for students to modify the predetermined sequence of activities. Moreover, in general, students had very little say on the themes explored. Adopting a more extended process drama approach, of the type where the themes and experience are fully negotiated (O’Neill, 1995), could have enhanced the dialogic tone of the learning experiences. However, it is arguable that such full negotiation, like the one possible in a drama-as-a-subject classroom, would not have been possible for these teachers. They had curricular and time constraints that they could not dismiss completely.

Having previous practice with active methodologies was a factor that affected teacher-students relationships in lower-primary. Children’s greater experience of freer classroom dynamics allowed
them to exercise self-control without the teacher’s authoritarian imposition of behavioural rules. On this point, observational data from lower-primary also showed the value of counting on colleagues’ support in classroom management when introducing DiE as a novel methodology.

Promoting dialogue is another key aspect of CP (Giroux, 1988). In the teachers’ baseline lessons, dialogue was generally restricted to plenary discussions. In their DiE lessons, in contrast, dialogue occurred more often. It involved whole-group work, but also pair, and small-group work. It was verbal and embodied. It was done in and out-of-role. Hence, DiE helped teachers expand possibilities for dialogue in their classrooms. Still, it is important to note that dialogue in the DiE lessons was not always critical. It led to critical reflection in five out of eight teachers’ cases (Violeta, Gonzalo, Inés, Sofía, and Patilla).

Overall, students’ levels of participation in dialogue were higher in the DiE lessons than in the baseline lessons. Firstly, this can be attributed to the greater motivation that DiE seemed to provoke in students, in comparison to the baseline lessons. Also, this can be explained by the greater variety of modes of participation involved (verbal, physical, emotional, and intellectual). However, some DiE approaches hindered participation. Performative activities, where students were exposed to an audience, seemed to inhibit participation. Also, when the DiE lessons did not prepare all students to engage, the experience was dominated by a few, seemingly more knowledgeable students. In these instances, our application of DiE failed to disrupt unequal power dynamics, observed during the baseline lessons, where knowledgeable students had more voice than others.

Regarding the opening of spaces for conscientization through DiE, these were observed in the work of five of the eight teachers. Working within a fictional framework facilitated the opening of these spaces. In Patilla’s lessons, the imaginary context led a few students to question the taken-for-granted. In Sofía’s lesson, dialoguing with a fictional role promoted critical and independent thinking about a moral problem. In the cases of Violeta, Gonzalo, and Inés, the fiction opened a few spaces for critical analysis of social injustices. Also, an emotional and empathic engagement with experiences of oppression was observed at certain moments in these teachers’ DiE lessons.

However, spaces for critical reflection were occasional. At several points of these five teachers’ lessons, a light-hearted rather than reflective mood prevailed amongst students. Students were entertained, but not critically engaged (McLaren, 1988). The level of engagement students had with the material determined the level of critical reflection achieved. Greater engagement led to a more authentic attitude in students, allowing critical reflection to emerge. In other words, students needed to care about the matter under scrutiny to consider it critically. This corroborates Bundy et al.’s (2016) claim that investment is fundamental for critical understanding in DiE.
Several factors affected the level of engagement generated in students, which, in turn affected the possibilities for critical reflection. A hindering factor was the use of materials unconnected with students’ interests. This was most evident in Violeta’s forum theatre adaptation. In Patilla’s case, while discussing a relevant topic for students (technological devices), his DiE lessons did not address the topic in a way that was meaningful for students. On the other hand, Inés’ choice of a role popular amongst students in her second lesson did engage them from the outset, enhancing opportunities for critical reflection.

The structure of the lessons also impacted on students’ engagement. Although the material was usually unattractive for students, some teachers were able to elicit investment as the DiE experiences unfolded. In the cases of Sofía and Gonzalo, engagement with the topic was gradually built in several students, leading to critical consideration. These lessons offered a more sustained and organic journey of dramatic exploration. In contrast, Inés and Patilla used DiE at some points of their lessons only. Moreover, the sequence of activities in their lessons was more disjointed. In Patilla’s second DiE lesson, the only DiE-related activity was a game loosely linked with the rest of the lesson. These lessons failed to build engagement in the majority of students. Only a few, more knowledgeable or better predisposed students reflected critically here.

Another factor in generating engagement in students was the application of teacher-in-role. When this strategy was employed with credibility in the fiction, students tended to emulate the same kind of authentic engagement (Heathcote, 2015d). This authenticity facilitated critical reflection.

The use of ‘performative’ versus ‘dramatic’ activities also impacted the levels of critical reflection achieved. Performative activities seemed to emphasise first order emotions, that is, emotions caused by the real-life dimension of the activity (Bolton, 1984). Here, feelings of embarrassment and overexcitement stole the focus away from critical reflection. Conversely, dramatic activities – those with an integral audience – did not seem to elicit such strong first order emotions. Therefore, students could concentrate on the material under study. Moreover, this enabled the emergence of second order emotions, that is, emotions provoked by the fiction and capable of being reflected on (Bolton, 1984). At certain points in the lessons, most prominently in Gonzalo’s writing-in-role activity, it appeared that the second order emotions elicited by the fiction fuelled critical reflection about social injustices.

Except in Patilla’s case, explicit links between the social justice issues explored and the students’ lives were not drawn during the lessons. Moreover, moments for final reflection were rare in these five teachers’ DiE lessons. Students were not offered the chance of making sense of their experience. Further, their potential for changing current social injustices was not discussed. Hence, conscientization was not fully promoted (Freire, 2000b). This highlights the importance of considering enough time for reflection when planning.
However, compared to their baseline lessons, there were more moments of critical reflection in these teachers’ DiE lessons. Four of these five teachers appeared aligned with CP from the start of the Programme, while Patilla seemed to have radically changed his initial negative perception of CP, now incorporating critical aims in his DiE lessons. Unlike these five teachers, Laura, Josefina, and Nicole did not touch on social justice or moral issues in their DiE lessons. In keeping with the trend observed in previous stages of the Programme (see sections 5.2 and 5.3), these teachers did not seem to aim at fostering conscientization through DiE. In this sense, the Programme did not impact their stances. Still, they did advance in generating more dialogic learning experiences. Moreover, Laura and Nicole created highly motivating experiences for students. Laura in particular seems to have empowered students through her MoE-inspired approach. This alone cannot be considered CP (Shor & Freire, 1987). These teachers did not fully act as critical educators in how McLaren (1988) understands the concept, as they did not problematize contents in relation to wider social issues. However, the critical pedagogical value of boosting motivation should not be dismissed too easily. This is particularly relevant considering the School’s reported problem with student-aphathy. Challenging students’ negative views of schooling could lay more fertile grounds for promoting critical reflection. Additionally, transforming the curriculum to value students’ desires and embodied ways of knowing, as Nicole did, is one of the trademarks of a critical pedagogue (McLaren, 1988).

Reflecting on my own work coplanning and coteaching these lessons, I recognise contributions to the teachers’ practice of CP. I helped some to link curricular contents to human dilemmas and I also modelled DiE strategies and helped strengthen belief in the fiction through my in-role work. On the other hand, I recognise several shortcomings. Firstly, my greater familiarity with a “conventions approach” to DiE (Neelands, 2000), determined the planning and teaching advice I was able to offer teachers. For instance, I had limited practical experience leading forum theatre or MoE approaches. Also, by not prompting certain teachers, like Sofia and Nicole, to have greater leadership in the DiE lessons, I might have obstructed their learning process. Similarly, I was not always able to motivate all teachers to break their habits in terms of lesson structure. I sometimes failed to convey to them the value of allowing the dramatic experience to gradually develop over time. My lack of rapport with students also sometimes prevented me from fruitfully intervening in the DiE lessons. A complex aspect of coteaching was deciding when to step in and when to let my coteacher solve situations by him/herself, so as not to hinder his/her learning process. Finally, during the Workshop, I failed to model the importance of setting aside enough time for reflection. My time management issues, visible during the Workshop, were later replicated in the teachers’ DiE lessons. As argued before, this influenced negatively their promotion of conscientization. All of these aspects affected the teachers’ application of DiE and, hence, the spaces for CP that were opened up.
In spite of the shortcomings of my own work, overall, observational data indicates that DiE amplified spaces for CP in these eight teachers’ practices. In the following subsections, I will analyse students’ and teachers’ views of the DiE lessons.

5.4.3. Students’ views

Towards the end of the Application Stage, data were gathered about students’ perception of the DiE lessons. At the end of the lessons, primary-level students were asked brief questions about their experience. A semi-structured, voluntary, and anonymous questionnaire (Q3) was applied to secondary-level students. As mentioned in Chapter Four, considering literacy levels in the School, it was deemed appropriate to apply this instrument to secondary-level students only. Data from the 47 completed questionnaires were edited following Kent (2015). This resulted in a total of 45 valid questionnaires. Table 5.5 shows details of the application of Q3.

Table 5.5. Students’ Questionnaire (Q3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Total no. of students</th>
<th>Eligible sample-permission granted</th>
<th>No. of students who agreed to complete Q3</th>
<th>No. of completed questionnaires</th>
<th>No. of valid questionnaires</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gonzalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Patilla</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13/10/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Violeta</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11/10/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eligible sample numbers showed in Table 5.5 correspond to the students whose parents had given consent for their participation. Of those students, a total of over 70% agreed to complete Q3. Students in Class 1 completed one questionnaire per teacher (Laura and Gonzalo). Students in Class 2, in contrast, preferred to report on their experience of either Patilla or Inés’ DiE lessons. Due to these limited samples, bearing in mind the total of students, findings from Q3 cannot be considered representative. However, they help triangulate data collected through other mediums during the Application Stage. Most importantly, results from Q3 provide the opportunity to hear secondary-level students’ voices about their experience in these DiE lessons.

Data from Q3 will be presented thematically, focusing on the question:

- How did DiE open up spaces for CP?

The subsection closes with a summary of findings from Q3 and a brief overview of primary-level students’ responses.
5.4.3.1. Secondary students’ views: Creation of dialogic classrooms through Drama in Education

Q3 gathered students’ opinions of the classroom environment promoted in the DiE lessons. In general, it seems that students perceived these lessons as spaces for open communication. For instance, the majority felt that their opinions were heard. Most also felt free to express their beliefs even when these differed from others’ views (Figure 5.22).

Gonzalo’s DiE lessons were an exception here. Only 38% of surveyed students felt heard during his lessons. The fact that these lessons emphasised physical and written work over spoken expression could explain this. Also, 63% felt inhibited to refute Gonzalo’s and classmates’ opinions. Gonzalo’s high-status as a border guard in the teacher-in-role activity may have intimidated some students, explaining these responses. Pre-existing group dynamics and students’ familiarity with Gonzalo (who had only joined the School that year) could also be a factor here.

Despite these responses, all surveyed students valued teachers’ (including Gonzalo’s) interest in their opinions (Figure 5.23).
Most (82%) acknowledged their decision-making power in the DiE lessons, as shown in Figure 5.23. This aspect emerged particularly strongly amongst Violeta’s students. Most highlighted the creative input they had in the forum theatre-inspired activity. This suggests that the DiE lessons were perceived by these students as dialogic educational encounters.

Additionally, as visible in Figure 5.23, teachers’ promotion of equal participation in the lessons was recognised by most students (84%). Moreover, for several, the participative environment developed was their favourite aspect of the lessons. Related to this, observational data indicated that performative activities caused embarrassment in students which acted as a barrier for equal participation (see section 5.4.2). This was corroborated by responses to Q3. Around one in every four students felt embarrassment and/or anxiety in the DiE lessons. They noted that performing in front of others was the most common explanation for feeling embarrassed or anxious. For a substantial number of students, DiE did not seem to offer a safe space for participation. However, it is noteworthy that performative activities also elicited positive feelings in most of these students, including motivation, happiness, and interest. This suggests that feelings of embarrassment did not cloud these students’ enjoyment of the overall DiE experience.
From a CP perspective, developing dialogic classrooms also implies attending to students’ “generative themes” (Freire, 2000b, p. 103). As Figure 5.24 highlights, most students did not recognise a strong link between the topics discussed through DiE and their lives.
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**Figure 5.24. ‘The themes of the lessons were connected to my life’ (Q3)**

However, as shown in Figure 5.25, it appears that the majority were generally interested and motivated by the lessons.
The feelings most frequently elicited by the DiE lessons in these students were motivation, happiness, and interest, with 75% noting that they would like to continue being taught through DiE. Judging by the open answers to Q3, this positive reception of DiE was provoked by the fun students experienced in the lessons. Being in-role and observing others perform were identified as particularly entertaining experiences by several students. Being physically active and “learning without being bored” (Q3.4L), were also factors associated with their enjoyment of the lessons. Although the themes of the lessons did not address most students’ pre-existing interests, the DiE methodology seems to have made the lessons interesting for them.

Taken together, these data suggest that for surveyed secondary-level students DiE generated a dialogic environment in the classroom.

5.4.3.2. Secondary students’ views: Promotion of conscientization through Drama in Education

Q3 also enquired into students’ perception of the contents studied through DiE. Most students reported that the DiE lessons led them to consider social justice issues (Figure 5.26).
Violeta’s students had one of the highest levels of agreement with this statement (73%). This was further attested by the majority of responses to ‘what were these lessons trying to make you to think about?’ Students offered answers like “about social problems and repressions” (Q3.40V), and “[about] injustices that women used to live, and how to generate consciousness” (Q3.34V), for instance. This implies that, despite the light-hearted mood observed in Violeta’s DiE lessons (see section 5.4.2), some of her students did engage in critical reflection.

The majority of other teachers’ students also agreed with the statement shown in Figure 5.26. However, there was little evidence of this in their open answers. One of Gonzalo’s students said that the DiE lessons explored the “suffering of real people” (Q3.15G). A student in Patilla’s class mentioned that the DiE lessons helped her “realise the reality we live in” (Q3.25P). One of Inés’ students highlighted how “the violence of [Colonial] times is still visible in our times” (Q3.31I). These comments suggest that critical reflection was provoked for some students. Moreover, the two latter comments evidence that those specific students did establish links between the fiction and their reality. However, unlike in Violeta’s case, comments like these were rare in Gonzalo’s, Inés’, and Patilla’s cases. This may be explained because, unlike the others, Violeta’s lessons explicitly asked students to choose a scene displaying social oppression.

As mentioned in Chapter Two, the literature suggests a link between emotional engagement and students’ changes in understanding when working through Applied Theatre (Bolton, 1979). It is therefore worth considering students’ responses about the emotions caused by the DiE lessons (see Figure 5.25 above). Judging by their explanations of the feelings reported, it appears that these
generally corresponded to first-order emotions generated by the real rather than the imaginary context (Bolton, 1984). This suggests that a deep connection with the fictional worlds was usually not achieved in these lessons. The emotional layering of first- and second-order emotions that can be conducive of conscientization was not reported in Q3 (Bundy et al., 2016). Perhaps the time lapse between the DiE lessons and the application of Q3 (two weeks on average) impacted students’ responses. Second-order emotions might have faded away because of this time lapse. Even so, it is telling that whatever second-order emotions were generated were not a significant aspect of these students’ recollection of the lessons. Students’ responses substantiate classroom observations of there being, in general, a light-hearted mood in the lessons, rather than a strong emotional commitment to the fictions explored (see section 5.4.2).

Besides critical reflection about social oppression, conscientization also involves envisioning possibilities to effect change (Freire, 1985). In Q3, students indicated the extent to which this was provoked by the DiE lessons (Figure 5.27).

![Figure 5.27. ‘These lessons made me feel motivated to change the world for the better’ (Q3)](image)

Most students were ambivalent about this, marking the mid option. A transformative motivation was only activated in 40% of reporting students. This might be related to the fact that the majority did not see a connection between the DiE lessons and real life. Seeing the social issues explored as remote, students remained unmoved to challenge oppression. In Gonzalo’s, Inés’ and Violeta’s cases, this makes sense considering that the issues analysed were situated in the past. For instance, elaborating on whether Violeta’s DiE lessons were related to real life, a student said: “perhaps a little, but in the past, now women demand more respect” (Q3.46V). For this student, the sexist
oppression analysed through the forum theatre exercise was dated. Also, in Patilla’s case, only one student perceived a connection between the criticisms of technology encouraged through the DiE lessons and her own life.

Laura’s students offered surprising answers to the questions depicted in Figure 5.26 and Figure 5.27. The vast majority (75%) agreed that Laura’s DiE lessons made them think about social injustices and moved them to change the world. This contradicts observational data indicating that these lessons had not addressed social justice issues, nor promoted social transformation (see section 5.4.2). Perhaps students associated the medical profession in the MoE-inspired activity with effecting changes in society by helping the sick. However, the fact that no student mentioned these issues when asked about the lessons’ themes indicates that social justice matters were not prominent in these students’ minds. Possibly, their agreement with these statements could be attributed to response bias (Bryman, 2012). Students’ appreciation of Laura’s DiE lessons might have led some to assign high scores to every item. This cannot be determined by the available data.

5.4.3.3. Summary

Results from Q3 suggest that, in general, surveyed students responded favourably to DiE. The majority perceived the lessons as active and participative experiences where their voices and creativity were valued. Coherently with observational data, a significant minority reported feelings of embarrassment during these lessons. However, this did not take away from their enjoyment of the experience. Although students’ generative themes were not commonly addressed, the teaching methodology was interesting for most, fuelling their motivation levels. All of this suggests that DiE generated dialogic classroom environments for these students.

Evidence of promotion of conscientization can also be identified in some surveyed students’ responses. However, except for Violeța’s students, reflections about social justice issues were rare in Q3. Additionally, it seems that transformation in the real world was seldom motivated by the DiE lessons. This could be explained by the disconnection between topics discussed and students’ lives. Not seeing the injustices studied as relevant to their realities, most students did not envision a need to transform them. Hence, conscientization was not fully promoted in these students.

In relation to primary-level students’ comments at the end of the DiE lessons, only Sofía’s class reflected on the lesson’s contents. They spoke about the moral dilemma explored, corroborating observational data indicating that these students had engaged with the fictional context. Josefina’s and Nicole’s students, however, did not refer to the contents of the lessons. This is not surprising considering that, unlike Sofía’s, Josefina’s and Nicole’s lessons did not centre as strongly on a
fictional story. Even so, Josefina’s and Nicole’s students did engage in meta-cognitive reflection in their final comments, valuing their physically active participation in these lessons. As one of Josefina’s students said: “we had fun, we participated, and we learnt a new way of learning” (research journal, 30/08/2016). Like secondary-level students, the majority of primary-level students reported high levels of motivation in the DiE lessons. Enjoyment was provoked by DiE across all levels.

5.4.4. Teachers’ views

The eight teachers who participated in the Application Stage were individually interviewed between September and October 2016 after they had trialled the use of DiE in their classrooms. Interview 3’s semi-structured schedule (I3) focused on the possibilities and challenges teachers experienced when trying to open up spaces for CP through DiE. I3 also enquired about teachers’ opinions of the CPD Programme. This subsection presents a thematic analysis of I3’s data, closing with a summary of findings.

5.4.4.1. Teachers’ views: Creation of dialogic classrooms through Drama in Education

All teachers valued DiE’s contribution to establishing dialogic classrooms. Teachers agreed that DiE transformed their usual teacher-students interactions. For Patilla, Violeta, and Josefina, this was done by giving students more creative ownership in the DiE lessons. Others, like Laura, noticed how, while requiring risk-taking from them as teachers, teacher-in-role and other strategies made the lessons “more horizontal”, bringing them closer to students (29/09/2016). However, some qualified this idea of horizontality in DiE. Inés said that this does not mean that “teachers and students are the same” (11/10/2016). Like her, Violeta and Sofia emphasised the need for maintaining a level of teacher authority when applying DiE. For them, only clear limits could allow students’ freedom to flourish. This resonates with Freire’s distinction between authority and authoritarianism (Horton & Freire, 1990). These three teachers’ alignment with Freire is not surprising, considering their ideological commitment with CP, as shown in the baseline data.

DiE’s promotion of dialogue was another recurrent theme in the interviews. Teachers saw the embodied and experiential nature of DiE as supporting this. According to Inés, Gonzalo, and Sofia, this gave voice to typically silent students. Moreover, the majority of teachers mentioned the greater participation levels achieved during the DiE lessons. For them, DiE created more equal opportunities for students’ participation. Nonetheless, teachers also recognised the reluctance to participate shown by a portion of the classes. Primary teachers explained this as hinging on students’ interests. Secondary teachers, contrastingly, attributed this directly to feelings of
embarrassment. For example, Patilla, who taught mostly secondary-level students, said: “I’ve had trouble with those activities where [students] have to act (…) because there is a problem of shame” (05/10/2016). Secondary-level students might have been more self-conscious and susceptible to feeling embarrassed than primary-level students. This confirms observational data suggesting that performative DiE activities hindered participation of some secondary-level students.

Basing learning on students’ “generative themes” is another trait of a dialogic model of education (Freire, 2000b, p. 103). This rarely emerged in the interviews. This is not surprising, as only Nicole and Patilla explicitly focused on students’ topics of interest in their DiE lessons. However, for Gonzalo, Inés, and Patilla, DiE’s experiential quality added relevancy to learning. All teachers seemed to agree that, as a methodology, DiE was more meaningful for students’ lives than traditional approaches, thus enhancing its ability to create dialogic educational encounters. Related to this, Laura noted that rather than speaking to students’ previous experiences, the DiE lessons had gone “beyond what [the students] do in their lives” (29/09/2016). For Laura, being in-role as doctors “opened their perspective” to other social contexts. Arguably, there is potential for conscientization in challenging students’ existing views. However, as will be seen next, this potential was embraced only by five of the teachers who participated in the Application Stage. In contrast, as discussed above, all teachers, across levels and subject areas, recognised and seized DiE’s power to develop dialogic educational encounters.

5.4.4.2. Teachers’ views: Promotion of conscientization through Drama in Education

Five teachers (Gonzalo, Patilla, Inés, Sofia, and Violeta) commented on DiE’s contribution to promoting conscientization. For them, DiE was a suitable approach for transforming the official curriculum by looking at contents through a socio-political or moral lens. Gonzalo particularly valued how role-play moved students to empathise with narratives of oppression. Similarly, for Sofia, being in-role allowed children to argue their opinions freely (Morgan & Saxton, 1989), thus eliciting critical thinking about a moral dilemma. The experiential and embodied reflection fostered by DiE was also appreciated by Sofia, Inés, and Patilla. For these teachers, DiE fostered a more praxical critical analysis in students.

However, these teachers noted the complexity of promoting critical reflection through DiE. At times, their critical aims in the DiE lessons clashed with students’ interests. Patilla, Violeta, and Gonzalo detected moments when, contrary to their wishes, students chose to have fun rather than reflecting. This corroborates observational data indicating that, at several points, the DiE lessons were entertaining, but failed to elicit critical consciousness in students. This echoes the distinction made by McLaren (1988) between teachers as entertainers and as liminal servants, explained in Chapter Two. This also relates to the tension between “the play for the children” and “the play for
the teacher”, analysed by Bolton (1979, p. 51). For Patilla, reaching a balance between these ‘plays’ depended on teachers’ skills of “negotiation” and “flexibility” (05/10/2016). He spoke about finding a middle ground between his and the students’ interests. This is aligned both with CP theory (Freire, 2000b) and with DiE’s best practice (Bolton, 1979).

Although this complicated critical reflection in DiE, it also added value to it. For Violeta, DiE made critical reflection more spontaneous (28/09/2016). Students ultimately decided the tenor of the work, with the teacher “becoming more of a guide” (28/09/2016). Hence, for Violeta, student-generated critical reflection in DiE was “less indoctrinating” (28/09/2016). Violeta’s comments about her forum theatre-inspired activity exemplify this. In that exercise, students chose scenes about oppression from a film (see section 5.4.2). Violeta was surprised to see that several groups did not choose scenes on sexism, the film’s central topic. She explained:

It’s not that they don’t live [sexism], it’s that they don’t see it (…). And that’s why I think they opted for that other scene (…). Although it seemed to me that there was much less oppression there than in everything else. (28/09/2016)

Although Violeta would have preferred that students reflected about sexism, a topic she was particularly interested in, DiE gave students freedom to pursue their own interests. An imposition of the teacher’s views was, thus, avoided. DiE’s potential to escape indoctrination is significant, as imposing teachers’ perspectives is one of the biggest criticisms against CP (Ellsworth, 1989). This also substantiates the complexity of the DiE teacher’s work. Artistry and experience is required to embrace students’ interests while challenging them towards novel insights (Bolton, 1979).

These five teachers acknowledged that conscientization was promoted only partially in their lessons. Students did not reflect explicitly about their power to transform oppression in real life. Lack of time for reflection and lack of connection with students’ lives were named as reasons for this. Still, teachers valued their limited accomplishments. Patilla, for example, valued the occasions in which DiE encouraged students to question the taken-for-granted. He fondly recounted how students had deemed him “destroyer of minds” because of the questionings he motivated through DiE (05/10/2016). Likewise, Sofia appreciated students’ interest for learning more about dung beetles’ habits as a result of the DiE lesson. They acknowledged that people had to be understood before being morally judged. In relation to the DiE lessons, Inés said:

There was meaningful learning, which has to do with [the students’] context, with their reality, how they somehow transport this figure from the past into the present and link it with other figures and ideas. Or how today there are public policies and governmental actions being developed and they may hear them and establish a parallel with the past. So, for me that is sufficient, and that is meaningful. (Inés, 10/10/2016)
In Inés’ view, understanding the past more would help students to make sense of present-day political events, which was a worthwhile achievement. These comments are significant, as they speak of several traits of critical pedagogues: problematizing knowledge, kindling epistemological curiosity, and linking contents with wider social issues (Freire, 1998; Giroux, 1988; McLaren, 1988). Moreover, they suggest that, albeit moderately, DiE did effect some transformation of students’ ways of thinking and acting beyond the DiE lessons themselves. As Violeta argued about her lessons: “maybe this is not Freire, right? It’s not full transformation and all that, but it’s a step” (28/09/2016). For these teachers, conscientizing students through DiE was a gradual process and every step needed to be appreciated (Chan, 2016).

Unlike these five teachers, Laura, Nicole, and Josefina recognised that they did not try to promote conscientization through DiE. The fact that they used DiE to teach sciences was a factor as, like Laura noted, it was hard to find links between their subjects and social issues. Although, as previously mentioned, these teachers had seemed more interested in creating dialogic classrooms than on promoting critical reflection from the outset of the Programme, they did find that DiE develop a level of criticality in their students and in themselves as teachers. In Nicole’s words: “maybe it’s not a reflection about politics, or society, but [DiE] does generate a questioning about how [students] are learning (...) [students] are discovering that they can learn in a way that is a bit more interesting for them” (11/10/2016). For these teachers, there is critical power in students’ metacognitive reflection, even when the curriculum is not transformed. DiE fostered students’ self-perception as subjects rather than objects in their schooling process (Freire, 2000b). This cannot be considered conscientization, but it could be seen as a preliminary and crucial step towards it.

5.4.4.3. Commenting on the Continuing Professional Development Programme

All teachers reported that the CPD Programme impacted their professional lives positively. The highest impact was reported by Patilla. For him, the Workshop challenged his prejudices against CP (05/10/2016). He went from being opposed to this paradigm (see section 5.2), to embracing it in theory and practice.

For teachers unfamiliar with CP, like Nicole, Laura, and Josefina, the Workshop helped them understand this paradigm better. It also helped them recognise dialogic practices in their teaching and to enhance these through DiE. However, they did not set intentional conscientization aims for their DiE lessons. Perhaps they needed more time, support, and deeper acquaintance with CP theory before taking that leap. Alternatively, that aspect of CP might simply not have been aligned with their priorities as teachers.

For those already knowledgeable about CP (Gonzalo, Violeta, Inés, and Sofía), it seems that the Programme impacted their practices mostly. For Sofía, for instance, it helped her overcome
difficulties putting her CP views into practice. Something similar was reported by Inés, who added: “this is the only training of my ten years of work that has made sense to me” (10/10/2016). Nonetheless, she explained that the Programme did not modify her view on CP. Rather, it reinforced it. The theoretical framework of the Programme was aligned with their existing educational views and contributed a valuable way of practicing them.

Teachers evaluated our coplanning and coteaching collaboration positively. Gonzalo, for example, characterised this as a “very dialogic process” (07/10/2016). Working alongside a drama teacher was seen as an essential support. In Josefina’s words: “it was like, ‘great, I’m not alone in this’” (26/09/2016). For many, it also helped visualising, in practice, how to plan and apply DiE.

Teachers also suggested improvements to the Programme. Inés, Josefina, and Nicole believed that it should have been a School-wide initiative. This would have facilitated their collaboration with other educators in their classroom. Additionally, the issue of time constraints was mentioned by six of the eight interviewees when commenting on the Programme. More time to read the bibliographical materials shared in the Workshop, a longer process of coteaching, and more time allocated in their schedules to plan and apply DiE were mentioned.

Despite these difficulties, all teachers affirmed they would continue applying DiE in the future. They seemed optimistic about the sustainability of their practice of this new methodology.

5.4.4.4. Summary

Teachers found several openings for CP through DiE. All recognised its potential for creating dialogic classrooms. The DiE lessons were described as collaborative, non-authoritarian, meaningful, and participative. Some also valued DiE’s potential for conscientization. DiE enriched students’ critical reflection by fostering empathy, questioning the taken-for-granted, free expression of ideas, and greater understanding of social issues, particularly through role-play. Moreover, DiE was valued for avoiding indoctrination.

However, not all teachers incorporated conscientization into their aims. As before, two groups of teachers were visible here. This could be explained by their ideological stances at the outset of the Programme. Those aligned with CP’s socio-political lens (first group plus Patilla) seized DiE’s potential not just for creating communicative classrooms but also for criticising curricular contents. Contrastingly, those more akin to constructivism (second group), focused on DiE’s student-centredness. They opened up spaces for CP mostly through the form of their teaching, but not through its contents, although they did find critical value in metacognition, which emerged as a precursor of conscientization. The Programme proved insufficient to significantly transform these teachers’ views and practices and align them with CP. However, interview data suggests that, to
various degrees, the Programme had a generally positive impact on teachers’ practice of CP. The sustainability of this impact will be examined in the next section.
5.5. **Follow-up Stage**

The final stage of the CPD Programme aimed at gathering the views of all the 15 teachers who participated in the Workshop. A questionnaire (Q4) was administered to the 15 teachers via the Internet between two and four months after the Application Stage finished. Q4 had two strands. One was for those who applied DiE after the Workshop, either with or without my collaboration (n=14). The other was for those who did not apply DiE at all (n=1). A thematic analysis of the data is presented next, addressing the research questions:

- What possibilities and challenges did teachers meet when trying to open up spaces for CP through DiE?
- How did teachers evaluate the CPD Programme, including the Workshop and Application Stage?
- What impact did the CPD Programme have on teachers’ views and practices of CP?

The first research question is explored by looking at data from the 14 teachers who applied DiE in their classrooms. The second and third research questions are answered next, analysing data from the whole cohort of teachers. The section closes with a brief summary.

5.5.1. **Opening spaces for Critical Pedagogy through Drama in Education**

5.5.1.1. *Creating dialogic classrooms through Drama in Education*

The 14 teachers who applied DiE valued its power to turn their classrooms into dialogic spaces. This included challenging the verticality of teacher-students relationships. For example, the vast majority (12 of 14) agreed/strongly agreed with the statement: ‘In DiE, teacher and students relate in a less hierarchical way’ (Q4.8j). This also emerged frequently in the data as an important contribution of DiE to teachers’ practices. For example, Patilla asserted that DiE “neutralises the types of hierarchical relationships in the classroom” (Q4.11). Likewise, Josefina stated that “leaving the hierarchies aside” was one of the benefits of applying DiE (Q4.11).

Additionally, these teachers valued the relevancy given to students’ input in DiE. All affirmed that DiE empowered students to take ownership of their own learning. Bernarda remarked that in DiE students “become empowered in their role” (Q4.11). Similarly, Michelle stated that DiE gave her students “more protagonism”, allowing her to “integrate their discourses more” (Q4.4). She regarded DiE as a more student-centred approach, compared to her normal practice.

Michelle’s comment also relates to Freire’s notion of “generative themes” (2000b, p. 103), which is key to establishing a dialogic educational encounter. However, this was not usually reported in Q4. Teachers rarely referred to addressing students’ topics of interest through DiE. This is
coherent with previous data showing that only a few teachers integrated these topics in their DiE lessons (see section 5.4.2). In Q4, most teachers reported having to address a great number of curricular contents during the time they were applying DiE, as the end of the academic year approached. This may explain why they focused more heavily on the curriculum rather than on students’ themes of interest. Still, in Q4 all 14 teachers who applied DiE agreed that it made curricular knowledge more meaningful and relevant to students’ lives. Indeed, all but one undecided respondent characterised DiE as motivating for their students. Patilla, for instance, stated that in DiE lessons “students have a better disposition (…) [they] participate because they want to and not due to mere school routine” (Q4.11). This perspective is also consistent with previous data. It links with McLaren’s (1988) thesis about experiential and embodied learning being closer to students’ “streetcorner knowledge” (p.172). These data suggest that, although students’ thematic interests were not central in teachers’ responses, DiE as a methodology was reported as being interesting for students. This is particularly important considering that student- apathy was initially reported as an important barrier for CP in this School (see Chapter Three).

A criticism of CP, seen in Chapter Two, is that it can fail to create safe spaces for all to contribute equally (Ellsworth, 1989). Q4 enquired into whether DiE had enabled spaces for equal participation, according to the teachers who applied it. The majority (11 of the 14) agreed that DiE allowed all students to participate in the lessons in their own way. However, this was somewhat contradicted by responses to DiE’s appropriateness for all student-types (Figure 5.28).
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Figure 5.28. 'DiE only works with certain types of students', n=14 (Q4)
Half of the respondents rejected or were undecided about DiE’s suitability for all students. In addition, three teachers (Josefina, Andrea, and Cristián) identified encouraging everyone’s participation as their greatest challenge when applying DiE. In Interview 3, teachers commonly attributed this to feelings of embarrassment, particularly in secondary-level students (see section 5.4.4). However, in Q4, only Andrea, a primary teacher, mentioned the negative influence of students’ shyness in determining levels of participation. Perhaps, as students became more used to DiE, initial feelings of embarrassment decreased. Hence, this might not have been an issue for the majority of teachers in their work after our collaboration ended.

Data from Q4 shows that, for the majority of teachers, DiE infused a dialogic quality to their teaching practices. It challenged hierarchical classroom relationships. It emphasised students’ creative input and preferred ways of learning. However, there were mixed views about DiE’s capacity to elicit equal participation amongst students.

5.5.1.2. Promoting conscientization through Drama in Education

The majority of those who applied DiE saw conscientizing potential in it. For 11 of these 14 teachers, DiE can help raise students’ consciousness of social inequalities. All but three agreed or strongly agreed that DiE can increase students’ awareness of their capacity to change society. However, it seems that only some took advantage of this potential in their application of DiE. For example, only six teachers (42.8%) reported discussing social justice matters in their DiE lessons (Figure 5.29).
Violeta, Sofía, Inés, and Gonzalo were amongst those who agreed/strongly agreed with this statement. They also mentioned conscientization or conscientization-related aspects when commenting on DiE’s contributions to their practice of CP. For example, Gonzalo stated that DiE helped him “link[ing] the notion of social critique with concrete classroom practice” (Q4.11).

Michelle was ambivalent about the statement in Figure 5.29, but she valued DiE as a methodology that can “generate consciousness” in students (Q4.20). This corroborates their pre-existing knowledge of, and commitment to CP, as evident from the outset of the Programme (see section 5.2). Like Michelle, Patilla was undecided about the statement in Figure 5.29, which may be explained by the fact that his lessons, at least those I observed, touched on social issues (mass-media), but not necessarily on social justice issues. However, he also mentioned DiE’s conscientizing power: “[DiE] can be a highly efficacious tool for students to begin approaching a socio-critical thinking that aims at transforming their reality” (Q4.20). This evidences his adoption of the CP paradigm, which seems to have been triggered by the Workshop’s sessions (see section 5.3). In contrast, other teachers did not refer to conscientization or critical reflection when talking about DiE’s contribution to their practices. Rather, they focused on its promotion of dialogic classrooms.

However, all teachers saw DiE as an approach that stimulated critical thinking. Critical thinking is intimately linked with the development of critical awareness in DiE (Doyle, 1993). Additionally, as mentioned before, teachers valued DiE’s generation of motivation in students. This can also be deemed a crucial first step towards conscientization. This is because without a basal interest, no
critical reflection can emerge (Bundy et al., 2016). Therefore, all teachers found value in DiE for fostering crucial precursors of conscientization.

Taken together, these data suggest that the vast majority of teachers recognised DiE’s potential for conscientization. However, fostering critical reflection about social issues was a relevant aspect of only some teachers’ experience of DiE.

5.5.2. Impact of the Continuing Professional Development Programme

5.5.2.1. Evaluation of the Programme in general (Workshop and Application)

The 14 teachers who applied DiE in their classrooms were asked about their overall experience of learning and practising DiE. It was not unexpected that the SEN teachers reported having applied DiE as they had been part, albeit intermittently, of the Application Stage. However, it was somewhat surprising that four of the other five teachers who did not collaborate with me during that stage did nonetheless apply DiE in their classrooms. Data from Q4 suggest that the high number of teachers who tried DiE in practice was due to the practical emphasis of the Workshop, as all but one teacher agreed or strongly agreed that the strategies studied in it could be applied immediately in their classrooms. A reason reported in Q4 as to why these four teachers decided to apply DiE without my collaboration appears to be their lack of time and heavy end-of-year workload. Although the Application Stage encompassed a period of over eight weeks, some teachers reported this was not enough time for them to fit in coplanning and coteaching sessions in their tight schedule. Others, like Bernarda and Roberto, had expressed their intention of collaborating with me in our informal conversations, but they did not follow-up on that intention. Both teachers approached me towards the end of the Application Stage and reported having applied DiE fruitfully, regretting not having been able to coordinate cooperation with me. These teachers seemed to prefer applying DiE according to their own emerging needs rather than going through the process of coplanning and coteaching. Besides time and work-load constraints, their professional personalities and preferences might have been a factor here.

All of those who applied DiE (n=14) would recommend the Workshop and subsequent practice of DiE to a colleague, and all noted that it helped them to reflect about their roles as educators. Moreover, for all but two neutral respondents, participating in the Workshop and applying DiE in their lessons increased their motivation for teaching. Thus, the Programme fulfilled its aim of encouraging a self-reflective and committed stance in teachers, evidencing the study’s catalytic validity (Lather, 1986). Such a stance is aligned with CP, as it rejects technocratic views of the teaching profession (Giroux, 1988).
Except for one undecided respondent, all indicated that integrating DiE in their classrooms had a positive impact on their professional lives. This could explain why the vast majority of those who had applied DiE said they would also apply it in the future (Figure 5.30).
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However, all but two teachers agreed/strongly agreed that they needed more practice with me to feel confident as DiE practitioners. Moreover, 10 teachers only felt ‘somewhat capable’ of applying DiE at the time of completing Q4. Importantly, only teachers who collaborated with me in the Application Stage felt ‘very capable’ as DiE practitioners (Patilla, Violeta, and Inés). An exception was Michelle, who also felt very confident but did not collaborate with me in that Stage. This can be explained by her previous experience using role-play, reported in baseline data, which might have endowed her with the necessary artistic skill-set to successfully apply DiE independently. It is also noteworthy that Patilla, Violeta, and Inés requested a lower level of support in coplanning compared to the other five teachers who collaborated with me in the Application Stage (see section 5.4.1). Perhaps the balance between receiving my support while also showing initiative and independence helped them become more confident with DiE.

Alternatively, their greater confidence might not be related to the form of our collaboration, but to their pre-existing risk-taking dispositions.

Several teachers spoke about the difficulty of finding time for planning DiE lessons. Laura stated: “it’s necessary to think of each one of the stages of the lesson carefully, so that even the students’ possible responses are projected in advance and therefore, [DiE] places a greater demand on time.”
Although six teachers applied DiE at least once every two weeks after my departure from the School, the other eight did so once a month or less, being lack of time the main factor that prevented them from practicing DiE more frequently. As several teachers reported, the pressures of the end of the academic year greatly constrained their possibilities of applying DiE more regularly. Similarly, lack of time was the reason given by Francesca for not having applied DiE at all after the Workshop. She was the only teacher who took the alternative strand in Q4. Teachers reported that they would have benefited from free slots in their work-hours especially allocated for planning DiE lessons. This is something I should have negotiated with the School management in advance as part of the Programme’s requirements.

This criticism notwithstanding, data from Q4 show that the overall CPD Programme was evaluated positively by the teachers.

5.5.2.2. Evaluation of the Workshop

In Q4, all 15 teachers were asked to assess the Workshop in particular (Figure 5.31).
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*Figure 5.31. ‘On a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 being poor and 7 being excellent, how would you evaluate the Workshop?’; n=15 (Q4)*

As this figure depicts, the Workshop was evaluated favourably. Several teachers suggested some improvements. A few proposed students’ participation in the Workshop, to allow them to “better visualise the application of the strategy” (Francesca, Q4.17). However, the most common criticism of the Workshop was its short duration (Figure 5.32).
This coincides with my own assessment as facilitator. We consistently ran out of time, particularly for reflection (see section 5.3).

Amongst the Workshop’s positive aspects, 10 out of the 15 teachers mentioned the value of experiencing DiE in practice. This enabled them to understand “what students would feel when performing the different strategies” (Tamara, Q4.16). The experiential format of the Workshop (Girvan et al., 2016), appears to have increased the teachers’ comprehension of the methodology. Josefina, Gonzalo, Violeta, and Patilla also signalled my facilitation of the Workshop as one of the most positive aspects. They saw it as the beginning of a collaborative relationship.

Teachers also valued favourably the discussion about CP that the Workshop stimulated. For 11 of the 15 teachers, the Workshop helped them to understand and/or reconsider this paradigm which is explicitly connected to the School ethos (Figure 5.33).
This confirms observational data from the Workshop, suggesting that a rich reflection on CP emerged during the sessions (see section 5.3). To various degrees, this appears to have impacted upon teachers’ stances on CP.

5.5.2.3. Impact on teachers’ perceptions of Critical Pedagogy

Before the Workshop, four teachers felt unable to define CP (Q2, I2). In Q4 all but Nicole gave definitions of it from their personal and professional perspective. Josefina focused mostly on creating dialogic classrooms. However, most teachers defined CP not only in relation to classroom interactions, they also acknowledged its social justice goal and socio-political critique. This corroborates what emerged previously in this section: that the majority were aware of the conscientizing aspect of CP, even though only some integrated it into their DiE lessons.

The experience of the CPD Programme seems to have impacted teachers’ self-perception as critical pedagogues (Figure 5.34).
This is most evident in Roberto. He went from considering himself as a critical pedagogue pre-Workshop (Q2), to not doing so post-Workshop (Q4). Initially, Roberto was not very familiar with CP and had a somewhat loose notion of it. Contrastingly, he now defined CP clearly, while stating that the Workshop had helped him to better understand/rethink the paradigm. In his definition, Roberto remarked the difficulty of doing CP. He said that CP “makes [society] more equal, something many of us aim at, but which is really hard in the context and reality we live in” (Q4.19). Arguably, his greater awareness of the meaning of CP, which was elicited at least partially by the Workshop, brought along a more realistic self-perception. Something similar could be said of Nicole and Cristián. Nicole went from being unsure, to not seeing herself as a critical pedagogue by the end. Cristián changed from seeing himself as a critical pedagogue to being uncertain. Like Roberto, they both said they understood CP more thanks to the Workshop. Hence, this might have afforded them a more accurate self-view in terms of this paradigm.

Patilla had the opposite shift. He went from not considering himself a critical educator, to declaring himself as one after the Workshop. For Patilla, the Workshop helped him to “reread the socio-critical model” (Q4.16). Before, Patilla reported being only somewhat familiar with CP and regarded it as an outdated paradigm. Now, he had a rich definition of it: “a promoter of reflection about discourses-ideologies present in culture, in politics, in economy and society. In terms of this reflection we can transform our reality” (Q4.19). The Workshop led Patilla to value CP and to integrate it into his practice (see section 5.4).

Applying DiE also impacted other teachers’ self-identification. This occurred in Sofia’s case. She changed from being unsure at the outset of the Programme (Q2) to recognising herself as a critical teacher (Q4). Sofia remarked: “so far, [DiE] has been the most concrete way to carry out critical pedagogy in the classroom” (Q4.20). Teaching through DiE strengthened Sofia’s practice of CP.
This could also be said of Bernarda. She underwent the same self-identification change as Sofía, while recognising that DiE helped her put CP into practice. Francesca’s case, on the other hand, cannot be similarly explained. She changed her self-perception in the same direction as Sofía and Bernarda. But, unlike them, Francesca never applied DiE. Also, she was uncertain as to whether the Workshop helped her understand CP better. Therefore, her change may be unrelated to this Programme.

As Figure 5.34 above displays, four teachers remained unsure about their status. For Josefina and Laura, DiE enabled their application of the paradigm. However, this seems to have been insufficient for them to deem themselves critical pedagogues. Andrea and Tamara, on the other hand, were undecided as to whether DiE had helped them bring CP into the classroom. Hence, the Programme did not appear to significantly impact them in terms of CP practice.

Finally, teachers who were knowledgeable and confident as critical pedagogues at the outset of the Programme continued to be so at the end. Still, they valued DiE’s contribution. Violeta, for instance, said: “[DiE] facilitated my work within the socio-critical paradigm” (Q4.11). Gonzalo, Inés, and Michelle made similar remarks. For these teachers, DiE seems to have presented an alternative educational tool that complemented their critical pedagogical practice.

5.5.2.4. Conclusions

Data from Q4 show that the overall CPD Programme had a favourable impact on teachers’ stances and practices of CP. The DiE methodology explored in the Workshop and applied by the vast majority supported most teachers’ practices of CP. For most, DiE opened up spaces for the creation of dialogic classrooms. They characterised DiE as a methodology that values students’ creative input while challenging authoritarian teaching stances. The majority also found potential in DiE for fostering conscientization and precursors of it, like critical thinking and motivation. However, only some teachers embraced this potential in their application of DiE. Importantly, in general, those teachers were already knowledgeable and aligned with CP at the beginning of the Programme. Arguably, their greater familiarity and conviction gave them a more solid theoretical foundation to guide their practice of DiE towards a critical pedagogical aim. The distinction between these two groups of teachers, those who aimed for conscientization in their practices and those who did not, continued the trend visible in previous stages of the Programme. Although the Programme did not trigger radical changes in teachers’ pedagogies (except in Patilla’s case), it did affect most teachers’ view of CP. It helped the majority to further understand CP and, for some, to gain a more realistic self-perception in relation to the paradigm.

Q4 data also show that the Programme was a positive learning experience for teachers. Although it was criticised for its short duration, it appears to have introduced teachers to a relevant teaching
and learning approach. The vast majority integrated DiE into their practices. Moreover, all but two were certain that they would continue applying this approach in the future. This speaks positively about the sustainability and impact of the Programme.
5.6. Synthesis

In this chapter, I presented and interpreted data from the CPD Programme. Baseline data further contextualised this inquiry, showing that teachers’ views were, in general, aligned with CP premises, although these were not frequently visible in their practices. In addition, there were differing understandings of CP amongst teachers, the vast majority of whom were unfamiliar with DiE. Considering this, the Workshop sought to open a platform for teachers to dialogue about CP, while having a direct experience of DiE as a methodology. Workshop data show that these aims were generally met.

In my subsequent collaboration with a number of teachers, I observed several ways in which DiE opened up spaces for CP in their classrooms. Other data sources corroborated my observations. DiE helped teachers to challenge authoritarian stances, particularly through teacher-in-role. DiE also enabled more ways for their students to be actively involved, emphasising their creative input. Dialogue transcended speech and so, more possibilities for students’ equal participation were created. While performative DiE activities appeared to inhibit some students’ participation, this did not detract from students’ favourable evaluation of the DiE lessons. In general, these were seen by students, teachers, and by myself as encounters where more dialogic teacher-students relationships were fostered.

In some of the teachers’ cases, DiE also contributed to promote conscientization. At some points of the DiE lessons, role-taking encouraged students to question the taken-for-granted, to think critically about moral dilemmas, and to empathise with experiences of oppression. At a few points, manipulating aesthetic form also enabled critical reflection about socio-political issues. In those occasions, DiE became a form of dramatic and theatrical codifications. However, these moments were infrequent. This was seemingly provoked by a lack of connection between the themes explored and students’ lives, which appeared to cause light-hearted responses in students. This bore testament to the dialogic quality of DiE, as it prevented teachers’ thematic interests and reflective aims from being imposed over students. At the same time, this showed that an important factor affecting teachers’ ability to open up spaces for CP through DiE was students’ engagement levels. It was noted that when the teacher-in-role strategy was used with belief, student engagement was enhanced. Additionally, presenting students with a dramatic journey was apparently more conducive of engagement than the unconnected use of DiE activities. The promotion of conscientization was also hindered by the lack of moments for reflection in the DiE lessons. This further prevented explicit links between the issues explored and students’ own realities from emerging. Nonetheless, teachers who did incorporate conscientizing aims into their lessons valued DiE’s contribution, albeit limited, to their advancement of critical consciousness.

Two groups of teachers were visible from the outset of the Programme, constituting a trend throughout. The first was formed by those knowledgeable of, and committed to, CP. Teachers who
seemed closer to a constructivist paradigm comprised the second group. While the first group applied DiE to both promote conscientization and create dialogic classrooms, the second focused mainly on the latter aspect of CP. This makes sense, as fostering dialogic classrooms can also be seen as a trait of constructivism (Breunig, 2011). The stability of these groups over time suggests that, except in one case (Patilla), the Programme did not provoke deep changes in teachers’ pedagogies. Even so, the Programme did seem to offer them a methodology that enhanced the criticality of their practices. Considering both groups’ interpretations of CP was important for me as a researcher. In my understanding of CP, the second group was not fully aligned with the paradigm. However, these teachers’ valuing of metacognition, critical thinking, and motivation, encouraged me to also recognise the critical worth of these aspects in this particular context. Arguably, these could sow the seeds of “epistemological curiosity” in students, a stepping stone towards conscientization (Freire, 1998, p. 37).

It was also found that having certain artistry as a teacher when applying DiE is crucial. Teachers who were more comfortable using active methodologies, who were flexible enough to alter their usual teaching structures, who showed belief in the dramatic fictions, and who took risks were also those who applied DiE most fruitfully.

An important factor throughout the Programme was lack of time. This impacted teachers’ application of DiE negatively, therefore diminishing their opening of spaces for CP. It also affected my own work as practitioner. I mismanaged time during the Workshop, failing to model best practice in this respect to teachers. My limitations as a DiE practitioner seem to have impacted teachers’ subsequent application of DiE. That being said, data suggest that the overall experience of the Programme was enriching for all involved. In the next chapter I will assemble a dialogue between these findings and the literature to discuss how DiE opened up spaces for CP in this context.
6. DISCUSSION

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter I discuss empirical data from this Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme in light of the study’s theoretical framework. In so doing, I respond to the main research questions:

- How can Drama in Education (DiE) open up spaces for Critical Pedagogy (CP) in the classroom?
- What factors facilitated/hindered the development of these spaces for Chilean school teachers?

Answers to these questions are strongly interrelated. However, for ease of presentation, I discuss them thematically in two separate sections below.

6.2. How Drama in Education opens up spaces for Critical Pedagogy

In the Literature Review, I identified two main principles of CP relevant to this research: dialogic classrooms and conscientization. Drawing from Giroux’s (1988) notion of transformative intellectuals, I recognised different tasks related to these principles. In considering the Applied Theatre literature, I also identified ways in which DiE could open up spaces for teachers’ enactment of these tasks (Figure 6.1).
In the sub-sections below, I will argue that, although empirical data confirmed these potential connections between DiE and CP, these were not fully enacted by participating teachers. An additional connection that emerged from the fieldwork, that is, the fostering of precursors of conscientization through DiE, will also be discussed. Although the two main principles of CP were entwined in practice, I begin by discussing aspects of the promotion of conscientization and then focus on the creation of dialogic classrooms.

6.2.1. Codifications in Drama in Education

6.2.1.1. Theatrical codifications

As seen in Chapter Two, Pompeo Nogueira’s (2002, 2015) concept of theatrical codifications is relevant for this inquiry as it links Freire’s theories with Applied Theatre. Following Freire, Pompeo Nogueira (2002) defines a codification as an instrument that “allows the participants to
have a distanced perspective of their daily life” to facilitate collective analysis (p. 107). Therefore, codifications can promote conscientization, that is, critical reflection about participants’ lives and possibilities to effect change (Freire, 1973). According to Freire (2000b, pp. 114-115), codifications should:

- Represent situations that are familiar to learners
- Not be too enigmatic nor too explicit
- Offer various decoding possibilities (to avoid propaganda)
- Point towards multiple other themes.

Pompeo Nogueira (2002) argues that devising and presenting theatrical plays can be forms of codifications. Unlike the pictures commonly used as codifications by Freire (1973, 2000b), theatrical codifications may not represent reality in a realistic way. However, their imaginative and symbolic qualities can open up alternative ways to reflect on reality (Pompeo Nogueira, 2002). In this way, Pompeo Nogueira expands the notion of codifications, valuing the critical potential of theatre’s aesthetics.

While participants in this study did not engage in the kind of sustained theatrical work analysed by Pompeo Nogueira, the notion of theatrical codifications is germane to some episodes of the Programme, particularly when presentational conventions like still-image were used (Neelands, 2000). During the Workshop, teachers commented on the value of form to convey meaning in still-images. This value was experienced during the first session, when as described in subsection 5.3.2.1, teachers debated about the meaning of a particular still-image showing two persons with books over their faces. While for most, these persons represented pedagogical standpoints, for a few, they symbolised teachers blinded by their ideologies. This still-image met the traits of Freirean codifications mentioned above. Firstly, it was understandable for teachers but not univocal. Secondly, it pointed towards several themes, like teachers’ positionality and CP’s indoctrinating potential. Finally, it symbolised a relevant aspect of teachers’ lives, allowing them to examine their professional reality from a distance. Moreover, like a codification, this still-image elicited critical reflection. It encouraged teachers to consider the teaching profession not as a technical, neutral endeavour, but, aligned with the notion of teachers as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988), the still-image emphasised for teachers the political nature of their work. This example demonstrated that theatrical codifications can develop not only through a lengthy devising process like that described by Pompeo Nogueira (2002), but also through presentational conventions, like still-image.

However, at several other points of the Programme, the presentational conventions used cannot be considered codifications. This is illustrated by Inés’ still-image activity as described in subsection
5.4.2.8, where students used their bodies and voices to create still-images that represented social classes in Colonial Chile. Through this exercise, Inés linked curricular contents with wider socio-political issues, like classism. In this way, the activity opened up possibilities for problematizing the curriculum, which is part of CP (Giroux, 1988). However, these still-images were too literal to invite in-depth reflection, as students were not encouraged to include symbolism and experiment with form. Being unambiguous, the still-images did not open various interpretations or themes. From my observation, the activity developed more like a game of charades than an opportunity for critical reflection (research journal, 01/08/2016). This corroborates O’Neill’s (Manley & O’Neill, 1997) assertion that still-images “will not automatically result in reflection or elaboration without the teacher’s encouragement and skilful questioning” (p. 94). In the Workshop example, still-images were scrutinised collectively, guided by my queries. In Inés’ lesson, contrarily, she and I failed to pose questions that challenged students towards detailed consideration of the still-images. Additionally and perhaps more importantly, the theme of these still-images was not closely connected with students’ lives. This is corroborated by results to Questionnaire 3 (Q3) where all but one student who completed this instrument said that the DiE lessons were disconnected from their lives. This contrasts with Pompe Nogueira’s (2002) description of theatrical codifications as symbolisations of an aspect of participants’ reality. Inés and I needed to draw connections between the theme and students’ lives so that the work could become a codification. In addition, we should have purposefully guided the experience to encourage critical reflection.

6.2.1.2. **Dramatic codifications**

In Chapter Two I suggested that the notion of codifications could be expanded even further to consider dramatic codifications, and not just theatrical. I argued that the experience of role-taking could become a codification as it can allow students to be distanced from reality while being engaged in a fictional world. Following Bundy et al. (2016), I theorised that the critical potential of dramatic codifications may be enhanced when a tension of metaxis, a dissonance between real and fictitious contexts (O’Toole, 2003), occurs. That can lead to questioning of students’ habitual thoughts and actions, which are challenged by the fictitious experience (Bundy et al., 2016). In this way, the tension of metaxis may allow students to consider their reality, like a codification. When such contemplation leads to an analysis of wider socio-political issues, then conscientization may be fostered (Freire, 2000b).

A key question in this Programme was whether role-play gave way to dramatic codifications. Considering the data, it seems that this only occurred partially and occasionally. To discuss this, I will use as illustrations three moments when teachers applied role-play in different ways: an intervention in Violeta’s forum theatre-adaptation, Inés’ conscience alley, and Gonzalo’s writing-
in-role. I have chosen these examples as they contained evidence of students engaging in critical reflection.

As reported in section 5.4.2, during Violeta’s forum theatre-adaptation, one of the students’ interventions opened up a space for critical reflection. In-role, students explored the many-sided and inter-generational gender oppression that affected the protagonist. In Inés’ conscience alley, students in-role as villagers in pre-Independent Chile argued for and against protecting a leader of the patriots who was fleeing from the Spaniards. Their arguments evidenced a consideration of the peasants’ unfair situation. In Gonzalo’s second DiE lesson, students wrote letters in-role as concentration camp prisoners, displaying sharp criticism of repression and discrimination.

In all these examples, role-taking turned an aspect of human reality into an object of analysis. Students considered these issues from a distanced but engaged position afforded by role. In this sense, these role-taking activities can be considered codifications. They met some of the traits identified by Freire (2000b). Firstly, students’ in-role work was neither too enigmatic nor too explicit. Their contributions made logical sense within the fictional situation while leaving some room for different interpretations. For instance, the letter written by one of Gonzalo’s students read: “I should have been born as a white person, blonde and blue-eyed, that way I would not be treated like the scum of society” (Document G.13, 07/10/2016). This letter evidences the role’s self-loathing, but also hatred for those who discriminate against her. These role-taking moments also pointed towards various themes. For instance, Violeta’s students addressed the theme of patriarchy, but also that of sexism amongst women. Students had a degree of creative freedom over the work which multiplied the “thematic fan” explored (Freire, 2000b, p. 115).

However, these role-taking experiences did not fulfil what is arguably the most important feature of a codification: portraying a relevant aspect of students’ reality (Freire, 2000b). For Freire (2000b), it is “inadmissible (…) to present pictures of reality unfamiliar to the participants” (p. 114). While acknowledging the dialectical value of analysing unfamiliar realities, Freire (2000b) believes that this cannot precede students’ questioning of their own context. Even recognising that school teachers commonly have to deal with a received curriculum, Giroux (1988) seems to agree with Freire in that curricular contents can and must be linked with students’ local context. This did not occur in these role-taking examples. Violeta’s adaptation of forum theatre did not abide by a basic aspect of the approach, namely, that of portraying an issue of “burning importance” for participants (Boal, 2002, p. 277). Similarly, Inés’ and Gonzalo’s role-taking activities did not address students’ generative universe explicitly.

At this point, it is pertinent to revisit Pompeo Nogueira’s (2002) expansion of the notion of codifications. As originally proposed by Freire (2000b), codifications must represent situations where participants’ involvement can be easily recognised by them. However, Pompeo Nogueira
(2002) questions the value of such a transparent representation. She criticises some Theatre for Development projects where a community’s problematic situation is codified through a scene that mirrors that situation. She argues instead for a more aesthetically developed type of theatre, where imagination and symbolism play a greater role in codifying reality. Analogously, dramatic codifications may not be a transparent representation of students’ reality but nonetheless contain the key ideas which can potentially resonate with their day to day realities. Indeed, as mentioned in the Literature Review, several Applied Theatre exponents recommend approaching topics tangentially so as to offer protection (Aitken, 2009; O’Connor, 2013; O’Toole, 2003) and to promote greater reflection through moving beyond the immediate context of the situation/storyline so that it holds potential to resonate with a wider range of interests and realities. Indeed, Markovich and Rapoport’s (2013) experience, mentioned in Chapter Two, suggests that inviting students to reflect critically on their realities in a direct way can provoke resistance in them, advancing a ghettoization of the CP paradigm whereby students associate critical reflection with their stigmatisation as marginalised youth. Considering this, when the aim in DiE is to promote students’ critical reflection about their realities, it would be suitable to discuss this through a distanced fiction so that they do not become overly immersed in the ‘drama’ of the immediate context but can stand back from that moment and apprehend its significance for their lives and the lives of others. Moreover, this would also respond to the stance expressed by teachers in the Workshop, that sometimes it is useful to show students realities other than their own in order to promote criticality. Hence, the fictional situations explored in the role-play examples under discussion here could have been appropriate codifications.

Yet, for them to function as codifications, connections needed to be drawn with students’ lives. As seen before, the tension of metaxis could have facilitated such connections, as a dissonance between fiction and reality might have led students to question their habitual views and practices (Bundy et al., 2016). It is possible that tension of metaxis did occur in these role-play examples. For example, in Inés’ conscience alley activity, students were positioned on either side of the alley (arguing for/against helping the patriot leader) arbitrarily. Hence, the arguments they voiced were determined by the side of the alley they were standing in, rather than being a representation of their own views. It is possible that their actual views (or what they would argue for if the situation was real) contrasted with that of their role or attitude in this activity, in which case a tension of metaxis could have emerged. This dissonance could have made them re-consider their actual views. This would corroborate what I conjectured in Chapter Two: that dramatic conventions that preserve in-role work can also develop a tension of metaxis, even without offering a lengthy ‘living-through’ experience. However, there is limited data to confirm whether students in these role-play activities experienced a tension of metaxis that led to critical reflection of their realities. These activities were not followed by a plenary reflection where students’ analysis of their in-role experiences could be made explicit or could be deepened and questioned. For Heathcote (Wagner,
reflection makes drama worthwhile, so she often interspersed moments for out-of-role reflection in her lessons (Heathcote, 2015c). In the examples from the Programme under discussion here, the emphasis was placed on participation, engagement, and action, and these teachers and I neglected to plan enough time for reflection. This is a challenge for Applied Theatre practitioners in a short lesson where time is required to build investment in the characters and storyline so that the students have something meaningful to reflect on. The constraints of time emerged throughout this study.

It can be posited that there was reflection occurring as the activities developed. In relation to Gonzalo’s activity, it can be argued, following O’Neill (Manley & O’Neill, 1997), that writing-in-role was a moment for reflection in itself. For Gonzalo, this activity enabled students’ reflection, which was, for him, one of the contributions that DiE brought to his practice of CP (I3, 07/10/2016). However, data suggest that the reflective element of these activities was not enough to promote a critical analysis of students’ own lives. This is evident in the responses to Q3 given by Violeta’s, Inés’, and Gonzalo’s students. The majority (65.5%) reported that the DiE lessons made them think about social justice, which indicates that a degree of conscientization was promoted. Yet, only 10.3% saw the topics of the lessons as closely connected with their own lives. Hence, these role-play activities cannot be regarded fully as codifications.

This discussion suggests that there is potential for role-play experiences to behave as Freirean codifications leading to conscientization. However, such potential was not fully realised by teachers in this Programme. As the examples above illustrate, this is because the themes explored were not sufficiently linked with students’ lives. In that sense, a dominant “banking” model of education was not challenged fully (Freire, 2000b, p. 72). Also, teachers and I failed to help students make sense of their in-role experience, reflecting collectively about possible moments of tension of metaxis (O’Toole, 2003). We did not support students in finding relevance in the dramatic experience for their own context, and thus limited the potential to build sustained emotional connections which can ultimately drive change. In general, students enjoyed the experiences but their emotional engagement with the work remained at a superficial level, occasionally hinting at a deeper meaning and level of connection, tantalisingly close but never realised. Therefore students were not challenged enough from a critical perspective, and possibly remained a little confused by a promise of a pedagogy which attempted to tap into their emotional reserve to care deeply about issues, but which did not value or connect with their own lived realities and experiences, and ultimately fell short of disrupting the dominant banking model of education (Freire, 2000b).
6.2.2. Emotional engagement

Students’ level of emotional engagement determines the openings for conscientization in Applied Theatre (Bundy et al., 2016). Data from this Programme corroborates this in the subfield of DiE. To organise the following discussion, I will draw on Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy of engagement, explained in Chapter Two and seen again in Figure 6.2.

For Morgan and Saxton (2006), transformations in students’ understandings happen at the internalizing level of engagement. In this section I discuss whether and how student engagement was promoted by teachers in this Programme, so as to reach the level of internalizing, conducive of conscientization.

6.2.2.1. Generating interest

Being interested in the dramatic experience is the first step towards emotional engagement. Hence, it is crucial to foster an emotionally engaged critical reflection. Although teachers rarely based their DiE classes on students’ thematic interests, data indicate that, as a methodology, DiE was in fact interesting for students (Q3). As will be discussed in a later subsection, this is important from a CP perspective as it corroborates McLaren’s (1988) claim that embodied classroom methodologies are closer to working-class students’ “streetcorner” ways of knowing (p. 169).

Bundy et al. (2016), drawing from Silvia (2008), affirm that interest in Applied Theatre is generated when the experience is novel, comprehensible, and challenging. This is substantiated by the empirical data. Given that art-based pedagogies were generally unknown in this School, students appreciated the novelty of DiE, describing it as “innovative” (Q3.12L), “a different dynamic” (Q3.1L), and “more active than a normal class” (Q3.41V).

The comprehensibility of the DiE tasks, namely whether these were understandable to them (Silvia, 2008), also impacted students’ interest levels. In general, DiE activities seemed accessible to them. However, when students did not possess the content knowledge to fully participate in an
activity, they quickly became disinterested. This was observed in Inés’ DiE lessons, where the structure allowed only knowledgeable students to engage actively. For Silvia (2008), people need to deem they have “the skills, knowledge, and resources to deal with an event” (p. 58) in order to be interested by it. Hence, ensuring that all students have the necessary means for participation is a crucial aspect of planning interesting DiE experiences. Emphasis on this was lacking in the Programme. During the Workshop, a few teachers commented on the prospective problem of students disengaging from activities because they lacked content knowledge to fully participate. However, neither the Workshop nor the process of coplanning anticipated the extent to which the DiE approaches needed to accommodate and compensate for knowledge deficits, in order to engage all students. This can be attributed to a lack of time, expertise, and experience on both my part and the teachers to use DiE in a more inclusive and differentiated way.

Overall, the DiE activities seemed to challenge students constructively. Comparing observational data from the Baseline and the Application stages, DiE dared students to participate more actively in the learning process. In Interview 3, teachers like Sofía, Laura, and Nicole, also perceived that students’ habitual classroom behaviour was challenged fruitfully through DiE. Its novelty, general accessibility, and challenging quality can help explain why interest was one of the emotions most frequently elicited in students according to Q3 responses.

6.2.2. Fostering willingness to participate

According to the data, DiE impacted students’ participation levels positively. For Patilla: “[DiE] generates a positive change in [students’] disposition towards learning (…) they participate because they want to and not due to mere school routine” (Q4.11). This is evident in students’ responses to Q3. For instance, for one of them the fact that her classmates “participated without being obligated” was her favourite aspect of the DiE lessons (Q3.46V). This is relevant for the creation of dialogic classroom relationships, as will be discussed later.

Even so, encouraging students to participate was, at times, problematic. As reported in section 5.4.2, in most lessons there were students who remained on the outskirts. A few seemed completely disengaged. Most, however, seemed interested by the work, but opted to observe from afar. Performative DiE activities tended to enhance this type of reaction in secondary-level students. Being under the lime-light was too challenging and uncomfortable for some. As Heathcote (1984g) would put it, these students were feeling “stared at” (p. 162), something that, in concordance with Heathcote’s views, was avoided in more dramatic DiE activities when the focus of attention was placed onto an ‘other’ instead of the students, for example, onto the teacher-in-role. For Inés, feelings of embarrassment in secondary-level students were linked to their stage of development: “students are in a complex age (…) they want to avoid being exposed” (I3,
This interpretation coincides with Bolton’s (1979) assertion that embarrassment can occur in adolescents who are new to drama work. The fact that reports of embarrassment are notably absent from teachers’ responses to Q4 suggest that this might have decreased as students became used to the methodology.

Students’ willingness to engage also reduced when belief in the fiction was not appropriately developed. This occurred, for instance, in Gonzalo’s first lesson when towards the beginning students were asked to imagine what they would pack if they were running away from a fascist regime. With half of the class appearing disengaged, Gonzalo asserted that this activity did not enable students to “really situate themselves in that condition” (I3, 07/10/2016). They had not been sufficiently prepared to enter into such a challenging fictional premise. In contrast, when the lessons helped students to believe in the “one Big Lie” (Heathcote, 2015b, p. 51), participation levels soared. For example, for Laura, greater participation levels were elicited in her second DiE lesson because “students believed in the story” (I3, 29/09/2016). Corroborating Morgan and Saxton’s (1989) claim, in this Programme, students’ “willing suspension of disbelief” (Heathcote, 1984b, p. 82) deeply affected their engagement levels. The challenge however was to create sustained investment and belief in the fictional contexts over a period of time, which was not easily achievable through the use of once-off conventions such as still image and conscience alley in individual lessons. In order to ascend the steps in Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy of personal engagement and move towards criticality, a deeper level of knowledge and experience with DiE was required by the teachers, which was unfortunately not available in this Programme.

The role of teachers in helping to build investment and belief in the lessons further highlighted the skills deficit in this regard. This was demonstrated in relation to the use of teacher-in-role which as indicated in the Literature Review, can promote students’ belief in the fiction (Edmiston, 2014; Heathcote, 2015d; O’Neill, 2006d). In this study, whenever teachers used this strategy with belief, students’ own belief strengthened and increased their commitment to the work, foreshadowing the potential to reach further up the scales of engagement. However, the reverse also appeared to be true. For example, Nicole commented on the negative impact of her own lack of belief during teacher-in-role: “if [students] had seen me more into it maybe they would have been immediately hooked [by the fiction]” (I3, 11/10/2016). Teacher-in-role either enhanced or lessened students’ willingness to believe and engage depending on teachers’ own capacity for belief. This points towards a greater need for teacher education and training around the artistry of drama than was possible in this study.
Cocreating to elicit commitment

Morgan and Saxton (1989) define commitment as “acceptance of personal engagement and responsibility to the work and the group” (p. 24). Collaborating with students can elicit their commitment in Applied Theatre (O’Neill, 1995). Comparing observational data from baseline and DiE lessons, it is possible to affirm that, in the latter, students and teachers worked more collaboratively. In the DiE lessons, teachers encouraged students to decide what roles to assume, what questions to ask, and how to solve fictitious problems collaboratively. The vast majority of students who completed Q3 noticed they had greater voice in these lessons. Teachers also were united in their view of DiE as a methodology that enhances students’ ownership of their learning process (Q4). This replicates Cawthon et al.’s (2011) findings from their Drama for Schools project, where drama-based pedagogy increased students’ ownership over their learning. In Neelands’ (2009) terms, teachers in our case study were able to ‘uncrown’ themselves through DiE, thus enhancing the dialogic quality of their classroom interactions. However, it must be acknowledged that this was only partially achieved as students had limited input on the initial construction of the fictional worlds. This is significant as, according to O’Neill (1995), “only participation in the creation of the dramatic world can bring that world into being” (p. 64).

Teachers, and I as their coteacher, generally spent little time setting up the imaginary contexts, due to time constraints, associated mainly with the one-class approach we were following. Arguably, had we planned for a more process-based engagement with the content where the same storyline and characters were developed over a number of lessons, greater commitment to the drama could have resulted as the students learned more about the situation and were afforded time and space to begin to forge a connection with the characters and the fictional scenario under exploration. This was further compounded as the teachers and I generally planned somewhat rigid structures that did not allow students to “join the dots between episodes” (Piazzoli, 2018, p. 297) or activities. This responded to teachers’ control needs (Heathcote, 1984), as well as my own lack of confidence with more spontaneous forms of Applied Theatre, like improvised process drama (Piazzoli, 2018). This helps to explain why commitment was not always secured in the DiE lessons, and hence the technification of teaching remained mostly unchallenged in these lessons (Apple, 1986; Leaton Gray, 2006). The aim that teachers fulfilled a role of transformative intellectuals problematizing the given curriculum to enhance its meaningfulness for their students and open up possibilities for conscientization was not fully achieved (Giroux, 1988), as teachers needed considerably more time and experience before handing over control and responsibility to their students to cocreate learning experiences which would build commitment to the issues under study.
Morgan and Saxton (1989) speak about internalizing as the mode of engagement where the external fictional world is merged with the personal. As a result, changes in understanding conducive of conscientization can be fostered.

This level of engagement was observed only in isolated moments of the DiE lessons. One such occurred during Sofia’s hot-seating activity with first-graders. When, in-role as the ant I wondered if it would be correct to let the beetle starve, some students changed their initial recommendation and proposed to share food with the insect after it apologised. Students’ engagement with the fictional situation allowed them to re-consider the dilemma, problematizing their initial views. Moreover, as Sofia reported, the dramatic experience led them to question in a following lesson: “why do we criticise the beetle without knowing him?” (I3, 06/10/2016). Students were then motivated to learn more about the beetle, suggesting that “epistemological curiosity” was provoked (Freire, 1998, p. 37). Furthermore, as Sofia recounted, in that following lesson students drew connections with their own lives, saying: “we sometimes criticise our classmates and we don’t know what is happening to them” (I3, 06/10/2016). Students seemed to have moved on to the interpreting mode of engagement in Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy, where learners want to communicate new views with others. Their comments show that the DiE lesson opened a space for them to reflect about moral judgements, prompting them to take a more empathic stance. Importantly, empathy is a sign of internalizing (Morgan & Saxton, 2006), and conducive of critical awareness as it enables a recognition of shared humanity (O’Connor, 2013). Although this lesson did not touch directly on social justice themes, it did, through analogy, promote critical reflection about what it means to be human which is intimately connected with a CP stance (Freire, 2000b). In so doing, it fostered a re-evaluation of the self (Neelands, 2010b), and an enhanced awareness of the undesirability of prejudice.

Another moment of internalizing was observed in Gonzalo’s writing-in-role activity. Judging by the letters produced, this experience elicited empathic engagement in students. This is corroborated by Gonzalo’s opinion that students in this activity “were able to put themselves in the situation of an oppressed person” (I3, 07/10/2016). As mentioned before, because there was no posterior reflection, there is no available data to ascertain whether this experience impacted students’ views of the world in a long-lasting way, provoking transformative praxis. Still, there was a clear change in attitude towards the topic by the majority of students, at least within the circumstance of Gonzalo’s DiE lessons. Their initial light-heartedness was replaced by the beginnings of an emotional investment.

Although there were other moments in the Programme where spaces for critical reflection emerged, these two moments stand out because students’ reflection was seemingly kindled by
strong emotional engagement with the fiction. Moreover, emotional layering could be perceived in both activities. In Sofia’s hot-seating, children displayed anger and passion towards the fictitious context, while also seeming entertained in the real context. In Gonzalo’s writing-in-role, students’ letters showed emotions like sadness (Document G.20, 07/10/2016), anger (Document G.13, 07/10/2016), and fear (Document G.4, 07/10/2016). At the same time, students’ concentration in this activity indicates that they also enjoyed the task, as demonstrated by the fact that some stayed after the end of the lesson to finish their letters (research journal, 07/10/2016). First and second-order emotions appeared interwoven in these moments. However, it is noteworthy that Gonzalo’s students’ responses to Q3 showed little evidence of second-order emotions having been provoked by DiE. Perhaps, this is because there was no time for reflection after the writing-in-role activity, where students could make sense of any second-order emotions elicited. As explained before, for Bundy et al. (2016) emotional layering is crucial to elicit conscientization as it can facilitate connections between the fictional and the real contexts. However, they are clear about the importance of including reflective moments so that these connections can come to light. This appears to have happened in Sofia’s students’ case during a subsequent lesson. However, Gonzalo’s students do not seem to have had that chance or an opportunity to interpret their experience collectively (Morgan & Saxton, 2006).

Another characteristic of these activities was the safety they provided students, which seemed to facilitate their emotional engagement. As Sofia remarked, the fiction “allowed them to have more freedom to pose what they [were] thinking” (I3, 06/10/2016). This echoes Morgan and Saxton’s (1989) and Aitken’s (2009) view that dramatic worlds give students a safe platform for self-expression. Similarly, Gonzalo’s writing-in-role activity provided students with an anonymous and private space to safely express their opinion of this sensitive fictional situation. Moreover, in both activities, the fiction was set in contexts removed from students’ realities, thus enhancing their safety (Aitken, 2009).

Importantly, Sofia’s and Gonzalo’s activities were the conclusion of a dramatic journey. In both cases, teachers had gradually built enough protection into the fiction so students could engage authentically with it (Heathcote, 2015b). Davis (2014), drawing on Bolton, describes “protection into role” as the process through which teachers help students engage with an imaginary stance (p. 96). For Davis, logical sequencing of activities can enable this process. Time must be invested to help students imagine the roles not as empty stereotypes, but as contextualised human attitudes. This is substantiated when comparing Sofia’s and Gonzalo’s DiE lessons with others where drama conventions and strategies were integrated sporadically almost as stand-alone exercises which Dunn and Stinson (2011) describe as being used in an “ad hoc” (p. 630) way, rather than as coherent learning experiences and journeys. The sense of a journey created in these two lessons also helped to gradually develop dramatic tension (Aitken, 2013; Dunn, 2016), so that students
cared about the dilemma explored. In both cases, students had opportunities to progress through the different modes of engagement in Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy, until reaching internalizing. Offering students a dramatic process or journey was vital in this study to gradually provoke engaged critical reflection through DiE.

6.2.2.5. Motivating transformative praxis

As identified in Chapter Two, the last mode of engagement identified by Morgan and Saxton (2006), namely, evaluating, can give way to transformative praxis. The review of literature also suggested that Applied Theatre can enhance praxis as it unites action and reflection (Doyle, 1993). It is acknowledged that dramatic action may only be a rehearsal of action in the real world (Aitken, 2009; Boal, 1993), yet, it is hoped that the safety afforded by the fiction and the possibility of metaxis can move students to question their quotidian behaviour, which may have an impact on their real lives (Aitken, 2009).

In this study, some teachers valued the praxical quality of DiE. Patilla stated: “we could talk about becoming liberated from oppression only in the realm of ideas (…) but experience [in DiE] does not only remain in your head, it remains in your body” (I3, 05/10/2016). Analogously, for Sofía, DiE allowed students “to reflect much more deeply because the body was also included” (I3, 06/10/2016). As detailed in section 5.4.4.2, a few teachers, like Inés and Sofía, also expressed hope about the impact of DiE experiences on students’ everyday lives. However, there is scant data corroborating their hope. Sofía’s students’ comments in a subsequent lesson suggest that they did connect the drama with their everyday lives, realising the undesirability of prejudice. However, there is no data proving that this realisation impacted their daily-lives. Regarding secondary-level students, the data challenge teachers’ aspirations for transformative praxis. The majority of students did not find a connection between the DiE lessons and their lives (Q3). Therefore, it is doubtful that they were motivated to transform the real world as a result of their DiE experience. While, as discussed before, very occasionally students’ engaged empathically with the issues explored through drama, this empathy did not seem to have reached what Segal (2011) describes as ‘social empathy’, that is, not only understanding others’ suffering, but assuming responsibility for the unjust situations that afflict them, and being motivated into action. It appears that in this Programme, teachers did not prompt students to the evaluating mode of engagement in Morgan and Saxton’s (2006) taxonomy, whereby they could have attempted to transform the outside world. The discussion here highlights a number of difficulties which appear to have precluded the possibility of students and teachers attaining transformative praxis through these lessons, not least of which were the issues of a lack of expertise, experience, and time to move from well-
established teaching and learning patterns to new forms of pedagogy. However, there were seeds of change which testified to a positive impact from this experiential journey.

6.2.3. **Precursors of conscientization**

Although transformative praxis, an integral aspect of conscientization (Freire, 2004a), was not activated, data show that some spaces for critical reflection were opened through DiE. In addition, throughout the Programme teachers also valued the promotion of certain aspects that could be considered precursors of conscientization. These were seen by teachers as small but important contributions of DiE to their gradual creation of fertile ground for critical reflection and action. As Shor (Shor & Freire, 1987) advises, considering “a gradation of transforming moments” (p. 34) can help preserve hope and value every step towards a critical stance. These precursors are also important from a progressive postmodern perspective (Freire, 1996), and help to avoid unilateral and fixed views on transformation. Although these precursors, discussed below, cannot be considered a full enactment of CP, they could, in this specific context, constitute small steps towards transformation.

6.2.3.1. **Critical thinking**

Teachers identified critical thinking, an ability to make well-grounded arguments, as an important prerequisite of conscientization and one that is particularly age-appropriate for younger students. Moreover, for teachers, critical thinking was seen as being able to endow students with a questioning stance that could prevent indoctrination. This is aligned with CP authors’ understanding of critical thinking as the ability to question the taken-for-granted and assume a reflective stance (Freire, 2000b; Giroux, 1988). According to the data, teachers’ application of DiE allowed their students to exercise critical thinking through questioning the taken-for-granted, expressing and defending arguments, or making informed decisions about how to represent a concept, for example. This confirms drama’s capacity for developing critical thinking in students, observed by a number of authors (Doyle, 1993; Landy & Montgomery, 2012; O’Neill, 2015).

The importance of critical thinking as a precursor of conscientization is underscored when considering Nelsen and Seaman’s (2011) claim that such ability and disposition is essential to prepare students to question their own assumptions and habits that might reinforce social oppression. Developing a self-questioning capacity in students can prevent their rejection of critical reflection about their own lives, which may otherwise be perceived as a threat to the stability of their beliefs and practices (Nelsen & Seaman, 2011). Additionally, by prompting students to make well-grounded judgements, DiE encouraged them to move from passivity to
active opinion. This can be seen as a necessary transition for the future development of critical consciousness and transformative praxis (Aitken, 2009).

6.2.3.2. **Metacognition**

Metacognition is defined as students’ awareness of their own learning (Smith, 2013). At several points in the Programme, the teachers’ application of DiE tapped into students’ metacognitive thinking by inciting them to reflect about the differences in their learning process through this novel methodology. While students’ appeared to value learning in a different way, teachers in this study did not invite them to critically analyse “the ‘raison d’être’ behind the knowing and the conditioning to which that process is subject” (Freire, 1973, p. 89), for example, they did not reflect on why they had rarely encountered arts-based pedagogies before, or on why these are marginalised in Latin American educational systems (Da Porta, 2017). However, students’ reflection about their own learning is an essential step towards conscientization. This is because it may increase awareness of their human capacity to reflect over their own actions (Freire, 2000b). Students’ active role as learners who can consider and eventually have a say over their own learning process was highlighted by their encounter with this novel form of pedagogy, thus defying passive and de-humanising stances.

6.2.3.3. **Motivation**

Unlike in traditional education, in Applied Theatre motivation is fostered intrinsically by valuing students’ interests and voices (O’Neill, 2006b). Although, as discussed before, the DiE lessons were rarely based on students’ thematic interests, their voices were emphasised in comparison to baseline lessons, which led to significantly higher motivation levels. Students reported that DiE motivated them by giving them greater creative freedom, chances to participate and collaborate with classmates, and experience an overall sense of fun (Q3).

Following Heathcote, O’Neill (2006b) argues that intrinsic motivation is instigated through authentic teaching. This study corroborates her view. The first two triggers for motivation mentioned by students are directly linked with Heathcote’s (1984i) concept of “authentic teaching” (p. 174), which involves promoting student collaboration and decision-making. This aligns well with CP’s dialogic classrooms.

However, the last trigger was more problematic from a CP perspective. As seen in Chapter Two, McLaren (1988) distinguishes between “streetcorner” and school knowledge (p. 172). Whereas the former is connected with students’ bodies and desires, the latter is discarnate and devoid of affective engagement. Being closer to students’ ways of knowing outside of school can help
explain why DiE was reported as being fun for them and why 75% of those who completed Q3 would have liked to continue being taught through DiE. Recognising that students must have an affective and embodied experience in order to critically reflect on the subject matter, McLaren’s (1986) stance that drama-based learning can speak to students’ streetcorner culture seems to be corroborated here, as does O’Neill’s (2006b) claim that Applied Theatre can be a “powerful antidote” against students’ disaffection (p. 107).

On the other hand, some teachers identified moments in the DiE lessons when “empty fun” (Gonzalo, research journal, 03/10/2016) prevailed. For example, some moments in Violeta’s forum theatre-inspired activity provoked much laughter in students, although the subject matter was sensitive. As previously argued, this light-heartedness was caused by the disconnection between the topics of the lessons and students’ lives. Also, it was caused by our inability to support students’ authentic engagement, since, as Wagner (1976) referring to Heathcote’s pedagogy points out, “you can laugh only at what you don't take seriously” (p. 222). By this I do not mean that the work should have been devoid of all joy. Zembylas (2013) has demonstrated that when social-justice education exacerbates negative emotions, students can become de-sensitised. Rather, the theme and structure of the work should have enabled students to take the experience seriously while still enjoying the process. On such occasions, teachers and I failed to foster the ‘dual affect’ (Vygotsky, 1976) that dramatic experiences can provoke (O’Connor, 2013). Thus, we failed to answer Freire’s (Horton & Freire, 1990) question: “how to make education something which, in being serious, rigorous, methodical, and having a process, also creates happiness and joy” (p. 170). Provoking such kind of “epistemological curiosity” (Freire, 1998, p. 37), fuelled by motivation, was only achieved during isolated moments of the DiE lessons observed, as discussed before.

The problem of fostering empty fun is epitomised by Patilla: “you end up entertaining the kids and not generating meaningful experiences for them” (I3, 05/10/2016). McLaren’s (1988) differentiation between teachers as entertainers and as liminal servants is relevant here. As mentioned in Chapter Two, the latter promote criticality, while the former simply amuse students, who remain uncritical spectators of the lesson. However, in this study during the moments when light-heartedness was perceived, for instance during Inés’ improvisation (research journal, 04/10/2016) or in certain moments in Violeta’s forum theatre-adaptation (research journal, 28/09/2016), students were not mere spectators of the action. However, as Jackson (2011) remarks, “activity per se does not necessarily equate to purposeful participation” (p. 238). So even though students were physically active, they were still simply “in the process of being entertained” (McLaren, 1988, p. 165). During those occasions when light-heartedness prevailed, teachers had not challenged students to consider the issues critically, and hence fulfilled the role of entertainers and not of liminal servants. This calls into sharp relief the sophisticated role of a teacher in CP,
and one which is arguably under-developed in Freirean pedagogy. Neither teachers nor I had appreciated the delicate balance required to facilitate critical engagement during lessons. While the Workshop and the coplanning process focused on introducing DiE activities into their classrooms, there was little or no attention paid to notions of teacher management roles. This left the teachers in a very difficult, if not impossible situation – trying to introduce a novel learning and teaching approach without sufficient understanding of how they might interact and change their own well-established teaching style and management approach in the classroom accordingly. Students also needed experience and time to become accustomed to shifts in pedagogic practices so that they could fully embrace the opportunities afforded by them. In managing the classroom in this study, teachers largely located themselves in the early or middle approaches in the list of management styles below, without reaching a balance between student needs and teacher needs vis-à-vis curricular coverage (a win-win situation):

- Avoiding the students;
- Dominating the students;
- Accommodating the students by giving them what they wanted;
- Compromising with the students;
- Integrating students’ needs with the teacher’s needs (a win-win situation).

(adapted from O’Sullivan, Symonds, & Akkermans, 2017)

While this is not expressly articulated nor possibly envisioned in the literature on CP, the results of this study suggest that consideration of teacher management roles, particularly in terms of integrating student and teacher needs, may be necessary to transition to more dialogic classrooms.

Within this transitioning phase, teachers’ fostering of students’ motivation needs to be valued in the context of this School. It is clear that raising motivation alone does not constitute CP (Macedo et al., 2005; Shor & Freire, 1987), however, in a setting where student apathy was originally identified as a major problem, helping students disassociate schooling with boredom seems to be a necessary precondition for the development of life-long epistemological curiosity.

6.2.4. Expanding opportunities for equal dialogue

The centrality of dialogue in Applied Theatre (O’Neill, 2006b; Winston, 2004), was corroborated by the practice of DiE in this Programme. According to the data, opportunities for dialogue opened up by teachers multiplied when they integrated DiE. One of the characteristics of the dialogue provoked by DiE in this Programme was its polyphony (Edmiston, 2012). The multi-voicedness of the discourse resulted from students and teachers interacting on equal terms, and revealed resonances of the voices of the others’ discourses within them, which showed a spirit of listening
and taking each other’s ideas on board (Dentith, 1995). Commonly, dialogue in the DiE lessons did not seek synthesis, but emphasised a variety of opinions. This happened, for instance, when teachers used strategies like hot-seating or conscience alley, inviting students to consider several viewpoints on a fictional situation, and accepting their viewpoints. The dialogic dimension was particularly evident when students and teachers were in role, as it afforded them a higher degree of percipience about the subject matter under exploration (Davis, 2014).

The use of the body in DiE expanded the forms of communication enabled by these teachers. The false dichotomy between mind and body that, according to McLaren (1988), is promoted by traditional schooling, was challenged. Considering McLaren’s claim that a crucial mission of critical pedagogues is “the clearing away of obstacles to the embodiment of knowledge” (p. 172), then in this sense, applying DiE strengthened these teachers’ practice of CP. Moreover, the importance of giving the body a more prominent role in learning is accentuated in the Latin American context:

The human body and the community body constitute the motor of the Latin American subject (…). However, we still martyrize children in the current material conditions in which education develops: the static space, staring at each other’s necks, always facing the teacher. (Pinto Contreras, 2010, pp. 80, my translation)

Although, several DiE activities facilitated by teachers did not drastically change students’ physicality, for instance, students continued sitting down during hot-seating, it is arguable that the mere act of forming a circle, something rarely seen in the baseline lessons, already disrupted the static classroom arrangements described by Pinto Contreras. Students were now facing each other, not just their teacher, and this opened up more spaces for communication.

According to teachers like Inés and Gonzalo (I3), expanding ways of participation beyond verbal and intellectual modes helped typically non-participating students to contribute in the DiE lessons. The “avenues of engagement” available to students were multiplied (Winston, 2004, p. 21). The idea, posited in Chapter Two, that Applied Theatre can expand the possibilities for equal dialogue was, in this way, substantiated. Empirical data also corroborate Ellsworth’s (1989) claim that employing methodologies that transcend speech can enhance equal classroom interchanges.

Conversely, as mentioned previously, there were also DiE activities that inhibited some students’ participation because of excessive exposure or incomprehensibility. In these cases, our facilitation of DiE worked against CP’s aim of giving voice to the marginalised in the context of the classroom (Jackson, 2011). Unlike the cases reported by Ellsworth (1989) and Bali (2014), unequal opportunities of participation were not provoked in this case through cultural differences amongst students, as students seemed to belong to a relatively homogeneous cultural background. Rather, these authors’ criticism of the utopian quality of CP’s idea of equal dialogue were
substantiated at moments when DiE strengthened voices already dominating the learning experience.

6.2.5. Defying authoritarianism while preserving teacher authority

Establishing less hierarchical teacher-student relationships was an important contribution of DiE for teachers in this Programme (Q4). Working alongside students and emphasising their creative authority were identified by teachers as ways in which DiE challenged authoritarianism, thus strengthening their role as critical pedagogues (Freire, 2000b; Giroux, 1988).

Although I have already referred to students’ greater creative ownership when DiE was applied, the collaboration between teachers and students, particularly when they shared the experience of being in-role, requires more attention here. For several Applied Theatre authors, teacher-in-role allows educators to momentarily abandon their usual position of power (Bolton & Davis, 2010; Heathcote, 1984h; O’Neill, 2006b). That occurred in this case. Commonly, when the teacher-in-role strategy was applied, students led the inquiry. Consequently, the view of teachers as all-knowing experts was defied (Doyle, 1993). This is crucial from a CP perspective, as it can move students to relinquish passivity and develop their own agency (Giroux, 1988). For example, in Sofia’s lesson (research journal, 03/10/2016), the low status of the teacher-in-role allowed students to “oppose the teacher’s power” (Heathcote, 1984g, p. 165). This was evidenced in that several children continued to defend the position that I, in-role as the Ant, had challenged.

As posited by O’Neill (O’Neill & Lambert, 1982), the shift in teacher stance from instructor to collaborator can be problematic. This was observed in Josefina’s lesson. Josefina and her students lacked experience working with such physical and creative freedom. As a group, they needed to unlearn their usual passivity observed in the baseline lesson, and learn how to navigate an active methodology (Giacomelli, 2012; Heathcote, 2015b). The structure and implementation of the DiE lesson did not enable this and the result was a chaotic environment with Josefina, at times, assuming an authoritarian stance. This was due to a lack of explicit or implicit boundaries. Josefina and I failed to establish a behavioural contract that helped students navigate the unfamiliar waters of DiE (Neelands, 2004a). Also, the structure of the lesson lacked a fictional frame that created its own tensions and behavioural constraints (Morgan & Saxton, 2006). This highlights the delicate tension between unbridled freedom, and authority, possibly best reflected in a model of praxis where student and teacher needs are integrated. As seen in the Literature Review, this is relevant for both Applied Theatre practice (Aitken, 2009; O’Neill, 2006d) and for CP (Freire, 1996; Shor & Freire, 1987). When teachers established certain boundaries, either overtly or through the dramatic structure, students’ freedom was potentiated and collaborative work could emerge.
Having discussed the ways in which teachers’ application of DiE opened up spaces for CP, and failed to do so on other occasions, it is evident that DiE holds considerable potential in this regard. With due regard to the findings in this study, the experience of these teachers and their students suggests that if DiE practices:

- take the students’ experiences and interests as their starting point;
- problematize these by linking them with curricular contents and wider social and political issues through theatrical and/or dramatic codifications;
- offer students a coherently structured journey of exploration, progressively building interest, belief, commitment, and reaching an internalising level of emotional engagement where their opinions and habits can be critically reflected upon;
- allocate moments for reflection so that students and teachers can make sense of their experience, share and interrogate discoveries, and reflect on real-life connections;
- promote critical thinking, metacognition, and motivation;
- expand opportunities for dialogue by promoting polyphony and varying the modes of participation available to students;
- and allow students and teachers to share authority while the latter establish clear limits,

then spaces for CP can be achieved in this School.

In the next section I will elaborate on the main factors, several of which are implicated above, that affected the opening of spaces for CP. These included factors related to the planning and application of DiE experiences, as well as aspects related to the CPD Programme and the contextual conditions under which it occurred.

6.3. Factors that facilitated or hindered the opening of spaces for Critical Pedagogy through Drama in Education

The analysis of data showed that presentational strategies provoked embarrassment in certain students, while representational, or more ‘living-through’ strategies seemed to offer students a safer space. This affected their participation and hence, teachers’ openings for creating dialogic classrooms through DiE. But other than these differences, there were no substantial observable differences between the various DiE approaches explored in this Programme in terms of their potential for CP. Rather, what appeared to make a difference was the way teachers and I structured the DiE experiences, and the degree of artistry with which we applied these structures. These are major factors impacting teachers’ opening of spaces for CP, which will be discussed next. The effect of aspects related to the CPD Programme and the contextual conditions under which it occurred will be discussed afterwards.
6.3.1. Planning Drama in Education lessons

The planning of DiE lessons greatly affected the degree to which teachers’ application of DiE opened up spaces for CP. The choice of source material and the sequencing of DiE activities were important factors here.

In drama, the choice of pretext or source material has a crucial impact on the fruitfulness of the upcoming learning experience (O’Neill, 1995). A good pretext is engaging, and while it denotes certain circumstances, it is also ambiguous and open-ended (Dunn & Stinson, 2011). This also proved true in this Programme’s DiE experiences. Dunn and Stinson (2011) are adamant that, to generate engagement, choice of pretexts must not be guided by curricular contents, but by their relevancy for students’ lives. As previously discussed, this was corroborated in this study, as lack of connection with students’ thematic interests seemed to hinder their engagement with critical reflection.

Even so, some source materials used by teachers in their practice of DiE seemed to incite stronger engagement in students than others, thus opening greater possibilities for CP. Piazzoli’s (2018) differentiation between a pretext and a stimulus can help explicate this. Unlike a fleeting stimulus, a pretext inspires the entire dramatic exploration. Following her definition, some source materials used by teachers in this Programme can be considered stimuli rather than pretexts. For instance, the puppet play in Josefina’s lesson served only to introduce the theme of the digestive system, but not to guide the subsequent exploration. Conversely, Aesop’s fable used by Sofía, behaved as a pretext by animating the entire lesson. It raised questions, presented a moral ambiguity, and had a certain level of tension, all traits of fruitful pretexts (Schneider, Crumpler, & Rogers, 2006).

Selecting a pretext rather than a stimulus appears to facilitate the opening of spaces for CP through DiE by enhancing students’ sustained emotional engagement. Importantly, while Josefina’s DiE lesson was a sequence of loosely connected activities, Sofía’s was a more coherent exploratory journey. In Sofía’s words “[the lesson] had a progression, each segment gave way to the next” (I3, 06/10/2016). As argued before, this journey harnessed students’ engagement and fostered critical reflection. The way DiE activities were structured, therefore, also impacted the opening of spaces for CP through DiE. While a logical sequencing facilitated the opening of such spaces, the use of isolated activities hindered them. The negative effect of inappropriate planning was visible in Patilla’s DiE lessons which were somewhat haphazard and failed to offer a connected experience to students. It would seem that, as Heathcote (2015c) states “you can’t get away with ‘shabby’ planning ever” (p. 45) when working through drama, particularly when attempting to practice CP.
6.3.2. Teachers’ artistry

Piazzoli (2018) and Dunn and Stinson (2011) refer to drama teaching as a kind of artistry. They draw from Eisner’s (2002a, 2003) views on the need of artistry in teaching to argue that drama teaching requires a certain aesthetic sensibility. Drama teachers as artists need to “manage form and content skilfully and purposefully to achieve heightened cognitive and affective responses simultaneously” (Dunn & Stinson, 2011, p. 619). Data from this study suggest that artistry is also needed to open up spaces for CP through DiE, which, in this case, required a number of skills and dispositions from teachers.

6.3.2.1. Flexibility

Section 6.2.2 discussed the significance of incorporating students’ creative input to generate engagement, but also to emphasise their voice in line with CP’s dialogic classrooms. Teachers’ openness to students’ input could be referred to as flexibility. This is one aspect of artistry that impacted the teachers’ work in this Programme (Dunn & Stinson, 2011). Bolton (1979) believes that a drama teacher must be a “flexible thinker” (p. 139), ready to put his/her pre-conceived goals aside to welcome emerging ones. Resonating with CP, O’Neill and Lambert (1982) speak about having the ability to “focus critical reflection” (p. 108) as it emerges. These authors refer to the skill of co-constructing the experience with students while at the same time harnessing any spaces for changes in understanding that arise.

Observational data indicate that teachers, and I, frequently struggled with responding flexibly to what occurred in the classroom. Teachers hung on to the preconceived plan, probably because of their inexperience with the methodology. I was also hesitant to redirect the lessons in fear of overstepping teachers’ authority, a mistake that will be discussed later. Consequently, often, an unsuccessful negotiation between “the play for the teacher and the play for the students” occurred (Bolton, 1979, p. 51). As noted previously, greater consideration seems to have been needed in terms of how teachers’ needs to cover the curriculum (their ‘play’) and students’ needs to explore and engage with that content on a personally meaningful level (their ‘play’) were balanced. Teachers, and I, failed to identify and maximise the opportunities to respond flexibly to students’ contributions. We did not attempt to connect their contributions and responses to the work, and missed valuable opportunities to work through DiE to manage and negotiate both priorities. For instance, in Patilla’s second DiE lesson, students’ comments seemed focused on power dynamics within the classroom. For example, a student complained to his classmates: “you are chickens, we should have left” in reference to the groups’ decision not to leave the School as part of their tour. Perhaps the lesson would have been more fruitful if Patilla had picked up on this emerging topic of the decisions we make and their consequences, exploring it through drama, rather than persisting.
with his original topic of communication problems in social media which was explored
discursively. This revised aim might have had a more “modest” (Tinning, 2002) scope by not
addressing wider social issues directly. Yet, it might have been more meaningful for students, and
could have been linked back to their decision to comply with the rules within the broader topic of
social media’s influence on young people in this regard, and in other aspects of their daily lives.
This resonates with Nicholson’s (2005) notion of transportation, which suggests the ability to
abandon larger-scale transformative goals in favour of emergent, smaller-scale but potentially
more meaningful ones. This also aligns with the liminal servant’s recognition that “results will
often be unpredictable” in an educational encounter that emphasises communion with students
(McLaren, 1988, p. 175).

Although teachers were not yet capable of “managing the planned with the lived” (Neelands, 2000,
p. 8), some of them, like Violeta and Patilla himself, showed awareness of this aspect of the
artistry of teaching in DiE. This speaks favourably about their developing competence as DiE
practitioners. As Piazzoli (2018) drawing from Underhill remarks, being conscious of one’s
limitations as a teacher is a mobilising step towards growth. Violeta noticed how the
unpredictability of DiE, which demanded flexibility from teachers, also defused the danger of
indoctrination from the approach (I3, 28/09/2016). This quality is important, considering that the
imposition of teachers’ views on students is a recurrent criticism of CP (Bali, 2014; Bruce, 2013;
Greenhalgh-Spencer, 2014). Moreover, this was a concern expressed by a few teachers during the
Workshop (video 07/07/2016). Having the necessary flexibility to allow the “maverick” quality of
DiE, as O’Toole (2003, p. 225) puts it, to emerge could respond to these criticisms and concerns.

6.3.2.2. Risk-taking and belief-in-role

Closely linked with flexibility was teachers’ risk-taking dispositions, signalled by Dunn and
Stinson (2011) as another aspect of drama teaching artistry. Risk-taking is a necessary trait not
only of drama teachers (Morgan & Saxton, 1989; O’Neill, 1995; Wagner, 1976), but also of CP
advocates (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010; Horton & Freire, 1990). By applying this novel
methodology, it is arguable that, to different degrees, all teachers took a risk in this Programme. In
particular, DiE’s collaborative nature implied a risk for teachers. For instance, Laura stated that
collaborating with students in DiE made her feel “more vulnerable” (I3, 29/09/2016). She added:
“it is scary at first, but it leads to learning”. For her, DiE was a worthwhile risk. Seemingly, this
was also the case for most other teachers, as evidenced by the high percentage who said they
would continue applying DiE in the future (Q4).

Teachers’ application of DiE appeared to be a more manageable risk for those who had previous
experience with active methodologies. However, the teacher-in-role approach, completely new to
all teachers, seemed to demand especial risk-taking, regardless of their experience with active methods. While some, like Patilla, Inés, Laura, and Gonzalo seemed enthusiastic about trying out the teacher-in-role strategy themselves, others, like Sofía and Nicole preferred that I assumed the main fictional roles in the DiE lessons, even though, as evidenced by baseline data, they were used to applying active methods. The latter teachers seemed more cautious in this sense, and appeared to prefer observing how their students responded to the strategy before attempting it themselves. This highlights the importance of scaffolding teachers’ application of this valuable strategy, tailoring to their differing risk-taking dispositions. The value of the teacher-in-role strategy was discussed in section 6.2.2, where it was shown that teachers’ in-role belief impacted students’ critical engagement. Therefore, displaying belief can also be considered an aspect of teachers’ artistry when applying DiE (Heathcote, 2015d). Seeing that a few teachers, like Nicole, struggled with their in-role belief, the Programme could have provided greater support in this respect. It could have shared “protection into role” and building belief strategies to help them apply the teacher-in-role approach more confidently and authentically (Davis, 2014, p. 96). In addition, more process-based approaches which encouraged a gradual investment in the fictional situation rather than once-off lessons which drew principally from de-contextualised strategies, could have been encouraged as these were shown to help teachers and students commit to the situations and build belief in role.

6.3.2.3. Enabling reflection through questioning

For O’Neill (2006b), provoking critical reflection is an aspect of drama teaching artistry particularly important when adhering to a CP paradigm. In this Programme, teachers’ abilities to generate questions affected their capacity to provoke critical reflection in students. Through questioning, teachers can invite students to make collective sense of the dramatic experience (Bolton et al., 1986; Neelands, 2004a). For example, critical reflection on the still-images in Inés’ first DiE lesson was not promoted partly because she and I failed to explore with students the deeper meaning behind their creations. Something similar occurred in Violeta’s and Patilla’s DiE lessons, where lack of questioning hindered the chances for critical reflection. Conversely, teachers like Josefina and Laura were able to raise questions that, while not promoting critical reflection per se, supported students’ decision-making and critical thinking, a precursor of conscientization (research journal, 30/08/2016; 06/09/2016). Importantly, the types of questions they posed were not “phony questions” with already known answers (Wrigley, 2009, p. 73). Rather, they were open-ended and called for students’ creative investment (Morgan & Saxton, 2006). Also, these questions were not directive. Josefina and Laura did not decide for their students, they mediated. This echoes the descriptions of the Joker as mediator in the Theatre of the Oppressed system (Boal, 2002), and of drama practitioners as facilitators of learning (Alrutz,
2003; Heathcote & Bolton, 1994; Nicholson, 2005), mentioned in Chapter Two. Questioning in these cases was an active and creative task on the part of the teachers, which defies notions of extreme student-centred education where, as seen in Chapter Two, teachers’ roles in the learning process are seen as negligible (Biesta, 2017). These questions enhanced the dialogic quality of the lessons because teachers were genuinely curious about, and willing to actively listen to, students’ answers (Piazzoli, 2018).

6.3.3. Other factors

In this final section, I discuss other factors that facilitated or hindered teachers’ opening of spaces for CP through DiE beyond the skills required when planning and applying DiE experiences. Here, I focus more specifically on the impact of the CPD Programme, and my leadership of it, on teachers’ changes.

To guide this discussion I draw on Opfer and Pedder’s (2013) model of teacher learning, displayed in Figure 6.3.

![Figure 6.3. Opfer and Pedder’s (2013) model of teacher change](image)

The model considers several recursive elements involved in teacher change, rejecting simplistic models of teacher learning and allowing for a multi-factorial discussion of the CPD Programme.
6.3.3.1. **School orientation**

A school’s beliefs, needs, sense of collectiveness, and support systems influence teachers’ professional development (Opfer, Pedder, & Laviczka, 2011a). Both the School’s beliefs and its identification of change needs were favourable factors for teachers’ learning in this Programme.

As mentioned in Chapter Three, the School’s institutional beliefs about learning were oriented towards CP. As such, the kind of ideological institutional resistance to CP reported in the Literature Review was not visible in this Programme. However, the School’s Management Team identified a dissonance between their institutional beliefs, aligned with CP, and teaching practices in the School. As Opfer and Pedder (2013) propose, an institution’s dissonance for learning prompts it towards change. Hence the School’s openness to this Programme.

However, lack of a sense of collectiveness in the School was a hindering factor. For some teachers, like Nicole and Inés, the fact that not all the staff learned about DiE, impaired their own practice of the novel methodology, as they lacked support from other educators (I3, 12/10/2016; 11/10/2016). This was evident in Josefina’s DiE lesson, as we could not count on the assistant teacher’s collaboration, which seemed to affect the quality of the lesson. On the contrary, the help of assistant teachers in Sofia’s DiE lesson facilitated a higher quality experience. The fact that one of the assistant teachers in this lesson was Tamara, who also participated in the Workshop, seems to corroborate Nicole’s and Inés’ claims. A more consistent institutional approach to change could have been enabled if the whole staff had participated in the Programme.

Finally, the degree of support given by the School was also impactful. The majority of teachers felt supported by the School in their implementation of DiE (Q4). However, for a significant minority (35.5%) the level of support available was insufficient. In my observations, I detected that teachers generally lacked time to plan and apply DiE. The School could have facilitated their learning process by decreasing their work-load during the Programme when teachers were actively learning about this new methodology. In order to reduce the effects of the technification of teaching and increase teachers’ political agency through supporting creative, critical, and reflective abilities as mooted by the DiE approaches in this project, the School management needed to provide adequate space and resources to support and empower teachers in their role as transformative intellectuals. Providing the opportunity to participate in the Workshop was the first step, but time for quality planning and sustainability were not factored into teachers’ work-loads during this experimental period and proved to be a contributing factor regarding the impact of this intervention overall.

School and society continued to remain as distinct realms of practice (Shor & Freire, 1987), and thus transformation in this study remained at the level of critical awareness rather than social change (Freire, 2004a).
Teachers’ subjectivities affect a CPD Programme’s capacity to promote change (Fore, Feldhaus, Sorge, Agarwal, & Varahramyan, 2015). According to Opfer, Pedder, and Lavicza (2011b), teachers’ perceptions of their dissonances or gaps in knowledge/practice are a crucial factor. The greater the dissonance, the greater the chances for teacher change. Baseline data suggest that the Programme did respond to certain dissonances perceived by teachers. For instance, several joined the Programme to expand their knowledge of CP (Andrea, Francesca, Josefinia, and Laura). However, opening spaces for CP through an arts-based methodology was not a deeply-seated concern for them. Although their knowledge-gaps were considered in its design, and were generally aligned with the Programme, this was not conceived in response to teachers’ most crucial dissonances, which, for the majority, seemed to revolve around broader concerns about enhancing their students’ learning and the meaningfulness of curricular contents. This may explain why, in general, the Programme did not promote radical changes in the majority of teachers.

Confirming Opfer and Pedder’s (2013) model, teachers’ previous practices and experiences affected their learning process. Teachers who were more familiar with active methodologies seemed more able to incorporate DiE and to open up spaces for dialogic teacher-students relationships. Additionally, teachers’ existing beliefs about education also influenced their learning, determining the aspects of CP they advanced through DiE (conscientization and/or dialogic classrooms). Teachers who seemed aligned with CP from the beginning aimed at promoting both aspects of the paradigm when applying DiE (conscientization and dialogic classrooms). Contrastingly, the majority of teachers, who appeared closer to a constructivist stance, centred on DiE’s facilitation of dialogic classrooms and precursors of conscientization, but did not explore DiE’s potential to problematize knowledge in relation to wider social issues. In the latter case, the Programme was insufficient to encourage this change. They incorporated the “bits and pieces” of the methodology aligned with their existing stance on education (Fore et al., 2015, p. 107). Confirming Opfer and Pedder’s (2013) views, an important factor that determined these two groups of teachers was their knowledge of CP. Greater knowledge of the paradigm seemed to allow teachers in the first group to set broader critical aims, involving the types of classroom relationships promoted, but also the problematization of curricular contents. For teachers from the second group, however, the Programme failed to endow them with an in-depth awareness of CP theory. For Nicole, the Workshop helped her “to form a basal idea of what CP is”. However, she recognised that this was not enough: “until one is not properly informed, [CP] won’t be consolidated, ingrained (…) I think I am still far from that” (I3, 12/10/2016). This was evidenced in the critical aims she and others in the second group set for their DiE lessons, which did not include the connection of curricular contents with wider social problems. Although teachers in the first group did not fully achieve their conscientizing aims, the fact that they set them in the first
place is important. This is because, as argued by Neelands (2004b), and as discussed in Chapter
Two, having clear transformative intentions is a crucial step in striving to achieve them. While
rare, the spaces for critical reflection opened by these teachers were not “miracles” (Neelands,
2004b, p. 53), but the result of thought, teaching skills, and dramatic artistry.

Although radical changes were infrequent, some modest changes in beliefs were provoked by the
Programme. While it did not enable a thorough acquaintance with CP, the Workshop did help
several to understand the paradigm better. This increased some teachers’ self-awareness in relation
to CP (Roberto, Cristián, and Bernarda, for example). It suggests that incorporating purposeful
reflection about teachers’ identity in a CPD Programme can modify teachers’ subjectivities
(Castro, Krause, & Frisancho, 2015).

Patilla underwent the most palpable change. According to his accounts, the Workshop challenged
his previous negative view of CP, and modified his beliefs (I3, Q4). Moreover, his practice was
also impacted. Instead of applying the dated National Curriculum on Technology unquestioningly,
Patilla transformed it through a critical lens. He developed key traits of a transformative
intellectual, like problematizing the curriculum from a socio-political perspective (Giroux, 1988),
even though, according to observational data, his practice of DiE did not fully attain his critical
aims, seemingly because of lack of time and experience with the new methodology. Patilla’s case
and that of the other five teachers who became more self-aware about CP, suggest the study’s
achievement of a degree of catalytic validity. Although “self-determination” to pursue social-
justice-oriented changes was not stirred in all of the 15 participating teachers as, according to the
data, only six tried to promote conscientization in students through DiE, the Programme did appear
to promote “self-understanding” about their roles as critical educators in the vast majority (Lather,
1986).

The Programme also fostered certain changes in teachers’ practices. Although, as discussed before,
DiE’s critical potential was not fully seized by teachers’ application of this methodology, data
demonstrate that, in comparison to their usual teaching approaches, DiE increased the spaces for
CP opened by at least all of the eight teachers who participated in the Application Stage. Albeit
small, these changes were valued by teachers as steps in their transformation process. In this way,
most teachers in this Programme seem to adhere to Tinning’s concept of “modest” pedagogy
(2002), understanding transformation as a gradual process. Arguably, greater practical impact may
have been possible if teachers had reflected more about their application of DiE (Castro et al.,
2015; Piazzoli, 2018), but insufficient time was allocated to support this aspect. If teachers had
kept a reflective journal, as initially requested by me, they may have made more sense of their
experiences during this project (Avalos, 1998; Kara, 2015; Schón, 1983; Taylor, 1996), and
identified aspects of their work that needed to be changed to align more with CP.
The Chilean educational system

Fore et al. (2015) suggest that educational policies also affect teacher change. In this case, certain characteristics of the Chilean educational system appeared to restrict teachers’ practice of DiE. As presented in Chapter Three, teachers’ excessive work-load is a trait of the Chilean system (OECD, 2016; Perticará & Román, 2014). From the outset, teachers recognised that they worked longer hours than they were paid for (Q2). Hence, the extra time required to transform their plans and apply DiE added to their already heavy work-load. In fact, lack of time was one of the main roadblocks for teachers’ application of DiE (Q4). The national emphasis on teaching accountability (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016) can also be seen as a negative factor. Teachers were meant to cover a specified amount of curricular contents before the end of the year. Failing to do so could have lowered their students’ results, impacting the School’s vouchers (Head of TPU, I1, 26/05/2016). This seems to explain why their point of departure for incorporating DiE was content driven rather than using students’ generative themes. Additional time would have been needed to introduce teachers to ways of planning their lessons using student themes to help explore curricular contents. This ultimately prevented them from completely defying a “banking” concept of education (Freire, 2000b, p. 72). Moreover, thematically, the DiE lessons generally served the teachers’ interests more than their students’ (Nicholson, 2005). In this sense, teachers struggled to find the available “cracks” in the system to problematize both curricular contents and students’ thematic universe through DiE (Cavieres-Fernández & Au, 2010, p. 78, my translation), although, as argued before, they were able to find some modest fissures to enact other aspects of CP.

My role as Programme leader

The performance of facilitators of CPD significantly impacts teachers’ learning (Dunn & Stinson, 2011; Guise, Habib, Thiessen, & Robbins, 2017). As reported in section 5.5, my role was generally well evaluated by teachers. While the possibility of bias cannot be discounted, as teachers might have felt obliged to evaluate my work positively, spontaneous comments suggest that teachers did have a favourable experience during our collaboration. In particular, data suggest that teachers appreciated the experiential format of the Workshop (Girvan et al., 2016), as well as the support received from me subsequently. This corroborates that extended support in implementation is more fruitful than one-off interventions limited to a few Workshop sessions (Conway, Hibbard, Albert, & Hourigan, 2005; Sangster et al., 2013; Stinson, 2009).

Nonetheless, like other CPD Programmes in Applied Theatre (Stinson, 2009), this Programme was criticised for its brevity. 15-hours was insufficient to prepare teachers as DiE practitioners. My
design of the Workshop was partly at fault. Perhaps, rather than including such a wide range of Applied Theatre approaches, I should have narrowed the focus to enable deeper analysis of a limited number of forms. My time management problems also meant that I continuously lacked time to promote out-of-role reflection as part of the Demonstration Lesson Plans. Failing to model this seems to have affected teachers’ own practice of DiE, where moments for reflection were also missing. Planning excessively ambitious lessons was a factor here. We also failed to identify when to stop the activities so that, as advised by Davis (2014), the work ended on a high note leaving sufficient time for reflection. In general, teachers and I neglected to place enough emphasis on securing moments for reflection after DiE experiences, privileging the practical work over collective sense-making of it. In this sense, the work fell into the trap of what Freire (2000b) calls activism or the “sacrifice of reflection” in favour of action (p. 87), instead of achieving the balance of praxis we were aiming for as critical pedagogues.

Joyce and Showers (1980) highlight the importance of modelling in professional development. As noted in sections 5.3 and 5.4, I seem to have successfully modelled a number of DiE skills through my work in the Workshop and Application Stage, however, I failed to exemplify other key skills. Apart from correct time management, I could have modelled the planning of more flexible structures that developed student agency. My limited experience with more improvised forms of process drama was a hindrance. I also failed to demonstrate how scientific curricular contents could be linked with wider social issues and students’ thematic interests. This corroborates that, as reported in the literature (Dossett, 2014; Dunn & Stinson, 2011), substantial experience in Applied Theatre is required to fruitfully guide teachers who are new to these approaches.

Several appreciated the dialogic tone of our collaboration which indicates that the spirit of coteaching was preserved (Murphy & Martin, 2015) and my intention to establish a “reflective contract” with teachers was achieved (Schön, 1983, p. 296). However, in trying to avoid imposing my views over them, I might have failed to assert my authority, understood, following Aitken (2009), as my own expertise as a DiE teacher-artist. Frequently, I preferred not to intervene and I did not challenge teachers enough, even when I recognised that an alternative line of action would result in deeper DiE experiences. My internal conflict is patent in my notes about Inés’ reluctance to allocate more time during her lessons to DiE:

(…) my focus is on responding to [teachers’] needs, but maybe what they perceive as their needs does not align with what is recommended by [Applied Theatre] literature. I would have done the whole lesson through DiE (…), but I cannot impose anything! (research journal, 01/08/2016).

In being too accommodating to teachers’ requests, I might also have denied them the opportunity to test strategies themselves, and thereby negated the impact of an effective coteaching model. I
was not bringing my full expertise to the relationship out of a fear of overstepping my role in the classroom. It is noteworthy that teachers who required the least practical support from me, like Violeta, Patilla, or Michelle, are also those who reported greater levels of confidence with DiE in Q4. While this may be due to their personalities, it might also be a result of their lower degree of dependence on me during the Application Stage. In fact, according to Laura, her confidence with DiE grew from her first to her second DiE lesson because I assumed a more secondary position in the latter: “that helped me because I started getting the rhythm of it (…) I think it’s good [for you] to slowly let go” (I3, 29/09/2016). In keeping with the findings of the Drama for Schools project, where Dawson et al. (2011) found that some teachers “preferred to keep the drama-based instruction solely attached to the [specialist]” (p. 332), a similar phenomenon occurred with Nicole and several others, who did not engage with the fiction in the DiE lessons. Q4 data indicate that Nicole mostly used drama games in her subsequent application of DiE. Perhaps if I had encouraged her more to take on a fictional role in the DiE lesson, she may have experienced the power of this strategy first-hand, incorporating it into her teaching and learning repertoire. This is significant considering the value of teacher-in-role in opening up spaces for CP as found in this study.

Finally, the fact that I was the sole DiE specialist involved in this Programme might have hindered teachers’ learning as it limited opportunities for collaboration. Fruitful coteaching is facilitated by the development of strong rapport between coteachers (Mastropieri, Scruggs, Graetz, Norland, Gardizi, & McDuffie, 2005), and having more DiE specialists in the Programme, as in Dawson et al.’s (2011) case, could have allowed a more personalised and extended collaboration with each teacher.

### 6.4. Conclusion

The critical potential of DiE was not fully seized by teachers in this Programme. As the discussion shows, a banking model of education was not completely challenged by them through their practice of DiE as they focused on curricular contents rather than finding ways to problematize these through DiE and connect them with students’ lives and experiences. The findings from this study evidence that, as Freire (2000b) had posited decades ago, for education to be a true act of communication, learners’ realities need to be the point of departure. With such a point of departure missing, teachers’, and my, efforts to provoke critical reflection in students through an exploration of social dilemmas through DiE remained unfulfilled because of its irrelevancy for students. In these circumstances, teachers struggled to generate and sustain interest in, belief in, and commitment to the dramatic contexts, with students’ emotional engagement, key to elicit conscientization, rarely being developed. Moreover, the hints of critical reflection that teachers’
application of DiE occasionally provoked in students were not harnessed by teachers or by me because of the consistent lack of intentional moments that could have offered students a chance to reflect on their experiences and teachers a chance to listen, elaborate on, and critically question these reflections. While many factors affected teachers’ practice of CP through DiE, not least of these was my performance as leader of the CPD Programme, it is arguable that the greater factors hindering teachers’ learning process were systemic and somewhat naturalised: lack of time, heavy work-load, and a culture of accountability. These prevented them from adopting a more dialogic style that could also open up greater spaces for critical reflection and action. While not meeting explicit institutional resistance to their CP efforts, these were implicit barriers that ended up restricting their critical practice, as well as their learning of DiE and their development of the planning skills and teaching artistry it requires. Substantial and sustainable teacher change, it seems, needs to be supported more strongly by educational institutions, helping teachers defy the systemic barriers that prevent them from stepping out of the day-to-day schooling machine to truly explore innovative approaches.

That being said, the partial and modest critical accomplishments that teachers’ participation in this CPD Programme brought to their understanding and practice of CP should not be dismissed. In general, the Programme’s duration and characteristics did not allow teachers unfamiliar with CP to become fully aligned with this paradigm, failing to challenge their comfort zones in terms of educational views. Yet, the Programme did enable most teachers’ reflection about CP and about their profession. Moreover, for all those who applied it, DiE opened up more spaces for CP than their usual approaches. Considering the complexity that teachers’ practice of CP through DiE involved, the fact that they related differently with students, that they promoted their critical reflection, even if only sporadically, and that they provoked precursors of conscientization, can be considered valuable first steps in their learning process as critical pedagogues and DiE practitioners. In an educational system where students from a low socioeconomic background can perceive schooling with apathy and indifference, as was seemingly the case in this School, the perceptible boost in students’ motivation levels that was brought about by teachers’ application of DiE needs to be recognised and valued. Based on the data, there is considerable hope that these teachers will continue with this work, which, possibly could turn DiE into an “antidote” against students’ apathy (O’Neill, 2006b), arguably one of the greatest barriers to criticality, since, as Maxine Greene (1978) states “boredom, lassitude, automatism, and abstractness; all of these erode self-awareness and the desire to make sense” (p. 39). In the next chapter, a summary of findings and their implications will be presented, as well as a discussion of the study’s recommendations and limitations, thus bringing this research journey to an end.
7. CONCLUSION

7.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I summarise the study’s main findings and consider recommendations for future practice and policy. I identify the findings’ implications, as well as the study’s limitations and the areas of further research that have been suggested by it. The chapter concludes with a brief personal reflection about this research journey.

7.2. Main findings

This case study explored the main research questions:

- How can Drama in Education (DiE) open up spaces for Critical Pedagogy (CP) in the practices of Chilean teachers?

- What factors facilitated or hindered teachers’ opening of such spaces?

The case of a 15-hour Continuing Professional Development (CPD) Programme in a school in Santiago, Chile, involving 15 teachers, was analysed in order to address these questions. The following major findings emerged:

- The systematic literature review on recently-published academic articles on CP conducted for this study found that present-day adherents to this paradigm are joined, in spite of their differences, by their general alignment with Freire’s theories. It was found that there is fidelity between current understandings of CP and Freire’s progressive postmodernist stance, visible in his later oeuvre. That stance combines a multifarious understanding of oppression and a valuing of localised and gradual transformations with an over-arching commitment to social justice.

- **How DiE opened up spaces for CP**

  - Analysis of empirical data found that, in the majority of the participating teachers’ cases, DiE strengthened their capacity to promote dialogic classrooms when compared with their habitual teaching methods. DiE helped most of them, particularly those who applied teacher-in-role, to defy vertical teacher-students relationships. It opened more opportunities for dialogue by incorporating the body as a mode of participation. In this way, teachers’ application of DiE usually prevented the kind of exclusionary dialogue that CP has been accused of (Bali, 2014; Ellsworth, 1989). There were exceptions to this finding when the DiE activities failed to offer
students a non-exposed way of participating, and when participation hinged upon their knowledge of curriculum contents.

- DiE allowed most teachers to emphasise their students’ voices to a greater extent. However, spaces for this were precluded by the teachers’ lack of integration of their students’ generative themes into their application of DiE. Although DiE seemed to make the lessons more interesting for most students, by not considering their learners’ thematic interests, teachers failed to completely eschew a banking concept of education (Freire, 2000b).

- According to the available data, it was found that spaces for conscientization were partially opened in the practice of DiE of six of the fifteen teachers who participated in the CPD Programme. Certain openings for critical reflection were elicited by their practice of DiE. Also, potential was found in the activities of still-image and role-play to act as Freirean codifications, whereby students could assume an engaged distance from which to critically reflect. However, in general, it was found that the disconnection between the DiE lessons and students’ generative themes elicited light-hearted responses in students, who did not appear to find enough relevancy in the topics to consider them critically and praxisically. This, along with a lack of moments for reflection, prevented teachers’ conscientising aims from being fully reached. Apart from specific instances, teachers were not liminal servants or critical pedagogues, but functioned more as entertainers in these lessons (McLaren, 1988).

- It was found that securing emotional engagement is essential for the promotion of conscientization in students through DiE. Only when students were interested in the topics explored; were willing and protected enough to enter a dramatic context; and were given opportunities to gain creative ownership and responsibility over that context could they consider the topics authentically and empathically. Only when the stage of “internalizing” (Morgan & Saxton, 2006, p. 28) was provoked by teachers, were spaces opened for students to critically reflect. This occurred at very few moments of the DiE lessons observed in this study.

- Related to the earlier finding, the study showed that emotional engagement was promoted when DiE activities were structured logically, offering a journey of exploration to students. Only a minority of teachers observed during the Application Stage were able to offer such a journey. Contrastingly, the application of isolated or disconnected DiE activities rarely generated deep emotional engagement in students, thus reducing the likelihood of opening up spaces for conscientization.

- The study also found that DiE promoted certain precursors of conscientization, including critical thinking (capacity to make well-grounded judgements), metacognition (recognition of own reflective ability), and motivation (enjoyment of the learning process). While not involving critical reflection and action about social oppression, these precursors arose as necessary preliminary steps for future attempts at developing conscientization in students in this particular context.
Factors that facilitated or hindered opening up spaces for CP through DiE

- Amongst the factors affecting teachers’ opening of spaces for CP though DiE, it was found that teachers required significant skills to create these openings. Choosing appropriate source materials and structuring coherent drama experiences; and developing artistry as drama practitioners – taking the risk of abandoning habitual structures and relating with students differently; modelling belief in the dramatic world; and being flexible enough to negotiate “the play for the teacher” and “the play for the students” (Bolton, 1979, p. 51) – emerged as crucial skills. The latter ability is particularly valuable from a CP perspective. While the indeterminacy of DiE complicated teachers’ work, it also decreased the risk of indoctrination, usually attached to CP (Ellsworth, 1989; Greenhalgh-Spencer, 2014), as it emphasised students’ creative input.

- Teachers’ ability to raise fruitful questions and to provoke reflection also surfaced as an integral part of the necessary artistry. Helping students’ reflect about the DiE experience emerged as essential for them to make sense of their experience, drawing possible connections with their own lives and opening up spaces for conscientization. However, some teachers’ lack of experience in posing such ‘I wonder’ type questions which Heathcote advocates (Wagner, 1976) limited the scope and extent of enquiry possible.

- In general, the format and structure of the CPD Programme, and of the CPD Workshop specifically, supported teachers’ learning of this new methodology and created a collaborative relationship between the drama expert and the classroom teachers. However, the Programme’s time limitations were a hindering factor for most that prevented more sustained support which could have enhanced teachers’ confidence as novel DiE practitioners, their developing artistry, and, consequently, their ability to open up spaces for CP through this approach. Teachers’ work-load and time restrictions during the Programme also limited their possibilities for applying DiE.

- Bar one exception, all six teachers who opened up spaces for both promoting dialogic classrooms and conscientization through DiE were already aligned with, and knowledgeable of CP before the Workshop. It was found that their greater levels of familiarity with the paradigm facilitated their critical application of DiE. It was found that the Programme added a valuable practical method to their repertoire of CP practices.

- Other teachers embraced CP’s dialogic classroom aspect only, which was more aligned with their constructivist tendencies. While the Programme helped them further understand CP, it was insufficient to provoke radical changes in their educational stances.

- My facilitation of the Programme was a central affecting factor. I facilitated teachers’ learning process by establishing a dialogic collaboration with them and modelling aspects of the artistry, like belief in-role and fruitful questioning. However, my time management problems
prevented me from exemplifying the promotion of reflection after DiE experiences. My lack of practice with DiE approaches other than a conventions approach also restricted the breadth of advice I was able to share with teachers. Finally, in my efforts to avoid imposing my views on teachers I sometimes failed to assert my authority as a DiE specialist (Aitken, 2009), not prompting teachers sufficiently to exit their comfort zones and open up greater spaces for CP through DiE.

7.3. Recommendations arising from this study’s findings

Because of the uniqueness of the case, this study’s findings are context-specific. However, a number of recommendations for future practice and policy can be derived from them.

In relation to teacher education programmes aspiring to develop teachers’ application of DiE to open up spaces for CP, a similar overall programme format and structure is recommended. A baseline assessment stage can help make the programme relevant to teachers’ professional lives. Adopting an experiential format for the workshop (Girvan et al., 2016) can allow teachers to visualise their future practice of DiE. Following this workshop with an Application Stage can also help support teachers’ integration of the approach into their classroom practices. Following-up on teachers’ use of the methodology after the programme concludes can be useful to assess the learning process and to determine possible areas for further development. Based on this study’s findings, it is advisable that future such programmes take place over a much longer period of time, possibly incorporating a greater number of DiE specialists to allow a more extended and personalised drama specialist-classroom teacher collaboration. The study also recommends introducing DiE as a form of CP during initial teacher education, preferably with opportunities for practice in school settings. This could contribute to their future successful application of this methodology, while also surmounting the time constraints that CPD programmes usually encounter. Finally, it is recommended that teacher education mentors have extensive expertise in DiE and knowledge of CP in order to fruitfully model best practice to teachers new to this methodology.

In terms of the contents of a teacher education programme on DiE and CP, this study’s findings suggest that it is advisable to focus on DiE approaches that offer students a journey of exploration and emotional engagement, like role-work, rather than on isolated DiE activities, like games. Special emphasis and extended time should be given to analysing and practising the various aspects of the artistry required to open up spaces for CP through DiE. It seems particularly important to encourage teachers to attempt the teacher-in-role strategy, which, according to this study, can be vital in opening up spaces for CP. CPD programmes should teach “protection into role” measures to teachers (Davis, 2014, p. 96), in order to support their application of this
strategy. The importance of addressing their students’ thematic interests, either in their choice of base materials, or in their integration of moments for reflection after DiE experiences, should also be emphasised in these programmes. Accordingly, teachers should be taught about the value of incorporating moments of reflection in their lessons, where students can make sense of DiE and connect it with their realities.

Finally, in relation to policy, this study’s findings suggest that challenging work conditions and heavy accountability measures can hinder Chilean teachers’ innovation. This supports previous research warnings against technocratic views of the teaching profession in Chile (Cavieres-Fernández & Apple, 2016). Consequently, policy makers should advocate for decreasing teachers’ teaching hours and enhancing their planning hours. Also, other forms of evaluating teachers’ performance should be developed, incorporating teachers’ opinions about this, and acknowledging how their various teaching contexts affect their work. This might liberate them from a narrow focus on raising students’ academic achievement, encouraging them to explore alternative educational perspectives and methodologies, like CP and DiE.

7.4. Implications of this study

The findings confirm McLaren’s (1986, 1988) postulate that dramatic methodologies can open up spaces for the practice of this paradigm. Moreover, the findings suggest that DiE can, through appropriate structuring and facilitation, provide an answer to deep-seated criticisms of CP, like the risks of indoctrination and of unequal dialogue in the classroom (Ellsworth, 1989). Additionally, the notion of dramatic codifications that emerged from this study expands previous knowledge on Applied Theatre’s potential to elicit Freirean codifications (Pompeo Nogueira, 2002, 2015). This study’s findings also corroborate the idea, advanced by Bundy et al. (2016), that emotional engagement is necessary for Applied Theatre to foster conscientization. Findings about the importance of teachers’ artistry are also noteworthy. While the notion of teacher artistry has been developed in depth by previous research on process drama (Dunn & Stinson, 2011; Piazzoli, 2018), this study shows that artistry is also required to open up spaces for CP through DiE. This verifies and deepens Freire’s (Shor & Freire, 1987) view of critical teaching as an artistic process. The findings here add to a limited but growing body of knowledge exploring the possibilities of Applied Theatre to enable the practice of CP (Dawson et al., 2011; Finneran & Freebody, 2016b; Freebody & Finneran, 2013; O’Connor, 2013).

This piece of research also has implications for teacher education on Applied Theatre. It adds to previous research showing that teachers who are new to dramatic methodologies need to learn how to plan drama sequences (Dunn & Stinson, 2011). This can help teachers to facilitate a journey of exploration that kindles and maintains students’ emotional engagement. In terms of teacher
education on CP, this research evidences that a CPD programme on DiE can help make the paradigm more accessible to school teachers. This is especially important for those advocates of CP who wish to bridge the gap between its theory and its practice (Gore, 1993; Neumann, 2011, 2013; Teemant et al., 2014).

Also significant is the notion of precursors of conscientization which emerged here as a major finding. This notion suggests that there are necessary preconditions that need to be addressed before critical reflection and action can be promoted in the classroom. This notion could be of interest to CP theorists and practitioners.

Finally, this study has important implications for the Chilean context. The study constitutes one of the first pieces of research about the use of Applied Theatre approaches as a methodology for teaching-and-learning across the curriculum in Chile. Findings evidence that Applied Theatre approaches, originated in foreign geographical contexts, can enhance the practices of Chilean teachers, and ultimately the experiences of their students. Therefore, this study contributes to the development of the nascent field of Chilean Applied Theatre. By offering evidence of the value of DiE in the local context, these findings may be useful for Applied Theatre practitioners and researchers who hope to advocate for a greater inclusion of this methodology in Chilean schools.

7.5. Limitations of this study

This case study had several limitations. Firstly, time constraints prevented a more extensive collaboration with teachers, restricting the available data. As a single researcher/practitioner, I had to divide my time to accommodate the teachers’ busy schedules. Observing more lessons during the Baseline Stage could have given me a more complete understanding of the teachers’ practices before the Workshop. Also, having more opportunities to coplan and coteach with teachers would have enhanced the data about their application of DiE and its impact on their practice of CP. Therefore, if I was to conduct a Programme like this again, I would extend the overall time frame. I would also negotiate with the School that specific slots in the teachers’ weekly schedules were freed for their work on the Programme. Perhaps this could enable teachers to keep a reflective research journal, adding valuable data and supporting their learning process as novice DiE practitioners (Kara, 2015; Taylor, 1996). Additionally, I would involve more DiE researcher/practitioners, so as to allow a stronger coteaching rapport to be built with each teacher.

In this investigation, data about the students’ experiences were limited. My decision not to focus more strongly on students’ views responded to the main focus of this study: teachers’ experiences applying DiE to open up spaces for CP. It also responded to time constraints. But although this decision can be justified, I may have inadvertently marginalised the voices of students. This goes
against my critical research perspective (Kincheloe et al., 2011), since students were directly implicated in the research even if they were not its central focus. Obtaining informed consent was a factor that reduced students’ data, limiting the representativeness of the sample of students who answered Questionnaire 3. To augment available data, I could have applied other data gathering methods with those students whose consent I did obtain. Conducting group interviews, for example, could have resulted in greater data about whether and how teachers’ use of DiE fostered conscientization and dialogic classroom relationships according to the students. While questionnaires were not deemed appropriate for primary-level students, group interviews rather than informal feedback sessions might have successfully gathered their opinions about the DiE lessons. Focusing on students’ experiences more closely could have helped determine if the DiE lessons elicited tension of metaxis in students, leading them to reflect critically about their own realities.

Managing my dual role as researcher and practitioner was also limiting. While it allowed me to have a valuable insider view of the Programme, it also restricted my gaze when facilitating the Workshop or when coteaching. I had to divide my attention on facilitation, mentoring, and researching, rather than just concentrating on the latter. Video-recording lessons, which could have helped surmount this issue, was only conducted partially, so my selectivity as a participant observer was not fully resolved (Flick, 2009). In the teachers’ classrooms this was due to the difficulty of gaining consent from parents and students, which is an aspect that should be considered carefully by future researchers.

A limitation characteristic of case study research is that they do not allow the drawing of generalizations (Yin, 2013). This Programme was a unique case conducted under very specific circumstances that affected the study’s results. Findings could have been dissimilar if the study had been conducted in a different type of school (municipal or private) or in one located outside the Metropolitan area or in a rural context. The School’s unique characteristics in terms of its affiliation with a University and, more importantly, in terms of its CP-oriented ethos also impacted the results. Teachers in a school not inclined towards CP might have met stronger institutional resistance. Although in this study the level taught by teachers or their students’ gender did not impact the openings for CP through DiE significantly, it is possible that dissimilar results would have been reached had the study been performed in a solely primary or secondary school, or in a single-sex institution. Also, it is likely that if all the School’s teaching staff had participated in the Programme findings would have been different as a more coherent institutional approach to change could have emerged, possibly supporting teachers’ learning process. The timing of the Programme, conducted mostly over the second academic semester, also affected the results as teachers’ need to finish their curriculum coverage increased as the end-of-the-year exams approached. Conducting the Workshop and Application Stage earlier in the year might have
expanded teachers’ time to incorporate the new methodology into their practices. Although the study’s findings are context-specific, “naturalistic generalizations” might be possible (Stake, 1995, p. 85). The in-depth description and analysis of data provided, within the space limitations of this report, are meant to enable other researchers to assess the relevance of this study’s findings for their own contexts.

7.6. Possibilities for further research

The study’s implications and limitations suggest several areas of further research. To deepen the exploration of the link between CP and DiE, subsequent research projects could focus more closely on students’ experiences. As Pinto Contreras (2017) points out, although there is a large body of work on Freirean-inspired teaching, a “theory of critical, emancipating, and transforming learning” (p. 140, my translation) has not been sufficiently developed. Freire (1998) suggests crucial abilities necessary for a student to engage in critical reflection and action, like epistemological curiosity. Yet his oeuvre centres mainly on the work of the teacher (Pinto Contreras, 2017). In this study, the abilities of critical thinking, metacognition, and motivation emerged as essential precursors of epistemological curiosity. The importance of emotional engagement was also underscored. However, these were analysed in relation to the teachers’ pedagogy. Future research centred on students’ development of these and other critical abilities through DiE could contribute to build a much needed theory of critical learning. Particularly important would be to examine if critical learning through DiE provokes transformative praxis, impacting students’ opinions and actions beyond the context of the lesson.

The challenge of balancing teacher and student work-loads specifically related to curriculum coverage in a CP inspired model requires considerable attention in the literature. It remained an unresolved challenge in this study also. Further research into the area of teacher leadership as suggested in this study, could provide a mechanism for addressing what Bolton and others have referred to as ‘the play for the teacher’ and ‘the play for the student’. Adopting an integrated style of leadership with a focus on integrating teacher needs with student needs could elicit a win-win scenario and provide a way to meaningfully integrate curriculum contents with students’ generative themes.

Given the embryonic status of research on Applied Theatre in Chile, the possibilities for future investigations in this country are multiple. In particular, further questions related to teacher education on DiE have emerged from this study. One such is whether a more extensive CPD Programme involving a greater number of DiE mentors could enhance Chilean teachers’ artistry and confidence when teaching through DiE. Future research could examine this question. Additionally, a longitudinal study could evaluate the long-term sustainability of teachers’
integration of DiE to their professional repertoire of skills and practices. It could also inquire if any further training opportunities are necessary to support teachers’ developing competency as DiE practitioners. Such research could contribute to the body of knowledge on teacher education on Applied Theatre, adding a Latin American perspective to work conducted in other parts of the world (Dawson et al., 2011; Dunn & Stinson, 2011; Stinson, 2009). Finally, future studies on teacher education on DiE, both in Chile and in other locations, could adopt a participant action research methodology (Brydon-Miller et al., 2011). It could be explored if involving teachers as researchers could strengthen their development as DiE practitioners, as has been suggested by previous scholarship (Neelands, 2005; Piazzoli, 2018; Taylor, 1996).

7.7. Concluding remarks

Knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other. (Freire, 2000b, p. 72)

In the introductory pages of this thesis I made my own interest about this inquiry explicit, believing that a researcher’s worldview gives shape to a research project (Leyva & Speed, 2008). It seems appropriate to conclude this report with a brief reflection about my personal learning throughout this study. In this chapter I have identified the main contributions to knowledge and practice that have resulted from this research journey. As explained here, the journey had several roadblocks and constraints, some of which I was unable to surmount. Both the modest moments of discovery and the difficulties encountered contributed to my re-invention as an emergent researcher and as an Applied Theatre practitioner. I leave this process with an enhanced understanding of the requirements of fruitful practitioner research and with a greater cognisance of the art of drama facilitation. I have a renewed appreciation of my competencies and a painful but illuminating new awareness of my shortcomings as an Applied Theatre researcher and practitioner (Piazzoli, 2018). I also conclude with a deep-seated admiration for the work of the Chilean educators who cooperated in this study, who, on a daily basis and despite several barriers, endeavoured to make learning worthwhile for their students. Above all, inspired by Freire’s words quoted above, I conclude with a “restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful” wish to keep exploring the power of drama and theatre to work within the cracks of neoliberal educational systems.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CPD Workshop lesson plans

SESSION 1: Reflecting about Critical Pedagogy through Drama in Education (3 Hours)

1. Introduction
   - Welcome
   - Objectives of session
     To discuss the notion of Critical Pedagogy (CP) and to experience a number of Drama in Education (DiE) strategies.

   - Warm-up: Name game
     Participants introduce themselves by doing a gesture and saying their names preceded by an adjective that begins with the same letter (Curious Catalina, for example). At the end, volunteers attempt to remember all the gestures and adjectives-names of the group.

2. Presentation of general objectives of the Workshop

   To provide a space for the development of critical pedagogies through the use of DiE as a learning methodology across the curriculum. By the end of the Workshop we will have:
   - Discussed the notion of CP, overviewing its main principles and debates;
   - Reflected critically on our work as teachers;
   - Become familiar with a range of DiE strategies and analysed their critical pedagogical potential.

3. Walk, walk, walk

   Participants walk as if they are:
   - late for work,
   - window-shopping,
   - in a church,
   - police officers,
   - in a cemetery,
   - in a march for education.

4. The museum of teachers
Participants freeze into a still-image of the kind of teacher they would not like to be. Afterwards, they freeze into a still-image of their ideal teacher. Then, they transit from the first to the second statue in five seconds. Finally, half the group observes the other half’s statues. Then, they swap.

5. **The sculptor**
Volunteers build a sculpture in the centre using the other participants as clay to represent a concept instructed in secret. Spectators guess what the sculpture represents. Concepts gradually become more abstract.

6. **Boal’s multiple image of happiness (Boal, 2002, pp. 189-190)**
Five volunteers sculpt their image of happiness using other participants as clay and including themselves in the image. Each remaining participant decides who the happiest person in the five images is and they replace this person, who must exit the sculpture. Then, the ones who exited choose the happiest person but instead of replacing them, they join them. All participants are on stage. Everyone can now change to a happier position if they want. As Boal states, the hope is that this activity fosters reflection about “the oppressed/oppressor side of the participants” (2002, p. 189).

**BREAK**

7. **The notion of CP**
Pieces of paper with quotes about CP are on the floor. Participants stand by the one that calls their attention the most. Groups are formed according to choices. Each group creates a still-image that represents the statement. Afterwards, they incorporate the statement verbally. Then, still-images are shared.

8. **Final reflections and closing**

**SESSION 2: Theoretical overview and first Demonstration Lesson Plan (DLP - 3 hours)**

1. **Game - Four people standing**
Sitting in chairs in a circle. Four volunteers stand up. Using only eye contact, the four people standing must vary but there must be four people standing at all times for a certain amount of time. If a mistake is made, a person recalls something from last session and the group starts over.

2. **Theoretical framework of the study: CP**
The facilitator explains the principles of CP that have been identified in the research and welcomes the participants’ feedback.

3. **Role-on-the-wall**
Participants walk around the classroom. The facilitator calls for groups of 3, 2, 15, 1, and 4. In groups of 3-4 the participants receive a large paper and markers. They draw the outline of a person and write down characteristics of a critical pedagogue. Groups share their work.
BREAKE

4. **Introducing Antigone** (Neelands, 2004a, pp. 70-72)

A drawing of Antigone and Creon by Jean Cocteau (1922) is projected. Participants describe it and analyse it in plenary. The facilitator poses questions about the characters’ gender and their relationship.

![Antigone and Creon by Jean Cocteau](image)

Then, another image of Antigone is projected (by Frederic Leighton, 1882, retrieved from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Antigoneleigh.jpg) and participants describe it and compare it with the previous image:

![Antigone by Frederic Leighton](image)

The facilitator poses the question: which female character seems stronger? Why?

5. **Whoosh!**

The group stands in a circle. Facilitator narrates and volunteers come into the centre to represent the narration. When the facilitator says “whoosh!” the people in the middle re-join the circle and new people can go in to represent.

Narration:
We are in Thebes in Ancient Greece. Two brothers, Eteocles and Polyneices, are fighting over the throne. Eteocles was fighting for Thebes, defending the city, whereas Polyneices had sought allies from abroad and stormed the city walls. They kill each other in battle. WHOOSH!

Creon, uncle of the two brothers now sits in the throne of Thebes surrounded by his advisors. He calls a servant and commands him to bury Eteocles with great honours. Then, Creon writes a new law that forbids anyone from burying the body of Polyneices. If anyone disobeys, says Creon, that person shall be stoned to death. WHOOSH!

Antigone, sister of Eteocles and Polyneices rushes to talk to Ismene, her sister. Ismene is crying over the death of her brothers. Antigone says: “sister, I will bury Polyneices, will you help me?” Ismene, terrified, says: “Go against the orders of the tyrant? We must remember we are born women and are not meant to do battle against men. That would be pointless”. Antigone, turns her back and says “Do what you want. I will bury my brother even if I must die”. And she leaves slamming the door behind her. WHOOSH!

6. Conscience Alley

A volunteer assumes the role of Antigone. The rest of the participants form two lines facing each other. One line says arguments for burying Polyneices, and the other, against, as the volunteer-in-role walks down the alley. When he/she reaches the end, if he/she lifts a piece of cloth it signifies that he/she decided to bury Polyneices. If he/she drops it to the floor, it means the opposite.

7. Advising the King (Hot-seating)
Participants imagine they are advisors of Creon who have just received the following letter:

Dear Advisors to King Creon,

I am very sad to hear of the gruesome battle that took place at our beloved city and of the attack led by Polyneices, the brother of my wife-to-be. I am sadder still to hear that Antigone, having disobeyed the ruling of my father, the King, of leaving Polyneices’ body unburied, has been sentenced to death. As you know, I was to be married to Antigone but no marriage means more to me than my father’s continuing wisdom. Still, I must ask you to advise him to consider the opinion of the people. He is not in a position to know everything that people say or do, or what they feel. His temper terrifies them—everyone will tell him only what he likes to hear. But I, at any rate, can listen. “She covered her brother’s body. Is this indecent?—She should have all the honour that we can give her!” This is the way they talk out there in the city. You must urge my father not to be unchangeable. He must not believe that he alone can be right. He must listen to the people and reconsider his sentence. I will be there shortly to counsel him in person, but, in the meantime, I beg you to fulfil your duty and offer him this much needed guidance.

Sincerely,

Haemon

The facilitator assumes the role of Creon when she sits on the chair. Participants, in role as the advisers, try to counsel him. Before going into role, the facilitator asks them to prepare questions and arguments to present to the king.

8. Closing
A conversation about the various strategies explored today is promoted, reflecting about their critical pedagogical possibilities.

SESSION 3: Second DLP, theoretical overview, and games (5 hours)

1. Recapitulating previous session
2. Game – Mirror and distorted mirror
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Participants form pairs and stand face to face. One is the mirror and imitates the other’s movements. After a few minutes they swap. Then, they join another pair. Three are the mirrors and must imitate the fourth person’s movements but doing the opposite, for example, they go left if the person goes right.

3. **Forming groups**

Participants walk freely around the room. They form groups of:

- $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total participants,
- $\frac{1}{4}$ of the total,
- groups of even numbers,
- groups of uneven numbers,
- $\frac{1}{15}$
- $\frac{2}{8}$ of the total

Facilitator asks them to remember the last groups they formed.

4. **Compound stimulus (Somers, 2002)**

The facilitator in-role as the leader of a company of nutritionists welcomes the participants as if they were the company’s staff. They decide on the name for their newly formed company. The facilitator in-role projects a website (a blog) and shows fashion magazines with passages about weight loss underlined. She explains that these items belong to the girl whose case they will be working on. Participants make inferences about the girl’s situation from the elements shown. The blog shows poems written by the girl and comments from other users that evidence cyber-bullying.

5. **Adapted Mantle of the Expert (MoE)—introducing the case**

The facilitator in-role explains that the girl is suffering from bulimia and depression from bullying. She is being treated by health practitioners, but she also needs the company to help her reach a healthier weight and diet.

The following information about the girl is given:

- Age: 12 years old
- Weight (mass): 35 kg
- Height: 155 cm

‘As usual’, says the facilitator in-role, ‘you will be working in teams so as to provide a solution as fast as possible. Let’s begin by organising our work stations’. The participants go back to the groups they had created previously.

6. **The commissions – first part**

One group calculates the girl’s BMI and determine in which percentile she is according to standards for her age. Another group calculates her ideal weight. A third group calculates the Basic Metabolic
Rate and Daily Caloric Need according to her current and ideal BMI. Information given to participants:

- Formula of Body Mass Index

\[ \text{BMI} = \frac{\text{Kg}}{\text{M}^2} \]

- Graph showing ideal BMI for girls from 5 to 19 years of age (source: WHO 2007)

- Formula for calculating ideal weight (Kg)

\[ \text{Ideal Kg} = \text{normal BMI} \times (\text{height})^2 \]

- Formula for calculating Basic Metabolic Rate

Boys: \((17.5 \times \text{mass in Kg}) + 651\)

Girls: \((12.2 \times \text{mass in Kg}) + 746\)

- Caloric need based on BMR and level of physical activity:

\[ \text{BMR} \times \text{physical activity factor} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Activity Factor</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light physical activity</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate physical activity</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense physical activity</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each group shares their answers with the rest of the participants.

7. **The commissions – second part**

Each group makes suggestions for a segment of the girl’s meal plan (breakfast and tea time; lunch; dinner).

8. **Presenting the plan to the mother**

A volunteer assumes the role of the mother of the patient, a woman from a lower socioeconomic grouping. Participants in-role present their dietary suggestions.

9. **Reflection**

About the themes of the lesson plan, the potential for CP of MoE, and its possible applications.

**BREAK**
10. Theoretical framework of the study: DiE as a form of CP
The facilitator presents theory on DiE and its connection with CP and welcomes the participants’ feedback.

LUNCH BREAK

11. Drama games
- Cadavre exquis (Boal, 2002, p. 85)
Participants create a communal story. Each person says one word at a time. Whenever someone makes a mistake they start again until a story is created.

- What are You Doing? (Winston & Tandy, 2009, pp. 18-19)
Participants form a circle. A volunteer steps into the centre and mimes an action. Another person asks What are you doing? The volunteer answers saying an action different from the one he/she is doing. The person who asked steps into the circle and mimes the action the previous volunteer said, and so on.

- Fruit-salad
A circle of chairs. One volunteer sits on a chair in the middle of the circle. Facilitator names the participants ‘Apple’, ‘Orange’, ‘Banana’ in order around the circle. Whenever she calls out one of these fruits names, the participants who received that name change seats and the person in the centre tries to return to the circle. Whoever is left without a chair takes the one in the middle and calls out another name. When ‘fruit salad’ is called, everyone changes chairs.

- The keeper of the keys (Winston & Tandy, 2009, p. 22)
A volunteer sits blindfolded on a chair in the centre of the circle holding a rolled piece of paper. A set of keys is under the chair. Another volunteer tries to steal the keys. He/she loses if touched by the rolled paper or wins if manages to steal the keys without being touched.

12. Final Reflection and Closing
Conversation about the critical pedagogical potential of DiE and its applications.

SESSION 4: Third DLP and planning and implementation strategies for DiE (2 hours)

1. Game: Zip-zap-boing
Participants form a circle. One by one, they clap and say Zip when turning to the person to their right or Zap when turning to their left. They can send the impulse across the circle by saying Boing.

2. Defending a wolf (Taylor, 2000, pp. 9-18)
- The case
The facilitator tells the adapted version of *The True Story of The Three Little Pigs* by Jon Scieszka (1989). The facilitator turns into a defence attorney and explains the case of the wolf, Juanito Lobos. Participants-in-role as attorneys discuss possible witnesses of his character. Participants form pairs. One will become a witness and the other continues in-role as attorney and interviews him/her. Facilitator out-of-role indicates in secret to witnesses that they might have something to hide about the wolf. After, they report on the interviews and write information on whiteboard.

- The pigs unite
Participants sit in front of the whiteboard. The facilitator in-role as the pig leader says they have obtained inside information about the wolf’s defence. They decide on how to smear the wolf’s image.

- Stereotypes grow
Participants create a gossip mill about the wolf. They walk around the room and as they meet someone they swap their gossip with them, continuously until everyone has heard all the gossips.

- Shattering the stereotype
Facilitator and participants return to the roles of defence attorneys. Facilitator in-role explains that information about Juanito leaked and they need to cleanse his public image. They discuss ways of doing this.

- Contrasting images of wolfness and thought tracking
In small groups, participants imagine that they are a specific group of pigs. As this group of pigs they create two still-images: one before and one after the defence’s campaign to cleanse the wolf’s image. They share their images and the facilitator uses thought-tracking: participants voice their roles’ thoughts when facilitator touches their shoulder. Finally, participants reflect on the way prejudice is reproduced.

3. **Presentation: DiE Planning and Practice**
Presentation of guidelines for planning and practice when working through DiE.

4. **Reflection and closing**
Conversation about the critical pedagogical potential of DiE and its applications.

**SESSION 5: Forum theatre and final reflection (2 hours)**

1. **Game: Guess the leader** *(Taite, n.d., p. 19)*
Participants in a circle. A volunteer steps out of the room. Another volunteer will be the leader and must make movements for the others to follow. The first volunteer returns and must guess who the leader of the movements is.
2. **Forum theatre**

The facilitator comments on the origin and characteristics of this approach. Participants form small groups. Confidentially, they share stories of oppression they have witnessed or lived. They choose one of these situations and create an improvised scene. Groups present their scene. Spect-actors can replace the oppressed protagonist and try solutions when the scene is re-played. Participants reflect on the experience and its possible applications.

3. **Reflecting on the Workshop**
   - Marking the moment (Neelands & Goode, 2015, p. 83)
     Listening to ambient music, participants choose a particularly memorable moment of the sessions. They go to the location in the room where that moment took place and freeze showing what they were doing at the time. Voluntarily, they share their thoughts about the moment chosen.
   - Mind-mapping (Prendergast & Saxton, 2013, p. 197)
     Large pieces of paper are on the floor, one per session of the CPD plus one titled future applications. Participants write down comments and ideas on each piece of paper.

4. **Final reflection and closing**

Conversation about the critical pedagogical potential of DiE and its applications.

**References for the Workshop lesson plans**


**APPENDIX B**

Non-participant observation semi-structured schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Time:</th>
<th>Duration:</th>
<th>Teacher:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year:</th>
<th>No of students:</th>
<th>Subject area:</th>
<th>Unit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning aims:

Setting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basing learning on lived experience:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom relationships (equal/unequal):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links with social justice issues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of (self-) critical reflection:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active methodologies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
Interview semi-structured schedules (English versions)

Interview 1 (School’s Management Board members – Baseline Stage)

1. **Introduction**

2. **Opening question:** What motivates you about working in this School?

3. **General information about the School:**
   - In general, how would you describe the work environment in the School?
   - Could you tell me about the impact of the Educational Reform on the School?
   - What are some of the issues the School is currently facing?

4. **Critical pedagogy (CP):**
   - Where did this impulse come for incorporating CP with more strength?
   - From Questionnaire 1: teachers’ ideological differences
   - Is there a political tone involved in CP?
   - Are parents aware of this tendency?
   - Are students aware of this tendency? Are students aware of their social reality?
   - Are there any difficulties in putting this view into practice? (in relation to standardised tests? teachers, students, parents, external administration)
   - What CP theorists have influenced you?
   - What is your interpretation of critical pedagogy?

5. **Drama in Education (DiE):**
   - How would you characterise the place of the arts in the School? Do teachers ever use art-based methodologies in their teaching of subjects other than Arts? Are students generally interested in the arts?
   - DiE usually requires flexibility and openness to students’ voice and opinion, and generally is characterised by discussion, movement, and a bit of noise in the classroom. How would that fit with the School’s views on discipline? How open do you think that teachers would be to this?
6. **CPDs:**

- From your perspective, what are the School’s expectations of this specific CPD project?

7. **Closing:** anything else you would like to say or ask about this project?

Talk about next steps in the study.

Thank you and switch off recorder.
Interview 2 (Teachers – Baseline Stage)

1. Introduction

2. Opening question: Tell me about the reasons that motivated you to enrol in this Workshop

3. Drama in Education (DiE):
   - What is your previous experience with theatre/drama (personal and/or professional)?
   - Related to responses to question 11 in Questionnaire Nº2 (about teaching strategies):
     - I see here that you always/frequently/occasionally/rarely/never integrate role-play and dramatizations in your lessons, why do you think that is? (Don’t ask this if they marked “I prefer not to answer”).
     - What do you think dramatic activities (could) add to your lessons?
     - What are (would be) your apprehensions about incorporating DiE in your lessons?
     - What are (would be) your students’ reactions to the incorporation of dramatic activities in your lessons?

4. Critical Pedagogy (CP):
   - Related to question 16 in Questionnaire Nº2 (about familiarity with the topics of the CPD):
     - If this participant’s answer is “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar” with CP/Paulo Freire:
       When did you first come across the notion of CP/the work of Paulo Freire? How would you define CP?
     - If this participant’s answer is “not very familiar with” or “don’t know” CP/Paulo Freire:
       Do you identify with a particular educational perspective? (Link here with answer to question 15 in Questionnaire Nº2 about educators/theorists that inspire their work).
   - Related to questions 17a and 17b in Questionnaire Nº2 (about self-perception as critical pedagogue):
     - If this participant considers him/herself as a critical pedagogue:
       - What do you think is the importance of CP in our society?
       - In this School? Do you think the School promotes CP?
       - To what extent are you able to practice this pedagogical perspective in your teaching? Could you give an example of how you practice CP in your lessons? What are some of the difficulties you face? How do your students respond to this approach?
     - If this participant does not consider him/herself a critical pedagogue (or does not know):
       Probe deeper into why he/she answered in this way and what motivates him/her to try become a critical pedagogue by participating in this Workshop.

5. Their work in the School:
   - In relation to the answer to question 9 in Questionnaire Nº2:
If this participant feels “very represented” or “somewhat represented” by the School’s principles and values, ask by which principles and/or values.

- In relation to answers to question 12a and 12b (about planning): Integrating DiE in your lessons will require you to spend some time modifying your planning, how do you feel about that? Would coplanning with me help ease this process?

- About creating a dialogical classroom environment:
  - Link to question 12 in Questionnaire Nº2 about considering students’ needs and interests when planning and adapting their plans according to students’ feedback, and to question 11 about connecting curricular contents with students’ lives:
    - How do you access students’ voice and life experiences?
    - How do you invite students’ feedback? How do you respond to their feedback?
  - How do (would) you deal with possible power imbalances that could take place (for example when (if) a few students dominate the conversation or when (if) some students do not participate)?
  - (Link to question 13 in Questionnaire Nº2) How do (would) you deal with prejudicial or discriminatory opinions or behaviour in the classroom?

- Link to question 11 in Questionnaire Nº2 (about projects outside the classroom):
  - If they answered always/frequently/occasionally: Do any of these projects relate to the community outside the School?
  - If they answer “no” to previous question (and also for those who answered rarely/never/prefer not to answer in Questionnaire Nº2): Would you consider such projects? Why/why not?
  - To all: To your knowledge, has the School organised projects with the local community in recent years? Does the School encourage teachers to develop such projects?

6. The Workshop (show the chronological view of the Programme):
- Would you be interested in/have sufficient time to read some literature about critical pedagogy/drama in education in preparation for the Workshop?
- About applying the learning developed in the Workshop: would you be open to co-teaching? (Link this to question 18 in Questionnaire Nº2 about helpful professional development).
- During the Application Stage, I would like to ask you to keep a reflective journal: would you prefer it to be very structured (having a specific set of questions with specific time to answer them) or less structured (writing more freely)?

7. Closing: anything else you would like to say or ask about this project?
Talk about next steps in the study.
Thanks and switch off recorder.
Interview 3 (Teachers – Application Stage)

1. **Introduction**

2. **Opening question**: Tell me about your overall experience applying Drama in Education (DiE) as a form of Critical Pedagogy (CP).

3. **General questions:**
   - What is CP to you? Has your notion changed as a result of this experience? If yes, how?
   - What is your general impression of DiE as a methodology for teaching and learning? And as a form of CP?
   - Can you tell me about the ways in which your application of DiE as CP has been successful?
   - Have you faced any challenges/difficulties when applying this approach?
   - How do you perceive your students’ general reception of this methodology?
   - What is your impression of the process of coplanning and coteaching?

4. **About DiE:**
   - Can you think of DiE activities that were particularly useful/not useful? Why?
   - What can you tell me about the students’ engagement with DiE?

5. **Specific questions:**
   - Did DiE help you to make teaching and learning more relevant to the lives of your students? How?
   - To what extent has your use of DiE promoted critical dialogue in your classroom? Differences in dialogue generated in DiE and in more traditional lessons? Tell me about the classroom environment (do you think most students felt free/comfortable to participate? Was an equal space created? Why/why not?)
   - According to your perception, did students identify connections between curricular contents and social justice issues? How? In general, did the students realise of these connections by themselves or did you have to point them out explicitly?
   - Did students reflect about their own role in social oppression/transformation? How? Tell me about the students’ responses to this type of self-reflection.
   - In general how did reflection take place? What was your role in encouraging reflection?

6. **Final general questions:**
   - Do you see yourself as a critical pedagogue? Has your self-perception as a critical pedagogue changed as a result of your use of DiE?

7. **Closing**: Anything else you would like to say or ask about this project?
   - Talk about next steps in the study.
   - Thanks and switch off recorder.
APPENDIX D
Questionnaires (English versions)

Questionnaire 1 (Head of Technical Pedagogical Unit – Baseline Stage)

Dear Respondent,

Please read each question and follow the instructions for answering. Completing this questionnaire should not take you more than 15 minutes. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for your time and collaboration.

Catalina Villanueva, PhD in Education Student, Trinity College Dublin

1. What is your role in relation to the School?

2. How long have you been in that role?

3a. On average, how many Research Projects are conducted in the School?

Please tick only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than one every two years</th>
<th>One every two years</th>
<th>One per year</th>
<th>More than one per year</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b. How many of these projects are developed or organised by the University?

Please tick only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On average, how many student teachers from the University does the School receive per year?

5a. How often do Continuing Professional Development initiatives for teachers take place in the School?
Please tick only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less than once per year</th>
<th>Once per year</th>
<th>More than once per year</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5b. How many of the CPD initiatives are developed or organised by the University?

Please tick only one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>About half</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5c. What are the criteria when deciding which CPD initiatives to run? Please rank the following statements in order of importance on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important.

___ a. The interests of the teachers.
___ b. Areas for improvement of the teachers and school environment.
___ c. The yearly goals of the School.
___ d. The goals of the University.
___ f. The results from standardised tests applied to students.
___ g. Other. Please specify:____________________________________________________

5d. In your opinion, what makes a CPD initiative successful?

5e. In your opinion, what makes a CPD initiative unsuccessful?
6. On average, how often:

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than once a year</th>
<th>Less than 2 times per semester</th>
<th>At least 2 times per semester</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>More than once a month</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Do meetings between representatives from the School and from the University take place?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Do the administrators from the University visit the School?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Are the teachers’ practices observed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The Institutional Educational Project was written in collaboration between the University and the School’s community.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communication channels between the University and the School are open.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The School’s vision of playing a “‘conscientising’ role” that promotes equality and social awareness is generally shared by the teaching staff.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Instances for reflection for the School’s teaching staff are constantly promoted.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. In your opinion, what are the biggest strengths of the School?

9. In your opinion, what are the biggest challenges that the School currently faces?

10a. How would you define critical pedagogy?

10b. In your opinion, how important is critical pedagogy to this School’s identity?

*Please tick only one box*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>A little important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10c. Please elaborate on your response to previous question (10b). If relevant, please include practical examples which illustrate the role of critical pedagogy in the School.

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire.
Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire forms part of the doctoral research I am developing at the School of Education, Trinity College Dublin, under the supervision of Dr Carmel O’Sullivan, which practical phase will take place with the collaboration of the School. The aim of this questionnaire is to learn more about your general views of education and about your teaching practice. This information is very valuable as it will guide the development of the CPD Workshop in which you have enrolled.

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any point. The information you provide will be treated confidentially and nobody but me and my supervisor will have access to your completed questionnaire. Pseudonyms will be used in all reports that derive from this study.

Please read each question and follow the instructions for answering. Completing this questionnaire should not take you more than 30 minutes. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you very much for your time, commitment, and collaboration.

Catalina Villanueva, PhD in Education Student, Trinity College Dublin

General information about yourself*

1. Please state your name: ____________________________

2. Please indicate your age range:
   Please tick one box.
   □ 25 or less
   □ 26 – 29
   □ 30 – 39
   □ 40 – 49
   □ 50 – 59
   □ 60 or more

3. How many years have you been working as a teacher?
   ________ Years

4. How many years have you been working in this School?
   ________ Years

5. Do you work as a teacher in another school?
   Please tick one box.
6. What grade(s) are you teaching in this School this academic year?
________________________________________________________

7. What subject(s) do you teach in this School this academic year?

*Please tick all the boxes that apply to you.*

- [ ] Language and Communication
- [ ] Foreign Language
- [ ] Mathematics
- [ ] Natural Sciences (Primary)
- [ ] Chemistry
- [ ] Physics
- [ ] Biology
- [ ] History, Geography, and Social Sciences
- [ ] Technological Education
- [ ] Visual Arts
- [ ] Musical Arts
- [ ] Physical and Health Education
- [ ] Religion
- [ ] Other. *Please specify:* __________________________

**About the School**

**8. How represented do you feel by the School’s principles and values?**

*Please tick one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very represented</th>
<th>Somewhat represented</th>
<th>Not at all represented</th>
<th>I don’t know the School’s principles and values</th>
<th>I prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In relation to your work in this School, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The School grants me sufficient autonomy to do my work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I dedicate more hours a week to my work in the School than the hours I am hired for.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I like working with colleagues to plan teaching and learning activities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I find it hard to teach in the School because of the students’ lack of discipline.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I generally have a good relationship with my students in this School.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About your teaching practice**

10. In an average school month, how often do you employ the following strategies in your lessons in the School?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>I prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Establish links between curricular contents and socio-political issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Connect curricular contents with my students’ lives and experiences.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. You ask questions and the students answer them.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. You give lectures while the students take notes.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students present orally in front of the class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Organise practical projects outside the classroom (e.g. field trips).</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Students work with school textbooks.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Incorporate individual-work activities in the lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Integrate group-work activities in the lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Incorporate debates in which the students discuss about the topics of the lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Incorporate dramatizations and role-play in your lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About planning lessons**

**11a. Thinking about how you plan your lessons, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. When I plan I consider the needs and interests of the students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I like having a prepared plan before teaching a lesson.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I adjust my way of teaching and the materials I use according to the students’ feedback.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I am not given sufficient time to plan my lessons during my work hours.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e. I like varying my plans when I work with a new group of students.</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f. I prefer to stick with a plan that I know works rather than trying something new.</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g. I frequently integrate activities that are suggested in the Study Programmes written by the Ministry of Education.</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h. I find it hard to stray from my planning when I teach.</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i. I use my plans as general rather than strict guidelines.</strong></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**11b. How often do you plan?**

*Please tick one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Around once a year</th>
<th>Around once every semester</th>
<th>Around once a month</th>
<th>Before each lesson</th>
<th>I prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About education in general**

12. **Thinking about schooling in general, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Schools are places where social inequalities are reproduced.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Schools are places where social inequalities can be resisted and transformed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The knowledge imparted in schools is more important than knowledge acquired through experience outside of school.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong> Schools must work to promote social justice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong> Teachers and textbooks are the only valid sources of knowledge in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong> The main purpose of teachers should be to prepare students to integrate the job market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g.</strong> The main purpose of teachers should be to impart knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h.</strong> The main goal of teachers should be to empower students to realise their capacity to transform society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i.</strong> One of the main goals of teachers should be to make students conscious of inequalities in society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>j.</strong> One of the main goals of teachers should be to raise their students’ academic achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>k.</strong> Teachers should be willing to reflect upon their practices as a result of the feedback they receive from students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>l.</strong> Teachers should not allow the expression of prejudicial or discriminatory opinions in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What is your opinion about the Educational Reform that is currently being developed in our country?
14. Please name three educators or theorists that inspire your work as a teacher.

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

______________________________________________________

About the topics of the CPD Workshop you have enrolled in (“Drama in Education and Critical Pedagogy”)

15. How familiar are you with…

Please tick only one box per statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat familiar</th>
<th>Not very familiar</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The notion of “critical pedagogy”?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The work of Brazilian educator Paulo Freire?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Theatre pedagogy?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16a. Do you consider yourself a critical pedagogue?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ Don’t know

16b. Could you please elaborate on your answer to the previous question (16a)?

About CPD courses for teachers

17. In your opinion, what characterises a helpful CPD course for teachers?

Please tick as many boxes as apply to you.

☐ a. It is well structured and planned.
☐ b. It encourages practical work rather than just listening to theory.
☐ c. The facilitators are enthusiastic and engaging.
☐ d. It offers practical guidance.
| ☐ e. The knowledge, skills, and/or strategies offered can be applied immediately in the classroom. |
| ☐ f. It provides materials and resources. |
| ☐ g. It offers knowledge, skills and/or strategies that are new for the teachers. |
| ☐ h. It is relevant to our needs or interests in our professional context. |
| ☐ i. Other. Please specify: ____________________________________________________________________________ |

18. What are your expectations for this CPD Workshop (Drama in Education and Critical Pedagogy)?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.
Questionnaire 3 (Secondary-level students – Application Stage)

Teacher: ___________  Subject: ___________  Date: ___________

Dear Student,

This questionnaire aims at gathering information about your experience of the drama-based lessons led by your teacher. Your answers are very valuable for this study because they will allow us to know about your perspective of this new approach.

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you are free to stop taking part at any point. Your answers will be anonymous and confidential, and you do not need to provide your name.

We will read the questions together first and then you will have 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Please answer the questions following the instructions given. Remember that this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer according to your own experience and opinion. If you have any questions you can ask me or your teacher.

Thank you very much!

Catalina Villanueva, PhD in Education Student, Trinity College Dublin

---

1. You are:
   Please tick one box.
   □ Male  □ Female

2. How old are you?
   (Please write your age in numbers, for example: 14).
   ______ years old

3. In general, how much do you like this Subject Area?
   Please tick one box.
   I like it very much  I like it  I don’t mind it  I dislike it  I dislike it very much
   □  □  □  □  □

4. How much did you like learning through drama?
   Please tick one box.
   I liked it very much  I liked it  I didn’t mind it  I disliked it  I disliked it very much
   □  □  □  □  □
5. Please **assign a grade from 1 to 7** (where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree) **to the following aspects of the drama lessons.**

*Please circle only one number per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a. The themes of the lessons were connected to my life.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. These lessons were very active, we moved a lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. I would like to continue having lessons like these ones.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. As a group we generally had good behaviour during the lessons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. During these lessons, I felt that my opinion was heard.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. During these lessons, I felt free to express my opinion even if it was different from my classmates’ opinion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. These lessons made me think about some of the injustices in our society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. During these lessons, I felt free to express my opinion even if it was different from my teacher’s opinion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. These lessons made me feel motivated to change the world for the better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In relation to your teacher’s role in these drama lessons, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The teacher seemed to enjoy the lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The teacher encouraged everyone to participate.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The teacher seemed interested in listening to what I had to say.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The teacher gave us opportunities to make decisions about what happened in the lessons.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7a. In general, how did these drama lessons make you feel?

*Please tick as many boxes as appropriate.*

- ☐ a. Motivation
- ☐ b. Optimism
- ☐ c. Pessimism
- ☐ d. Anger
- ☐ e. Sadness
- ☐ f. Happiness
- ☐ g. Powerlessness
- ☐ h. Embarrassment
- ☐ i. Empowerment
- ☐ j. Hope
- ☐ k. Interest
- ☐ l. Boredom
- ☐ m. Anxiety
7b. Please explain what parts or aspects of the lessons made you feel that way.

8. In your view, what were these lessons trying to make you to think about?

9. Did the topics of these lessons relate to real life? How?

10. What were your three favourite things about these lessons?

1) ____________________________________________

2) ____________________________________________
11. If you could change anything about these lessons, what would you change?

1) ________________________________________________________________

2) ________________________________________________________________

3) ________________________________________________________________

12. What was your favourite activity? Why?

13. What was your least favourite activity? Why?

Thank you very much for your help.
Dear Teacher,

This questionnaire forms part of the doctoral research that I am developing at the School of Education, Trinity College Dublin, under the supervision of Dr Carmel O’Sullivan, which practical phase took place in the School thanks to your collaboration.

The aim of this questionnaire is to know your opinion about drama education and the CPD project we conducted at the School, as well as gathering information about its impact on your teaching practice. Your answers are crucial for this study, as they will help us understand if this approach is useful on a long-term basis. Your answers could also help illuminate future attempts to integrate Drama in Education (DiE) as a form of Critical Pedagogy (CP) in the Chilean classroom.

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from this study at any point. The information you provide will be treated confidentially. Nobody but me and my supervisor will have access to your completed questionnaire and pseudonyms will be used in all reports that derive from this study.

Please read each question and follow the instructions for answering. Completing this questionnaire should not take you more than 40 minutes. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me by email.

Thank you very much for your time, commitment, and collaboration.

Catalina Villanueva, PhD in Education Student, Trinity College Dublin

1. Name: ____________________________________________________________

2. Have you applied the drama strategies that you learned in the CPD Workshop in your own lessons?


☐ Yes (go to question 3b)

☐ No (go to question 3a)

3a. Which of the following factors influenced your decision NOT to apply the drama strategies learned in your lessons?

Please tick as many boxes as apply.

☐ a. The drama strategies explored are not appropriate for the reality of the School.

☐ b. Lack of time.
☐ c. Lack of support from colleagues.

☐ d. Drama does not suit my teaching style.

☐ e. Lack of support from the researcher (Catalina).

☐ f. Lack of support from the School’s authorities.

☐ g. I don’t find drama to be a useful teaching tool for the subject/level I teach.

☐ h. I did not find possible connections between drama and the content I was teaching.

☐ i. The CPD Workshop was not enough for me to feel able to apply the drama strategies in my lessons.

☐ j. Other: ________________________________________________________________

PLEASE GO TO QUESTION No.14

---

3b. Since the second half of October, how often have you integrated DiE in your lessons?

*Please tick one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More than once a week</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Once every two weeks</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Less than once a month</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Why? Please elaborate on your answer to the previous question (3b).

---

5. How likely are you to integrate drama in your lessons in the next academic year (2017)?

*Please tick one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Not very likely</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. At this point, how confident do you feel to use drama in your lessons?

*Please tick one box.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very confident</th>
<th>Somewhat confident</th>
<th>Not very confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About DiE**

7. According to your experience of DiE as an approach to teaching and learning, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. DiE motivates students to learn.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I enjoy using DiE as a teaching and learning approach.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DiE only works with certain types of students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I find it hard to deal with behaviour management when using DiE.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. DiE does not suit my style as a teacher.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. DiE allows all students to participate in their own way.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. DiE is an ineffective pedagogy to teach curricular contents.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. DiE is very time consuming.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. DiE only works for the humanities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Students prefer traditional lessons over DiE.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Integrating DiE in my lessons has had a positive impact on my students’ learning.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. DiE is easier to do with younger students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. DiE makes learning more meaningful for students.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. It is easy to lose control of the lesson when teaching through DiE.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8. In relation to DiE as a form of CP, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. DiE has helped me put CP into practice.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It is more effective to have classroom discussions about social justice issues than to explore them through DiE.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. DiE helps encourage students to empathise.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. DiE empowers students to take ownership of their own learning.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Students find it difficult to identify the connection between their real lives and the drama.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. DiE helps to make students aware of inequalities in society.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The lessons I taught through DiE touched on social justice issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. There is too much emphasis on action in DiE and not enough space for reflection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. DiE encourages the development of critical thinking in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. In DiE, teacher and students relate in a less hierarchical way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Students have fun doing DiE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. DiE can very easily become fun with little attention to content and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. DiE makes knowledge more relevant to students’ lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. DiE helps students to become aware of their ability to change society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Which of the following DiE strategies have you applied in your lessons?

Please tick as many boxes as relevant.

- ☐ Teacher-in-Role (teacher takes on a role and interacts with students).
- ☐ Forum Theatre (spect-actors can intervene to change the unjust outcome of a scene).
- ☐ Still-Images (students form a statue with their bodies to represent something).
- ☐ Decision Alley (students form two lines; one line provides arguments for something and the other line, against).
- ☐ Whoosh! or Active Narration (teacher narrates and students go to the centre of the circle to represent the narration).
- ☐ Improvisation (students, and sometimes teacher, assume a role and improvise a situation).
- ☐ Mantle of the Expert (students in role of experts must solve a problem).
10. How valuable do you consider these DiE strategies?

*Please rate each strategy in a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is not useful and 7 very useful.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Teacher-in-Role (teacher takes on a role and interacts with students).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Forum Theatre (spectators can intervene to change the unjust outcome of a scene).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Still-Images (students form a statue with their bodies to represent something).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Decision Alley (students form two lines; one line provides arguments for something and the other line, against).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Whoosh! or Active Narration (teacher narrates and students go to the centre of the circle to represent the narration).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Improvisation (students, and sometimes teacher, assume a role and improvise a situation).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Mantle of the Expert (students in role of experts must solve a problem).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What positive aspects did DiE contribute to your teaching practice?
12. What were the biggest challenges you found when you applied DiE strategies in your classroom?

About the Project in General

13. Thinking about this CPD project, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Integrating DiE as a form of CP has had a positive impact on my teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I need more practice with the DiE specialist (Catalina) before feeling confident to use the approach by myself.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Participating in this CPD project has helped me reflect about my own work as a teacher.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. This CPD project was a waste of time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I have felt supported by the School throughout my participation in the CPD project.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Participating in this CPD project has increased my own engagement in teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Participating in this CPD project demanded too much time and effort from me.  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

h. I would recommend this CPD project to a colleague.  
☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

About the CPD Workshop

(15 hours, conducted between the 30th of June and the 27th of July 2016).

14. On a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is poor and 7 is excellent, what grade would you give the CPD Workshop about DiE and CP?

*Please tick one box*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Thinking about the CPD Workshop, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

*Please tick only one box per statement.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. It emphasized practical work over just listening to theory.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It could have been better structured and planned.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The facilitator was enthusiastic and motivating.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. It offered practical advice.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The knowledge, skills and/or strategies offered were able to be applied in the classroom right away.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The materials and resources provided were helpful.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. It included new knowledge, skills and/or strategies for teachers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. It was irrelevant for my needs and/or interests in my professional context.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The strategies taught are suitable to be applied with students from different levels and abilities.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. The CPD Workshop fulfilled my expectations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. The CPD Workshop was too short.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. The CPD Workshop helped me understand/rethink CP.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 16. In your opinion, which were the most positive aspects of the CPD Workshop?

### 17. What aspects of the CPD Workshop would you improve?

### Final Questions

### 18. Today, do you consider yourself a critical pedagogue?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I’m not sure
19. How would you define CP?

20. After your experience in this CPD Programme, what is your opinion of DiE as a form of CP?

Thank you very much for your valuable participation.
APPENDIX E
Informed consent forms (English versions)

Consent form: School Principal

The school has been invited to participate in this research project which is being carried out by Catalina Villanueva. The school’s participation is voluntary and I, as Principal, have the right to withdraw the school at any point without consequences of any kind, wherein the school’s data will be destroyed.

The study is designed to investigate drama as a form of critical pedagogy in the Chilean school context. The practical phase of this study involves 5 stages (see chronological view of the fieldwork attached),

- **Preparation Stage**: General information about the school has been gathered via school documents and a questionnaire to be filled by school’s administrative staff. An invitation to participate in the project will be extended to teachers in the school and those who enrol will be asked to complete a questionnaire about their teaching practices and views.

- **Stage 1**: Baseline information about the teacher-participants’ practices will be gathered via individual interviews and observation of teacher-participants’ lessons by the researcher. School staff will also be interviewed individually to deepen the information they provided via questionnaires in the previous stage. Upon agreement, these interviews will be audio recorded. The researcher will offer to facilitate a brief sample drama lesson for the teacher-participants with a group of students of the school.

- **Stage 2**: A 21 hour Continuing Professional Development Workshop for the teacher-participants on drama as a form of critical pedagogy will be taught by the researcher at the school. If all participants agree, the Workshop will be video recorded.

- **Stage 3**: Teacher-participants will be invited to put into practice the learning developed through the CPD Workshop by integrating drama in their lessons. These lessons will be observed by the researcher. Teachers will be offered opportunities to co-plan and co-teach in collaboration with the researcher. In order to understand the process of application from the teacher-participants’ point of view, they will be interviewed individually and they will be asked to keep a reflective journal. Upon agreement, the interviews will be audio recorded. At the end of one of the drama-based lessons taught by each teacher, their students will be asked to fill in a brief anonymous questionnaire to gain information about the students’ view of this teaching approach.
- **Stage 4:** Data will be gathered about the sustainability and impact of the project on the teacher-participants’ practices. Two months after the end of Stage 3, teacher-participants will be asked to complete a final questionnaire. They will also be invited to be interviewed individually via the Internet by the researcher. Upon agreement, the interviews will be audio recorded.

I am aware that there is room for modification of the above plan in light of the school’s and participants’ interests and needs.

This research may benefit the school because it will offer an opportunity for teachers to learn and practice an innovative teaching approach based on drama and to reflect upon their pedagogical work. As a result of attending the CPD Workshop, teachers will receive a Certificate of Participation from Trinity College Dublin Ireland. In addition, this research may benefit the field of education generally by examining in practice drama as a form of critical pedagogy in a variety of subject areas. The findings of this research will be available at my desk upon request.

Because the school’s staff, teachers, and students will meet the researcher face to face, they will not remain anonymous to her. However, any information which is obtained from them during this research will be treated confidentially. This will be done by using pseudonyms in all reports and by making every effort to avoid making the participants’ identities recognisable in the reports. I am aware that if a role in the school is unique, these participants might still be identifiable in the reports.

All the data will be digitalised and kept in the researcher’s password-protected personal files for her analysis. Five years after the research is finished, data will be destroyed. Data from this research project may be published in the future.

If I have any questions about this research I can ask the researcher, Catalina Villanueva by email: villanum@tcd.ie

I understand what is involved in this research and I agree for the school to participate in the study. I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

```
Name of participant

Signature of participant         Date
```
Consent Form: School’s Management Board Members

I am invited to collaborate in this research project which is being carried out by Catalina Villanueva, PhD in Education student at Trinity College Dublin. My participation is voluntary. Even if I agree to participate now, I can withdraw at any time without any consequences of any kind and without having to give explanations, wherein my data will be destroyed.

This study aims to investigate drama as a form of critical pedagogy in the Chilean school context. My school has been invited to collaborate in the practical phase of this study, which involves the conduction of a CPD Workshop for teachers in the school and the subsequent application of the learning developed through the Workshop in the teachers’ practices.

If I agree to participate in this study, I will be interviewed individually by the researcher about the school’s ethos and practices. If I agree, this interview will be audio recorded. Only the researcher and her supervisor will have access to this recording.

In addition, as a collaborator in this study, I will be asked to help distributing and retrieving questionnaires amongst the teachers who participate in the CPD Workshop. Questionnaires will be made available to me at my workplace in envelopes ready for distribution, and they will be collected from my workplace.

This research may benefit me and my school because it will offer an opportunity for teachers to learn and practice an innovative teaching and learning approach based on drama and to reflect upon their pedagogical work. This research may benefit the field of education generally by examining in practice drama as a form of critical pedagogy in a variety of subject areas. The findings of this research will be available at the school principal’s office upon request.

Because I have met the researcher face to face, I will not remain anonymous to her. However, any information which is obtained from me during this research will be treated confidentially. This will be done by using pseudonyms in all reports and by making every effort to avoid making my identity recognisable in the reports. I am aware that, given that my role in the school is unique, I might still be identifiable in the reports.

All the data will be digitalised and kept in the researcher’s password-protected personal files for her analysis. Five years after the research is finished, data will be destroyed. Data from this research project may be published in the future.

If I have any questions about this research I can ask the researcher, Catalina Villanueva by email: villanum@tcd.ie. I can also contact her via mobile phone (90962337), from the 2nd of May, 2016 until the 30th of September, 2016.
I understand what is involved in the research and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Name of participant

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

Consent Questionnaire 1, included at the outset of the questionnaire (Head of Technical Professional Unit)

Your participation in this questionnaire is voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any point. The information you provide will be treated confidentially. Because you hold a specific role in your institution, anonymity and non-traceability of your identity cannot be guaranteed. Still, pseudonyms will be used in all reports that derive from this study.
My name is Catalina Villanueva, and I am a Chilean PhD in Education student at Trinity College Dublin in Ireland. I am an actress and drama educator. I am inviting you to participate in this study that will take place in your school and that aims to explore drama in education as a form of critical pedagogy in the Chilean school context.

What is drama in education?

Drama brings the elements and skills of theatre to the classroom as a teaching and learning methodology that can be applied in a variety of subject areas. Research from all over the world has shown that drama in education can have a positive impact on students’ and teachers’ motivation, making curricular contents more relevant and meaningful for students and allowing them to experience knowledge in a more active way. Drama can also invite students to reflect deeply about the world around them.

What is this study about?

Because of the characteristics of drama in education, this study wants to explore if drama can be useful to teachers in Chilean schools to develop a critical pedagogy in their teaching and learning practices.

In order to examine this, I will teach a Continuing Professional Development Workshop for a group of teachers in your school where we will learn about drama as a teaching and learning approach that can be conducive of critical pedagogy. Before this Workshop, from May 2016, I will be visiting the school on a number of occasions to learn more about the teacher-participants and about the school in general. After the Workshop, I will collaborate with each teacher-participant creating and applying drama-based lessons plans in the school. I will be available to work with teachers until the end of September 2016.

What would your participation involve?

The practical phase of this study consists of 5 different stages (see chronological view of the project at the end of this document). Your participation in each stage would involve:

Preparation Stage: (May 2016)

- To answer a brief questionnaire about your educational views and practices.

Stage 1: (May – June 2016)

- To be interviewed individually by me to deepen the information provided through the questionnaire. If you agree, this interview will be audio recorded.
- To allow me to observe your practice in the school on a consensually agreed number of occasions to know more about you as a teacher.
- If you and other teacher-participants find it useful, you might be invited to observe a brief sample drama lesson taught by me for a group of students in the school.

**Stage 2: (July 2016)**
- To participate in a CPD Workshop on drama as a form of critical pedagogy taught by me of approximately 21 hours duration that will take place in the school. If you and the other participants agree, the lessons will be video recorded and photographed.

**Stage 3: (August – September 2016)**
- To develop and apply drama-based lessons with my support, the number of which will be decided consensually. I will offer to co-plan and co-teach with you. I will also ask to observe and register (video and/or photographs) some of the drama-based lessons that you teach on your own.
- To keep a reflective journal, the frequency and extension of which will be agreed in consensus according to your interests and availability.
- To be interviewed individually by me to learn more about your experience of integrating drama in your practice. If you agree, this interview will be audio recorded.

**Stage 4: (December 2016/ January 2017)**
- To answer a brief questionnaire about the impact of this project on your teaching practice.
- Those teachers who are interested and available will be invited to participate in a short online individual interview with me to deepen the information provided in the previous questionnaires.

Your participation in this research is **completely voluntary**. Even if you agree to participate now, you can withdraw at any time without any consequences of any kind and without having to give explanations, wherein your data will be destroyed.

**What are the benefits associated to your participation in this study?**

As a result of your participation in the CPD Workshop, you will receive a **Certificate from Trinity College Dublin** confirming that you took part in this Workshop. This CPD Workshop is completely free of charge to you and your school.

This research may benefit you and your school because it will offer you an opportunity to learn and practice an innovative teaching approach based on drama and to reflect upon your pedagogical work.

**Are there any risks associated to your participation in this study?**
No. This study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education, Trinity College Dublin, where I study. In addition, this study has the support of the authorities of the school and of the University that administers the school.

**What will happen with the information gathered from you?**

All information which is obtained from you during this research will be treated **confidentially**. This will be done by using pseudonyms in all reports and by making every effort to avoid making your identity recognisable in the reports. However, if your role in the school is unique, you might still be identifiable in the reports.

Nobody but me and my supervisor will be able to access raw data from this study. All the raw data will be digitalised and kept in my password-protected personal files for my analysis. Data from this research project, such as quotes from what you say or write, may be used in my future publications but your name will not appear in any of them. Five years after the research is finished, data will be destroyed.

The findings of this research will be available at the school principal’s desk upon request. In addition, I will offer opportunities to discuss the findings with the teacher-participants.

**Contact details:**

If you have any questions about this research please do not hesitate to contact me by email: villanum@tcd.ie. You can also contact me via mobile phone (90962337), from the 2nd of May, 2016 until the 30th of September, 2016.

I invite you to participate in this innovative experience and to become a co-researcher of this study!

Thank you very much!

*(To be completed by the teacher-participant)*

I understand what is involved in this research and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

Name of participant

Signature of participant  Date
Information sheet for parents and guardians and secondary-level students

My name is Catalina Villanueva, and I am a Chilean PhD in Education student at Trinity College Dublin in Ireland. I am an actress and drama educator. I am inviting you to participate in this study that will take place in your school and that aims to explore drama in education as a form of critical pedagogy in the Chilean school context.

What is this study about?
This research wants to explore drama as a form of critical pedagogy in a Chilean school.

What is drama?
Drama brings the language of theatre to the classroom as a way to teach and learn a variety of topics from different subject areas. It has been proven to be an effective teaching and learning approach in schools.

What is critical pedagogy?
Critical pedagogy believes that education should encourage social justice. This means that all people in our society should have equal rights and that nobody should be discriminated. Critical pedagogy encourages students to analyse their political role as members of society and the ways in which we can all contribute to have a fairer world.

How will my School participate in this study?
Some of the teachers in your school will participate in a Workshop where they will learn about drama as a teaching approach. Before the Workshop, I will observe some of their lessons and will talk to them and other school staff to get general information about your school and about the work of the teachers. After the Workshop, the teachers and I will develop drama-based lessons for them to teach at your school.

What will my participation involve?
I will first explain the research to you. If you agree to participate, I will observe and take notes in some of your regular lessons. I may also teach a brief drama lesson to you and your classmates who also agree to participate. During the second semester, your teacher and I will teach you some lessons using drama. I will teach, observe, and take notes during these lessons. Finally, I will ask you to complete a short questionnaire to find out what you think about drama as a teaching and learning approach.
Am I obligated to participate?
No, your participation is voluntary. Even if you agree to participate now, you can decide not to continue to participate later without any consequences in which case all your specific information will be destroyed.

Is the research safe?
Yes. Even though examining social justice issues can make students feel intense emotions, drama as a way of teaching and learning can help providing a fun and safe context for this kind of work. In addition, this study has been approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the School of Education, Trinity College Dublin, where I study.

What will happen with the information gathered from me?
Only I and my supervisor will have direct access to the information you provide. I will digitalise the information and store it in password protected devices. Your name will not appear in any reports and a fictitious name will be used to protect your privacy.

I might use the findings of this study, including something that you say (written, verbal or from your artwork) in my reports, in specialised magazines or conferences, but your name will not be revealed. When the research finishes, I will use some of the information I gathered to write a doctoral thesis (a book about the research) for the University where I am studying. Five years after the research is finished, all data will be destroyed.

What can I do if I have questions or comments about the research?
You can contact me via email at villanum@tcd.ie. I will be happy to talk to you about the research and try to answer any questions you might have.

THANK YOU FOR READING THIS INFORMATION SHEET!
Consent form: Parents and Guardians

Participant ID: __________________________

Please tick

I have read the Information Sheet and I have had a chance to think about the information and ask all the questions I wanted to.

I understand that it is OK for my child to stop taking part in the research at any time without giving any explanation.

I understand that the researcher might include quotes from my child (written, verbal or from their artwork) in reports, when she is talking at conferences or in research papers and I give my permission for her to do this. She will not use my child’s name – any quotes/written work or artwork will be anonymous.

I agree to:

1) Allow the researcher to attend my child’s regular lessons to observe and take notes.

2) Allow my child to be taught at the school by the researcher, along with the regular teacher.

3) Allow my child’s lesson to be recorded. This video will only be seen by the researcher and her supervisor.

4) Allow my child to complete an anonymous questionnaire about his/her experience of drama-based lessons taught by his/her teacher.

5) Allow my child’s visual image to be used by the researcher for academic purposes (her doctoral thesis, academic conferences, academic or professional journals). I give consent with no claim for payment.

I understand that a school teacher will be present in these occasions.

I agree for my child to take part in the above study.

________________________________________
Name

____________________
Date

____________________
Signature
Consent form: Secondary-level students

Student ID: ________________________________

I was explained what this research is about and I have had time to think and ask questions. □

I understand that it is OK for me to stop taking part at any time and that I do not have to say why. □

I understand that the researcher might like to use something that I say (written, verbal or from my artwork) in her reports, when she is talking at conferences or in research papers and I give my permission for her to do this. She will not use my name. □

I agree to:

1) Allow the researcher to attend my regular lessons to observe and take notes. □

2) Allow the researcher to teach me in collaboration with my regular teacher. □

3) Allow my image to be captured in those lessons. □

4) Answer questions about my experience in these lessons. □

5) Allow the researcher to use photographs of these lessons in her reports or when presenting at conferences or academic journals. □

I understand that a teacher from the school will be present on all these occasions.

I agree to take part in the above study.

______________________________
Name

________________________
Date

________________________
Signature
APPENDIX F
Thematic map

Final thematic map developed through thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) – Created online with bubbl.us
APPENDIX G
Sample of coding process

Below is a sample of field notes from the first session of the CPD Workshop registered in my Research Journal in NVivo 10. The description of the activities is written in Spanish, while the emerging analysis is in English:

Below is a sample from the coding of a video of the Workshop’s first session conducted through NVivo 10:
Below is a sample of field notes from the Application Stage registered in my Research Journal in NVivo 10. The highlighted passages have been coded under the nodes displayed on the right hand side of the screen (coding stripes):

Below is a sample of data coded under the node ‘Uncrowining teachers’ in NVivo 10. On the right hand side is some of the other nodes under which extracts of these data are coded:
[Texto extrayendo con Google Lens]
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